

March 9, 1967

Mr. Steven J. Burton
Citizens' Committee of Inquiry
Box 150
380 Westwood Plaza
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dear Steve:

I am even more rushed because I have to deliver one book in two weeks, another one within four weeks thereafter, and these delay WHITEWASH III by that much.

On Kupferman, I believe he is sincere and am in accord with other things you say. I have spoken to his assistant, Mr. Kaufman, who knows my apprehensions.

I am opposed to anything like a mock court but think your professor's idea may be a good one. My own preference is for a Congressional investigation, which, however, requires a proper legislative purpose; that is, it must be related to legislation. I will be interested in knowing the conclusions you people come up with.

My opinion of Garrison is that he is sincere, right, and pursuing what I had already outlined in Ch. 11 of the first book and 7 of the second. I have a considerable amount of this material myself.

There are a number of reasons why I prefer Congress, and I believe we discussed them briefly. However, I know of no pending legislation; hence, some would have to be introduced. Were this to happen, much would depend upon the committee to which it was referred and whether or not the committee was disposed to hold hearings. Of course, committees can hold hearings on the adequacy of present law.

I hardly know what further to suggest at the moment because I can't free my mind.

Regards to all.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

BOX 150

380 WESTWOOD PLAZA

Los Angeles, California 90024

STEVEN J. BURTON
GARY D. KUKES
Co-Chairmen

March 3, 1967

JACKIE PILCHER
Secretary

Dear Mr. Weinberg,

I have spoken to Rev. Kupperman, who, as you know, introduced a resolution concerning a new investigation last session. I asked him if it would be introduced this session ⁱⁿ ~~at~~ the same form, which was very weak. He invited our suggestions and it is my opinion that he will listen to them rationally. I would like to hear from you as to your views on this subject.

I'm sure that we agree that adversary procedures in open public hearings is desirable and that Congress is the only means available at this time. However, my problem concerns the exact nature of those 'adversary' procedures. A mock court trial could not be sufficient in that the accused cannot be confronted by his accusers and the legislature cannot constitutionally conduct a trial. Furthermore, the goal of such a 'trial' would seem to be the innocence or guilt of Oswald, rather than

the identity of the assassins. One alternative suggested by a UCLA Professor of Political Science would be to adapt the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946 to this case. Briefly, this Act, used primarily by Executive agencies, would allow any interested and qualified party to present evidence, cross-examine witnesses, etc. This may be the answer, except that the jury would be composed entirely of members of Congress, who would be subjected to political pressure and consideration of the "National interest." I am shortly going to research the actual wording and nature of this act so as to get a clearer picture of what it is.

You have some experience in Senate investigating and are probably one of the most qualified to help me. I would greatly appreciate any specific suggestions you may have.

Also, just as a matter of curiosity, I'd like to hear your views on Jim Garrison. Some of the critics seem to have faith in him, but I'm a sceptic. They may have the "inside dope" while I only know what I read in the papers. I'll look forward to hearing from you soon, for Kysferman would like to hear from us quickly - Please excuse my handwriting.

yours
Steve Butler