

1/20/76

Mr. Tom Susman, Counsel
Administrative Practices Subcommittee
United States Senate
Washington, D.C.

Dear Tom,

You may not be in a position to do anything, you may not want to do anything but I feel I have the obligation to inform you to the limited degree I can with this carbon of my today's letter to Tip O'Neill.

A much greater tragedy than the one I predicted now appears certain.

Today's paper forecasts the completion of action a week from yesterday. Not much time, especially when I cannot go to Washington and knock on doors. I will serve anyone who wants to listen to the degree I can.

What is now certain is that the executive agencies with so much to hide have been able to manipulate the House's Frankenstein at will and without any reasonable doubt will continue to be able to.

It is also clear that the committee has begun with these preconceptions of the past, the same assumptions in the absence of any investigation.

Yesterday's Anderson column about which I have written him through Les Whitten is a classic example of total incompetence indifference and ignorance. Where the content of the leak deals with reality it is old and in all cases published by me, hardly an "investigation" by the House. In one case these new sensations consist of a quotation of one of my 1967 books!

Its biggest sensation is an obvious impossibility, the alleged Oswald association with CIA agents in Dallas at a time he was not in Dallas and could not have been.

I cite these merely as readily available illustrations. But can you not ask yourself at least about minimal competence when after four months and all that money this committee is reduced in its report to the planted fabrications of officials with much to hide and in its effort to blackmail the House into continuing it it can add only published work and claims it as original investigations by it? Lesar will tell you that this follows immediately upon their obtaining that work from him.

Competence is only one of many questions, perhaps the least significant.

I am distressed that where details knowledge is not needed questions are not asked. The proposed budget for \$6.5 million works out to about \$100,000 per witness. They propose about 70 witnesses. So far they have not mentioned a single relevant one, either, except for one or two who may in the late days become relevant.

Please excuse the haste. All I can do is try to inform and alert.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg