

6/29/90

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

Dear Harry,

I have no objections to your criticisms, some of which are justified. Also, although I once had a photographic memory, today it is seriously flawed. I have only a vague recollection of my letter that you resent so much, but I think I am correct in remembering that I was trying to be of help to you. I've read the letter and I'll skim it now and address some of it.

One thing in particular took my attention, on the last page, where you say you "don't think that I (you) confabulate between fact and theory." Just reread your own letter critically and ask yourself how you can believe this. You confabulate throughout.

Perhaps you can better understand the defects in my writing if you understand the circumstances. For reasons I now do not go into, I had to write the first book in a month. I delivered it ^{at} the contracted time and the publisher broke the contract while still drooling into the till. He never returned the ms. I had to reconstitute it in part from recollection and in part from illegible carbons made, because I then was broke, on the unused side of mimeographed writing, on mimeo paper. But so far as your comments may have included it, I tell you that it was, of all improbable things, runner-up in the mystery writers award for 1966! And when Sylvia Meagher read it, in the xerox edition, she had her own book done and if you'd care to you can go through that file and get her letter. I encapsulate when I tell you that in her opinion, if there were a choice between the two, she preferred for mine to be published. Of course, she had quite some time after that to work on hers. *And it is great!*

I've always been aware of the need for editing, in part because it had been so long since I'd written (I'd been a farmer, remember?) and in part because we all, the very best of us included, need editing. I asked Sylvia to edit the second part of Post Mortem when I finished it. She declined, describing it as a tour-de force.

Whitewash II did not begin as a book. I did not, originally, plan more than the one book. I had other writing in mind. I'd been asked to write some lengthy magazine articles for a French service, which then changed its mind. I did very little to that and called it a book. *Deal proved to edit I II - and didn't change a word.*

Photographic Whitewash was 28 days from the time I wrote the ^{pre}face or introduction and the delivery of the first 100 copies, with sewed bindings. They took more time to sew than printing the book required.

What I am saying in point ^{out} how little time I took for the writing, and of course that has to show, is that these are unedited rough drafts, almost entirely. I made a few changes in the first book that Sylvia suggested. They are quite visible. I was so broke I didn't even go into town from the farm to buy a typewriter ribbon. (I was, in fact, broke and in debt, increasingly in debt, when I published all but Post Mortem.)

I began Post Mortem, as I now recall, early in 1967. Whitewash II was completed before the second wave of books appeared. I was simultaneously working on Oswald in New Orleans, for which Dell broke its contract. I had it finished and added a chapter that May. I worked on all but the first book while I was continuing research in the Archives and later, investigating in person. All without any income or subsidy.

I began writing the second part of Post Mortem the Sunday night before the day they started to empanel the Shaw Jury, using a broken East German portable Matt Herron let me use. Parts missing, I think letters. I had to use a library table in his home and in Garrison's office where, for the first time, I used an electric upright. *I was never able to use a typing table until after we moved here. I didn't have the money to buy one and I then picked up a World War I typist's desk for \$10.00 I think you are aware of the*

many other things I was doing, except for Ldl's retyping, entirely alone. None of this is conducive to good writing. End of course it shows!

But it is not all that bad. I was recording for a talking record when part of what was to be used was cribbed in a Jay David anthology. That ended that.

John Friedman, then a reporter on the Baltimore Sun and a friend of the Richard Levine who interviewed J. Thornton Boswell, visited us the afternoon of the morning on which I'd written the Epilogue to II. He read it and said the words rolled off his tongue or over it like a fine wine. I hadn't yet read and corrected it. One man's opinion, of course. But it was the opinion of a fellow writer. And I've had many that are quite the opposite of what you say. And some that agree with you, as in places I also do.

But these are rough drafts on the most controversial subject of my lifetime and after all these years they stack. Written in the greatest haste, alas. But what were my choices? Have you asked yourself this, or any other questions about those books? Which broke the ice for others.

Reminds me. You say Simon and Schuster would not publish us. In 1965 their paperback subsidiary told me that Whitewas would be the Green Felt Jungle of the year, That book was the best-selling book of the year before, their's. It was approved all the way up to Boris Shimkin, then the controlling owner. He liked the book but didn't dare do it. And they were more than honest with me about it. He had just published a fraudulent book, Calories "on't Count," something like six people had been indicted, and he did not want to be added to the indictment. He referred to my book as the red flag before h the charging bull. But they in my presence got Doubleday to read it. Even demanding that Sam Vaughn, Ike's and Nixon's editor, read it. Doubleday was also honest with me, saying that they'd had a high-level meeting on it and their decision was not editorial and not easy to arrive at.

So, everybody does not agree with you and even when your criticisms are justified, they are without context. Moreover, I've gotten and still get thousands and thousands of letter from strangers, a large proportion of whom, from their letters, are not well educated. They do not reflect the trouble understanding what I wrote that you have. This was your one response, by the way, when I asked you if you'd read Post Mortem.

I'm going to have to suspend in a few minutes for a while, so I'll explain part of what I was talking about when I asked you if you'd read it. Do you remember when you asked me to read a printout of several chapters? And I wrote you and told you you should be more careful, that you were taking credit for the work of others by representing it as your own? You got a bit huffy and sent me your notes. I have never mentioned it since, but you represent as your work what appeared in Post Mortem and you not infrequently credit others in your notes for its content that they just picked up and presented as their own work. One I remember is Gary Shaw.

Harry, I'm used to this and don't resent it. I've never before mentioned it to you, for example. To a degree it is inevitable, because I did virtually all that is factual based on the existing volumes and records. I mean it first appeared in my books. Not much has been added from those sources, if you recall the literature. I was always aware of this but to begin with I resented others not citing their sources when I was their source and they were selling my work and pocketing what they got and I was broke.

How broke? I once spent a fortnight in New Orleans and had four meals, to which I was treated. I'd have powdered milk for breakfast, a 10¢ pie if I had lunch, and a 19¢ hamburger for supper. I lost more than a pound of weight a day for that period.

The one time it was possible for me to interview any doctors at Parkland the Ferrells put me up, gave me breakfast and supper, and I didn't have the money for a cab. I had one morning to spend at Parkland. Buck Ferrell drove me there and I had a ride from there for noon. I had to do some waiting but I got to interview Perry, Carrico and

~~with~~ McClelland. That later Ferry and McClelland told you other than what they told me does not give me confidence in what you say they told you and to a degree I knew very well they did because you played the tapes for me. I did do other things while I was there that time, of course, and they were not unfruitful.

One other thing so I won't forget because I must stop for a while now. I think I suggested, on the casket and such, that you go over what I got from the MDW when I asked it only for what it gave Lifton.

And one other thing for context, when I resume. Remember, I once told you I go with Occam, not with oriental philosophy and approaches, which are complex and I think often convoluted. I've not condemned, which I think is the word you used, what you did. All I have said is that I saw (and after reading this letter still think) no need for faking the pictures and X-rays. I have not said that what you and Robert see in the prints is not there. I have said I do not see it. And if I were in opposition, would I have taken the time I've taken to try to help you, including in the other long letter and this one?

In resuming, I wonder if your trouble comprehending Post Mortem is because you have factual rather than literary problems from it?

And another story, to indicate to you how I lived when I did the early work, which means most of my publishing, research and investigating. On another trip to New Orleans I spent the first week ~~with~~ as the guest of a college professor I knew was an FBI informer, in a small apartment he had ostensible for quiet when he worked but actually for privacy with his girl friend. Who with her husband served me a real banquet at home. The rest of the trips that year I had the use of a former slave quarters in the Garden District as the guest of a woman whose son had escaped from an insane asylum with a doctor's pistol to kill Garrison. Instead he beat his mother up. When I drove up to Jackson, where he was in a closed ward, to interview him, I had one of my sources with me, a young woman I knew was at the very least a narc link and I was driving a Fiat sports car. I was loaned it by a dealer who had had as his sales manager a Bay of Pigs captive I'd befriended in the owner's presence. I think this also indicates that I'm not paranoid.

There is a reflection of what I was talking about, your lack of knowledge of the basic fact, on page 1, graph 5, your 1). You say the body reached Bethesda at 6 and the autopsy began at 8, ask when the pictures and X-rays were taken, and say it took 2 hours, at least 1 1/2 for the body to get from Andrews to Bethesda. I've forgotten what is said to be the precise time of arrival at the hospital and when the pictures were taken or when the cutting-up began, but as I remember, it 4 p.m. ~~Mr~~ Burkley had the radio operator make arrangements from AF1 for the autopsy to be done at Bethesda. There was ~~no~~ no trickery with the ambulance. When it left Andrews and when it got to Bethesda is recorded. It was about a half hour. The first X-rays were taken in the X-ray room before the body was taken to where the autopsy was done. I don't recall the time on the picture-taking. Other X-rays were taken during the autopsy with a portable machine.

Yes, I do try to be precise, whether in letters or in conversation on this subject. This is not being "super-legalistic." It is simply being accurate.

You say I care about this subject but "not enough," which you underlined. You can have your opinion. I'm sorry if you and as you say almost everyone you know can't understand my writing. Perhaps if you had the education of the high school and younger children who write me after reading it you'd have less trouble. They have no trouble understanding and offering informed comment and asking sensible questions.

You say you go on your own interaction with those you interview. Is O'Connor an example? You have only belated questions about him, after my comments, if I recall correctly. And you have done any further checking on what they have said? Some impossible.

With regard to the Dallas doctors and what they told you, I repeat, they said the

opposite on Nova, after seeing the autopsy pic and X-rays.

You are entitled to disregard what I said about your theory of the conspiracy but aside from self-serving and I think/unreasonable insistence that they had no reason to be afraid of getting caught in faking the film you have no reasons. You just disregard what is not congenial to your theory and pre-conception. "They" controlled everything, so you answer everything with this assumption. They in fact could not expect to keep all mouths closed and in fact they didn't. Elsewhere on this you say that as of the day of the assassination "they" knew they would kill Oswald. This is enough for you?

If it is, and I think most people would not think it is, try a different approach. What did the conspirators have to worry about once the killers were not caught at the scene of the crimes? What did leaving evidence pointing to Oswald have to accomplish for their purposes other than giving them "lead" time, time for the killers to get away? Nothing at all, I think. Anything more than that is icing on the cake.

"They" did not fake the picture that got the conservative Democrat "Lila" Tydings defeated. It was done by the GOP in Maryland. And you say it was Gus Hall. I thought it was Earl Browder, but I'm not 100% sure. I do remember it.

You are, of course, entitled to depend on what you say the nurses said about the fragments removed from Connally's body. But you'll have a problem in that does not agree with the FBI reports on what they told the FBI and what fragments they turned over to the FBI. I'm not going into all of the other information on this in Post Mortem but to make the point I think I had in mind, there is the fragment still in Connally's chest. Why depend on what is subject to dispute, when the other side gets heard and is believed with regard to every dispute, when you can use the size of the fragment from their evidence, which they cannot refute or dispute. But there is much, much more on this, how much was missing from 399.

Thanks for including copies of my two drafts on this. I see this is what I said at less length. You say this was "a subtle form of sophistry" and that I'm staking a claim etc. Which, obviously, isn't at all necessary. I was merely referring you to where you could and would find irrefutable information. You miss the point I was making in referring to what was not recovered from Connally's body because it was washed away. I've just referred you to what I'd not have had to refer you if you'd read the book, so what was lost from Connally's body is in addition to what was known to the government to be missing from 399, and that alone was enough to rule 399 out. You are so wound up in defending yourself about imagined condemnation and so determined to find a basis for criticizing me you did not even think/We don't know the weight of what was deposited in Connally's body, as I said, because some of it was washed away. Yet you underscore this as you (2). And I added a caution, that while I agree with the nurses, who you cite and I'd known what they said years ago, I cautioned you that "the official records" showed less, and that was based on what the reports attributed to them and the weighing of the specimens turned over to the FBI. Your way you have problems. My way you can't. This is "sophistry"?

Resumed 6/30 You quote my paragraph in which I said that if you'd had my approach you'd have had no trouble proving that more was missing from 399 than the government accounts for. You underscore this and write "arrogant" in the margin. I don't recall what if anything you said about this in your letter or book. I presume that whatever it was did not come from the available official information, including but not limited to documents, published and unpublished. What you say is this letter has no relationship to that. Now without knowledge of that, and you reflect the grossest ignorance of it, where do you get off saying that what I said is arrogant? Is not your presumption reflected here that you know all there is to know the real arrogance? On this aspect you lack any real scholarship at all. And I'm being blunt to try to get through to you, as I did not in the letter you quote. What you quote begins, "I think your concept of what exists is limited by your approach." In thinking about this I not only think I was correct - you prove it by taking the same pretended omniscience approach. You have not used in your book, to the best of my recollection, any of the documents I got under FOIA. You also have never asked to see them. On

5

this basis alone your scholarship is deficient. And if you think a critical audience is going to accept a newspaper account of what a nurse said more than a decade later of what she remembers over contemporaneous official documents you are plain nuts. And instead of asking yourself if I could be correct in any degree you accuse me twice of arrogance.

I do not dispute that "earwitness testimony is as valid today as it was 27 years ago," but then that is because there was never a time when earwitness testimony was all that dependable. Too many factors enter into it. I spent virtually no time at all on earwitness evidence in the belief that is still valid, it can't under scrutiny or analysis stand up against other forms of evidence.

You follow with a dissertation on how governments have been overthrown, saying it can be done by about 50 people. It has been done throughout history by as few as one and in the official mythology JFK was killed by a lone assassin. You say of this one, with a few in your view, and as many in my view, of 50 people was compartmentalized. Only those who had a need to know knew what they did know. Then you say that I attempt to destroy the whole construct you have made, your word, on the basis of assumption you do not make. At this point on this page you have Hoover, Dulles and Helms controlling the conspiracy and include some of the Secret Service and the Dallas police. "They needed fools like Ford and Specter to invent a theory to fit the need." What did Ford invent? And how can you possibly evaluate Specter as a fool? Can't you see how you are stretching without any factual basis at all, to support a preconception?

Then you say they "flashed" phony pictures to trick Warren, Boggs, Russell, Cooper." "This is an act you report as fact. I challenge you on fact and ask you to support it with meaningful evidence. So far as I know, you just made this up, as the conspiracy theory is just made up.

I have never doubted there was a conspiracy and I set out to establish this as a matter of fact from the official evidence itself. No presumptions, no theories on my part. What the government itself said is fact. That cannot be refuted by the government. But that is not the same as theorizing who did it, which is what you do without a scintilla of evidence. That you believe it I do not doubt. But you have not proved it, you won't and you can't. No matter how reasonable it may appear to be to you you will not get any acceptance where acceptance can count or mean anything at all.

You return to O'Connor after acknowledging that you "made a mistake" re the alleged "decoy ambulance." I note in passing that you'd not have made this mistake if you were not so arrogant and self-important in your refusal to look at the official evidence when I offered it to you. I am not saying this to anger you or put you down, I'm trying to get you to think and to ask yourself if this kind of comment can be applied more widely than I have.

With regard to O'Connor, and with the intent of having what I'll say be applied more widely, how can you possibly think he can be accepted as a dependable source if he ~~strongly~~ disagrees with anything Lifton published as coming from him - topped?

Your proof that JFK's body was stolen at ^{Arkland} is: "It could have happened. We don't know that it didn't." "We" don't know. Unless you intend to broaden your conspiracy "we" do know and you either don't know the facts or don't care. There never was a time the body was alone, unguarded. Guarded so diligently that the Secret Service knocked an FBI man down to prevent him from going where the body was. The FBI man had not identified himself. This is a ridiculous argument you ~~make~~ make: because you don't know that it didn't happen, it did happen."

Next the utter nonsense of tearing the front neck wound to get bullets out. Unless you want me to waste more time on this I'll say only a few things. How did anyone know there were bullets in the neck? What kind of bullet would strike in the neck and remain there?

In the end you say that NOW you don't believe the body was stolen or tampered with.

What basis in fact did you ever have for any other opinion? And I'm underscoring your alienation from the available official records and testimony.

Where you say that I said the body was examined for bullets, I do not recall the context of my exact words but I believe I was referring to the X-rays. Bullet metal is like a fluorescent light in them.

I'd have to check my Marchetti file to be able to give you a definitive reply about ^{what} Marchetti said that is the opposite of what you said but it was when Jim ~~K~~ Lesar and I met with him years ago. He gradually changed all that he told us over the years.

What you next refer to is not clear but I presume you mean, in using the word "coup," the conspiracy you visualize. You say of this, "I think you make a serious error which if you mused about this in the presence of newsmen, would tend to ridicule me at all with regard (Regard?) to the conspiracy...." I presume you think I met with newsmen or am where they are, which is not so, ~~is~~ and that I muse aloud about your work. I never have and I can't recall that any reporter phoned to ask me about anything you said. On the other hand, if anyone does, I'm not about to not be responsible and responsive or to be dishonest about what I believe. You have to stand on your own feet. Or to put it another way, lie in the bed you made. But I've not taken any such initiative and have no reason to believe that anyone now will have read your book, write a story, and call me.

You are essentially correct in saying that I "reject forgery of the autopsy pictures." What you have to show me is that there was any need to do this, any purpose to be served by it, etc., and that if there had been, that it was less dangerous than not doing it. And that anyone would fake proof that disproves what they are trying to prove, which is true of the existing autopsy pictures. And X-rays. All you say about this amounts to blowing smoke. You may believe it but there not only is no evidence, it isn't even reasonable. You show the influence of too many novels and too much reading of what to me is the nut literature on the subject.

You do say "they were going to kill Oswald all along." I presume you have a teletype which tells you this? But you tell me what was the need to kill Oswald? To keep him from being tried? Acquitted? How would either have overturned the coup you visualize? Unless you presume that Oswald was a conscious and informed part of the conspiracy, what difference would it have made if he'd not been killed? They'd still not have solved the crime or exposed or caught the conspirators.

If you want to continue thinking and writing as novelist, go ahead. You describe as "bullshit" my saying that as of the night of the assassination it had to be assumed that Oswald would be tried and all the autopsy film would be used in evidence. Your alleged thinking is in terms of the prosecution. I have the defense in mind and it would not be denied that evidence. Matter of fact, before he chickened out, Garrison had gone to court and had won on his having access to all the film and much more. Or didn't you know?

You have the understanding that when Bobby tried to get into the Archives he ^{was} ejected." What did he have to go there for? Assuming he did, as I think he didn't. Until he turned it over he had all the stuff in question.

When you say that Buchanan's ~~new~~ book and "Farewell America" "reflected information shared with the Kennedys and Intel" you again reflect awful ignorance. There was nothing in Buchanan's to share and "Farewell America" was a phony by the French SDECE, which made it all up. With less than a page on the assassination. Have you lost all your critical faculties and swallowed all the crap you can find?

More fairy-tales when you talk about Oswald having to be killed because he could prove himself innocent. If Ray had not been nutty and had gotten only a public-defender lawyer he would ~~never~~ have been acquitted and when it was possible to have him killed easily to avoid the ~~having~~ determining whether he'd get a trial, he wasn't killed and we did exculpate him. You make up theories, believe them, and face nothing else.

You say you have a vague recollection of what did not happen, that "Hugh or the pilot radioed ahead for a decoy ambulance, which you now acknowledge didn't exist, and you say that in acting as an indispensable part of the conspiracy there were not acting as an indispensable part of it. Come on, get your feet on the ground and your head out of the smoke you've been blowing.

I've forgotten what you said about the Post story on the bullet you say you now have. I'd like to read it, so may I have a copy, please?

Of course the Bethesda doctors did not have any of the records of the Dallas doctors during the autopsy and I didn't say they did. I believe that what I was saying is that the Bethesda doctors had to assume that a careful examination was made by the Dallas doctors and that they recorded their observations.

Although you have already acknowledged that you no longer believe that the body was stolen and toyed with, on the basis of an alleged recollection of some two decades earlier you now say that the anterior neck wound was torn open in the quest for bullets, the quest I asked you above to show some rational reason for making. Now you say of those who allegedly did this, "These guys were not doctors with medical instruments, but butchers and killers, conspirators with pliers only." But you've already said there was no such thing. Which way is it, or are you reduced to having it both ways? This isn't reasonable.

You refer to your use of inductive or deductive reasoning but you make no reference to established fact. You can't replace fact with your smoke, Harry, no matter how strongly you blow it. You also say "I am very hard on myself." The letter which I am in response proves the exact opposite. In almost no instance have you given any thought to what I said, self-critically, and instead give me theories, fairy tales and novel plots.

O'Connor? "rely solely on him" at your own risk.

Harry I've taken this time in what I have every reason to believe is a futility, trying to get you to stand back and evaluate and from your response I have no reason to believe that you will or even are capable of it. I intend it to be helpful. But you are dredging intellectual swamps for mud to sling instead of fact you can comprehend and on the basis of which you can reason.

If you want any further discussion of any of this, it will have to be verbal. I shouldn't have taken all this time and I won't again.

and you have an enormous liability coming from ~~what~~ what is readily available and you've not deigned to look at. This will be very hard to overcome now. There is just too much to encompass.

Best wishes,



June 28, 1990

Dear Harold:

Thank you for your long letter of June 6. I have been very busy, or I would have tried to respond sooner. I appreciate your caring and attempted precision in your responses. I hope you are well.

So don't take anything here with offense. We all make mistakes, me probably more than most in some respects. I wouldn't be writing you about these matters, if I was not trying to avoid making such mistakes and trying to get to the truth.

As previously stated, I am deeply troubled by O'Connor's story of a shipping casket and body bag. He is not entirely alone in that story. I am convinced that all he says seems to be the truth, with regard to the wounds and even that story. We have to observe the "demeanor and bearing of the witness." Perhaps it is just some trick his mind played on him, which can happen.

The worst case scenario is that Lifton did this. The worst aspect of what these witnesses have to say is that Lifton developed them. He is like a poison.

1) The plane landed at 6 PM. in Washington. The Autopsy began at 8 PM or thereafter. Were the X-rays and photos taken before that? (They took most of them before the autopsy began, but when exactly did the picture taking begin? In any event, it appears that it took up to two hours for the casket to go from Andrews to Bethesda, and I could never accept this. At the very least, 1½ hours.

As you talk about making a lot of mistakes in your letters from haste, I do that too. This is not offered as a lame excuse, but I'm simply not careful enough talking to you, though I believe for the most part this is an isolated incident. You get super legalistic and precise with me, and (don't be offended) often make as many mistakes in the same breath that you are correcting mine.)

I know very well that the credibility of a witness is on the line when anyone thing they say can be discredited, even by innuendo.

I have no doubt but that there seems to be a lot of deliberate lying on the part of Stringer, Humes and the other doctors! In addition, there are so many contradictions in their testimony. A certain number of clear fabrications, in addition.

As you are free to criticize me, I have the following to say.

First of all, you have a great bias in understanding this evidence. You never really cared enough about your material to make your case or points of evidence clear or readable. Yes, you greatly cared about this case, but not enough. You did a vast amount of important research in the autopsy, but you were unable to present this in a clear enough fashion for almost anyone to understand it. THIS IS WHAT ALMOST EVERYONE, IF NOT EVERYONE, HAS TO SAY ABOUT YOUR WRITING. It is so heavily larded with personal comment and invective, asides, digressions, poor organizations that it is a massive job for anyone to read or understand it. You always refer to your own work as if it is the definitive work. It is a seminal work, yes. But not definitive.

There is so much that you did not deal with or face.

As for bias, it blinkers you severely. Granted, I was acutely nervous for years about the indications that the X-rays and photos were forged. Robert has made other mistakes. ~~Maxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~
~~xxxx~~ Tell, me, did you talk to many of the doctors? I have to go on the personal interaction and impressions I have with witnesses and when enough of them tell me that there not only was no bone in the back of the head (laying their hands--everyone of them--on the back of my head) but no scalp, then there is a prima facie assumption that the picture of the back of the head is forged. B) The picture is out of focus along what we are calling the matt line: a photographic impossibility. C) There are various other anomalies in that picture. D) The autopsists insisted that the entry wound was not where it is claimed in that picture. F) Several other witnesses from the autopsy have flatly declared it fake.

Three different police men independently of each other have found retouching in one of the photos (a different one) and others are noting it as well. There appears to be retouching in several other photos as well.

My closest friend is a radiologist who trained at Bethesda. He insists on numerous things being wrong with the X-rays of the head. The x-rays are prima facie incompatible with the photographs. In addition some of the photographs are incompatible with each other.

This is my starting point. I interpret the conspiracy from this point. The pictures were faked. What you have to say about their fears of discovery are of no account. They controlled that. They made fakes with little fear that even discovery would hurt them, because they controlled the government at that point. They controlled LBJ, and therefore the WC. They made the pics to make things easier if ~~that~~ evidence had to be produced to buttress the official explanation of one assassin. They made mistakes in that, perhaps even deliberately. Making them incompatible and showing them privately to many people years ago let the smart money know that everything was in control, and where the plot came from.

My family is one of the hundred most powerful in the world, and I can tell you that that is how it works. This country has a long history of faking evidence. When I was a kid they used compoistees of Millard Tydings and Gus Hall on every phone ~~xxx~~ pole in the city. But people were always framed for crimes by the police here.

Now, I will try to do some microanalysis of your letter. In your second paragraph you denounce what I saw about the fragments from Connally's body. Your book is not the last word. I go on what the nurses and doctors have said all along. There was a vial with fragments as big as a matchhead, and that greatly outweighed anything that could have been lost from CE 399. I refer you to p 64 of my book. Audrey Bell said that several fragments were at least twice the size of the smallest, (matchhead) size.

I don't hang my hat on one statement alone, but how it is corroborated. So what exactly do you mean by this paragraph (below,) or is it just a gratuitous attack on me?

① 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.

② 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

as for bias, it concerns you severely. I was nervous for years about the indications that the X-rays and photos were forged. Robert has made other mistakes. ~~xxxxxxx~~ Tell, me, did you talk to many of the doctors? I have to go on the personal interaction and impressions I have with witnesses and when enough of them tell me that there not only was no bone in the back of the head (laying their hands--everyone of them--on the back of my head) but no scalp, then there is a prima facie assumption that the picture of the back of the head is forged. B) The picture is out of focus along what we are calling the matt line: a photographic impossibility. C) There are various other anomolies in that picture. D) The autopsists insisted that the entry wound was not where it is claimed in that picture. E) Several other wintesses from the autopsy have flatly declared it fake.

Three different police men independently of each other have found retouching in one of the photos (a different one) and others are noting it as well. There appears to be retouching in several other photots as well.

My closest friend is a radiologist who trained at Bethesda. He inssts on numerous things being wrong with the X-rays of the head. The x-rays are prima facie incompatible with the photographs. In addition, some of the photographs are incompatible with each other.

This is my starting point. I interpret the conspiracy from this point. The pictures were faked. What you have to say about their fears of discovery are of no account. They controlled that. They made fakes with little fear that even discovery would hurt them, because they controlled the government at that point. They controlled LBJ, and therefore the WC. They made the pics to make things easier if ~~xxx~~ evidence had to be produced to buttess the official explanation of one assassin. They made mistakes in that, perhaps even deliberately. Making them incompatible and showing them privately to many people years ago let the smart money know that everything was in control, and where the plot came from.

My family is one of the hundred most powerful in the world, and I can tell you that that is how it works. This country has a long history of faking evidence. When I was a kid they used compoistees of Millard Tydings and Gus Hall on every phone ~~xxx~~ pole in the city. But people were always framed for crimes by the police here.

Now, I will try to do some microanalysis of your letter. In your second paragraph you denounce what i saw about the fragments from Connally's body. Your book is not the last word. I go on what the nurses and doctors have said all along. There was a vial with fragments as big as a matchhead, and that greatly outweighed anything that could have been lost from CE 399. I refer you to p 64 of my book. Audrey Bell said that several fragments were at least twice the size of the smallest, (matchhead) size.

I don't hang my hatx on one statement alone, but how it is corroborated. So what exactly do you mean by this paragraph (below,) or is it just a gratuitous attack on me?

① 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.

② 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 IM, 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.

You engage in a subtle form of sophistry with me. Everyone accuses you of doing this out of need to protect your territory, or what you perceive was your territory. You play games with words and definitions often. Granted, we have to be very precise in this work, but do you do that? You so often screw up as fast as you are correcting others. That is one reason why the press often put you down, and by inference, us.

You say, "there is no way of knowing the weight of what was removed from Connally's body..." and then obfuscate that with what might have been washed away. It doesn't matter as long as it can be established that there were hunks of metal of any substantial size, such as that of a matchhead in size, since only a grain or two was missing from CE 399

It didn't take Postmortem to establish that. Everyone knew that.

In case there is a fundamental disagreement in approach between us that has not clarified before, it might lie with the possibility that you tend to totally rely on official records. We are doing new research, taking new testimony. Is this any less valid than the very tainted official record?

Then you tell me

Amusing → 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 PH. So, - think you've not really read the book itself. Not with care in any event. (WHO CAN????!!!!)

Harold, this is really arrogant. Didn't you read my chapter on the fragments? Don't you think I did all of this? I wouldn't say all of this to you if I didn't care, respect you, and know that this whole case may soon be plastered all over the news and us with it. Everything we say will be under scrutiny, and I don't think you are as careful as you want me to be.

You say I would have no trouble in establishing that more was ~~mis-~~ missing from 399. I did not have any trouble with that, as explained above.

Earwitness testimony is as valid today as it was 27 years ago, if many witnesses say the same thing. It is not useless. A court has to start with certain presumptions about best evidence. If there is corroboration in the form of acoustics tests and medical evidence, then it is more than valid.

As for my saying no-one could have fired 3 shots in that time, of course I meant with that rifle.

#

I think it has been found that governments can be overthrown with about fifty people. Most of them can be on a "need to know basis" and not even know that they are part of a plot. People are used to plant a fake document, not even knowing what it is or where it is going. People can be used to forge a document. Hitmen can kill someone without knowing who they are killing. This has the earmarks of an intelligence operation, and therefore would have been ridgedly compartmentalized. One had does not know what the other is doing.

Once again, you attempt to denounce a whole construct on the basis of certain assumptions that do not apply. I postulate that one or two men in the Secret Service were used, or actively betrayed the President. one or two Dallas cops were used. Hoover, LBJ, Dulles, and Helms controlled things at the top. They needed a fools like Ford and Spector to invent a theory to fit the need, if they weren't actively involved in covering

up or involved in the plot itself. The main things was to trick Warren, Boggs, Russell, Cooper, and some of the phoney photos were used to do that. They were just flashed at them. No study. No questions.

I made a mistake with regard to the "decoy" ambulance, in the letter. You were right about that.

(and to others)

But some of my questions to Paul/are designed to get answers by making people refute me, so don't take the question as an indication of what I believe. This is a common lawyer's tactic.

As for a possible theft of the body at Parkland, I stand by what I said to you privately. It could have happened. We don't know that it did not. I don't think that the evidence contradicts it there. In addition, I had thought that it was possible that the body had been tampered with for the purpose of removing bullets. My last interviews with Paul, and others, tend to contradict this. THAT IS, he has clarified what he meant by no brain in the head. He meant only that a lot of it was blown away. I think that all that Lifton had to say was made up, in this regard. It appears that Sibert & O'Neill made an error when they wrote surgery to the head area. Nevertheless, my radiologist friend said that the X-ray seemed to show surgery in the right temple area. I think S & O'N were talking about the top of the head, as they wrote.

My conclusion now is that no-one took the body and no-one tampered with it. That still does not explain the large gash in the throat, some of which has been painted in in the photograph. Perry insisted to the SUN (with Groden present) that he made no such gash. Paul and others say the photo of the neck wound has been tampered with, and all of them say the wound did not look like that when the body came in.

You indicate at the top of p. 2 that we can prove the body was pre-examined for bullets, although you have that phrase lumped in a sentence with several other negatives. This is a common fault in much of your writing, which tends to rub off on other writers.

Circumstantial evidence exists, as I wrote in the letter to you, that the body was tampered with or stolen, but I now reject this. I think.

What did Marchetti say that is the opposite of what we are talking about with regard to a coup?

I think you make a serious error which if you mused about this in the presence of newsmen, would tend to ridicule me et al with regard to the conspiracy, when you extrapolate from my writing that it would take regiments to have performed this. I don't say this at all, other than to state that numerous people were used unwittingly by the few that orchestrated the coup, as you call it. You say it had the effect of a coup. Please clarify.

As for another statement of yours, a person close to the Kennedy family had me talk to the Secret Service (their own trusted men whom they had put through school) at length, and this person also told me flatly that the family knew (what he, and me) knew) of this plot as I describe it and understand it. In addition, a staff person working for Jackie told me the same thing, in response to a series of yes and no answers. Also told me that the picture of the back of the head was fake.

As I understand it, you still flatly reject forgery of the autopsy materials. I am working with you for the past ten years to get you to see that. I know, it is hard. But you are dead wrong when you project

your assumptions (that they would risk ruin by detection) to a conclusion that therefore they would not have done it. That is where the nonsense is. You admit to a conspiracy, but you fail to see that they won the war, that they overthrew the government and controlled the investigation from that point. The faked materials were made to flash at the key people, knowing that no questions would be asked. People don't get to power in this country or anywhere else unless they are "Safe." People like us don't get Simon & Shuster for a publisher unless we are corrupted, safe, unless we have already been made to sell out to the devil. They were all team players, except for the Kennedys.

Once again, you make a false assumption, that "When the pictures were taken, it had to be assumed that they would be used in a public trial." Not at all. They were going to kill Oswald all along. They would be foolish not to. Their real intent was for this phoney stuff to survive for a long time after it could be said that the recollections of the witnesses was foggy. When the HSCA examined this stuff, they never really questioned their authenticity. No-one has. On the face of it, they look all right, so no-one would give them the acid test. Another false assumption is saying "producing them meant close and expert scrutiny." Bullshit! You put far too much faith in a basically criminal judicial system that could care less. You know in your gut that nobody ever cared enough in official life in this country about this or any other of our political murders. Nobody wants to rock the boat like that.

As for RFK, my understanding is that when he tried to get into the Archives he was physically ejected. He was also shocked and stunned by events, and never went after the case. He didn't dare to, if he knew (as I believe he did) the truth. Nobody could go after that kind of power. But the family retained intelligence operation (INtertelk?) did in fact know what happened, and so did everyone in the Establishment. I got it from my family long ago, and they were in a position to know. Thomas Buchanan's book, as also Farewell America, reflected information shared with the Kennedy's and Intertel. Your paragraph and RFK is total nonsense.

A lot more nonsense: The Bureaucratic Phenomenon is a real good way to obfuscate any criminal case which someone wants covered up. Again you say that they had to assume a trial of Oswald. See, you don't make any sense if you postulate a conspiracy and no plan to kill the Patsy before he could possibly prove his innocence, as he probably could have. A lot more false assumptions from you. Nobody is going to quit, or if they do, they are a voice in the wilderness and no-one listens. The WC bitched about the status of the evidence they had to deal with, but in the end they had to ignore it and go with the flow. They all signed the document. If I was the CIA and faked the evidence, I would be totally confident that the system would completely ball things up and never uncover a damn thing.

Prove that the casket was attended every moment during the battle at Parkland.

If I have a vague memory of someone on the plane radioing ahead for a decoy set-up, that doesn't make McHugh or the pilot part of the conspiracy as you immediately assume I mean. That is a real bad way of thinking, Harold. Gets me in more trouble. I was asking you if you recall anything about a radio set-up of a decoy thing, or discussion of it on the plane. Maybe its in Manchester!

As for the negatives, I don't have the answer. The prints show airbrushing. Period.

The negatives may or may not be there. We feel that what they have are not the original prints, and that they were all doctored from secondary negatives. Those negatives may or may not be there, but the originals are long gone.

The autopsy doctors falsified criminal evidence. They therefore committed a crime, and it is them that are in question. To continue to focus on ~~xxxxx~~ their record is to deflect attention too long from trying to get them to tell us the whole story. These men have committed serious crimes.

I have the Post story about the bullet, and in my opinion, they ad nothing and failed to corrobtrate it. I didn't have the story when I asked you about it.

With regard to one of your final comments about my question to Paul, the fact is that we have a huge tear in the throat that wasn't there in Dallas, and you know very well that Nobody talked to Dallas until the body was gone from Bethesda. Your statement is nonsense. They did not have any such records from Dallas during the autopsy, as you state, " Any alteration in the body would have been obvious from the records of the Dllallas doctors." Harold, I am here (as you are here for me) to sharpen up your brain again, as we may have to do a lot of talking this Fall. Don't be offended.

I also implied that if someone had looked for a bullet before the autopsy, then obviously, they had no X-ray, or if they did, they knew ~~where~~ to look and got the bullet out. But this is speculation. The tear, by circumstantial evidence indicates that if someone was looking, they did not have ~~axxxxxxxx~~X-ray, and literally tore open the throat to get whatever might have been there. These guys were not doctors with medical instruments, but butchers and killers, conspirators with pliers only.

Come to think of it, I may have heard the dstuff about decoys from Lifton. I dred having to comb through his damned piece of shit again.

I don't think your closing crit of me at the end of p. 4 is at all justified, but I appreciate anyone trying to keep me ~~xxxx~~ accurate. I don't think that I confabulate between fact and theory. I utilize inductive or deductive reasoning where necessary. As for being my own devils' advocate, I am very hard on myself. I did not get involved with Groden until I had certain of the above assurances from private sources who should know about the true nature of this plot. I then sought to isprove him. I talk to every available witness when I can.

This ends where it began. I am deeply troubled by O'Connor's casket and bodybag story, corroborated to some extent by others. I don't need that, and it threatens everything glse, as you say. But what else he has told me about the wounds, the photos, is all corroborated by plenty. So I do not have to rely solely on him, and I plan to ignore his other statements. Sure, someone will bring it out, but that's neither here nor there.

As for your final comment on the 5th page of your addendum, I do not plan to prove in the ~~proed~~ documentary who did the forgeries or who was behind the assassination. I would not be so foolish. Sorry you don't know me that well to know I'm not that stupid.

Thank you for your many notes of auation, and your caring.

Very best wishes to you & Lillian,

Harry