COPY from letter of November 6, 1965 from Dave Lifton

I told you that I had spoken to Liebeler, and that he seemed very impressed and disturbed by the splice in the film and the curved lines. He told me that he was going to get to the bottom of it, and that I should come back in several weeks. Last week, I returned to his office, with Salandria's Liberation articles. I had no sooner walked in than he tossed three letters at me. "Here," he said, "read these." One was a two-page typewritten letter which Liebeler had sent to Rankin, with "copy sent" to Redlich, Goldberg, and Willens. The letter starts with the fact that a graduate student walked into his office and pointed out the splice and the streaks. He explained the significance of the streaks, and that this would involve another gurman in the assassination.

He then spends a paragraph recollecting that the signs had indeed been moved. He called it "unfortunate" that the frames had been/omitted without explanation. "Apparently," his letter states, "the people who discovered this absence have consulted Shaneyfelt and after some pulling and hauling, he told them that the frames were omitted because they were damaged. This is obviously not so since 210 is included in CE 893. If there is a ready explanation for the omission of the frames and the appearance of the marks on the back of the sign, I would certainly be relieved to know what it is. If there is none, I think it would be appropriate for us to raise this matter formally with the FBI, Since LIFE magazine has the original film, they might be able to tell us what appears on the frames that are missing..."

Now here is what happened. The letter was addressed to Rankin. Redlich, who received a "copy sent," answered with a seven-point rebuttal, each point of which is either false or irrelevant. Then Rankin, receiving one of Redlich's "copy sent"s, wrote a brief one-paragraph letter in which he says, "I have not made analyses of the questions that are raised by your letter...but I did examine the copy of the letter from Norman Redlich ...on the face of it his letter seems to dispose of the matter to me. I confess that I am reluctant to dig into the matter further at this time unless there is more doubt raised...."

Thus, Rankin is on record as not really having considered the point Liebeler raised, but of having done his duty by reading Redlich's reply.

Finally, he ends with a short jibe: "...I am looking forward to seeing some of your writings in the legal periodicals when you find time to make contributions of that kind."

I pointed out to Libbeler that Redlich's answer was loaded with false statements, starting with his point number 1: "The sign to which you refer was, to the best of my knowledge, never removed from its location..." His point 4 says that the film was possibly damaged. Finally, he concludes with point 7: "My conclusion is that the presence of these curved lines does not warrant any request to the FBI for an investigation, either formal or otherwise."

Mr Liebeler agreed with me that Redlich's reply was not adequate. "Besides," I said, "you yourself took the testimony where Emmet Hudson SAYS the signes have been changed."

"I did???" he exclaimed, and I snatehed his Volume VII off the shelf and showed him..."Look," he said, "you get all this material together so that I can answer this letter." I indicated that this was fine with me...

Mr Liebeler actually made a comment to the effect that now the different attorneys might try to "hang it on each other"...He indicated to me that it was he, after all, who had urged that the Commission be kept in existence to handle any questions that might come up, but that he was in a losing minority on this point.

Furthermore, he pointed out that he definitely wants to get those missing frames in the archives. Besides, as Mr Liebeler also point out, to fully appreciate this, one must understand that he hates Redlich's guts and vice-versa. "But Mr Liebeler," I said, "this is an important historical document!" "My boy," he replied, "history sometimes turns on petty hates and jealousies"!