

Dear Bill,

9/29/95

Reur 26, I suggest that cobbling Sherlock Holmesery together, which is more like keystone kopyery, is also hurtful and misleads many people. The added confusion created also helps official miscreants. I've heard nothing from Cesar since and so far as I am concerned that is over and fine a guy as he is, he is hopelessly addicted to they nuttury.

I'm not at all certain that in the society in which we live sticking to the facts only is the best course for all lawyers under all conditions. I am sure that there are times when other approaches are needed. Not without regard to the facts and to truth but in addition. How else, for example, counter the prejudicial substitutions made for reality in the Simpson case?

I'm disappointed Cochran missed or decided to ignore some of the openings he had, effective and eloquent as he was. And he did use something I suggestd. He pointed out the foliage on the fence was undisturbed. When Clark made a crack about his not calling a promised witness, what an opening that gave him to say they do not have the facilities of the police and prosecution and it as late when they discovered that witness had a record for untruthfulness. So, of course, they did not call her. But take the case of Ms. Clark. First she offered Fuhrman as one of her most important witnesses. Then when we knew and sought to ~~op~~ prove that he is both a racist and a perjurer she opposed out telling you the truth (successfully). Then when despite ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> successful effort to keep the ruth from you we were able to get some of it to you, she sought to mitigate her personal involvement in adducing perjury by castigating Fuhrman when that was like gilding lilies ~~or~~ <sup>or</sup> But she did not tell you that the prosecution knew nothing at all about his record, as obviously it did. She did not apologize for using a perjurer and she did not withdraw the evidence he faked. All she did is try an additional cover-up and that from the outset is what taints this case.

I did not get and did not expect any reply from Reno. But unless I made the effort she'd not have any chance of knowing. Not that I'm at all certain she wants truth about the FBI.

I agree that Powell has been impressive but do not agree that he needs "some elective experience." I think that anyone running for the presidency today needs his head examined. Except Clinton, who has himself to defend in history. Powell has had a full and fine life and there is no real chance that anyone can make any real difference before the terrible <sup>s</sup>crash that is virtually certain. So he will be happier if he enjoys <sup>n</sup>this retirement in the many ways he can.

Thanks for the clips. I think that Vidal is indecent: speak only well of the dead is a correct way to think and act. And how many president's wives were better for the country? Best to you all,

Arnold