

8 June 1969

Dear David, (Lifton

I am glad that you agree that the Givens business is an important find. It has to be looked at on at least two different levels. First, in terms of reconstructing the actual events and movements of witnesses inside the Depository on the morning of 11/22/63, Givens' original account--and we have every right to assume that it is the authentic story--far from placing Oswald on the 6th floor at about noon actually corroborates Shelley and Piper in placing him on the first floor at that time. Mrs. Carolyn Arnold places Oswald on the first floor 15 to 25 minutes later. And Truly/Baker place him on the second floor at 12:36:15 seconds. Clearly, then, Oswald was not on the sixth floor at all, or not there for the sustained period needed to reassemble the rifle, build the barricade of cartons, and be viewed in a state of immobility by several witnesses. If those witnesses were truthful, someone other than Oswald was in the southeast corner window, who may or may not have been the same man seen in the southwest window by Arnold Rowland.

On a different level, the Givens business exposes a prima facie case of collusion on the part of the Dallas Police and the WC lawyers involved to suborn perjury and deliberately and consciously render a false picture of the real facts elicited, with the clear purpose of incriminating and framing Oswald. Ball and Belin cannot shelter in the rationale that SS 491 cleared up inconsistencies because Belin did not question Givens about his original account of his movements and establish on the record that he was mistaken or that his statements were erroneously reported. On the contrary, Belin in taking the deposition deliberately concealed that Givens had initially rendered a totally different account of his whereabouts--one that tended to exonerate rather than incriminate Oswald. Compare this to, for example, the great pains taken with Brennan to "explain" the contradictions between his first and later versions, and to validate the later story (and his "identification" of Oswald, despite earlier failure to identify him).

I am disappointed, of course, that you have not made definite plans for New York. I hope it will not be too much longer before your ms. is reasonably complete and ready for you to seek publication. So long as you have a conclusive case, it need not be delayed until every last odd and end is run down and can be added. I want to issue one word of caution: that is, do not base any arguments on Tink Thompson's finding of a dent in the lip of CE 543, one of the three cartridge cases found at the window. It has come to my attention recently that his findings are incorrect so far as the dent is concerned. I won't go into detail on this since it is not relevant unless you are in fact planning to incorporate or extend his material on this point in your own ms.

About the letter from J. Edgar Hoover--your request gave me a frightening insight into the dangerous deterioration of my memory of the comparatively recent events of late 1966. My first reaction was that you must have been mistaken, as I had no recollection of mentioning such a letter at the Theater for Ideas, and no memory of such a letter. However, I proceeded to hunt up the tape and listen to it. Sure enough, there in my own voice was the reference to the letter, but even so, I still did not remember it at all, had no idea what I had been referring to during the debate. My next step was to make a methodical search of my "archives," all correspondence, notes, and records up to the date of the debate. It was only when I reached the "T"s that I located the letter in question, filed under "Time"

because the correspondence had been initiated as a result of "Time's" attempt to exonerate the Humes' autopsy report. Not only did I find the letter I mentioned in the debate, but I also found two letters I had written shortly afterwards to J. Edgar, as well as his two replies to me---of which I had no conscious recollection whatever until I found them.

The letter I mentioned during the debate was sent to Bill Crehan, who has agreed that I may supply you with that correspondence. Therefore, as soon as I can get access to the xerox, I will send you copies under separate cover, together with copies of my own two letters and replies from J. Edgar. I am glad to be able to provide you with these treasures and glad also that you will use them only under the conditions you suggest in your letter of 6/2/69, which will give me a chance to get Crehan's prior approval too.

But I must say that I am appalled to discover how much I have forgotten, not only these letters but the various other matters that I looked through in the course of the search. I hope that the other items on your list will not be as elusive. If I receive the list immediately, I might be able to do some work on it before leaving for Boston, although time is getting short and I have a lot to do to ready myself. Otherwise, it will have to wait until at least August.

I guess that is about all for now. All the best,