

Dear Jim,

11/1/75

The local printer made a typo in this page of the flyer. So, instead of throwing the paper away, nice fellow that he is, he made me scratch pads out of the cut of the book and gave me these other pages to use as scratch paper. (He doesn't know me!) I'm not sending any flyers out, in an excess of caution. I have more than 2,000 ready for stamps and will be stamping them when and as I can.

The interrogatories and some clips came this morning. I've read the inter. and the clip about the indignation of the judges over the Hiss -Rosenberg stonewalling. I think you should be alert to the point where we can be used as witnesses in any proceeding in which the deliberateness of the sabotage of the law and the efforts to compile phone statistics in an effort to obtain amendment The record in 226-75 alone is shocking in terms of the amount of work, cost and effort the government went to to avoid compliance and then complained in court that it was burdensome. Ryan did use the same ploy in this case, in court, and Pratt almost wept with him.

I think the interrogatories are, as usual, good. I have a few suggestions for the future, if and when they are relevant.

#s 5 and 8, include purposes.

15, Nosenko: a subject rather than the (other defectors and other subjects); and any other such transcripts.

17, What purpose(s). Did they files and/or report or communicate in any way any recommendations, requests, opinion(s), report(s), opinions? What were these? Were they followed? Is there legal basis or need to adhere to these whatever they were?

19:Authority.

I still await, after months, any response from Archives/CIA in several matters referred to CIA for review by Archives. I've written CIA several times, Archives for most recent time only yesterday. These relate to the content of one or more of the transcripts and/or Nosenko, I don't now recall which.

If you stay later today maybe we can talk a little more of this.

Hastily, HW