10/18/70

Howard (Gary & Dick),

I've just gone over the Rhoads affidavit in the Nichols suit. While I think it may be enough to defeat that egomaniac arrogant men, I also think it is quite valuable for my purposes. Neither you nor anyone else has commented on this. So, I am writing to ask that, if and when you again read it, you seek what you think may be of this kind of help. It is always possible that another mind will detect something else. However, to avoid feedback, I'm not indicating what I believe to hold such values.

Another thing is possible error, misstatement or misrepresentation. It is there also. Maybe you'll see or be able to prove in a different way what I may not have seen or maybe be able to use added proof in establishing.

I'll be reading the rest of it momentarily. One thing that interests me may be of no consequence, but I note it in the event it is possible for you to make inquiry of John. The attached copy of the contract bears superificial evidence of being a copy of the remote-generation copy they have always used, which is strange, considering they have the original and under no circumstances are restricted to poor copies. However, this copy is an enlargement. I presume it is a xerox of the xerox John made for you, therefore reproduced 1 for 1 from his copy, or that with which they provided him/the court. If he wondered about the size, he may have gotten or thought of an explanation. The most obvious is for legibility and as an alternative to using a closer-to-original copy, for which they may have what they regard as sufficient and compelling reasons.

Different subject: preparing to put swimsuits away for winter, I notice I have a new pair of walking shots, size 30, that I thought were swiming shorts. I got them in an odd lot at a sale and hand't examined them. Can you use them? They've never been worn, still have all the tags, etc. I know only oneother person that thin.

Sincerely,