

At last, if inadequately and incompletely while for what it is passionately, the Post tries to put what has been called the Watergate into perspective. Where it falls most short (aside from examining its own record on so many vital issues) is not not saying the obvious, that from the time social progress became a strong effort in this country those who have by any convenient expedient opposed it have always said they stood for "the system" and were and remain, in fact, subversive to the system while those who sought progress, including the Communists, actually were attempting to givin !the system" viability.

It falls far short in isolating the ITT stink. This is merely the one that got attention. It is typical and permeating. Among the obvious newsworthy items the Post has ignored is the misuse of the judicial process by the administration, against "the system" and as corrupt as could be.

Nixon typifies those who built careers by blending corruption, personal, political and financial, with loud bleatings about his defense of "the system" and became most subversive of that system. Those who follow him seem to be largely those who would emulate. Yet there is an unreality to all of it. These people actually still BELIEVE. An example is the letter from the former Creep director of publications who at this late date still pretends that none of it happened and that it is all some kind of persecution of a truly glorious leader. HW 3/25/73

It is not because I couldn't find the time to complete Hinckle's piece on Farewell America at one sitting. Esquire articles are not all that long. After three attacks I have the 7th of 7 pages to read. As some of you know, I have fairly extensive first-hand knowledge of the 26 1971 affair and did a bit of investigating. There are portions about which I can speak unequivocally. That I speak no further at this point is because I solicit untainted evaluations. To a degree I believe no knowledge of the book and circumstances is required. Among the opinions solicited is whether there seems to be any special timing, aside from the scheduled appearance of the Hinckle-Turner-Asinov book. I do not propose a complete analysis at this time, but I will record opinions in a letter to one with personal interest. I have also been marking my copy up as I read it. If a copy is desired, I'll supply it. I do believe serious thought and the time this takes may be justified. HW 3/26/73

The two large folds of clippings at Saturday's and today's Post. There are backups I decided you just might want to read hence less cutting than I'd have done. I have not yet read my own copy. Nor have I had time to listen to the radio today. No word from Bud. Your 3/24 came today. Valuable, if I don't get to responding today. Thanks. Letter, that is. Haven't looked at clips which I presume also are valuable...I have a notion things are going to change. Maybe if the complaints from the back and legs subside I'll get out with the bramble sgyth and be able to think of it a bit. HW 3/27/73 3 27 Mar 73