

Meeting with Senator Schweiker and Legal Counsel Dave Marston @ 10/10/75

Whether others inspired it or not, Bud, who intended to, had not. S had copies of On in NO and F-U on his desk.

He appears to be a straightforward man. He asked me to shoot down and I did, from his approach to what he believed and who he trusted. He appeared to welcome this. I told him that while I did not know what he'd heard of me and didn't care I can be blunt and I feel I owe him directness. He said he wanted this. (What else?)

He was going off on four conspiracy theories. I told him they all four come from my work, all should at some point be investigated, and now ought have lowest priority. Instead I suggested that he take a two-step approach: use enough solid, irrefutable and important evidence to get a real and separate investigation authorized and in doing this eliminate the opposition he could expect from a theoretical approach from his colleagues and the major media; and then have a real investigation. Meanwhile, be cool, work as I suggested and serve all the broadest subpoenas possible. On all the investigative and intelligence agencies possible while he has this power.

I told him if he could wait a few weeks I'd give him the package he needs and it will be documented. I showed him samples and he was impressed. I think it sold him. I am confident the political approach of caution and building bridges and making opposition difficult if not impossible appeals to him and he'll do it.

He assured me he'd protect me on the book, which is all I asked. I explained it was not entirely personal, although I did have problems with the stuff being ripped off. It is because one-shot or out-of-context use could dull the impact.

He and Marston saw some of the Burkley stuff. Only what I selected of what it had not been possible to refile. I wasn't able to get stuff from files.

We spent more than an hour together and then broke off because I had to go to the doctor. I suggested that the next step should be to seek my representations out. He said he had confidence. I said I appreciated this but feel he should make no exceptions because anyone can err and because there can be political problems. On the latter he has none. He is a maverick and says so. That the party opposed his nomination once organized labor endorsed him and that Specter personally contributed to his opponent. Then phoned him to seek support of the Carswell nomination! On the former I told him I have an unclear copy of the text and a clear xerox of the well-annotated appendix and will have not the best proofs in a week. So, they will come up here to see of his idea, provide me with transportation to and from his office. I said I could use my car but merely made no unnecessary use. They insisted. In fact, Marston took me to the doctor and if a staffer with whom he wanted me to talk had not been at the CIA would have waited, talked, and taken me back to their offices. (The federal agencies are giving them the same Nosenko line Crewdson talked about.)

I suggested that they make all their requests and get all their don't haves in writing but in each case insist that he who writes and says also assure that he has first-person knowledge. After explaining that the key to understanding is to assume that there was a disinvestigation (explained in detail) he should also understand that it is a standard to device to search the wrong files and have the wrong person execute a n affidavit. I told him the record I had built on this would at some point help him with live witnesses.

On this I said that at the appropriate time I would recommend that he take joint, sworn testimony from me and federal agents, one at a time, beginning with Frazier. I assured him that Frazier would break it open if the use of FM doesn't or will give him a solid case of perjury, which could launch him well.

What turned him on after years of not questioning the report was shock at learning under oath that there really was a CIA-Mafia contract for \$100,000 on Castro.

He asked me about a few of the other critics (not Lane or Bud. I volunteered about Bud when Marston asked me while driving me to doctor.) I told him Hoch is a meticulous researcher who is Prussian-minded, has done stupid things, keeps the worst of company and had bad political judgement. I encouraged him to depend as an alternative on Howard, explaining our relationship. Specifically I said that they should want documents from my files and if I do not find them we can make a list of them and if we pick a holiday period maybe Howard can fly up. I emphasized that on balance Howard is by far the best on the JFK assassination and on FOIA and "Inf Lesar is and that neither has the liabilities others do. More on Howard while driving to the doctor with Marston.

They had been given some material in confidence they asked me to look at in confidence. I laughed and told them that with one possible exception, a document I didn't remember for sure and a picture of an area of which I was not certain I could provide better copies and documents not supplied them that are relevant. But that it is not and never has been secret and in part was published.

His conspiracy interests were Lake Pontchartrain camps, Odio story, Milteer another I do not recall. (made no notes.) I addressed each and told him that the Milteer one, in time, could lead to the story of the B'ham church and the lack of the necessary investigation. He, too, had been taken by the accuracy of what later was the official explanation of the assassination in this tape. I told him each was in time worthy of investigation but not backburger and he agreed. I also told him I could add to all. I also suggested that in taking the approach of first proving the need for an investigation with evidence that proved there had been at least one conspiracy the investigation itself could explore all and might find a more significant one. (Some talk on Tippit and Ruby.)

I said his present committee had powers that need not be added to and that there need be no problem if Church decides to run and gets out. That this committee and its staff has received education and information invaluable in a JFK (or other) investigation and ought be the one to do it -after this one is over. I said I believe there has been a conscious effort to dilute what it can do and what its immediate obligation is is a serious one and ought be met to the degree possible but that steps should be taken to avoid any memory-holing and there should be a determination to punish any who might do this.

The question of who killed JFK: I said that while I had as much interest as the next in knowing my approach had never been "Who Killed Kennedy" but the consequences. He seems at least now to agree.

(If there is a continuation of this committee for this purpose, Hart would become chairman. He has terminal cancer. If he were to elect not to take the job it would fall to Mondale, who would be good.. A Church replacement would go to the tail, end.)

Marston had suspicions about Jones Harris I was glad to confirm and to which I added a few details.

Someone has come. Must stop.