

August 2, 1992

U *walsh*
mlem

This is to thank you for the materials you sent. I was glad to talk to on the phone the other night, and hope that if you are up this way at the AARC sometime, we can visit. You can always stay here.

Martin Shackelford will come here from Michigan to go with me to the National Archives, and maybe you can come with us.

Ralph Nader has filed suit for us on the basis of my books alleging forgery. I am working with them now on that.

My publisher wants a third book so I have gotten a good start on it.

Can you research the firearms issue for me? I continually get reports from veterans that a military jacketed bullet will not in fact deform if it hits bone. I would appreciate it if you could collect ballistics articles. I will reimburse you well if you can prepare a dossier for me to study. But I need all aspects of the questions.

Please do not be offended, but I feel that you are making a couple of mistakes in method. 1) Merely because there is a quote from a Dallas doctor in the JAMA article which seems to impugn Crenshaw in general does not mean that you have to give any weight to it at all if it is out of context and not linked to a specific charge or statement that Crenshaw has made. Remember, you are dealing with outright yellow journalism, and you have as much a duty to expose that for what it is. Attack it directly.

This is doubly true because as you well know all of these doctors have previously stated nearly all of the facts that Crenshaw has stated, and secondly, those of us who were close to the doctors at the Dallas forum at the end on the podium heard several of them reaffirm specifics in the evidence: The throat wound, the missing back of the head, etc., not to speak of their general reaffirmation of all that they might have said in 1963.

As I previously stated, it is deeply offensive to me to ignore the very many interviews I have conducted in recent times and published which illuminate their feelings on these issues, and just discount eyewitness testimony altogether if it is stated at this time, out of fear that they were repudiating

their original statements in the JAMA article, which is simply not true. It is too easy to want to get rid of eyewitness testimony in general, but the virtue of my work is the compilation of definitive eye witness testimony. You'll see it in the film. How else can you truly discount the photos and X-rays, except for the intrinsic conflicts?

You say in your letter of July 9: "Unless Breo and JAMA misquoted or mislead the 5 doctors...." JAMA took them out of context. That is how it's done.

The plain fact is, Breo and Lundberg worked an outright fraud. It was Doublespeak and a propaganda exercise.

You yourself lose all credibility when you do not sign your work, or always properly source it.

I realize the problem everyone has in wondering who to believe or how to interpret the language and evidence, and that is what my new book tries to tackle head on. If you will send a list of the questions that need to be answered, I will try to answer them.

A film company connected with NBC, (NBC people have been working with me behind the scenes for the past two years) has asked me up to NYC this week, so perhaps I will finally get my documentary out. I have been told that I will have editorial control, but there are financial problems for all that I want to do. I will be concentrating on the witnesses.

Please stop scaring me with some of the general statements you write. If I am wrong, say so. Certainly give credit where credit is do. The following statement is completely false: "These contradictions have led many (underline mine) to suggest that the fragment could not have actually been present on the skull." And, "This 4-inch discrepancy in the location of the head entry wound attracted a great deal of attention when it was revealed." With whom? I recall that my book was the first one to bring that question out in the open, and I simply do not know who else has tried to make an issue out of that or the big fragment on the outer table of skull. Nobody noticed it when the Clark panel report was issued. Nobody or almost nobody picked up on it in 1979. Can you show documentation of the contrary?

! we have to pull together. I believe I am getting in a position to break the case, but it is crucial now not to impugn the Dallas doctors in any way. They are steadfast and unchanged, so we need them for their statements now. You seriously undermine them.

Don't be offended. I make a lot of mistakes and can be wrong about this, but I would hate to think that all of that interviewing is worthless, which is what you are saying. You write as though that monumental work never existed.

Sincerely,

Harry

Harrison E. Livingstone