

Dear Howard,

Hmh's 7/5/76 to you 8/20/76

This is a continuation of my earlier partial response to this mailing. Perhaps you know that I fit things twist and tween. Jim has just left after we worked on interrogatories in 1448, I'm having a cool drink and relaxing and then I'll still have time for all the mowing I should do before supper, with time to stop sweating before I wash and swim briefly. Howzat for figgurin?

Paul seems to have not as good a memory as I'd believed or not as good a filing system as that of which I was certain. Or is playing some kind of game with you. He knows the amount of work I did on the training camps, that they include exclusive interview (I learned in checking that the pictures the sheriff took for me have been stolen!) and that I sent him the names of all ten men arrested at what Garrison called the "Inute-man camp, probably over Lauchli. Lauchli I'm pretty sure is one of the ten.

He refers to "the Lacombe camp." There is no such thing. There was no camp inside Lacombe and there were four close enough to be identified by that little town. Aside from my work I think only two are known.

On his not having access to the Florida papers, I'm mystified. One of the group with which he was affiliated in the early days did a detailed study of papers, including the ~~XXXX~~ Miami papers, on Cuban activities. I gave it to Garrison to copy and did not get it back. I am not now certain of when it began, perhaps not until after 6/15/63, but he makes no reference to it at all. Even the Garrison-Watergate gang as a description is typically imprecise for Paul. As you may recall most of these people originated in my work, but not in this sense. And any Sturgis involvement in what Paul writes about is outside my knowledge or recollection.

However, when he talks of factual error in the Schweiker report he could and should have given you illustrations. They exist and are obvious. From what I sent him years ago I would have expected Paul to know this.

There can be a number of candidates for "A". In one sense Paneque did run the camp. I did send this to Paul years ago. However, the man in real charge was Rocardo Davis. I have a long phone interview, you may recall.

Paul's guess on Lauchli and Collinsville, Ill., is very good. I'm certain. That was another camp of the same period. Ten were arrested. We are using this in interrogatories, with all the names and others a bit of added detail on Davis, a real Watergate #connection."

There is a problem with Paneque. The Schweiker report described a "Cuban-American." I have no reason to believe Paneque was. Or Fernando Fernandez. Or Angel Vega. Or others. I believe there is a reference in the Schweiker report to the part of the US from which "A" stems. Well, Davis's father or Davis at a time his parents were not in Cuba stem from New Jersey, as I recall Elizabeth or near there. And Davis also worked for Jack Caulfield or his NYPD unit.

What I'm saying is that the letter of which you sent me a copy is not at all like the Paul I knew and trusted. (He does not know the Caulfield angle and I want nobody to.)

I don't know why and I don't want to try and figure it out. There are more important things. But I take this time so you can understand. By the way, I also gave him the unprinted appendix to O in NO which does include a fair amount on the camps.

A Univ. student who knew Shannon gave him Paul's memo that was such a gift to the Rockefeller Commission. This former student, Mark Ark Allen, was here Sunday and told me. He now regrets it. I had thought the memo was prepared for Congress. Allen confirms it. Imagine a Paul at one end and a Gregory-Schoenmann combo at the other setting all this up for Ford's Belin! However, I have enough to turn it around, given the attention. That I do not see. Which means I wait.

If I'm not mistaken Paul has the transcript of my Davis interview, that with his then temporary girl friend when he ordered the camp to break up-almost everything of that period of my work. So I have an uneasy feeling in reading what he sent you. Thanks for sending it. I'm making no distribution of it. Best,

July 5, 1976

Dear Howard,

There are lots of interesting things in the Schweiker Report, and one in particular has piqued my curiosity. I'm wondering if you have checked this out, or could do so easily.

A Cuban exile described as "A" appears at several points in the Report. On p. 12-13, he is described as one of 5 people detained but not arrested after the seizure of an airplane with explosives at Miami by Customs Agents on June 15, 1963. "A" also transported the dynamite which was seized at the famous Lacombe raid of July 31, 1963. The dynamite was purchased by "B", who is pretty clearly Rich Lauchli, one of the people reportedly arrested at Lacombe.

Then, in mid-1965, "A" turns up as a lifelong friend of AMLASH (Cubela), according to his claim, whose knowledge of the AMLASH operation caused the CIA to terminate it. (Pp. 78-9) (He was questioned in New York in June 1965.) FBI reports "detail his involvement with anti-Castro exiles and underworld figures who were operating" the Lacombe camp.

Finally, the Schweiker Report notes (p. 86) that a CIA analysis of "public allegations of conspiracy" (i.e., Garrison) in 1967 involved a name check on "A". (This name check should have but did not reveal the AMLASH connection.) This suggests that "A"'s name was given some public prominence by Garrison.

So, I think "A" would be a rather familiar figure if we knew his name, and we don't have quite enough information. I wonder if the Miami (or even Tampa, Gainesville, or N.O) newspapers would have detailed information about the June 1963 arrests, perhaps with names. There is a New York Times article of June 21, 1963 (p. 8) which reports the arrest on June 19 of 5 men, 4 of whom are members of the Intercontinental Penetration Force. That, of course, gets us back to the whole Garrison-Watergate gang: Sturgis, Patrick (Hemming), Paneque, Rorke, Davis, Hall-Howard-Seymour, and who knows who else! Despite the discrepancy in dates, it might be that this is the arrest referred to by the Schweiker Report. The Miami papers for the period after June 15 (which I don't have access to) might have the clues we need. If you do have a chance to check them, I would be interested in anything you come up with.

(My guess is Paneque, but right now that's just a guess.)

Thanks for sending us the review of the anthology from the Philadelphia paper. We eventually did get a copy from Random House, but quite a few weeks later. I understand that the book is not doing particularly well.

Sincerely,

*Paul*

PLH