

5/27/76

Senator Richard Schweiker
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dick,

Whether or not George Gardner's story in today's Post is full or entirely faithful I do not know. I do know that I read it with a sense of *deja vu* and on this aspect not for the first time.

The words attributed to Senator Tower and the uncertainties of Senator Huddleston are close to exactly those of the caution I addressed to you last October.

You are an independent-minded man. So I would press upon you Santayana's wisdom about reliving the past if we do not learn from it.

Much of the public attention to your subcommittee's work also took the form I predicted in telling you that the major media would have to be addressed and it could be only with definitive evidence proving the entire official solution to be wrong. If in the end this is to be what Senator Towers says, "more questions than answers," the country will suffer more uncertainty and unease and there may well be still another whitewash as well as continuing coverup.

I was in federal court in D.C. Tuesday. This first status call on that case went very well. I think it is possible more suppressed material may be released. I saw Bud Fensterwald then. He said you had been refused membership on the new intelligence committee. With all the work you've done I suspect this is precisely because you are of independent mind. But it also can be taken as a reading on how this new committee will work if a man like you is not acceptable. I hope I'm wrong.

From what I've seen and heard of what is public your subcommittee's report is not going to address the basic official conclusions. There is some opposition anyway. Except for your doubts that were not in the papers I saw when Senator Hart endorsed these wrongful conclusions I have seen nothing as the consequence of your committee's work that does not endorse these conclusions. I continue to believe that within this doctrine at most only the most limited national good can be accomplished, far less than the country needs.

So I again suggest the hip-and-thigh approach I first suggested to you, prior to the submission of your report. This is your best shot, I believe, at reducing opposition to your report and objectives. You can do this in a speech. There is more than enough in documentary form in Post Mortem alone for a simple approach, the basic evidence in a homicide. In giving away what it cost so much in time and money to develop and when I'm far from recovering the mechanical costs of the book alone, when in addition even if attention were to be directed to it it would do me no good because it is not in bookstores, I hope you can see I'm not being selfish in this recommendation.

If you give Senator Huddleston the executive session of January 22 (and I'd use it in a speech, too) I think you can resolve his doubts. There was no Commission innocence on the question of conspiracy.

I am letting the National Enquirer have some unpublished material I do not want jumped. They wanted an opinion to quote. I recommended you as an honorable man who would not jump them and me on this. You may have heard from them before you receive this.

Their man was here when there was some attention to Earl Gols' story on what you were doing and planned. I was confident it was inaccurate. I suggested to him that he consult your office on this. As a result ¹roy Gustafson made the statement that did correct this. I know of its use on the UBI B wire only.

In calling these two illustrations to your attention I hope you can perhaps see that in none of what I say and encourage am I being negative.

I also go back to what I said and confessed at the same time last October. ¹t takes years of concentrated work to begin to understand all the fact available and all the "Through the Lookingglass" operations. This was not then nor is it now a claim to infallibility. The disinformation aspects were several years beginning to get through in my own thinking when I worked on this full-time, very long days, too. I made mistakes in thinking past which I was trying to guide you. I'll stack the subsequent record on judgement and the entire record on fact against any other. It is the result of these experiences I was then trying to give you as it is the same basic approach I now urge on you so that you may accomplish all that still can be.

In the months ahead there will be much I can give you if you want it. My work continues to be productive, I think. There may be occasion for your presenting evidence to the committee from which the leadership appears to have wanted to exclude you.

Whatever your course, I do hope it works out to be the best for the country. Young people in particular urgently need reason to have some faith in our basic institutions.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Potentially Explosive

Intelligence Unit Votes To Release JFK Report

5/27/76 By George Lardner Jr.
Washington Post Staff Writer

The Senate intelligence committee voted 8 to 12 yesterday to make public a potentially explosive report on the investigation of President John F. Kennedy's assassination.

Vice Chairman John G. Tower (R-Tex.) said the committee provided for a waiting period in case last-minute misgivings should build up, but he said he doubted that the decision would be reversed.

The report, 172 typewritten pages in draft form, is expected to provide strong impetus for a new congressional inquiry into the assassination because the the gaps and shortcomings in the work done by the Warren Commission.

Tower said he voted against releasing the report because he felt it would "raise more questions than answers." He said he was afraid the study might simply rekindle the long-standing controversy over the Warren Commission's findings without offering much hope that the issues will ever be definitively settled.

"I don't think the Warren Commission was wrong about who pulled the trigger," Tower said. But he added that "there are questions . . . very legitimate questions" that the select committee's own limited investigation have raised.

The other dissenting vote came from Sen. Barry M. Goldwater (R-Ariz.).

Several sources said the report would prove startling and will include information about Lee Harvey Oswald and others that should have been pursued, but instead went ignored.

The committee discussed the issue at a closed-door session yesterday morning that was billed as its final session. The members

agreed that their decision would not be considered final until 5 p.m. Friday—in case a majority, after reading the draft report, should change their minds and want to suppress it.

Tower said the committee also decided to turn over "certain files pertaining to Indian matters" to the Senate Indian Affairs Subcommittee, headed by Sen. James Abourezk (D-S.D.). But Tower declined to say whether they concerned recent reports and allegations of FBI misconduct at Wounded Knee, S.D.

Sen. Richard S. Schweiker (R-Pa.) said it will be about two weeks before the Kennedy assassination report can be made public. He said some of the agents named in the draft report are still "working under aliases" and covers, and their names will be deleted from the published report.

The committee had already endorsed a continuation of the Kennedy assassination investigation by the new permanent Intelligence Committee that was established last week.

It will be headed by Sen. Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii), who sat in yesterday on the select committee's session.

Sen. Walter (Dee) Huddleston (D-Ky.), who was named to the new 15-member committee after serving on the temporary panel, said he felt there were, at least, "some loose ends to run down".

He said that he was not ready to say the Warren Commission was "wrong in its conclusions." But, he said, it is clear by now that the commission's rejection of any conspiracy was a conclusion "they made without having all the information they should have had."