

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
3/20/75

Mr. Tom Susman, Counsel
Administrative Practices Subcommittee
Senate Office Bldg
Washington, D.C.

Dear Tom,

More that I think you should know.

March 22 Jim Lesar renewed my prior requests for those of the Warren Commission executive sessions that I had been denied.

March 14 they declassified that of January 22, referred to in Whitewash IV, if you remember, the first on the question was Oswald an FBI agent (meaning informant of some kind, or activist).

With a covering letter beginning rather casually, "Some years ago you requested a copy of the transcript...." it was mailed to me yesterday.

In my opinion it really is dynamite. I can't now go into all of it. One thing is beyond doubt the Commissioners knew that Hoover "would like to have us feld up and quit" (p.12) because "They found the man. There was nothing more to do. The Commission supports their conclusions, and we can go home and that is the end of it." (p.13)

After Dulles postulated that the FBI used Oswald to penetrate the Fair Play for Cuba Committee (p. 6) Ferd displayed an understanding not in the Report - and remember, long before the first hearings: "He (Oswald) was playing ball, writing letters to both the elements of the Communist parties. I mean he was playing ball with the Trotskyites and with the others." (p. 7)

Rankin explained that in his ^{NINE} ~~seven~~ years of experience he had found it impossible to get them to do more than "claim that they don't evaluate" before they had really investigated "they are very explicit that there was no conspiracy, " that Oswald was the lone assassin, yet "they have not run out all kinds of leads." (p.11) He contrasts this with "it is hard to get them to say when you think you have got a case tight enough to convict somebody, that that is the person that committed the crime...and it is the uniform experience that they don't do that." (Dulles agreed.)

That the FBI had a predetermined conclusion with which the Commission had no choice but to agree (as it did) is made explicit by Boggs (p.13): "This closes the case, you see. Don't you see?" Dulles: "Yes, I see that." Nobody disagreed.

They do agree on suppressing the transcript, the final item of business.

It has been my experience that once I compel disclosure, where it can serve interests other than mine attention is called to it. This whole thing is, to me, getting more Byzantine all the time. There is currently a heavily-promoted book that to me is not distinguishable from what the spooks call a black book. I can see this being used out of context to promote it. While writing this I have initiated a few steps toward a means of disclosing this publicly rather than trying to hold it for the book for which I initially sought it. And I do believe it ought be before the proper committees. Now, before it can be misused.

Friday Jim and I met with the FBI on what they now promise will be full disclosure on the spectrographic and neutron-activation analyses. They would not let me go over the files and select those papers I want. They insist on giving me copies of all and not letting me see the files. I merely noted that this compels me to buy what I may not want and is contrary to my experience with Department policy. I'll pay for it all to get what they'll give, which can't possibly be complete, and will protest their forecast time charge. They did swear in the past to having collected all the records.

Yet today, in asking Jim to agree to an extension in time, the Assistant United States Attorney actually told him that they can't find some of it! (I explained the need for a memory hole on what they "can't find" to Jim.)

I told Jim to agree to the extension if the request is in writing and with the reasons explicit. And if that letter does not include all he was told to write one recording those omissions.

They did make representations to the court under oath. I want a record in writing that courts or committees can at some point consider.

One of the home movies of JFK being killed does not show the gore. Last month I taped a Black Journal show in New York in which it is shown. I believe it makes certain that there was at least one shot from the front and that the official explanation is impossible. They attribute it to the sudden acceleration of the car. This particular and lesser-known film also leaves no doubt when the car did start to speed up - much later. Thus it could not have accounted for that violent motion.

That show is to be telecast on Channel 26 at 9 p.m. day after tomorrow.

Now that the ice is broken there are other and self-serving efforts being made. I know of and am disassociated from them. I know the leader and his record only too well. He seems to have conned some responsible types into support. And he always appears to be a man of principle, always on the right side of serious public issues. Because I know him as others do not and the materials as others also do not, I find him to be the man about whom the legal maxim was phrased: *Penis erectus sciam non habet.*"

What he has done to date is utterly irresponsible and could hardly better serve the end of an adverse precedent.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg