

5/27/76

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

Dear Dick,

Whether or not George Gardner's story in today's Post is full or entirely faithful I do not know. I do know that I read it with a sense of *deja vu* and on this aspect not for the first time.

The words attributed to Senator Tower and the uncertainties of Senator Huddleston are close to exactly those of the caution I addressed to you last October.

You are an independent-minded man. So I would press upon you Santayana's wisdom about reliving the past if we do not learn from it.

Much of the public attention to your subcommittee's work also took the form I predicted in telling you that the major media would have to be addressed and it could be only with definitive evidence proving the entire official solution to be wrong. If in the end this is to be what Senator Tower says, "more questions than answers." The country will suffer more uncertainty and unease and there may well be still another whitewash as well as continuing coverup.

I was in federal court in D.C. Tuesday. This first status call on that case went very well. I think it is possible more suppressed material may be released. I saw Bud Fensterwald then. He said you had been refused membership on the new intelligence committee. With all the work you've done I suspect this is precisely because you are of independent mind. But it also can be taken as a reading on how this new committee will work if a man like you is not acceptable. I hope I'm wrong.

From what I've seen and heard of what is public your subcommittee's report is not going to address the basic official conclusions. There is some opposition anyway. Except for your doubts that were not in the papers I saw when Senator Hart endorsed these wrongful conclusions I have seen nothing as the consequence of your committee's work that does not endorse these conclusions. I continue to believe that within this doctrine at most only the most limited national good can be accomplished, far less than the country needs.

So I again suggest the hip-and-thigh approach I first suggested to you, prior to the submission of your report. This is your best shot, I believe, at reducing opposition to your report and objectives. You can do this in a speech. There is more than enough in documentary form in Post Mortem alone for a simple approach, the basic evidence in a homicide. In giving away what it cost so much in time and money to develop and when I'm far from recovering the mechanical costs of the book alone, when in addition even if attention were to be directed to it it would do us no good because it is not in bookstores, I hope you can see I'm not being selfish in this recommendation.

If you give Senator Huddleston the executive session of January 22 (and I'd use it in a speech, too) I think you can resolve his doubts. There was no Commission innocence on the question of conspiracy.

I am letting the National Enquirer have some unpublished material I do not want jumped. They wanted an opinion to quote. I recommended you as an honorable man who would not jump them and me on this. You may have heard from them before you receive this.

Their man was here when there was some attention to Earl Gels' story on what you were doing and planned. I was confident it was inaccurate. I suggested to him that he consult your office on this. As a result Roy Gustafson made the statement that did correct this. I know of its use on the USI R vira only.

In calling these two illustrations to your attention I hope you can perhaps see that in none of what I say and encourage am I being negative.

I also go back to what I said and confessed at the same time last October. It takes years of concentrated work to begin to understand all the fact available and all the "Through the Lookingglass" operations. This was not then nor is it now a claim to infallibility. The disinformation aspects were several years beginning to get through in my own thinking when I worked on this full-time, very long days, too. I made mistakes in thinking past which I was trying to guide you. I'll stack the subsequent record on judgement and the entire record on fact against any other. It is the result of these experiences I was then trying to give you as it is the same basic approach I now urge on you so that you may accomplish all that still can be.

In the months ahead there will be much I can give you if you want it. My work continues to be productive, I think. There may be occasion for your presenting evidence to the committee from which the leadership appears to have wanted to exclude you.

Whatever your course, I do hope it works out to be the best for the country. Young people in particular urgently need reason to have some faith in our basic institutions.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg