

non H.S.C.A. archived report

August 27, 1994

Mr. Garrett B. Timmermans  
1164 Lincoln Ave. #138  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dear Mr. Timmermans,

Garrett! Hello, I hope all is well with you. Once again, thank you for writing to me. I hate to bore you with another letter, but I have to respond to your last letter to me. (You are a fantastic letter writer. You put me to shame.) Oh, by the way, I really do apologize for any past and future typing errors. It's this darn SEARS typewriter I am using.

In your letter to me, I can't be certain if you read all of CASE OPEN, because you used the words "paged through" and "skimming," but if you have not read the entire book yet, I hope you do. In regards to CASE OPEN I find it really disappointing that you describe it as shrill, uh, I mean strident, (now that's a word I DO like) and that you take exception with Mr. Weisberg because "he goes on to accuse Gerald Posner of dishonesty." Have you "paged through" case closed? (Sorry, but no capital letters for that book). On pages 295-299 your friend, Mr. Lifton, is ridiculed and takes a verbal beating from Dr. Michael Baden, Dr. Cyril Wecht, Professor David Wrone, Richard Billings and I guess we can add Posner, too. You must be aware of this particular part of the book (chapter 13) so I will not quote from it, but believe me, I, uh, don't think that these particular men were impressed with BEST EVIDENCE. SO, in an offhand way Mr. Weisberg extracts some kind of revenge for Lifton (by destroying Posner with CASE OPEN) and all you are concerned about is Mr. Weisberg's strident writing style!! This makes me shake my head in disbelief. You are correct about one thing, Mr. Timmermans: "heroes are hard to find these days." I will bet ( this is Vegas!), that Mr. Lifton had to smile when he read CASE OPEN. Did you expect Mr. Weisberg to go "easy" on Posner? Let Posner take him to court. After all, Posner is a "WALL STREET lawyer." Mr. Weisberg will wait. And wait. He still is waiting for Specter to sue him for slander. After reading pages 295-299 to refresh my memory, it amazes me that for all the times you refer to Mr. Weisberg as being shrill, when Mr. Weisberg responded to my question about the David Lifton "stolen body" theory, all he wrote was: "Impossible - and he knew it." Is that strident?

I believe that President Kennedy was "greeted" with an ambush when the motercade turned on to (Nightmare on) Elm street that fateful day, November 22, 1963. I believe that Oswald is as guilty as I am. (I was born in 1967) I believe that the Warren Commission whitewash is seperate from the conspiracy that killed JFK. I feel that OUR government, though not a "partner," covered up for the conspirators. ( The end justifies the means)? I put great faith in the testimony of Pierre Finck at the Shaw trial in New Orleans, 1969. I quote from page 235 of POST MORTEM: "Finck nonetheless was forced to acknowledge that the nature of the examination made and not made was not determined by the requirements of the law or regulations but by DIRECT orders given on the spot by top brass...important as was

the tracing of the path of that magical Bullet 399 through the President's body to learn if, in fact, there was any bullet that did or could of taken this guessed-at path, Finck finally admitted the doctors were ordered not to do this obviously necessary thing." The autopsy doctors had "military orders" (by Generals and Admirals) not to perform "a complete autopsy under the definition used by the American Board of Pathology." (Now that's medical forgery!) I believe these "military orders" had a definite connection to the conspiracy that killed JFK. The wound in the FRONT of President Kennedy's neck is not noted in the (not found by Harold Weisberg) Sibert & O'Neill report because the stinkin' doctors did not even know (at the time) that the wound was situated under the tracheotomy that was administered at Parkland Hospital. Humes "discovered" this information later on when he FINALLY spoke to Dr. Perry, who did say it looked like a wound of entry. I believe those nonmedical military people dictating the so called autopsy were well aware of the press conference held earlier that day, in which Dr. Perry spoke of this wound. Those doctors were well controlled during and of course after the autopsy by their superiors. "Master of Puppets!!!"

In respose to your statement: "I'm surprised that Harold Weisberg didn't find CD 7 or that statement, being the master and all," I'm once again upset with this cheap shot to Mr. Weisberg. I think that because you didn't like the reply to your letter that you received from Mr. Weisberg, I feel this is a major reason you disrespect him at every turn. I mean, after all, you wrote in your letter that after you received his letter you dumped all of his books. Now it dawns on me. Add to the mix the fact that he has no time for Lifton's outlandish theory and it all adds up. I can only imagine what you think of Harrison Edward Livingstone. Since you did write some complimentary things about Mr. Weisberg in your last letter, I now believe that you have no problem with Mr. Weisberg's incredible investigation, you have a problem with Mr. Weisberg. That I can live with. As for the Sibert & O'Neill report, I say big deal, so he didn't uncover EVERY shred (as if this was possible) of evidence in this case. You accuse Mr. Weisberg of being paranoid ( a very ambiguous statement and I am still waiting for you to enlighten me on this) and yet throughout the WHITEWASH series Mr. Weisberg always credits the work of others. Your friend, Paul Hoch, is mentioned all through POST MORTEM for the fine discoveries he made. I wonder if Mr. Hoch feels the way you feel about Mr. Weisberg? You may not agree, but Mr. Weisberg has done historical work on this case. Warren Commissioner Richard Russell must have agreed with Mr. Weisberg's investigation. ( See WHITEWASH IV ) And not that Mr. Weisberg needs me to defend him, but I would have to say that getting the ballistics results JUST might "redeem" Mr. Weisberg for not finding the "vaunted" Sibert & O'Neill report. Where oh where would you and Mr. Lifton be without this FBI report???

Those words in the last part of your letter: "SS agents controlling the body were involved in a secret interception," they fascinate me. Where do you get this from? What agents? Kellerman? Greer? Hill? My friend at work thinks Clint Hill shot Kennedy because he and Mrs. Kennedy were lovers!! Can you believe that one!? Good luck in your respose to Dennis Ford. I disagree with what Lifton has led you to believe, but I give you a lot of credit for sticking with him. I admire your convictions. Lifton should be very thankful

that he has a friend that is willing to stand by him and defend his theory. But I honestly can't see where you could possibly go with your defense of the Lifton stolen body/pre-autopsy surgery theory. Just as the Warren Report has Oswald shooting from the six floor of the TBD without (of course) really explaining how he got the rifle inside, where he hid the rifle in the morning, where and when and how he re-assembled the rifle, etc., Lifton has the body stolen and then the wounds altered, (altered??) yet you can't do this without a body. How did the plotters get the body? Best Evidence (page 792) has the body hidden in the "baggage hold." Yet, in your first letter to me, you said: "I too, find the disguised-as-luggage Air Force One hypothesis weak. David's friends, (among whom I count myself), have discussed this with him. He and others like myself now find the Air Force Two hypothesis to be stronger." Stronger, so you say? Well on pages 791-792 in BE Lifton wrote: "He too had never heard of the dead Secret Service agent story, and didn't recall the plane being held for anything to be placed aboard. I rejected the Air Force Two hypothesis." Those are not my words, Mr. Timmermans, those are Lifton's very own words, in his "National Bestseller." I have my copy of BE right here in front of me and I do not see a caveat printed on the front cover. The book is written as if it is nonfiction, and so the reader has to assume he is reading the true feelings of the author. But if what you wrote about Lifton changing his hypothesis amongst his friends is true, well then I have to use a "street" term - YO! What up with that? This contradiction is why I absolutely 100% refuse to deal with books that "solve" this case. Mr. Weisberg makes it clear that he has no "solutions" that solve this case, he only offers to his readers the reality that the case was never fully investigated and that Oswald is innocent!! Almost 30 years after his first WHITEWASH book, Mr. Weisberg certainly has no reason to change his mind about anything regarding his investigation. I say this because he deals in reality. Mr. Timmermans, let me ask you a question, please. If someone you knew, or maybe even a stranger, for that matter, approached you and told you they wanted to learn about the events surrounding President Kennedy's assassination, would you recommend that they read Best Evidence or would you direct them to Harold Weisberg's books?

Mr. Timmermans, the debate will go on long after both of us have left this world, but as long as the different paths we are traveling leads down the same road (that Oswald is innocent), I feel we are on the same team. But please, don't question Mr. Weisberg's writing style, because there is no way he should show any mercy for one second to any Warren Report author or sympathizer. The real assassins, along with Ford and Specter, will most likely skate away free as a bird, but maybe, just maybe, there will be some justice to fate.

BEST WISHES!  
Sincerely,

Neil Gottlieb

"For whom the bell tolls... Time marches on."

4558

2727

Call 4 5548

Sully

302253 4216