

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

5/30/90

Dear Harry,

I respond to your yesterday's letter in haste on the chance we go out for supper. That would save a day in reaching you.

You underscore the word "question" and say that "some of the pictures appear to be altered without reason." But you at no point address why anyone would alter an autopsy picture without reason. Is it not a fact that there must be a reason for any alteration of any such photographs? Why would anyone run the risks entailed without some really compelling reason?

With regard to O'Connor, I begin by emphasizing that I have never said he is dishonest and do not even suggest it now. But I repeat that I'm confident that in some areas he is not correct. A number of innocent explanations are possible. My own belief is that where he is not correct it is part Lifton's influence and part just confused recollection.

You quote him as saying "that the large gash in the neck was painted it," after which you annotated "Why? Red herring?" You then say he "now says there was only a tear-dropped shaped hole there when they got the body." You add that Stringer also told you this. I say it is impossible. Among other things, read in Post Mortem what Dr. Perry told me about his strange cosmetic concerns when he knew the President was dead, that he made the incision horizontally, so the healed wound would look like a normal crease in the skin. There is no doubt that the tracheostomy was performed. Through a hole shaped like a tear drop? A hole of less than a quarter of an inch? Come on! This is impossible. *See p 2 of #*

With all he and Stringer and others said much later you have the problem of the existing contemporaneous records. And unless you conjecture that the entire world was part of a conspiracy you do have serious problems with using these people as witnesses.

There is no doubt at all that a shipping casket was delivered. There also is no doubt about why. It was shipped by the Military District of Washington, acting normally and automatically. When Lifton's fabrications appeared or I first heard of them, I'm not taking the time to check but you are welcome to, I filed a simple FOIA request of the MDW. I asked only for copies of what it had provided Lifton. I have them as I got them and you are welcome to read or copy them.

(Yenne)
He says there was no body in the bronze casket. Everybody else says there was. Read the Sibert-O'Neill report again, for example. It is in Post Mortem. They were there when it was opened and there simply wasn't time to cue them in on any hanky-panky. And the body was not in a body bag, as they and others who were there say *it wasn't*.

Check the list of those present in the Sibert-O'Neill report. They may have missed some who may have entered and left the autopsy room later but I doubt they missed any who were there to begin with. They have O'Connor as present at the autopsy but not as receiving the body or assisting in getting it out of the casket. What happened is that they body was removed for X-raying before the autopsy examination itself began and then was taken to the autopsy room.

I think O'Connor is quite wrong in saying that no pictures were taken after the autopsy began, by which I take him to have meant after the body was in the autopsy room and after the cutting of it began. I think, from recollection, that the pictures themselves refute this. From recollection, how else could they have photographed what is described as the unidentified oblong object inside the back of the head? And how about the film that the Secret Service exposed?

I don't know that there is any meaning in his statement that no pictures were taken after they started putting plaster in the head. That would have been done after the end of the autopsy, by the funeral-home technicians preparing the body for interment.

As for any "decoy ambulance," all that means is that there was a second ambulance there and he or Lifton or both decided that it was a decoy. What was the MDW GI casket delivered in? Was it an ambulance? Neither he nor Lifton, who knew of it, make any reference to this MDW casket. Or, was another ambulance there for other reasons, like delivering another Navy patient? Or the victim of an accident on the nearby road? **

You say "there is no compelling evidence that the body was tampered with." I say there is no evidence at all, that this is Lifton's impossible fabrication. You follow this by saying that "It may have been as simple as slipping the body out of Parkland while the scene was staged over the casket." That is a dyadream and is not possible. The body was never unattended, there were many too many people present and there was an enormous press corps in and around the ambulance dock.

But were this done, how do you account for getting that body to Washington without any record of it and of getting it into the Navy hospital without any observation? and unless you are going for some of Lifton's crap, why would anyone have done this?

Do you have even the remotest notion of the simply enormous amount of work and people required by all this theorizing? All those people to somehow have been informed in advance of all the details none of which could have been known until after the shots were fired? Can you believe that the veritable army you are talking about consisted only of people who would forever be silent? Or have left no record of any kind at all? It is not reasonable.

I'm not competent to offer any opinion on any alteration of the pictures so - don't. You know what I've said about this in any event. I saw and see no purpose in it and my eyes, which are far from the best, do not see what Robert says he sees in what he published.

Before you assume that the report from the crime lab, the note you added on the envelope, "may be a trap," you ought ask yourself why the Baltimore crime lab would want to trap you or anyone else, including the colleague of those policemen Rick. I see no reason for them to. and my, my, how much more enormous the conspiracy grows!

They thought there might have been some airbrushing of a picture of the right side of the head, rather of the right eye there. Why? What purpose could that have served?

As I read and correct what I've written where you ask "Why" relating to the alleged non-existence of the slit in the throat, allegedly painted on, you do not address your own question. I think you should. Why? What purpose was or could have been served by this?

** Few things are less unusual than ambulances at hospitals.

As I reread your letter I note that you asks me to prepare my case against the autopsists. Why them personally rather than their autopsy and their report(s) on it? While they cannot be separated from their report(s), why target them personally rather than their report(s), their work, their conclusions, etc.? Should not primary interest be in the work?

You say that O'Connor is giving you extensive notes. You need devil's advocacy much. If you have a finished documentary and any one part of it is refuted the whole thing is done in. and nothing will be believed. I suggested this earlier, in a different way. and it will seriously impair the sale of the reprint of the book.

Remember, the Dallas doctors told you one thing, on tape, and when they were taken in to see the autopsy pictures they came out and said they show what they remember. Learn from this. You don't want anything like this to happen to your documentary.

If you want to discuss any of the by phone, not until after Monday. A number of people are coming and will be here until that night.

Best to you all,

Harold

Harrison Edward Livingstone
3025 Abell Avenue
Baltimore, Md. 21218

May 29, 1990

Dear Harold:

I hope this finds you well.

I have scored several major wins. A ~~producer~~, provided by our publisher, is flying here next week to stay at my house, and Robert and I will begin preparing a 2 hour television special to lay out the new evidence and the case, OUR WAY.

I have moved for total editorial control.

As stated, it is imperative that you prepare your case on the autopsists, and be prepared to carefully present this for filming. Also, it looks as though the police investigation will go into it also.

Rick says that he "has no doubt that the pictures are forged." The Crime lab will get a look at the set O'Connor provided this week. If this turns out positive, we will provide a better set, hopefully, and are not walking into a trap.

Question: Some of the pictures appear to be altered without reason. As a Md. State Police homicide investigator pointed out to me last year, there is airbrushing all along the hairline across the forehead, and on the right side. Why? Robert says maybe because the face was added onto another head.

PAUL O'Connor ^{noted} said the same airbrushing, and a lot else wrong with the pictures. He is giving us extensive notes under my proding. He is a retired cop (homicide investigator) and is in direct touch with Rick now. He calls frequently and indicates he is with us and wants nothing more of Lifton. He said that no pictures were taken at any time after the autopsy began. He was with the body to the time of closing the coffin, and no pictures were taken after the plaster was being put into the head. Says that the back of the head pic is simply forged, and has said this often now.

Says that the large gash in the neck was painted in, and now says there was only a tear dropped shaped hole there when they got the body. This is what Stringer told me.

He is adamant about a shipping casket arriving and a body bag, and says he is sure there was a decoy ambulance, that the body was not in the bronze casket. There is no compelling evidence that the body was in fact tampered with. It may be as simple as slipping the body out of Parkland while that scene was staged over the casket.

Best to you,

301-243-4272

Harry

Harrison Edward Livingstone

3025 Abell Avenue

Baltimore, Md. 21218

20

411

After waiting this, Rick called. The findings
are not good. It may be a trap, they want prints.
They did say they thought there was airbrushing all
around the right eye on the one pic of the right side of the
head.

Dear Jim and Bud, who may be in outer Outer Mongolia,

5/25/90

Harry Livingstone tells me that you are considering filing suit for Rick Waybright for the JFK autopsy film. If so, I think I can help, and that it can have a potential of which you may not be aware. If, as Harry said, crime-lab police are going to help.

Whether or not the participation of crime-lab specialists makes a difference as a matter of law, it can make a great difference in its effect in the areas to which I have devoted much time and have considerable evidence.

I think it can, depending on the attention it would get, break the official mythology and thus have considerable impact.

I have what the crime-lab experts can attest to, giving it meaning that can not be refuted and can make disclosure of the film appear to be a national need.

What I have in mind can also have considerable political impact and thus get more attention and have more significance that could translate into attention.

I'm not going to try to go into this now, in part because there is too much detail and in part because some is photographic but by a copy I'm suggesting to Rick that he and his expert or experts come up and we can discuss what I have in mind and show the expert(s) what I have and suggest what they can do.

If their schedules preclude their coming together, I suggest to Rick that we tape what I'll say and make copies of some of the things I have in mind.

Where I refer above to appearance of a national need, the nonverse is that withholding can be made to appear a national scandal and unjustifiable suppression.

Indispensible, in what I have in mind, is crime-lab expertise. That is something we have not had before, something I could not get years ago when I tried.

I really do see a major sensation and an importance never before possible.

If Rick and the expert(s) cannot get here together, he knows I'll be in Baltimore on as I recall the 19th. I've check^{ed} and it is correct. As of now I have only a 1 p.m. appointment at Johns Hopkins but I may by then have more.

I think it is probable that none of you can visualize the potential I see in this. I think it cannot be exaggerated, it is that great.

Do not assume that because I say the participation of crime-lab experts is indispensable that there would be any layman's difficulty in comprehending because that is not the case. Put together as I can put it together the average person will understand it easily and completely.

So, of course, will any judge.

In Baltimore, I think Judge Kaufman in particular if he still sits on the federal district court bench there. Jim should understand this!

Separately and unrelated, I enclose a clipping from yesterday's Sun you may find of interest. This story was not in the Post yesterday or today.

Best to you all,