

There was nothing in class U when I took
"il to work this a.m. so, because I wanted
your(pl) opinion(s) re Dione's letter and
there was room for the stamps to carry, I
included rough chapter draft. Today there
are some stories in U. HW 2/9/73

FEB 12 1973

75

Very glad to have learned of the special propert-
ies of the yellow Carter Hi-Liter from you. It
enables me to mark a single copy when I read it
without interfering with the copy for you. This is
NOT a hint. Much life in the one you sent and I
have a second. Didn't go into town this a.m., so I
had only the one copy and didn't want to turn the
copier on before I awakened LiI. HW 2/10/73 75

Sent you copy Braden "An Admiral's
Boy", Sun-Times 1/31/73. The bottom
lines was missing both columns. In
each, it is, "Roscoe V. Hillenkotter.
he didn't have" and "McCarthy era
and the cold war." This column was
cut but it is the only one I have.
Post hasn't carried, which does seem
a bit strange. HW 2/9/73

FEB 12 1973

75

Why did Paul Hoch, who, as a physicist should have known better, attempt to duplicate the
JFK head-shot with wrongly-attached melons? Why did Bob Smith, of CTIA, also a scientist,
go off on a kick about explosive bullets without satisfying himself that the incontro-
vertible evidence permitted consideration of their use in the JFK assassination? I have
often wondered about this atypical behavior by both. If Smith went off on his kick because
Garrison had talked of explosive bullets, it was a long-delayed reaction. In The Day of
the Jackal, Viking 8/71; Bantam 9/72, the assassin uses explosive bullets and for sighting
his piece in, ~~is~~ a melon. The Day of the Jackal is said to be based on fact. I don't know
if it is and I see nothing wrong with serious consideration of a melonist's ideas, if they
can be given serious consideration without known factors ruling them out. In both of these
case, there is no doubt that what is not reasonably questioned rules out the use of melons
with respect to the JFK head wound(s) and explosive bullets as causative. HW 2/11/73

FEB 12 1973

75

FEB 12 1973

Larry, Ben Bagdikian, now National Correspondent of the Columbia
Journalism Review, has a long 1-2/73 piece on the success of Agnew's
attack on the press, including partial record CDN. It is largely
analysis and statistics on the treatment of the Watergate arrests and
related stories. I think you'll want to have it (about 12 pages). If
you do not get the mag., let me know and I'll send you a copy. I do
not know what else is in the issue because a xerox was sent by a
young student friend and that is all I've seen. HW 2/11/73

FEB 12 1973

After reading the piece last night I put a note in the HR envelope
asking him to send you a copy. The copy will be a better one and HR has
much cheaper and ever-so-much faster facilities, which will not over-
expose as my machine sometimes does. If the commentary on the press
will not be news, the factual record, beyond you or me, will tell
you that what we'd suspect is the case, in spades.



Howard has sent me a 13-page piece by Ben Bagdikian
in the Jan-Feb 72 Columbia Journalism Review, The fr
fruits of Agnewism. From the first page it is very
good. I can lend it to you or if you think you will
want, I think it would be cheaper for me to make the
copies or cheaper still to ask him to. Ben says the
plan worked, the press was intimidated, etc. He is
now CJR National Correspondent. I've not read
piece yet. HW 2/10/73

FEB 12 1973

75



Early a.m. all-news radio WAVA today reported DJ confirmation of FBI Segretti investigation, no other details. It seems to have UPI service. There was no story in the edition of the Post we get. Got into town too early for NYTimes, which couldn't have arrived by then. No AP B wire story in local paper. It is a rather interesting development on which I'd appreciate anything you see, for there is presumeably nothing now known that was not known before. As for law violations, the charge used against the Chicago 7 would be at least enough for a legitimate justification of investigation from the first, from what has been published, so I infer the downplay was not accidental. Aside from election-law charges. Seems unlikely that this kind of story would break too late for Monday a.m.s. HW 2/12/73

FEB 12 1973 75

Jules Wircover has a long piece today, headed "More Nixon Radio: President likes to over TV, likes the selective audience." The whole thing boils down to nothing. Selective audience? Except when he has to pay for time, which is during campaigns only, were ~~that~~ it true that there is the "selective audience", he would still be throwing most away. I think the real reason is one of his more serious hangups: he does not think he is pretty. Perhaps another, this concept that those who don't drool over him, won't accept his lies as gospel, those mongers of "elitist rumors" and "instant analyses" on TV are really out to get him and to distort and misrepresent on TV. Also paranoid. He is a liar and he doesn't like to be exposed for what he is. I think he is trying to use his power as President to undermine TV hw 2/12/73

FEB 12 1973

75