June 6, 1968

Honorable Richard B. Russell
Attn: Mr. Charles Campbell
United States Senate
Washingon, D. C.

Dear Senator Russell:

It was an unexpected pleasure to meet you yesterday.

I am particularly gratified at this accident for I did not, until then, know that you had misgivings about who Oswald really was, if I may put it that way.

There is a considerable amount of new material on this, beginning, I believe, with my work, and carried considerably forward by District Attorney Garrison. For example, I believe I have established that Oswald, the so-called "Communist", got Communist literature openly in the Marine Corps while he enjoyed a top secret security clearance. He was actually strongly anti-Communist and anti-Soviet. I know from other official sources that he had associations in New Orleans that were withheld from you members of the Warren Commission. It is my information, as it is my belief, that this was known to the staff.

I now have tape-recorded interviews with a number of people who saw Oswald in New Orleans in places, on occasions and with people not testified to before either the Commission or the staff, although this information was readily available from both the witnesses examined and not asked this and others known but not questioned at all.

Further, Oswald was known to have had an association with one of the witnesses before the Commission who had connections with the extremist Cuban factions. This was not adduced in the testimony, nor does it exist in the FBI or Secret Service reports, although it was known. Relating to this is the careful leading of a related witness by the staff lawyer to circumvent what would have disclosed this. The result is an open deception in that testimony, making it appear as though these two witnesses had but a casual relationship with each other that, remarkably, began the day that Oswald, just as remarkably, blundered into the store of one. The truth is that these two witnesses had known each other for some time and had, indeed, entered into a small contract, a copy of which was obtained by the Secret Service and was never thereafter mentioned. It is not in your printed evidence, but is in the files.

I have this evidence and will supply it to you, if you want it.

In this connection, I think you also should know that your staff lawyer made a "deal" designed to deny the public the knowledge that one of these witnesses did, in fact, give testimony.

Enclosed is a copy of my correspondence with Archivist Rhoads on the executive session transcripts, particularly the altered one of September 18, 1964, a copy of which I gave you yesterday. Most pertinent is the second paragraph of my letter of May 4 and the third of his letter of May 20. Because of your personal interest, I underline his sentence:

> "No verbatim transcript of the executive session of September 18, 1964, is known to be among the records of the Commission."

This means that, in the official depository, those questions you and other members of the Commission raised about the draft of the Report no longer exist.

Please notice also that where I declared that I have knowledge of what was discussed at the executive session of January 27, 1964, that is not included in what I was allowed and is not within the description of what was withheld and asked for a list of the subjects discussed, thix was denied me in Dr. Rhoads' letter of May 20, where he repeats what amounts to a right to suppress by raw power.

There are other references in my letter of May 29 I hope Mr. Campbell will understand and analyze for you.

The last paragraph requests further amplification of what is of most direct interest to you. Should I get an answer, I will send you a copy.

If there is any manner in which I can serve you, please ask. As you know, you may have copies of anything I have.

I write this as we are all immersed in this new national trauma, the shooting of Senator Robert Kennedy. It weighs upon me especially because only last night, on TV in Washington, I discussed just this, which had been predicted to me two months ago. If his accused assailant turns out to be a Cuban, I think you will have grounds for additional apprehension about the inadequacy of the information you were supplied about Oswald.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg