

HS LA - letters

Dear Paul,

5/29/79

I read your 5/24 while taking a rest after some exercise and I respond in the next one, feeling fine as I always do after working up a good sweat. My damaged arm even feels better for the work the blood and muscles had to do in it. It turns out that pulling and pushing are about the only uses not proscribed, so I'll been pulling monstrous big honeysuckle out by the roots and piling it for possible winter dens for small animals.

Rae is back and as soon as she gets to a break in the appeals records work she is doing she'll check the HSCA Col. 4 for the IG report. You guessed my sources and I think its, for the gaps appear to coincide. (Where there is no problem with letting me have stuff I have a good relationship with one person there, who happens to be a fine human being and what doesn't hurt, actually a fan. Says I'm the last of a dying breed in his craft.)

On the critics conference with HSCA: I have no personal interest in it except as a horror story and I have enough of them from official records. My interest as archival, so I'll ask Wrono if he wants to borrow a copy for his archive. I think he should have it but I'm not going to pay the cost of copies for it. I appreciate your notes on it and I'll probable read them this afternoon while I wait to get through first to the doctor's office, then to his nurse and then for her to get to him to give me the dosage of the anti-coagulant for the coming week. Today was blood-test day and it actually takes as long as I've indicated. Last time 40 minutes!

I'm sorry the rest of you went for that obvious trick. The HSCA long before then had no choice because its course was set and its need ~~clear~~ clear. I suppose for some it was wishful thinking and for other hope against hope.

Kafka: I've drafted an appeal in addition to the one I'd filed. If you can give me the WC citations that will gild lilies for their coming Summary Judge, ent motion. I'd forgotten that. I think he was a symbolled informer. Also a little nuts....I don't know why Hal doesn't respond. I've given up trying.

I don't like the idea of sacrificing two copies of O in NO for a legal-size xerox in part because of their value today and in part because of the awkwardness of handling pages of that size in reading. I have received what I'd been using as a master copy back, at long last, and will limp along with that until I can figure something else out, thanks. (I think of money in terms of what I can do with it. I can pay Rae for a day's work for what I can get for each of the couple of copies of the book I have.

Wrono wrote an introduction to the court records in the case for the 1/27/64 transcript and added footnotes. I've not taken time to reread those court records. Policoff's reaction was quite good. It is, to the best of my knowledge, the first time anyone ever beat a national security claim and although he didn't spell it out the judge found Rankin to be a liar.

On your goodies lists, 5/19 I'd like the TGI-Soutre thing, which I believe has already been questioned.

The FBI books look interesting, when they are out. I'd not heard of them. Perhaps of some use in FOIA cases, too. On 5/12, the three clippings only. My interest in Chavez is the possibility Epstein's Fedora smoked out Schevchenko.

On NO 105-1096, I have a request under which they may supply these records. If they do I'll let you know. Otherwise, I'm inclined to think that aside from the specifics I've asked for, like Bringuier and Quiroga and Davis, other requests are likelt to be more important and for now I'd rather not dilute the manpower they may have on this still more. However, when we have a conference on it I'll raise the question as historically important in the overall of the case.

Thanks,