

March 14, 1986

Dear Sylvia,

Thanks for your letter of 2/18. Interesting, the exchange you mentioned about the Rogers Commission. The first thing that led me to think they were serious was ~~that~~ that they weren't all lawyers. (Having Richard Feynman was the second - he's definitely a free ~~xxx~~ spirit.)

I wouldn't say that I expect that the JD will do anything about my letters, but it's a bit more than a pro forma approach - at least while they are still delaying an ~~affix~~ official response to the HSCA. I also sent copies to the FBI, on the theory that there is more likely to be someone there with the interest in, and authority ~~xxx~~ to look into, loose ends. (Well, more likely than it was before 1972, at least.) I like to believe that the fact that I don't get routine acknowledgements right away means that someone is thinking about who to send my letters to, at least. But no, I don't have any inside contacts there, ~~x~~ or any reason to believe that something is going on.

I didn't mention your Burkley questions in the EOC which I mailed out last week. Here are 5 pages of my further thoughts on the question of a "national security autopsy."

I was able to get Tony Summers interested enough to try to call Burkley the last time he was visiting me, but he couldn't reach him. The prospect of disproving Lifton does have a certain appeal for some people, and I think Tony felt that he owed me a favor. He doesn't claim to be up on the medical evidence, of course. Tony is now on his way back to the U.K., unfortunately, and has two other ~~highxxx~~ high-priority projects (one being the Marilyn Monroe paperback, the other being completely unrelated). I don't know if Hurt gave me ~~xxxx~~ Burkley's address in confidence, but if he'll give it to you, maybe you should just ~~x~~ call him yourself. I don't have any confidence in my own ability to work the phones. Robert Ranftel is getting to be a bit of an expert at it, however, and I've told him that he should call Burkley. I expect that Sylvia Chase is too tied up in her new job as a local anchor to get involved in a story without a S.F. focus. But I agree with you; let's pressure Burkley, if we can.

Your comments about a forthcoming Castro-and-the-Mafia book are particularly interesting in light of Hurt's apparent tendencies in that direction - not in the book, but after publication. If you can figure out some way to get the author's name in circulation, I would like to spread the rumor. (Of course, you can give my name to anyone who might be interested in contacting me.) I don't know if George Crile would now be considered as having good credentials, but his one-time co-author, Taylor Branch, would. (The Crile stuff about Castro and Trafficante, 5 HSCA 308, was pretty heavy.) Recently, a young college-student intern with some group linked to Stanton Evans contacted me and the AARC, pursuing the Castro-did-it hypothesis. Nothing got published, as far as I know, but he did some serious work - interviewing Mann, etc. As you know, I'm always worried that Ronnie "Ich bin ein Contra" Reagan will discover that Castro killed JFK as the troops are approaching Managua (or Havana).

Mike Ewing is thought to be working on the definitive Marcello-did-it book, but I don't think he believes Castro was behind it all. I wouldn't be totally surprised if he does, however.

I thought Jones believed the Japanese were behind it all!?

With best regards,

*Paul*