Dick, Howard only 7/26/70

Dick got an undated "Memo from: Vitizens' Committee to Clean Up the Courts" on 6/20/70 and send me a copy. If anyone else has gotten this, it has not been indicated to me.

Not the least fascinating thing in it is the perveding dishonesty: It is also interesting that he now seeks to emphasize the not-new Bolden angles.

One of the simply entrancing things is that he claims the story originated out of ashington:"...the story was sent to Washington and came back to Chicago on the A.P. national wire". How this could have been done without the greatest expense is not clear, for it was all one day, the filing of the suit and the carrying of the story. I believe some of my copies of the story do carry a Chicago deteline, but I'm not taking the time to check and may be wrong.

I'm inclined to doubt that anyone other than me who can be defined as a critic has done anything he can interpret as againstb him and his publicity. (--ere note that where hitherto he has done all of this personally and in his own name, he seems to be trying to get the idea accross that the action is by the Citizens' Committee. Of course, his is it and he uses it as himself, but I am suggesting he has several purposes in mind by not simply sending out his own memo but pretending it is the Committee which is behind the action and reporting the alleged interferances in its efforts to "clean up the courts".

Yet there is persistent reference to critics in the plural, alleging what I didn't, even in a normal Skolnick extension of fact, do or suggest. One such is the reference to "numerous news desk directors". Another is the alleged threat of reprisal against newspapers, and only for publicizing Skolnick's suit, which is crazy, for such things are impossible. What, if anything, he can mean by the collection of "mind-blowing data" he is compiling about critics', his plural, alleged efforts to "stifle news coverage", I can only imagine. But if there is any basis for this, you can understand the restricted distribution of this memo. In wonder what he can mean by "Attempts were made, for example, to harrass the plaintiff in another federal suit against the National Archives ( a suit involving the Kennedy assassination but so far unrelated to the Chicago plot". This cannot refer to me, but who can understand the workings of the Skolnick mind? I did try to file against him and in Chicago, and I have yet to file any action vs Archives.

He says "several" critics are "hounding" him to withdraw (which is the effect of what he has done, despite his loud noises). I wonder who? I have written him but once, which is hardly "hounding". Would he invent a greater opposition than he has? His stock ploy is to appear persecuted, so perhaps he might. But I do welcome hi again involving the college.

The last paragraph is a distorted reference to Trunzo. Example, the no right jazz. What Trunzo told him, without denial, is that Skolnick had violated his trust and made unauthorized use of materials given him in trust. The Daily Calumet story on Groth's effective denial of Skolnick's inventions, banner headlines, front page, did make good p.r. for Groth.

I think it could be hel ful if Dick (alone, unless others get this), could be so shocked at the unseemly conduct of these unnamed critics that he ask Skolnick to identify them so h can be cautious in any of his own relationships and not impart trust where it shouldn't be. And about the harrassing suit, which is entirely unreported in the press, is it not? It might also be helpful if Dick could make a few caustic comments about personalities and internecine warfare, etc., to see what he might thereby elicit. While I do not believe there is grounds for the plural, it is worth attempting to learn this and other things. I think he's crazy. H