

NOV 30 1973

Dear Jim,

11/29/73

Thanks for your enclosures with 11/24. I'm sure glad you didn't figure as I did, that all of GL's imperishables would be type-set! I find it exceptional that there seems to have been no paper that used the q and a. Barry Sussman thought the NYT had in the latest edition, but a friend who had naysayed. I have written Barry again because the first of the series of Post editorials quoted directly.

X Today I received but have not looked at the 22pp filed in court summarizing and analyzing the tapes, if you want a copy. It is legal-sized, so I'd have Lesar, who may or may not want a copy, have it made. I'll read it when I can.

X Your making no mention of Pacifica b'cast of the Fensterwald insanity is encouraging. He and Lesar both indicted Pacifica broadcast in toto. I shudder! I saw a headbanded Pacifica technician there. Farout (for our generation) types also videotaped.

Recently I had a clip from Chicago of an Anderson column the Post hadn't run. I wondered then if this was from during the strike, for papers do not always run them as distributed. However, yours on the police-state business, if of a time and character that preclude this explanation, are also of content I would have expected the Post to save and use. It is too consistent with too much. Reminds me of today's lead editorial compared with its suppression of what I gave on Jaworski. The story was written and handed in but it has not appeared. The assigning editor and the writing reporter are Metro. The story itself is again National. and therein lies the explanation for what has not been touched.

You conclude with ref to talks shows. I hear none here and none worth listening to are local. There are a few night-timers I can get but work instead. That people are talking openly about a coup is good. But if this means they can come to accept it, that is not, of course. I have commented separately on Washington talk. Not just friend of DIA people, who I have now met and will when I can look up and talk to.

One of the problems of being into too much and trying to remember too much (and not being able to) is a lack of certainty. I think that while GL said he first heard of "Hillsberg job 3/17/73, he did nothing until I think 4/25 and not until long after order from judge. It is my recollection that it was laid out as a threat to him on 4/15, that same Sunday of the runout tape. I'll eventually read Petersen's testimony on this rather than my notes on it.

Digression: Petersen was in on the Hoffa fix. I now have a transcript of a Sheridan intercept of a phone conversation between Whitey Partin and Bill Loeb's Arthur Egan. They go into this. If I didn't make a carbon of what I wrote the evening of Petersen's Ervin testimony, I then made strong notes on him. You may have seen this in the Gray excerpts. Except from self-description, he is no white knight.

Perhaps the few short notes amplify on what we agree on and I'm sorry I misread in my constant haste, what GL is up to. Noe he has made a deal on the Ford confirmation and in terms of a crack at him on impeachment. His whole scheme is to delay, regardless of what it means and can result in. The only explanation is not insanity but knowledge of what can come out. Of this I have enough to account for his course and I do not think for a minute it is all. Put simple, guilty knowledge, knowing what can come out. Thus the difference in him when he is to be questioned, when his nervousness can't be hidden. You are right in his seeming to be forcing the issue because the sooner it comes up the better his chances if for no other reason because it will be limited to what is then known. I am trying to address this but without any great hope. I've made a few more than the indicated approaches. A possible good word on the Wolfson one today. I am to hear from someone. With tests. Meaning judgements.

If any of the new names mean anything, I hope you'll let me know fast. Lesar has checked them at Group Research and told me that Marsen has old radical-right connections but seems to have disappeared. I'm disappointed that Mindeman didn't show. I've asked him to make a check of the Congressional record index, to see if we have more than a chronological link.

...At lunch I began to read Buzhardt's 22 pp of 11/26. It appears to be worse and much more arrogant and deceptive than papers indicated. I'll probably make a brief note of the pp on which there is bad stuff. The beginning is incredible enough: after service of a subpoena, he says Nixon provided this "voluntarily." Voluntarily under subpoena? Sick!

Heard 2 p.m. newscast that Herbert Stein forecasts 6% unemployment. A source once high and for months out of government told me they long ago expected 6 1/2% "and that's high."

Work calls. Again thanks. If I get AP/E transcript, I'll let you know.

Best  
Hew