

Dear Sylvia,

Dec 5 65

Enclosed find

1. Notes and comments on phone call with Jean Hill
2. " " " " " " " " Mary Moorman
3. " " " " " " " " interview with WJL, at which I presented my pictures, head reaction, Oswald compositing etc.
4. Either enclosed or under separate cover is the series of Secret Service reenactment photos.
5. Kilgallen letter

The above notes (and especially the conversations with Liebeler) are as accurate as possible; I will vouch for the tone, but I can't say that every quote is exact, or that the conversation is constructed in exactly the same order. But if I use (SIC), I mean it!  
(yours and mine)

I still sometimes regret that our/first conversation dealt with the subject matter it did, because I would not blame you if you entertained the notion that I am ~~MAX~~ a person who simply exaggerates everything, perceptions and conversations. I'm counting on the fact that you don't, however, despite the sensational~~XX~~ aspects of some of the above enclosures. If the Liebeler interview has a slightly irreverent tone, that is only because that's exactly the tone that exists. This fellow is a real character. He is utterly un pompous, frank, and blunt. If his questioning seems so obviously argumentative in the 26 volumes, it is not so much that he is a sinister figure selling the American people a bill of goods, but that he is an attorney who is not afraid to put bluntly into the record the farcial nature of what ~~his~~ going on. Of the attorneys on that Commission, each somehow had to justify what he was doing, in his own eyes. Now some, I realize, did resign. Of those that remained, some deceived themselves to the point that they actually believe their own "big lie". My own opinion of Liebeler at this point is this: he was confronted with the constraints, rules, and regulations that prevented ~~MAX~~ a completely free and impartial inquiry, and--- not being as hypocritical as some of the others---didn't go out of his way to make that inquiry LOOK LIKE something it wasn't. His questioning of Hudson, Tague, etc. are cases in point. If you approach this testimony thinking that Liebeler didn't ask Hudson what was going on ~~behind~~ him, or freely pursue other lines of inquiry, keep in mind that he probably couldn't. I believe that if Liebeler had had his way, the Warren Report would have contained accurate conclusions, OR (more probably) a statement that they were unable to find the answers\*. Thyway, that correspondance you have testifies to his attitude; Epstein tells me that during the Hearings, Rankin wrote him a memo urging him not to "~~open~~ more doors than you are closing". IF you were on that Commission, would you have resigned, or fought from within? Its an intriguing question. Meanwhile, I wish there were more Liebeler's and less Redlich's on the staff.

either

\*This would be politically incongruous and would lead to all types of chace; I find it hard to imagine the headlines that would appear had those been the conclusions of the Commission

Jones Harris called me long distance and gave me his usual amount of insults and extreme compliments. He presented himself, as usual, as a well-meaning person who is getting angry because I simply don't realize how important he is. "You're a fine technician, you ~~XXXXXX~~ write well, but I want to make it clear to you that we're not equals". (Blink once, consult psychological index under "Methinks...") He heaps much abuse on "those ----heads you've surrounded yourself with in California".

"Lifton, when are you coming east? Don't you think its about time you came East? Don't you care about your parents, your family? ...".

I really don't know what to think about this fellow. Perhaps I HAVE A soft spot in my heart for him because he is so extremely interested in the photographic work on "camouflage" that I have done. In fact, he's VERY VERY interested in it. Since he has done so much interviewing down there, I'm impressed that he's interested. He had wormed a promise out of me last September to send him photos on the subject, and sent me \$60. I have had \$30 worth of color prints made up, and am going to send him a portion of it, to see his reaction. My fear is that he will take the next plane to Dallas, and use the photos to get certain eyewitnesses to talk about things they would prefer not to talk about.

He told me that if the work I've done in this area is good enough, he'll take the next plane out to California and would like to form some sort of "partnership". I am very leery of restrictive agreements with anyone who bluntly informs me "we're not equals" and intend to be quite caustic. He is capable of very chauvinistic speeches that are rather illogical. He is obsessed with secrecy. He is constantly taking the sort of precautions that I only found necessary in the week or two following the discovery of the images, and while an initial distribution of enlargements and negatives was made. (Someday, I would like to tell you about those very funny and hectic two weeks; the behavior of myself and Ray, at that time, resembled that of Laurel and Hardy suddenly caught in the middle of a James Bond adventure). Jones Harris says that the Paris Match article was "like a bunch of wet chinese fireworks going off in all directions. I hope you're satisfied that you made a jackass out of yourself on that one...thats a terrible article, Lifton, admit it...why won't you admit your errors, Lifton, you must learn to admit it when you're wrong...now if you had listened to me, this wouldn't have happened...if you work with me, we'll get that material published the way it ought to be published..." Anyway, his compliments are as extreme as his insults.

Finally, there is always his proposition: "you, I, and Epstein... I'd like to form a partnership, and we'll work together".

I don't think he's any sort of government informant.

Theres something very funny about Jones Harris that I can't quite put my finger on. Perhaps its that I can probably now predict the nature and content of his diatribes. For one week, now, my girl friend and I had a bet that an "I told you so phone call" must come from Jones Harris as soon as he saw the Match article, so when it did, I was rather amused. Finally, he insists on pronouncing your name wrong. He is always calling you "meager", which doesn't describe your work at all. Anyway, he seems to sometimes mix me up with "Bernie". Has he ever called you "Mrs. Meager"? If so, what do you say? So much for non-important gossip.

I think the Paris Match articles have serious deficiencies. One thing that irks me is the use of a frame that is at least 250 or 260 to illustrate that "Connally has not yet been scathed".

This article is a good example of what can happen when people in Europe take good research and jazz it up for the purpose of a reading audience, at the expense of page references and other attention to detail. My argument on the sign is all botched up, and the right photos weren't presented (206, 212, and 213). Finally, no mention was made of the 42 frame constraint on the lone assassin theory. God only knows why they didn't use the enlargements of the wall section, seeing all that white space. Also, I object to the use of hearsay type evidence to argue that the shots came from the knoll. Quoting the police radio log is not to me very important. It might be nice to quote such items if you want to vividly reconstruct what happened at 12:30, but such quotes are not ~~IK~~ as important as the earwitness testimony of t eordinary bystander.

If you can, Sylvia, I would like very much if one of your Spanish friends at the UN~~XXXX~~ could get a copy of TRIUNFO. Buchanan's article is being printed ~~IK~~ unabridged, in three parts, in TRIUNFO, and my cousin out here ~~XXXX~~ perfectly fluent in the language. I know French well enough to have meandered through the Match article with considerable accuracy on the first reading. But Maggie is more fluent in that language than I. No one here knows Italian. But my cousin can and will translate Spanish. Therefore, if I can get a copy of TRIUNFO, that would be great. My mother, who is a first rate Manhattan go getter, still hasn't been able to locate a copy. Natrually, you'll be the first to get a Xerox of the translation, when its finally done.

I'm very curious to know Sauvage's reaction to the Paris MatchX article, and your opinion of his reaction.

\*\*\*\*\*

I got a reply from Orth. There was no time to write him, because of the unexpected publication of the splice in all those articles. For that reason, I attempted to get a quick~~te~~ reply by nightletter. I'll Xerox request and reply soon. His answer to three questions was by mail. It read: "Mr. Lifton: I believe my testimony is a matter of public record. I'm sorry but I have nothing more to say" (the quote is not exact, I've misplaced the letter somewhere in this room; I'll get it soon). Anyway, his testimony certainly isn't public record. He never testifies. Yet Shaneyfelt (V, 13809) says that Orth came down to Washington on some date in February and spent the day with the CommissionX reps, other officials. Turn to that date in Volume one, and there is nothing recorded there. Either he didn't testify, or its been locked up. If the former is true, I'd like to know why he used the word testify. Since I'm sure he doesn't know whether or not his testimony is locked up, you might call him and ask him the innocent sounding question: "Mr. Orth: When you testified before the Commission, doX you clearly remember whether you were put under oath". If he is using the word testimony slippily, he will say "No". Otherwise, he will say "Of course", and you might check that this is indeed that day in February mentioned by Shaneyfelt.

Item: DePoste (Germany?) and Epoca, (Italy) are also carrying the article by Buchanan.

I have been very intrigued by your sharpness in noticing the lack of an ammunition clip. I think thats first class sleuthing. The suggestion that you can put more than one bullet into the rifle without a clip is absurd.

I'm sorry all this material comes in all at once like this.

I'd like to hear your comments on it, but there's no rush.

Sincerely yours,

\_\_\_\_\_  
David

P.S. Liebeler's reply to Redlich's reply should go out this week. I'm going to wait a week or two, and try to see him when the next round of replies come in.

A member of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions called me up at my home and had quite a talk with me about the case. He wants me to send him my "research packet", even if uncompleted. HE SEEMS to agree that there had to be more than one man involved, and devoted a considerable portion of the conversation to who I thought did it. I said I could only speculate. So he and I had quite a discussion about "junta", "CIA", and you-know-who. Once again, it was he who brought up the ~~XXXXXX~~ set of initials which rhymes with CIA, not me.

I met this fellow at the Vietnam teachin at UCLA. His name is Stanley Sheinbaum.

P.S.S. Please let me know if you do finally get any tape of the radio programs on which you and Fox appear together. I have access to tape-duplicating facilities.