Hart's reply was prompt (5/10), non-responsive and not encouraging. He addressed nothing I wrote him and referred me to the to-be-cceated oversight committee for any help I can give it or he can give me. I was correct in not having written him earlier. Where he is coming from ~~on~~ on this remains a question to me. He and Schweiker, Schweiker from the first according to last year's Pittsburgh clips I have just received, have done the Epstein/WC bit, assuming Oswald's guilt. Now the real questions, according to Hart and Schweiker, are was LHO anti- or pro-Castro and what did the spooks agencies hold back on this. Schweiker is quoted as expecting a breakthrough on this. Either way, whither then?

HW 5/12/76

GARY HART
COLORADO

COMMITTEES:
ARMED SERVICES
PUBLIC WORKS

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

May 10, 1976

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route 12
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I have asked that all the Select Committee's published material, on both foreign and domestic intelligence, be sent to you. Our committee rules prohibit any other material from being released to the public.

As you know, the Senate will soon vote on the question of creating a permanent oversight committee on intelligence activities. I believe a committee will be established. If so, I suggest you get in touch with the committee soon after it is underway to determine what assistance you can offer it as well as what assistance it can offer you.

Sincerely,

Gary Hart
U.S.S.

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
5/8/76

Senator Gary Hart
U.S.Senate
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hart,

"Hart to Request Congress Reopen JFK Death Probe," the page-one headline in the May 2 Denver Post, ought gladden the heart of the one who in all ways is senior among those generally called "critics" of the Warren Report. That it does not is represented by the carryover head,"Urges Exploring Two Theories."

Theories will get you nowhere, even if, as I'm inclined to doubt, you can find definitive answers to those attributed to you.

The late Senator Richard Russell had your same doubts, if they are not in a minority report. He shared them with me in the summer of 1969 or 1970. I am responsible for his breaking his long friendship with LBJ and his giving up his CIA oversight responsibilities, although I neither asked nor suggested either. He then also theorized, incorrectly, I'm certain, and reached conclusions I'm also certain were not justified.

Your colleague, Senator Schweiker, was turned on to theories last October when he asked me to spend a morning with him. It was, as I have recently written you, a very painful morning for me and when the next week I was hospitalized and heard news accounts of his continued theorizing there was a different pain.

With seven months to pursue theories do you really think a few more months will yield more? And if you resolve the questions you are reported to have about Lee Harvey Oswald, what is there to convince you that this will resolve your doubts about the JFK assassination or those most Americans have?

There are much more basic questions. Satisfying yourelf on both your theories will not address either, leave alone resolve them. You will then be left with still more theories to follow. And as you are quoted as saying, this will not do any good and will be hurtful.

Senator Schweiker presented four theories to me and asked me to shoot them down. After doing this I told him they all originate in my work, that I would like them investigated, and that there would not be any real investigation if it started with them.

Because your subcommittee has not been on the high road you can't be fully aware of the fact. The most basic of all question is answerable with fact and the fact is that the entire "solution" to the assassination is false. If you do not confront this directly you will fail and you should.

My advice to Senator Schweiker was to forget all theories and present the possible irrefutable case that the crime is unsolved. Part of your recommendation is what I did recommend to him, that your staff, which would have acquired much experience, be continued with pretty much the same committee and that his recommendation be that both be continued with no other responsibilities.

In my belief, whether or not it is required for a supporting vote, you owe it to your colleagues who do not possess all the fact to make out a solid case before asking them to vote. I also believe you will lack the essential support of the major media, which has its own past and hangups with which to coexist, without doing this.

You can. I've done all that work. I offered it all to Senator Schweiker, all the

necessary evidence the Warren Commission did not have and all with a chain of possession. As I am sure he will confirm, I went much farther. I told him he did not have to credit either me or my work, mostly a book I was then putting on the presses. I could not have been more unselfish.

I make you the same offer. There is no way I can commercialize it because I am my own publisher. My books are on sale in almost no bookstores and I have no way of getting them there.

Being fully responsible, with the best of intentions, is not easy on a matter like this. But there is nothing that can persuade me to do what I consider less than responsible. Intentions are less than enough.

I have several books partly written that for various reasons I have laid aside. For these books I have done considerable investigating. I am quite prepared to give this all away if I am satisfied on how it will be used. Here I am getting to your theories. But I will not do anything until the national need, as I see it, is met. That begins with laying a factual foundation, a foundation of complete credibility without any theorizing.

If you want a dramatic means of doing this, I make you the same offer I made Senator Schweiker: call me and federal agents and Warren Commission counsel to testify at the same time and to the same matters, with both of us subject to the penalties of perjury. There is no single thing to which I would testify in response to the proper questions that would rest on my word. I do deal with fact and I do have the proofs, all official. You can satisfy yourself on this quite easily. And at 63 and with permanent damage from a very heavy phlebitis I am not about to tempt jail for perjury.

Do not misunderstand me. I wrote the first book on the Warren Report. It concluded with a demand for a Congressional investigation. Eleven years ago I would have welcomed any. But during the past year or so, where there has been Congressional demand, my experiences of these eleven years have kept me off the Hill except on the rare occasions when I was invited. A Congressional investigation no longer interests me and I believe will no longer meet a real national need. What kind of investigation means more to me.

"I don't think the American people need more idle, random speculations by public officials, "you are quoted as saying."These questions can't be answered by reopening public wounds." I agree. This is why after all this time I am so small a minority with so few agreeing with me among those called "critics."

I have no way of knowing what you know. I do know that until I suggested it in mid-October your subcommittee had not issued a single subpoena. I do not know which if any you issued or what you obtained. I do know who some of your witnesses were and what they testified to. Some called me before and after they testified. I do know that you did a not inconsiderable amount of wheel-spinning. And I know that sometimes you were close to the real and got diverted. But there was nothing I could do or believed I could. However, if you are willing to go into the most basic issues, I do believe I can guarantee you success. I believe also this is an urgent national need.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg