

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701  
11/15/75

Mr. Richard Schweiker  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Schweiker,

As soon as NBC News saw the UPI tomorrow's story on the wire it phoned me from New York to ask if I had agreed to appear before your committee or if you had asked me to. I said you have not asked me to and that I would appear before any properly constituted committee. I write because I do not want you to think that I used your name or in any way traded on it. I didn't.

When I asked why the question was asked because I had not said anything to prompt it this reporter told me that UPI had used part of the general challenge I had issued to those to whom I attribute perjury in Post Mortem. You have such a committee. Whether or not questions were asked of you after my Friday's statement I have no way of knowing but I do want you to know that I took and will take no liberties. I also want you to know that with ~~them~~ the nature of the letters being written for your signature you may yet find this is not the common practise. I am hearing from those who are long in interest and short on fact and common sense claiming that you have invited them to testify.

While I am writing there are some explanations I feel I should make.

I did not wait for your response to my question about a press conference to initiate my own arrangements for one. I did not expect you to do this but consistent with the view I expressed to you on our meeting I was willing for you to have the attention with a solid, factual approach. I was also by then fairly well convinced from the reactions and the non-reactions I was getting that the major media would for various reasons cop out or I rather expect not uncommonly suppress this story. I wanted fair attention to unprecedented evidence and I wanted your proposed inquiry launched on something of more substance than the receding sounds of flapping wings.

I had individual briefings for a few reporters only, excellent reporters. Each had ample time for comprehending the large book and each had enough of a guide to it to need none, to be able to write good stories without reading the book. It is my readings from them and my recollections of the past that told me I needed a press conference and that I would need something different for it, something other than news that remains too tough even after Watergate. Thus my challenge to all to whom I attribute perjury to testify jointly, each under the penalty of perjury. I felt that those wanting to cop out on content might well go for this (I now know UPI did) and that with attention it might serve to take us off the defensive with the powerful defenders of the official mythology and with some of the press.

If there should now be any allegations of inaccuracy attributed to this work there is also the answer: testify under oath and subject to perjury. My recent history, however, has been one in which the others opt silence except for an occasional writer whose own past galls him. This is the sixth time I have dared a perjury charge against me. I do not expect any and handicapped as I would be I would still welcome it.

As of this evening my expectations are of a heavy radio play, none from TV at least to begin with, and probable suppression in the Post, Star and Times. However, I do expect papers more distant from Washington to use wire copy, with the play to vary greatly. I expect less of a breaking of the ice than I had hoped for and less than there would have been if there had been any help from any quarter. Nonetheless I also expect it to be a beginning of a reorientation from the essentially peripheral (which is generally factually wrong and often paranoid) to the more central questions.

I will be making a different kind of effort Wednesday, without time for adequate preparation. You will be under no obligation, but I have the purpose of trying to persuade one of the Commission's more vocal defenders among its counsel ~~to~~ join in asking for a full and completely open real investigation. This will not stop there. I have agreed to debate with any combination of former commission counsel on the 24th and have given the students sponsoring that a list. While in this case I expect none to agree, it may be effective in the Washington area for this in itself to be known. There is no Commission counsel of whom I do not know enough to worry about any confrontation with him or his work.

Because it is probable that at some point some body is going to take testimony and because when this happens there is a good prospect of nasty official behavior behind the scenes and because I know what can be alleged, truthfully and falsely, about me, I have renewed old efforts to obtain copies of files on me. (Remember one of my suggestions was to ask the CIA for its file on me and that I would give you a release? When you did not take me up on this I pushed harder, threatening to go to court immediately, and got some results.) I have received only a fraction of what it is admitted in writing does exist. It is less than 10% of what I had already and none of it comes from files from which the copies I have come. However, if someone found it necessary to change in 1968 my uniformly excellent ratings of World War II, these were my evaluations and they have been released. Also the fact but not the substance of my having helped FDR through his son Jimmy with one of his more sensational fireside chats. I will be getting more but what I have holds fair promise of being sensational in a hearing. It is part of the domestic-intelligence operation against me as a writer. I have written Colby and if there is not further response by the time Jim Lesar can take this to court we'll do that. How much we'll be able to do will be limited by the help Jim can have. We will undertake discovery and in the course of it there is no doubt at all that this will begin with the disclosure of at least one unexposed CIA front for domestic intelligence. I have a full case in hand without discovery.

We long ago initiated the same steps with the FBI. We have not had the time to deal with their stonewalling effectively. (By the way, illness has not slowed me down to where I could not file six more FOIA requests for FBI withheld JFK evidence. And I have proof of the destruction of some by an element of the military.) When Jim can, we will press the FBI, too.

I would be doing these things if you did not have your subcommittee. I began them all long before you did. However, I want you to know about them in the event the time comes when it may be useful to you, not only as it relates to me but also to others. I do not want your teeth kicked and I know with how many they can be and exactly how.

I seem to be making a fair recovery. I can walk fairly well, if not for too long. But I'm slowed down and I'll now have all the work of attempting to draw attention to this new book and mailing out the copies. The combination will diminish the speed with which I can hope to return to the writing I know you are interested in, as I have been, too. When I can I will. If you get a full investigation authorized I'll find a way of putting it together for you in time and will then also provide you with a list of possible witnesses.

Sincerely,  
Harold Weisberg