

In early October 1964 I was studying the Report when I came to ~~to~~ a strange series of app passages. In the chapter entitled "Investigation of Possible Conspiracy", which is mistitled, for the Commission never really investigated the possible conspiracies; the most superficial examination of the chapter sections reveals that the Commission, even in gesture only, never considered any possibility of any conspiracy not involving Oswald.

Its own irrefutable evidence that no one man could have committed the assassination and its own overwhelming proofs that Oswald could have killed no one were skilfully avoided or misrepresented. The Report declares to the contrary that Oswald was the lone and unassisted assassin. Laid bare in an honest representation of the evidence in the table of contents is the stark admission that the Commission at no time ever seriously pretended to seek any other assassin than Oswald. This is the built-in conclusion with which the Commission began its work, the conclusion it had, before the conduct of a single hearing, determined to sustain to the degree possible. For the benefit of those professional scoffers who find defense of the Report financially and professionally rewarding, I here interject the comment that I now have the documentary proof of this from the Commission's own once-secret files Liebeler says he is anxious to have made public, so this self-evident fact does not rest alone on the unquestionable evidence of this so deceptively titled chapter.

The 80 pages of a single ~~subsect~~ section of this chapter headed "Background of Lee Harvey Oswald" is almost three times as long as the entire major chapter entitled "The Assassination", a chapter one might have expected to find the most exhaustive. Thirteen pages of this section are headed "Investigation of Other Activities".

For the benefit of logical-minded citizens who without warning would be justified in thinking that their government employs the same dictionaries all other ~~xi~~ Americans use, I hasten to assure them that this refers refers to activities that are not Oswald's. Yes, it is true; the "investigation of Other Activities" sub-section of the "Oswald's Background" section of this chapter relates almost 100% to the activities of one or more men the Commission was absolutely convinced was or were not Lee Harvey Oswald. The minor exception is a reference to "Oswald's use of post office boxes and false names". After this brief reference the Report makes a big deal of his "use" of the name "A.J. Hidell" without at any point indicating that not a single person in the entire world knew him by that name.

From this point on, the rest of this subsection consists entirely of the redundant recitation of the career of this man or men in each case accompanied by the Commission's solemn assurance that it was not Oswald. It was not Oswald who owned a second rifle, not Oswald who had a telescopic sight mounted on a rifle, not Oswald who visited a furniture store searching for a gunsmith, not Oswald who conspicuously engaged in ~~an~~ unforgettable arguments at a gun range, to the ostentatious demonstration of his superb marksmanship (as it could not have been, for he was a real duffer, one of the worst shots in the Marine Corps), not Oswald who had an automobile demonstration, where he said "Maybe I'm going to have to go back to Russia to buy a car".

Above all it was not Oswald who had "Alleged associations with various Mexican ^{and} Cuban individuals. There is no question about it. Not one of these very public, always memorable appearances of a man or men represented or representing themselves as Lee Harvey Oswald in Dallas right before the assassination was Lee Harvey Oswald. The Commission's evidence is overwhelming. I am in total agreement with its conclusions this was not Lee Harvey Oswald.

Where we disagree is in the official dismissal of this part of the so-called investigation of the assassination with the statement that this

was not Oswald. It is not an answer to say, as does the report, that this was not Oswald. That should have been but the beginning for the Commission, as it was for me in October 1964 and for District Attorney Jim Garrison in New Orleans in 1967.

Blindly assuming it is as natural as breathing, the Commission content itself with saying this was not Oswald, without, in its Report, ever asking the question that must be asked and answered, "Why should anyone, right before the assassination and in Dallas, laid so obvious a trail leading to Oswald? Why should anyone want to counterfeit this nobody?"

The Commission's evidence that Oswald was framed is staggering from its evidence, if not from its Report. So ashamed is the government at its avoidance of this, one of the most obvious of all the inevitable meanings of the solid proofs that were gathered, that it edited his words from the printed and the private record, as I document in WHITEWASH II: THE FBI-SECRET SERVICE COVERUP. Even the tape-recorded version of his assertion "I am a 'patsy'" has been doctored, as has the transcript of his remarks printed in the Report.

All of these misrepresentations as Oswald of those who could not have been so lightly swept under the rugs of the hundreds of thousands of words in the Report can have been but a single meaning, exactly that ~~denied the murder~~ lest claim of innocence denied the murdered accused. Oswald, regardless of who or what he was or was not, was framed. Every bit of solid evidence the Commission could not avoid gathering or gathered for other purposes finds meaning in this sense. This is the only point in counterfeiting Oswald before the assassination, to draw inevitable attention to him immediately after the assassination, when all of these appearances of The False Oswald, as I entitled this in October 1964, less than ~~an month after the Report was issued~~ a week or so after the Report was issued, always with a rifle suggesting the one found on the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository Building, where Oswald worked.

Chapter 11 of WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT, is devoted to the throughout the 26 volumes mustering of most of the evidence scattered and ignored by the Commission

For this reason I do not repeat it here.

Of all the many instances (and the Report does not acknowledge all of them) that is a leech in the mind of the analyst is that involving Mrs. Sylvia Odio. We will deal with this at length. In this case, which has a non-Oswald connected with extremist Cuban exile groups saying that Castro and Kennedy should both be killed and he would show how easy it is to kill Kennedy, the Report content itself with what it seriously presents as an explanation and an end of to all:"...the Commission has concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald was not ~~at~~ Mrs. Odio's apartment ~~at~~..." In this same sentence the Commission acknowledged the only incomplete investigation, saying "While the FBI has not completed its investigation of this matter at the time the Report went to press..." What the Report does not spell out is that the investigation was not complete by design. It was not ordered until August 28, 1964!

Ultimately it was "completed". Its results are set forth from the evidence suppressed in the 26 volumes in C chapter 7 of WHOTEWASH II: THE FBI-SECRET SERVICE COVERUP. Until this moment, nowhere else does this stunning evidence appear. In the current book I shall put it in its proper context, as its essential part in the conspiracy to kill President John F. Kennedy, the conspiracy the government says did not exist.

extra space

I cannot and I do not avoid specifying that more than any other member of the staff this was the work and responsibility of Wesley J. Liebeler, the "goddamit" men with the "frustrations" ~~that~~ because he cannot get his own memoranda, presumeably other than those he kept, including classified ones, and gave to Edward J. Epstein for use as an assault on the members of the Commission and the other member of the staff who, with Liebeler, was the Commission's most active and hardest-working lawyer. Liebeler is as skilful as any man in the country at pointing fingers at anyone else-Arlan Specter, his former associate, the Chief

Chief Justice, his former Commission chairman, J. Lee Rankin, now corporation counsel of the City of New York and then Commission general counsel."government people" again meaning anyone but Liebeler, and all those writing critically of the Commission save one- me. He never mentions my name, that of my books, and never keeps a single appointment to confront me, although he leads those extending the invitations to think he may.

I am not Wesle We Wesley Liebeler. I do not mince words. I have travelled the breadth of the land to confront him, only to find that he has travelled the same distance in the opposite direction to avoid it.

It is not because he ^{has} owed me \$5.05 since July 19, 1966, when he ordered a copy of my first book in a letter promising to pay for it and hasn't, but because he has never answered the challenges I then wrote him and he has since so completely avoided while loudly berating everyone else and pind p'u ding pounding his chest like a legal Tarzan. It is also because he has avoided the challenges in my second book and those I left all over California in December 1966 when I expected to find him in radio and television studios in San Francisco and Los Angeles (although he had failed to appear in New York and Chicago).

So, ignoring the past, I here make an additional specific challenge to Wesley Wesley J. Liebeler, professor of law at the University of California at Los Angeles. most available, most vocal and most innocent member of the staff of the former Commission; Wesley J. Liebeler, the "both sides" inquirer subsidized by the tax-payers and sponsored by his university; Wesley J. Liebeler, the self-appointed conscience of the country:

"Did you, Wesley J. Liebeler, write that section of the Report that pretends the questions are answered with the declaration that it was not Lee Harvey Oswald who appeared at Mrs. Odio's apartment, not Lee Harvey Oswald who "has told us" how easy it would be to kill President John F. Kennedy, not Lee Harvey Oswald the "shotsman", as Mrs. Odio put it, who was to be infiltrated

into the anti-Castro underground in Cuba?

"Is it you Wesley J. Liebeler who conducted the essential hearings on this aspect of the Commission's work, aiming them all at this "answer"?"

"Do you, Wesley, J. Liebeler, still regard it as an answer when the assassination of an American President is "investigated" to say that it is an end, rather than a beginning, to conclude that The False Oswald and his career were not and could not have been Lee Harvey Oswald?"

"These are not dicey difficult questions for so brilliant a debater as the legal eminence of the University of California of Los Angeles. Nor should they tax the resourcefulness of the man so sharp he has become the fox who got himself hired to guard the chicken house, the man who has conned his university and a constitutionally uncritical press into believing that the fox of the Commission's staff will protect the chickens of its evidence as he guards it from attacks such as mine in his "both sides" book now that he has engineered a second chance. Remember, he had his first with the Commission.

These are not questions that can any longer be avoided or unanswered.

I think I am not alone in expecting answers, no matter how much too late, from Wesley J. Liebeler.