Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
6/30/76

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

Dear Senator Hart,

While our previous correspondence about your responsibilities as a member of the select intelligence committee was entirely unsatisfactory to me I write you furo thar after having read your subcommittee report and a number of press accounts of it. I hope in the future to resume writing in which this report and a not favorable view of the subcommittee's work now may be relevant. I think it is only fair while your work is fresh in your mind to take the time now. I hope you have some concern about how all of this will be regarded in the future and how you will be as well as concerns in no way reflected in your report or any statements you have made that I have seen.

Your report opens with the declaration that you did not examine the work or the evidence of the Warren Commission. (It does not say what is fact, that you also refused to examine evidence of the crime the Commission elected not to have.) You did not question its conclusions. Yet simultaneously you conclude that it was unable to do its job because of the faults of only two - you pretended that two are all - of the executive agencies. And then, without any investigation, you personally are quotedm often, as in the Star of June 24, this way,"Hart said he retained confidence in the findings of the commission..."

I would like you to explain how you could undertake any investigation with any degree of responsibility without at least a decent evaluation of the Warren Commission's conclusions; how you could believe that Commission was unable to do its assigned work, and still express complete confidence in its conclusions. I would like you to explain how under these conditions you could feel free to sign any report, regardless of who wrote it.

Last October - the month I spent a morning with him at his request - Senator Schweiker said the Warren Report was a house of cards that soon would fall down. His report and yours and your personal statements now are entirely to the opposite, after your investigation carefully limited to exclude that Report. I know of only one intervening report in the press I can find relevant: the White House leak that Senator Schweiker was under President Ford's consideration as a possible vice presidential candidate. Subsequent to your report Senator Schweiker announced "very strong support" for President, which is to say Warren Commissioner Ford. The uninvestigated Ford. By you, not by me.

Please find time to explain to me so I can write about it faithfully how and why I should not consider that you joined Senator Schweiker in the misuse of the processes of the Senate and of public funds as part of the election campaign of our first unelected President and if there is any way, especially because of what will follow, for me not to believe this is the only reason the subcommittee did not begin at the beginning, with the basic fact of the homicide.

Please explain to me how there is anything relevant in your report unless there is either the certainty of Oswald's guilt - singular guilt - or the certainty that he was agency-connected? You evaded one and were less than honest on the other. How could you, then, say you even investigated and how could you draw conclusions without establishing at least the possibility of relevance? How are the agencies more at fault than you if you both assume the Commission's conclusions? (I don't think you will find anyone in wither agency who will call me its defender.)

The mythology of your report gets around and back to me. Today, from a reporter, it is that had you investigated you'd have bogged down in a "morass." Totally false.

The sole morass is the disinformation in which you did not have to mire. The actual evidence is clear beyond equivocation deppite the enormous effort to kake it equivocal. Then there is the care of the drafting of your disclaimed. You did not include the tangible evidence the Commission did not have.

Where it is material it is in no case because the Commission was deceived or had evidence hidden from it.

Last October I offered what I was about to publish to Senator Schweiker. I showed him some samples of it. I offered it with no strings attached, with a chain of possession, with the checks for which I paid to the government. I went farthur. I told him it was not necessary to credit this as my work: that I wanted no more than what national good could come of responsible use.

When you had the results of more than a dozen years of hard work and a number of FOIA lawsuits available free I believe it is not unreasonable to ask you why you signed a report that made no reference to the tangible evidence of the crime you refused and avoided examination of any evidence or any conclusions drawn from any.

You have the facilities of the Library of Congress available. If you used them you could not have avoided me or my work. You could not have avoided the FOIA suits and what they are about and have yielded. Yet of all the many books, however you regard them if you have read any and were in a position tomevaluate them, I am the author of the only ones that are by your own limitations relevant to your irrelevancy you call a report. So you assume the conclusions of and the content of the Warren Report when you are supposed to investigate, not assume, base your report on other basic assumption that are without foundation in fact, and base on side of your conjectures on a gross factual error contrived by a Warren Commission lawyer and included in that Report as fact. You do not mention Wesley Liebeler's name. He knew it was false and I have the proof he created the falsehood. (Not only in his own handwriting, but in that, too.)

President Ford's record on the Warren Commission ought not be hidden in an election year by a Senate committee and by its Democratic members. If you want his secret record with Democracts on the staff he considered "liberal," be my guest. It is McCarthyism and the Department of Justice has gone to court to deny me what I do not have. Not that what I have ought not blow civil-libertarian minds. His Department of Justice, the one you said withheld from the Warren Commission. If you have any curiosity about the rest of his record there is much, in facsimile, in those executive session transcripts I had to sue to get so you could suppress them from your report and consideration. I printed them in facsimile. He stole one, edited all reference not favorable to the FBI and CIA out, did not indicate any editing, and sold it for profit. Compared with thisuperhaps his perjury about it is minor. All this was public domain before you began your work. Your colleague, the supposedly possible running mate, had it if you didn't. I did print it all, with a word-by-word comparison and in facsimile, in 1974. This is in the fourth of my Whitewash series.

If I never complete the book referred to as one in which Immay want your answers, I willxx want them as part of the archives I will leave. That books is a rather extensive study of Oswald. I did offer all that work and the ruin of the book to Senator Schweiker.

In fairness to you I think I should report more of that meeting, what I said and the impression with which I left it.

Because long and painful experience has taught me responsible people cannot compete with the assortment of nuts, self-seekers and other dubious character who have laid court to the Congress on this I took no initiatives, knowing they would do no good. I believed and believe than any serious Members would have to learn about me and if they wanted to see me would communicate with me. I have done that much work that the Library of Congress would report. I will continue this work as long as I can and I do work a very long day in order to. I seek and have sought nothing for myself.

You can measure my desire to help you by the fact that although I was in agony

from a severe phlebitis and could barely move with crutches I went to see him first and he had his staff persuade the doctor to shift the appointment until the end of the morning. I told Senator Schweiker what you can perceieve, that I am a forthright man and above all believe I owed this to our legislators. He said he welcomed this. He then said he had four theories on which he was working and could I shoot them down. He presented them, I did shoot them down (including the one in your report) and went farthur. I told him all come from my work, all should be investigated but that none should be addressed without laying a basis in fact. It was my expressed and remains my belief that you had no right to expect the support of your colleagues on still more theorizing and that with the record on this subject of the major media any such approach would result in another coverup. You are welcome to decide for yourself if I exaggerated in telling him I had done all the work necessary for this factual foundation. I did offer it to him, free. After that I told him he was welcome to all else he wanted.

Your report leaves little doubt that even this material that would not have been relevant without a basis also was not wanted.

Senator Schweiker impressed me much. I left after two hours happy that at last the Congress was going to address one of the turning points in history directly and honestly. My pain and difficulties were beyond hiding. He said he'd be in touch soon and that if he or his staff could not travel here he'd send transportation for me. I believed this so literally that when I was hospitalized I took a private room I could not afford and is now part of my other debt.

It never happendd, then or since. Naturally not. If it had that infmany you call a report could not have issued.

And your name is on it.

Quoth the raven, ever more.

I have no way of knowing what you know, what you did, what you understand. But in your personal interest I want you to know that you, too, suppressed because you were a member of the subcommittee. I have some of what you suppressed. The only beneficiary I can conceive is President Ford.

If you abdicated, that is your responsibility. If your staff is incompetent, that also is your responsibility. But if they read the records you should be looking for some with a casual acquaintance with the mother tongue. I have some of those records, not from you. If you have no interest, then I'm with the young people who ask me where you are coming from.

You referred me to the new oversight committee. Each new quotation of the chairman says organization alone will take a stretching six month. By then the election will be over. You will have helped elect a "epublican if that happens Aside from the national need you have not served as the people had ever right to expect you would.

I did ask you for those records on me that you did not have to withhold. I am not here repeating that request. You do or do not do what you please. I am masked from your Exhibit 42. I knew this because I have some proofs of my own. Here is the relevance, and perhaps some information for you on how well your subcommittee worked. I made several suggestions to Senator Schweiker. If you have the interest in others I'll take the time later. He asked me what he should do. I said serve duces tecum subpoenas on everyone possible and on the CIA for its mail interceptions and ~~xxxxx~~ other improper acts I mentioned. It then turned out that as of October you had not served a single subpoena! On myself I waived any privacy rights. I know what you should have gotten. I cannot know the fabrications. I know to what it would have led and how a real investigation could have used it. Having read a press copy of the report I understand why this didn't happen. And your promise of what would be sent me has not been kept. Don't bother. Sincerely, Harold Weisberg