

Howard, even TIME (6/4/73) couldn't overlook that word "specific" in GL's 4/30 speech: "His careful use of the word 'specific' could imply that he might have approved of such activities in general." TIME does not note that the same interpretation applies to "knowledge". And to what he didn't say, concept. Loser was here yesterday. Gave him my files for the book on informers, which he'll write where I haven't already. We are not certain of the meaning of the cryptic order of the court of appeals in the spectro case, but we take it to mean that the full court feels the record is enough for it to work with. If so, the vibes are good. Two of the more conservative members voted for further proceedings, which would have given the Gov't the opportunity of overcoming what should, under Hink, be a fatal flaw, not meeting the burden of proof. My own view is that Bazelon and Kaufman recognized the corruption and deliberate misrepresentation and want to do something about it.

HM 5/31/73