

1249 Hi Point St
L. A. 90035
Aug 10 ,1966

Dear Sylvia,

It troubled me to feel I had to talk to you about Dave Lifton the other night, so I want to make ~~xxxxxxx~~ sure I am not misunderstood about him.

I certainly do not consider Dave a bad person. If he has been something of a problem child to us here, it's not out of any meanness of character, but rather out of immaturity, extreme self-centeredness, and instability. However, for reasons I spoke of re his "Dialog", the map, and numerous other incidents not mentioned, I simply don't feel I can show him a hoped-to-be-published work with complete confidence that the original points and presentation will not be compromised in some way. (incidentally, the single point in his Dialog which represents his own work is the "wounded sign" hypothesis).

Dave's interest in the case, by his own admission to me, has been spurred primarily by the "excitement" it provides, and for what he considers and opportunity for recognition. (He told me after his recent ~~xxx~~ interview on the Joe Dolan show it was "a lot of fun", and he was going to try to get himself on other shows). Obviously for such factors to be one's primary motivation in a case of this magnitude can lead to difficulties.

As to the compromising of material, up until recently this in itself would have been of no concern to me, as I had no intention of attempting to have anything published. I made all my stuff available to him despite my familiarity with his traits. My feeling was that it was important to get everything "out" that seemed to have validity, to do so by any means; and this specifically included Dave since he was talking to anybody and everybody.

At this stage of the game, though, due to the recent opening up of the ~~subject~~ entire matter, there is obviously more than enough stuff out to scuttle the WR for anyone who cares.. Therefore I think it justified to be more selective in choosing to release material.

Although I don't ask Dave to contact me re his activities, I expect to continue to cooperate ~~xxx~~ with him in most ~~xxx~~ areas of mutual interest.

Re Eptstein, while agreeing his book deserves credit for a unique inside look at the Commissions operations, which succeeded in forcing open the subject, I feel ~~xxxx~~ that in reviews by Commission critics he ~~sh~~ould ~~have~~ be severely taken to task,

1. for his shameful denigration of all previous critics as "demonologists", and
2. for his bland acceptance of Oswald's guilt, despite his admission that he did not study the assassination, but only the Commissions modus operandi (and despite his own attack on some important "evidence" against Oswald). (that all previously published genuine critics were included in his epithet was made clear by the nature of his two "exceptions," MacDonald and Freese.)

I consider it thoroughly and unforgiveably rotten for a critic to so characterize all the others, without even making an attempt to name them and spell out their alleged demonology; and doubly so because his motive was clearly to elevate himself ~~at~~ by placing the others beneath him.. His obvious deal with Liebeler (implicit, to be sure), is another example of moral and intellectual opportunism which I find disgusting.

I thought Sauvage's approach in The New Leader was correct vis a vis Epstein; although I thought somewhat stronger terms were in order.

It appears to me you have been caught in the middle on this, and I promise not to belabor you again with ~~this~~. *it*.

I would very much like to see your manuscript some time. Dave and Maggie both have said the portions they saw were very fine. As I mentioned, had I realized you had included a chapter on the background of 399, I probably would not have felt it necessary to do my own piece.

I have another piece in mind -- a short one, I hope -- on the missed shots; especially the Tague shot, which I feel has not been adequately handled in anything I have yet seen (particularly how the Tague curb shot was transformed by the FBI from a "chip" to a "mark") I feel such a piece would be important, not because it shows more than three shots (those unconvinced on this point by the already published material being beyond reach), but because it shows criminal alteration of evidence.

(I believe the "chip" referred to in the Dallas News story, Dec. 13, '63, was patched; and that at the section of curb was not removed by the FBI until Aug '64 (21/476) in order to give the patch time to weather, so as to be inconspicuous. The section of curb shown to the Commission (21/482) may or may not have been the same one photographed by Underwood (21/478), but it is certain the sizable chip in the Underwood photo could not have "washed away" as the FBI suggests (21/472); and it is equally certain it would not have been left unrepaired for any troublemakers to examine.

As to the Moorman photo, I admit to being considerably taken aback by your revelation that you have seen photographic proof that convinces you that the images are not men. I am wondering at the implications of these not being men.

First, from #1 on the extreme left (cowboy hat) to #5 on the extreme right (right collar--point showing, hands in front holding long object), these "faces" are in the same approximate range of size, a remarkable coincidence for five ~~xxx~~ optical illusions (leaf, light patterns, etc.)

Second, whereas if optical illusions, such images would be expected to appear in various attitudes (inverted, horizontal, all angles), all five of these are in an upright position -- another remarkable coincidence. Third, they are the approximate size one would expect for the distance, yet another coincidence (compare with face sizes of men on the stairs). Combining all these coincidences must result in extremely long odds against optical illusions. Yet, if the proof you have seen indeed precludes the possibility of the images being men, the long odds are successfully defied.

In addition, how to explain the form in Willis #5 -- consistent with the position of #2 in Moorman shortly thereafter -- which has disappeared by Willis #6 several second later?

I have a 16x20 of #2, and ~~and~~ an 8 x 10 of #5. Viewed at the proper distance (which I did again today), these are extremely life-like, especially #5. If these indeed are not men, I'll never trust my vision again in any photo that has the least element of doubt.

Whoever it is that has proof invalidating the images, I wish they would make it available ~~unless~~ assuming they have no intentions of publication.

I want to thank you again for your most cogent and helpful suggestions re my piece. I am including most of them.

I believe an in-context reading of 5/155-156 supports "The Commission . . . concedes . . . Connally . . . reacting . . . prior to 240". ~~it~~

We do remain in disagreement on your suggestion that I should inform the experts that no bullet emerged from JFK's front, and that none remained in his body. While I think the former hypothesis very likely, and the latter unlikely, I have no reason to rely on either. At any rate, there are only three possibilities: The bullet that struck JFK's back either emerged from the front; stayed in his body; or fell out the back through the entrance wound. If I am, a priori, eliminating the first two, I see no point in asking an expert, or anyone, about the third; there being no other alternative.

If a bullet did in fact fall from its entrance wound after even comparatively shallow penetration, the opinions I have received (reflecting 15,000 separate examinations) make it apparent that it did so despite contrary odds of at least 15000 to 1. I know such long shots can and do occur. But it seems no less unrealistic to assume it happened that way in this case than, similarly, to assume that the wound in the throat, completely atypically, could have been an exit wound.


Certainly, the problem of what happened to the bullet is at least as puzzling with the throat-entry hypothesis (which I definitely support), as with the back wound. To my knowledge, none of those writing of a throat entry has even attempted to deal with this question, and no wonder -- it's probably the most troublesome physical difficulty involved with any major hypothesis put forth by the critics.

A last word on Lane. Reflecting on his book several days after reading it, and considering it with the Newsweek piece, I definitely feel Lane has again ~~now~~ clearly emerged as the leading critic. I certainly am in no position to dispute any of the charges you make against him, any more than I ~~can~~ can agree with most of them, since I know very little of the facts. ~~But~~ But even if Lane kicked small dogs, gave poisoned candy to small kids, and raped his grandmother on alternate Wednesdays, I believe his position as the embodiment of resistance to the Official Lie is historically secured.

Robert Kirsch seems definitely to be coming around. He called yesterday and said that he thought quite highly of Lane's book, although he felt he was being "too much of an advocate" in spots. Re Weisberg, he said he now thinks considerably more of Whitewash than when he read it several weeks ago.

He also asked me if I knew who Epstein was referring to as ~~demons~~ demonologists; and, although not mentioning it in his review, said he felt the acceptance of Oswald's guilt was inconsistent with the material presented.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Ray', written in a cursive style.