

6/27/76

Senator Richard Schweiker
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Dick,

The confidential label is for my own files and the archive I will leave. It is not a restriction upon you. I intend no use of this letter or any response or non-response. As I told you last October, public controversy or attracting attention to myself are not within my serious purposes. The political and media attitude toward the work I have done and the minority view I represent have forced me to reconsider and recast my own roles.

As I told you last October I am and I try to be forthright. I then told you that I also owed you forthrightness. You will see how forthright I can be.

Your appearance on Face the Nation, which I have just viewed, was as impressive as you were with me last October. This and the agony I was in when I did struggle to your office on the way to the hospital are my clearest impressions of that meeting. You may have no knowledge of the pain that is typical of the ailment I suffered, but I assure you it is considerable and if I had not begun with faith in you and your intentions, as I had not sought you out I also would not have subjected myself to what I went through in order to spend that morning with you and Dave Marston.

Your sincerity impressed me so much, through all that pain, that in order to serve you better I did what I could not afford. I took a private room in the hospital so there could be privacy in the further communication between us you did forecast. We neither knew I would be going to the hospital, but you did tell me you would want to spend more time with me and that if you could not come here you would, having observed my difficulty in merely moving, would provide me with transportation to your office.

Beginning when I heard radio reports of your public statements while I was in the hospital, I have wondered why you were not again seeking help or information from me. This wonder increased as I learned that you were and remained in close contact with nuts, paranoids, assorted self-seekers and others of the dedicated wrong. In retrospect I confess indebtedness to you for staying detached.

I cannot be certain that I now know the answer to what has puzzled me. I am not putting you on when I say how much you impressed me or how impressed I was about your sincerity and genuineness. Until there is something better I will have to accept as an answer your statement on "Face the Nation" that you are "very strongly for President Ford." This gives you an irreconcilable conflict of interest. Ford was a member of the Warren Commission. Now I think I also have an explanation for the opening of your report and your rejection of the unselfish offer I made you: all my records with a chain of possession as they deal with the most essential evidence in any homicide investigation, more that of a President. I did offer you this evidence, my originals, and I did say you did not have to credit me or my work.

If you would care to explain that you could still support Ford and publish what he as a member of the Warren Commission avoided even looking for, what you and he, as lawyers know is the most essential evidence in any homicide explanation and you in particular when your mandate was to investigate the federal agencies, I will welcome the explanations I do not expect. You go so far as never to mention the agency which did not volunteer this evidence to the Commission, not that Ford, the other Commissioners and all their lawyers did not know it had to exist and was essential.

You go farther. You open your report with what to any thinking person is total disqualification and certification of the lack of relevance to all that follows. You proclaim you did not question the conclusions of the Report and that you did not examine any of the evidence of the crime itself. You thereafter and without exception defend the

Commission and its lawyers. You carry this so far that you quote those who have self-interest to serve by what they said and in no case quote a lawyer who worked on the relevant areas of the Report. You carried this to the extreme. When you had in your possession and suppressed what Balin as the Rockefeller Commission's honcho also had and suppressed, what it totally destructive of the report and its integrity. Thus because it was the most serious self-accusation by the CIA against the CIA in your attack on it and the FBI you had to suppress it.

Whatever is or was in your mind it is apparent that this was political expediency, a requisite of your being "very strongly for President Ford."

And now, of course, especially because of their great relevance to your report I understand why you used none of the transcripts I had to use FOIA to obtain. How could you and survive support of the man responsible?

I have no personal investment in who is the next president. I do have a deep, long and continuing interest in the integrity of our society and its institutions and their viability. I recognize that as a politician you have rights and needs. Having them I believe you should have faced this conflict of interest prior to taking the initiative that saddled you with this conflict of interest you have not reconciled in the national interest.

I am basing what I say not on this TV show alone. I have read the press copy of your report to the appendix. You were conned by the spooks you pretend to expose. You suppressed names that are well-known publicly. You swallowed the Rocca bait, hook, sinker and line to the pole. You then went farther and as with the FBI you suppressed mention of Rocca's name and those of the others who did this dirty work with him, names freely available in court records and the Archives. The identity of "D" is not and has not been secret/ Why do you suppress it? Is there a more likely explanation that anyone knowing it would learn what you also suppressed in your report, that he and his fabrication were misused in a Strangelovian effort you avoid entirely? Or is it that your staff is this close to totally incompetent?

That I spare you more of this is not because it does not exist. This is adequate for the record I will leave for the future and for your understanding. I could continue it indefinitely. This would include serious and disqualifying factual errors in your report. Errors relating to your entire basis, rather pretended basis. There is no basis for any of your report without what you refused to investigate, who did the dirty deed. While you pretend otherwise on "Face the Nation" you did assume Oswald's guilt without investigation and while condemning the honesty of the so-called investigation. Unless you make this assumption of guilt there is one one fig-leaf of any relevance and that also you avoid: was Oswald a federal agent of some kind?

You pretend but present no proof of his "connections" with both the pro- and anti-Castro groups. There is no proof. His sole "connection" with the FPOC is his writing them without their solicitation and their not empowering him to establish what there never was, a New Orleans chapter. Your sole allegation of an anti-Castro "connection" is via Bringier. Here you have the most serious factual error. This error is essential to all in your report. It is also an area of your personal suppression of what you did obtain from the CIA and failed to mention on "Face the Nation:" The Bringier and Clay Shaw connections with CIA.

Am I glad you did not come back to me! As I offered, I'd have given you all I have. It is solid, it is considerable, it cost me much and it proves perjury by the CIA's Bringier, protected by a relevant Warren Commission lawyer of your political faith by his personal alteration of a transcript.

I want the record between us and that I will leave, also duplicated out of my possession, to be as explicit as possible. I am saying that Bringer committed perjury. I am saying this perjury is the basis of all your theorizing as a substitute for the fact you were ~~mandated~~ mandated to establish. I am saying you could not have had a staff that even checked sources that was not aware of this. And I am saying I had other and repetitious proofs that were available to you. I did offer them to you and specifically on this subject, which is one of the four "theories" you did ask me to shoot down, your words, which I promptly did although they come originally from my own work in each case. (I then warned you against the consequences of beginning with theorizing rather than fact.)

You may regard this with resentment and as a personal attack on you. I would like you to consider the pain it causes me when I have ruined my life and my future to establish what truth one man can about an event on which the world was reversed and I have done this so unselfishly I ~~is~~ offered you without restriction or even acknowledgement all of my work and files. (Yes, I am still in debt for the private room, too. At 63.)

Having thus endeared myself to you I propose providing you with an opportunity to live by and with your words on CBS.

You should recall that you and your derring-do investigators, having the power of subpoena, had not issued one until I proposed this when you asked me for recommendations on how to proceed. With competent subpoenas you would not have had the limitations you said on CBS had been imposed on you because the CIA had not informed you. They could, of course, have failed to comply, but there was no reasonable limit on your power to specify and compel compliance if you had the political courage. One of the specific suggestions I made - and I made more than one - is that you subpoena all their records of whatever source on me. I also waived my rights to privacy for you. I had reasons I could not go into in the time we had. I have some of these records, from CIA and not from them. If you had done this you would have established the existence of a still-unexposed CIA front from proscribed domestic activity and a super-sensation the nature of which I will not now indicated. I also withdraw my waiver of privacy rights, based on what you have done.

What you have done is to needlessly limit me in court. I have asked you for a copy of your Exhibit 42 with all names but mine masked. You have not responded. As I told you, I want this for court, not literary use. Obviously when I am the author of the first book on the Warren Commission I have no literary need of this. I know of no prohibition on your providing this.

You do advance certain theories, whether or not they are founded in fact or reason. If you had done as I suggested you would have advanced your theorizing very much. While what I possess of these records is far from complete, I have enough to tell you this in my possession. I also have proof of the deliberate withholding of more and where it is filed. As you know, the kinky sex pictures are not of me. As you may not know, this was provided to the Shaw defense. That is, not Garrison's but CIA's Shaw, as you must have read in Gerald in New Orleans. And for whatever it may be worth to you, CIA Shaw did perjure himself, other than as Garrison charged. I'm now happy you did not ask for this proof I'd have given you.

Here are some other "face the action" quotes:

We can "go only as far as we know." (You refused to and you did not.)

"The American people can handle the truth." (I'm delighted you recall that from what I said last October.)

"I think the public has a right to know." I agree. But you are asserting a monopoly on what the American public can know from the needless hiding of names, like that of Nosenko where in hiding it you repeat the official CIA propaganda while suppressing what he said. Had you not it would have advanced your theorizing by giving it a basis you did not but it surely would have made "very strong support ~~from~~ for President Ford"

awkward. He was aware of what Nosenko said but he stole and sold for profit a TOP SECRET transcript he then edited to make say the opposite. His government then undertook to present perjury to a federal court to deny me this transcript as it now has forced me to court to obtain the records relevant to his red-baiting of Professor Redlich (now law-school Dean Norman Redlich) over Redlich's record on civil rights.

My record is one that certainly establishes dedication to the public's right to know. I regularly go to what for me is difficult and costly lengths to obtain suppressed evidence and then hold press conferences and give it all away regardless of my sometime literary interest and rights.

Your record is not one of guaranteeing the public's right to ~~know~~ know. Rather is it a record of granting the public the right to know what you want it to know.

I have asked you for copies of records that you are not required to withhold. You have not responded. I have asked you for records to present to a federal court. You have not responded. In fact, you did not even provide copies of those non-withheld CIA records I had to buy from CIA when I offered you and through you the Senate all of the work I had done at considerable personal cost, including these countless thousands of pages for which I paid the executive agencies.

Despite what you told the CBS nationwide audience the records of these agencies is other than you represent. If they lived within the law I would have no need to ask you for these records. I have asked for them under FOIA and Privacy Acts, Combing my files might yield more and older, but I can give you records of my having paid the Department of Justice for public information in 1970 and still await it. I can show you requests of CIA for records that since the 1971 request have not been supplied.

The political reality is precisely as red Graham represented: there is little likelihood that the oversight committee will do anything and none that anything will be done in the immediate future. As a lawyer you know that what your report gives this new committee lacks factual foundation and that with all the work it will have to do even if it had the visibly lacking disposition to do anything its other obligations more central to its mandate also precludes this.

I and to the best of my knowledge I alone have devoted myself to meeting the writer's obligation in a society like ours to the public's right to know. I continue to do this despite the seriousness and the permanent damage from the phlebitis the manifestation of which you observed. I have done work nobody else has begun to approach. The FBI has certified to a federal court that I know more about the subject of your report than anyone in the FBI. These are not inconsiderable credentials. And I will be leaving an archive for the future in which what you have and have not used and do not have to suppress can be valuable. So, I am offering you an opportunity to assure a right of the people to know what you did not see fit to tell where you are not under any legal or moral obligation to secrecy.

Let us see if your concept of this right to know is impinged upon by your political support of the man who denied the public this right when our President was killed and the entire basis of our society nullified by that killing.

In these 12 hard years I have had many disappointments. Garrison wound up my enemy when I tried to steer him toward responsibility. So also did several of his associates I understand have been yours. I tell you frankly that between what I believed of you before we met and the impression you then made on me your report is perhaps my greatest disappointment. It is so dishonest and irrelevant that despite its parroting of what I wrote a decade ago, despite my title's using the words "whitewash" and "coverup," you were even very unfair to the FBI and the CIA. I have sought no attention on your report but when I have been asked an opinion or comment in every case you have forced me to include this.

Apologies for the typos I'll not have time to correct-I began this Sunday's work at 5 a.m.

With disillusionment tinged sorrow and regret,
Harold Weisberg