

5/6/67

Dear Steve,

There may be a certain amount of response you feel you may have to make to Dave. My unsolicited suggestion is that you spend as little time on this and related unessentials as possible. They are bad, psychologically, and interfere with constructive work. I haven't had time to read his long letter but I have replied, politely telling him that he and Liebeler will have to decide whether they are Jekyll or Hyde

The Liebeler tape can be important. I have spoken to Bill about it. I want everything he says, whether or not we have a confrontation, whether or not I am again out there as soon as I finish my presently-scheduled writing. I am also anxious to get a copy of a statement made by Joe Ball 3/16/67, on how they checked rumors.

When you see my just-finished book (rather the rough draft is just finished) CIAWHITWASH - OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS, you will know more of Liebeler and his activities and my interest in him.

Bringuier has filed an entirely frivolous suit against me. If there is anything in these papers out there, please send to me.

If Dave meant it an an insult to say you were only 18, accept my assurances I wish I were but that age!

I'm still plugging on Manchester Machiavelli and Whitewash III but have a considerable accumulation to clear up after my work in New Orleans. I am heling Garrison as much as I can.

Thanks, best to you all, and do not worry about Dave.

Sincerely,

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

BOX 150

380 WESTWOOD PLAZA

Los Angeles, California 90024

STEVEN J. BURTON
GARY D. KUKES
Co-Chairmen

MAY 2, 1967

—
JACKIE PILCHER
Secretary

Dear Harold,

Thank you for your letter. I guess that you 've received the letter from Lifton that the critics all got copies of.

I didn't write specifically because of that, but I feel that I should clear up several mis-facts that Lifton stated. First of all, when Lifton spoke to Hyatt, he asked him if he remembered anything about a "formal research project" on Whitewash II. I never contended anything of the sort. He only said an 'outline' which could even be verbal. In reply to your question, I don't think that it was prepared before the exchange that Lifton mentioned. What Hyatt wrote to Lifton directly contradicts what he said to me and three other members of the Committee when we saw him in San Francisco for the march. Other points that are incorrect are: Maggie has given the Committee a donation of \$20.00. We survive on literature sales, donations, and an arrangement we have with Lane by which he donates his services as a lecturer at various colleges in L.A. for which we get the fee. Our bank account at this moment is about 650.00, not in the thousands. I am not in control of the account in that all other than petty expenditures must be approved by the Committee. It is true that I am 18, but that seems like hitting below the belt--it is irrelevant. He libeled me (demagogue is libel per se) and he displayed a viscious nature toward Maggie. He called her a 'bitch' in speaking to a member of the Committee.

But this is enough on that subject. I don't intend an

8 page memorandum for all the critics. There are more important things to do with my time. Namely, what follows.

Our friend Mr. Liebeler spoke today for the UCLA Honors Forum. About 20 people showed up of which 8 were members of the Committee. I taped the main section of the speech for you but ran out of tape in the question section. As soon as Bill and I can transfer it from my cartridge to a reel, we'll send you a copy. But I thought you might want the most meaningful statements right away.

The body of his speech (50 min.) was a rundown of what is happening in New Orleans with comments from the Commission viewpoint. Very little was not in the volumes. Most of what he said was predictable.

On Ferrie, he said, "On the basis of the FBI reports, I decided that he had nothing to do with it (the assassination)."

On the Bertrand to Andrews phone call, he tried to discredit Andrews by saying that he was under heavy sedation in the hospital and saying that his investigator was supposed to be in the room but that the investigator doesn't recall the call. But, he admitted that Zelden, Andrew's attorney, does mention a call about Bertrand from Andrews that day and that this is in a FBI Report in the archives (classified).

He said that Phelan is sending him copies of the memos he based the Post article on. He knows two other people (Schiller?) who met Garrison in Las Vegas.

Liebeler did not place his working papers in the Archives, (They "just happened, just happened to be in the papers I took with me") and the notes on Ferrie show that he made two trips to Guatemala in October, 1963. He explains that Ferrie was an investigator for Marcello's attorney and went there to check if Marcello had forged a birth certificate in order to get into the country.

He mentioned Breck Wall's trip to Galveston and his conversation with Ruby and how weird it was for them to talk about union problems on that Saturday (Vol XIV-605+). Listen to the

tape for specifics.

Then he mentioned the Odio incident and how the commission established that it wasn't Oswald but that if it was, Oswald may have been trying to use the Anti-Castro Cubans in order to get to Cuba.

He said that he was writing the Report on the Odio incident on Sept. 21 or 22 ^{10/11} when an FBI report naming the three visitors crossed his desk. The chapter was footnoted and he felt that this would cause problems since the draft went to the printer the next day and he quickly wrote the three into the chapter being careful to use the same number of footnotes so as not to throw off the whole footnote sequence. Then, after the report was printed, he received the Miami FBI report that stated that the three were in Miami during the Odio incident and he fully conceded the point to the critics.

Then came questions and answers, mostly not on tape. Most of this was his normal rationalizations on the usual topics (The best evidence that Oswald was a capable rifleman was that he did it.).

On the Autopsy X-Rays and fotos:

"It was the height of stupidity not to have them submitted into evidence and not releasing them now compounds the stupidity."

The fotos were found in a trunk in the basement of the archives.

Q. Is the statement by Ramsey Clark that Shaw was cleared by the FBI in Dec. 1963 ethical?

A. "No."

"No matter what happens now, the Chief Justice and the staff haven't really done themselves much good by this report. It's not going to reflect much credit on it."

This last statement was made only after he asked me if the recorder was off. Too bad I ran out of tape.

So that's the essence of what he said that I feel is pertinent. I hope it helps you.

Anyhow, everything is going well. Bill looks just great and he is doing fine. He's interviewing Gruvere (from New Orleans) this week for KPFK. We now have a Committee in St. Louis.

I'm sure you heard that Kupferman re-introduced his resolution. If you don't have the news release, I can Xerox it for you. He is still mild, but his speech was stronger than last time.

We are all looking forward for your new books, especially III. Don't work too hard.

SB
Best wishes,

SB
Steven J. Burton