

Sept. 6, 1969

Dear Sylvia,

For once, I am not going to delay even an hour in answering a letter.

I am really delighted to get those FBI reports you sent me. Very specifically, I think that the Brewer and Postal reports are of prime importance, and I certainly will be using them as such, and for precisely the reasons you stated in your letter.

We are dealing with much more than the Tippit murder here---we are dealing with evidence, FBI documents which contain solid information re foreknowledge on the part of the police department of Dallas that the Tippit murder suspect is in any way connected with the Kennedy murder suspect; which, in my jargon, can be summed up as whether some officers in that police department are running on a scenario which they can't quite keep secret long enough to legitimize properly, chronologically speaking.

I have, in my files, a folder devoted to exactly how the Tippit suspect became the JFK suspect. Months ago, I took notes on, or xerox'd the appropriate section in your book, plus all the others, to make sure that I would have all this information in one place.

These reports you have sent are surely prime material in that regard. They are really incriminating, especially if, as in my case, I will not be forced to use them in isolation and infer a theory of police involvement on them alone, but rather use them to corroborate other data. I am really happy about this. Also, because they are unpublished, I can note this down among my "sins of omission" regarding the Warren Commission and its staff.

\*\*\*\*

In this regard, I would like to make a request of you which I think ought to be done, and which will save me much time.

Can you "defense brief" this info for me? IE, could you perform the check of the testimony of Postal, Brewer, etc. to see whether the Commission attorney, having this FBI report lying in front of him, attempted to elicit any sort of testimony that they had not heard such remarks, then let testimony of that sort appear in the record, and then ~~XXXX~~ suppressed the report itself. If this checks out negative, just let me know. But if it is not, could you briefly indicate just what transpired, writing this up as an attachment to some future letter, and I will simply incorporate it in the file on that subject; this will give me great confidence, when I use the report (which can be used in either case, as their date precedes the testimony dates, but they would, in that case, have to qualified or at least discussed in the context of fishy behavior on the part of staff counsel, which would then only make them that more incriminating) that that there is nothing left lurking in the record on that subject which I did not know about.

I can assure you that this particular topic, and anything else that indicates foreknowledge on the part of any officer, will be used. I am interested in all types of foreknowledge (or actions that indicate it) on the part of anyone connected with this entire case.

\*\*\*

For all practical purposes, I have the entire CD 385 (I am missing a few pages, about 8 I think). If you missed anything, let me now. By Monday, I will send you pages 84-98 which are entirely devoted to Tippit witnesses. Except for this business of DPD decision making, I am

AAF  
85-88

not primed, at this time, on the Tippit area, witness by witness. If you find anything in here that you think is of significance, please let me know. I will also send pp45-54, re the cameras in the garage. Does this tell us anything? It has helped settle my suspicions that the Stereo realist was LHO's, or that the minox was LHO's. If you find anything worth commenting on in these documents, or anything you think I should know about, let me know.

\*\*\*\*

I never met or wrote or spoke to Kimbrough. I did meet one of her associates, Mary Farrell, who came out to LA and spent 4 days at Fred Newcomb's house, about 2 weeks ago. Like many of us, she has devoted almost all of her existence, since 1963, to the assassination, and has collected vast quantities of material. One item she brought that was really worth listening to, and quite dramatic, was the police recordings from Channel 1 and Channel 2. Its one thing to read the transcript, but another level of appreciation is reached when you listen to those tapes, which are, I suppose, the audio equivalent of seeing the Z film in motion for the first time, when you have, until then, only seen slides.

Of course, the same problems of authentication exist, with respect to material of that nature, as with respect to the "available copy" of the Z film. Furthermore, a quick check shows that, somewhere along the X line, the tapes were edited, because they do not check out, when clocked against "real-time". (The time checks don't match, ~~XXXXXX~~ when a clock is put on a tape, over intervals of 10-15 minutes). According to her, these tapes come right out of the Dallas police department, as does a transcript which comes with it. I checked the transcript against the 3 or 4 we already have (!!) and found it to be still another version, and further found that it is close, but not entirely accurate, to everything that is on the tape. I am going to settle with her the question of making copies.

\*\*\*\*

In his last letter to me, Tom Bethel wrote that he is writing a book based on a diary which he kept while he was in the office. Are you still close and communicating? Isn't he keeping that sort of thing quite secret, seeing as he is right there under Big Jim's thumb? Although he didn't admonish me not to tell, I haven't mentioned it to anyone, but I thought I'd ask you.

\*\*\*\*

Have you any new information on the possibility of getting New Orleans trial transcripts of Finck, Frazer et al? I am told through Paul, that I may soon be able to get Frazier. He is getting it, I think, from Nichols. Are you close to Nichol's, or is Paul as good a contact as any? I ask this because there are still several more witnesses I want (like Finck, Zapmuder, all Dallas eyewitness (except, perhaps, Carr) and I want to go by the shortest route possible. But I don't want to initiate any requests that will disturb, in any way, Paul's contacts.

\*\*\*\*

Sylvia, on their trip out here, my parents told me that they heard Wecht, months and months ago, on a radio program with Flammonde. I have not approached him, because I am not quite ready yet, but is he very close with Flammonde, Fensterwald, and Garrison? If not, fine. If so, would it really matter. Do you feel that he can keep to himself material which I would not, under any circumstances, want them to get ~~XXXXX~~ near?

Best wishes, thanks again

David

David

P.S. I forgot to answer all questions in your letter.

1) re rushing. No comment I could make could add to what you have already noted.

2) Re address bok.

I have never looked into anything in CD 897 yet, or into the address book, or into Gandy.

(There is an item I have on the address book, a working memo from one staff attorney to another. Its on my schedule to be xerox'd and I will send it along).

3) Re sermon.

The other day, I encountered at breakfast in the UCLA student Union a fellow who graduated from Cornell the same year I did and is working to complete his PhD thesis in solid state physics. I left graduate school at about the time he completed his course work, and was starting his thesis.

I almost asked him "When will you be finishing your experiment, getting your thesis, getting your Phd..." etc. Then I thought of the 100 times a month I run into acquaintances I meet who ask "When is your book going to be finished, anyway(????)"

(????) is inflection probably provided by my imagination.

So I'm just working.

Incidentally, you might be interested in one cute anecdote.

In May, I was talking to a girl, who gives a rather attractive appearance (which I insert because of what comes next) when along comes Wesley J. Liebeler\* to ask me:

"Lifton, are you still working on that? When are you going to get off that and get onto something meaningful?"

Well, I walked with him up to his office, asking him a few questions along the way, as I hadn't seen him in months. To one, he answered:

"Look, I don't have time to go into that anymore. I'm spending my time on things that are important. I've got a book to write on anti-trust law."

~~XXXXXXXX~~ Hearing, as I do, that anti-trust law is even boring to anti-trust lawyers, and knowing of Liebeler's secret interest in the limelight and power politics, I said:

"Well, I hope your book sells as many copies as mine will."

Of course, the one thing about Liebeler is that he will never let on if you've really reached him. Only his wife knows if, when he came home that night, he was grumbling at all about that repartee.

\* who probably wouldn't have ambled over, otherwise