

he does ("Daily Californian", 11/16/67), "Liebelser said the anti-Vietnam group moved out of the building long before Oswald ever used it." He added, referring to his leaving: "I

"Would you rather go to Calistoga or by bus?" he asked an inch-long Banister.
NEW ADDRESS: Rt. 7, Frederick, Md. 21701-301/473-8109.

The question is not whether that lone group moved out of the building in New Haven
11/28/67

Editor makes clear-clears to Liebelser, what is what his job was, and whether
Daily Californian
University of California-Berkeley. That is the job I find no mention in your report of the
Berkeley, Calif.

continued use of that building by the Communist Party by Gray said he did very much
Dear Sir,

in on it (and whose name Liebelser repeated) and evidently in how the mail was
I salute you for respecting the transformation of UC Berkeley Professor
delivered in that building, addressed to him after any mail addressed to Oswald
Wesley J. Liebelser from the Fox who got himself hired to guard the chickenhouse to the
pig who got stuck. He squeals, but is non-sentient.

My speech was too brief. I had to catch a plane to LA. There were expressions
of my surprise means: the New Orleans Invertorial presentation of photostyles of documents that were not published by the Warren Commission;
Committee had any part in a conspiracy, it is an absolute fantasy," Liebelser said.
are neither mentioned nor considered in the Report, and were the in the possession of

Is there any reason to presume that I do think I wrote 200,000 in a book on
the counsel in charge of that part of the case and that part of the Report, Wesley J.

and he finds painful (here we are in accord: it I think it should gain him after it
Liebelser. I can present ample evidence that he did have them, if you are willing to
is about his own performance). Can he quote anything even indicating he held this
consider inconsistent description (by him) of what he did have. I can present his own
belief. I have never heard anything otherwise than anything in any one to his admitted cheap
voice saying he had been CIA reports and that he alone decided not to tell David W.

Ferrie, so typical of the unknown official and unofficial (as he calls it, though
Ferrie as a witness to the various officials (including me, though
he makes me wonder if he has really made the requisite effort to make his voice
acknowledging a connection between Ferrie and those at the 114 Camp St. address

our stamping with the statement that Liebelser demanded that anything
that Liebelser's demands were financed by the CIA (rather an understatement since the
relationship between them was suppressed. Let me give you a few FBI reports that were
CIA also required the group). I have a photocopy of Oswald's use of that address.

not published in the paper (and are not in the Report). Since Liebelser's
I will present you with a copy of an FBI report that, even despite the
egregiousness of his claim with the Cuban representative by whom he is mentioned - of
not being able to get the FBI after he disclosed that Ferrie sold the document should
Buy the car he was driving. - would drive away, but a block from where the office
be shot. - on the day of his no reason for calling him to a witness when
to the police station from the Crescent City Garage, where he had just sold
the car he was driving. And when Liebelser had the testimony of another witness
who was driving a car which had damaged their cars. Then the FBI went to the
who was driving a car which had damaged their cars. Then the FBI went to the
he apparently had to do this because groups said exactly this to the FBI. It
happened in the same place as the FBI report, among others.

Liebelser, I would like to show you to the also-enclosed page from a Secret Service report,
which is a fair interpretation of the conflicting FBI and Secret Service reports
which shows that the arrangement for the Cuban uses of the office at 542 Camp St.,
that Liebelser elected not to straighten out when it was his job to do that to say, as

he does ("Daily Californian", 11/16/67), " Liebeler said the anti-'astro group/moved out however, had of the building long before Oswald ever used it."

"Would you rather go to Calistoga or by bus?"

The question is not whether ~~that~~ one group/moved out before Oswald in New Orleans makes clear/cleared than Liebeler (he didn't say he did that) but whether the activity continued. That it did. I find no mention in your story quoting him of the continued use of that building by the same people, by Guy Banister, who was very much in on it (and whose name Liebeler kept out of his evidence), of how the mail was delivered in that building and who would be responsible for mail addressed to Oswald at 544 Camp St.

Liebeler runs the animal pens at the San Francisco Zoo. The concluding paragraph of your story reads:

"if Weisberg thinks that any staff member of the New Orleans Investigation Committee had any part in a conspiracy, it is an absolute fact," Liebeler said.

Is there any reason to presume that I so think? I wrote 200,000 in a book he said he finds painful where we are in accord; if I think it should pain him, for it is about his past performance). Can he quote anything even indicating I hold this belief? I have never given speeches. Is there anything in any one to justify this cheap device, so typical of his performance, official and unofficial. The fact is, though he makes me believe he was wrong, I have made the opposite explicit.

Now, let me begin with the statement that Liebeler denied that anything relating to Oswald's death was suppressed. Let me give you a few FBI reports that were not published in the ~~San Francisco~~ newspaper (and Liebeler's departmental files) which conflict with the FBI misrepresentation -by non-identification- of Guy Banister ~~as a Cuban~~. It was, in fact, he put a block from the Heily Coffee Co., where Oswald worked, ~~to~~ ~~at~~ the Crossroads Garage, where he hung out and where the FBI and Secret Service obtained their stories. Then, if this gross assertion that was repeated on the committee does not make you wonder what kind of a job Liebeler did, let me refer you to the also-enclosed page from a Secret Service report, which shows that the arrangement for the Cuban use of the office at 544 Camp St.,

was made by Liebeler didn't identify Jack Martin-Bain as either right-hand man,
why or teach him how to do it. Liebeler left out of the evidence in hearing these
and never either reported his statements to the Commission or told him what was said between Banister
offices and that's why the tales, "which were told to us by Liebeler" did not tell
Commission that Banister's office was located at 1000 St. Charles Street which is exactly the
same building as the ICRG yet Liebeler didn't tell the Commission about it.

Unfortunately, the tales, which he didn't tell the Commission, he got them
again at his trial. In New Orleans, he was investigating the life
of Cuban Revolutionaries. Council of three days before he was indicted, he had already
been officially approached by the Cubans via their lawyer and was asked to assassinate. It was also
investigating using his contacts with the Cuban government and what group in the
men Government of Cuba and the Garrisonians who had been involved before May 1, 1865
the New Orleans, and he was approached by the WPA to assassinate the Cuban's last
Revolutionary, who was the last one to leave the country. He acknowledged that he had been
there, where he had acknowledged that he had been approached by the Cubans to assassinate, after
with his contacts in New Orleans, if there was any connection in connection
with the Cubans to do something like such a connection?
In the language in the story ("Report of Investigation Committee"),
which Liebeler has been called, Liebeler says that he is not unfair
in his statement that he is not going to say that he is modesty,
was not approached by the Cubans to assassinate them from the time he was running for
Senate to the time he was running for Vice President. He says that he just about all
of the work he did in Chapter 7 was done by a Colloquial
expression - "I'm not going to put 50 holes in the diary of my AG fingers.
On page 182, the first sentence you will see that there is no mention on the Warren
report of the fact that the Commission had a condition of the "statement that Resident
Kennedy was assassinated at Camp T. Address. There is. The Commission
said that they wanted to find any other intention that this to someone else
would be found to be true. They did not want to find any other intention that he would have
done it himself. (Enclosed). (Enclosed) and no connection
comes up in the hearing. They didn't find any connection to the killing. They didn't find any connection to the killing or
those connected with Oswald, communist, Castro activists, nothing like as far
renting. No one named in court.
No. 1 sel.

Liebeler talks about everything that I did not say, says nothing responsive

to what I did. Perhaps, like the new math and the new morality, this is the new way of teaching law at the University of California. It is the not new manner of the Warren Report that I have so thoroughly exposed in my four published books. (Lisbeler figures prominently in three, as he earned. Until now he has failed to mention my name or in any way drew any attention to my books, which themselves are his handling of other evidence.) It is typical of Lisbeler's method of teaching law.

Please excuse the haste. I will write you again today.

If I am invited to speak, I hope I'll be allowed to say what you'd like. I can play lengthy excerpts off him, revealing just what he is saying and more. I'm keeping a tape recorder for you!

It is a year and a half since Lisbeler got my first book, and a year since he got my second. If he has not yet responded to it, he has not shown it to me, as challenged, nor invited me to speak at his school. He has not even written to me. Perhaps the eyes that became so practiced on the "Meme, Tekel" of the Warren Report have not yet transmitted "Meme, Tekel" to his mind.

Lisberg

P.S. I am enclosing a copy of my book "The Warren Report - A Manual of Evidence". Welcome. If you want more information, write the author, "The Warren Columns" and I'll send them to you. That is the title of my column in the "Los Angeles Times". I have a special page 184, in the "Times", where I discuss the Warren Report. I think that this is done. What else would I do? But like the author of the "Warren Columns", I have no money, could not afford to do anything. So I have to depend on the good will of the public. I am not doing this for money. I am doing this for justice.