

12 July 1976

Dear Harold:

Herewith some brief replies to some of your recent questions, along with the enclosed.

Yr letter of July 4: we never have run into the WH leak about Schweiker as a possible VP choice, either in the newspapers we see or in the electronic media. As far as we're concerned, you're the only source we've had it from.

Also yr July 4 letter, we've seen nor heard nothing of David Phillips' appearance on PBS the night of the Schweiker report. We'll watch for anything on both these items, but don't expect to run into anything this late.

Yr July 7th, the locals have been ignoring Lane for a long time, and the treatment appears to be continuing. In other words, no word here of ~~ixx~~ his allegation that Bringuier did the PR work for Oswald.

We do have a clipping, enclosed, about Ruby's alleged meetings with Castro.

Other stuff enclosed deals mostly with the FBI's clean-up campaign, so-called, some of which may include a morsel or two you haven't seen.

It would be madness, at this distance and with my imperfect understanding of the Ray situation, for me to try to give you any semblance of advice about what you and Lesar should do about the campaign by the networks to get Ray to give one of them an interview. I do agree fully with your ^{suspicion} that they're after a splashy show, not real information. And you may be correct in your suspicion that Rather imagines he can solve the case.

My one certain feeling is that while I don't fully understand Lesar's situation vis-a-vis the court and his status as Ray's attorney (and probably would be no better off if I did), I do nevertheless feel that the first priority in this situation probably has to be for neither of you to do anything which can jeopardize his status as an attorney. That seems central to me. Beyond that, I think you both should think first of yourselves as a functioning team and try to preserve that, doing nothing to impair the effectiveness of that team.

Beyond that I can have no real opinion. Many of your letters and memos are far from clear when read here. You know perfectly well what you're saying, but much is left out and even more is written with the assumption I have more legal knowledge and experience than I do and that I have a good working knowledge of all the people and issues with which you deal. I'm able to infer some, but there is much that is not clear, partly because there is no real necessity for it to be clear but also because you sometimes assume I have more background on tap than actually is the case in many instances. I do read practically everything you send, in an effort to keep current, but that doesn't mean I fully understand everything.

Sorry I can't be more helpful, but this is clearly a touchy situation where any advice ought to be based on real knowledge and experience. I'm doing you a favor by recognizing my own limitations.

Best,


jdw