

Liebeler-Lomas Show Oct and Nov 1966:

#1 Liebeler +
the Evidence

Tippit shell cases- said matched revolver. The point is not this, but that they did not match the bullets. To say that the shells match the revolver is to say nothing unless it can be shown that the bullets matched either the shells, then attached to the revolver, or that the bullets themselves matched the revolver. In this case, neither was done. His big speech is but propoganda.

It is not alone the lack of rifling marks that made impossible the matching of the bullets with the revolver. There was also deformity which made it impossible to match the bullet with anything, as was also true in the alleged assassination attempt against General Walker.

Oswald's broadcast description: Liebeler fibbed a little in the direction of the real Oswald's real description, and did not accurately reflect either the actual broadcast description, the lack of a source for it, the delay in broadcasting it, the contradictions between it and that given by Brennan, the imputed source. He was without comment on the inability of the police to identify the source of their information when then had to produce this source in a trial as a witness.

L. said nobody saw Oswald walking except Tippit. The person who killed Tippit was seen by a number of witnesses, known to Liebeler. He just plain lied here, for it is he who was sent to Dallas in a special effort to get Mrs. Markham, the most spectacular witness, to withdraw her perjury. There is the question I raised about the doctoring of the transcript of this interrogation by Liebeler on which he has been silent. If anyone knew of Mrs. Markham, if not the others, it is Liebeler.

"Very active in the Fair Play For Cuba Committee" in New Orleans. There was no Fair Play For Cuba Committee in N.O. There was but a one-man front organization of Oswald's, matching exactly the one-man committee Carlos Bringuier, his adversary in the street fight (give details). O's committee and his activities ended and he went to Mexico as soon as he reaped the propoganda harvest of this affair. O's committee had no connection with anything

In his big speech about conspiracy, L was addressing himself only to a conspiracy involving Castro. He never addressed himself to any but a political conspiracy. There without question was a conspiracy to kill, for noone was capable of what was attributed to Oswald.

Bag. Liebeler twisted and misrepresented. They "had plenty of time to talk it over among themselves". The truth is that Frazier was soon arrested and sweated and given a lie-detector test and held up from the very first 100% without consultation and under pressure to change his story. L and the Commission practise selective credibility? The witnesses are right in saying there was a bag but wrong in saying the bag couldn't possible have held a rifle, as with Brennan and Markham, both admitted liars, believed as non-liars when the Commission wanted to. More spectacularly, Merina said she was a liar, but was believed and continued to speak other than the truth. Without these two witnesses there was nothing to base any package-carrying on. Yet both, as did all other witnesses on the bag, testified directly opposite to what the Commission concluded. The "bag" was not so identified by the FBI at the beginning, and there is no picture of it at the place it was allegedly found, although 50 pictures were taken there. No effort was made to affirm or disprove Oswald's certain story for 9 months?

L said the bag had O's fingerprints and palmprints, both plural, on it. This is false. What he did not say it that there is nothing unusual about his fingerprints being where he worked, and this bag was allegedly found exactly there, where Oswald was assigned to work and was known to have been working. What L avoids is how O managed to avoid leaving a single fingerprint on allegedly hiding the rifle (story of barricade). Liebeler said of this, "which shows

H2

conclusively that he carried that bag..." This is also false. It shows only that he had touched the paper. It shows the opposite of Oswald's having carried the bag, for there were no prints where he is supposed to have held it and where he would have had to have held it to do what is attributed to him. L also said this bag "matched the description of the bag these witnesses saw him carry in in every respect except that length." Again, false. Also width, and no one saw him carry anything "in" anywhere. Exactly the opposite is true. Misrepresented Dougherty's testimony as "thought" he saw Oswald enter building and "didn't remember seeing him carry anything." Dougherty was emphatic, O had nothing and he did see him. On "assuming" O threw the bag away, there are, as L knows, many other alternatives, such as putting the package in a shed at the end of the bldg., and on this there is no evidence of search or desire to search... "The rifle, which had been in the garage prior to that time." This rifle was never placed in that garage or anywhere else except the postoffice months earlier, was never placed in O's possession, and there was proof only that that bag had never held a rifle.

Lomax is repeated responsible on his attitude to the assassination of a President and inferences in its solution "too grave".

"Inference" is "the nature of the fact-finding process": When you have had an unchallenged fact, the drawing of inference as opposed to fact is the opposite of the fact-finding process.

Nobody, despite what Lieveler said, saw Oswald carry anything out of the house in Irving. Frazier did not "follow" follow him right in" the bldg.

If Dougherty is "a most unreliable witness", and this is "gracious" to him, why did the Commission use him? He was actually a specially trusted employee. L keeps on saying this bag that Frazier saw is the same bag that was found on the sixth floor. Despite the semantics of the Report and the unjustified presumptions of Liebeler, all the evidence is the other way (give evidence on bag-West, F on O never taking anything home, creases in bag, etc.) L avoids the fact that with all the people working on the sixth floor and elsewhere in the bldg., no one saw either O with a rifle or the rifle in or out of the bag and there is no indication the Commission ever looked for such a person or witness - not even a suggestion of it.

L evaded on absence of picture of bag where found and has nothing to do with Exhibit 1302, as he said. In talking of Oswald's prints, again and persistently in the plural hence falsely, L fails to note that Studebaker, who generously supplied his fingerprints to everything else he touched, mysteriously left none on the bag he says he found. The question is not whether the Commission "fudged" the evidence on the bag, but whether those it should have investigated did, and in this the Commission never had any interest or showed any suspicion.

His opposition to the use of Markhem's testimony. He should explain his own concluding comments where he interrogated her. "Then ", meaning after her testimony, "she had talked over the telephone with Mark Lane". This happened, as L knows, before she appeared before the Commission, for in that testimony she perjured herself in denying she had had this conversation. All L would say of her is that her capacity to observe reality is quite limited. What he should have said is that despite his best efforts at persuasion, she persisted in her perjury. The failing is his, personally.

Haste in writing Report does not reflect on the "quality" of the investigation. Comment on that "quality", esp. as it relates to Liebeler.

"Any doubts" will be "resolved" by the "issuance" of the autopsy pictures and X-rays. This is false. They can address themselves to but little of the basic fact of the assassination and at best, if they can now be trusted, prove at

#3

most onlt that one less lie was told. Liebeler avoids what is more important, the autopsy notes, 100% of which are entirelt missing, in both the printed exhibit and the files, and in duplicate files. In talking of "best evidence", exactly the phrase first used in WHITEWASH, he obfuscates by ignoring the fact that, as the law requires, the pictures were denied the doctors as the basis of their expert testimony and the basis of their testimony on their autopsy. He misrepresented the doctors' testimony. Were they to testify they had perjured themselves, that they didn't know their business? What he avoids is their virtual begging for the production of their pictures, that they had never seen.

On LIFE photo is O with rifle, L says there were two photographs, as there were. One was stolen after the police seized it illegally and inventoried it. This is allegedlt the one that appeared in LIFE and elsewhere. He says of it only that "it was not available", without saying why. He says that only the "available" one was found in the Paine garage, whereas, according to the police, both were. This is but protection of the police who deserve instead his and everyone else condemnation. Here refer to Sheneyfelt's decapitations. What he does not say is that the shadow is stright down from the nose in the one that did not disappear. Where the Commission prints them both side by side, (16H510), they are so small this comparison can not be made.

On cutting off Bowers as a witness, go into Liebelr's cutting off-phot-graphic and Mellers.

On what Bowers told the FBI, Liebeler certainly has no knowledge of this and we do no almost everyone complained about the unfaithful representation by the FBI agents of all that was said. The agents recorded other than what witnesses swear that said and left out what witnesses swear they said, and in not a single case was there a confrontation between the agents and the complaining witnesses, inc. Secret Service agents.

Liebeler had WHITEWASH several months before Lane's was out.

On single-bullet theory, alleges facts taken out of context. Opposite is true. Saying the bullet had "plenty of power" means nothing. It is not, however, a "very high powered" bullet with "tremendous penetrating power". It is a small-caliber bullet of bud medium velocity. The kind is merely presumed. L evades on this saying there is no other explanation of what happened. This is false, and the Commission's record show no search for any other explanation. Hypothesis vs reality and their substitution. Absolutely no evidence this is what did happend and 100% medical testimony is contrary to conclusions. When he says "all the doctor that examined him think that", L is misrepresenting, for the doctors all swore that this particular bullet, 399, could not have inflicted these injuries. If 399 didn't "what did": There were five fragments found in the car/ The Commission did not look for any alternative. It presumed there was none.

Reaction time of men different. "medical testimony thus evaded.

* "No autopsy report ever stated that the wound in the front was an entrance wound". Show blowup or page 197 of WHITEWASH. "Speculation" by doctors in Dallas. They are the only ones who ever saw that wound, before they cut it way in surgery. "They did not observe the wound closely" Contrary, they did and they all described it as one consistent with a front-entrance wound and their measurements ate given. Misrepresented "fibres were bent inward" because Frazier was specific in saying he could not say what was true at the time of the assassination, only that as of the time of the testimony, if nothing had touched the clothes, it seemed to be a back-entrance wound. "Traced through the body". ever. Just projected.

* The Dallas doctors "never specifically said it was an entrance wound" Opposite from the truth.

#4
 "All the shots came from behind and above". Assuming this to be true, is the TSB and its sixth-floor window the only such place? No.

(*) On OSs poor marksmanship and the inability of the best "master's" to duplicate imputed shooting, "that's not true at all". Even his own stipulation of "duplication" shows unfaithfulness - 30 ft vs 63, fixed targets to sign on, etc. Also fixed rifle before they used it. To say "in the time invoked" each of the experts missed one of the shots is to say nothing because of the varying degrees of skill and because all experts had all the time they wanted for the first shot. Also, where did they hit targets: None duplicated assassination shooting. In saying they did "exactly what Oswald did" of this shooting, he is misrepresenting, for the question is not alone one of conditions of test but of where bullets hit. "The Marine Corps did not conclude that Oswald was a poor shot". Read Folsom. "The said that by Marine Corps standards he was a fair shot".

On what is secret in archives, he avoided majority*FBI secrecy. It is not CIA that classified most of what is withheld. It was not the Commission that decided "this should not be made public" but the FBI.

/// "Anything being withheld that were it to be made public would change our thinking". Liebler: "No, No, I've already discussed the autopsy report...but other than that, that the only thing that bears on that that, that's the only thing that hasn't been made public that bears on the assassination." Use Docs 5,7, SS and FBI Reports, Meller, Zap camera speed, Altgens picture, etc.

SH 17/2/63
 Did not answer question of 399 and its ^{almost} pristine condition, lack of duplication of alleged actuality in any test when it was all quite possible. He misrepresents tumbling on Connally's wounds, because it had to have been controlled tumbling. If there were any deficiencies in the testimony of the autopsy doctors and what they saw and did not see it, was the fault of the staff of which Liebler was one. Doctors need only see medical reports. Why did they not see Connally's Xrays.

399 came from Governor Connally's stretcher. No evidence that it did, all evidence contrary. Best that can be said is that it was proved not to have come from JFKs, but there were other stretchers. Also Tomlinson (no statement from him?) No chain of evidence on 399 in record. Liebler, in answering Linton about the residues not interfering with examination of the bullet, avoids the basic fact, that there was no testing to see what the residues were and that the Commission even belated demanded none. All the business about the rubbing around is non-sequitur because there were traces of foreign matter, there was enough to test, there was spectrographic analysis, "dragged around by the Secret Service Agents" (is this the way the assassination of a President is conducted and approved by those charged with Liebler's responsibilities?).

Puff of smoke or steam. Any proof of leak in pipe?

"Look for fairies" re puff of smoke. Not at all the situation, nor does the utterly incompetent, incomplete and only dubious autopsy report end the possibility of front entrance wounds. There was not only the question of bullets that struck the President and Connally but of other possibly participating in the assassination whose shots might have missed, and Liebler himself handled one such interrogation (go into Mrs. Baker, his treatment of her, the picture he used instead of the one he should have used, its poor quality and the fact it could not and did not show what she was testifying to, etc. "No shots could have come from that directions". False, and no evidence on this. Perhaps no shot that hit anyone, but of this, in the absence of any real investigation, as L concedes, there is no serious purpose served by such a deceptive statement.

#5

Additional partial program, reference to rifle print. Liebeler does not say this was an old print, and that Day would not say anything in writing to the FBI on it and got away with it. When L. in the light of this, says the Commission "got the FBI to conduct this additional investigation", he is simply deceiving or uninformed.

If the Commission did not rely on Brennan's eyewitness identification of Oswald, why did it use it if it is not credible? On what eyewitness identification did it rely? The presence of his prints on the boxes means nothing, for he worked there. On the rifle it was an old print and there were no new prints and he had no time to wipe prints off and there were no gloves found or sought. Truly on employees there never wore any. His opportunities were those of dozens of others. He was never placed on the sixth floor at that time, despite Liebeler's statement that he was.

"Basically it revolves around the fact that his rifle was used to kill the President." Agreeing for the sake of argument that this is true, and it is mere presumption, how does it prove that he used the rifle that was never placed in his possession? Liebeler's allegations of circumstantial evidence is not accurate or meaningful.

"Oswald's prints were found at the bottom of the bag". Not true. In any event, this does not prove the rifle was in it and there was no evidence, despite L's confusions, that the rifles had been in the bag. The makrijgs, of oil and indentations, had to be there for the rifle to have been in it. They were not. This rifle, despite Liebeler, was never placed in the garage or anywhere else. This rifle had to be proved and in not a single instance was it.

His representation of Gov C's position at the time of the assassination is evasive. It is "almost certainly true that it would have had to hit Governor Connally" does not say that it could have done what is imputed to it or that the Governor in fact was in a position that make this likely. The staff said of this merely that they moved the Connally standing around to see if he could be manipulated into a position where this might have happened, and this in an unfaithful reconstruction. He said "yes, we did find that bullet" There is no evidence of this, the evidence is all to the contrary, and the best that can be said is that in the fact of 100% of the medical and other evidence, this is a conjecture. In discussing this he refers to Epstein, who has but little on it, and ignored WHITEWASH, which has much, and which he had.

399n"glanced off one of his ribs". It smashed 10 cm of it. He made no reference to fragments known to have been shed in all three parts of the Gov's body. Where in the Report is there the statement that "there were traces of blood on the bullet"/and where the evidence in the Report or the record that there was an effort to identify the type? Or of the contact, no matter how slight, with any bone? Frazier ss testified the bullet would have been marked with going through coarse cloth or leather. This bullet has no such markings. He misrepresents the nature and purpose of the Edgewood tests and their results, fails to admit that there was not even the effort or pretense of duplication, and that even then the tests showed the opposite of what he and the Commission said and entirely supported the contrary medical testimony. If the bullet was tumbling, how did the sides not get marked? How could it go through the bullet be tumbling through bone without marking the sides, if not the front? What Liebeler here really says is that the bullet, once it started tumbling, stopped by itself and thensforth went only backwards. This is ridiculous and entirely impossible, in defiance of all the laws of nature and science.

P. 6

/// "All of the evidence that the Commission examined...was turned over to the National Archives at the conclusion of our work." This is both false and evasive, ofr the question is also what the Commission, meaning either members of staff, did not examine, i.e., the spectrographic analysis. Refer to 904 and letters.

////// Of what was withheld, "We've gone through all of them ourselves, obviously." Thus he has no excuse for Meller, the photographic evidence missing, the pictures he handled that were doctored, those that are not in the files or archive, etc.

|| "3.4 grains permissible wight loss of this bullet." False. Here Liebelar refers to Salendria's work and again avoids mine, which he had and has failed to deny. He says it is wrong for Salendria to say there were three grains of lead in the Governor's wrist, "based on Xray evidence", but the reality is that the doctors testified there were more than three grains lost here alone. Liebelar ignores the lead in the chest (tell the Shires story) and in the leg. Give the size of the leg fragment, nowhere mentioned by the Commission, although they had it in the same document I have.

////// How can he dismiss what Dallas police did by merely saying he made no apologies. The fact is that the Report did."

/// Didn't know how far from rooming house to scene Tippir murder? This is what he said. He certainly could have made an approximation. Reason: Time does not work out. He pretends the Commission lawyers reconstructed at least three times. "There is no question but that he had time to do it" and he names both FBI and SS besides the Commission. What he fails to say is that in every case it doesn't work. But he said "plenty of time". He knows better, for he has WHITEWASH, if nothing else. He says what is not true that Brennen's description was "immediately sent out over the police radio". Says Tippit's actions are those of an officer making an arrest. his is childishly ridiculous, from even the ludicrous witnesses.

Here begins another, in which L answers Lane:

"The amount of the lead lost is perfectly consistent with this bullet having done this kind of ~~xxx~~ damage to both of them. But this is not the point. Both the condition of 399, which is the central issue, and the factual opposite of what he says of wight, is the real condition. He is evasive on the condition of the nose of the bullet. He gives the opposite of the importax of Gregory's testimony to make it see, contrary to fact, that Gregory said this bullet actually did all the things attributed to it. He did not. He said the opposite.

/// Falsely he said "the Commission had no way to get the bullet to go through other things and tumble in the same way that 399 did..." This is false. They actually did use cadavers at Edgewood and never used a tandem to represent both men and all the injuries this bullet had to have inflicted. The only inference, because it was possible, is that they did not dare face the result. He says of the power remaining in the bullet, to imbed a fragment in the thigh bone (he also elsewhere said this bullet went into the governor ~~for~~ an inch, "barely scratched his thigh..."

//// He denies Marina was sweated by the FBI when she herself so testified. He said "that just didn't happen" refer to Scherezade.

me!
In clobbering Lane he says there is a basis for an "honest, straightforward commentary and criticism of the work of the Commission, and nobody is afraid of that..." but he fails to mention WHITEWASH and goes after Lane alone.

47

Bruise on top of the lung. Did not the doctors say this could have come from the tracheotomy? They did not trace the path, and the dissected the body as required by their task. |

"Knew for absolute ~~certainty~~ certainty that it had certainly gone past the strap muscles because it bruised the top of the lungs," re Humes and bullet. |||

LIFE owns Hughes film. Why does Liebeler not address himself to the use to which this film was put in the FBI report and what it might or might not show in the sixth-floor window.