

September 9, 1976

Dear Sylvia,

Thanks for your letter of the 20th. I'm afraid that there is not much to report from out here. Peter, Russ and I are still trying to put together some coherent commentary on the Schweiker Report. So far, the best I have been able to come up with is a couple of indexes - one for names, and one for sources (documents and testimony). Let me know if you could use a copy.

Enclosed is the best commentary I have seen on Schweiker's campaign. Doonesbury is always reliable.

Although I thought the Schweiker Report handled the Castro hypothesis about as well as could be expected, I am discouraged by what is happening now. Jack Anderson's columns today and two days ago are pushing the theory in a somewhat improved but very bad form. Today he said, as he did in 1967, that RFK was keeping tabs on the anti-Castro plot, referring specifically to RFK's reaction to the CIA briefing of May 7, 1962. The Church Committee Assassination Report established quite well that the CIA falsely told him that the Harvey-Roselli plot had been terminated, and that his reaction was to say that the CIA should not contact the Mafia again without prior consultation - quite different from Anderson's claim that he said they should not go ahead with the assassination plot without consulting him. It looks like someone in the CIA, probably Harvey, was trying to do a job on RFK, in 1967 if not in 1963, and that Anderson is carrying on now. The Schweiker Committee did very little to get to the bottom of this, and I doubt that anyone in the press is now interested in exposing their colleague.

Your information about Epstein's book is interesting. All I know is from two calls I got from his "research assistant" in February. I was told that the book was on the life of Oswald; he was supposed to come up to S.F. and talk with me, but didn't make it. I was asked about Oswald's fellow Marines, for suggestions on classified documents, etc. The assistant was interested in connections between Oswald and "something like the KGB, or Russian intelligence, or even American intelligence." (My emphasis.) I heard that he was asking one researcher how to contact DeMohrenschildt, and he refused to tell him. (I see that Random House reprinted a collection of ^{his} essays on the press, including the one which John Mitchell liked so much, proving that the Panthers really weren't being ~~xxxx~~ killed in quantity by the cops after all. You would think he would be embarrassed by that one!)

The CIA has released another batch of 900 pages, with the usual small percent of really good items. Enclosed is the most interesting single page (#173A), which reinforces the suspicions in my book (p. 467) that the CIA had oddly little contact with Oswald, given that his manuscript on Minsk was just the sort of thing they would be interested in.* We also know now that G. Walton Moore (p. 473) was in touch with DeM for the CIA, although they say not after 1961 (and, therefore, DeM must have been wrong about possibly asking him about Oswald.) DeM tried to join the CIA's predecessors in 1942, but was turned down; I wonder who he went to next?

I got these CIA documents from Bud, but I haven't heard anything else from him. I guess his book project is still going; all I know about it is that it will include some photos. I guess you saw Russell's piece in the Voice for 8/23; very interesting, especially in connection with the stories about Manuel Rodriguez Orcarberro, and the fact that Ellsworth was in the TSBD quite promptly. (24H320) On the basis of one call to Schweiker's office, he doesn't seem to have recovered yet. I wrote Senator Hart, and got a rather friendly but non-substantive reply. Abzug's committee seems to be interested in the CIA interception or non-interception of Oswald's mail, and they have published their hearings on the Archives (including testimony from Belin last November). All this adds up to not much happening, and no real prospects.

Sincerely,

Paul
PLH

*P.S.: The FBI memo quoted on p. 54 of the Schweiker Report can be most naturally read as meaning the FBI thought Oswald had been on an intelligence assignment for the U.S., not the Russians - note the use of "particularly ... definitely ... at that time."