

Harold - This gallery ^{Rel 7/20/88} were first completed the end of June ¹⁹⁸⁸
(before July 4th, because I had to draw.) I sent you
the gallery's (4 chapters) You had marked the computer printing
but never sent it to me. We finally did
this by phone.

August 8, 1988

Dear Harold:

Thanks for taking the time to comment on the chapters. I should have sent you the whole book, but its a little late now, and I'm sure you might totally disagree with our main thesis.

* || I believe I made all of the changes you mentioned. I just hope that I did them correctly. It was difficult to find the places in the text that you mentioned, as I did not have the book in front of me when we spoke. I didn't have to pay for that call, fortunately.

If we have some luck, and we might, I will send you enough to print a book (if you are willing) of some of the new documents you feel ought to be printed. But, as our backers have set up a company to publish our book, I mentioned to them that they might consider doing one for you, also. The backer talked with Peter Dale Scott yesterday, and he told Scott that he would like to print a book of his. I said fine, then first do one for Harold!

Some very high levels of the Canadian government may be involved in our project, as a full time federal employee has worked full time on our project for months, and the original contact came from someone working for the Prime Minister's Office. I even suspect that the Queen may be involved. Certainly Harvard had a hand in all of this now. They paid for all of my work and got me to write the book, ever since I talked to the doctors in Dallas.

As for the break-in at the Assassinations Committee, There was no robbery, burglary, or theft. Legally it was a break-in, as there need only be an entering into the premises or a safe (for instance) of only a hand or a finger, for it to be a "break-in."

Best wishes to you, and God bless,

Harrison Edward Livingstone
Author

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD 21701

9/12/15

Dr. Harry Livingstone
P.O. Box 7149
Baltimore, Md. 21218

Dear Harry,

Thank you very much for speeding to your publisher, to which I return below.

There is a minor error in the corrections but not to worry about now. Commission Document 7 is a correct identification but as used this was confusing because it is entirely an FBI document. But it is not correctly identified as FBI Document 7. What I was suggesting is that you identify it as an FBI report, which it was, as I now recall of three volumes, originating in the Dallas office. To me it was a consolidated report, a collection of a number of reports by a number of FBI agents, bound and forwarded together.

I didn't keep a record of the other matters I called to your attention. I merely put paperclips on the computer printout and when we first talked removed them after we discussed them. I left the clips in place after you said you didn't have it before you if you ever want to discuss any of the other places later.

Don't bother to send me the sources. My point was not that I questioned them. It was rather that you and Robert might be faulted if you used as your own ~~what~~ could have come from no source other than me. I don't care about credit, as I told you, and being ripped off is not new. My only point was that you not make yourselves subject to criticism by seeming to pass other work off as your own.

Whether I agree with what you and he believe is not material. I believe as Mao only said he believed about all the flowers blooming. and from what - take is a xerox of the dust jacket I don't agree with some of what it touts. Makes no difference. Unless it is irresponsible and I'm asked about it. Probably not much chance of that.

If the stealing of the autopsy pix was legally a breaking then it was. Again my only point was accuracy. I knew what had been published, that the guy was assigned there as security and rifled the safe. So he did not have to break into the office is that way I saw it.

What you say about support from Harvard and the Canadian and possibly British governments is astounding. And your offer of new records is fine. Only I'm not in a position to print them myself. I'm just not physically able any more. I'd like very much to be able to do a few more books. One can be of unimaginable importance and solid as Gibraltar and sensationally new. I call it The King Conspiracies. I'd like to do a shorter one I began years ago and laid aside, tentative title, Agent Oswald. I've got some new good stuff for it. Among the problems are my inability to do much file searching because I can't stand still any length of time at all before the blood engorges my left leg and I don't have enough of it elsewhere. This problem became more serious January 1986 when a urologist went out of his way to give me new throusboses. And I stay very tired. So, I'd need help, an assistant to look where I say and retrieve and copy. But if your people do have an interest I'd like to talk to them and give them an idea of content. What I can do on the King case you can't imagine and what I have on Oswald is official that was hidden and is quite provocative. You won't find it on his service record. The key to understanding this and him is that he was anti-Soviet and anti-US communist. Maybe we can talk about this when you are back. Remember, I don't have a computer and it is rather late in my life for me to try to use one. Also, this hunt-and-peck typing from my earlier reporting days is now worse because I have to keep my legs elevated when I type. In fact, whenever I'm not walking or sleeping, when they are better positioned for my medical problems.

You've got a catchy title and the sooner your book is in the stores the better its prospects. There is a considerable amount working for TV here and abroad and some of it is terrible but several will probably be good. Washoff time.

Sincerely,

