

5/21/90

Dear Harry,

About a week ago Lifton was on a TV program, "Hard Copy."

Jerry Ray phoned to tell me about it and offered to tape it from the Chicago station whose promotion he'd heard.

I checked the local TV listings and found it was to be aired on Channel 4 a week ago today. I did not use the VCR not knowing who'd be on and expecting crap.

And I wasn't able to pay close attention to it, but as I recall it Lifton is changing parts of his story.

I think he has now eliminated Walter Reed.

Today I got the sound tape from Jerry if you did not take the show in and would like to know what he said.

I'm not taking the time to listen to it now and would find it difficult even to hear with the noises being made while central air conditioning is being installed.

It is my recollection that Lifton was not embarrassed or even apologetic about his admitted major error in basing his book on the fiction that the body was altered at Walter Reed.

I do not recall that he offered any explanation and if he gave a new explanation of how the alterations were possible or where and how made and by whom.

While I have no way of knowing what made him exculpate Walter Reed, I suspect it is because I told Paul Hoch that the gate through which he said the ambulance snuck in was locked, with nobody at it to open it.

Best,

*Harrison Edward Livingstone*

*3025 Abell Avenue*

*Baltimore, Md. 21218*

May 16, 1990

Dear Harold:

Pursuant to our discussion a little while ago, I would appreciate it if you would prepare a briefing paper on questions that should be asked of Humes and Boswell.

As I stated, we are going after them with everything we have.

Please make this as complete as possible, with very specific questions. I will even pay you for your time, if you will accept it.

You did the pioneer work in this area (of the autopsy) and so now we hope to bring it to a conclusion.

I realize that one question will lead to another, and that you can't cover all of the bases, but I would like you to provide us with a starting point in each area that needs to be clarified.

After my recent major interviews with Stringer, O'Connor et al, and glancing at your books again, I think the fraud they perpetrated on us is vast.

Please repeat the Washington Post story Humes responded to, and so on.

I acquired an assistant, who is transcribing some of the tapes, by providing her with a place to live. She is taking care of other jobs, too. I badly needed help.

Robert and I went to New York last week to see the paperback publisher, and went to a play afterwards, and it was a good trip all around.

The key thing now is that the autopsy evidence betrays itself several different ways by incompatibility. It is prima facie forged.

Best wishes,

*Harry*

Dear Harry,

5/16/90

As I told you a few moments ago when you phoned, at the moment my mind is overloaded with special problems, medical and legal. And I'm not a lawyer although on Friday I'll be making on I am. That makes me nervous now and I not only have these immediate matters on my mind, I can't really concentrate on what you want. So, this while I'll be making copies for me.

I think that on the basis of what he cannot deny, Humes' greatest weaknesses are, aside from competence in forensic medicine, his destruction of anything at all and his contradictory accounts of what he destroyed.

Any destruction was prohibited by Navy regulations. Those same regulations prohibited the transfer of the records and required their preservation by the Navy. (He can't be held to account for the latter, however)

I no longer have my clippings. They and a much better collection are at the Univ. Wisc., Wrono. But all the media immediately after the Dallas doctors' press conference reported their statement that the President was shot in the front of the neck, from the front. Humes does cite the Washington Post in his protocol on something else, so why did he not cite it on a shot from the front?

I know his story is that he phoned Perry the next day to learn whether he'd performed a tracheostomy but this is a lie because he knew as soon as the body reached the Navy Hospital and was removed from the casket. This is in the Sibert-O'Neill report that I use in Post Mortem, p. 534: "...it was also apparent that a tracheotomy had been performed..." Lifton's misuses of this very paragraph leads people away from the above quotation from it. So, what did he really phone Perry about? The probability is the reports, quoting Perry and Clark, that JFK was shot from the front.

But if he does not break the interview off, keep asking him why he had to ask about the trach. when he knew about it and told the FBI agents, the only way they could know. It was "apparent".

In your area, pix and X-rays, what are required to be taken and did he take all that were required to be taken? He didn't have all that should have been taken or he did not tell the truth, as I recall it, and took some not accounted for.

In what position was the body when he had the back photographed? (Pick this up from Post Mortem. He had to know that in the prone position the photograph would show the rear back wound about two inches higher than when he was sitting and the shoulderblade did not force the wound to appear higher than it was. I still recall the local radiologist telling me that the scapula "is the floatingest bone in the body.")

Has he read any of the Commission testimony? Carrico's? Didn't Carrico twice testify that the front neck wound was above the shirt collar? Then how can he insist that anything exited through the collar and tie? Has he seen the pictures of the shirt collar and tie since he testified to the Commission? Can the damages to either or both have been caused by anything exiting there? Of course not! I think I gave Robert a good print of what I published in PM that I got from Kaeindienst but if he doesn't have it I can lend you one. My pictures of the necktie are not as good but you can borrow them.

Is he familiar with emergency procedures with such injuries? Don't they not require that in the interest of time such things be cut off? This is the fact. They did he not have reason to believe that the damages were caused not by a projectile but by a scalpel? Particularly when the Dallas doctors, in the paper he read and cited, said that front neck wound was caused by a shot from the front. (I'm continuing in a disorganized way because there isn't enough time to return to what takes precedence now before we leave for supper.)

My thinking is that if you get him rattled and he does not break it off he will be

rattled and may say something other than he has said.

As I told you when we spoke, there is a chain of possession on his notes and I think you should have a set of them. You can copy them from the book or from my copies if you do not have them. Show them to him, including his own certification, then refresh his recollection of his Warren Commission testimony, then go to his HSCA testimony and ask him to reconcile them. His Commission testimony is that he destroyed the draft of the autopsy and my reconstruction from his testimony is that he did this when he learned that Oswald had been killed, or when he knew there would be no trial. The draft of the protocol is not his "notes." aside from what legal right he had to destroy anything at all, does he not know, from his forensic training, that he had to keep the basis for the protocol? He had to for the Navy and he had to for any investigation, and he sure as hell knew that there would be some investigation. So, why ~~stuck~~ does he dissemble on the notes? And if he said, as he did, that his reason was to hide the blood and fluids on the paper, why did he then not destroy all of the paper with blood and fluids on it? The Boswell head chart, which exists and from which I had copies made, I mean the original, has these deposits on it and he did not destroy that.

In the few minutes before we leave I switch to Boswell. I told you to remind me about Richard Levine's story in the Baltimore Sun. I'll start an account of that now because he interviewed Boswell and Boswell, whether or not in consultation with others, has to have decided that what he told Levine was good stuff that should get out. What then happened is that the identical story was carried by AP before the Sun could appear and Levine accused me of tipping AP off. I didn't speak to AP and didn't make any suggestions to anybody. Obviously, I would not have prepared Levine to interview Boswell and then leak what Boswell said to anyone else. I can give you more on this but what Boswell said that

sticks in my mind is his explanation for the correct information he said is not correct on the body chart, the location of the read back wound. He said that if he'd had any reason to believe that he had to be careful he would not have been careless and that he had been careless and made an error in this location. The fact is that he did not make any error, that his locating of this wound is authenticated by the death certificate, which the Commission had, did not use, and it or the archives hid by misfiling it. It is also authenticated by Barkley's authentication of it that I published in PM. If he does not just break the interview off he can't wriggle out of this. Even a candidate medical student can't not know that an autopsy requires precision whatever the purpose of an autopsy and a forensic one even more so. At the time he prepared that chart he had to expect a prosecution in which the autopsy would be quintessential evidence.

It went against me in court yesterday. The judge held that what happened to me was unjust and I should appeal, as I will. But that means I have to get on it promptly so I won't be able to add much to this. First, I think that Humes and Boswell will be unwilling to be interviewed. But if they agree, I suggest that you interview each twice or pick the one more important to you to interview first. I suggest that with each you begin easy, not going into what will get their backs up, or lay a predicate for the second interview in which you do go after them. They have too much to lose by being interviewed and nothing to gain. ...I did not know you are preparing a videodocumentary but that makes no difference to me... There is the credibility problem of those Lifson interviewed and if you use them for you to have credibility you have to get around that some responsible and honest way. I do not know how you can do this absent some means of getting them to recognize and then admit what he did to them. Or at least one you can use as a model. Hastily 5/19, Harold

I'll keep a copy of this and of your reminder letter so we can, if you'd like, return to this in the future when the immediate pressure is off me.

Dear Harry,

5/20/90

Cindy is in the Montgomery County Detention Center!

We were shocked to hear of her arrest. It was in the Wash. Post and other papers we do not see but missed it in I think Friday's Post. We'd thrown it away before going to the restaurant to eat.

Rick can probably get you accurate details. We are unclear on too much, including the exact relationships. Even if there are any.

You are to get a phone call. I write merely because I have no way of knowing if you do, so you'll know.

What the older man said is that Cindy is involved in criminal activity, robberies, with a gang. She does the fingering or makes the contacts. He claims he also was a victim. I have difficulty believing this, it is that irrational to me. He said they tied him up and had a pistol to his head.

What the Post appears to have reported is that this gang is wanted in four states.

Frankly, I'd never have thought it of that young woman. She makes no such appearance, gives no such impression.

Yet what we were told is that she was found to have a three-carat diamond, among other costly things.

I have the impression that Tom's wife, whose name is something like "Lane," will get your books and note to Cindy and is going to suggest that Cindy phone you. She did seem terribly distressed and was using an excess of makeup to hide the reflection of this in her face. If you phone, may I suggest that you speak to her rather than any of the others? In part this is because her comprehension of English is best. But the older ones are clearly much more embarrassed. There is an older woman there now, too.

They have changed the name to "Hana's" and will have a new menu tomorrow. They are now including other Oriental dishes, particularly Korean.

We were there with dear friends of our youth, a reunion after about 50 years.

If you remember, when we were there I asked Tom if he can prepare fish for me without any salt and he reeled of a number of kinds. Since then he's done this and it was both superb and beautiful to look at. And much more than the two of us could eat. I go into this in the event it interest you when you are here again. I'd never heard of this fish he served. He called it "salmon trout."

We'd not been in a really good Italian restaurant for decades so we did enjoy Rick's taking us to Sabatini's Thursday very much. Alas, it was too close to the lunch we'd had at the hospital. As he may have told you, I did not get to see two of the doctors I'd hoped to see because there were long-lasting surgical emergencies. I have a new appointment with the chief of cardiovascular surgery for 6/19, 1 p.m.

Don't know how much room, if any, you have in your garden, but we have some young Beauty Bushes" "il doesn't want. Those that are old and established are now in bloom. So if you are here while they are still in bloom you can see what they look like. As you can in gardening books.

I am under the impression that "Lane" will get your books and note to Cindy. If we do see anything in the papers we'll clip it for you. But ordinarily neither of us has any interest in the Post's crime news. I'm curious if Rick gets the rundown for you or what Cindy tells you.

Best,

