

4 November 1966

Dear Lifton,

I want to repeat on the record what I told you on the phone Wednesday night--I will not welcome any further calls from you. From your call on October 8th, when you asked my advice about approaches made to you by Liebeler, until our last conversation on November 2nd, you have been childish, presumptuous, unfair, and irresponsible. But you have also acted in bad faith, and that I cannot overlook.

After our exchange of letters--in which you asked me not to make a family affair of this matter (for which you later apologized) and told me that I was exaggerating the whole thing melodramatically --you telephoned again, this time insisting that you intended to do nothing more than sit in on Liebeler's classes. We went over that several times. You pointed out that it would be useful for you to keep an eye on the progress of Liebeler's "investigation" and said repeatedly that nothing more was involved or contemplated. I replied that if sitting in on classes was the only thing at issue, there could be no objection; but that if this was the only question, it was hard to understand why you had even called in the first place or what kind of "advice" you needed.

In any case, it was my understanding from the time of that talk until you called again two nights ago that all you were doing was sitting in on Liebeler's lectures. Now it has become clear that what you were actually doing was quite different--that you had made some kind of discovery, which even two nights ago you were unwilling to reveal to me (you volunteered that and I am sure you will agree that I did not ask you to reveal it), a discovery that you considered conclusive and of far greater importance than a discovery, for example, that the man in the doorway was Oswald, not Lovelady. Whether or not your find is actually that crucial is another question--the point is, you thought it was. And you concealed it from every one of your colleagues, whether you were on good or bad terms with them. Instead of even discussing it with people you have been able to call on, and did call on, for information, help, and friendship--instead of consulting the researchers who have the same purpose and commitment you say you have--you took your discovery to Liebeler and Specter. I am sure you are not so naive as to have believed that you would "convert" those people. Certainly you had ample warning that you would not convert them. You chose to ignore that warning, and it

turned out exactly as predicted. No; you were not naive. You were self-serving and double-crossing.

But your partners of first choice let you down, so you decided to call me and fire questions at me about Silvers, Arnoni, press conferences, etc., after which questions and answers you then told me the sad story of your abortive alliance with Liebeler and about Specter's fear for his private parts. I am certainly astonished that you felt you could expect me to make any effort on your behalf after your deceit and indisputable breach of faith, and your willful irresponsibility about evidence you believed to be conclusive.

The time has come for you to ask yourself some searching questions about the alleged hostility of the other researchers and their reluctance to have dealings with you. Who is out of step with whom? For myself, I can say only that you have abused my friendship and trust, caused me much needless consternation, and imposed on my patience and the precious time that could have been used for constructive purposes. I want no more of it.