Dear Harry, 12/24/81

Among the many things I can now do well without is distribes like yours of the 16th. If you want to belive that all the world consydres against you and that this includes me, believe it. And if this requires you to twist and distort, you won't have any monopoly. If I didn't hear you theories, then, of course I didn't hear you theories.

I tried to help you as best I could, without regard to the content of your book, of which, as you well know, I have no knowledge.

With regard to Sullivan and his story, if you were not aware that he might find no newsworthy you sure have a big void in the head. However, I have no interest in personal publicity and never seek it. You should be aware of what I could have done long this line by merely attending HSCA's hearings. The plain and simple truth, as I told you before, is that you turned him off and would turn any reporter off with the same attitude, approach and statements.

On the other hand, you had no right to say anything to Penn Jones about what I was tryijg to do. That kind of puff, in that source, can well turn anything off. I am capable of speaking for myself and you were not authorized to speak for me. You didn't even ask.

My experiences lead me to believe that it would be a serious error to introduce you or your work to any such people because, inevitably, you'll be accusing them of conspiring against you, too.

We'd better knock it off. Please don't write me again and don't come here again. I don't have enough life left for such wastes of it or such unpleasantness.

I do hope you can get your book out.

Suncerely,

Harold Weisberg

Dec 16, 1981

Dear Harold-

I'm pretty sick today, so forgive me. This is going to be a little bit tough. You are in a way the father of us, so excuse me.

You might have taken a closer look at 7HSAC (medical evidence) as there is much valuable information there.

Jackie did get some of the brains (1HSAC 137), saying so (1HSAC 53) and handed it to Dr. Jenkins (7HSA 287). She was trying to retrieve the rest of his skull or the trunk.

You don't listen closely to what I'm saying, and so did a lot of damage with Chris — I said that the large head defect extended from the back of the head to the side, that there was a flap on the side, and that Jackie closed that so that the Dallas doctors did not see the fullest extent of the large hole. This could be my error though.

The flap is visible in the alleged pictures, on the side, and is described elsewhere by Humes, etc.

People close to the Kennedy's told me she closed it, trying to reassemble his head. If you have contradictory information, please tell me.

I found many other errors in your statements. Your writing is full of speculation and theory. I have desperately tried for 2½ years to get out my findings and have failed. You'd shot down that chance with Chris. Ea
I've made has been distorted so as to his credit
both me, and my work. I have con
testimony discrediting the picture

of the head and I am made out as a fraud, I not only can't present it, I can't defend it.

I've gotten countless "new statements" from the witnesses (quoting you) and I can't get one of them out in the media. Neither can they. The AP man (Voris) whom I brought you was my one chance at it after many hours of work with him, and the article ends up being about you and discrediting me.

I'm in extremely ill health. I'm often just barely alive. I'm living a ten year nightmare that has no end. I spent forty nites this week in my car in freezing weather, dampness, and am quite ill as I write this.

We can break the Kennedy case now. If I had a little resources and a journalist working with me, I could break it.

I don't have any theories. Maybe you do. I worked for a Senator who knew the truth. My family is well connected and knew, telling me. I've interviewed high intelligence officials who told me.

I'm sure I made mistakes and maybe I'm wrong but you have no right to shoot all this down. I'm living with horror beyond all description. The [illegible] I have in this life is with some favorable some publicity, and you helped ruin that

for me again.

"You will never be published again. We can play pretty rough," they said to me. I was defrauded of my property, and my career ruined forever, to cover up for someone else's mistakes.

So you too hurt me, betrayed the trust I put in you.

I motivated the EVU and the Globe and they tried to destroy utterly this case. In the end they gave me all of this research, but the damage was done and in both cases it all but cost me my life. I hope to get over that bitterness someday.

No-one yet knows what my whole "theory" is because I've never had a chance to present it, except in an unpublished book. You and I are probably in near total agreement and I don't think you should have shut me up in public the way you did. Many of your acts, such as the attack on Gonzalez, are highly suspect. Friendship with Wade, etc. Hickey had his faults but he never had a chance.

If you are going to misunderstand nearly every fact I present, (such as the 2.5 cm dispute) and then give the impression that I am undisciplined, etc., then you literally ruin me. This is the new line being pursued by several people I'm dealing with, and it's bullshit. You effectively programmed the media to think of me as a theorist.

I said "Jackie was going after part of his head" (skull and brains) and you misunderstood that. I didn't say she got it. I knew she had part of his brain, but that could have been from holding his head. I then said she put the flap back in place (on the side of the head.) leaving the back open.

Now, that I could be an error, but that is my understanding.

What counts is my interpretation of the data I, the EVN, and the Grobe (under my direction) gathered in the past 2½ years and obviously side issues are burying all of that new data on the autopsy picture (alleged). Who cares what I have to say!

I am in the most desperate circumstances. I had a chance for a book contract and that is all but destroyed. I am just barely alive.

But then liberals have always cut off their noses to spite themselves, always shot down their best fighters. It's like the ACLU defending the NAZIs.

So I hope you will give great thought before you ever make any comment regarding my research or work or ideas.

Nevertheless, with respect,

Harry

Sorry to hear about your wife, and I hope you are well.

PENN JONES' THE CONTINUING INQUIRY

VOLUME VI, NUMBER 4 NOVEMBER 22, 1981

LIVINGSTONE JFK MEDICAL ARTICLE ACCEPTED, THEN SUPPRESSED BY BALTIMORE SUN

by Gary Mack

Our March 1981 Briefs column mentions further research of the medical evidence by a major news organization. A few months later the Boston Globe ran a considerably weakened report of the discrepancies between the Dallas doctors and the JFK autopsy report.

Harrison Livingstone and Robert Groden were heavily involved in providing information and research until the story was written. Both have expressed great dissatisfaction with the final published version, which is why TCI didn't reprint it.

Livingstone, considered controversial by some, has continued his work in this extremely important area. The article printed below, which according to Harry was accepted by the editors and publisher of the Baltimore Sun, was rejected by the owner. It now rests in the newspaper's computer.

We have confirmed that Harry did talk with all the doctors he quoted, and tape recordings attest to the accuracy of the quotes. With the assistance of Harold Weisberg, this evidence is being persented personally to Tip O'Neill, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The full text of the computer printout follows:

TAKE 256502 PAGE 00001 TIME 17:22 DATE 08-02-81

(SCR 256502)KENNEDY/LIVINGSTONE/PERSPECTIVE/ [08-01 Q055.5)[

(Copyright: Harrison Edward Livingstone)

Dallas, Texas_More than a dozen doctors and nurses who either treated former President John F. Kennedy during his final hours or participated in the autopsy of the slain president have recently stated that the offical autopsy photographs of the back of Kennedy's head do not show the same gunshot wounds which they saw_and reported to the Warren Commission in 1963-64.

The autopsy photos, which were among many items of evidence in the assassination kept secret by the Warren Commission, were never offically shown to the Dallas medical witnesses during the various investigations into the killing. After looking at them for the first time recently, however, nearly all of the nurses and doctors involved in the shooting said that the pictures do not show the wounds as they actually were.

The testimony of these witnesses, which was assembled recently in a series of tape recorded interviews in Dallas and several other cities, presents the most significant challenge to the offical explanations of the assassination to date.

Among other things, the startling testimony indicates that members of the Warren Commission covered up informaton about the 1963 murder; that there were three or more gunmen on the scene; that the president was shot from in front, as well as from behind, in a well-planned ambush which was the result of a broad conspiracy.

''That's not the way I remember it,'' said Dr. Richard Dulany, a medical resident who was on duty in the emergency room when Kennedy was brought in, after looking at a copy of an offical autopsy photograph. According to Dr. Dulany, there is a ''definite conflict'' between the wounds as portrayed in the photo and the wounds which he observed in the emergency room.

There were at least 22 witnesses in Dallas who have described a ''large hole in the back of the head.'' Dr. Dulany insists that the photo does not show the large, gaping wound which had blown out the back of the president's head.

Dr. Paul Peters, professor and chairman of the Urology Department at the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School at Parkland, also questions the accuracy of the disputed photograph. Dr. Peters told the Warren Commission: ''We saw the wound of entry in the throat and noted the large occipital wound.'' After seeing the pictures, he said, ''I don't think it's consistent with what I saw. There was a large hole in the back of the head through which one could see the brain. But that hole does not appear in the photograph.''

(The president's widow also described a severe wound at the back of the head to the Commission: ''But from the back, you could see, you know, you were trying to hold his hair and his skull on . . .''

Doris Nelson, a Dallas nurse who was the supervisor of the emergency room when Kennedy was brought there, and who helped to treat the dying president, said that government autopsy photos of the skull are ''not true. There was no hair,'' she said, while disputing the most controversial photograph, which merely shows a small entry wound in the cowlick area, which is four inches from