

Dear Jim:

75-1448 interrogatories 7/20/76

Having read the two batches at different times and with other matters on my mind each time I'm not certain of recollection. I do not in thinking back perceive the structure we discussed. The questions themselves are good.

I have the impression that they focus narrowly on points of law, which is necessary.

However, not knowing what else you have done or have in mind, I do make a suggestion because I know you want to get them filed as soon as possible: leave a supplementary set to be filed with both NARS and CIA in each case addressing the integrity and prejudice of their classifications, etc. I feel more strongly about this after reading Wilkey on our ⁿmandate and obligation and because it resulted in a deception of the whole Senate through the deception and misleading of a committee.

This and the subsequent campaign of continuing deception, which there is no reason to assume is spontaneous, make all relating to Nosenko and suppressions that are at issue even more important.

We now have more to add:

The same Briggs is the withholder on my personal files and all my requests of CIA.

We have the right to establish his truthfulness, integrity, impartiality and judgment, etc., because all are involved in his withholding of the transcripts. We can do it with emphasis and considerable effect with illustrations of how he withholds from me what is not withheld from others and masking on me what is not masked on others and invoking exemptions on me over identical documents supplied others without exemption.

This is what I meant by saying the letter I will write to CIA in response to the one received yesterday will establish these and other facts, which really means how Briggs personally and CIA in general have made a special case out of me, relevant in this suit, and the utter frivolity with which they continue to regard law and regulation. We started to go into this when you were here last. I can now carry it farther. I did not go through unfiled material, which will take time, to extract some relevant Nosenko samples. The suggestions of the same nature on Rhoads I'll give you lead up to this with Nosenko. They did withhold. You were there. You asked Johnson for me. We received these records from him the day we took the curbstone pictures. They were FBI only.

Especially for an added reason do I think there should be a separate supplementary set: they'll squawk and Robinson may be tempted to support them. And if as I doubt this goes against us it will be a separate basis for appeal. Meanwhile, in and of themselves, these parts of the interrogatories will become an important record for history, for us and for others, of whom one of the more probably now is Lamont.

With what we will be giving Robinson on 5/19 I think the one question he will not have is of our credibility. However, on this transcript, I believe we want to do nothing publicly that can become public prior to the GOP convention. If Robinson wants to, that is different. I do not think we should delay anything we've discussed, like filing an affidavit and attachments relative to his in camera inspection. I would not follow immediately with a motion for summary judgment on that separately. I would wait a couple of weeks to give him and his clerk time to read. I do not think it is necessary to delay the filing of a motion past about 2 weeks before the convention, however. We would not go public on that and the government has time for response. I'll not be surprised is after we file the affidavit and attachments Robinson does this on his own. That is one reason I suggest giving him time before giving him the need to face that particular question.

Meanwhile, by the time there can be any questions raised about those added interrogatories relating to intent and integrity, the record I will have compiled will be ever so much more compelling, not that it is not adequate now for ordinary cases.

J