Dear Jim, Schweiker/Church Report 6/26/76

Thanks to mowing I've finished the text of the report. I have the 20 pages of appendix to read but the night light is not good enough for me on footnotes so I've laid it aside. I'll finish it during rests from physical work, perhaps tomorrow.

Appreciate your concern about the work I do. I do not think I'm overdoing it and I do think it is good for me. And for what is wrong with me. I come in, hot, sweaty and pooper, strip down to the supports, and do I love to see that red in those toes, the only part of the thigh-leg-foot that shows below the crotch.

I always did enjoy physical work, except for sweat getting on the eye glasses. Hot days I use a large, old-fashioned bandana around the head. Pick up most of it. Aside from this I also enjoy the sweating. So it was a good day and I can use some. Thanks to Paul E's making a decent riding mower possible I caught up on all I could do with it except a little near the pond first thing, soon as the dew was off the grass. That isn't hard and I'm careful not to go too fast and bounce too hard. I'm careful other ways, too. Low gear on the hillsides, which are steep.

After a rest and X instead of lunch I went out back where it is densely overgrown at with an old walking push mower assaulted that, close to an hour. Man, weeds five and more feet high, but I whomped 'em down. I have not yet been able to liberate all I had freed from those repressive influnces before I got sick. But I'm after 'em.

These bouts are physically tiring because they are hard work and because I'm out of shape. Otherwise, when I'm as careful as I can be, I really do think they are good for me. The first hand job was a little much, physically, not medically. I could barely pull the faithful old gadget back up the hill. But I did, stripped, sweated about 15 minutes while resting until I thought I could wear glasses again and then read while I continued to sweat and sip cool drinks. Each time after I cooled off I washed and took a cooling dip then returned to reading and annotating. I went out the second time after you phoned.

I do have to get all those seeding weeds and the proliferating poison down, so I do it. And I still begin with a good walk after breakfast.

Don't worry. The only real problem is stones. They work up and sometimes Lil is a bit careless with them as she gardens. They can become projectiles so I'm as alert to them as possible. The exertion itself is fine medicine and great for the mind. It is even a good feeling being able to get the wildness back under control. I've enough mowed now so Floyd can pitch his tent next week. He, Scott, Kin and Lila are coming for a private and appropriate Bicentennial celebration. As it now stands Lila will go to Floyd's Wednesday, Kim will spend Wednesday night here, driving in from Erie, she and I will drive to the hearing Thursday and return with Lila. Floyd and Scott are coming Friday. Floyd will return to DC, I suppose with some or all the others, in time for the official fireworks, so he'll have both celebrations. (Scott could not come today to put more enamel on the card-file cabinet. He had to clean the family garage, flooded and muddied. He says and I believe much work.

I'll get on the other work in the morning. If it doesn't rain tonight I'll also do more of this mowing, until I'm caught up. I'm too tired physically for it tonight. I plan to do an off-the-top affidavit first, in support of the old Hue motion. I've been thinking about it.

Back to Schweiker: I have no ready explanation and can't say I perceive or can even attribute motive to what is in every way a very bad job. It is entirely without factual foundation but is jazzed up with direct quotations and numerous footnotes. The problem with these is that of the report itself it is relevant to nothing, based on nothing - not even a reasonably-based suspicion; and is so excessive and unfounded it becomes very unfair to the FBI and CIA, the only spookeries mentioned at all.

It is consistent with what Schweiker has been saying publicly but there also has

never- anywhere- been any foundation for that. You know the line, the Oswald pro- and anti-Castro connections were not investigated and should have been; and that there may have been a Castro kickback. (This is why they were so dishonest with the reference to Jean Daniel.)

What is the proof Oswald was pro-Castro and had good, solid pro-Castro connections? They cite no proof. They merely decalre he was connected with the FPCC. And how was he simultaneously anti-Castro? (Here their ignorance hurt them.) His "connection" with Bringuier. He went there and this makes a solid connection. To them. Even the WC didn't dare that one. But they did dare corrupting the record, so Schweiker accepts and uses uncritically their corrupted version which I ll have in detail and facsimile in Agent Oswald. Actually, Oswald played games with Bringuier (why they suppress the CIA admission that he was one of them you can guess as well as I, but they do suppress it and they had that file as I do.) Their nothing case still would have been nothing but it would have appeared to be better if they used this as a proof LHO was pro-Castro, which fits their kickback scheme better.

The first page tells all: they assume the entire Warren Report, an essential for the writing of this kind of report. They do not question Oswald's guilt, did not look at any evidence although their madate did include it, and then then make it up as they go. The citations are not relevant so it remains a made-up propaganda the only beneficiaries of which are the spookeries. Even their criticisms are not substantial on unhurried reading. The excuses they received are logical and reasonable: there was no reason to look into any of that. The fact is the only relevance had to come from an entirely different assumption: LHO was an agent.

There is slight value in some of the quotes from the agencies' internal papers. As you know by now when I got to p. 6 I filed an FOIA request for the CIA's 1967 review, the timing of which is exquisite. It came when I had O in NO about completed, right after WWII and just when Garrison was about to say "CIA". They know so little of the La. stuff, for all their expert "critic" help (includes Weberman, I forgot to tell you) they have only one camp and place it repeatedly and undeviatingly inside New Orleans.

They were not able to make out a case for even reasonable suspicion for AMLASH and unthinkly destroy their conjectures on this by the admission or other plots, before and after. The record of them McGovern brought back is dismissed in a destructive footnote. But it is not the only admission of before and after plots, so what makes this non-attempt special?

They hide virtually all names and virtually all are non-secret. They do account for more CIA analysts, by number, than have surfaced in the Archives material I have/ have read. Ditto with all the FBI agents. They appear to have swallowed the Rocca-for-Belin bat es all the way to the pole. Where they quote (self-servingly both ways) some formerWCcounsel, they invariably use those who did not work in the areas discussed. Libeler and Jenner, on this the two most important, are never mentioned, by name or role.

With this for openers (and my annotations are extensive) do you think it is worth your time to read? I don't. Having it is something else

They don't even have a conclusion or build to one. Obviouslt they can't. Simple way to avoid it: just peter out near cloud 9.

It is even more unfair to the agencies than I told the local paper, which did not use that. On the way to dropping dead, factually if not on TV, they didn t evenget around to mentioning any "back channel." Their use of the 1967 leak to Pearson is self-destructive. Inless Maheu and either Rosselli or Giancana had the same lawyer there is something funny about this on that count alone. But when they criticize the FBI and CIA for leaking out the lawyer's unsubstantial claims, like his clients had someone with Castro, they admit in a footnote that all three claimed no recollection of saying it. Guess who launched that one during Garrison's early appeal and attention?

They can't even spell names ("Atwood" for Attwood.) The play for real the masked CIA invention with Guitterez Diaz, "D". After the name is known. Ditto for Nosenko, the thrust of whose evidence is suppressed. Hacth. Otherwise, no report, huh? Hastily,