

Dear Jim,

2/26/84

Good Opposition in Mark's 81-2543.

But there are two points I'd like you to rethink not like a debater but like an adversary who is attacking (blatant dishonesty and corruption) and not merely feeding off an attack.

In footnote 3 on page 6, where there is the obviously phony CIA question of dissemination, you say only that "ark gave Paul and me copies and we are critics. How much more effective it would have been, I think, if you'd added a few words, like "who between them have published eight books, countless magazine articles, addressed innumerable college, university and other audiences and have been dependable and regular sources for all elements of the media, domestic and international."

At the top of 10, where you refer to the large number of CIA files drawers that HSCA did not search, what an opportunity to declare that the CIA still has not complied with "ark's and my and other requests that include it after almost a decade. Put what they are up to in a proper perspective and is the difference between attacking them as an adversary and defending against spurious allegations and fabrications.

You never know the panel in advance, but there are still a few judges around who might well have been impressed by this additional information the presentation of which required very few words and little time. Just a somewhat different attitude and concept.

Best wishes,