After having drafted several detailed response to Eastland’s letter, I have arrived at the attached response. The reason I recommend that we not have a detailed response is that we must be careful regarding precedents of your appearance. I have now reached the conclusion that if we tick off exactly what areas you are prepared to deal with, we may set a precedent for areas the White House Staff considers outside the performance of their official duties. On the other hand, if we are not specific, we may -- I repeat (may) -- be able to later say that the real substance of your testimony before the Committee was really your role as a conduit for McLaren and the other matters of substance were those that lead up to that involvement and resulted from it (i.e., the meetings with Geneen and the Attorney General).

In short, what I am saying is that we can’t get into trouble for what we don’t say.

I reviewed the attached draft with Clark MacGregor last night and he concurs. You may wish to raise this with others this morning.