

Dear Paul - 1/1 (ms) - This

4/13/71

Dear Paul,

This is a kind of unhappy anniversary, this letter. When the Fechs (probably Army) took such good care of my previous portable, the advice of my local shop was that I get a Hermes 3000, with none but metal knit parts, where such destruction could not be as easy. Although I couldn't afford it, I followed his advice. I used the machine little until my old Underwood got too bad, even for me. Then I started to use this and like it. I used one ribbon, the original, put a new one in, and lo and behold, besides tearing and punching everything I did, it also inscattered the ribbon. Phone diagnosis proved correct. This "Cadillac" of portables has an inferior platen when new, something in the compound the meticulous Swift use. From I got it back today. Most of use equal to the life of the first ribbon, 10.66—and that with the kindness of the dealer in charging nothing for his labor or the rental during repair.

Before you, this comment on your excellent 4/9 to Klendickent. Have you decided why Sam Stern's draft was not sent? Without knowing that, I've a hunch you'd best be careful about later use of the auto device. The fourth paragraph, if you file, you might want to break down some, perhaps separate complaints, to keep one from springing against the others. Do you feel that this includes, the way they'll interpret, notes, including handwritten, and possible report?

I'm glad somebody else is throwing Clark at them. For more than four years I've been so lonely. If you do not recall their interpretation from the coroner, I've sent you, tell me and I'll repeat it.

There was once a time I was alone in getting delays, from all sources. It is good to be in company, welcome to the club! But I've had them go much longer.

By today's, to the expert on exempt responsibility, not to his assistant Fine who isn't. I'm happy to keep it in slight and in responsibility, not to deal with those to whom he passes the buck. Let him refer, but my coroner, I think, will usually be addressed to him, esp. when I have a complaint. In this case I'm stretching something. The law requires no more than that I identify. The letter did that, he knew the letter did that, he wanted to put me to trouble, so but for tit-and I'm in compliance. I wish I had time and resources to load them with suits, where I've exhausted my remedies. If I return to AGENT OSWALD, which is now more timely and more possible, I think I'll file a couple more, including those you like, the fingerprint one (remember, Wasp?) probably follow your advice and waste three beginning with the form on the pre-acc pix (they have to have the TV stuff and what was in it the file because of USCA, return, watching and, I think, recruiting. And I'll throw Dallas-Fort Worth in too, on that.

In your own thinking, never forget the clause of the investigative exemption they also omit, for if, in a trial, it would have been available to LHO or Ruby, the exemption no longer obtains. Or to any other litigant not an agency. I don't get answers, but I make a record, when I think of it, and ask "what law"? They haven't any. And don't forget what you haven't seen, not having seen that book I filed in 2569-70, that one of the reasons this law was enacted was to eliminate the "national interest" hoax. Here the House Report is esp. good.

You indicated no distribution. I include a copy for JMS if you've sent this to him.

Best,

HW