

July 16, 1976

Bud Fensterwald
910 16th St. NW
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Bud,

I just thought I should drop you a line to report that very little is happening out here either (since the Schweiker Report came out). George mentioned that you had a CTIA meeting right after the release, and that the consensus was that there was nothing that needed to be done immediately, and that you would probably let things ride a bit.

There seems to have been relatively little interest in the press. Apparently Time and Newsweek skipped the story entirely. I have heard of a Detroit News story indicating that LBJ's suspicions of CIA involvement were deleted from the report. (I'm suspicious of this story - a possible FBI plant?) Newhouse News Service did a piece recounting what the SR had on the 1963 raids involving "A" and "B", and I am told that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch did a piece after talking with "B," who obviously was Rich Lauchli. Also, there was the Sturgis story about Ruby and Castro - very interesting, what kind of funny business is going on.

I taped some of the initial radio-TV coverage (some of which was strikingly bad), and Lifton sent me a tape of an L.A. radio interview with Gary Hart, and most of the PBS show (MacNeil Report) with Morgan, Horrock, and Phillips. I can send these transcripts, if you are interested. Generally, the press response to the SR has been so unimpressive that I am not inclined to try to get any goodies relating to the SR to the press now. Russ, Peter, and I are working on putting together a fairly long analysis of the SR, with annotations, extra documents, etc., for possible publication.

Overall, my feeling is that the SR is much better than it might have been on the Cuban Connection. Given all the temptations, this could have been handled in a really irresponsible manner. It could have been done better, of course, but given my initial impressions from the press reports, I think that the SR is about as good as could have been expected. It is really quite weak, however, on the Warren Commission's role in the coverup, and the Commission's perception of their relationship with the FBI and CIA. It is not good at all on the substance of the FBI's handling of the Oswald case, especially (as the AIB position paper points out) on the informant question. By skipping over the basic issues of Oswald's guilt, the DPD reaction, etc., the report makes it impossible for the reader who is not familiar with the case to put the Castro angle in context. The strongest part of the report is the exposure of the fears and suspicions behind the original Federal coverup.

One thing we have been trying to do is fill in some of the deleted names. We know "B-1" (Arttime) and "B" (Lauchli), but not "A", who was apparently mentioned prominently in the Garrison investigation. The AIB says the Washington lawyer is Edward P. Morgan, who is mentioned in another context in the earlier assassination report; can you confirm this? I have identified the Cuban-American from Tampa; the WC was told of his departure to Havana on a "special plane." I'm also interested in the omission of the RFK-LBJ angle (and the actual Pearson columns) from Ch. V.B. (Cf. pp. 487-9 of our anthology.)

I have just heard from the CIA that they are "re-reviewing" the documents involved in your suit, and that they expect more stuff to be released. I suspect there will be some real nuggets - let's keep in touch on that.

Sincerely,
Paul
PLH