

Dear Chancellor Murphey, Mr. Liebeler, and the Dean of the U.C.L.A. Law School,

I am writing this letter to all three of you at one time. It is important, and I ask that you please read it very carefully.

In addition to mailing this to you, I have also sent copies to various newspapers and magazines throughout the United States, in France, and in England. It is necessary that the thoughts I share with you be seen by the entire world. For the record, for all to see, I do not intend to be ignored or lost amongst a pile of papers on a desk.

Mr. Liebeler, a member of the staff assisting the Warren Commission, is now teaching law at the University of California in Los Angeles. He announced this week his intention to use twenty law students from that campus for the purpose of further investigation into the findings of the Warren Report. The Los Angeles Times quoted Mr. Liebeler as saying, "what is needed at this point is one piece of work which sets forth both sides objectively." In the same article, he did not hesitate to include that, "he is thoroughly in accord with the commission findings." Being a member of the staff who did the writing of the Report, Mr. Liebeler is taking on a tremendous responsibility.

Very many good citizens and public officials lent their names to that document called The Warren Report. They did this thing without accepting the full responsibility of the necessary work or research which it involved. The final result of this behavior could easily become their eventual embarrassment or disgrace.

Other prominent citizens, lawyers, newspaper editors,

writers, Government officials lent their names to the full approval of the Commission's findings and conclusions. They must also share the possible shame and guilt which could point to them if the facts some day prove the Commission's conclusions inadequate. It is my opinion that the ordinary American citizen puts too much faith and confidence in powerful or prominent public servants. It is the absolute obligation of those with power, reputation, or prominence to have at least read the documents and testimony before giving full approval to the Warren Report.

Now we find a situation where one of the largest and greatest Universities in America is allowing it's law department to be put into the situation of either defending or exposing the Warren Report. The use of this law department may have far reaching consequences which at first glance do not become apparent. The University is the last and largest stronghold of free men. Should it be used, either knowingly or innocently, to either expose or cover up that which may be dangerous to the interests of Freedom and Democracy? I think this is an impossible task which should be placed in the hands of a private foundation or institution not related to Government or the University.

Suppose that Mr. Liebler wishes to limit his field of inquiry. He published the seventeen subjects which will be investigated. Later, I shall challenge the value of the selection of study. This shall in no way answer the many, many questions which are all inter-related. If the Law Department does not do a thorough job, can you see how that involves the University and the law students? The American University has already been used by Government for the purposes of supporting the Diem regime, for C.I.A. agents, for

many aspects of germ war-fare. These are scandals because they are Government problems. The students, faculty, and University are not to be used for these purposes.

Chancellor Murphey, are you prepared to explain, defend, and ignore the critics if the work Mr. Liebeler and your students do is not complete or fair?

If their findings prove, without a doubt, Oswald's guilt for the murders of President Kennedy and Officer Tippit, you will have done a great service to all Americans. There is nothing they would want more than confidence in their leaders and in their Government.

On the other hand, are you mature enough to face the facts and consequences if their winding path towards "truth" takes another turn.? If Mr. Oswald turned out to have been an agent of the C.I.A and the F.B.I, if he did not shoot the rifle or kill Officer Tippitt, could you accept these findings too? Could you accept the fact that he might not have been "self taught" with regards to the Russian language? Could you accept the fact that his two jobs in Dallas were not received on his own volition, but that he was "sent" there both times? When the name Hidell is thoroughly investigated, and if you find out who wrote that name on the Social Security card as well as the immunization record, will you like what you find?

Are you able, in the name of truth and honesty, to accept the full consequences if your University students bring much new evidence into the open?

If your answer to these questions is not "yes", then you better think over the matter if you want them to start this project. You, as the President of the University, have a GRAVE RESPONSIBILITY.

Do not take it lightly. The American citizen, as well as other countries, will no longer tolerate anything that is less than truth. There is much in the testimony that reveals serious evasions, inconsistencies, discrepancies, and deep problems to the future of America. The United States is already the subject of criticism over the entire world. How long can this image continue? How long can there be a loss of faith in our higher institutions?

Mr. Liebeler prepared a list of seventeen subjects to be researched by his students. They included; 1. How the police got the description of Oswald, 2. Oswald's rifle capability, 3. Source of the shots, 4. Did Oswald purchase the rifle and possess it until the time of the assassination, 5. Did Oswald bring the rifle into the Book Depository?, 6. Was Oswald at the window at the time of the assassination?, 7. Did Oswald kill Officer Tippit?, 8. What did Oswald do from 12:30 until his arrest in the theatre?, 9. Did Oswald shoot at Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker?, 10. Analysis of the story of the sight mounted by Ryder, 11. Analysis of testimony by Silvia Odio and Cuban conspiracy, 12. Were Oswald and Ruby acquainted directly or indirectly?, 13. Make strongest argument that (a) Oswald was not involved in the assassination at all, and (b) he did not do it alone. Defend the report on these propositions, 14. Where was the bullet found that was recovered after the assassination? 15. Medical evidence relevant to the one-bullet theory, 16. Other physical facts on the bullet, fire-arms identification, weight, etc., 17. Did the bullet go through the President's body as suggested in the one bullet theory?.

This list of subjects to be investigated is impressive but is going in the wrong direction for a road to start. After going through the testimony, I know that there is a pattern throughout

the original investigation which will be duplicated at the expense of new evidence available.

There are many major topics I would suggest to Mr. Liebeler that precede these questions. The first is Oswald's Marine service record. In the twenty six volumes, without going to the archives there is much information. In order to evaluate each witness, I made charts listing who was called to testify, how long they knew Oswald, how long ago it was they were recalling, their education, background, and whether the information they provided was positive or negative regarding Oswald's personality. I also listed the date they were first interviewed by the F. B. I., Secret Service, and Commission.

I soon found out that the people who knew him the least amount of time, long ago in terms of years, or spent no time on duty, off duty, or in housing while in the service, had the most negative remarks to make. Coincidentally, these same persons were interviewed very early, within hours after the assassination. Their negative remarks were going over the air waves and around the world.

It was also interesting to find men like Oswald's officer in the Marines, who spent the most time with him, praising his work. his ability, and saying that he was in highly classified radar work. If you read the Marine records very carefully, you will find that Oswald was relieved of night duty on the post to meet with a man, not military or family, when the post was closed. After these meetings he went into L. A., received money, and was in contact with persons other than Marine associates.

You also find that he received a passport from Washington while still serving the Marines, before his "disability" leave

occurred. When he left the Marines, he was prepared for his trip to Russia.

Secondly, before worrying about sending twenty students to Washington at taxpayers money, you might ask yourselves to go into all the papers involving Oswald's relationship with the State Department. Sylvia Meagher, in October 1966 Minority of One, begins to touch on that subject. There was more in the volumes than she could begin to touch. By the time you finish "disproving" Mark Lane with a team of twenty to one on whether or not Oswald was on the sixth floor, it is important to know all about the passports, correspondence, entry and exit into and out of Russia. The same persons who challenged the rifle capability are now working intensively on this next stage. It is imperative that you do not ignore one word.

Next, you might go into the subject of Oswald's ability to learn the Russian language. In Volume X, Mr. Ofstein said he could hardly speak Russian with Oswald and he had taken one year of intensive training at Monterey Language Institute with the army. Marina testified that when she met him she did not know which part of the Ukraine he came from. In Volume VIII, page 307, you find Colonel Folsom being asked about Oswald's Service records. Mr. Ely, a member of the Commission staff said, "We have a record of a Russian examination taken by Oswald on February 25, 1959. Could you explain what sort of a test this was?" Captain Folsom said it was "the test form of Department of the Army, Adjutant General's Office."

All the officers and enlisted men surrounding Oswald in Japan and the United States knew he took Russian papers, spoke Russian, was learning Russian. All this was going on while he was

doing very highly classified, skilled, technical radar work.

Another subject the men might go into immediately is the use of the name Hidell and the necessity to fingerprint and check the handwriting wherever Hidell was used. It was not until June 30, 1964, that Marina Oswald was called back and testified that she wrote the name Hidell on the Fair Play for Cuba card. The very first day she said she never heard the name Hidell before. Later she said she heard it on a radio broadcast. The tape of the New Orleans broadcast never used Hidell. Mr. Catigan testified that the Hidell on the Secret Service card and immunization records were not Oswald's. The original Commission never indicated any interest in finding out who wrote that name. Will Mr. Liebeler and the law students follow this?

I do not see on the list of subjects to be studied any mention of Oswald's movements when he returned to Dallas. It never seemed strange to the Commission that an entire community of white Russians, all whose families were killed by the Soviets, pounced upon Marina with goodies of cash, food, clothes, transportation, housing. None of this was for Lee. All was out of either the "kindness of their heart" or their desire to learn the "native tongue". All of these people are executives or geologists with high degrees from Universities. Many of them work for large oil companies, or occupations far removed from Lee and Marina. At their parties were some interesting people such as Volkmar Schmidt, servant and bat boy for Maj. Gen. Walker. It was Mr. Schmidt's brother, Larry, who placed the "Wanted for treason" ad in the newspaper the day President Kennedy died. Mr. Schmidt planned in Munich, Germany, to take over the Government of the United States and to infiltrate

wealthy, powerful right wing organizations in Dallas.

Will Mr. Liebeler direct his students to go over the witnesses he superficially examined at a crucial moment in history?

Then there is the subject of Oswald's occupations which I do not see on the list. Mr. Meller, one of the "Dallas friends" of Marina, called the Texas Employment Agency to "get Lee a job". Marina and her baby were living with the Meller's at the time. The entire testimony of the Agency and Oswald's jobs is to, incredible to believe. It is found in Volume X. Exhibits are in Volume XIX. If Mr. Liebeler does not ask the students to read the testimony of Helen Cunningham, R. Adams, Donald Brooks, I. Statman, T. Bargas, Robert Stovall, John Graef, Dennis Ofstein, then he has not done an investigation into the Commission's findings and is not capable of claiming validity to his study. No matter how long the students take, where they go to work, if they do not cover this evidence they are remiss. Where is Louise Latham who was never called as a witness? In these pages you will see pictures of payments made to Lee Oswald from a State and Government agency for \$33.00 a week. Nowhere on the records does it tell you why he received these checks. You learn that he worked at Jagers-Chiles-Stovall from October, 1962 until May, 1963. It is not entered on the books. This topography office did "classified, technical work for the Government" such as "bond printing" and other work. There is a complete story here. This must be researched.

Mrs. Paine called Roy Truly for the job Lee had at the Depository. Three weeks after Oswald's death, she admitted she was the one who marked the map. Both Mrs. Paine and Mrs. Oswald had what I called delayed memories.

I do not see among Mr. Liebeler's projects the interest in finding out who dry cleaned Governor Connally's clothing. They went from the surgery room, to Clifton Carter, President Johnson's aide who was in the room at the hospital with President Johnson, to Texas Congressman Gonzalez. The night of the assassination, the clothing of Governor Connally was in two paper bags in the closet in Washington, D.C. of Mr. Gonzalez. The matter was dropped right there. Dr. Shaw and Dr. Gregory had deep doubts about the Governor's wounds. One of these gentlemen, discussing entry and exit bullet wounds in the wrist, said, "if only we had his clothing it would help". Mr. Robert Frazier of the F.B.I testified that "in as much as the coat, shirt, and trousers of Governor Connally had been dry cleaned, he could make no statement regarding entry or exit wounds". I hope the law students, for the sake of a "once and for all" statement, will tell us what happened to those clothes.

It might be helpful to investigate what happened to the President's car. Other than the fact that it was examined at 3 a.m. the morning after the assassination, I see no mention of it further. Mr. Frazier did remove bullet fragments from the car. It might have been helpful, in such a terrible time of anxiety and curiosity, to have photographed the location of those fragments in the car. No investigation is complete unless we know who ordered the car to Dearborn, Michigan, where the interior was ripped out and destroyed. It might have been preserved in total, such as the Wright brother's airplane. For a country ~~who~~ wants to prove that we are above the capability of plots of assassinations, we did a good job of destroying vital evidence.

0.

Mr. Liebeler wants the students to inquire into the possible relationship of Jack Ruby with Oswald. This is necessary. I see no mention of a student assigned to investigate the possibility of a relationship of Jack Ruby with Maj. General Edwin Walker. You will find testimony of Howard Duff, Agent Cantrell, investigators Keester and Roberts who worked for General Walker.

I see no mention of any interest in investigating the relationship of Jack Ruby with the Anti-Castro Cubans. Why does Mr. Liebeler speak of Mrs. Odio, when there is so much evidence of an army Colonel, Jack Ruby, and the Anti-Castro groups?

Are the twenty law students going into the question of Oswald's mysterious subscriptions, seven of them, that started coming to Mrs. Paine's house in October, 1963 and ended the day of the assassination. Who sent for these? Was the signature verified on the request and payment of subscriptions? Who cancelled them when he was dead? His wife might have "wanted" home town news from "Minsk" as postal clerk Holmes testified. Why did Oswald call a party in Houston on the way to Mexico and ask how they got his name and sent the "Daily Worker" to his post office box? This was the first indication, October 1963, that Oswald suspected something happening to him. To complete the subscription story, you must research what the magazine's, themselves, had to say and if Lee Oswald was on their mailing list.

Need I say more? I could go into many more IMPORTANT AREAS FOR CLUES BEFORE THE LAW STUDENTS EVEN BEGIN TO WORRY ABOUT RIFLE CAPABILITY, OSWALD'S CAPABILITY AS A MARKSMAN. You have to cover carefully everything Oswald did preceding the day of the assassination. IF YOU FOLLOW HIM FROM THE MARINES, TO RUSSIA, BACK

TO FORT WORTH AND DALLAS, TO NEW ORLEANS, MEXICO, BACK TO DALLAS, you will then get the stage set for the great motorcade which was to come down Elm Street. With an accurate description of what preceeded the assassination, the incredibility of Mr. Brennan, Mrs. Markman, barber Shasteen becomes understandable. When you follow this with the testimony of the detective who went to Mrs. Paines the afternoon of the 22nd of November, without a search warrent, and stuffed boxes into the trunk of his car, you can believe anything. The next day "he returned with the boxes" which were listed by the F.B.I. Will Mr. Liebeler ask about the Dallas Police? He did not list that among the topics. Can boxes like this, removed by the men working with Captain Fritz, be returned, opened, and can you make any conclusion as to whether or not the important negatives of the pictures or secret service cards were in that box originally? That is only one of the questions the students must ask. If they do not cover the Dallas Police, their findings supporting the Warren Report have no truth.

With the limited subjects^{THAT MR LIEBELER} listed, any conclusion is possible. The problem is that the mystery of the three murders is not isolated into compartments. It is a TOTAL PICTURE, EACH INTER-RELATED, GIVING A PATTERN of consistency when viewed objectively. Can Mr. Liebeler, having been a member of the original Commission staff, remain this objective?

Can Chancellor Murphy back up the conclusions of his law department if they do not cover all of these fields of inquiry?

Are you both ready for the challenge and the responsibility?

Sincerely,

Mal Buswell