tenstervored plone interven Fred Sayle 4:10 pm Junday 11/21/71 Jolo- What's hypered in ge since you have ? B - Here hopep 1 and Och Ree X Aph lat Now Clear, don't crist or com't Shows to anyone - Eyst Buche Marshel Sofn he has chosen not exercise his discret A much Quinent patholynos home Species long in advance ung zanne Undo WR 12 × Puller is get anyme in suttenty do my Sont put road blocks in my

30 September 1971

Mr Jim Lesar CTIA 927 15th Street NW Washington L.C. 20005

Dear Jim,

Thanks for your letter of the 27th. Yes, certainly, you may feel free to circulate copies of my letter to Belin. Enclosed is a copy of his reply, and my further rejeinder to him.

I new have a large supply of copies of <u>The Texas Observer</u> issue of 13 August 1971 with the Givens article, the Belin "reply", and the editorial. If you would like a dozen copies or so, just let me know.

It is interesting that you and I had such differing impressions of RFK's reaction to questions about the Warren Report in California. I can agree that he was shaken, but I saw anger rather than fear, as well as discain, irritation, or impatience. As to why he might have had such a reaction (as the one that I postulate), one cannot really be sure but I do suspect that his contempt for Garrison and for Mark Lane (who had suggested in an article in the LA Free Press that an RFK plet against Castre might have beeneranged and led to the assassination of JFK --if my recollection is correct) colored his view and pushed him toward the WR as the lesser of two obscenities. But of course this is only guesswork on my part. (You will recall that RFK refused to visit New Orleans for campaigning purposes unless he received a guarantee that he would not be subpensed er etherwise harrassed by Garrison.)

With best personal regards,

Sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher 302 West 12 St NYC NY 10014

Enclesures: 2

BERNARD FENSTERWALD, JR. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

ROBERT SMITH DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH

> JAMES LESAR COUNSEL

## COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE

ASSASSINATIONS 927 15th street, N. W. WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005 (202) 347-3837

Sept. 27, 1971

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RICHARD BILLINGS, WASHINGTON, D. C. FRED COOK, INTERLAKEN, NEW JERSEY HAL DORLAND, WASHINGTON, D. C. JOHN HENRY FAILK, AUSTIN, TEXAS BERNARD FENSTERWALD, JR., WASHINGTON, D. C. MARY FERRELL, DALLAS, TEXAS PARIS FLAMMONDE, NEW YORK, N. Y. JAMES LESAR, WASHINGTON, D. C. RICHARD POPKIN, LA JOLLA, CALIF. L. FLETCHER FROUTY, WASHINGTON, D. C. RICHARD SPRAGUE, HARTSDALE, N. Y. LLOYD TUPLING, WASHINGTON, D. C. WILLIAM TURNER, MILL YALLEY, CALIF.

Dear Sylvia,

Please forgive me for being so tardy in responding to you last letters. I did receive a copy of the letter you sent which initially gave the Committee permission to reprint the Givens article. I'm sorry that permission has been retracted, but understand the reasons.

By the way, may I send copies of your personal letter to Belin re his Texas <u>Observer</u> snake-out to others? At the moment I have in mind two highly reliable friends of mine, Prof. David Wrone, who teaches history at Stevens Point State University in Wisconsin, and Dick Ehlke, a third year law student at the University of Wisconsin---Madison.

Thank you for sending the issues of  $\underline{\text{TMO}}$ . I made copies of them for the Committee's files. I believe I have in my personal library nearly all of the back issues of  $\underline{\text{TMO}}$  containing assassination articles, as I was a subscriber from about 1963 until the dateof its demise and generally kept all back issues. However, should take the time to go back over them, as I have forgotten much of what was in them in the interval.

Several people have now pointed out to us a number of factual or interpretative errors in the first <u>Sputnik</u> article, and I thank you for calling attention to some additional ones. The second installment of that article suggests that Garrison was probably the source for much of it.

I'm not at all sure what to make of **the** RFK's remarks in California vouching for the Warren Report. I saw television films of that incident. There is no doubt that he lied about reading all the documents in the Archives. Apart from that, my recollection" **differs** differs from yours, in that I do not recall that he "angrily and adamantly vouched" for the Warren Report; rather, I was struck with an impression that he was terribly shaken, frightened visibly, at having to answer the students' question. But why?

I recently came across a list of names which crop up in the declassified CD 355. Apparently a copy was to have been sent you several months ago but got mislaid. I've sent it along with you <u>TMOs</u> and the <u>Sputnik</u> article.

Best regards,

70 Jim

BF very Smiple, Flor. 2 Some = 3nd one permit becidents Lallen that's more Scorry Sales file adving EMK BE yes unurse 4 him to per Beline very prompt grap behand Dollars, the other, myto, we don't know Jales the you Bud. # #