3

10/29/66 Lie Liebeler + Evidence

Dear Bill, these are random thoughs and notes on the clippings you sent me, one of which indicated no source. It is a UPI story and resembles the LA Time typography.

How can pictures and Xrays show that the shots came "from behind and above", as Liebeler is quoted (UPI) as saying? The Report says the non-fatal wound struck no bones. The wound in the front of the neck was cut away before the pictures were taken. Therefore, unless Liebeler can prove that the Xrays show both the path of the bullet and its entrance and exit and the pictures can show both the entrance and exit, he cannot be other than misleading and wrong.

As quoted in this story, Liebeler deliberately misrepresents the meaning of the handprint on the inaccessible part of the rifle and avoids the total absence of any other prints on the weapon he and the Report allege was fired during the assassination and for which he and it allow no time for the wiping of prints. That particular handprint was specifically identified as "old" by Dallas Police Lieutenant Day, meaning it could not have been left on the rifle at that time. However, it also proves that the rifle was capable of both taking and holding prints. Further (as WHITEWASH II reveals(Lt. Day refused the give the FBI a statement on his handling and "lifting" of this print and both the FBI and the Commission allowed him to get away with it. The Commission, at least, could have compelled him to testify or punished him for not doing it. This print did not come from "the bottomside of the rifle, but from a part hidden and made inaccible by the bottomside. It came from the part of the barrel that is protected from prints by the bottomside. There is no evidence that the rifle was disassembled that day, as there is no evidence that Oswald had it in his possession or used it that day. These are assumptions made by the Report and Liebeler in the absence of evidence, of even disreputable character, the absence of evidence of any kind or nature whatsoever. I t is a smaple of the lack of forthrightness with which those participating in the Commission's work and since then defending it approach truth and the quest for a solution of the crime.

Old Prints Evidence

What Liebeler says the autopsy report "showed" those doctors who wrote it could not and did not say. They equivocated and conjectured and created hypothethises and made sunstantive changes in the autopsy report to make it seem as though the short came from above and behind, but they did not, as Mr. Liebeler says, declare without question that all of the shots came from above and behind. Were this even true, it would not prove that either Oswald fired them or that they came from the alleged sixth-floor s sniper's nest in the Depository Building. There are a number of other buildings from which they could more readily have come.

Liebeler's suggestion that the pictures and Xreys be shown only to "an independent panel of pathologists" is but a further effort to evade. Those to whom these pictures and Xrays must be shown are those most intimately familiar with all of the evidence and those who have studied the case quite probably in more detail and certainly with more impartiality than its apologist-participant. The kind of panel Liebeler seeks is but part of his unending search for whitewashing.

It is an absolute and unquestionable lie to say "that the Warren Commission 'has not suppressed any evidence of any kind' in the investigation", unless, as so consistently he does, Liebeler here again hides behind cheaps legalistic devices. There is the most sensational kind of evidence not in the Report, not in the parts of the Report for which Liebeler had responsibility, not to the best of my knowledge in the 26 volumes of evidence and not in any of Liebeler s public statements either, including things that were within the field of his responsibilities. I challenge him to dispute this, and if he does, I challenge him to do it to my face. I further challenge him to declared publicly that he did not himself participate the the suppression of evidence from the access of the geheral public

Liebeler asserts that the Report's "central findings are correct" and "will stand well the tests of time and history". This is arrant nonsense. They cannot stand the present examination. Not one of them can survive the examination of WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE

WARREN REPORT and Liebeler personally, after getting a copy of the book (for which he guaranteed payment but has not yet paid) has failed to accept my challenge that he disprove even those references to him.

In the Gene Blake story, how can the LA Times expect the students to " analyze the evidence on both sides" when the Commission staff, particularly Wesley Liebeler as a member of that staff, saw to it that so much of the evidence on "the other side" was kept out of the record and is not there ot be analyzed.

Liebeler is not "frank" in "admitteding" that this stidy was "spawned" by Inquest and Rush To Rudgement. This is, in fact, contrary to the truth. Inquest makes Liebeler into a hero, which he is not, and surprisingly enough, Rush To Judgement does not even mention his name. The book Liebeler fears and will not mention, the book that challenges his personally and whose challenge he refuses to accept, is WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT. It is this, my book, that specifies those "errors" if this is what they are, for which Liebeler is personally responsible, that specifies what evidence was detsroyed in those parts of the case for which Liebeler was personally responsible, which soecifies what was destroyed and what it showed.

Liebeler is "appalled"? What then should those of us who paid him to once and for all be at his monumental failure which he now deceives us about.

Claiming he has found distortions and misrepresentations in Lan's book, Liebeler is silent about WHITEWASH. Yet on July 19, 1966 I gave him the references to him in WHITEWASH, page by page, and challenged him to show me a single misstatement. He has failed to do so. He cannot do so now. He will not even try.

If Epstein has, as Liebeler says, has since the appearance of his book been "convinced to abandon some of his contentions", is this reflected in the new paperbacked edition of Inquest? It is now. If Epstein has been convinced that some of his contentions are worthy of abandonment, it is because they were wrong, and now one had nay greater influence on the content of the erroneous Epstein work than Liebeler.

How dare Liebeler say that what is noe needed is impartial work? Is that not what we were to expect from the Commission, from its Report, and from its assistant counsel, of whom none was more important than Liebeler, and of whom none did worse?

Liebeler's references to "evidence in the record not entirely reflected in the text of the Warren Report" is a gross deception. The truth is that there is the most important evidence in the record that is not at all reflected in the Report, whether or not, as Liebeler says, "That doesn't mean it wasn't considered". Here no transgressions are greater than Liebeler's.

I should like Liebeler to list and describe what he calls "working papers" of the Commission whose sudden declassification he now predicts and upon what basis he makes this prediction. I should also like him to give their identification in what is represented as a bibliography of the entire files of the late Commission. I am unaware of any such listing and I bought just this bibliography from the government.

Is he asking suddents to go to Dallas and subject themselves to physical dangers now no longer doubtful. Is this what their parents are sending them to the University of California for, and for Liebeler's commercial benefit in his projected book?

How dare Liebeler say that the students will be able to interview the pathologists when these some pathologists refuse interviews to analysists not under Liebeler's auspicies, when they fail,to answer letters, when one is, at last Report, in Viet Nam?

"Liebeler's specific task for the Warren Commission was to write the chapter dealing dealing with Oswald's background and possible motives plus about one fifth of the chapter on possible conspiracy." If Liebeler told Blake this, then Liebeler is a liar. For example, Liebeler was responsible for the interrogation of witness on many

other aspects of the case. A very good example os this is the interrogation of the photographic witnesses. Heere he was if not the cause of the destruction of evidence at the very least a party to it and in at least one case a knowing party to it. Without Liebeler's mishandling of the photographic testimony for which he, personally, was responsible, the whitewash would not have been possible.

The listof 16 questions he says he will assign to his students, aside from the propaganda and deception contained in them, is a good beginning point for Wesley Liebeler himself to come clean, for him to debate with those who know something about the evidence. I would be delighted.