

Neil Gottlieb  
5250 Mission Monterey Lane #104  
Las Vegas, NV89107

9/30/94

Dear Neil,

Thanks for your 9/17 and the enclosed Timmerman letter to you. If we have further correspondence about this I will put it in my Lifton file and may not remember. I hope there is no further correspondence about this, however, I am interested in Lifton because he is the biggest and most successful of the disinformationists.

I thank you for your defense of me but I suggest it is a total waste of time. I think you will be well advised to forget about that whatever he says and stick to what he cannot respond to. Not that I think that will do any good. Those who do not see through Lifton are hopeless if they have any intelligence at all.

You are right about Lifton making money. Aside from what he got from the hardback there were at least 15 printings of the quality paperback. I have one that says it is the 15th. And after making all this money and whatever he got for the other paperback he is now so honest he says the basis of all that money and his fame was wrong. Which he had to know to begin with.

On his first page T. refers to the Sibert-O'Neill report. You might ask him why in so large a book <sup>Lifton</sup> he did not reproduce it and then answer from my facsimile reproduction of it in West Horton. In the same paragraph they report that the body was in the casket in which it left Dallas and was not in any body bag but was wrapped in sheets. Is it a reflection of Lifton's honesty that impelled him to suppress from the source of his ticket to fame and fortune what proved it and him to be a fraud? No body bag, no shipping casket, no book Best Evidence.

Later T. reveals having a copy of the FBI letter to Lifton by quoting the irrelevant part and paraphrasing the body. Ask him for the body of it unless he is ashamed to let anyone see it. And from what he paraphrases, can he say that it was not a question from a doctor rather than a statement?

He would indeed like to read my correspondence with Lifton, which he broke off. I tell you this in confidence because I am too old and too weak to get into any further arguments about it. The record is clear anyway. Lifton refused to deny that a crooked cop working for Harry Livingstone stole from me originals when he had the unrestricted use of our copier and sold them to Lifton. This includes the only copy of my page-by-page analysis <sup>what is</sup> of anything but Best Evidence. I have the proof in that despicable cop's handwriting that he was working for Lifton and nobody else worked in the files from which he stole from me. Nobody had any interest in most of what he stole other than Lifton. So Lifton is not about to show such letters to anyone. So if you want to respond to that, ask him why Lifton has not given him copies- and all copies, but just selections of them.

In writing him about what he says about what I wrote about Thornley I have to

caution you again. He asks if you have read what I said about Thornley as the <sup>is</sup> also Oswald in Whitewash. The answer is that I said nothing at all like that in that book or to the best of my recollection elsewhere. So tell you must be as big a doper as he says because you do not remember reading in Whitewash what he says is there ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> there so will he please send you a copy of it? Which obviously he cannot do.

Now where he talks about me believing that Thornley was <sup>a</sup> false Oswald that is something Lifton made up, Lifton and nobody else with his instant vision of what is not there. So do not let him know that you know this. Do not mention it. What really happened is that when in New Orleans I got such a report and did not believe it, with identifications from pictures, not trusting Garrison's people not to fake something I sent copies to a Los Angeles commercial artist I knew but did not know he was in bed with Lifton. I asked him to see if with makeup he could make it look like <sup>Oswald</sup> Thornley. That would prove that it was not <sup>Thornley</sup> ~~Thornley~~ those people said they saw. So Lifton just assumed it was to frame "Thornley." which was impossible from those pictures, which cannot be made to look like Oswald. It is not easy to exaggerate the kind of despicable person Lifton really is.

He says that Lifton learned after 1981 that the body did not go to Walter Reed. Which he had just made up anyway. Those radio broadcasts do not say he went there. But why, "as an example of honestly dealing with evidence," did he not make the correction in his 1988 Carroll & Graf reprint then or as late as the 1992 15th printing of it? Answer. Without it he has no book.

His and Lifton's #2 suspicion is desperation. Lifton cannot face the proven fact that he is a fraud and made money by defrauding people about the assassination. You might ask Timmerman how many of JFK's closest had to be part of the conspiracy to steal the body (without the casket) from AF1 when only of them all O'Donnell went to the swearing in with Jackie. And a bit of ridicule, he and Lifton now have a magic body, one that is over six feet tall and weeping blood and other fluids all over the place that without a trace on them the agents moved from one plane to another. And all of that entirely unexplained. So he has to have a magic corpse not to weep stains and not to be seen. With transferable magic, imparting invisibility to those carrying it. Or they are/or their strange position would have been so very conspicuous in the airport in broad daylight and with all those people and the distance between the planes.

Lifton is an unscrupulous bastard but he is not a fool. He will have no sequel to Best Evidence. He will leave that entirely alone. He knows he got away with murder. His next book was announced last year for this year, on Oswald.

But forget about me with them. It will do not good and if you speak in your own name they cannot ~~be~~ pretend to deprecate it by attributing it to me.

For file I would like to be informed. I plan to waste no more time on Lifton and his knowing frauds by which he commercialized the subject and desecrated the President's memory.

Thanks and best wishes,

Hardy

September 27, 1994

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
7627 Old Receiver Rd.  
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

Hello, Sir. Thank you very much for your letter, dated 9/6/94. It is always an honor to receive a letter from you, Mr. Weisberg. As I always write in my letters to you, I am a dedicated fan of you and your incredible investigation on the JFK assassination. I am very sorry that you are not feeling well, and I pray for you every day. I also wish to say hello to Mrs. Weisberg, and I hope she is feeling well.

In my last letter to you, I mentioned the correspondence I was having with Garrett Timmermans, who is a defender of David Lifton and the book Best Evidence. I know it is not necessary to defend you, but this Timmermans fellow talks about you in such derogatory and condescending tones, I just can't let him get away with it. He talks "down" to me in his letters. He thinks he is superior to me because I absolutely refuse to take Lifton's theory serious. He can't believe that I follow your investigation. In one of his letters, he referred to you as a "first-generation" investigator who has been "eclipsed" by Best Evidence. I responded by saying that the only thing Lifton has done is peddle a sick and demented theory, whereas you based your investigation on the government's own documents. You may think that this is childish, but he has implied that you are paranoid. No way would I let him get away with that. I told him to prove this, but all I get is silence. I could go on, but I think you get the idea. However, he informed me in his last letter that he has "discussed" our correspondence with Lifton, and my support for you. He wrote: "David was amazed that Weisberg would have any adherents this late in the history of the case." Since he travelled down that road, I'll follow. I have enclosed a copy of his last letter to me. I am sure you will laugh when you read it.

You had wrote in your letter that you wanted a copy of Lifton's "new" Air Force Two hypothesis, which he (supposedly) revealed to his friends. I'll try to let you know as much as I know. I have also enclosed the part of his letter where Timmermans spoke of this.

I read a letter that Timmermans had sent to The Fourth Decade, in which he defended Lifton's theory. I wrote him a letter in which I disagreed with his stance. In my letter, I made it clear that there is no way that President Kennedy's body was "disguised as luggage," which is how Lifton said the body was "stolen" by the "plotters." In his first letter to me, he told me that he thought the luggage hypothesis was "weak." He said that he and others had "discussed this" with Lifton. He then said that "He (meaning Lifton) and others like myself now find the Air Force Two hypothesis to be stronger." He didn't explain what he was talking about. Of course, in my response I pointed out that on pages 791-792 of BE Lifton raised and then rejected his speculation that the "stolen body" was placed aboard Air Force Two. On page 792, the reader finds this: "I rejected the Air Force Two hypothesis." In a later letter he finally "answered" my questions about this Air Force Two business. This is what I have copied for you. He didn't say he was quoting Lifton, he just wrote what he "suspect(s)." Now, Mr. Weisberg, since I find it hard to believe that anyone would honestly

take Lifton's theory or theories seriously, I take what Timmermans wrote with a grain of salt. I have suspected that he is joking when he defends Lifton in his letters, but he writes like he has a passion for Lifton's theory, so who can know for sure. Since he claims to be "friends" with Lifton, I can only assume that he gets his ideas from Lifton. In reality, I guess it doesn't matter, because I think it is all a hoax! Timmermans "suspects" that during LBJ's swearing in "disloyal" Secret Service agents "removed" the Presidents body from Air Force One and "placed" the body aboard Air Force Two. His "view" is that the "disloyal SS agents permitted someone to work on the body aboard Air Force Two." Is he serious? Naturally, the respect and restraint I was putting forth in my letters disintegrated. I reasoned that if this was what he would write to me, he obviously has no respect for me. After our recent last exchange of letters, I doubt there will be anymore.

Mr. Weisberg, I realize that this is silly, and I am sorry to bother you with this stupidity. But according to Timmermans: "We will very likely see his revised view in print when his sequel to Best Evidence is published and the reasons for it." This is another major issue I tried to raise with Timmermans. I say "tried" because he wouldn't respond to one of my charges. I told him that I feel that Lifton is only concerned with making money off this case. I also said that by printing his theory he is disrespecting the memory of John F. Kennedy. I am sure that you have much more important stuff to deal with, but if there is anyway that you could give me your opinion of all of this, believe me, Sir, I would be very grateful. I also hope that if you are able, maybe you can let me know what you think of the copy of Timmermans letter, which I have enclosed.

Thank you very much for taking the time to read my letter. I only "know" you through your books and your tv appearances, but I want you to know that you are an amazing human being. God bless you.

Sincerely yours and best wishes,

*Neil Gottlieb*  
Neil Gottlieb

*Neil Gottlieb*  
F260 mission monterey Lane #104  
Las Vegas, Nevada  
89107