

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

12/17/91

Dwar Harry,

Your use of the old zip <sup>delayed</sup> your letter. I regret that once again you have not done what I suggested, not discussed it with me, and after the waste of considerable time <sup>may</sup> yet have to go back and do what I suggested if as I suspect after reading some of this chapter there is no other practise approach.

You do have problems that are sometimes not easy to cope with. They have made problems for us before. If there is anything <sup>you</sup> can take to ease them I suggest that you do now and then, when and if it is possible for us to return to them, you do it again.

I do not deprecate your problems and ~~I~~ know they are real. But this time you are going to have to accomodate with mine, which are also real and very pressing. I am now, in addition to added medical consultations, having to spend more than six additional hours in physical therapy <sup>weekly</sup> and I'm having trouble staying asleep. It is almost supertime and I've been up working since 1:30 a.m. I am more than ~~merely~~ tired. And I am deeply involved in what means much to me and that also is very pressing and it may get worse once people can see and write more about Stone's film.

So I begin with bluntness and please understand that I am not trying to put you down or to insult you. I think your publisher made an unreasonable demand on you and that you simply are not able to do what this chapter reflects he wants you to do. I gather it delays the appearance of the book, too,

First, and again this is not to insult you: you are grossly ignorant of the basic material and this time, in Whitewash, it is not at all incomprehensible. You use the most dubious and trivial sources and remarkably few of them. What you use is not fit for use as toilet tissue, Some is just wrong and some is without any credibility at all.

I've read and highlighted the first 7#plus pages and made a few annotations. This is so very bad it is not possible to annotate it in the margins.

You have been put in the position of having to write about what you know nothing about except the ravings of the lunatic fringe. I can't help or eliminate that.

If you had done as + asked it might have worked if after I read and marked this you taped it and went from them but there is so much wrong in these few pages I think that would not really have worked because you do not have the factual basis to begin with, 2

I do appreciate the check for \$100 but as you know, I've never asked for any pay for any help. More, if I'd know what this chapter really is, I'd not have said I'd try to help you, certainly not for that money.

So, let me think aloud with you and see if we can in some way salvage this so you do not look like an ignoramus to your publisher and so that he may perhaps be satisfied.

But in thinking of this + have to know precisely what he demands of you.

Please understand that from what I've read you heed the nuts who are not ever dependable

and flaint<sup>y</sup> ignorance and make serious factual errors and make little or no sense.

From as far as I've gone you do not want to use any of this stuff. Your publisher who knows nothing at all about the case may not be all that disappointed but as he gets his ass kicked often enough he may be a bit disenchanted. As you know from the past, I won't do any of that kicking.

You begin with no understanding at all of what Garrison did so it might be better to address that in a different way. You have all the contrivances that are ~~wrong~~<sup>wrong</sup> and baseless and that is no help.

Some of the writing is not good but all this that I noticed is easily ~~correct~~<sup>it</sup> minor in context, but I think it reflects your uncertainty and apprehension.

I'll continue reading this when I can. You see that with all I'm into and can't get to I began the day I got it. I was delayed a day because again you did not use our new zip, 21702.

Off the top of the head, and with no assurance I will do it after I read more and think more. I am inclined to believe that with a better understanding of what your publisher wants I might be able to dictate that for you. If this turns out to be something we can all agree with, you can attribute the information but not the writing of me (and it will probably require editing anyway, it has been that long since I've dictated anything) and I agree in advance<sup>you</sup> to any changes not of fact of substance.

I might even let you use my correspondence with Stone. With Garrison I can give you fact and truth that is so ridiculous you'll have them laughing aloud, plus the nitty-gritty. I may even give you, and I have to think of this, one of the most farout charts of one of his innumerable conspiracies to use if the publisher would like that. I will not give you my own work produce<sup>t</sup> but I may and probably would draw on some.

But for this, at this stage of my life and what I have to give up doing to be able to do it, I will expect decent compensation.

As I told you I have a dear and cherished friend who has some connections with your publisher, perhaps only of friendship and proximity. I think their offices are on the same floor. I've not mentioned you or this book to him so he knows nothing about it from me.

I will not mention this to him now unless you want me to. If you think that perhaps what I suggest will help you and are unwilling to discuss it with Carroll or Graf, I can with this friend, who is also a lawyer, and perhaps he would be willing to use good offices.

Please understand that when I am always awake by 2 now and today even earlier I am weaker and less able to do what means much to me. So understand that there can be discussions but no arguments. I am not up to them and would not want them now if I were.

Please understand too that you ~~now~~<sup>have</sup> some shit that if I were a professor I would give a student hell for, like that Oliver impossibility. And she says that Regis Kennedy took her camera (I'm not convinced she had one or was even there) when he never left New Orleans. You also have him, unsource<sup>d</sup>, in activities in which he did not engage.

~~Frankly~~ Frankly I shudder to think of what follows. I may or may not gird my loins and read it in the early a.m., which I have enjoyed reserving for reading for pleasure and work.

It is suppertime. I've been up and working for 13 hours, I'mna to tired to read and correct this, but if it is not too cold for me to be out tomorrow other than from real need, like medical, I'll try to get it in the mail that leaves tomorrow, the same as if it were in my mailbox. I'll have to drive it to be mailed.

I urge you to avoid anger because if and when I detail what I've noted you'll be ashamed about writing with such ignorance and inaccuracy and to try to keep control over yourself, particularly your thinking, and to try to figure out what can best cover your very naked ass.

I think this <sup>can</sup> be salvaged, but not with this guck I've read.

Don't fret: think.

Best,

Resumed 12/18, to be helpful, at 2 a.m., before I get too tired. After a few comments I'll read and correct what I wrote you last evening. A student came to help me a little last evening after supper. I had her make copies of the pages I'd read and duplicate the high-lighting and make my marginal notes more legible. If we talk about these pages by phone you'll begin to appreciate - and to be helpful I must be blunt - the extent of your ignorance and perhaps some carelessness and your reading of the nutty literature while ignoring the little that is factual, correct and dependable. This, obvuous to me, should be clear to <sup>you</sup> you from the paucity and nature of your sourcing. Explaining some of these markings will not take all that long but giving you the understanding for responsible writing would.

On the first, Ferrie as a matter of act was not active in the CAB when Oswald was in it for a short while. Ferrie had been and he was again later.

From recollection, I'm not rereading what I did because I just do not have the time, you lived in N.O. and ye<sup>t</sup> you say that Camp and Magazine, which were parallel, intersected. It was Lafayette, not Magazine.

After reading what I wrote to the bottom of page 2 I have the impression that you ~~re~~ really go for the nuttiest of the nutty fabrications and drivvel. This is to say again that you know so little that is factual if you care about your book and reputation, you have very real problems here. Bluntness again is the only way this can be worked out. You must tell yourself and believe the truth, that you are so ignorant of all of this you have to ask yourself how you can get away with it, what you can substitute for what you have done, have on paper. I could not begin to make all the time required for correcting these and the similar pages I anticipate. Perhaps one way would be to simplify it into a chapter on Garrison and Stone, which is what I had in mind last night. For that you do not need all this mythology, w ich is just frightful as you have it.

I've r ad a bit more to see if it gets any better, to the notton of page 8. Word of

Garrison's investigation was not leaked. It was first of all impossible to keep it secret when he and his staff spoke to so many people. Garrison spoke to the reporters who spoke to him in a way that persuaded them not to write anything. He was a first-rate con man. The way the story actually broke is that Jack Dempsey found the expenditure records that are public while checking on something else.

While you may like Crouch's imagery and he may be quite sincere in it it is plain shit. Garrison was his own worse enemy. He had a theory of the day for each day and he was within days ridiculing himself to sophisticated reporters. The nature of the story justified the sending of the best reporters. The Times sent my dear friend and one of the best of reporters, Martin Waldron. No, his nickname, was quite serious. He had a list of good questions, ~~five~~ several pages of them and he could not get sensible responses from Garrison.

On 9 it was Garrison, not his business friends, who decided on the name Truth and Consequences.

Ferrie knew before the story broke and was talking about it while he tried to do his own investigating of what could happen to him. Dean Andrews told me he knew the previous November when Garrison walked into his office, threw a copy of the Dell edition on his desk and told him he should read it.

On 10, what do you mean by big hands, referring to Lardner?

Who you refer to, Ferrie or Lardner, is not clear in the second graf. And the fact is that the coroner changed his report, corrected it. He had been wrong. More, Garrison had Ferrie's apartment under surveillance that in the end led to discovery of his death.

Perhaps your publisher knows that you know nothing about this aspect and does not really care how accurate it is. He should have asked you and learned before demanding what is now quite topical.

But understand that with few exceptions the reporters did only what they usually do and should do. And that it was Garrison himself who triggered them to greater activity.