

Dearest Editor:

In two fields David Lifton can lay genuine claim to expertise: In "weaving Kennedy-assassination theories" and in framing people. His own distortions in your second attack on Jim Garrison and me establish this. Dave is less irresponsible when he works on his own pet "theory," that the assassination was committed from papier-mache trees somehow, mysteriously, removed in the middle of the night, while thousands of unseeing looked on. Such, he once explained to me, is the power of the power-elite in Dallas, all those visitors, too, were intimidated into silence.

Kerry Thornley will be fortunate indeed to survive Dave's "friendship," particularly its manifestations. Dave will be lucky to survive his own self-indictment as a "critic" of the Warren Report, all the recent manifestations of which are of collaboration with the major framer of the frameup, Wesley J. Liebeler, the Commission lawyer in charge of the "conspiracy" part of the case against Oswald.

Dave is Liebeler's advance man. It is in just that capacity that he intruded into a debate arranged between Liebeler and me in Reseda, California, this past February. Liebeler could not turn it down, for I had published a detailed account of his own career in framing history and Oswald. Instead, Dave butted in and raised new "conditions" of the debate and, between him and Liebeler, got it called off.

If anyone doubts the truth of this, let him arrange an identical debate NOW. Like Lifton, who has talents. He can both arrange and moderate it. We can have the very same debate anytime Dave arranges it and Liebeler agrees to it. But will Liebeler, who was really in charge of this part of the investigation, its crux? Will Dave, whose heart bleeds so for the fascist-minded?

Dave's literary techniques come right from Goebbels:

"...Barbara Reid, an alleged practitioner of witchcraft..."

Thornley, something less than an impartial source, is the origin of the allegation that Barbara, a writer and a TV producer, is the "key witness" (Dave's word, or the only witness in Kerry's representation) against Thornley.

Aside from his slurs on those who refused to be conned by his own gross errors, what has Dave in this second opus? The detailed story of how he fed false affidavits to Garrison and how he and Thornley plotted to frame John Rene Heindel. Of course, he has a few lies, too. Like:

"In the fall of 1963 Thornley lived in New Orleans and was in the city during a two-week period when Oswald was also there."

If Dave doesn't know better, he should have said nothing.

"Thornley has been charged and arraigned for perjury because of this disagreement."

No wonder neither Dave nor Thornley troubled your readers with a printing of the indictment!

It is perfectly proper for Lifton and Thornley to cook up an untrue story on John Rene Heindel. And it is perfectly proper procedure for Lifton, AFTER he has filed the affidavits with Garrison, to check out the story and find it is untrue. Noble man, he then telegraphed Garrison. And terrible prosecutor Garrison, he didn't just forget it there, did he? Or is this his crime, wondering why Thornley would swear to what was not true, to point the accusing finger at the wrong man? Shades of the Warren Report and Wesley J. Liebeler, how can that be wrong?

Let me digress for a moment for Dave's delineation of a true-blue Warren Report "critic," David Lifton.

"Lifton met Thornley in 1965 and they discussed the Heindel matter."

Garrison's investigation became public knowledge in mid-FEBRUARY 1967. So, this stellar critic does what?

"In SEPTEMBER 1967 (after waiting seven months) Lifton called Jim Garrison..."

About what?

"Thornley's and Lifton's theories of Heindel's possible in-

volvement as a 'co-patsy' with Oswald in a two-gunman assassination plot..."

How anyone, even Dave, could connect Heindel with a gun, Dealey Plaza, or anything else besides a bad assassination trip I'd like to hear. THIS theory is invention, nothing else.

Dave says of Kerry, "I knew he just didn't want to go any further" than making wrong affidavits. No reason other than a dislike for Garrison (stemming from that solid base of having once served him dinner) ever occurred to Dave? Like Thornley knew it just wasn't so?

Again, Dave's words, "explaining" how Thornley ultimately appeared before the grand jury in New Orleans. "Kerry, in order to prove he had nothing to hide, went voluntarily."

Is that what it means when you are hailed into a Tampa court and the judge orders you to go, Dave? "Voluntarily?"

To those of us who wondered about his association with Liebeler, Dave's explanation was that he was just trying to get cookies of information from Liebeler, that they really detested each other. I have had earlier signs of this mutual "dislike." Here is a grand one. Liebeler is responsible for this part of the Warren Commission case. His self-description is of the ten-fingered Dutch boy with a twenty-holed dike. Albert Jenner, his associate, was too busy running for the presidency of the American Bar association to do any work, so Liebeler had it all to do. True, Liebeler did. And none of this Thornley bit is in it, aside from his misrepresentation of Oswald the Marine, who had the highest security clearance possible while openly getting Communist literature in the mail and who was anti-Communist. From Thornley's testimony this comes out that Oswald was a Communist.

Who is Dave REALLY "defending?" Can it possibly be his "friend," Thornley?

Or is it Liebeler and the Warren Report?

Yours for truth
Harold Weisberg.

OPEN CITY 59
7/5-11/68