

SL, AK, JW

8/23/71

Mr. Evelle Younger, Attorney General
Room 500, Wells Farge Bank Bldg.
5th St. & Capitol Mall
Sacramento, Calif. 95814

Dear Mr. Younger,

When your father was in Congress, I knew him and made him part of an agricultural promotion that helped him politically. Your mother was our friend. We supplied her with some of the exotic egg shells with which she did such beautiful work, and my wife prizes one returned to her beautifully decorated. From this I think you may understand that I do not intend this as an unfriendly letter.

Further, I know that in every large city the district attorney is essentially an administrative officer. The magnitude of his job gives him little choice. He simply cannot know all or even the essential details of the cases in his office.

However, your August 19 release, a copy of which has been sent me by one of those to whom you sent it, raises some questions and reminds me of others unasked.

Especially because, as I presume you have no way of knowing, exactly the same thing happened with the evidence in all three major political assassinations, why is it that you do not address the destruction and tainting of the Sirhan evidence in this release? And how, if you can, do you explain public authorities making this possible?

I would like to ask your opinion on the propriety of the book Special Unit Senator, of a public employee making secret information available to a ghost writer for personal gain, which is only part financial. This is a work of propaganda. It addresses nothing not already in the press, seems designed as a combination justification of all public authority and response to what you refer to semi-flippantly as "conspiracy theory". In the other cases, there is no doubt of conspiracy proof, and from is now appearing in the papers, this seems to be possible in Los Angeles.

Why should secret police, prosecution and FBI files be made available to a ghost writer and denied others? Is it, in your view, proper for this to happen? Is it proper for there to be this taxpayer subsidy of a private, commercial, for-profit venture? Would you, for example, undertake to see that precisely the same raw materials were made available to me as a writer? Have I less right to them?

Now it happens that without my name being mentioned in that book, I am. The writing is grossly inaccurate. Whereas the police sought me out, as I can prove, because they did it through an intermediary to whom I am sending a copy of this letter, exactly the opposite is said in the book, which then proceeds to ridicule me. Aside from questioning the propriety of this, I note that one of the things to which I referred them now figures in the news. There are other areas in which I could have helped, were help and fact wanted, but what the police seem really to have been doing was attempting to foreclose criticism that might later be made, not looking for information that might be useful. Spending time doing such things, they did not find it for obviously required investigations not yet reported.

My best wishes to your mother is she is still alive.

Sincerely,
Harold Weisberg