

4/11/70

Dear Howard (cc Dick),

If I have forgotten to background you, the Skolnick suit is exalted by calling it a feke. It is a mishmash of thievery, ego, egregious error, the wildest imaginings, and a new pinnacle in legal incompetence. I really cannot do it justice. However, because it is a suit the unceremonious defeat of which would result in nationwide headlines to the effect there is no suppression, it has taken more time than I'd like to have spent on it. Aside from that, it is stolen from COUP.

I do not recall whether I had posted the two of you.

Your mailing of the 9th, containing two welcome clippings I haven't had a chance to read yet, your letter of the 3rd and the draft of the 7th arrived today. I read the letter while my wife was grocery shopping. Rather than objecting to it I think it is an excellent idea and very well done. Before getting into that, in the letter you speculate on the possibility of a wound through the hand. I consider this too improbable and requiring an enormous number of people to be conscious in a place where they have no excuses or worse, parts of a conspiracy of silence and to hide.

Kleindienst is making me more interested in Kleindienst with everything he does, each new step being that more fascistic. I do not suggest he is politically isolated in the administration, or an exception.

As I've not had time to read the clippings, but will before going to bed (I'm very glad for any lengthy story on the Brown matter), I'm not going to reread the Fisher draft. I made a few notes on it as I read it and I'll use them only.

P.1, par 5, last half. Why not raise question of personal and professional integrity and, if you do not think it too emotional, proper concern for the good names of their families and descendants? I am serious about this. By now they have to know enough to be worried, and decent men would give exactly these considerations the deepest thought. I have from time to time made such suggestions and I have no reason to believe they are always unfelt. I think a reference to the character, nature and magnitude of the responsibilities they assumed would not be out of place here.

P2, #3, next to last line, precede "source" with "one" or "single". Next graph, line 4, 1st word, rather than both, why not "either"? Next graph, fragments in next, strengthen by asking not only that they explain this to you in the context of the basic conclusions of the Warren Report, which they presumably read whether or not cited and then ask why they didn't undertake to explain this fact that in itself if totally destructive of the Report they in silence have permitted their report to be said to confirm. Last graph, why not delete last sentence. Why go into your present belief there was a smaller calibre, which is but one of the possibilities.

P3, end 1st graph, why not include completeness in what should have been expectable of such a report. Next graph, where you joke about being born yesterday, why not really needle him by saying it was, in parens, 16 whole years ago? And where you talk about the structure, why not chide him for not mentioning this is absent from 100% of the Commission evidence, testimony and Report but he fails to mention this gross omission, then ask why he failed to suggest possibilities. Final graph, rather than saying you have every intention of publishing, I'd refer instead to the fact that in your book you will have to record it as it is, that you made proper inquiries of those who undertook a public responsibility of great and historic significance, one involving the integrity of society and government, and they have evaded, refused to answer and played childish games with words. If this is the record they want recorded, that is what you will do. Best regards, HW