

Harry Livingstone
3025 Abell Ave.,
Baltimore, Md. 21218

7/3/91

Dear Harry,

Were it not that I know you have problems, as well ^{as} in varying degrees do, and that sometimes they are rather difficult for you I'd not reply to your 7/1/letter.

You inserted a scrap on which you'd written, referring to the citation I gave you, that "ref. to 1:47 p.m. is ridiculous to imagine that refers to the body going then from Parkland. How do you extrapolate that?"

I didn't and I don't. And I'm taking some time for this to illustrate to you, if you will please pay attention, how first, you did not even try to do for yourself the simple thing I suggested, getting that citation from Meagher's index, and then instead of paying attention to what ~~id~~ I did say, gave it an absolutely impossible meaning and now ask still more time of me to explain it again.

You faced ~~me~~ contradictory statements about when the body left. I suggested that because the police did escort it there might be something in the FBI's transcriptions of those broadcasts that would help you with the time. Unless you are willing to believe nothing at all and imagine that there was a conspiracy involving the major part of the world, all with advance knowledge ^{of} what would happen and what would need to be done.

So I used the index for you, which a child could do, got that volume and exhibit, and ^{flipped} the pages first to be sure that the transcript included the time period of your interest and then, when I noticed it, a point where you could begin to read it to learn whether or not there is reference to that particular escort and what it was doing.

All you have to do is glance at that page and you'll see it says nothing like ^{you say} this.

I gave it no meaning. I suggested no meaning. I merely suggested that you might ~~start~~ start looking at 1:47 p.m. If you had to go back to an earlier time, which one of your sources seems to have indicated, ~~not~~ then you also have that page to start with.

This is really quite simple. If you could not handle it I suggest that you ought to seek help.

I did not ridicule you, leave alone heap ^{down} it on you, and I am tired of these accusations. As you know, I have always disagreed with your theory. But despite that I've taken a really great amount of time in an effort to be helpful. I simply can't any more.

If you have the high opinion of the importance of what you are doing and you want to continue with it, that is your right and it is exclusively your business.

But you have no right to impose your judgement of what you are doing on anyone else and you have even less right to demand that all others drop whatever they are doing ~~at~~ and do what at any moment seems important to you.

Among other things, this is incredibly selfish. It assumes also that you alone have rights, including to the time of others.

With regard to what you say Jenkins said and meant and what the Sibert-O'Neill report does, you may remember that when you were here I suggested the possibility that you were finding what you were looking for when it might not be there and you think it is. Disregarding all the other things that - think make what you think impossible, the possible solution to the FBI report of "surgery" in the head when there was none, Jenkins actually said what you did not tell me earlier, that Humes was baffled and called to the gallery to ask if there had been surgery on the head. This is not by any means a statement that there had been and it is possible that when the agents typed their notes they did not have full and complete notes, misread some or had no notes on that matter at all and wrote their report from memory. And that the memory failed them and they said there had been surgery based on faulty recollection of the question they did hear, asking if there had been surgery on the head.

I can't see how you could not understand this unless you at the time were emotionally unable to.

You regard your work as important. That is for you to decide for yourself. As you know, I have disagreed with it from the beginning. But that did not stop me from taking a great amount of time from my own interests in an effort to be of help to you. Really quite a lot of time, and that means time I did not have for work I want to do. As you know, I can't live long enough to do it all. I have on my desk writing of more than five months ago I've not been able to resume reading and correcting, and atop that another thick stack of more than a month ago of which the same is true.

You have no right to demand that I use my time in what you regard as your interest and not use it in what I regard as my interest. Yet that is what you repeatedly do. This time, as not infrequently in the past, along with accusations that have no basis at all.

I'm sorry for the condition in which you are. Once again I ask you to make an effort to understand mine. I am past 78, frail without much energy, and I want to spend what time remains for me as I want to spend it. Not as you do, not at your beck and call, not in your interpretation of importances.

If this means I have to start ignoring ^{your} ~~your~~ letters, that I'll do. These demands and ^{these} ~~this~~ insulting and baseless tirades have to stop.

So far as I am concerned, this time, with this letter, they have.

H. C. Cold

July 1, 1991

Dear Harold:

With regard to Jenkins, I feel that you are stating that I am making a statement of fact or taking a position one way or another. You told me to report what he had to say, and I have shared that with you.

I am the only person working with these medical witnesses at this time. I feel that this work is of the gravest importance, and of course I needed your help in interpreting and analyzing it. I realize that you have severe constraints on your time and available energy. But it is clear to me that the massive investigation that I am conducting now, with a team of people I have built up, dealing with many aspects of this case, means absolutely nothing to you. I have made my own commission, so to speak. You could do little better with just a bit of your time than to try to work with me when it is possible for you. But you choose to expend a vast amount of energy heaping abuse and cruelty on me too often, rather than saving that energy and just sticking to the point. I have been willing to help you with money and equipment in return.

I have had a total nightmare with many things going on: My book being illegally published abroad, Jim Marrs plagiarising it, Lifton trying to destroy me behind my back, Rick taking \$8000 from me after softening me up with extensive intimidation. That is just what is happening currently. Year after year of hostile action up to and including an attempt to blow up my car by a federal employee whom I worked with. I have lived with fear, often great illness, and terror most of my life.

Could you tell me what DJ's are?

Time after time you tell me to look for this or that and it is impossible to find. I spend a vast amount of time trying to take your advice because I have respect for you, but it often runs me into the ground because I can't find something or sort out your meaning, which is often presented so obscurely that it can't be discerned. I don't mean to offend you. I never have. I need your help but I don't need to be treated like a fool when I am remise or inadequate in some fashion. So are you, but I don't treat you like that. We all have faults. But your attitude is totally unfair.

Thank you for your kind letters. I knew that when I gave you that money I could count on your to help me out.

I am also missing some tapes here that only Rick would have picked up on one of his visits.

As far as the Silvia Meagher index goes, to give you an example, recently I tried to look up Diana Bowron (whom, I believe, I have found in England), and as some of us might expect, she was not in there.

Why? I have found that the WC index (vol 15) is often inaccurate or incomplete. In fact, I go crazy trying to track things down, as I am sure you have often enough. I go out of my way to help others with things like this, and have a massive correspondence, as you do.

As you know, my health is poor and always has been since birth. How I made it this far, I'll never know. I was brought to Baltimore for experimentation and treatment as a child at Hopkins. I remember all of the Blue Babies there when I was being treated along with them. This life had not only not been easy for me, but it has often been a nightmare. Now many thousands of people are dying from the kind of radiation they were experimenting on us babies with. Thyroid cancer.

Let us stick to one issue in Jenkins' perceptions here: He says that he saw himself the brain stem appearing so smoothly severed that he believed that it had been cut. He says that it was not cut loose in the morgue because it fell out in the doctor's hand. He describes other instances of apparent surgery to both the brain and skull and scalp that caused Humes to ask his question of Burkley in the gallery.

I don't think you can jump as you appear to be doing in your letter to suppose that I said that "You did get an explanation of how that mistake got into the Sibert-O'Neill report and it is on this same page, where Humes asked the gallery 'IF there has been any surgery at Parkland,' and they were talking about the head!" What in hell is this supposed to mean? Is it a mistake? If so, why?

Harold, it may not yet seem to you important, but I am repeatedly going back to these people, including O'Neill, who is now talking to me, and trying to sort this out so that we can answer as many of these questions as possible. This is perhaps the most important work that has every been done on these issues. What good does it do for you to heap scorn and ridicule on me at every turn, or denounce things as you appear to do just above, without really sorting through it?

What good does it do to drive me as crazy as certain other people trying to sort through ten new puzzles if I dare submit my findings for criticism?

When Matthew Kane of CNN comes to see you around the twelfth, I hope that you are a little less obscure with them and a little more helpful.

Harry

Harold:

23 WCH 874 ref. to 1:42 PM
is ridiculous to imagine that
that refers to the body
going then from Fatland.
How do you extrapolate
that?

Harry