

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

1/22/91

Dear Harry,

When I came to the 4th graf of your yesterday's letter-made good time- I wrote "confidential" on it and when I finished reading it I put it in a separate folder marked "confidentjal."

I don't know how much I'll be able to write you today but because I appreciate your anxiety I will have something for the mail in the monring. With the cold predicted, just going out in it is prohibited and if there is any wind I won't. I paid no attention when a doctor told me not to go out if there is much windchill and a couple of yours ago, on a beautiful, sunny Xmas morning I walked out for the ^{papers} mail and almost didn't get back to the house. If it is too dangerous for me to go out in the morning I'll try to drive to a mailbox where there will be a pickup in time to make the only outgoing mail we have, once a day for the entire area.

Last Thursday, after my blood test, I was too weary even to think of my prescribed walking. I want home instead and my fellow walkers, knowing that except for bad weather I never skip it, were worried and some phoned. Today I had to cut it short, which was a real surprise, as I explain. After last Thursday's experience I got a prescription from the family doctor so I could stay asleep. It has worked to a limited degree-until I have to urinate. I am then able to return to sleep promptly but until this morning I still was wide awake the next time I got up and could not return to sleep. This morning I was able to sleep until almost 4 and I felt much better for it. But again I had trouble walking and had to cut it short.

I'm having, and for some time have had to, let too many things go because I'm just not up to it. You should remember the great accumulation of papers all around my office that have been unfiled and still are.

It simply is not possible for me to provide a clear statement of all the lies by the doctors. I'm assuming that you mean the autopsy prosectors. But the last sentence in your letter may make it possible for you, where you say you'd use resources and ask Rick or David. I suggest if he can or will David because of his criminalkstics training and education. I've written you suggesting the chapters of Whitewash for reading and ~~with~~ with this somewhat better understanding I suggest that they, wither or both, use the index to Post Mortem to find where they are mentioned and then to read more than the mention. If David does this, and makes a list as he goes, I think you'll have what you want. ~~From~~ From memory that isn't as good as it used to be, ^{two} make additional suggestions for reading. I do mean all the last ^{two} chapters in the first book, not skipping ^{using} by the index. In this regard I suggest particular attention to the dishonesty of Specter's questioning. I go into that at some length and believe it can help understanding. I checked the table of contents. It is the last 2, about 30 pp., not that much and fully cited.

All of Part II of Post Mortem, but I think it will be possible to skip some and that the beginnings of the gra's will indicate which. When I can finish the reply to your earlier letter I'll have a couple of specifics. But this Part does prove that Humes did lie and that the lying cannot be accidental.

My recollection of Part III is not clear enough to be specific but I believe that it holds what includes some of the proof you are looking for. To a degree the table of contents will indicate the more ^{likely} relevant chapters.

Of course Humes is the most important one for your purposes as to understand them. So in particular the chapter on the burning of what he burned and on the subsequent changes in the holograph and in particular the receipts I print in facsimile. With this his public HSCA testimony. He lied he head off in that and the proof is in that PM chapter. He did not burn his notes. He burned the first draft, and that as soon as he knew there would be no trial because Oswald had been killed. I published the receipts for his undestroyed notes.

I do not recall that I learned any more in the records I got under FOIA but if I did I am sure I made copies for subject filing and when David or Rick is here they can make copies of anything that may appear to have relevance.

It is possible that the Finck chapter in PM may contradict ^{it} Humes if Humes ever said they had no pressures applied.

Because I may have to stop and try to nap, I do not want to forget to thank you for an ambiguity. It is not clear whether you are offering me a computer or electric typewriter or asking a question. But if it is an offer, thanks but I can't use either. We just gave two good electric typewriters to a charity. One was a standard typewriter in first-rate condition and the other was an electronic job with some of the features all needs not working as they should. With the passing of time without the supplier coming up with the parts and making the repair she had to get a new one. From somebody else! I've tried an electronic portable and loved it but for many reasons I won't take time for now I had to return it. My limitations create too many problems that can't be solved.

I'm sorry that Rick took Larry Howard when he followed my suggestion and saw Henry Wade. From whom I've heard, a nice letter. I'd suggested Lavelle.

I think it is in Whitewash II that I made the mistake relating to the position of the limo by being misled by Liebel's ^{positioning} of Altgens ^{NS} but I can't take the time now to look it up. That was long ago and my recollection may not be complete or fully accurate. It may be near where I got into the moving of the signs and the paving of the street and the ^{NEW} traffic lines not being identical. As I recall it, Liebel placed Altgens too far to the ^{or west} east and as I now recall, based on that I assumed that the road stripe not visible in Altgens' picture did not exist. It can't be seen in it but it is there, obscured by the car. Mislocating Altgens altered the angle.

Giving you a critique of Garrison's case also is impossible. It would take too much time and would still be incomplete. I think, however, that I was talking about his last book. Pretty much the same would be true of that. He lied about things that could have embarrassed him and for other reasons. I do not want to get into any controversy on this or on him, so I want you to go no farther with it. But I was involved in some of those things not related to his alleged case against Shaw. In particular getting rid of Boxley, which he attributes to Salandra. Salandra had nothing at all to do with it. I alone did the investigating, with some help from some of the detectives assigned to Garrison's office. ^{They got some records for me.} I've annotated a copy of the book for the historical record and I leave it at that. But I did not exaggerate. It is a frightfully dishonest and self-serving book.

I assume you have the book so I'll tell you one story that may amuse you. If you read it you'll recall his account of going to Albuquerque to make a speech, that Boxley joined him there and that indignant over that waste of his limited funds he sent Boxley right back to N.O. The truth is that the night before, really the early morning, I was tipped off by an absolutely solid friend and source of a plot to kill Garrison. I taped it, woke the chief investigator, Ivon, up, told him about he, he came and picked me up after phoning a couple of others high on that staff and they listened to the tape and decided, as I had, that it could not be ignored. I made three suggestions that they considered. I do not recall the two they did not accept but they agreed to the third, that I tell the FBI. I have those FBI records in substantiation. They decided to send Boxley as an armed bodyguard. Rather than sending Boxley back to N.O. Garrison took him to Los Angeles, where they lived it up for a week at an expensive hotel, The Century Plaza. While there a package was delivered to Garrison. Boxley grabbed it, took it to the bathroom, filled the tub with water and held the package in it until he sure sure it was waterlogged. He feared a bomb. When they opened the package it was of books that I suppose were ruined. There is more to this story but I think what I say should be enough.

If you can't do it yourself, as I think you should try, I urge you to get David or Rick to do what I say and then check my files on the doctors. All three of you should really be familiar with what I'm referring you to. For your purposes what I'll return to later when I finish response to the earlier letter, the Part of Post Mortem dealing with the Clark panels reports. I did say, explicitly, that Humes lied, libel if not true. And I've not heard a word of complaint about it from him or from anyone else.

Sincerely,

David

Confidential

January 21, 1991

Dear Harold:

Thanks for your letter of the 16 th and a shorter letter just before. I know that your many physical problems impede getting things done, and of course I am very sorry for the pain these things cause you. To a lesser extent, it is happening to me too, and it is a bit scary. I was more or less of an invalid with serious asthma much of my childhood, and now the effects of so many years of medications add to my troubles. Plus loads of new problems.

I'm just saying this so that you know I do sympathise. What I'm asking is to try to make one more big, organized, and methodical effort. I have got a major investigation under way and hopefully will be able to put together a more definitive book for historical purposes.

I need your help. You talk about how hard it is to get reading done, and I find that I have been so addled in the past two years that I cannot read much at all. I'm having trouble getting through a newspaper in the morning.

Whatever I say here of a personal nature is strictly between us and not to be broadcast all over the world. I need to unload to you and have you understand my problems too, if you will, and hope that you can do what you can to help me.

Primarily, if you can direct me to a specific page number where I might find the answer in your works, rather than have you write something out all over again, fine, but please don't get angry with me for asking. I have a lot of trouble reading anything, let alone your books at this point. I have been through one terrible ordeal after another.

No-one will ever know what sort of person Robert really is but me. I have never had such a bad experience with anyone in my life. He all but ruined me. At one point last Fall I really wouldn't have cared if he had died, he had hurt me so deeply. Now I find he has wrecked the most important thing in my life. This just surfaced.

Please don't repeat all of this. You simply cannot know what I have been through. I made so much work at such a heavy cost, I wonder if I will ever get a quiet space in my life to recover.

Thank you for the tip on Morrissy. I get very many letters now, most of which I answer, but some just keep coming right back at us. Some of these folks are very nice and interesting people, and some get put in the "nut" file.

I needed to have a clear statement from you on every point that the doctors lied about. I had some specific requests in my letters, so I hope you can give them your attention.

Did you get the check? Could you use a computer or electric typewriter of some kind? A computer with a word processing

program is a great tool to have, but it has to be set up and takes a bit of learning. Not any real problem.

Rick is late with his report on the Dallas trip. He did say that he found one piece of evidence that seemed to corroborate the Ricky White story.

He also got in to see Henry Wade, and took Larry Howard with him.

As for Moore and his piece of shit, I don't put any store by it. I sent that to you just in case you were unaware of what he had to say about you. I was his real target, but Groden's ego shielded me, since Moore was stupid enough to think Groden wrote HIGH TREASON, and so much of his book was devoted to attacking Groden. That pleased me, since at this point anything at all that hurts him is okay by me.

Yes, Robert cannot write. Two pages were requested by me and it was a devil to straighten out. Two other pages were forced on me by him. During the final drafts, it took me up to a year to get him to read the book once. He did some corrections and editing, but it was minor. I saw some of his sort manuscript, a try at another book, and it was awful.

I talked to him yesterday and he bitched because the Baltimore Sun article recently made clear that I wrote the book and not him. I tried to share with him but shortly after the book was printed, he published a newspaper story telling how he wrote the book and why, and never mentioned my name, even that there was a co-author. He even told the Post Office that he owned half my company. He interfered at Berkley very greatly.

He did so much else to hurt me, and sabotage my little company, I'll never forgive him. I never should have shared with him at all, and was totally taken in by him, but his plan seems to have been to walk off with the farm. He is still asking for my help.

Also, he double dealt me three times, when we signed with a film producer and then he made a secret deal with another. David Lifton was paying him thousands of dollars after our book came out while Lifton was trying to destroy me behind my back contacting Harvard, the police, and everyone else. The two of them got me in that trouble in 1979 for which I took it in the neck publicly, and those are the reports you have from Justice, which Rick got. I just endured a whole year of very tough scrutiny from Rick before they finally came to me and said "we don't believe any of the stories we heard about you," and related to me much slander.

Meanwhile, Rick is slandering me to all of our witnesses. (I have it on tape.) I had a very bad year and a half just now. Then Robert and his lawyer totally disrupts Berkley just at the moment they are publishing, with a lot of false charges. Now he has assigned back to me the half of the copyright I was stupid enough to voluntarily give him.

Can you direct me to where you explain what the story is on


the Altgens photo mistake? I don't quiet understand that. You say you made an error because Liebler had Altgens in the wrong place?

You also talk about Garrison. Can you give me a critique of Garrison's case? You say that he misrepresented things as dishonestly as possible. What?

Harold, I know that I need you to help me in very specific ways, but its to the end that my next book will not have mistakes, or very many of them. You know that I made very many corrections in the last one on the medical chapters, which you had called in to me.

I know that you are tired and unwell, but we have got to finish the job with this case, and you and I and perhaps Rick and Dave are the people to do it. I am willing to spend some of my resources to that end.

God bless,


Harrison E. Livingstone