

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

10/9/76

Dear Tom,

Yesterday I was told that prior to supporting the House assassinations- investigation Tip O'Neill spoke to Senator Kennedy. The Senator's position is represented as being for an investigation if it would get to or be able to get to the bottom of it all and that he would not be for another study group.

I have no way of knowing whether this is accurate. It represents a perfectly proper position. It also represents what I believe is utterly unreal. This is one of the two reasons I write.

The other has to do with the kind of record I am establishing under oath in C.A. 75-1996, for the withheld King assassination evidence. On this if you can find time to speak to Jim Lesar, me or both it could be helpful all around. I am looking ahead to another effort to nullify the Act. I believe this record is of considerable relevance to the Senator's bill for honesty in government. I'll be in D.C. again on the 14, to conduct a seminar that evening.

Do not misunderstand me on a Congressional investigation. My ~~first~~ ^{first} book, completed 2/15/65, calls for one. Through a friend then a Member of the House Judiciary committee I tried to interest M. J. Celler in one. It could be the best possible approach. I have no reason to believe this will be true of the House operation and I have troubling fears that it cannot be true of this one.

Perhaps the best way to make this comprehensible without writing you a book is to recount my own history on this for the past year and a half.

Very early last year it appeared probable to me that such an investigation was probable. I therefore used the occasion of a speech at N.Y.U. Law School as part of an effort to persuade the irrati^onals and self-seekers who get most of the public attention to become responsible and honest. As was almost certain, these strange ones being like leopard spots, it failed. Thereafter I remained off the Hill except in response to invitation. These came from a Member of the Church committee and his nominee on it, from Schweiker after he had his subcommittee, and from several in the House, through their staffs. It included a position paper for several in the House about May or June of last year and one for Downing the night the Rules committee in the House acted.

To date, in varying degrees, all these things have been disinformation operations.

It is not possible for me to compete with the nuts and self-seekers. I've had to give the effort up. I tried with Schweiker when I could not walk from the thrombophlebitis I learned about at the end of the morning I spent with him and with the staff director of a House subcommittee who was so anxious to get my advice he insisted on driving me to the Washington hospital. That subcommittee did not fail. It merely accomplished much less than was possible. I am inclined to believe the responsibility for this does not lie with the staff.

It is much safer to judge a book by its cover than to take those who received all the attention on political assassinations by their press or self-representations. Those who are dependable in any degree are extremely rare, largely unknown to the Congress except through the poisonous representations of the pot-boilers. On the subject, meaning both command of fact and solid judgement, there are only two others of whom I can speak with unstinting praise, Howard Roffman, a brilliant last-year law student and Jim Lesar. There are a few others with good command of the fact that has been developed. In all cases I have found their judgement, especially their political judgement, serious^{ly} flawed, not uncommonly very bad and dangerous.

None of us was consulted when consultation meant anything except that I was by Schweiker early last October. He heeded no cautions and went ahead and committed the easily and accurately predicted mistakes. His report is rubbish. Worse, it was a job for Ford.

I had one call from a Gonzalez staffer, one who lives not far from here and was coming to see me. In four or five months it did not happen. Gonzalez has been dealing with the most extreme of the irrationals. He has done many foolish things, beginning about an hour after the assassination, of which he was a witness.

If I have no reason to doubt any Congressional attentions, all the other records are as unpromising as Gonzalez'. Downing has been insane, dedicated to an obvious fabrication and its manufacturer, a bad one named Morrow. His book is an incompetent fraud. It is also the basis of Downing's presentation to the Rules committee.

What seems to have been decisive is a Mark Lane-Abby Mann operation through and with Fauntroy. Perhaps less significant is the total dishonesty of what they did. It was low-grade thievery. The result, when they embellished, is a very serious misrepresentation and deception. Stripped of the verbiage and obfuscation it is that the FBI killed Dr. King. There has been four internal D.J. investigations on or including this diversion. Each is keyed in time to what I was doing, generally in court. So the FBI will be well prepared to blow that nonsense apart.

In all of these manoeuverings I have not heard a single word about any opposition from the executive agencies, particularly not by the FBI and CIA. Because I did not expect any I did make inquiry. There appears to have been none, according to ~~some~~ someone very close to Downing. I wanted to know this because I have believed all along that these agencies want an irresponsible inquiry, because they are more than content with what Schweiker did.

As of now, now including the first thing the new committee counsel did, I have no reason to expect anything as worthwhile as a new study group, little value as I think that could have. The first thing Sprague did is write Dallas and Memphis authorities asking if he can depend on their cooperation. I believe they are four-square against sin and for motherhood and that they will hasten to give this assurance in writing. If they needed any warnings, which they didn't, they have a warning instead of subpoenas. With all except the Dallas District Attorney I'm quite serious about this. If all the records had not already disappeared more surely will now. Especially in Memphis, where there is a culpability other than the one with which Fauntroy was deceived.

If there is anything you would like of me, please let me know. I have made an effort to at least direct the committee properly. I do not expect it to pay much attention to what I regard as the responsible approaches and needs.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg