

I'll be providing a copy of what, much to my surprise, is the lead story on the front page of our local morning paper. It was not on my initiative and it is fairly certain from the time I was called that the front page was remade to give it this play. It was after dark when a reporter I've never spoken to called.

We have two local papers of common, conservative ownership. A friend, who is on vacation, edits the afternoon paper. I don't know who edits the morning Post.

This young reporter phoned me and said he had been asked by his editor to see if I would make any comment on the report. I gather and I think he gathered that what they were looking for was a paragraph or two to add to the wire copy.

I had just begun to read the press copy of the report. I was outraged. Perhaps by then I had read 2-3 pages at most. I've read only the first 20 all together, in three brief readings and extensive annotations.

The account is faithful and understated. The quotes are close enough if not precise. It was impossible for them to be precise because my feelings gushed after eruption.

He could not include all. Late as he phoned for a morning paper we must have talked an hour. (It turns out he is the one who worked on the Olson story. He has his own suspicions and regrets the size of the local papers precluded the cost of the investigation he would have liked to have made.)

Of the other things I said one he did not use may interest you: that this report is unfair to the FBI and the CIA, for all their abuses and violations of law and coverings-up. It blames them not only for their own sins but for all of the failings of the Warren Commission and its lawyers.

I also told him that in terms of the assassination itself, as distinguished from suggestoons of a conspiracy, this report is totally irrelevant without a fixed and positive identification of the assassin(s).

It therefore assumes Oswald's guilt and pretends relevance of what without Oswald's guilt and without the certainty of a conspiracy is not relevant.

Before seeing this story I wrote my Senator, Mathias, who was on the Church committee, a letter about it and suggesting that he respond to any questions by saying he was not on that subcommittee and has no personal knowledge of its work.

Because my phone stayed so busy the night of the report, exceptionally busy, I don't know how many people tried to call me and could not reach me. Actually I had not expected any calls. But for all the phone traffic I did a talk show to Pittsburgh and a new interview to a Chicago clear-channel station, aired live and taped.

There have been personal calls from Maine to Florida, from doubters and the uncertain. But, as I expected, none from the major press or electronic media.

Today's WxPost has no second-day story. It does have a story about possible prosecution of FBI burglars that was on the wire in ample time for use yesterday. It did not use this story yesterday although it was on night before's evening TV net news.

From reading perhaps a fifth or less of the report I believe Lardner's WxPost story of yesterday is a fair one on this report, it it asks no questions and reflects no solicitation of any outside view from any side.

Actually, Schweiker fell for the bait the CIA gave the Rockefeller Commission. Of what Lardner reports on the mysterious plane delay, I have and have read that in the masked CIA original report. I suspect Amlash is of this nature, too.

As far as I have read there are basic and disqualifying factual errors and omissions. One example: Oswald, Bringuier and the date. Another on this alone is what Oswald was really doing. I have the suppressed proofs in my position, oddly enough because of Codename WALF, represented to me by WALF as CIA and known to me to have then been a Narcfink. (For PW: this is a minor part of what I suggested could make both a delightful spoof of all James Bond type movies and one of social usefulness.)