

Mr. Roger Feinman
CBS News- radio
524 W 57 St.,
NYC, NY 10019

7/4/76

Dear Roger,

This is prompted by a Mark Lane piece in something calling itself Newswork, published in Washington. Reading it increases the outrage that grew as I read the Schweiker report when it was issued.

What I will say is not new. I said it when interviewed by phone by a CBS-owned station the night of the day the report was issued.

This report is an indecency, a new imposition on the faith and trust of the American people that succeeds in what I would have once considered impossible, abusing the various federal police and intelligence agencies of which it mentions but two and omits one of the more important.

There is no way one who knows the subject can reject the certainty that this report is an essential to the Ford campaign, regardless of anyone's motive or intent. Intent is subjective. Fact is not. This report exculpates Ford, who was a member of the Warren Commission and then failed in his responsibilities, regardless of what one believes of that Commission's conclusions.

If you want, call me and I'll explain. Because at some time I may want to address this I'd appreciate from your files a non-secret item I heard reported on radio news but did not see in what I read. There came a time when the White House let it be known that Ford was considering Schweiker as a possible running mate.

I don't believe that 60 Minutes or anyone else would consider airing me in an attack on the report, including on details of fact as well as on doctrine, but I would be willing, knowing that it would cast me in the role of the agencies' defender. There ought to be a reasonable limit to that for which they can be blamed. The failures of the Warren Commission are not their fault, regardless of their stonewalling records.

The committee report circumvents this by an opening admission that amounts to a confession of total irrelevancy: it did not examine the Commission's conclusions or evidence. (I would add what the Commission deliberately ignored and this committee refused to accept.) This means it assumed the Commission's conclusions. As an example, without Oswald as the assassin, there could be no relevance in the report's pretended examination of his Cuban "connections." He really had none. To make this seem possible the committee unquestioningly repeated a basic factual error made possible by the alteration of a supposedly verbatim transcript of testimony.

It is all pretty disgusting, more so because Lane is now part of it and because there are virtually no reporters who are prepared to assess this kind of propaganda with a basis in fact.

Hastily,