

## **CHAPTER 31**

### **How Crazy Can You Be — And Be Publishable?**

For the single-bullet theory to have any possibility of any validity that bullet has to have emerged from its theorized spectacular career without the loss of any metal not acknowledged to have been lost by the Commission. By limiting itself to the weight of the fragments recovered from Texas Governor John B. Connally's wrist the Commission decided that the weight loss was within the two grains it says that bullet lost after being fired.

And of that two grains, a half-grain is lost in the barrel when the bullet is fired.

The Commission is explicit in stating that in passing through the President that bullet struck no bone. If it did, that would disprove the Report and the theory in several ways. One is by being at the least scratched by any bone or bones, as this "magic bullet" was not, and the other is if any other fragments were deposited.

The official evidence establishes that the theorized bullet did leave other deposits inside Connally and that there were other fragments not recovered. So the ignored and misrepresented truth is that in terms of the official mythology itself the theorized basis of the official "solution" is impossible. Meaning knowingly false!

Unrecovered fragments remained in Connally's chest and thigh and the Dallas doctors testified to fragments being washed out and not recovered when his wrist was cleansed.

As the two admitted fragments that remained in the body were seen on the X-rays each is too long to have come from the base of 399.

So it is not only the weight of what the bullet allegedly lost that destroys the official mythology. It

also does not and cannot account for these two fragments that remained in Connally's body.

This is without question clear in my books that Livingstone had, cited and used.

(Much more is in *Never Again!* 1995)

In my response to Harry's silly question he pretends has substance I did not limit myself to that panel report. I also referred him to the other related official reports, also kept secret until that report was disclosed, when not suited the Justice Department's political purposes, by the Navy autopsy prosecutors who also had been taken in secret to examine and report on all autopsy film, pictures and X-rays both.

As I told Harry many times and told his publisher including with facsimiles of the relevant pages from Post Mortem, those prosecutors as much as said that in the X-rays they saw bullet fragments in the body. This is the strange language to which they resorted:

The x-ray films established that there were small metallic fragments in the head.

However, careful examination at the autopsy, and the photographs and x-rays taken during autopsy, revealed no evidence of a bullet or of a major portion of a bullet in the body of the President and revealed no evidence of any missile wounds other than those described above.

Aside from this there is also an explanatory footnote on that page (578):

Note the careful game with words under "NO OTHER WOUNDS." Dr. Humes' sworn testimony is that the x-rays revealed no evidence of bullet fragments at any point in the President's body except the head. The official solution of the crime cannot stand unless that testimony is true, for the bullet officially alleged to have wounded the neck,

399, is already impossibly burdened by requirement that it have produced all of Connally's wounds as well. Here the doctors say only that the x-rays reveal "no evidence of a bullet or major portion of a bullet in the body of the Presidents" (as distinguished from the head). What this peculiar language must mean, and as the second panel later confirmed, is that there are indeed "minor portions of a bullet" in the President's body, a negation of the official solution.

Commander James J. Humes was in charge of the autopsy. His fellow naval pathologist assistant of same rank was J. Thornton Boswell. They were assisted by Army lieutenant colonel Pierre Finck.

This language is "very difficult" for him "to follow?"

There is nothing obscure of in any way "incomprehensible" about this language. Moreover, Harvard Man that he is, Harry had this book and had no need to ask me anything at all about its contents. Or, as he described it, "crucial" contents.

In their report the Justice Department panel did not play that kind of games with words. It is explicit in stating that there are metal fragments in that area:

Neck Region : Films #8, 9 and 10 allowed visualization of the lower neck.

Subcutaneous emphysema is present just to the right of the cervical spine immediately above the apex of the right lung. Also several small metallic fragments are present in this region. (page 592)

Again I provided an explanatory footnote:

In describing the all too few x-rays of the “neck region” the panel demolishes the Warren Report and the integrity of the autopsy doctors’ testimony. Humes had sworn there were no metallic fragments in the neck visible on the x-rays (2H361). 399 is clearly unfragmented, yet it had to have caused the neck wounds for the Commission’s case to survive. Thus, the panel’s statement that “several small metallic fragments are present” in the neck region, although lacking the detail and precision that might be expected from such eminences, is sufficient to prove that the Report and the autopsy findings on which it was based are irreversibly wrong.

Shame on Harvard if Harry can’t understand this language!

Shame on him too!

For that matter, shame on any high-school student who can’t understand it.

From and in that panel report and in Post Mortem (page 590) I also brought to light the fact that these most eminent of the experts the Department of Justice could muster from around the country also said that the shot to the President head was four inches higher on it than the Warren report says:

On one of the lateral films of the skull (#2), a hole measuring approximately 8 mm. in diameter on the outer surface of the skull and as much as 20 mm. on the internal surface can be seen in profile approximately 100 mm. above the external occipital protuberance.

Because the panel was careful not to appear to be disputing anything official at all it did not note the enormous difference between its observation and the Commission’s. Four inches on the head is an

enormous difference!

So that readers not familiar with the official autopsy report or the Commission's not to miss the significance, again I added a footnote:

Here we learn that the entrance wound in the head, never measured by the autopsy doctors who preferred to locate it merely as "slightly above" the occipital protuberance, was actually 100 mm. above that point. No silly millimeter here. That is 4 inches higher than the autopsy doctors made out, putting the wound high on the back of the President's head instead of near the hairline as the doctors swore to and depicted on drawings. This is how the panel "supported" the autopsy report.

Is a law degree atop one from Harvard necessary to understand this?

Is there a reasonable intelligent child who would not understand it?

Indeed, after Harry read the book and praised it, can it be that he read it without understanding it when he read it? Did he have to ask me any questions at all? And can it be possible that when I referred him to those pages he then read them and then did not understand them?

After what I quote from page 376 above about my allegedly no being able to answer his question he has this explanation, again nothing omitted in direct quotations:

"His problem is that he systematically take opposing position for the sole purpose of defeating you personally, of being cantankerous and contrary."

It goes without saying that once I published this I could not take any position "contrary" to it. Moreover, there was no need to and in fact I never did, despite his saying this. Without any source

indicated, naturally, there being none. And my “position” predates his by more than a decade.

It may well be, however that after explaining this to him time after time, with all that time wasted for me, I may well have spoken severely. Whether or not that would have been justified the explicitness and comprehensibility of what I did explain and refer him to may well have angered me.

In what follows to which I return later he ever quotes my indignation over having to explain this very matter to him time after time. His quotation from my letter of November 20,1992

“I’m not going to waste any more time trying to explain or argue with you about the autopsy film. Not at least until you answer the question I’ve asked you first. (Why would anyone fake film to create fake film that defeated the purpose of the faking, by disproving the Report.) If you do not understand the report of the Department of Justice (Clark) Panel that is your problem and it exists only because you begin with a preconception that was not based on fact and are unwilling to face the fact that you cling to it still. In a simple response, that report utterly destroys the Warren Report and if you cannot understand without explanation, you are out of your depth on the entire thing.”

Now this in not only on the very page in which he says I “never answered” him - it is in the very same long paragraph of what is obviously the most transparently dishonest writing. He calls himself a liar and he illustrates the exasperation faced by anyone who tries to talk simply facts with him in an effort to be of help to him, when he clings to baseless preconceptions that is vital to his theorizing.

I did try to help him, and nobody ever needed help any more.

He replied, well, he wrote me four days later (pages 376-7) He then acknowledged that the panel did place the entry of the fatal head shot four inches higher. He follows that with a misrepresentation, that I “sent” him “down to the National Archives.” I did not and having no control over him, could not have. And I had and have no interest in what he did or does.

It would have been awkward for him to have told the truth, if truth had occurred to him, because of what he said, seeking sympathy for what he represents as his great personal sacrifice in continuing with the writing that yielded much more money for him and attention he never dreamed of. His first words on his Preface are that after his second book “I said I would not write another book on the assassination...(but he got) too many letters.... Besides, I knew I wasn’t done I certainly hope I can get back to my life somewhere along the line.”

That is not quite the same as his boastful letters in which he said his publisher was so pleased with that second book that he immediately signed him to a new contract. In one version it is for this book and another and in another version it is for this book and two others. He did not write those letters to me but I have xeroxes of them.

Then there is the truth about his going to the Archives. He phoned me and told me almost as soon as he finished promoting his second book to tell me that he was working on a TV documentary with someone in New York. In connection with that he wanted to go to the Archives to study the Zapruder film. Imagine, a man who has already published two large books allegedly on the assassination, a point easily disputed, and he still had not made his own study of that film? His coauthor of his first book has the clearest copies of it other than the original and did much work on it, including making a slow-motion version at my suggestion, and this greatest expert of them all, Harrison Edward Livingstone, still had not studied the film of the assassination about which he nonetheless wrote two fat books!

How much could he have known about the fact of the assassination, or cared about the fact, as distinguished from his theories, when he still had not studied the most important film of the assassination - after two fat books and all those public appearances in which he spoke as an expert on it!

Or, in his publisher's modest puffing up of his killing of the truth to reviewers, after he had "long led the (sic) independent investigation into the murder of JFK"?

I did not and I could not have "sent" him to the Archives or anywhere else. All I did is respond to his question, what should he look for in it. This was not, as he then told me untruthfully, for his work on any "TV documentary." It was for this book he says in his Preface he had not planned to write but was forced into!

In response to his asking what he should look for in the Zapruder film, I told him, "you won't like it, Harry." But he persisted and I did tell him what to look for that he would not like. But from reading his new book I seriously underestimated the power of his mind to invent conspiracies, to kill and against him and to see what is not to be seen - does not exist.

To a rational person what I referred him to in Post Mortem, the question he says now that I never answered, destroyed the basis for his first book, that the autopsy film was faked. What I warned him he would not like in the Zapruder film, to a rational person, destroyed the basis of his second book, that the back of the President's head had been blown out.

The Commission was to have published nine more slides from that film than it did. When I complained to the Archives they put those nine slides in the tray of frames available for viewing. I immediately spent a long time studying those nine frames, in late 1966 or early 1967. What was immediately apparent is that when as it does the back of the President's head becomes visible in less than two seconds after the fatal shot there is no sign of any bullet hole, of any bleeding or of any blood on the back of his head or on his shirt or jacket collar.

For those seeking facts, this, of course, consigns High Trash 2 to the garbage heap, as it does with his nonsense that is the basis of High Trash 1, that the autopsy film was faked.

Three weeks later Harry went there. He then phoned me to tell me he had seen clearly what I warned him he would not want to see. He then, for the one and only time of all the great amount of time he wasted for me, admitted being wrong. "I was wrong," he said, "And I thank you for telling me."

But to Harry, Harry is never wrong. When fact proves him wrong, commonplace in reality, that fact is not fact but is faked. He added it to his long list imagined fakeries that in time he came to believe were all part of a conspiracy against him. It was not long after his first and to me only acknowledgment that he was ever wrong about anything that with his unique brilliance he recognized still another of those many conspiracies against him and his work.

His current fanciful account of that Archive trip is that "What it does is throw into question the autopsy pictures.. There was no bone or scalp in that area. I know that beyond a shadow of doubt,.... I found proof of it. I will be able to get copies of that and prove it to the world."

In almost 800 pages he has no such picture.

And it assuredly is not because he saw that the back of the head had been blown out, his words, "There was no bone or scalp in that area."

He has a long chapter in his killing of the truth on some of the films, "11. The Bronson, Zapruder and Other Films," pages 311-342. It is, as we shall see, a remarkable demonstration of his ignorance of the established fact of the assassination and the Commission's information. Sure enough, when he got to those frames that were to have been published by the Commission and were not, those added to the viewing trays of slides after my complaint, his unique genius for seeing what others do not and cannot see and for seeing what is not there to be seen, came to his rescue. As he put it on Page 335, "This is where I feel the film has been forged."

Here it is only his "feel." Typically, that feel "becomes established and unquestionable truth and

proof of that truth. He in his own concept carries this forward from his much bragged of chapter, "Diana Bowron," (pages 179-199.) She was one of the Parkland Hospital nurses who attended the President there.

To call this crazy is not exaggerated. Moreover, not knowing he would try to cover his ignorance and stupidity this way but knowing that his second book is based on the back of the head having been blown out - imagine writing that when he could at any time seen that movie, and he did not - I wrote and offered his publisher a color picture that proves the back of the head was both in tact and bloodless. I sent him a xerox that was not color and not clear except in the density and that did prove that there was no change in colors on the back of the head. He did not want to borrow that color picture.

It was not long after that trip to the Archives that both by phone and in letters he was telling me that the Zapruder film had been faked. He was not wrong in saying that the back of the head had been blown out he told me. He is never wrong. Because he is never wrong it was obvious that the film had been doctored.

Now the history of those slides is not only clear, it is proven by internal evidence I do not here take time for. They were made from and only from the original of the Zapruder film. I tried to tell him the history of possession of that film that makes what he made up a physical impossibility but Harry knows better than truth. He also had no explanation for how that imagined doctoring of the film does not exist on the copies made from it when it was processed at the Dallas Eastman Kodak plant the afternoon of the assassination. They also would have had to have the identical faking. Otherwise the faking is exposed immediately on viewing any copy or any print made from the copy.

Nothing made any difference. It was faked because he said it was faked and neither fact nor

truth has any relevance once he makes something up and believes it implicitly the instant he makes it up. He made up what in his mind made his very wrong second book very right and justifies this third such book.

He is so devoutly persuaded that he is right and truth and fact are wrong that he does not even address how, when, where or by whom the film was allegedly faked. He does not even say here that it was faked. He merely says that he saw what he did not see, that “There was no bone or scalp in that area,” and the that “I feel the film has been forged.” He says it, therefore it is true.

These are his less defamatory complaints against me, that he cannot understand my writing and/or I did not answer questions and that I misled him about the Zapruder film that he discovered was “forged.” This is what he refers to on the first page of his preface as it relates to me, at least related in his sick mind to me. There he named me as the eighth of those he refers to as “The Old Guard” of whom he says we - and the “we” includes some I have no contact at all with, several I avoid any contact with and a couple whom I have only infrequent contact- “having nothing new to add to the case but have obstructed new research, new discoveries, and new evidence, obstructing anything at all that threatens their control.” (page xv)

Unless what I quote from him in this chapter is what justifies these words as addressed to me, in almost 800 pages he has nothing else to prove them.

Common sense tells that there is no way in the world in which anyone can “obstruct” what he refers to as his “new research” or “new discoveries” or “new evidence” or “anything at all.” Least of all could I, at my age and in the state of my health, interpose any obstruction of any kind. In fact, he has me and me alone to thank for that “new research” seeking “new evidence” and his “new discoveries” that as he put it proved that the Zapruder film is forged.

There remains his much more serious allegation against me, that I was part of the conspiracy to kill the President through what he represents as to my employment by the late H. L. Hunt, the ultra-conservative Texas oil magnate, and that I was also part of what he put more explicitly in his many letters I have, the alleged conspiracy to keep him from “breaking” the case. Indeed, as his mind waxed in indignation, his last formulation of that is that I am the “leader” of what he refers to as the “gang” out to wreck him and thus protect his “conspirators” of the assassination. As his publisher put it to Publisher Weekly, previously quoted, my alleged “gang” “put out a lot of disinformation, furthering the conspiracy.” Or, as he blurbed the book to reviewers, “its most stunning revelation” presents “a shocking case against certain well-known assassination researchers for fraud and misrepresentation that has aided the cover-up.”

When it comes to disinformation, Livingstone is the most practiced of experts. But that I did this does not exist in the book. The reason is obvious: I did not and could not have.

That such charges can be made and exploited without even a pretense of addressing them with proof in the book is par for publishers on this subject. That they are false and baseless merely means that they can be published safely if they do not constitute libel under prevailing court decisions. This alone makes him publishable.

We do not evade his charges that I am an accessory in the assassination of the President. They will not be ignored.

But first we assess what he represents as the fact of the assassination from his “new” work, his “new evidence” and “new discoveries,” and we consider whether or not he portrays himself as the genius he believes and says he is or the subject-matter ignoramus that in fact he is.