

The Schweiker investigation and its demon investigators HW 6/26/76

For months I have been hearing rumors of the odd assortment of self-conceived Sherlock Holmes and Sam Spades working as Schweiker volunteers.

The one representation of this nature Schweiker made to me, of his consultation with Meagher, she says is without basis. My recollection of what she told me the end of April is that she had heard from him but once, wither a letter or a call.

Now that the report is out I'll be more interested in his "helpers." The report shows clearly why he misled me into believing he'd want my help: he wanted to know the problems he'd face in pursuing his own special corruption of my work (he referred to four "theories") and whether he could get any help from me. When he learned I would not do what I regard as irresponsible he had no further interest. If Sylvia did not tell him she would not go for the line he took, an intelligent reading of her work certainly would have.

He has called authentic paranoids without bothering to get a reading, as Pena, who is in my work only and is a friend. He has read the Warren report without bothering to read the relevant exhibits and thus has made serious factual errors where the error is essential to the Report and to Schweiker's own wrong-headedness. He actually bases much of his so-called case on false swearing, I think perjury, by Bringuier. In this particular instance the combination of offenses is greater because Liebler edited a transcript of testimony by a relevant witness to provide a quotable falsehood to hide the truth that Liebler among others knew. This editing did provide the entire basis for the falsehood in the report that became the basic falsehood on which Schweiker's report builds that part of its case, Oswald's alleged connection with right-wing Cubans.

Bud Fensterwald, assisted by one Stone from Dallas, unknown to me, interviewed Gaudet. I have read the transcript. Between them they hadn't the slightest idea what to ask Gaudet about, uncritically accepted his blatant lies and were off on the wrong line. Stone once in a while got close to something only to be interrupted by Bud, whose lawyer's notion of a real interrogation is to make speeches. He even cut Gaudet off when Gaudet seemed to be leading to something that could have had meaning to make other speeches.

There can be a legitimacy in this kind of approach if it is to serve another end. In this case there was not and could not have been this purpose. One illustration of how this friendly, conversational method can be used is my long interviews with Hall et al. My purpose was to turn them on and get them to go to New Orleans before I knew that was the seat of incompetence.

The result was babbling. The result also is that Gaudet provided real leads for further questioning that were not followed.

Last night I got another report on another of Schweiker's Hercule Poirots, Fonzi, Salandria's friend. Whether or not he still is, Fonzi was editor of Greater Philadelphia, an influential magazine where any Republican needs help, Democratic Philadelphia. Fonzi and Salandria between them are responsible for two of the larger earlier diversions, the nonsense that Conally could not have been hit until Z287 and the Vaganov-assassin crap.

Jon Newhall says that Fonzi is mysteriously representing himself as off on secret investigations for Schweiker. From what Jon says it is more nonsense, at best tanglements if there is any reality.

There are reports of mysterious exploits in Miami, too, for Schweiker. Coinciding with this someone is trying to sell Fiorini-Sturgis to the National Enquirer, which checked with me yesterday.