

MAY 17 1972

Hoover's non-autopsys, AP stories a214, a219, both saying that the coroner held that with death "due to natural causes, an autopsy was not indicated." If he had said not required, that would have been closer. But indicated it was. It was avoided because despite his repeated lies on the subject, Hoover knew he suffered "hypertensive cardiovascular disease". His it say that despite his assurances to the contrary, he knew he could kick off at any unannounced minute, as he did. Now I have had two experiences of this sort in the past 10 days, in my own family, where each of two (I am without knowledge of a third) deaths of close relatives was, without doubt, from natural causes. In these two cases, there could have been a variety of natural causes. But there was no doubt at all, with both deceased long hospitalized, that causes were natural. With my stepfather, there was an autopsy. He was 88. Aside from one of the two things that could have killed him, discovered in the autopsy, bile blockage and the separation of an earlier intestine patch when 18" were removed (leading to peritonitis, known to exist before autopsy), he had hardening of the arteries and other problems of serious and potentially fatal character. With my brother-in-law, who is to be buried without an autopsy tomorrow, my sister-in-law got p(led off at the doctors' evasiveness in saying why they wanted an autopsy and had been because she could never find a doctor who had made any kind of real examination of the patient, and she would not sign for an autopsy. Her husband, a three-fifths daily alcoholic before permanent reform years ago, he had had a series of strokes and heart attacks over the past two years, negan with emphysema, had had brain damage after one of the strokes, and, as with my step father, science had the possibility of learning from an autopsy. So, to say one on Hoover was not "indicated" is to lie, and the lie is political. HW

5/14-Twixtween I've been nibbling away at the valuable clips you sent during my absence, all, to the point I've reached, not duplicated in the papers I see or missed if they were. The one I've just finished, from the S-O on the possibility of EMK's secret plans for being a compromise selection (I don't believe) and his support for McGovern, is by Anthony Lewis. I did not know he had returned from London, and I do not anticipate that his return will work any improvement in Times DC reporting. That he returns is a bit surprising for several reasons, one being the apparent solidity of Graham's position on his former beat and the other something you may not have seen reported. It goes back to the reason for his going to London, the compromise end of a bitter, inside fight that led to a strike by the DC staff, which is much larger than that of most papers. That is, the home offices of most papers. It was when there was the inside struggle to get Salisbury out of his mg. ed. position and Wicker out as DC bureau chief and Lewis in. The compromise shifted Salisbury to his present post, Lewis to London, not Washchief, and Wicker to what he probably prefers, columnist. I think but I am by no means sure that I have a clipping or two on this, likely from the Washington Post. It did seem unusual that almost all his colleagues would so vigorously protest Lewis' planned promotion to be their chief. In the areas of my interest, he was and remained an apologist, an unabashed sycophant. If it does not derive from personal dedication to LBJ or his regime, it can be attributed to adulation of Warren, on whom he also wrote a book. Collaterally, this who^e operation inside the Times to dump the few openly anti-war less-than-top executives, and with Wicker this mean influence over stories selected and men assigned to them, was a strange kind of putsch that in failure was a success for the putschists, as my friend Jerry, who has been making a study of the Times, would probably agree (I have not discussed this with him). If I have not been a close student of inner politics in the press, I also can't recall anything quite like that business, on either side, the major political effort by a pro-government cabal inside a major paper and the immediate reaction of the working reporters in the major bureau. HW

MAY 17 1972