

Jim,

spectro

3/13/73

Your 3/11 says we can't oppose the petition for a rehearing (what the hell is a "suggestion" in the law?) and opines the move is unusual and likely to fail. Great. You say we then get to submit a brief if they do the rare and grant the motion. I think we should really prepare that brief, even to lining it up in advance of need so that it can be terse: hard and to the point, as I indicated in my letter to Bud, with a few things I've thought of since, like today's coverage of the Hoback affidavit. Birch Bayh has it so with it published that should be no problem. The timing for the attack on the Williams affidavit could not be better. This stuff really makes it criminal. He did swear "never" and within the government (like Creep?) on a "need to know" basis only (like Dean?).

We and the judges will be looking ahead to the Supreme Court. This suits Whizzer to a whiz, and one vote may swing. He addressed this in link. This goes further, this relieves him in that case, where there was controversy, validating his dictum that an affidavit alone is not enough.

All of this new and topical stuff that proves the FBI lied and did that on purpose, to deceive all the courts, should have some weight now.

All this stuff also is what the law envisioned, as what I seek is not, so that gives it even more weight.

HW 3/13/73