

January 26, 1997

Mr. Cal Schoonover
604 S. Main Street
Janesville, WI 53545

Dear Cal:

Thank you for sending along the copy of your book. You are to be commended for it. For someone your age, it seems to be a pretty good effort, though I may disagree with some of your points.

So please don't be offended by the criticisms that I offer, which are intended to make you think more about what you have done and what you are doing if you go on with writing non-fiction.

Of course, when you get into real book writing someday, you have to cite each statement or reference. Your book, as it now stands, is an outline for the future. But it is only a statement of your *opinion*, or *conclusions*. You don't distinguish between *fact* and *opinion*.

Page 24: The eye was not "popped" out in Dallas or at the autopsy. It was "divergent" (askew) but this is not seen in the photos shown us in recent years, which myself and others published. I did see it in one of the photos in 1979.

The photographer, John Stringer, used two light stands, one on each side of the subject or portion of the body. What does that do for your shadow study? (p. 25)

I think you are terrible confused about "Badgeman" and "Black Dog Man", etc. There was a bench behind the low concrete wall on which the coke bottle sat. A young black man and woman were sitting there eating their lunch as the motorcade came by. They got up and fled after the shots. This is "Black dog man." It was not possible, in my opinion, for anyone to be shooting from that position right out in the open.

As for "Badgeman," I cannot give credibility to those interpretations of the Mooreman photo that there is a policeman or even a gunman just behind there, behind the wooden fence, firing from that spot. It is an irrational place to fire from. No one is ever going to prove that there is a gunman in that photo because it is not clear and never will be clear enough.

You accept without question all the crap about Roscoe White (p. 463 of *High Treason 2*, and in *Killing the Truth*, p. 499, 505-6, 615-619). Look at what I have published on that, after I investigated it as much as I could. Most of that story is enormous crap, because those folks needed to make some money from it. Is it reasonable to you that a police officer in full uniform would be shooting? What would happen if he was caught? How crazy can such a conspiracy be?

Yes, there was someone firing from behind the fence, but from far along it where it meets the cement balustrade on the bridge. He was standing in the storm drain and could get away through the pipes in it.

I thought your interview with Harold was pretty good, but you didn't ask the key question. Had you asked him if he thought any of the evidence in the case was altered or phoney, he would have said no. That would have raised a flock of other questions. (p. 375 of *Killing The Truth*) and in his own book. He simply ignores all the evidence. It is my opinion that he, like the other "gatekeepers" in the case, prevented the solution by ignoring even the possibility that it was a faked case. You assume that it is fake when you tried to demonstrate that the autopsy photos are fake, which was the main focus of a major portion of my research. You don't really prove it or show that they conflict with the known evidence. You just state a conclusion about the evidence. But you are right to focus on that top of the head picture because it is very dubious and conflicts with the Mooreman photo. Both conflict with other known evidence. The reason is, all the evidence is different.

Your "Table Of Contents" should have page numbers for each chapter.

I suspect that you spend a lot of time on Internet in the JFK chat rooms and such. Your book comes across as the kind of often un-disciplined opinion one used to get on Prodigy and now Internet. What you need is discipline. That is Harold's problem: He is undisciplined. To be a true scholar, you have to have more discipline.

You asked about *Killing the Truth*. This is one of the most major works in the JFK case. If you can't get it, write my publisher directly. It has 752 pages.

Lane's first book, *Rush To Judgement*, written with the help of others, may have been valuable or worthwhile, but after that, Harold told you right.

Kennedy was not killed by the CIA. Perhaps renegades in those agencies had something to do with it, but it is irrational that the agencies themselves committed the crime. You are parroting Lane and Garrison. Again, you need to see *Killing the Truth*. Why would you claim that the CIA killed him?

Did you make \$1500 over and above the costs, or did someone else pay to publish the book and you don't count that? That is not quite fair! But if you made money on it, you are doing very damn well.

Carroll & Graf is not publishing JFK books because there is no market for them and they cannot afford to lose money. This could change when the ARRB issues their report. There are many good publishers, but they want a lot more than you can give at this point in the beginning of your career. No, I cannot find the time to read your rough drafts. Things are too tough here. Get Harold to do it.

I'm taking a long break from the JFK case and working on other books. I would not have taken the time to answer your letter, but I felt you deserved it. So I wish you a lot of luck. I will not have the time for much correspondence.

As I said, your book is a credible first effort to make a book (assuming this is your first book). It bodes well for the future, if you can develop more scholarship and cite what you say to the authorities and documents. Otherwise, it is just your opinion and about as worthless as that of the rest of us!

But don't be discouraged at all.

Best wishes,

Harry
Harrison E. Livingstone