

10/22/66

Dear Bill,

This has been a non-work day once I wrote you this a.m. Beginning with the mail nothing but interruptions, including a required trip to the lumber yard for tar to patch my roof. My cousin came to do it and I had to get the stuff for him. While driving I thought the second installment in our "Hallelujah! Let's Save Wesley Liebeler Revival Program" might be on Helen Markham's perjury.

If anyone is interested, it probably should be redone. But the idea is here.

Next time we might ask him about how he located Altgens, why he didn't trust Altgens as a witness to make his own position, why he used a doctored and lousy aerial photo instead of the meaningful and existing surveyor's plat, how this conforms to the requirements of the law, especially the law he teaches, and whether, with or without correlation with the Altgens picture it could have misled the Commission.

Also, how Altgens, when Liebeler marked the map, got to be bigger than two cars.

If you use what I sent this morning and he complains the picture I used on 203 is not the one he showed Altgens, that is true. But the one he showed Altgens was also corrupted, and Liebeler is the one who showed it to him. I have loaned my first four volumes of exhibits to someone so I cannot check. I believe the exhibit number is 203 and that the cropping is even more severe in it. Should he make such a complaint, it would be wonderful. The picture I used is from 113 of the Report and is the one used in the FBI reconstruction.

Liebeler is riding high now. He probably will not take kindly to needling. It is for this reason and its deploring lack of ethics that I keep referring to what he did through Epstein, making Epstein his creature and apologist.

By the way, does any one of you have a picture of George or Mohrenschildt? If no, do not go to any trouble to get one. It is interesting but not currently of immediate importance. It may be of none.

One of the many ennoblements of Wesley Liebeler by Edward J. Epstein is because he found the testimony of Mrs. Helen Markham "contradictory" and "worthless" (Inquest. p. 135). The use of Mrs. Markham's testimony in the report, according to Liebeler, "could seriously affect the integrity and credibility of the entire report" (pp. 137-8). Over this Epstein's hero had "a heated exchange" with the lawyer writing that part of the report (p. 135).

Liebeler's knowledge of Mrs. Markham was not second hand. It is he who interrogated her beginning 10 a.m. July 23, 1964 in the office of the U.S. Attorney in Dallas.

It therefore becomes appropriate to examine Liebeler the interrogating lawyer in terms of his performance *and by the standards he would impose on his former associates.* ~~rather than as a critic of other interrogators on the Commission's staff.~~

Mrs. Markham had perjured herself before the Commission. Here was not just a tiny case of perjury. It was a whopper. She denied having had any conversation, especially any telephone conversation, with Mark Lane, then representing Mrs. Marguerite Oswald. Her denials were persistent and resolute. *But there was a tape recording of it.*

The real purpose of Liebeler's interrogation of Mrs. Markham was to get her to purge her perjury.

So we ask him first if she succeeded. When he was finished, was Mrs. Markham still a perjurer or had she come clean enough to meet the requirements of the law? For example, did she ever come right out and say, "yes, I did have a telephone call from Mark Lane and during it I said things other than what I swore to before the Commission, especially in my description of the man I identified as Oswald"?

In his interrogation, Liebeler was assisted by Dallas Secret Service Agent John Joe Howlett, who manned the tape recorder over which Mrs. Markham heard herself in this phone conversation and by a stenographic transcript/made by the FBI.

During the interrogation, Mrs. Markham was understandably put out at having been proved a liar. She characterized the man (who she never named) who made the tape recording as, "not no better than Oswald". She told Liebeler "That was dirty

in that man doing that." Without need, Liebeler replied, "Well, I think that that's right".

Possibly Liebeler might want to explain why he offered the unnecessary comment that the man who proved to the Commission that it's eyewitness to the murder of Officer J. D. Tippit was a perjurer was "not no better than Oswald" *rather than it's knuckle*.

At the end of her testimony Mrs. Markham professed to be afraid of an invitation to appear on international TV with President Johnson. Howlett assured Liebeler that he had assuaged Mrs. Markham's fears over the telegraphic invitation.

"Will I get in trouble over this?" she asked Liebeler.

"I don't think so, Mrs. Markham, he replied. I wouldn't worry about it. I don't think anybody is going to cause you any trouble over that."

At this point in the transcript there appear words never spoken. They are *in brackets* "referring to the telegram". "because the printed transcript is prepared from stenographic typescripts and because those typescripts are still classified "Top Secret", it is not possible to know who put the words there. Was it Liebeler? The Commission's editor? The stenographer? *At Liebeler's or another's instruction?*

Does Liebeler want us to believe that Mrs. Markham was not worried about a perjury rep but was worried about being on TV with the President of the United States? Are we to believe that it was by association with the President she could "get in trouble over this", the "this" here not identified with the added words "referring to the telegram" and that she was not at all worried about perjury?

Liebeler's recollection on all of this was refreshed when on July 19, 1966 I sent him a copy of WHITEWASH with a letter calling this particular passage to his attention and soliciting his comment. He has not responded. If he has forgotten he need only glance at pages 115-7 of WHITEWASH.

Perhaps he can now tell us how as counsel to the President's Commission he turned in a record that shows a perjurer was unafraid of perjury but feared LBJ, and whether or not, *under* the requirements of the law he teaches, she actually purged herself of perjury.