

April 26, 1966

Dear Sylvia,

I haven't written in some time and I thought I'd bring you up to date on the latest tidbits.

Attached is a card with my new address. I have just moved into a new apartment (which is merely up the street from my old one). My old apartment was so cramped and small that it was getting impossible to live there and have the space to spread out JFK material, do schoolwork, and eat.

My new place is much bigger, and I have bought my own furniture. I have bought a nice ~~new~~ four drawer full suspension file, a big ~~7~~ drawer desk, and a swivel chair.

I finally received Triunfo magazine (all three issues) just a few weeks ago. Their treatment of the material is the best I have seen yet in any magazine. The third installment has enlargements of the Moorman photo, excellent photos of the splice, both Willis 5 & 6. (Also, my name appears at the bottom of the last page of the article along with Willis and Moorman in a little footnote for photo credits.)

The second installment of Triunfo contains one of the best diagrams I have ever seen ~~XXXX~~ to illustrate the nonsensical flight path of one bullet through two men. It is a completely side view of the limbusine, with a "cutaway section" to show the sitting figures of JFK and Connally. Then, the dotted line representing the trajectory is drawn in. The whole Triunfo treatment very faithfully follows that Xerox'd blurb that I mailed you way back in November or December when I first got a detailed description from Buchanan of just what he was doing.

About Ramparts---I could go on and on with my views. I really don't know what to think. I started to write you a letter a few weeks ago, in which I said that they appeared totally confused and uninformed, but swimming around in a mass of data. I had called David Welsh at that time trying to find out just what was happening.

I asked: "Are you going to use my Dialogue". He answered that it was "on a table with all the other Kennedy material", and that they might ~~XXXXXX~~ Commission a writer to "write it up".

"But its already written up", I half protested. I then learned that he had only read about 3 pages of it. Anyway, he told me ~~th~~at that time the chances were very slim that they would use it. His emphasis seemed to be on "commissioning a writer".

~~IXKXKXKXKXKXKX~~ A few days later, Stanley Sheinbaum was at Hollywood High School on a Viet Nam panel with Donald Duncan. Duncan had said, in reply to a question from the audience as to why had he written his article for Ramparts, that he hadn't just quit ~~K~~ special forces, written an article, and then "peddled it". Rather, he said, he was approached by Ramparts and urged to write it.

I had some material to give Sheinbaum after the panel discussion and Duncan's remarks inspired me to tell Sheinbaum that that is how I felt about what I submitted. I submitted it because I was approached by him to ~~XXXX~~ write it. I was perfectly

prepared to have it rejected on the grounds that they were going to use some other approach.

But I submitted it in the spirit of one submitting a manuscript--- in contradistinction to one who submits some raw tabulated data which must then be written up in article form.

Sheinbaum is very honest and sincere, and told me that he really didn't know what was going on because he had just returned from Cambodia. I learned then that he ~~XXXX~~ was considering making a run for Congress (which he has now decided to do).

On Friday, Ray called me and told me that he had seen Sheinbaum when he was up in Santa Barbara that afternoon on business and that Ramparts had hired two people to handle the Kennedy material. One was Emmett Collins, a writer connected ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ (in the past) with one of the San Francisco newspapers. The other was someone highly recommended by Penn Jones. (I don't know who). *Do you know?* ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Now, it seems, they were heading for an August target date.

On Monday morning, I decided to call Ramparts ~~XXXX~~ just what their approach was going to be and where their Dialogue stood. Welsh's secretary, upon hearing who was calling, said that "the party should contact Emmet Collins. He can be reached via Maggie fields at such and such hotel".

~~XX~~ So I called Ray and found out that suddenly this weekend Collins, swimming around in a mass of those posterboard panoplys, had contacted Sheinbaum---and Sheinbaum had taken Maggie up on her offer to advise them and help them. Sort of like a consultant.

At first I was going to wait until Maggie's return tomorrow to find out where my Dialogue stood, but I decided that since I had submitted it to Ramparts, I would call again. So last night I called person to person to Emmet Collins.

So here is what happened. He got on the phone; I identified myself, and first asked whether he now had in his possession the complete Dialogue. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ He answered in the affirmative. I then asked ~~XXXX~~ what they intended to do with it, and if I could be of any further help.

The answer: "Look, Mr. Lifton (is it?) I don't even know who you are. Now ~~XX~~ I don't think I should answer or can answer the questions you have posed ...I mean, you're a stranger to me... etc. etc. etc. "

Then he made the weirdest remark: "I have read it through completely once; but I haven't read it, yet, with any idea of ~~(para)~~ exploiting it".

It was a very odd conversation, in which my natural exuberance was met with a rather aloof attitude. However, after a while, he seemed loosen up a bit. Just to see what sort of reaction I'd get, I said: "I'll bet you're just swimming around in excellent material submitted by so many people". And he said: "Yes, but this swimming has got to stop. We've got to figure out just how to present this thing".

At which point I said that what I would like to do, if they are interested, is to help them with any of the technically oriented writeups. Even if they don't use my dialogue, I would like to help them on such things ~~XXXXXXXX~~ as the trajectories, ~~XXXX~~ the sign hypothesis, head reaction, ~~shown~~ on the rifle picture etc.

Quid Stulow

- 3 -

Anyway, he told me that he couldn't give me any answers then but made a date to call me back at 7:30 tonight.

The one thing I felt I accomplished by calling was letting him know that the Dialogue manuscript is just that, ~~just that~~

Seeing the "I don't know who you are" attitude, I was surprised at 11:30 when my phone rang and it was Emmet Collins from San Francisco.

Identifying himself, he started right off: "Of all the people on the Warren Commission, ~~who~~ all the people who participated in it---who do you think DOESN't believe it?"

I told him that I had spoken to Liebeler (and he cut in: "Who?")
"Liebeler" I replied. "Wesley J Liebeler"

"He interviewed a good percentage of the witnesses" I said.

Collins called over to Welsh to pick up the phone. Then he said to Welsh: "Look him up; see if he's in there." ~~OK~~

Welsh now opens a Warren Report and looks on that masthead page.
"Oh yes. Here he is: Wesley J. Liebeler".

"Do you think he'd be willing to talk?" asked Collins?
(They're looking for a "Donald Duncan" amongst the Commission attorneys).

I gave my views that Liebeler certainly wasn't going to turn any tables, but ~~that~~ it was conceivable to me that they might get an interview with him. Anyway, I told them I'd speak to Liebeler about it and sound him out.

Now, why have I spent this time typing up this vignette ~~X~~.

For several reasons, Sylvia. Most important is the fact that I still don't think these fellows are "at home" with the arguments ~~of~~ the critics, the various weak and strong points of the various arguments, and the 26 volumes themselves.

For that reason, ~~we~~ get the impression that they are indeed "swimming around". As far as I know, my Dialogue, Fred Cook's article, ~~and~~ your manuscript materials, ~~are~~ the ready-to-go type material that has been submitted. Maggie's panoply's are a good source of tabulated quotes. Then they have the Sauvage articles, the Salandria articles, and Harold Feldman's articles. I happen not to think there is any need to be "swimming around". Before Collins and Welsh start planning any attacks on the WC they first must become familiar with the elements in their arsenal, and there is simply no substitute for spending the time to read and study that which has been submitted *and published*.

Frankly, I am amazed at the gaps that still exist in their knowledge.

This brings me to my next point. Ray and I have a sort of policy disagreement about how Ramparts should go about this. I think that if indeed Ramparts is going to have a wide variety of articles, then the ~~the~~ arguments about head reaction, sign, trajectories all belong in there.

Ray thinks that anything of this sort is "Far too technical", and should be merely footnoted.

You don't know what groans of disappointment this brought to a 36 year old friend of mine, who is just completing his studies for a Phd in Nuclear Physics and is avidly awaiting the Ramparts attack on the WC.

I met this fellow about 2 months ago, and he invited me over to his home to run through all the material I could bring.

Also invited were several professors in the physics department here at UCLA.

These men, of course, are scientists; and they were delighted with the way the arguments concerning head reaction, 2 shots in less than 42 frames, etc. could demolish the lone assassin theory.

(One of the physics Professors, in fact, wants to shoot a bullet through a sign. He also wants to tape the discussion we had at KFFK (the local Pacific station) and submit it for airing.)

I agree with Ray that there are people who do not appreciate ~~XX~~ the absolutism of and have some trouble following the details of the physical arguments.

Many such people will be ~~XXXX~~ more impressed with the FACT that Ramparts is taking on the WC, and the FACT that a Fred Cook or some other well known liberal writer wrote what he did. Among the several hundred thousand readers that Ramparts is trying to reach, there are enough of these that certainly the ~~XXXXXX~~ less-technical writeups beneath the big name are of major importance.

But if Ramparts approach is really going to be as big as they have intimated, if they are really going to be a forum for the critics, then somewhere in there the technical stuff should be presented as clearly as possible.

Frankly, I would love the chance to brief Collins and the others up there on just these aspects of the case. As Ray has pointed out in defense of his approach. "even Maggie" has trouble following some of these technical arguments.

One of the reasons I love to help my girlfriend with her calculus and physics homework is that I get a particular joy out of taking something that appears a bit complex and technical and ~~KK~~ explaining it to someone who thought it was "too complicated" for them before.

In concluding this section on my misgivings and hopes, I dearly hope that Ramparts is up to the mandate they have given themselves. It is not at all axiomatic with me that simply because their intentions are good, their competence level will be high enough.

Footnote to this page is that it is now well past midnight and they did not yet call me back as promised *yesterday*.

I am very glad that you found my last letter tantalizing.

As soon as I have completely finished this Ruby writeup, I will send you a copy. I suspect that ~~XXXXXX~~ well read critics such as yourself may turn out to be some of the toughest opposition to my Ruby hypothesis. Your characterization of him as a ~~ZZ~~"cold blooded~~XX~~ ruthless guy...still playing the "angles" " is not unusual. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ I hope to make Ruby emerge from my writeup as more of a ~~XX~~ tragic figure, a pathetic ~~shmo~~ who was used in a most ruthless manner by men who knew just what combination of stimuli would make Jack Ruby do what he did, yet think of himself as a profound idealist as he did it. Lest this seem like so much hogwash, please be patient. I know it sounds corny.

I fully appreciate your feelings re your phone bill. Enclosed find a little abner cartoon which I clipped a few weeks ago and which I, a past victim of attacks of telephonitis, found appropriate. (I am not a particularly big fan of Al Capp, especially in view of his viscious and sarcastic attacks on student political demonstrations in the recent Sunday funnies).

I am going to get myself a copy of your index as soon as possible. I passed by Libeler's office and told him about it. When I mentioned your name, he said:"How do you spell that?" I spelled it ~~out~~ and he said:"She wrote me a letter once, which I never answered. I suppose I should." He was very reticent with me this time. He limited his remarks to telling me that he had run into Jim Bishop, a Newsweek reporter who is stationed in L.A. and to whom I had shown my pictures once. Libeler met him at a cocktail party, it seems. "This fellow said he had spoken to you, and was quite impressed. He wanted to know what I thought of all this*. Since we were both quite drunk" he continued,"I just told him I knew who you were".

As a man of my word, I want to answer--however belated---the questions raised in your Dec 10 letter as briefly as possible.

When I first started writing to Buchanan, there was nothing but gushing idealism and a tremendous desire to see Buchanan do what was proper with the material. At the time, each photographic print I sent Buchanan cost about \$2 and I said I hoped I could get reimbursed for the price of these is they were ever~~X~~ used. I sent him about 10 prints in that manner.

Early in September, I sent him a lot more material. In October, he wrote alerting me to the possibility of an article, and sent me a numbered list of requests. He wanted Willis' address, information on the sign, etc etc. The packet of stuff I sent him then was so heavy that the postage alone ran \$4. I spent a good 4 or 5 days preparing it. I specifically requested at that time to have a hand in it, and to get copies of whatever he wrote before it was published to check for accuracy etc. In his letter, it had become quite obvious that he did not have a set of the 26 Volumes.

Then Maggie sent me a wire for some material to be sent to her, and to Buchanan. That immediately went out. It was now about October 30 to Nov. 5. (I have a record of this somewhere around here that I haven't been able to find). For ten days there was no word. I called Maggie's home and spoke to Mr. Field.

I was dying to find out just which publications were interested.

He told me that just last night he had spoken to Maggie by transatlantic phone.

I eagerly asked him which publications were the ones interested. He hedged a little, and then said:

"I do know, Dave, and I'm very sorry about this, but I'm under specific instructions not to tell you".

I was quite shocked at this and was deeply hurt. It was the first time that anything like this had happened. I just didn't know what to do.

Maggie eventually returned from Europe. I was all on pins and needles because it was now about November 18 and I still hadn't heard from Buchanan. Not a word, although it was now about 3 weeks since I had sent out material. ~~Maggie~~

I didn't know how to confront Maggie with her husband's statement to me on the phone without ~~it~~ it being an insulting accusation. ~~By~~ By mail, Buchanan had claimed to me that he dare not mention the magazine because even the U.S. mails were not safe from the prying eyes of those who could pull strings in Paris and kill all chances.

The presses at Paris Match "close" at midnight Saturday. That is when the issue for the following week (ie Tuesday is the day its put on the newstand in Paris) is "put to bed".

On Saturday morning, I got a call from Maggie. She said she "thought" Paris Match was going to do a story. That is when I first learned that she had been up there, and of what had transpired. She said she was not sure of any dates. ~~My~~ I thought quickly and realized that the one person in the U.S. who would certainly know the exact dates was Phil Willis, because they would have to telegraphically request permission to use his photos. I had Willis on the phone within minutes of speaking to Maggie. He gave me all the information I needed. Sure enough, the telegram had just sailed in yesterday. From him I got ~~the~~ the date, and the Paris Match official in New York who was ~~in~~ in the ~~Paris~~ office. I spoke to him on the phone and gave him my tale of woe. He informed me that there was really nothing I could do ~~because~~ because the Paris Match was now typeset. I was to speak to him about a week later, after I saw Match, and he gave me the ~~name~~ name of the person in Paris who actually handled the transaction ~~for~~ for Match. He also made some not too savory remarks about Buchanan's ethics. Anyway, I have never followed through on any of this. Purely as a practical matter, Buchanan is in France and I'm here. Secondly, there is the ambiguity of a correspondence that started in a purely friendly manner, and with a minimum of requests and restrictions. However, the requests are there in black and white. Buchanan's reply to my attempt to reason with him was a spotty letter in which he said: "You're just a rocky in this army. Get back in step."

Anyway, I have dropped the whole thing. You live and learn. I have bought some writer's handbooks, and now know much more of the ground rules concerning "common law copyright";

I now have two questions to ask you. Did you ever get the color blowup of Willis 7, with the running man?

What do you think of it?

I neglected to state, in the writeup that Willis 7 is within seconds of Willis 6; Willis 6 corresponds to about frame 410. I make this point because 7 is not just any old picture of the grassy knoll. It is taken immediately after the shooting. Jean Hill has not yet crossed the street in 7. (A color blowup of the left side shows Hill and Moorman, faces obscured by the crowd but blue and red raincoats still visible) standing together. ~~XXXXX~~

Secondly; about an hour after the assassination, the ABC network carried a newscast from a correspondent in Vienna named Serge Fliedlers, or Fleiglers or some such spelling.

The broadcast ~~XXXXX~~ went, to the best of my memory, something like this: "This is Serge Fleiglers from Vienna. "A series of mysterious happenings now occurring in the United States can be explained in terms a plot directed by a group of right wing Austrian Fascist Generals. According to a source here, the main purpose of the assassination plot was to shift the ~~EM~~ balance of power in the Atlantic community....."

One question raised in my Ruby writeup was connected with this broadcast and some other details in it. I immediately started a search of the 26 volumes to find if it was mentioned at all. Some time ago, I found something about it in one of the exhibit volumes. What I found was a a page or two of derogatory statements concerning Serge Fleiglers, much the same as the unsigned FBI attack of Joesten that is in one of the Exhibit Volumes. The credibility of this reporter, ~~went~~ the attack, was questionable.

I have searched and searched and have not been able to relocate this item. I spoke to Ray, who just received his index from Scarecrow, and he says there is no "Serge Fleiglers, Fliedlers, etc.".

Do you know anything about this?

Well thats about it Sylvia. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ You must feel quite proud and relieved now that your index is done.

I understand you have seen Weisberg's book and that it is quite good. Is the fellow having succes in getting a publisher?

Best regards,
Dave
Dave