

Dear Jim, 75-1448; Hoch to you 6/9/76

8/8/76

On the bus home I read Paul's letter to you on the executive session transcripts. It reminded me of his memoable comment on reading the then-released ex.sess. transcripts after I had written about 300 pages in analysis of them. He said boy, hum; old biddies at a kaffe klatch. Nothing to them. This is a not uncommon reflection of his judgement.

However, his 1. reminded me I had not checked the agendas. When I did I found that file gutted, too. So please phone Arch and ask them to send me a set of all. I'll then go over them. His 1/15/64 memo, his R73-I,M-2 may be interesting and may hold what he does not report.

In his (2) he has finally tumbled to the fact that the 6/23 was on Nosenko. I doubt his estimate of content His K.13 might be worth having.

(3) After the Devince letter he has doubts about "juicy stuff" in the 5/19? And it like (2) & properly classified?

He refers to his administrative remedies on the LHO files. I let him do this for five years. When after that time he had nothing I filed, long enough ago to have had response.

His reluctance to go ahead with a suit in which he is joined with me is a gratification to me. I'll not again extend an intended kindness of sharing with him. However, if you have not responded to the last sentence on his page 1 and top 2, may I suggest that you tell him that with immediate decisions to be made you think it would be best if you were limited to only one client who is generally immediately available?

If you understand him to mean more than the pix for which Bud has been suing with his "Mexico City photo stuff" please let me know. There is more there but I have no basis for believing it is more than hiding the source or avoiding the need for an LHO picture, which should have been taken. Following that, if one had a basis, could be a worthwhile endeavor. But he goes into none of this.

Best

M