2/2/72

Dear Jim,

After reading the 11/9/71 Law Weel page you gave me on "Freedom of Information", I feel that this constitutes tacit acknowledgement that by current standards the Department of of Justice itself regularly and repeated denied James Earl Ray his minimum legal rights before he had any defense or the possibility of defense and during the pre-trial period when he was represented by counsel.

I also interpret it to me that the proscriptions are pre-trial only, and that in this context it means that post-trial these things may be and perhaps prp erly can be made available, such things as "laboratory tests". The mere fats that it fails to say that at no time may such lab tests be released if ample evidence that it does nad has released and expects in the future to releases such lab tests. Hence by a reasonable interpretation of this new Amender Order to the Dept. Rules and Regs. of 11/2/71 I should be entitled to the lab tests I seek. I.e., spectro.

I think the last part of graph 1, top col. 3, addresses misconduct in my case.

I forgot to get the copy of the Lattimer biblio when I was there, Would appreciate a copy in response to request for one.

I have reread the GSA-familt contract and more than ever I am persuaded that "hoods' hair was short where I grabbed, that letting Lattimer see the clothes under any non-photographic circumstances is open violation of it as it was of the then-prevailing regulations, which in turn bear on whether I have a tort to al eged. If I refrain from citing the specific provision it is only because I want to avoid coloring your opinion, which should be independent. After you have read it with some care, separate from any xitation from me, I would like to discuss this with you. I think we are in a dangerous period, that the best defense is to attack, and that we have a very good chance of frustrating imminent danger by it, aside from the central purpose of getting my rights for me. If I write Rhoads about this, I will enclose the letter. However, if I do, please reread that contract before reading it.

May I suggest that some morning before you leave home you phone DJ, tell them you have read that you gave me from law week, tell them your are a law graduate and are interested in the subject, and ask that theysend you this, unless the full text is in Law Week, and any earlier orders or regs it supercedes and any others on the same general subject not addressed by it-to your home?

I no longer get the N.O. papers, but I have jusy been told that Guy Johnson is Garrison's local lawyer. The story does not make clear whether Rehridge is still involved or whether or not Bailey will still represent at trial(not mentioned either way). If Rehridge is out, I wonder why, and I suspect lack of independence may be one reason. I have no independent info. from there.

Best,