

13 June 1974

Dear Harold:

Thanks very much for the Kevin tape, which makes things much clearer. We'll be keeping it around with your explanatory note just in case you need it back for any reason. The note is dated 6/3/74, ~~xxx~~ and unless we hear to the contrary we'll assume that's the date of your conversation with Kevin. Thanks again.

To reply briefly to your letter of June 3, what happened with my envelope for the 5/30 mailing was that it was left until morning to seal in case anything new needed to be included, and then I put on the sticker without sealing the envelope. This seems to be clearly what happened. The San Rafael cancellation could happen to any of our letters, as some late collections or collections from certain mailboxes may be taken to San Rafael, the local collection point, for processing after the MV PO has folded for the day.

Re Colson's plea, we have a strong impression that what decided him could have been the WH transcripts in which the palace guard discussed him in very uncomplimentary terms, including some by GL.

A NY Times letter dated June 5 deals with an interesting point about the Jencks-Brady business about withholding exculpatory evidence, namely that the case is thrown out only if the PROSECUTION withholds such. GL is not the prosecution. Jaworski is, and cannot withhold evidence he doesn't have. The letter is enclosed.

We've complied with your request to do some more thinking about our aversion to relating a book on Nixon with Mao's quotations. We feel basically they are irrelevant. The book on Nixon will be basically a list of contradictions between what he said one time and then another. Mao's book is a compilation of quotations from things he has written on many subjects, and any contradictions in it are few and far between, if indeed any are apparent. It seems to me that even to suggest a ~~paralellism~~ paralellism is wrong.* Why not let GL stand on his own feet? ~~Nixon~~ To and Fro With Poor Richard. Richard Nixon -- Both Faces. Poor Richard vs Richard Nixon. And so on.

It's extremely difficult to say anything sensible from this distance about your Unimpeachment Book, which you generalize about in your letter of June 7 and ask my opinion about.

Because of the breaking nature of the story it seems to me that the narrower the implications of your title the better off you'll be. Behind Watergate, or something vague like that, seems to me to be safer in a way than the Unimpeachment, which commits you to explaining why Nixon isn't going to be impeached, or if he is, why it won't amount to much. I think the various elements you discuss all can fit in well and contribute interest if only you can arrive at a central ~~theme~~ theme that can be expressed in a title. I know this oversimplifies the problem, but if you can define the theme, maybe we can find a title to front for it.

To say any more at this stage of my ignorance and distance is to risk misleading you in some way or even discouraging you. To me the main problem would be to write something that would stand up no matter what happens. If you can do that, figure out what it all adds up to, make that your theme, and let's go on from there. You have much to say about how and why WG happened, what the rest of the iceberg consists of, and how many things that should have been done have not. I hope this is of some faint help.

Best,



jdw

* I'm very uncomfortable with your title. I haven't been able to see, and still can't see, any connection between the two titles.

Je