4/19/70

Dr. James Rhoads, Archivist
The National Archives
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Rhoads,

Thank you for the pages from the "Page Proof" file, omitted and now received. I did not order it sent at the added cost of registration, with return receipt to you and have not asked that anything be sent at this added cost in a very long time. I would prefer that you not undergo this added cost unless I ask it.

What you sent is not quite complete. There was more alteration than Mr. Liebeler indicated. In the original request I asked for all the changes in and required by the changes in the subsection "Alleged association with various Mexican or Cuban individuals". I believe in repeating it I did refer to page 383, which is an error. It appears in the printed Report beginning on page 381. Before final editing, this passage extended past the bottom of page 385, the last of the edited pages sent me.

I would appreciate what is missing in what you sent me that will enable me to understand all changes this change required, in the preceding and following sections as well as in the above-titled one.

Also, Mr. Liebeler referred to his having written these changes on a yellow pad. The changes sent me are typed. I recognize that Mr. Liebeler's recollection may have been faulty, but it is also possible that they are accurate. Therefore, if such changes exist, Mr. Liebeler's, in writing, I'd like them also.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Archives/Odio section WR/ Liebeler 4/19/70

Gary and Paul,

In what may be only coincidence but strikes me rather as an excess of puerile vindictiveness, I got, by costly registered mail, return receipt and all that (not requested) the first prompt reply to any Archives communication in several years, the missing pages from my last order, from the Report drafts file, showing Liebeler's last-minute alterations. They know my financial situation, I suppose, and delight in worsening it, even in small ways. But there was no need to have omitted it from the order, for I'd ordered that first of all, by phone, and there was no need to waste my buck with registration or the receipt to them.

If these pages are not inconsistent with the essence of what Liebeler said at UCLA-you've heard my tape of it- they also are not exactly in accord with it. He said he sent it over on a yellow pad. This is neatly typed and the typing is corrected, in a hand that can be his.

It discloses a petty prejudice against Odio and a strong unwilligness to believe her, mixed with literary devices to undermine her testimony, in the original. The original, before they got the last-minute FBI word, for example, referredmto the "alleged visit". Afterward, "alleged " was deleted. Now whether or not it was Oswald, they had no doubt of such a visit. It was confirmed and unchallenged. Where it said she "reportedly" saw them in the hallway it was changed to "and who stated that she "saw them etc.

I suppose that when I get back to AGENT OSWALD I'll go over this more carefully. There are remaining questions. Liebeler didn't change thenpages, but his changes did change the next subsection, "Oswald Was Not a Government Agent".

I do not think it now worth the time and cost of duplicating these for you. All of the bottom half od original page 323 was eliminated.It deals with LHO's departure from NO and his travels. All of 324 was replaced. So was the top half of 325. They did not send the final page of the original passages. I'll ask simply because I wonder why.

One of the items of minor interest I believe entirely eliminated was on 324:"...two persons have related that she previously stated that she also knew saw the man at anti-Castro group meetings". The stricken-through footnotes seem to be to CE3001, 3102. On 325 there was a distorted version of Odio not recognizing LHO until she saw his picture, whereas, as we know, Sylvia associated the assassination with the visit and zonked out. It quotes Annie as saying she did not make the association until Sylvia told her, which may be the case but is not my recollection of some of the testimony. And it has the strange, prejudicial line:"There is no indication that Mrs. Odio mentioned the alleged visit prior to the assassination". Is there any reason in the world why she shou;d have? This is followed by, "Ginally, investigation among anti-Castro organization members has revealed no familiarity in these circles with a person matching the description of either Oswald or of the 'LLeopoldo' to whom Mrs. Odio referred". Here the original footnote read, "CE 2943, p.8;CE1414,3119". I will not now check this, but this has to be a special kind of Liebeler frivolity. There was no such investigation anyway. My recollection of 1414 and 3119 is that they are SS NO reports. CE2943 is the Rowley letter on Machann. In short, Liebeler wrote a dishonest footnote pretending there was an investigation among anti-Castro groups in Dallas looking for both whereas there was none, and he pretends no such persons existed when they did, as the last-minute panic proved. What a smaple of the dependability of the writing and its reflection of both the "evidence" and what was called "investigation".

HW