

Whole Family History: delay for confirmation of the father of the story.

MRS JOSEPH A. FIELD JR
1115th BEVERLY DRIVE
BEVERLY HILLS CALIFORNIA 90210

Sunday
1/29/67.

Dearest Sylvia -

My first drive around, reading "The Philadelphia Story" proved somewhat baffling to me and I found that it didn't really register properly. After your letter arrived yesterday, I, of course, reread it and only then did its full impact strike! It is certainly a very important story and I marvel at how those who put it together ~~mean~~ first picked up the trail! I distinctly remember an allusion to "B," by you, Vince and Penn as long ago as last year and I wondered, then, if it would or could ever lead anywhere or be further developed. One wonders why he ("B.") has been allowed to survive and/or to be questioned! It would seem to me that this is surely the first (at least to my knowledge) concrete thread so far. Undoubtedly there are others but, if so, none have come to light as far as I am concerned. Friday, while Ray, Bill, Gillian and I were poring over the 7 frames at Time/life, we all paused for several long minutes when the man in the black suit and hat standing next to Willis and his family came clearly into view. (Geo. Thompson's "man in the black cloak"!!!) We stayed with him concentratedly because he baffled us. We immediately recognized, of

course, that what Thompson calls a cape or cloak is the illusion created by Linda Willis' skirt or coat brushing past him, plus the trunk of the tree blending into the figure at that point — and that he is wearing a black suit and a black hat. What stumped us, however, was the inability to determine what he held in his hand and what the two protuberances emerging suddenly from his silhouette could possibly be. At one point, the 2 protuberances became merely one — and Ray spoke of an umbrella but that suggestion dissolved when we so distinctly ^{saw} two such objects. Bill considered that he very likely held no object in his hands but only appeared to be holding something because he was applauding the President, but that proved to be fallacious because the position and placement of the hands appeared illogical for such an explanation. We then decided that perhaps he had a box-type camera — but that failed to satisfy us, ultimately, because in that context, too, the placement didn't make sense — and there were the mystifying protuberances which couldn't be accounted for. We finally went on from there, with the question unresolved. I spoke to Bill about it last night. He knows a good deal about stereocameras, recorders & such. He said that, indeed, it could very well have been a walkie-talkie type thing and that would account for our failure to identify it as a camera because it would be held somewhat differently, — away from the eyes, for example. But the 2 protuberances still appear to me to be too thick for rabbit's ears — and, also, there is the question of how he could have executed any

3.
sort of instructions, communication or 2-way conversation, without being observed or detected by Willis or anyone else. Still, it could be! Bill feels walkie-talkies in spectator situations are so common these days, that no one seeing a person engaged in the operation of one would think anything of it. I can't quite accept that — but, in this case, — where anything goes, I wouldn't be surprised if no one reported him or, if they did, that ~~anything~~ ^{nothing} further would have been done of an investigatory nature!

The Philadelphia version of ~~the Toppit murder~~ ~~isn't~~ ~~entirely~~ ~~accurate~~.
The Toppit murder isn't entirely accurate. ~~says~~ ~~the~~ ~~Comm.~~ ~~claims~~ ~~12~~ ~~eyewitness~~ ~~accounts~~, whereas I believe they claim 9 (small difference when 9 is just as fallacious as 12, really!) — and Fowzi attributes the "utter screwball" remark to a young Comm. lawyer when the person in question is actually Jos. Ball who is in his late fifties but now I really am "nit picking" and I know it, — yet, in this kind of story, I feel that even the smallest detail, the most insignificant phrase must be as accurate as possible. Otherwise, one inevitably begins to question other statements of fact. Incidentally, in the Fowzi article you sent me, for which I am profoundly thankful, the last sentence on p. 88 begins "Among these were...", then the next, continuing page which is numbered 106, begins with the following words, "Tippit killing whom the W.C. never called to

testify was Aquilla Lemons." This is a non-sequitur, of sorts, since the full sentence would have to read, "Among these were Tippit killing whom the W.C. never called to testify was A.C.!" And that doesn't make sense. Is there a page missing between p. 88 and p. 106, or, more likely, a paragraph?

The whole Damned Tippit sequence is maddeningly frustrating ⁴ for, as in every other aspect of the case, as soon as one tries to fit pieces together in any sort of logical pattern, there is always an incident which simply can't be made to coincide with the others. For example, Clemmons speaks of seeing 2 men & this jibes with B. and the Chicago ex-policeman. But then what about Frank Wright's adamant insistence that he only saw one man (with "a long coat") get into "a grey little old coupe" '50-'51 who drove away "as quick as you could see" — "I knew a man drove off in a grey car. — Nothing in the world's going to change my opinion" — as against Clemmons' recollection that one of the men waved to the other & ran away "in a different direction"? No mention whatsoever of a car. Then, in C.F. 1944, p. 61 is Hulse + Jackson's report: "said he pulled in there & bought some gas. Driving a white Pont. '61 or '62 sta. wag. with a prefix P...E... He had a rifle lying in the seat — .. We have a citizen following this car at this time...." Here there 2 women witnesses besides Markham — i.e. Clemmons & the woman "at the house 3 or 4 doors from the intersection" who had come down from her porch simultaneously with Frank Wright's leaving his house & later "went back up toward the house" — and is the latter woman the same one R. Croy spoke to, who was watering her lawn in front of her house — or is Croy's woman a 3rd female witness, exclusive of Markham? Is big puzzlement!

Anyway, the whole Fowki article is extremely significant, I believe. From what you tell me, I wish that J. Harris and Behrendt had nothing to do with the Brown episode! I am, quite naturally, teething with curiosity over the many

recent & obviously earth-shaking developments about which you are sworn to secrecy! After the Cavenger business & a few other minor depressants, I could use some encouragement again of a factual, tangible nature. But you have my word that I respect with my life the meaning of the word Confidential.

I was able to get confirmation for De Antonio straight from the horse's mouth. Sincie called him directly - with a disguised identity - and he proudly volunteered that he is the same Schiller who owns the rights to Ruby's life story & is on a very friendly basis with the family as of the past 3 years. I have had a newswoman, Mary Reinholz, call me, too. She is interested in writing & telling an expose of those two unspeakable charlatans. I told her everything I knew - stressing Schiller's tie with Liebel - and the piracy of Schiller's "dossier" on all of us which caused it "mysteriously" to end up in the hands of both Lomax (another Schiller-Liebel co-hort) and Joe Pyne! I told her about Schiller's appearance at the Liebel-Guy Under encounter when Liebel ^{identified} referred to S. as "the world's greatest photographic expert" to Lillian & the audience (among whom were Lomax & his wife!) & about the phony reproduction Liebel presented before 3,000 people of 133A, taken in front of Schiller's garage! Liffon Knew about this picture, admitted to being on the premises when it was taken - but he never said a word about it to me, during the time he was trying to unnerve me about all the terrible things Liebel was planning to surprise Lane with! We have our own Greenblatt! I also called Vince to warn him about Liffon's perfidy but I got the feeling that Vince didn't really take me too seriously. The reason for my call is that I had given Mort Sahl the article by McGinnis which appeared in the Phila. Inq. & which I had shown you - and Sahl, rather indiscriminately, I

feel - read the entire thing on his TV program (which I must assume both Liebel & Lipton monitor faithfully). Most should have prefaced the reading with a statement to the effect that this is a second-hand & speculative account but he didn't. Lipton the next day, - yesterday - called & demanded to know whether Vince really had information to the effect that "the Kennedys know" & that "Johnson was told by at CIA agent at Parkland" - or whether the entire story was based purely on rumor & speculation. I said I could tell him absolutely nothing about it - and quickly terminated the conversation. My desire to alert Vince was ^{promptly} ~~promptly~~ ^{how} ~~promptly~~ that Dave wouldn't rest till he could find out ~~about~~ ^{how} Vince's information was garnered & I felt that if Vince had valid sources, surely Lipton must not know their origin or identity. Vince assured me that speculation & rumor are not involved & I didn't pursue the matter any further! Lipton is now well over to the other side. He has told both Bill & Ray that he considers us all paranoids. That's like Manchester calling Lee Oswald a paranoid!!

How vile, now, to discover that people are peddling information. Are there no limits to the degradation? God! no wonder we are on the brink of destruction! I'm glad you warned us! I loathe feeling suspicion about everything and everyone but naïveté, in this world of jackals who now oppose us, is ruinous!

I'm anxiously awaiting word about Houston. Saturday was the day - but I won't be surprised if it turns out to be a bum steer! Take good care, dear. You're terribly important to us all. Your Father letter is, as usual, a masterpiece! Prando, the dog in history, salutes you as do Joe, Simsie, Annie & Ruby. Much love, M.