

Paul W. Valentine
Washington Post Bureau
10 N. Calvert St, #542
Baltimore, MD 21202

9/5/94

Dear Paul,

This will explain the enclosed and why you get it so long after I write it.

The Baltimore police, or at least its internal affairs component, whitewashed and continues to cover up violations of its own ^{regulations} records and thefts from me by a policeman who was moonlighting for two writers. His name is Richard Waybright. As of my last knowledge he was still on the force. The police themselves discovered improper and I think illegal uses of its computer system which ties in with so many other such systems. As I now recall the detective who phoned me, named Adams, referred to two separate policemen they suspected. One was ^{working for} Harrison Edward Livingstone. He had brought Waybright here to do research in my records for him. Then Waybright came often and usually alone and as I do with all writing in the field, gave him full access.

When Adams phoned me several years ago I then had no specific recollection of any statement Waybright had made to me about his uses of the computer system for Livingstone. When I mentioned this to Lil she reminded me of occasions on which he had told us that he was using the police computer networks for Livingstone and even offered to do that for us, to her.

I told Adams he should speak to her, told him he is welcome to access to all my records that could be voluminous, depending on how much he would want to examine, he expressed no interest in them and did not even ask me to send him any I believed might be relevant. He did not give me an address in the event I thought of any he might want to see.

While I have no personal knowledge of it I believe the improper use of the computer systems is strictly prohibited and may be illegal. If it were known it might make some problems for the Baltimore police.

What was stolen from me of which I know with a single exception was of interest to the second of the two writers for whom Waybright works and nobody else working in my files ever had interest in those matters. The one exception that comes to mind is what Waybright could have stolen for himself because it can have considerable value if he can make the right connection for it. It was something he would have learned about only by prowling in our basement, which he had many lengthy opportunities to do when ostensibly researching for Livingstone. Use of the stairs to our basement, ^{where} all the records I got by all those FOIA lawsuits and most of my own records are, is dangerous for both Lil and me. It has been for me for years and when Waybright was there I was then rarely going down. I almost never do now.

I have masked the name of the man in internal affairs who I know well because I do not want to involve him if that can be avoided.

What I enclose is all that I believed necessary to that writing but there is much more information on what Waybright was doing for Livingstone, all of it, as I understand the police regulations, the kind of outside work prohibited for the police. He flashed his police badge in Dallas and represented that his work there was official Baltimore police business when it obviously was not. He was inherently and by his presence directly involved in Livingstone's terrorization of an elderly and ill couple of whom the man was in terminal illness in an effort to get a false confession of involvement in the JFK assassination! By his presence there he was also involved in Livingstone's threats to others in that area because he was visibly with Livingstone then. I have several reports of his saying that he was there on police business when he spoke to people or wanted them to speak to him. I have it in writing that he threatened to kill a man and I have Livingstone's letters saying that he had or would prevent that.

He, a policeman, has to have been aware of Livingstone's repeated violations of the Maryland code that makes it a felony to allege an indictable offense that has not been charged. He did this with me more than once and in the last of his terribly bad books much of which was made possible for him by Waybright's activities, including the improper use of the police computer networks. *He did it in letters, too.*

When the police, probably internal affairs, decided to wipe all this out Waybright by the dates on them on a single day wrote a number of ~~use~~ lengthy longhand letters telling us he intended no harm to any of us and apologizing while denying all that he had done of which we knew. It was as big a lie as he could have written us and that he wrote the same letter to so many of us the same day indicates it was under instructions and perhaps that he was given the time to do them all that one day. Knowing that it was in all particulars false, internal affairs closed the book on his crimes and violations.

Lifton lives in Los Angeles. He received the stolen goods and paid for their theft from me.

The man whose name I had as "Rick" is the one who made the search for what Waybright lied about returning and he is the one who discovered that what Waybright insisted he returned had not been returned. ~~It~~ ^{It} was invaluable to Lifton. It is the proof that his best-selling book was not only a fake but that he knew it was a fake. I think that means he could be a fraud case but I think his main interest was in seeing that the record I had made for the record for history was no longer in my files. Nobody else had copies of it.

I think it is bad enough for a policeman, a man of public trust, ^{to be} ~~is~~ a thief and otherwise behaves badly if not illegally and that it is worse when the police cover that up, let him get away with it and keep him in his position of trust.

Livingstone, who I believe is not rational, also used a Baltimore police letter-head to complain to Baltimore's Union Memorial Hospital about a doctor on its staff who, in Livingstone's imagination, had leaked information about him. My sources on this include that doctor. I suppose the police and the hospital agreed to keep that quiet because it has been ^d/~~nothing~~ happened to Livingstone.

Livingstone, again to the knowledge of the Baltimore police, for I gave it copies, went around representing that he was part of that department. I have a number of his letters in which he actually said this or implied it as in "I am the law."

Moreover, I believe he can be dangerous. Three times I have told him not to return here but when he did after a lapse of time I feared telling him to go away. It is my concern over his potential for violence that made me happier to have Waybright doing his research for him, that and the fact that Livingstone also wasted much time for us.

Livingstone told me of a second Baltimore policeman also working for him.

If you get this it will be because the police refuse to do anything to right the wrongs done by one of them, by them also, and in not recovering my stolen property for me. I think that in the normal course of police ^{affairs} ~~affairs~~ they could get the LA police to do that when the case against Lifton is worse than merely accepting stolen property. ~~It~~ He has to have directed what Waybright stole for him.

Our best, and hope you can make it here soon,


Harold Weisberg

David Saulsbury
1220 McCurley Ave.,
Catonsville, MD 21228

9/5/94

Dear David,

In writing you recently to tell you that I had discovered still more thievery only Waybright was in a position to steal and only David Lifton had any interest in p even any way of knowing its relevance - I told you I believe I did not mention your name. I did not. I think I told you I had an account of this in a book I've been working on off and on for months. A young woman is retyping my terrible typing of the rough draft. Yesterday she brought more of her work to me. (She is numbering chapter pages beginning with 1 because they may be shifted around.) This morning, reading what she returned retyped, I came to the chapter well into this long manuscript, "Trust Me, I'm a Thief": David Lifton. I enclose pages 16-21. There are earlier references to "lick" that are not necessary to the purposes for which I now write. I think you may well recognize who "Joe" is but I did not use his name for the purpose stated.

As I asked you to tell Adams and the others in Internal Affairs involved in the covering up of what Waybright did, I cannot accept that ~~because~~ because of the serious damage to me and to my work. My most recent discovery of what Waybright alone could have stolen and in which Lifton alone could have any interest happens to be what I regard as important JFK assassination evidence but it involves a man who is a crony of Lifton's. If you are ever here again and are interested I'll tell you why. It was when I was able to return to this book and had come to where I'll use it that I discovered the thefts. It is something I do not want used out of context so I say nothing more about it now.

As I probably told you and as I think you know enough about me to know, I have no interest in public scandals per se. That does not mean that if I believe one is required I would do nothing about it. In fact I have that in mind right now unless I get full redress, the return of all that Waybright stole. While I am not in a position to know all that he could have stolen, I know that he alone was in a position to steal more than I've indicated ^{that} he alone could have stolen.

But because I think no useful purpose would be served by a public scandal, much as one could help the sale of my books now in the stores, I ask that you please hand-deliver this to the top of Internal Affairs. There is little point in my sending it to Adams. The whitewashing brush ^e appears to have been in his hands. I was certain of his intentions when he neither accept^{ed} my offer to free access to all I have and did not ask me to send him copies of anything. Thus I was never in touch with him again. When we spoke I did not recall Waybright's bragging about using the computer network for Livingstone. But when I mentioned it to ^{her} she reminded me that he had even offered to do that for us. Then I remembered more, as you'll see.

When I made copies of these pages to send you I also made copies to send to a reporter friend if and when I am convinced that the police will do nothing about this other than hope that their whitewash sticks a little longer. I am not now sending anything to this reporter friend. But because of newly-discovered additional health reverses I'll write him, with duplicates of these enclosures, so that if I am not able to mail it to him ^{it} will. (Dopplers on both legs reveal no functioning artery in either one. And I am 81 and frail.)

With regard to this book, Inside the JFK Assassination Industry, I have not mentioned it to any publisher and I have no plans for that as of now. Frankly, it is so critical of so many, including publishers, who have exploited and commercialized the JFK assassination, quite a few publishers will not be happy about what it says. However, others who are not mentioned, might well be. Only time will tell.

It will in any event be a record for our history, my primary objective in all I have written.

But if and when it is published, I think the position of the Baltimore police will be ever so much better if it can say that when we became aware of this we rectified it promptly. *As they have not done*

I do not care what happens to Waybright, if anything. Not that he does not deserve punishment for what he has done to me and to others. Including, and I have this in writing from those with first-person knowledge, showing his Baltimore badge in Dallas and representing that what he was doing there he was doing for the Department. As you can see, that not being necessary to what I wrote, I did not make a big deal of it.

And then there is the covering up of Livingstone's writing a letter on a police letterhead about which it did nothing. This ought not be overlooked.

As of now my interest is in recovering what Waybright stole. With regard to my commentary on Lifton's book, as I wrote him, I have no objection to his keeping a copy.

The letters the theft of which I refer to above were written by Kerry Thornley, who was in the Marines with Oswald, but that is not the subject of those letters, to a fine man who was a friend and whose name I want protected. His name is Phil Boatright. He then lived in Omaha. We have not been in touch for years. His name does not appear in any Commission records or in any FBI assassination records. I do not want him subjected to any possible embarrassment. I interviewed him in connection with Kerry Thornley, Lifton's pal, because of a special interest I had in Thornley that does have to do with the assassination investigation and is in neither any Commission nor FBI records. I did what they did not do to obtain the information I now do not want generally known. It is not in my view insignificant information.

I hope, of course, that the police department will now do what it can do to effect the return to me of what Waybright alone could have stolen. By the way, there is a witness to ~~be~~ what I refer to in the enclosed pages about those missing Oswald pages and how Waybright arranged so that with my physical limitations there would be little chance of my discovering what he did. There was, because there was no space for it in that Oswald file drawer, an overflow into another file drawer, in a box. I loaned that box to that writer. He has recently returned it for my writing, He saw that there was ample space for it in the Oswald file drawer after what Waybright took ~~for~~^{from} it but that before that theft there was no room for it. And that is on a subject of the announced Lifton coming book.


As I told Adams the one time he phoned the department is welcome to any relevant information I have, and as you know, I gave you a file of some correspondence and told you you could copy any of it for the department you thought might be of interest to it. I am not now physically able to make any searches but the Department is still welcome to anything relevant I have.

If you or the department have not read Livingstone's Killing the Truth, which is ~~is~~ what he did in it (incredibly, just had a letter from him!) I suggest that there is an obvious Waybright international use of the police computer system and perhaps networks to locate the woman who as a young nurse named Diana ~~Bowron~~ Bowron, was one of the first to participate in Dallas treatment of the President. As usual for him, Livingstone's sole interest was in contriving a false case he wanted for his own impossible theory through her. He was not interested in and did not ask her about the important evidence of which she has ~~some~~ personal knowledge. He ~~twisted~~ what she said to give it a meaning it does not have. She is married and lives in England. Waybright traced her there through other countries.

^{Livingstone's} ~~His~~ index is of ^{little} no real value. ^{INC} It omits most. I have written that if there is any interest in locating it without reading ^{all} that trash. He has Chapter 6 on her, pp. 179ff He says, "I was fortunate to gain interviews with her after she had dropped out of sight for twenty-seven years. Many people sought to find her but all failed." That ~~very~~, very obviously could not do that for himself.

While I'll write the letter to my reporter friend now I'll wait until I know or have time to know what if anything the department is going to do.

Sincerely,


Harold Weisberg

was apparent that Waybright stole it for Lifton. He had said that the only reason he worked for Livingstone was for the extra money. Why not work for Lifton for more of the same?

When Livingstone phoned me again about that memo and those MDW records on October 2, 1991. Waybright had been kicked out by his live-in girlfriend, a policewoman, and I did not have his new address. So I wrote the other policeman, Mick, whose real name I do not use not to involve him in what may yet become a public scandal, and asked him to speak to Waybright again and to ask him to get copies back from Lifton for me. And to tell me if he had stolen anything else because it is impossible for me to make all the searches that would be required. In fact, in so great a volume of records, it is impossible for anyone. In that letter I told him that I had asked Livingstone if he had any reason to believe that Waybright did work for Lifton. Livingstone's response was to ask me if I'd ever spoken to a man whose name I do not use not to involve him in some later public scandal. I said I had not. Shortly after we finished speaking that man phoned me from his then office in Pennsylvania. Our conversation was a long one. He confirmed that Waybright did work for Lifton. He had specific knowledge of payments Lifton made to Waybright and what they were for. What Waybright sold to Lifton included copies of even some of Livingstone's files to which he had free access! And he was supposedly working for Livingstone. And Livingstone knew he was stealing from him and selling what he stole to Lifton, too. Later, Livingstone gave me some details on this and how it had embarrassed

17

him!

This man I had never met- I'll call him Joe- told me that he had had a long and close relationship with Lifton until he had ended it that year, having had more than he wanted to take from Lifton. In what I wrote this second policeman, ~~Nick~~, of that phone conversation, I told him that Joe "says that Lifton boasted of blackmailing Rick," who is Waybright. "Lifton said he had a friend in the DA's office and he told Rick that if he did not do what Lifton asked Lifton would tell his friend all about Rick's misuses of police computers and information and he'd be fired."

Both Livingstone and Waybright had boasted of Waybright's misuse of the supposedly confidential police computer system for such things as locating people for Livingstone so he could speak to them. If that became public it could be hurtful to the Baltimore police department and the people it is to protect.

There was little Livingstone could do because he depended on the misuse of the police computer network to be able to locate the people he wanted to talk to and he needed that for his second book under contract and, he said, with the manuscript due to be handed in the middle of April, 1993.

I don't know what opportunities Waybright had to steal but I do know that he was doublecrossing everybody with whom he was involved. It was in the end so open that he was giving Livingstone handwritten reports on what Lifton was asking of him. I have a copy of one that Livingstone gave to someone else for a special purpose.

As Livingstone got further into his second book and he was in trouble he'd phone me about it. Once he told me what Waybright had stolen from him and sold to Lifton and how he learned about it.

The second of Livingstone's books, both titled High Treason, to me both High Trashes, was, he told me, aimed at Lifton. He does not make this clear in that book but he does devote much of it to saying the opposite of what Lifton had written and he used Lifton's own sources to do that. Then he started getting calls of protests from those people. They complained because Lifton was phoning them and raising hell with them for what they told Livingstone. Lifton knew because he had dubs of the tapes of those interviews and typed transcripts! Livingstone knew that only Waybright could have stolen those tapes to make dubs of them and he had known all along that Waybright was working for Lifton! And Lifton told them he was reading from Livingstone's transcripts.

Continuing to need Waybright, Livingstone just swallowed it.

Meanwhile, Waybright was travelling with Livingstone when he went to Dallas working on High Trash 2 and on his personal Killing the Truth. I have many reports of his telling people in Dallas that he was there on work for his police department. That and his own nuttiness got Livingstone to believe and to write often enough that he, too, represented the police. I have a number of his letters saying that quite explicitly. He even intoned, "I am the law!" in those letters. He has a degree in the law, of which he remains profoundly ignorant.


We return to aspects of this letter. Here I am addressing

Lifton as a practicing, experienced thief, with a Baltimore policeman he blackmailed into doing it, stealing for him.

This point by point exposure of the fraudulence of Lifton's best seller with only Lifton having an interest in seeing that the only copy of my detailed critique was in his possession is not all that is missing from my files to which Waybright alone had access. About two inches of files on Oswald, the announced subject of Lifton's next book, also were stolen. These records were in the front of a file drawer all the records in which are on Oswald. It was an overfilled drawer. It was so overfilled that it was not possible for the folders all to be pushed down so that all touched the bottom of the drawer. When I discovered that they were missing, that they were missing was hidden by the fact that the overfilled drawer had the same appearance. That was accomplished by jamming all that remained in that drawer forward from the back, with the keeper holding them that way, and with the back of that file drawer empty.

Not only did nobody else who used my files at all have no interest in seeing to it that I did not have copies of that Lifton had the only copies, nobody else had access to those files in my office. Only Waybright.

Only Waybright had any means of knowing that I had those missing Oswald files. And he worked for Lifton. Who did have a competitive interest in seeing to it that I not have that information, he had the interest in seeing that no copies of what I wrote about his best seller but that nobody else writing about

Oswald had the information in those stolen Oswald files. 

With a third of a million pages of previously-withheld official records plus my own extensive work product, it imply is not possible to make any real search to try to learn what else has been stolen. I learn these things only when I look for files I knew I had. These are not all that I have discovered were stolen. Others who may have had an interest in these stolen records would have been satisfied with the copies all who work in my files can make on our copier. It is apparent that Waybright did the stealing and that he did this stealing for Lifton. Lifton, who alone had any interest in what was stolen not being available to anyone else. AC/
cr/

The Lifton who has a record of being a thief, of boasting of his scheme for stealing in his boastful letters. And then hires lawyers and threatens lawsuits over the completely accurate exposure of his boasting of how he would steal and then of boasting again about how he did it.

Here is what Feinman wrote that Lifton alleged violated his privacy and his copyright rights, on page 97 of his book over which Lifton went ape:

"In June 1970, he engaged in a plan to induce LIFE to afford him access in Los Angeles to a first-generation duplicate of the original Zapruder film, as well as transparencies. An inspection of the original in New York City was also arranged, but apparently never realized. The cooperation of a Hollywood film producer was secured in trumping up a phony bid to purchase the film from LIFE. The producer gave Lifton and his cohorts access to an office and

letterhead stationary. (Lifton, David. Letter to Sylvia Meagher, June 17, 1970)

"On Monday, June 22, 1970, LIFE flew two copies of the film and many slides to Los Angeles by courier for the producer's inspection. Mr. Lifton and his associates headed for the producer's office. By pre-arrangement with Lifton, the producer was absent from his office when the courier arrived, but he placed a phone call to his office timed to coincide with the courier's arrival, in order to excuse himself and introduce Mr. Lifton and company as his representatives in the proposed transaction.

"As Mr. Lifton examined the 16 millimeter copy of the Zapruder film LIFE had sent, the courier left the room for several minutes. One of Mr. Lifton's associates then whipped out a camera and began shooting pictures of the transparencies arrayed on a light box.

"When Mr. Lifton and his associates left the producer's office, a 16 millimeter reel of the Zapruder film left also, and a reel of electrical extension cord wrapped in tissue was left in its box. (Lifton, David. Letter to Sylvia Meagher, June 25, 1970)"

It is not only by stealing and blackmailing that Lifton gets what he wants. He can be relentless in keeping after people, in making a persisting pest of himself. Even Oliver Stone was not immune when he was working on his movie "JFK," the movie that made a hero of Jim Garrison, who was one of Lifton's favorite hates.

When, as Feinman writes on page 91 of his book he learned from "a source close to the 'JFK' movie project" that Lifton had gotten \$50,000 from Stone, whose movie has nothing from Lifton in it, he