

23 August 1970

Dear Paul,

I have often regretted that I was indisposed just at the time of your visit to New York, instead of on any of the other 365 days available for such an experience. An unfortunate result is that I have little if any recollection of our conversation during your visit.

This year was my first opportunity since 1964 for a non-working vacation but as I have seemingly lost the knack of putting the case aside, I decided to use my liberty to visit Dallas and to see for myself, at long last, Dealey Plaza and the grassy knoll and all the other sites which figured in the events of 11/22-24/63. It was a memorable experience, as it was no doubt for other critics on their first visits to the scene of the assassination.

Although I had never before met Mary Ferrell, and had only been corresponding with her for a matter of months, I spent my time largely with her. She was extraordinarily hospitable, helpful, and open with her research materials. She is a woman of phenomenal energy, speed and efficiency and I doubt if anyone has a better collection of books, documents, tapes, films, etc.

I was surprised, however, when your name came up in conversation at one point and Mary said that it was her impression that you believe that Oswald was guilty and that you more or less accept the conclusions of the Warren Report. It was at that moment that I especially regretted my black-out of our discussion during your visit. I could scarcely believe that Mary's impression was correct, but I suppose that it is not impossible.

There is a small item in the New York Times today about the arrest of Perry Russo on three counts of burglary and theft, with an accomplice named Carl Moore, also apprehended. Specifically, they are accused of an \$8400 burglary of a home, possession of a stolen safety deposit box, and theft of a \$3000 motorcycle. What an added irony after the great fiasco of the Shaw trial---first the trial judge's downfall in a swirl of scandal, now the sordid fate of the star prosecution witness.

Strictly between the two of us, Paul, and I do ask you to keep this absolutely confidential---I am increasingly uneasy about David Lifton. That he has been having ugly quarrels with Fred Newcomb and others is not too unusual---Dave is a great one for falling-out with collaborators on the case, as perhaps many of us are also prone to do at times. But what really concerns me is that he has endlessly protracted his preparation of a manuscript and there seems to be no end in sight. If he has material as explosive and crucial as he has repeatedly claimed, then I believe that we all have a legitimate stake in the matter. At some point in time, the necessary time-lapse for preparation of material for publication, unduly extended, may in effect become suppression of vital information from the public. I have posed this question to David, but his reply was a postcard saying that he did not have time to reply. If I am correct, some of his most sensational but still wholly secret findings date back to 1966. Are we to wait 75 years for his "classified" materials, too? I would be glad to know what you think and whether you believe that there is any way to light a fire under Lifton.

Best regards,