

10/29/91

Lil is still reading the papers so I do not have before me two Washington Post columns neither of which appeared in the Post in any form when they were extraordinarily relevant. One ^{of} the radio news column, the other the regular oped column by Richard Cohen.

For whom I believe the epithet "Judenrat!" is not ~~in~~^{an} appropriate.

His column begins with his saying he dreams of doing a book on the Thomas nomination. He writes about ^{the} questions that he would have asked. I think you'll recall that not ex poste facto but contemporaneously I noted that obvious questions should have been asked and that these include whether or not he had ever looked at porno films, one in particular, "Long Dong Silver."

It was obvious the moment Hill mentioned that Thomas had insulted her with references to such films, this one in particular. So, it was obvious to Cohen then and he did nothing and to the Post's editors and reporters and from the paper they also did nothing then.

This could not have been oversight. Much too obvious!

As soon as Hill mentioned "Long Dong Silver" it was obvious that merely phone calls would have disclosed whether or not there was such a porno film.

This was an even more obvious need, for both the committee and the media, when Hatch tried to Hatchet Hill will irrelevant references to an obscure court decision that was not questioned at ~~the~~ the televised hearings or the reporting or commentary. Not even when Hill's lawyer, Ogle???? told PBS during an intermission that there was such a film.

It also now turns out that a ^a caller-in on the American University radio station, WAKU-FM, was clear in his recollection of seeing ^{Thomas} Hill often, at the very time to which Hill testified, in the porno section of the store in which he got his.

When there was a ^{confirmatory} call-in the moderator, the supposedly liberal Diana Rehm, cut him off with protestations of the need for of all things, "fairness." (The much respected president of AU when Rehm was hired was forced to resign when he was caught making sexually-harassing calls to strange women from his AU office phone.)

The Los Angeles Times story from the Philadelphia Inquirer that I sent was not used by the Post although it and the Times have a syndicate and in today's paper it uses a Times story from Israel. It knew that Wright confirmed Hill and that Simpson was a deliberate liar in saying, again ~~the~~ televised nationally, that Wright had gotten "cold feet." No comment, in news or opinion, by the Post. Or anyone on TV or radio ^I took in.

All the slurs, all the lies about Hill got full attention, including in the Post, whose editorial and oped editor is a woman who is also a Newsweek columnist. But when confirmation could not be totally ignored, as much was, it was downplayed and deprecated.

Including cutting off of testimony that Thomas lied in swearing that he had never discussed the Wade v Roe decision with anyone by Biden, the supposed liberal chairman, about which there was virtually no reporting and no commentary of which I am aware, what this means is that the committee and the media combined to see to it that we would have

2
an otherwise unqualified Justice who ^{is} was a perjurer as well as a sexual harasser.

Contemporaneous with or soon after major events, particularly the controversial, there is usually announcement of books in the offing. There may well have been in this matter without my knowing about it but if there was I read and heard no mention of it.

This is surprising to me for a number of reasons. One is the prospect of better than merely good sales to those who felt ^{and feel} so strongly about it, like womens' groups, ^{those} interested in minority rights, blacks and liberals. Any one, I think, indicates an interest that could make a book a success. With all the many interests, it seems to me that any book prospects are much better.

And this is without going into the potential of the content of a good, a solid book. This potential includes making Thomas' position on the Court intolerable - for him and for the Court.

It could in time force his resignation from it.

If what has despite all surfaced was so readily available, it is not easy to believe that with a decent investigation much more would not be available, especially along the line of sexual harassment and Wade v Roe discussion.

Almost all media did note how unusual it would have been for a lawyer not to have ever made ~~an~~ mention of this sensational and precedental decision on so controversial a subject. But it seems that nobody on the committee or in the media ever thought to ask those it ~~was known~~ ^{is known} Thomas knew and associated with if they had any knowledge relating to either area.

By the way, if you did not know it, the Wade of that decision is my friend Henry Wade. He was then Dallas, Texas, district attorney.

HW