

copy to - WEIBER  
VOLUME 2, NUMBER 3

WHO'S KILLING THE TRUTH?

by  
Harrison E. Livingstone

In his article in The Fourth Decade (January, 1995) reviewing my book, Killing The Truth, Gary Mack makes repeated misrepresentations. He implies but does not say that I did not in fact measure, draw, and observe the long bullet scar on the sidewalk on the north side of Elm near the lamppost. I have a very precise record of that which I performed in the early Seventies. I think it more than passing strange that as soon as I conducted my study of it, and the fact that the bullet scar pointed to the old storm drain on the south end of the overpass, the block of cement was removed and is in the possession of Gary Mack himself, with claimed fabric in the cement which, he says, discounts the possibility of a bullet strike there. How come this is not in the National Archives? Why does he not ship it there? Does he plan to exhibit it with the mummy of some important person at a future carnival? The storm drain was then paved over, completing the obliteration of this important piece of our history.

To answer his question about my "careless research" of the bullet scar, which is one more piece of evidence I cannot get at because it is in Mack's closet along with the Bronson film, is that yes, in my opinion, there is no question but that it is a bullet scar. But I am no expert and have no way of knowing other than from comparisons in my mind's eye with previously seen bullet scars on sidewalks. The presence of fabric in the cement proves nothing at all, except that all sorts of trash gets into freshly laid cement, along with the dog and hand prints and expressions of love and identity written with sticks. Does Mack deal with the fact that it pointed to the storm drain? In all of his brilliant wisdom in this case, did he study that himself before he removed it? He fails to deal with this issue but instead attacks me on a side issue of fibers in the cement.

He states that my last book presented a "bizarre collection of false and misleading information that has no basis in fact." What is that information? How come the book got past one of the best libel lawyers in the United States? Is Mack so afraid of the new scientific information about to be published in my

Harrison E. Livingstone  
3025 Abell  
Baltimore, MD 21218

new book? I'm very glad that Mack has told us several instances of his personal blocking of my research into the Bronson film and other areas. Again, he has this film? How? Why? First he seems to say that Bronson's lawyer Sigalos has it, but then it is clear that Mack has it himself, and then got a cold so that the police officers working with me were unable to see it when they were in town. We tried repeatedly to see it. How come Mack has it and Sigalos or his lawyer does not? That is what he says in this article in The Fourth Decade. How come his Bronson film is not in the National Archives?

Does Mack answer or deal with the fact that the FBI report on the film stated that it does not show the assassination sequence, and that my interview with Bronson was accurate when he denied that the film could have possibly shown the assassination sequence because he was taking snapshots of the murder? His photos were published.

The plain facts are that Robert Groden has repeatedly promised to introduce "never before seen" films of the assassination, and he and Mack fielded a film now known as the Bronson film which cannot exist, except for the final moment when Jackie is on the trunk, when Bronson got his camera going. Mack's own writing in this article makes it clear that he cannot explain or dare show this film to anyone seriously studying it. Why is it not in the National Archives at this point?

Mack is the man who put forward a tape he and Mary Ferrell claimed contained the actual shots of the assassination. This tape was calculated to explode in our faces, as it did. They, along with Robert Groden, even complied with the Committee's needs in placing a motorcycle where it could not be. Mack was filmed listening to the tape and announcing each shot with a strike downward of his hand. Now he tells us that this was a mistake. I never read or saw his retraction, and those issues of TCI, which Mack edited, were and are unavailable. A little late, don't you think, to retract it and make a new claim entirely without foundation: "I wrote in his March 1980 issue...that the noises I thought were shots were actually in an earlier part of the recording" (that's Show Biz!), when the National Science Foundation and the very policeman he and Ferrell and Groden needed to record the shots proved that it could not have happened? A little late, after misleading not just the United States House of Representatives and their committee on assassination, but the entire nation?

Does Mack answer directly in this article the charge that

there are no sirens for two full minutes on that tape after the shooting obviously had to have happened, after Decker lets us know in no uncertain terms he has got to get his men up on the overpass to see what happened there? This is what puts the lie to his false tape. He can stand behind it until doomsday, but it goes to the trash heap along with his Bronson film.

As for my "antics" at the JAMA press conference, I received wide spread praise for mounting what many called the only effective on the spot criticism of the abortion that occurred there. My statements were calm and well reasoned, and good enough to be carried that night on Dan Rather's CBS news, as well as CNBC that night. I made such a good impression, in fact, that my own press conference the following week was packed so greatly with all the same newsmen that the physician, Dr. Larry Altman, who is the medical reporter for the NY Times, had to stand on a chair for two hours. It was so packed that I did not see Mack's close associate, Robert Groden, in the room handing out mug shots of me, thus shooting down my credibility at perhaps the most important moment of the entire case in the last thirty years, as I presented for the first time some of the autopsy witnesses who denounced the photographs and X-rays. JAMA had no witnesses.

As for Mack's attack on Madeleine Brown, stating that I am a questionable judge of character because I accept some of what he says, Madeleine is a fine person. The false and politically inspired charges against Madeleine Brown, common in the way Texas does things, were thrown out of court, and therefore Mack's statements are not only false but show his constant mistakes and incompetence to the detriment of his victims and this country.

I have no question but the main evidence Madeleine Brown puts forward about LBJ's foreknowledge of the assassination is correct. Mack is more interested in protecting LBJ, so he falsely attacks the personal character of a 78 year old lady—an important witness. Even Jim Marrs will do battle with Mack on that one, and defend Madeleine and what she says in these pages.

Mack's credibility is blown by his own words and actions. This latest foray into the realm of criticism reveals him as an intellectual flyweight. R.I.P.