

Harrison Edward Livingstone

3025 Abell Avenue

Baltimore, Md. 21218

Dec 1, 1991

Dear Harold andillian

I hope you have a nice Holiday Season,
and are feeling better.

My book is gradually slipping into
production, as fast as I get jobs done.
Working on captions now. The Pub. is
being very nice to me. Put me up at
the Berkshire in NYC for four days. I
went to the Met. & saw Pavarotti &
Kathleen Battle.

Thought you'd be interested to read
what Groden thinks of you.

Tom Wilson may be a charleton. Hard
to judge yet, but I'm getting that under
control.

Best,

God bless -

Harry

Lifton tried to interfere w my publisher (insider!)

the head moved?" "Yes, every time you moved that head."³³

I doubt that gray would come from a brass military jacketed bullet, but it certainly could have come from some other type of bullet which more readily exploded on or in the head.

I believe that the large hole in the back of the head was connected to the area just above and in front of the right ear where we see this flap when a piece of bone evidently fell in between the two areas. This would be compatible with Dr. Humes' description before the Warren Commission that the hole extended all along the side of the head. The scalp was intact in between, or across the top of the head from ear to ear, and held the head together.

In Dallas, they simply did not see the full extent of the wound. The head was shattered like an egg shell and could just barely hold much of its shape, held together by what scalp remained.

GRODEN

Robert Groden seized upon or was directed to write about what others already had noted at the House Committee Hearings: That the Back of the Head pictures did not show the large exit and missing scalp which had been observed by all the witnesses who saw the body at any time that day or night.

The question must be raised, how come Groden--a self proclaimed photographic expert raised to the position of God and arbiter in the independent investigation by all of us--only pointed out forgery in one of the photographs, and did not mention the others and the many obvious problems with the pictures, or notice that they were not only incompatible with the X-rays but each other? Groden wrote and the House Committee printed a long article listing all of his dissents.³⁴

Groden's pictures have no background, no floor, no tables, no walls, no anything. Just blacked out areas and shadows. Why?

How did Groden come to walk out of the House Assassinations Committee with a set of the autopsy photographs, when the CIA's liaison with the Committee, Regis Blahut, was arrested for having tampered with them after the photos were found outside of the safe in the Committee's offices?

When I and Steve Parks of the Baltimore Sun first saw the pictures in Robert's possession, they were stamped "National Archives" on the back, in a large black box several inches across, with a black box border around the writing. We were told they were leaked.

At the time, I thought they looked awfully suspicious, as though they were water colors--clever paintings, as I told him. The Committee--as quoted above--commented at length on the lack of clarity in these pictures.

Frankly, that lack of clarity is impossible. We saw the grisly pictures of the dead Martin Luther King at a meeting of

the Committee, and they were clear as a bell, as are all other autopsy photographs. Why? Clearly, we are not supposed to see too much.

The reason is that a lot is covered over in them--painted over, reshaped, airbrushed.

What we have with Lifton is someone who staked out the other half of the territory Groden staked out, leaving no third possibility for the rest of us. We are left with an either/or situation with this evidence: Either the body was altered, or the picture of the back of the head is a composite matte line insertion. Nothing in between.

How can Groden narrate the Zapruder film and not be able to answer the questions "What is that coming out of his face?" when the President is struck in the head with a bullet? "I don't know," he says, though at times he has explained the Blob as being sunlight reflecting off the open skull flap on the right side of the head by the ear, and off Jackie's hat. This is clearly untrue, as President Kennedy's head falls to her lap, and one sees the Blob sticking to his face all the way down for many frames.

Since he was my partner, I know that his M.O. is exaggeration, distortion, and denial. Now you see it, now you don't. He has for a long time played a shell game with this evidence. At times, I was shown different views of the back of the head. In one of them, there is clearly a line of small black crescents, a half an inch long and a half an inch apart all the way around where he says there is a matte line--just as though a can opener had been operating there. I ask him what that is--"I don't know" he responds. Sometime later he hauls out a picture of the back of the head again, and I can't find the crescents. "Where are the crescents?" "I don't know. You imagined that. There aren't any."

Well, Mark Crouch saw them too.

In 1979, Steve Parks and I saw both a color set of photographs and a black and white set at Groden's house. Later the black and white set seems to have disappeared. He says he never had black and whites, but David Lifton and numerous others saw them. Groden doesn't seem to have them anymore.

Groden claimed never to have had the Stare of Death picture, but both Lifton and myself recorded at different times having seen this unique photograph in color in Groden's possession. It was later reported to be in the possession of Mike Marsh, who showed that and a left lateral view in color to Warren Graham, Jr., who said that Marsh told him he had got them from a doctor in Charlotte, North Carolina, who got them from Dr. Cyril Wecht.

Groden says that he personally interviewed Dr. Malcolm Perry, an interview I set up, but Perry, Jeff Price, the reporter, and Steve Parks, the editor from the Sun, deny that

Groden was allowed inside the interview. His pictures were not shown to Perry. The Sun (and most if not all newspapers) would never allow an outsider along on any personal interview, anyway.

For many years Groden did a good job of publicising the case, and keeping alive public interest in it. That is what he was primarily good for, making no substantive discoveries himself. But along with his message of governmental conspiracy came a vast amount of misinformation and mistake. One reason I wrote this book is that I made the mistake of accepting some of the things he told me without question, and put them in my last book. I figured his expertise had to be far superior to mine in photographic and related issues, never dreaming he was an amateur in many respects. That, and those things which I deleted at his request constituted all of the input he had in that book, written ten years before he first saw it. This is how some mistakes crept in.

We all have a degree of moral and legal responsibility in this life. We have to pay taxes, pay our debts, and honor our word. There are plenty among us who don't do so, but whom live for some cause--even though their actions and lives are to a certain extent of a criminal nature--are not excused from the rules of life and society. These rules are sometimes hard on us. In some respects, Groden is a hero, but in others, he is evil personified. We can all catch ahold of some cause or another, like the murdering drug dealer who presents his paper at a conference of researchers, hoping to gain legitimacy, like the Mafiosi when well healed, attempting to forget his past, buy into legitimate business, and put up a good front.

But one who continually points the finger at others for "Stealing my research," who in fact lives off the discoveries and writing of everyone else, off the blood, sweat and tears of other's writing--a sacred business--who trades in pirated and stolen films and videos, who invariably does that which he accuses other of doing to him, hoping no-one knows the truth, and does it in such a major way but denies even to himself what he is doing, that that is what he is, is no longer helping but causing vast pain to honest people. To quote Kelvyn Anderson in a local Pennsylvania paper writing about the Oliver Stone film³⁵ quoting Groden, "'Josiah Thompson, Sylvia Meagher and Harold Weisberg have had their work ripped off for years, and I know what it's like. I went public with this in '73, and again in '76, when it took off,' he said. There were three people taking credit for his discoveries less than three months after Groden made his findings public. It was a disgruntled and discredited charleton, who, rebuffed by Stone, leaked a copy of the 'JFK' script to Washington Post writer George Lardner, Groden said." This is what Groden thinks of Harold Weisberg, his close friend and mentor all of these many years, who was the one who gave Stone's script to George Lardner.³⁶ Groden (as does his chief competitor on the West Coast) frames others for his own acts,

And what did he discover in 1923 and
1926? What?

and calls the man who did the most for him a charleton.

Anderson goes on to quote Groden saying, "'This so-called critic leaked it because he was convinced Stone was going to do his story,' Groden said. 'Oliver saw through him at the very beginning, and wouldn't deal with him. His revenge was leaking the script.'" Groden, a little boy in knee pants next to the irascible old Weisberg, calls him a "so-called critic." The above totally off base attack by Groden on a fellow critic, totally wrong, is an example of so many wrong statements by him over the years, such as nearly every single statement which Groden said and claimed on the Geraldo Rivera show in November, 1991, was wrong. Not that Groden sold out his partner when he was already signed to a competing film deal and "Oliver" came calling and offered a vast amount for his property. Not that he didn't sell the manuscript to a competing author that was later plagiarised and later published, (that same manuscript was later published with Groden's name on it!) and take thousands of dollars from someone who was himself Groden's arch enemy trying to destroy his partner, and not that Groden didn't sell property belonging to other researchers and not pay them, repeatedly getting himself into conflicts of interest situations with all the sense of invulnerability of a child. And how does he have any of the property he has? Did he steal it? Has he ever respected anyone else's copyright?

Nothing in between. No painting. Lately I have found this sort of conflict in many of the facets of the evidence, and each time there is often an either/or situation, but no third possibility, no other ground to stand on, unless you look for it real hard. And now I am finding them, and for those who have co-opted this case, the answers I am coming up with seem to work a lot better.

1. 7 HSCA 70.
2. 7 HSCA 46.
3. 7 HSCA 46.
4. 7 HSCA p. 37-8.
5. 7 HSCA 47.
6. Interviews of September 22 and October 10, 1991.
7. Interview of September 27, 1991.
8. Interview of October 11, 1991.
9. 7 HSCA 28.