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

Dear Senator Schweiker,

While your letter of the 26, which did not come until today, requires no response, I feel I owe you one.

If it was not explicit enough in my earlier letter let me make it as clear as can now. I kipp hope you will understand that your interest in this is my interest, too.

One of my purposes was to caution you in neveral ways. One of these ways is who really is an expert, who really does know what he talks about, who really has done enough work to really know and to be able to informs a Member in a way that will not, now and later politically, kick back on that Member.

One illustration if not the most significant I can anticipate is last night's CBS evening TV news. (There mobody knew what he was talking about.)

My concern for Members in this is not new. It is explicit in a late-April speechs, when the situation was quite different. It is explicit in a position paper I was asked to prepare for Members of the House shortly thereafter.

My concern is increased by the belief that there is no single Member who is in a position to know or who has a staff that is in this position. You can all be at the mercy of those to whom you may listen, including me.

If and when you feel I can be of help I will be if my own work than late me. If it does not an any particular moment it will without the passing of much time. I do not spend my time talking. I do work and I believe it is productive and meaningful.

The FHI has recently found it expedient to assure a federal court that I know more about this subject than anyone in the FHI. If it does not constitute an answer to my documented, really proven, charge of FHI perjury, it is a kind of unique condentials. I think you will find that I am alone in a willingness to face any confrontation on anything I say on this and related subject. And alone in producing proof that is my own work.

Please do be cautious and careful. When the time comes I will be able to deliver close to a complete package, one I think you will also find if not unique the closest private approximation of it.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg