

1

copy to =
H. O. K. U. G. R. G.

NEWS FROM DALLAS

Excerpt from "DALLAS '60"
Vol. 2, No. 1 - June 1999

There are just two major news items to report this time, one concerning the former Texas School Book Depository and the other centred upon the Texas Theatre.

On the Sixth Floor - not as sinister as it had seemed!

Well-known assassination researcher Gary Mack now holds the position of Official Archivist to the Sixth Floor Exhibit in the former Texas School Book Depository building. He has maintained a lengthy friendship with San Francisco researcher Hal Verb for many years. Towards the end of last year's Kennedy Assassination Symposium in Dallas, Gary took Hal into the basement of the building. This is a privilege extended to very few people!

No, Gary did not show Hal the original Stemmons Freeway road sign which has long been suspected of being hidden down there. What he did show him, however, was both surprising and significant. It was the original window frame, including glass panes, etc. from the so-called sniper's perch. It had apparently been removed on the orders of the building owner, Mr Burt, after the assassination, sometime in the early '60s.

When Hal told me about this, I immediately tried to fathom out the reasons behind Mr Burt's insistence that it be removed from its correct position. Was there something sinister here? Did it hold some hitherto unconsidered clue? Did it somehow indicate that Lee Harvey Oswald was not the lone-nut assassin?

The answer to all three questions is in the negative. That window frame, still complete, has now been brought up from the basement and is again on the sixth floor. Now, however, it forms part of the exhibit and is on display to the public. The reason for its mysterious removal in the 60s has also been explained it was simply to prevent workers and other people in the building from removing pieces of it as souvenirs or covering it with graffiti!

Texas Theatre again in the news

The Texas Theatre, scene of Lee Harvey Oswald's arrest on the afternoon of the Kennedy assassination, has been seriously damaged by fire. The building represents an essential ingredient of the so-called Assassination Tour and has been visited by thousands of interested people in the 31 years since the presidential killing.

Not all of them can claim to have actually entered the building on West Jefferson Boulevard in the Oak Cliff district but those who did will have been fascinated by the somewhat sinister aura which it maintained.

The fire is believed to have started at 2.50 on the morning of Saturday 4th March. Co-owner Ron DuBois was asleep in his apartment behind the balcony at the time but he awoke and escaped unharmed. Damage has been estimated at around \$350,000. There was considerable damage to the roof of the theatre and to one end of the building where the cinema screen was located. The main auditorium, including that part of the theatre where Oswald was arrested, was not seriously affected by the fire.

At the time of the blaze, the display material - mainly photographs and other memorabilia - was well away from that part of the building affected by the fire itself and the subsequent efforts of the Dallas Fire Department to fight it!

Your correspondent was privileged to spend well over an hour inside the Texas Theatre during his regular pilgrimage to Dallas last November. The actual seat where Oswald was arrested has long been removed but the seat now in that position has been suitably embellished to indicate its significance. Whether this is appropriate or just an unnecessary and tasteless action is up to the individual to decide.

"A CONSPIRACY TOO BIG?": NOT AT ALL!

by

Harrison E. Livingstone*

Fred Litwin's article "A Conspiracy Too Big?" makes some valuable points, but it shows how effective the mind control apparatus among the Warren Commission critical community in America influences foreign opinion.

The control of foreign opinion with regard to the assassination of President Kennedy is a primary goal of powerful people in the United States. Mr. Litwin apparently has not bothered to study the actual medical and other evidence which show beyond a shadow of a doubt a conspiracy. Nevertheless, he is quite right about much of what he says.

Litwin demolishes the arguments of many of the theorists in the case, but not because his primary argument is true—it isn't. That argument is contained in the following solecism: "If one were to believe the current literature, we are faced with not just 'something larger' but a monster conspiracy that consists of several assassins, several accomplices, and the destruction and forgery of vital evidence. The critics have constructed a conspiracy so massive that it ultimately falls of its own weight."

He says further that "We are to believe that a conspiracy of multiple gunmen, massive forgery and tampering of evidence, impersonation, planting of evidence, etc. could survive without a single crack. It belies belief" This has been said often in the past.

Granted, Litwin is unaware that the autopsy doctors, forced to lie on another key point, have protested vigorously (he can't imagine how vigorously, courageously, and almost desperately) the movement of the head entry wound four inches from where they had found it. They tried very hard to get investigators to see that the photographs were wrong. I present their actual testimony in my new book for the first time.

There are a lot of problems with Litwin's reasoning. Many conspiracies historically involved cliques, political parties, circles of some kind which were composed of numbers of people. To assume that it would collapse merely because there are too many people is a fractured method of thought when such a conspiracy succeeds in its goal and takes power. Once in power, it may not matter if it is exposed, because those who won can prevent their own overthrow until a more powerful force removes them. They simply downplay or ignore the evidence against them.

In America, much of intelligent and informed opinion has always guessed at or known what the real facts were in the overthrow of the Administration in 1963, but we could do nothing about it. The physical and medical evidence was kept secret, for the most part, and remains so. In addition, the key evidence in the case continues to be excluded from the new disclosure laws, or protected by government regulation. That fact alone connotes sinister intent.

No-one publicly discussed forgery of vital medical evidence until I got into the case. The American critics of the Warren Report were largely a group of people who sought to control research in the case and threw up roadblocks to any notion that the evidence in the official story

was fake. I personally was blocked in my work by the famous people in the case, not just the government.

Litwin leads off with a basic fallacy which he lumps together with reasoning I agree with. His fourth paragraph begins with this denunciation: "If the autopsy X-rays and photos show evidence of a single head-shot from the rear, well, they must be fakes." He decides that this type of reasoning is "extremely dangerous," and he cites my second book, **High Treason 2**, "alleging massive forgery of the autopsy X-rays and photos." The book was about quite a lot else, but as he said, he could not follow my "erratic writing style" which made it "extremely difficult to follow his (my) arguments".

This is one of many signals in his article that Litwin does not pay attention to detail. **High Treason 2** was a **New York Times** best seller and was praised in America for its clarity. That book was primarily composed of interviews with witnesses which were presented in their entirety. It is not *my* arguments that had to be followed but the plain black and white statements of the witnesses, including two doctors at the autopsy, and Britain's own nurse at Parkland, Diana Bowron, who has strongly denounced these photos in my last book, **Killing the Truth**. My previous book, **High Treason 2**, presented many landmark interviews presenting materials previously unknown. Many call it a massive achievement, including some of my severest critics.

Unfortunately for Mr. Litwin, he makes an example of himself by not bothering to examine the actual evidence for forgery presented in any of my books. He merely attempts to reason from the top down just as the Posners, Lattimers, Wechts, Weisbergs, committees and commissions and others have done for so long.

It's true that under the pressure of researching and writing three such massive works in four years, my writing may have suffered at times. I'd like to see someone else duplicate what I accomplished.

The point of so much of what the other critics have put forward is to prevent serious consideration of detailed evidence which prove forgery. It's easy, after seeing how preposterous body alteration and other theories are, to throw one's hands up and not bother to examine the nuts and bolts of the actual evidence, as Litwin has failed to do.

I don't know what this half baked writer is going to do when my new book comes out this year, presenting the intense disagreement of the autopsy doctors with the photographs of the body taken at their autopsy, and the findings of the HSCA and the 1968 Clark Panel which so blatantly ignores their own autopsy report. The interviews were kept secret for the past 15 years for obvious reasons.

At the end of his article is the statement that we need to focus on the "more important issues. This need to throw out some sacred cows and begin to focus on the real issues cannot be overstated." *What are the real issues?* He then seems to answer this by implying that if we were to examine Oswald's possible relationships with various intelligence agencies, we might get some answers. What does he mean? Intelligence agencies killed Kennedy? There was no conspiracy but we should be interested in Oswald's intelligence connections, ("So, the case is very much open," Litwin writes in his fractured way of thinking) and this is "a more important issue?"

Litwin exposes his falseness with the additional comment in his last paragraph: "Dr. Gary Aguilar sums up some of the outstanding medical issues in a cogent article in **The Fourth Decade**." There was no article. It was a letter I also published in my last book. Litwin says of this letter in an endnote: "There are a total of 20 questions regarding the medical evidence. Most noticeably, the autopsy X-rays and photos show the head wound entry to be 10 cm higher than the point where the autopsy doctors placed it. This discrepancy has never been adequately explained."

What is wrong with this? I was the one who made a big issue of the four inch movement of

that wound in my first book. Book after book of mine presented the reasons why it has to indicate forgery, including the strong insistence of the autopsy doctors that their placement was correct and that its appearance in the photos is wrong. Everyone interested in this case therefore has to examine every facet of every statement already in the record and what I am about to publish from the doctors with regard to that because it can only indicate *forgery*.

Litwin argues that "to argue that evidence is fraudulent is to undermine the possibility that any theory might turn out to be 'true' ...to argue in such a style is to cause the collapse of the entire empirical edifice of assassinology. However weak, evidence could at least refute theories; now the evidence can't even do that." What kind of drivel is this? He is saying that *we should not notice evidence of forgery* because "it undermines the possibility that any theory might turn out to be 'true'" He then says that whatever evidence there is in this case can no longer refute theories. That is what he wants us to believe in this exercise in mind control. *Because* I have presented massive testimony, even from the men who took the autopsy X-rays and photographs, that they are false. So he wants us to believe that the entire business of assassination research has negated such testimony or evidence from many witnesses. He can say that again, as that is exactly what has happened. It happened to Litwin, who ignores such testimony from every single witness who saw the body that the official evidence does not show the wounds.

"So the critics are doing two things," Litwin writes, "they are rejecting many pieces of evidence. This rejection then forces them to paint a monstrous conspiracy and cover-up." It is Litwin who is rejecting many pieces of evidence which show conclusively that the autopsy was faked and that there was a monstrous crime in America in 1963 perpetrated by many people probably most of whom did not know what they were a part of.

But Litwin has already eliminated forgery without studying the obvious evidence for it. This negates whatever validity his otherwise interesting article might have had. When Litwin states that the movement of the wound "has never been adequately explained", what can he mean? Does he suppose that some other wild theory will explain it as a simple mistake by someone? Will he then ignore so much other evidence of forgery of everything else in the case? He names Dr. Mantik as one of the letter writers to *JAMA*, yet ignores the fact that Mantik then determined beyond a shadow of a doubt that the X-rays are altered. I'm presenting an entire chapter centered around Mantik's study of the X-rays with an optical densitometer in the National Archives.

Discussing the photos and X-rays (p. 11), Litwin ignores the issue that the photos and X-rays do not show the wounds as described in the autopsy report, and instead shifts emphasis to the discrepancy between the autopsy X-rays and photos. He then mixes the two issues and says that "not one forensic pathologist who has examined the original materials agrees with his assessment." If Litwin was a careful reader, which he is not, he would know that Dr. Angel and other scientists who examined the X-rays for the HSCA, Dr. Lattimer, and numerous other radiologists found that the front of the head was missing, and there is no mention of the back of the head missing. This is presented in great detail in my last books. Well, perhaps they did not address the question of that discrepancy. Since Litwin mixes two issues in true Posner fashion: the conflict between what the X-rays show and what the photos show (two different sets of wounds) and the conflict of both with what the autopsy report and all medical witnesses describe, it is clear that he does not understand any of this. So instead of paying close attention to the testimony, he blames his failure to understand it on what he says is my bad writing, which was almost universally praised in America, except for the allies of those critics who are opposed to this evidence and who stoop to character assassination.

It is not enough for Litwin to reason in true Posner fashion by saying that no forensic pathologist who has examined the original materials agree with my assessment (this is not true, since

NEWS FROM U.S.

Acceptance
Vol. 3, No. 1 - July 1995
concerning the former Texas School 1995

Cyril Wecht reversed himself, came to our press conference in 1989 and warmly endorsed my findings) but he says "The authentication panel of the HSCA was quite clear in their conclusions that all the material was authentic. Interestingly enough, Livingstone dismisses their conclusions with little analysis." (p. 11-12) Well, it may be all right for him to accept the findings of one more government panel paid by the government, but I don't, and I only listen to what the medical witnesses themselves said when they strongly denounced and even ridiculed this material, as did Dr. Pierre Finck, who said that he had palpated the head and knew what the wounds were, and that the photographs were no evidence at all. When you read the whole story of what these doctors said, you will be astonished, but you should have understood it from all the other evidence I already published.

No forensic pathologist, to my knowledge (other than Wecht) examined the photos and X-rays for the purpose of authentication. So called photo experts did, though, for the government.

As for his statement that four of the Parkland doctors, the photographer and John Ebersole said the materials in the National Archives are authentic, this is again completely false. The recent presentations of these men is in direct conflict to what they have always said and continue to say. I know many of them too well to believe for a moment that slick media distortions and TV editing of their statements have altered the facts. I published the photographs of each of the four Parkland doctors he names demonstrating on national television that the large wound was in the back of the head behind the right ear. Litwin and many others are fooled by JAMA's twisting of the actual testimony and meaning of these doctors.

The medical evidence is far too intricate for most to grasp without focusing on it. When witnesses have been forced to lie, they will often say things between the lines, as did the autopsy doctors in the JAMA articles when they stated where the wounds were, which was not at all where they are in the pictures. Witnesses forced to lie will say other things that negate the lie in subtle ways. Only great devotion to detail will show us the trail that they left for us to follow to the truth, and simplistic thinkers with only the most superficial observations have no hope of intelligent comment or understanding.

Litwin has restated Posner, about to be exposed for the massive fraud that he is, and tried to put it all into boxes and tables, which should tell us something. He's a chalk talker. The tragedy is, I agree with him on most of the rest of what he says, but when it comes to the key evidence in the case, the cover-up artists have done their job, because this man is not bothering to examine the detail of the keys to the case: the medical evidence.

In closing I'd like to say that your magazine performs a great disservice for publishing such intellectually dishonest work. This is what he accuses all of us of doing. I agree that many of the people in this tragic work are intellectually dishonest, but the vast majority no-one has heard from are doing fine work and are honest.

Mr. Livingstone's fourth book on the case, Killing Kennedy, and the Hoax of the Century, will be published in May, 1995, by his publisher, Carroll & Graf.