

Gary Mack
The Sixth Floor
444 Elm St.,
Dallas, TX 75202-3301

10/23/95

Dear Gary,

Among the things that came to mind as I read the undated Livingstone attack on you and on your name is the possibility that his name began as ^bLevenstein. Based on what he'd said about himself and his family that is the conclusion Peggy Rogohm Adler reached some time ago.

The man is crazy but he believes that all those who do not share his craziness are the crazy ones.

I do not know the law but I think that you'd have to file a defamation suit in Maryland unless it is for enough to meet the federal ^{court} ~~court~~ requirements. Years ago that was I heard \$10,000. But if you win in Texas then you'd still have the problem of collecting from him in Maryland.

There are as I recall four more references to the police, meaning only the Baltimore police, working with him. I think you might have a chance with the covering up Baltimore police. Their internal affairs has been covering up for him and for Waybright but he continue to say that the Baltimore police are working for him and in Dallas when they are prohibited this kind of work on their own. They covered that up once and may again but then again they may not with more dumped on them about Waybright. Beside which if they ignore it a letter to the mayor might be embarrassing enough to force them to do something. Artwohl can tell you that he wrote a letter complaining about him on Baltimore police stationery. He told me that.

I do not recall all he said about me but what I do recall is lies and he never checked anything with me.

He talks about your right-wingers down there yet he took the lies he got from Rothermel and Curington as the truth and again made no effort to check.

I can only wonder what kind of famed international reporter would go for his stuff.

As a practical matter I think there is little we can do about him. If I were younger and in better health I'd have sued him for libel. But if you or your people ever want to do anything, I've quite a bit you would find helpful.

The real problem is that he and Waybright are capable of violence.

He says Rookstool helped him. Is Rookstool still there?

What can he be talking about in saying that the FBI used B. Oliver's alleged film?

One thing that might help is catching Waybright representing that he is there for the Balt. police. Or Harry saying they work with him. Your ^{p.d.} ~~p.s.~~ might not like that, as Balt's should not. Don't tell him ^{if me} if you call him but maybe Paul Valentine, of the WxPost in Baltimore, might get interested in that business of the police actually

working with and investigating for him in Dallas and his representation that he is of the police and they are working with him, amply recorded. He has often written that he is the police and they should not like that if compelled to face it.

Catch him doing that in Dallas and the Dallas police would have grounds for doing something. That could include a sanity check.

He quotes Jerry Rose as telling him he would not let the pages of his rag be used for personal attacks. (page 9). Yet look what he published about me recently, from Livingstone. I've not heard from him since I sent him a response.

If my voice tells you I'm strong it deceives you. Or is the only part-time strong part I have.

Thanks and best,

Harold

What would be nice and do much good about this arrant insanity and the gross commercialism of it would be if the Zapruder estate sued Livingstone, in Maryland or the District, and ^{including} ~~going~~ his publisher in it. If that can be done they'd not have to sue in New York, which would require New York counsel. They could ^{do} ~~sue~~ on their own turf.

I informed C & G fully and with an abundance of documents, mostly his writing, well before his killing the truth appeared. I also told them he is crazy. Their lawyer was a dear ~~frank~~ friend. They knew and they did not check, had no peer review, etc. I wrote Kent Carroll and sent him prints of the back of the head, the frames I told you about, and got no response and certainly no questions. I think that alone could nail them in a lawsuit over it. They were on notice and published anyway if that remains in this new book. The checking to determine whether or not what he says is true, even possible, would have been no problem at all. I think this amounts to the intent to do the estate harm. My would it do good about the infestation of the crazies, those who are crazy and those who are not, if they did sue! Would I and could I help them!!!

October 20, 1995

Mr. Harold Weisberg
#100 Route 12
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Harold,

I enjoyed talking with you today. It was good to hear you sound strong and well. Thanks again for your helpful information.

Enclosed are copies of the dust jacket to Beverly Oliver's book. Since I reviewed it for The Dallas Morning News, the newspaper has never received a complaint or request for a retraction or clarification. Not one word from either Beverly or her writer, Coke Buchanan. When the review was reprinted in the newsletter Dateline: Dallas, the publisher urged Coke to write a response and he refused!

The Harry Livingstone nonsense was sent, unsolicited and with no cover letter, to our Executive Director, Jeff West. I have heard it has been sent to others. It looks like my only remedy is to file a defamation of character suit against him. This crap has got to stop!

Also enclosed is an article I wrote for one of our in-house newsletters.

Please give my best to Lil!

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Coke', with a long, sweeping underline.

WHO IS THE REAL "GARY MACK?"

By Harrison E. Livingstone

his record in this case!

Dr. Charles Crenshaw told me on Feb 8, 1995 that "Gary Mack" extensively helped out the defendant *Dallas Morning News* and Hugh Aynesworth against Crenshaw and his suit for defamation of character and slander with malice. Crenshaw won a favorable settlement of the suit. Why would "Mack," who professes to be a critic of the Warren Report, help those who tried to deny that Crenshaw was present and assisted when Kennedy died? The lesson in this is to demonstrate the real nature of "Mack's" mission in this case--a spoiler of legitimate testimony, witnesses, evidence, research and researchers.

Dr. Crenshaw also told me that the hearsay statement "Mack" repeats (imputed to Gus Russo) in his very vicious *Fourth Decade* article* that Crenshaw heard Lyndon Johnson tell Crenshaw "Make sure the son-of-a-bitch dies. You can drown him in his own blood," about Oswald after he had been shot, is an outright lie. Crenshaw insists that he heard no such statement, nor did he write it. In fact, the Parkland chief telephone operator overheard the entire conversation with Johnson (as she testified in Crenshaw's suit) and said it never happened.

Yet, "Mack" goes on with his lie: "We learned that an employee of Crenshaw's publisher also knew about the original quote, as did a reviewer who was asked about it." The editor, whom I interviewed, knew about it because it was apparently in the manuscript at the publishers, which "Mack" had seen but Crenshaw had not seen at the last moment. Crenshaw denies that any such statement was in the last version of the manuscript that he last saw. He insists that Johnson only told him to get a deathbed confession from Oswald and that there was a man in the room at that moment who was to take the confession. They saw a man with a badge and a gun in the emergency room and he was the one they thought was to take the confession.

I think it is amazing that in the January *Fourth Decade* "Mack" can inconsistently claim that his hearsay reporting of something he claims Gus Russo heard from Gary Shaw and Dr. Crenshaw at a restaurant in 1991, the statement that LBJ got Crenshaw on the line and said "Make sure the son-of-a-bitch dies. You can drown him in his own blood" and then attack me for publishing in *Killing the Truth* that this was taken out at the request of the publisher. I also wrote that Crenshaw never knew about the statement and never said it, and I now report that Gus, who lives near me, never told this to Gary "Mack."

"Mack" says that if the statement was true, "why change it?" The statement wasn't true, and someone tried to slip it in the book. "Mack's" inconsistent writing now tells us in the March issue that Crenshaw complained to the *New York Times* that his co-authors had taken "poetic license" with the writing and the facts. "Mack" writes, "furthermore, Crenshaw told

* "Killing the Truth: A Review," by "Gary Mack", *The Fourth Decade*, January, 1995.

"Mack" and what I get is a lot of personal stuff here intended to attack the credibility of my own medical research without his actually daring to do so. That's what is really going on.

If "Mack" is no longer close to Groden as he now claims, he certainly was, and my remark still stands about the falseness of the Mack/Ferrell "acoustical" recording, a finding which is backed by the National Science Foundation.

His vicious attack on Madeleine has no purpose other than to discredit what she says about who was behind the assassination, a job well suited to an employee of the Sixth Floor exhibit in Dallas, which "Mack" is. How come he did not state that the Court of Appeals reversed the lower court, in his first letter? If you want to throw stones, "Mack," don't live in a glass house. Here you show your failure to fully investigate matters, the very thing you accuse others of. You simply wanted to smear a grand old lady.

All this is so he can personally spit on my 18 month old request to measure the height of the window sill at the Sixth Floor, where he now works.

He says that all the films of the assassination match each other, which they certainly don't. We are publishing one of the colossal disparities in the films, confirmed by police here just this week. Its the same cop "Mack" maligned. "Mack" wouldn't show him the Bronson film, as he says in his article. But why is he making a target out of a police officer here with that kind of exposure? Dr. Boswell talked to his partner and I accurately reported that. "Mack" will have to look long and hard to find any major mis-reporting here, and if he thinks that police would go on working with me right up to today if I misreported what they told me, or for that matter anyone, he's nuts. "Mack's" real agenda is to knock me down at all costs because he's afraid the conspiracy will be pinned on his Texans.

His assault on my reporting has a far more sinister intent than first meets the eye. His mission is to discredit that reporting and therefore he has to ignore its achievements. This man says I am angry with him because he wouldn't help me with the acoustical work. It would be more accurate to say that he would not defend his position for my book, since he put forward the phony recording. It doesn't occur to him that I'm angry with him for his own stupid acts or wrecking Penn Jones's *The Continuing Inquiry*.

Remember that a number of Texans who knew "Mack" too well hated him, and that included Larry Howard and Penn Jones. Howard believed that "Mack" knew the names of those involved in the conspiracy and was protecting them. Daryl Howard can testify to this. Howard may have actually been killed, as some believe, because he was too close to some things in Paris, Texas and what Roscoe White's real role might have been. The name of the game with "Mack" and his friends has always been to get researchers directed to New Orleans and away from Texas.

"Mack" says I want you to think the Bronson film doesn't show the head shot. Show me that it does and prove to me that its a real film and that Bronson took it. I spent a lot of time with a Dallas FBI agent who briefed me and the police officers I work with on various members of the Dallas research community, "Mack" among them. The FBI helped me find Charles Bronson, whom no-one else could locate, except "Mack" and so on, and it is highly suspicious that he refused to divulge this. I was told what city Bronson lived in and

jockey *nom de guerre*, which he has used for so long. Why not use his own name? *What* is his name? He has used the following additional names at various times: Larry Darkel, Larry Darkle, Larry Dunkel, Lawrence Dunkel (legal name?). Why does he tease us in his article about what his legal name is, and yet does not tell us?

Lets face it, this case has so many alias for so many people, I have pages of listings. Among our research group we not only have "Mack" using a false name, but numerous others: Robert Goodman, Todd Vaughan, and on and on. Why do they do it? What is their real reason? Do any of us need a stage name?

Penn Jones hates "Mack" for good reason. Why would such an honest man as Penn Jones despise "Mack"? "Mack" got into Penn's good graces as advancing age dictated the need for help with *The Continuing Inquiry*, and when "Mack" took over editing of it, he soon killed it, and then walked off with Penn's mailing list, which he promptly used to set up his own magazine, the ill fated *Coverups!* Elaine knows this story well, and all of you are invited to ask her about it. Penn needed TCI to earn a little money in his old age, and "Mack" killed it for him with his own now defunct magazine.

Ask Larry Harris and R.B. Cutler about the letter they addressed to Doug Adams at KXAS T.V. in Fort Worth about "Mack's" "personal bias" in news broadcasts which unfairly did not present normal journalistic balance. Larry Howard and their attorneys wrote the letter. In fact, for two years this group protested "Mack" and his activities to his employer, who finally let him go.

As for "Mack's" claim that the central premise in *Killing the Truth* is that several prominent and respected researchers have misled the research community all these years, I'll stand by that to my death. Most of us know that very well. It was not the central premise of anything in that book, but a main point among many, which he'd rather not face. That book is a major work, and his cheap shots at it are but flies attacking a bull.

"Mack" is good about interfering in the lives of others, as the real focus of his letter to my publisher, under the guise of protest against alleged errors, was, like the letters of others in his gang and their lackeys who wrote my publisher prior to publishing my books, designed to prevent them from publishing me at all. Their efforts only angered my publisher, and we then proceeded to investigate and publish information about the letter writers in *Killing the Truth*. I regret that for reasons of space I could not tell the whole story about this gang that has so systematically derailed the Kennedy case all of these years. Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, as long as it is honest. We are not and never have been dealing with honest people. There is a big difference between honest opinion and tortious interference.

His article states that he wrote my publisher asking them to correct errors of fact, which was an underhanded attempt to attack my credibility, when his claims had no merit. He does not mention in his article what those errors of mine were supposed to be. I have the letter, and so know about it. I did not make a mistake. Constantly we have the spectacle of nationally known researchers bitching about the errors of others as a means of misdirecting attention away from such things as the hoax of the Zapruder film or of the

Kennedy.

I was informed that Texas law forbade any comment, and therefore we were consigned to utter silence as the old Dallas doctors were imprisoned on the stage for those long and terrible hours. Think about the fact that the so called leaders of our community, mostly right wingers or false liberals, are working so hard to shoot down the best fighters in the case and maintain their false evidence in the face of overwhelming proof of conspiracy developed by me and my associates. They are real good at sitting in judgement on me and many others, when in fact every one of these gods of our community commit far worse crimes and mistakes than I could ever dream of. And they do it deliberately.

They often have no idea what the First Amendment is all about. They readily accuse or sue others for constitutionally privileged criticism, but tolerate no criticism of themselves and their lame and often fabricated "research."

"Mack" continues to follow a program of denying this research to the community and the nation. There are many of us who help each other's research even though we disagree or are enemies, except for those in this gang. A recent example is my attempt to obtain from the TSBD the height of the sixth floor window ledge from the sidewalk by dropping a string with a rock tied to it down to the ground and measuring the string. The next thing I knew, "Mack" phones me about this. After his severance pay and unemployment ran out when he left KXAS-TV, unknown to us, he went to work as a clerk at the Sixth Floor exhibit at the TSBD, and was put in charge of fielding my request to perform this measurement. To my shock, "Mack" called me and proceeded to give me a royal run-around. He falsely offered to hire a big, expensive team of certified surveyors to perform this task. They did not want me present for this operation, and offered to have it witnessed by Dallas police. His snicker while he said all this was evident, as he played with me. When I told him I would have to be present and wanted police from my city to observe, he denied the request, and wanted to know why Dallas police would not do. The answer is self evident. In spite of repeated efforts, I have heard nothing more from the Sixth Floor exhibit.

Think about this. The TSBD Sixth Floor exhibit was paid for by the wealthy people of Dallas to tell the government's official story of the assassination. As the ship of their cover-up sinks, the rats run for cover, and get on the last remaining rafts--what still floats--having killed the women and children first. "Mack," having little place to run to, is taken in by the cover-up artists at the TSBD. He heads off at the pass a key piece of my research having to do with the false trajectories put forward by presidential candidate Arlen Specter, who stood in the very same window "Mack" doesn't want to unseal for us. I am publishing in my next book rather stupendous information with regard to the falsification of those trajectories, nevertheless. But I lack this key piece of information because of "Gary Mack."

This man has put forward one false story after another, helping to perpetrate some of the biggest hoaxes in the case, working hand in glove with those who would cover up the truth. Perhaps the title of his failed magazine was appropriate.

He repeats the cant phrase now so time worn about "prominent and respected"

the messengers. This shows who and what these people are really about. And always keep in mind that the mystery of JFK's death is *political*. It was a *political murder*, and many of those who co-opted leadership in this research have a political agenda to cover up the facts in order to protect right thinking Americans and their politics. They also have the mission of burying the facts because the murder benefited the right wing and conservative factions in this country, which were a small minority at the time. Since then they have wrecked the foundations and finances of this nation and blamed it on "liberalism." These same people now come among us in this research.

Jerry Rose has told me was not going to let the pages of his magazine be used for what he felt were personal attacks. Yet, I have been subject to such attacks in his pages. Tell me, Jerry (and I continue to respect you), what purpose does it serve to print much of the information that "Mack" relates in this article, such as the fact that I paid for rooms for my team at a hotel in Dallas. That is an invasion of privacy. How did "Mack" get this information? Is he the police? Does he have connections with the local police who would illegally pass on this information? The hotel didn't tell him that.

"Gary Mack" has misled all of us these years. He has nothing new to add to this case but has obstructed research, new discoveries, and new evidence, obstructed anything at all that threatens the control of his gang. I called him a fellow researcher as a sort of joke. He is a joke, after what we know about him is apparent to all, but being crazy is a great cover, as I wrote him about myself. I'm not afraid to say it. My objection is to the fact that these people don't see themselves for what they really are, with a lot more warts and craziness than they care to admit. In fact, they are terribly flawed, like me, but far more so than we care to admit or want to see. One of the many tragedies in this case is that many of those who lead it are badly damaged as human beings. Believe me, that is what the media thinks of these people, often referring to them as lunatics. If he and his allies think they can then insist (as they have for several years) that I am the lunatic, then they better think again. One of the top reporters in the country is living in my house and studying my new research every day, after the last several years as a foreign correspondent. If I was so nuts, he wouldn't be here. This is our big chance to break this case, and "Mack" and his gang don't want it to happen, finding any method they can to hurt or discredit me. In addition, if anyone were to examine who the rest of my old friends are, they would realize that whatever they think they know about me--after the false image that was put out by the terrible slander of Robert Groden and his friends--is just completely that: Entirely false. But will Jerry Rose publish this? I doubt it.

"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.

Harrison E. Livingstone

THE MAN WHO NAMED THE GRASSY KNOLL

by Gary Mack, Archivist

Thirty-two years after the Kennedy assassination and speculation about a conspiracy, "grassy knoll" has become a generic term connoting hidden plots and subterfuge. But who coined the phrase? Until now the answer has remained elusive, yet newly-discovered information identifies the source as a member of the news media. Here's how it happened.

The Kennedy motorcade from Love Field through Dallas included a news "pool car" loaned by the telephone company. It was the fifth car behind President Kennedy. Riding in the right front was Malcolm Kilduff, Mr. Kennedy's acting press secretary. In the middle sat senior White House correspondent Merriman Smith of United Press International (UPI). Thanks to a long-standing agreement to alternate seats with the competing wire service, Associated Press (AP), Mr. Smith sat directly in front of the car's only radio telephone. In the back seat sat the AP's Jack Bell, Robert Baskin of The Dallas Morning News and Bob Clark of ABC News.

When the shots were fired, Mr. Smith's car rode several hundred feet behind the president. The reporter had time to hear and see reactions from the crowd and police escorts, one of whom, Bobby Hargis, immediately stopped, jumped off his Harley-Davidson and raced up the nearby hill past horrified spectators lying on the ground.

As officer Hargis ran, the pool car picked up speed entering the Triple Underpass to Stemmons Freeway and the wild race to Parkland Hospital. Mr. Smith grabbed the radio telephone and called the Dallas UPI office, which sent his dispatch at 12:34, four minutes after the shooting. "Three shots were fired at President Kennedy's motorcade today in downtown Dallas" he reported and news bulletins around the world began with that short statement.

Meanwhile, in Anna, Illinois, WRAJ-AM owner and manager Don Michel responded to the UPI teletype warning bells and relayed those early reports to his startled listeners. Fortunately, Mr. Michel did something few others had presence of mind to do. He saved the UPI dispatches and filed them away, figuring someday they would be valuable for history. He was right. Mr. Michel placed those rare pages on loan to The Sixth Floor Museum, where several have been on display since opening day in 1989.

One of the pages in our archive reveals that in a dispatch sent about 25 minutes after the assassination, Mr. Smith reported "Some of the Secret Service agents thought the gunfire was from an automatic weapon fired to the right rear of the president's car, probably from a grassy knoll to which police rushed."

No other news reports or witness interviews are known to contain the phrase "grassy knoll" at that time. In fact, tapes of local news coverage reveal that "grassy knoll" was later repeated by a few other reporters for several hours until investigators became convinced the shots originated from the old Texas School Book Depository. Yet it remains a historical fact that police and spectators immediately ran to the grassy knoll, not to the Depository building. And UPI's Merriman Smith reported it first.