

Mr. Harry Livingstone
3025 Abell Ave.,
Baltimore, Md. 21228

6/6/90

Dear Harry,

As the enclosed copy of a letter to a friend about the newest of my health developments indicates, that is taking more of my time, as are other things. So this is a rushed reply to your letter of the 3rd. I'll be in Baltimore again on the 19th, at Hopkins, for an afternoon appointment but I've written the surgeon to see if he can see me that morning, so I may or may not have time then if you want to discuss any of this further.

On page 1, graf 3, you refer to your difficulty in getting evidence that is hard enough to hang your hat on. In this you are quite wrong, as I'll go into further. You then say that one piece of such evidence is that the total weight of the fragments removed from Connally's body is greater than could have come from CE399. This reflects a lack of knowledge of or understanding of (or both) of what I've published and what is available. Particularly in Post Mortem. You not infrequently, as I once, if elliptically, cautioned you cite it from sources that used it without credit.

First of all, there is no way of knowing the weight of what was removed from Connally's body because some was washed away when his wounds were cleansed. Second of all, as I go into in detail in PM, there is no official recognition of the fact that a fragment remains in his chest. There is contradiction of what fragments were taken out of the body. While I agree with the nurses, the official records, with which you apparently are not familiar, cited less.

I think your concept of what exists is limited by your approach. If you had my approach, for example, you'd have no trouble at all in establishing that more had to be missing from 399 than is missing. There is much more on this in PM. So, I think you've not really read the book itself. Not with care in any event.

Two graf's later you talk about "ear witness evidence" in the plaza. I agree with you on it, as others have, always. But this is the kind of thing that will not stick and the government was able to get away with. By itself, today, it is useless.

In the next graf you offer the opinion that ^{no} anyone could have fired three shots in the time Oswald allegedly had. I presume you mean with that rifle. Not true of some other rifles. But you don't have to conjecture of this. Efforts were made, officially and unofficially, and the best shots in the world couldn't duplicate Oswald's wizardry.

It is true (next graf) that I've always believed there was a conspiracy, and said so. But I've not conjectured "as to the origin of the plot" and I know of no responsible way of doing that. As a means of thinking about this, we can't apply the "cui bono" test as I thought we could in 1966, when I wrote Whitewash II and included that in the epilogue, but we can decide that some people or forces could have seen a benefit from offing JFK. Obviously, the military, those components not in agreement with his policies, and their corporate and political allies. In general, those who either wanted JFK out, LBJ in or both.

Page 2, graf 1, you ask if Robert had shown me a certain autopsy picture. Neither he nor anyone else has. *Not any of them that I can recall.*

In graf 3 you refer to the importance of what O'Connor said. I've cast some doubt on some of it. As a generality, there is always a problem in believing some of what someone says and not believing the rest. Specifically, if any of what he said is refuted, all of what he is quoted as saying is undermined and will be exploited by those seeking to destroy the credibility of what you say. You now have to have more and the most solid substantiation for anything he says and if you use anything you can still be wrecked by others using what you don't that they can prove isn't true.

In the fourth graf and in your letter to O'Connor you say that I said there was a decoy ambulance. I never said or suggested it and never, including now, believed it. I did say there was a second ambulance and I can account for three. But no decoys.

... leads me to caution you - are your preconceptions intruding on your recollections? You then ask for copies of this, without specifying what you refer to. I suggest that when you are here again you do what I suggested before and you didn't do, go over the file in which that info is and copy whatever you want. It is the Lifton/MW file, what I got from MW that I got by asking for only what it gave him.

Your first sentence on page 3 is nonsense: "The thing is, we can't prove that the body wasn't slipped away at Parkland and taken back in Air Force Two or another plane and that it wasn't examined for bullets that were removed." That we can't prove is false. But what kind of thinking leads you to say we have to? Nobody has proven that it was done. Lifton only theorizes that it was, and his concoction can't support its own weight. Which is the weight of smoke. And my God, Harry! Is there no limit to the hundreds of people you are involving in your theory of a conspiracy? All the Secret Service, all the Air Force and its pilots, all the murdered president's staff and friends, etc.,

I disagree with your statement that circumstantial evidence indicates that the body was tampered with in Dallas or en route to DC. There is no such evidence and there can't be. It was impossible. It was also impossible before the Navy hospital. You abuse the first word in what a next quote, "testimony is there that the body ~~was~~ did not arrive in the bronze casket." The only testimony is that it did and there in no other testimony. I know that O'Connor says it didn't, but his recollection cannot possibly refute the eye-witness contemporaneous statements, in writing, or their testimony under oath of not much later. But how many dozens or hundreds more does this add to your conspiracy.

You appear to be grasping for substantiation of what you believe, not thinking this through, analyzing it. You want to substantiate O'Connor. You can't.

The first sentence of the second graf confirms my belief that you are not familiar with what I've published, leave alone what I've always said: "The difference between us is that I know there was a major conspiracy and the government was overthrown." If by "major" you mean no more than its usually meaning there is no difference between us. But when you start adding to what you've published, you've got to separate your conspirators into regiments because they total a virtual army. I've always said that the JFK assassination- and any other- had the effect of a coup d'etat.

You say I "cannot throw out what Marchetti and Frouty have said about this." Which of what they said? Only one account? Do you know what Marchetti said that is not what you have in mind but is the opposite? and while I like Frouty very much saying that Ellsberg was working for the CIA when he got The Pentagon Papers out is only one of the things that are not so or are exaggerated in what Fitch has said.

Let me try to simplify ^{my} some of this so you can straighten your own thinking out and start thinking and analyzing rather than grasping for confirmatory straws. If the crime was beyond the capability of any one man, as it was, it was a conspiracy. But that there was a conspiracy does not indicate who the conspirators were nor does it identify them, specifically or generally. Some kinds of conspiracies can permit relatively large number of co-conspirators without too great a danger to all. Like in Watergate. But any conspiracy to murder, most of all a president, requires the smallest possible number with any knowledge of it. The more there are, the greater danger of detection and of subsequent regrets and defections. From recollection you've got the army, the navy, the Secret Service, the FBI and who can remember who else in civilian life, like the Commission, the Departments of Justice and Treasury, etc. This would be ridiculous in a novel. Back off and think! You say that "someone close to the Kennedy family confirmed all of this" to you. I don't believe it! That someone you regard as close to them believed there was a conspiracy I have no trouble believing.

In graf 3 and elsewhere I avoid comment on the pictures that I've not seen and am not competent to judge for tampering if I did see. But I did not say what you said I said

here, br, rather, asked, "if they had to forge one picture to cover up a large exit wound." I've never thought this and still don't and I see no necessity in any event for them to have done this.

Graf 4 you say, "They did not expect almost anyone to see these pictures for years." Why "almost anyone"? If anybody saw forged pictures they risked ruin and detection. And when the pictures were taken it had to be assumed that they would be seen by many, used in a public trial, ~~here there is no evidence~~. Refusal to produce them would have meant automatic acquittal. Producing them meant close and expert scrutiny.

Of course you now have Robert Kennedy a conspirator. ~~Or~~ didn't you know this? As of the time of the Commission he told Specter that they could have and use anything they thought they needed. Could he possibly have said that if a) he didn't have control over that information and b) he wanted nobody to see it? Or, how could any of those who did not have this control prevent anyone from seeing the pictures?

~~The~~ Beginning at the bottom of this page you say what I regard as nonsense, "The conspirators assumed that the murder would simply be swallowed up in the normal bureaucratic meatgrinder that had not a hope of getting at the truth by the very nature of the 'bureaucratic phenomenon.'" Harry, this is childish fiction. No matter when you think they assumed it, at the moment the pictures were taken or months later. To begin with they had to assume a trial. Later they had to assume that with all the people involved in the official investigations at least one might insist or at least one might leak. If one person quit in protest over being denied access to those pictures ~~the~~ who thing would have exploded. I need go no farther.

On 7 in graf 3 you say that in the "battle over the casket", which lasted a half hour (I think not) "everybody was drawn into the corridor." also not true. The plain and simple truth is that the body was never, ever, anywhere, alone. You conjecture that it was unattended while this diversion and fight was going on." Diversion? More conspirator? No limit to them? The next straw for which you grasp is "We don't know that it wasn't unattended." Maybe you don't want to believe it, but it never was.

Graf 4 is simply awful: "In addition, I recall somewhere in the evidence that the pilot or McHugh or someone radioed ahead and set up a decoy ambulance." Simply false. Do you know what McHugh's reaction was to that tragedy? Can you possibly make ^a conspirator, too? And you now have the pilot in on it!

In the next graf you conjecture that those who wanted to do it got the body at Parkland and spirited it out and to Washington. Your novel is getting wilder all the time! THIS SIMPLY IS NOT POSSIBLE. GET IT THROUGH YOUR HEAD ONCE AND FOR ALL OR YOU'LL BE RUINED. Even as speculation this is dangerous. get it out of your mind and you get out of the clouds.

Again missusing the word "evidence" in the last graf you refer to generally agreement that the pictures were airbrushed. For this to have succeeded it is the negatives that had to be doctored, not the prints. You have not quoted anyone as establishing that the alleged airbrushing was done on the negatives.

On 8, second graf, where you refer to my saying that you should focus on the autopsy report rather than the doctors you say you didn't mean it that way but you'll stick to it. You do things your way, no argument on that. But the distinction is significant, including on your thinking and your approach. The more you personalize the more you divert from the crux. The way to do the doctors is in ~~not~~ by going after them per se but by making them lives with their record. You should want the focus not on the doctors but on what they evolved. That does more to them than you can.

Graf # you refer to a Post story citing the FBI's alleged confirmation that a bullet was removed from the shoulder. I have no recollection of that and I gave my clippings to Wrono years ago. I'd like a copy if you get it but I think you do not want to rest anything on it in what you do because it is as firm a foundation as dry sand.

In the penult graf you ask, "What happened to the backbrace? To the undershirt if any -- did he wear one? Would the backbrace have greatly slowed down the bullet?" Harry, you do not realize what a confession this is of your ignorance of the basic and readily available fact that is without dispute. Pictures have always been readily available. I think I have some. My recollection is that he was not wearing an undershirt. I'm sure on this. But the brace was only of the lumbosacral area. The widest one I recall ever seeing or using was about 6" from top to bottom. ~~14~~ inches up from the bottom of the spine is remote from any area even allegedly struck by a bullet.

But to give you the answer, from conjecture and from my knowledge of such braces, the one that might have offered more resistance to any bullet would not have offered great resistance. Leather. I think he was wearing the kind I used to require, cloth with a fairly firm pad. But not so firm it did not bend to relatively slight hand pressure. I do not know the inner material but it could not have been steel. It was something like canvas or cloth. There are braces that have steel at the top and bottom, I think, but he didn't have one of those. The picture of his brace is included in the pictures I refer to above.

You conclude by offering to write me in for a consultancy on your documentary and as me to give you a figure. I have no idea what such consultancies are worth but that is not relevant because you do not want me as a consultant. There is too much disagreement between us and I do not want to be in contradiction to you or your work. Besides, I do not want to be associated with any allegations of toying with either the body or the film. At the same time, I do not want to be opposing you and "obert on your beliefs.

This is not to say that I do not appreciate the offer. It is thoughtful and generous and I do appreciate it. But I think it is not in your interest.

I'm rushing because I have a medical appointment soon and I want to get this on paper. When I can I'll read and correct it but the many errors I usually make are probably increased by this rushing.

In the 4th graf of your letter to O'Connor you ask him if "anyone" could have torn the anterior throat wound more than he says it was opened, "making it look like an exit wound, or trying to locate a bullet." Harry, this is silly. Any alteration in the body would have been obvious from the ~~records~~ records of the Dallas doctors. And why in the world would they be looking for a bullet when the X-rays showed none was there? But if they had, why would they have had to tear it in the quest? Didn't you ever hear of probes? And if the probe located one, do you think there are not medical tools for removing them without alteration other than possibly stretching of tissues? Particularly in a military hospital? ~~rape~~ grasping, grasping! Back off and think and analyze!

At the top of the second page you say that the MDW did say "that there was in fact a decoy ambulance and a shipping crate." They did not say this and I didn't tell you it. "Decoy" is perhaps Lifton's original fabrication. I said that the MDW sent a GI casket and without mention of "decoy," which I never believed and they would not have said anyway.

You conclude the fifth graf by asking if all that he says happened when "Sibert and O'Neill were not even there yet?" again, ignorance of the most basic fact. You've spent too much time on the trivial literature and not enough on the solid and readily available information. The SAs were waiting for the plane to land before it landed and were in the motorcade to the hospital. And in the penult graf, more of this. X-rays were taken in the X-ray room and then in the morgue with a portable X-ray machine.

In the few seconds before I must leave let me give you the same caution I did before but in a different way. Focus in what you do on the areas in which you are ~~less~~ least vulnerable and to the degree possible shun where you are most vulnerable. One of your vulnerabilities is your confabulation between fact and theory and another is in your inability to be your own devil's advocate. Don't put much weight on reads because none give much support. O'Connor or any other. I'll read and correct as soon as I can.

Good luck! Harold

Harold

6/8. Up at 3:00 and unable to sleep more I read and corrected this. Before I get started on my own day I add a few comments.

First, I did go to the Vietnamese restaurant, as you'd asked me to do. It is no longer the Vietnamese restaurant we knew. It is now oriental, including the old menu. Tom is no longer there. We were told he is in Denver. I assume he sold the place. So, I could not get your books back and presume they were, as I'd been told when - told you, given to Cindy. ^{Who}ever she is. Or was then.

I do not know whether your letter was just your thinking in general or whether you were going into what you plan for your documentary. However, whichever it is, I strongly urge you to go with Occam: keep it simple. As thinking or as documentary content, it is too convoluted, too inclusive, too vulnerable.

You can't include all of your book in any documentary, so begin by deciding what is necessary as a minimum and then consider what else can be included. Don't shun the vulnerable and don't include the whole damned world in your conspiracy.

I illustrate with the O'Connor claim that the body was not in the bronze casket. Even if it were true, you can get shot down on it. It isn't true, but is it essential in what you said or want to say? I think not, so why risk getting shot down with your own weapon and ammunition? You just can't get around all the evidence that the body was in the bronze casket. One of two such things and the FBI issues a statement pointing them out and you are done. Or commission counsel. Or anyone else. I've seen much of this in FBI records disclosed to me. And just as bad, you'll undermine the confidence your own people have in you and your work. You'll also risk what would have less impact, some of the critics pouncing on you. Including Lifton, perhaps. Keep in mind that the producer and his people will also be thinking and wondering and you don't want them to have any questions about your dependability or content. They have to be both able to understand and able to believe what you say. Unless they are either nuts or entirely unscrupulous they'll not believe there was a conspiracy of anything like the magnitude you postulate.

Something else comes to mind. Did HSCA have only Robert examine the pictures and X-rays or did others examine them? Some of the others they used on some things would certainly have had the capability of detecting any hankypanky. If any others did examine them and found nothing wrong you do have potential problems. I have in mind such people as Gary Mack has had do some enhancements.

I think also that you need to separate two things. You believe the film was altered. That you may or may not be able to prove to the satisfaction of others. What you will not be able to prove is who did it. If in your documentary you try to do the latter you will undermine willingness to believe the former.

June 3, 1990

Dear Harold:

Thank you for taking the time to write your probing letter of 30 May. I hope things are going well. My work is starting to flow better, with some help here from others to take care of typing, courier work, and so on. The film producer is coming to stay here this week and begin planning the project. Rick came by yesterday with his brother, and had one beer. He won't drink any more than that. Rick has been very helpful, and I hope to get him hired on as security or something in the Fall. He is a lot more than that at this point, as he is doing his own investigation, and helping all of us.

Now, for the points in your letter.

It has always been hard to find pieces of evidence that are hard enough to hang one's hat on in this case. One such piece of hard evidence seems to be rock hard indicating the total weight of fragments recovered from Connally is much more than could have come from any CE 399.

Another is the fact that clearly different bullets were used for the head shot or shots than that which hit Connally.

A third is that the eye and ear witness evidence of a gunman on the Grassy knoll seems to me to be beyond question, though of course perhaps subjective. In my opinion I believe that in the end what are known as the "Acoustical fingerprints" prove that shot, crosstalk notwithstanding.

It would have been simply impossible for any gunman, let alone Oswald to have fired the three shots claimed and hit anything in the time span the WC claimed. I think there is more hard evidence in this case--as you have noted--indicating conspiracy. But what is your thinking now as to the origin of the plot?

I feel that the cumulative opinion of the condition of the back of the head precludes a postulated flap of scalp that could have been pulled over the exit wound to make the picture of the back of the head we now have. Another possible explanation is that the hole was far enough over to the right rear side and they stretched the scalp over, but I have my initial impressions from the doctors when I was in front of them and showed them that picture, and it was one of ridicule. As you say, the written reports at the time are very strong evidence, and it all indicates that the scalp was badly shredded or lost back there.

*PM +
chest
frag.*

*wound
stuck*

*proven +
implied
can't know*

Robert has been dead wrong about some things. He sees things in pictures that we don't see. Of course he studies them far longer than we do, looking (hoping) for answers. Maybe he has shown you the colour photo of the back of the head, and I would say it is very obviously (and faultily) forged. Too many things are wrong with that are readily seen with one's naked eyes. There quite clearly is what he calls a matte line. And it simply is not the edge of one piece of scalp being pulled over a large hole. I could somehow be wrong, and my neck has always been far out over this. I went through years of ridicule and in fact horror here where I was severely mistreated and thrown into the gutter, abandoned for taking up his cause and being led down the garden path on some points.

hasn't

So far, three different police officers (not Rick) who are trained in homicide investigation or forensics (not photo analysis as far as I know) have found air brushing on the picture of the right side of the head at the hairline. Also, other of us noticed it. When a Md. State cop first told me this, I was astonished. O'Connor pointed it out, and the Crime Lab here found it. That still isn't good enough for me. I have to corroborate things twelve different ways.

I am having careful transcripts made of O'Connor's various talks. There are some inconsistencies. I'm deeply disturbed over the whole shipping casket-body bag story of his. I always thought Lifton was full of shit and that these boys (when they were young men) could have been mistaken. Too much of what O'Connor says about other things is vastly too important, so I'm searching around to find the answers and to see what corroborates what and with who, before I throw it all out with the washwater. One has to weigh the evidence. You are right, that the TV show could be discredited if we do not get all our pins in line.

or influenced high 4/4/68

You say there was a decoy ambulance and a shipping casket? Body bag? Yes, please let me have copies of that as soon as possible. As you may know, I published a refutation of Lifton in the Third Decade, for which I paid a high price, I can tell you, incurring his wrath. Unfortunately I did get sucked into his looking glass at the end, which I greatly regret now. I never should have mentioned his name in HIGH TREASON, as it was deliberately ignored through all but the last draft. Groden talked me into dealing with his evidence. Also, I find O'Connor and these men credible in terms of their bearing and demeanor. I just can't explain it all.

no

Obviously, there is a lot at stake now, and I will check in with you as I go along on the film project. I agree that if the witnesses (or us) are discredited, it can do a lot of damage.

*we can & L has not
proved it was*

no so

*I have never
said otherwise
strong book
stuff that
necessary*

The thing of it is, we can't prove that the body wasn't slipped away at Parkland and taken back in Air Force Two or another plane, and that it wasn't examined for bullets which were removed. Circumstantial evidence indicates that the body was tampered with, and testimony is there that the body did not arrive in the bronze coffin.

The difference between us is that I know for a fact that there was a major conspiracy and the government was overthrown. I talked to too many people in this who are privy to what went on. You cannot just throw out what Marchetti and Prouty have said about this. It is just hard for you to believe that such a large coup could go undetected. It was detected. They wanted the smart money to know what was going on, so that nobody would try to resist them. "They" lined up too much power. They got away with it and they continue, and they see no reason to rock the boat anymore. Killing the hitmen or other cut-outs silenced those links. Remember that the people above Surat and those who were hanged for being behind Booth got away with it. And they were definitely there. Also, someone close in to the Kennedy family confirmed all this to me. Since my family is in that league, only perhaps much richer, I heard things too that simply are not known to the public.

didn't

There appears to be airbrushing or tampering with several different photos, at least according to the MD State cop that looked at them. It may have been because the picture of the face was put on a different head. It may be a "red herring" --to answer the question first I and then you asked--if they had to forge one picture to cover up a large exit wound (and the Clark panel found--I believe--that there was no way to tell where the exit wound was from the beveling or lack of it) then they tampered with others in order to get people off the track. Its a conundrum.

*invalid
assumption*

As for your general approach of assuming there to be a reason for everything, or for taking the risks that they took--They did not expect almost anyone to see these pictures for years. It appears that some if not all were shown to Rankin and Warren at least, and perhaps the whole Commission. But since the WC rejected any forensic evidence, investigation, or real scientific help in the case, if not by accident or stupidity, then by the design of some person or persons on the Commission who prevented a proper forensic study of the evidence, there was little chance that anyone would give this a true investigation of that evidence. Lawyers' minds work differently and by temperament and training could not ask the right questions in an adversarial ambience.

The conspirators assumed that the murder would simply be

nonsense

swallowed up in the normal bureaucratic meatgrinder that had not a hope of getting at the truth by the very nature of the "bureaucratic phenomenon." Same thing happened with the HSCA. Purdy now lies to me and tells me he took the photos of the body with him when he talked to three of the Dallas doctors, and showed them to them, which he did not. I documented this, and we have their reports of those meetings. the pictures never came up, or if they did, they are certainly covering up what Purdy and Flannigan might have been told by the doctors.

Its clear to me they had their men on the Commission (and perhaps Helms--as Liaison--was in their pocket) who covered it all up. Obfuscation by the Bureau and Helms and everyone else at the time prevented a proper investigation.

The battle over removing the body from Dallas lasted a half hour or so, and it is quite possible that this started while the casket was still in the room. Everybody was drawn out into the corridor as the battle rose. Then I distinctly recall that the casket was wheeled out of the room through the door into the corridor and they actually battled over it. In other words (but I'm not sure), the fight started while the coffin was still in the room where they had put the body into it, and it is quite possible that it was unattended while this diversion and fight was going on. We don't know that it wasn't unattended.

In addition, I recall somewhere in the evidence that the pilot or McHugh or someone radioed ahead and set up a decoy ambulance situation. That would clearly entail the shipping casket you were speaking of. I have never been able to find this again, or document it.

But it seems to me that when the battle at the hospital got started and was pretty hot, that those who wanted the body to be taken out of there and got to Washington at all costs, would have got it out of the casket and take it out the other door of the room and through the tunnel out of the hospital while most people were in the hallway fighting.

But this is pure speculation on my part.

The State policeman also noted that part of the wound on the throat appeared to be airbrushed. I do not ask leading questions on all of this. He said it out of the blue and it never occurred to me. Now, a year later, Paul O'Connor, not knowing what this man said, said the same thing. You figure it out. You cannot therefore dismiss this evidence simply because we don't know the reason for it yet. These men have pointed out radical things wrong with at least 4-5 different views of the body.

body never alone

not likely

not possible

show about negatives

As for "Traps", there's a few people that would like to make a whole lot of trouble for me. After all, I am making accusations in this case. The world is filled with right-wing nuts that want people like us dead.

Right thing wrong way

With regard to your comment on my comment that we should prepare our case against the autopsists. I did not mean to phrase it that way, but I'll stick with that. They clearly lied and fudged their report on a few major points. They destroyed evidence. If we able to get in a position where they might find it advantageous to tell the truth--especially if someone made them do what they did--then it is best to show how (in your words) they misrepresented the evidence (feloniously).

This I hope deals with (as best as I can, though not definitively) the points in your letter.

Are you aware of the Washington Post article in 1966 where they claimed that the FBI confirmed to them that a whole bullet had been removed from the shoulder during the autopsy? The Pratt is sending me this now.

*roughly
best & no
inclusion
no idea*

What happened to the backbrace? To the undershirt (if any--did he wear one?) Would the backbrace have greatly slowed down the bullet?

This is all for now. If you could use some consulting fees, I'll try to write you into the film project. Just name a figure for me, and I'll see what we can do.

Sincerely,

Harry
Harrison E. Livingstone

~~Copy~~

June 3, 1990

Mr. Paul O'Connor
Gainesville, FL

Dear Paul:

Thanks for your help up to now. I hope you got the check for Ricks's set of pictures.

Did you or any of the Navy men help (or anyone else) prepare the body for burial before it left the Medical Center (after the Autopsy)?

Did civilians or others approach the body at any time and do anything at all?

Could anyone have torn open the throat more than it was so that it looks something like the large gash we now see in the photograph? In other words, making it look like an exit wound, or trying to find a bullet.

Did the doctors probe the knife cuts in the chest? In other words, did they know that they penetrated the chest? Drainage tubes were inserted there at Parkland. What was said about the knife cuts? Wouldn't they assume at an autopsy what those were and why and that they penetrated the pleural lining?

Were there sutures in the throat wound when the body was put into the casket?

The Washington Post reported in 1966 that a bullet was in fact found in the shoulder, and the FBI confirmed this to the Post, according to their story. Did you see this?

At what time did you leave the morgue? How many times? Where did you go to the bathroom, if at all?

In order to get your biography straight, were you in homicide investigation, and if so, how long and where? Do you have any training in photo analysis?

Do you think that Lifton might have influenced you in some way, and that some part of the historical record may not be correct to the extent that he has you saying some things that others do not support, or that other evidence does not seem to support? The point of this is that you have such important medical observation to offer, that your credibility is endangered because of the casket story and the body bag. I'm not saying that didn't happen as you say it did.

no way in any way

The Military District of Washington says that there was in fact a decoy ambulance and a shipping casket used. But was the body in it? Could you have been confused?

Both Stringer and you at one time or another say that when the body arrived the wound in the throat was tear dropped shaped, and small, nothing like what we see now. What explanation is there for the big gash we see? (before the painted-in part of it seeming to extend it even more).

You said that no pictures were taken after the autopsy began. Isn't it true that the picture you sent of the hole in the skull looking into the cavity had to have been taken after the autopsy began, or did they reflect back the scalp (did they?) for that picture before any other part of the autopsy began? You are certain (I take it) that no pictures were taken generally during the autopsy itself, and during the embalming and preparation of the body for burial. This last is most important. The issue is whether there were reconstructions of the head and that picture of the back of the head then made, or whether these are simply forgeries.

Pictures had to be taken after the chest was opened up. There are pictures of the brain, according to the evidence, but did you see them taking such pictures? See, its very important that you get together with Reibe--if we could only find him. Damn Lifton!

met SS & body of Andrews

The FBI report written by Sibert and O'Neill do not have you listed as present to receive the body or assist in getting it out of the casket. Are you saying that all this happened after the body arrived and you unloaded it? That Sibert and O'Neill were not even there yet?

Were the X-rays taken in another room, and then the body was taken into the morgue and photography began? Did Riebe take the pictures at Stringer's direction, or did Stringer take them and Riebe assist? The "unidentified oblong object" in photos (or x-rays?) of the brain--do you know anything about that?

Well, Paul, this is all I have for now. I would appreciate it if you could answer this point by point. It looks as though we are going to be able to make a two hour TV special which will come closer to the truth than anyone has ever been, and perhaps you can be hired as a consultant (if you are interested) and help out with this in a big way. But lets get all the details straight now. There are so many fine points about that autopsy that no-one has ever understood before.

Best wishes,