

7/9/71

Dear Lou,

It is now certain that I'll have a set of affidavits Monday, so if you ever intended making copies from any source and sending them, don't bother. However, stories are a different matter. They may tell me something not in the affidavits or provide a clue to inspired focus.

One of my young friends in NYC got a copy of the T-P for Saturday, 7/3 and sent me that story. I read it in haste this a.m., but it is clearly unfair and at best what is represented against Jim is double entendre, that is, something that can be taken more than one way, and they chose to take it a special way. With PG knowing what he was expected to accomplish, I think that in the hands of a good lawyer it could be exculpatory. It is at best ambiguous here.

However, my real point may be no point. This story refers to Steve paying a Mountaineer bill with money PG then gave Jim, about \$1,000. Of course, I know nothing about Jim's personal affairs or finances. So I do not know what this bill represents. However, I do have knowledge of an old bill, and if that was in payment of the old bill, it is entirely inconsistent with Jim having loaded up with loot for as long as alleged. You should remember the bill I mean.

This morning's Post carries a short story on the judge's rejection of Jim's motion.

But there is really no play here. Considering the number and extent of Jim's enemies, this is surprising.

If you hear any scuttlebutt on where they took Pershing, I'm quite curious. Not Sicily, I'll bet!

Best,