

Dear Paul, reur Legend article for Inquiry & Epstein 3/16/78 3/25/78

These came in this morning's mail and I read them immediately. By supertime I have not been able to look at the rest of the mail or do what I had planned with these. So while I await supper and the next interruption, a few comments.

First, these are both good, very good. I will have some suggestions about both.

Second, I assume from where it ends that you will have further notes on Epstein and the book. I hope so.

I may not be able to get to what I'd pinned to be doing during the day until morning.

I have no plans for writing articles about this. I do want to do what I can in court.

To that end I have to prepare whatever Jim can use, not will use, giving him choices - really much more than there is any chance he can use.

This gets to where my notes have to be pretty extensive. In turn this is what "ave Wrono wants.

And as always where does the time come from?

So I'm going to do some of it on tape, for the daynow not far in the future when Lil will have time for typing. If I can easily or if you desire even if not easily I'll supply you with a dub of the tape(s).

I read these this morning, knowing I'd not then have time to do more than read them. Not knowing that you had sent copies of Jim and Howard I did not mark them up so I could give them clean copies.

To serve as marks I used paperclips. I hope I recall their purposes when I get to them!

I'll write a few suggestions about the article and I'll dictate the rest for when Lil can type it. I'll also establish a separate file for your notes and mark it reserved, not for use of others without your okay.

On page 2 of the article you refer to Anatoli M. Golitsin. For some time I've been wondering if this can be the "Mr. Martin" who was in touch with me. He sure hated Nosenko, spoke of him as Angleton at al do and fiercely disputed the version in KGB about LHO in the USSR. I wondered then why he sought me out and met with me and why he should take the initiative on this line with Nosenko. That must have been not long before the beginning of the Epstein project. Maybe it was about this time two years ago. I'm not checking.

On page 3 you consider the possibility of an LHO/ONI hookup. A number of us did early on and even Garrison did for a while. If Garrison does not lend it probity I believe it is worth not being cast away as impossible.

Third graf: I think the clip was to remind you that the CIA did consider approaching Oswald to be of some use to it.

Graf 4, LHO and Soviet tie to assassination: Hoover jumped for the lona-nut so fast it was before he knew of any alleged FBI investigating deficiencies. I think there is another possibility not germane here.

Page 4, bottom, on citations: I've checked them and few if any relate to sources at that point in the text. His heading is Notes, his description is footnotes, and they are not citations to sources.

After this you note his claims to havin forced things out via FOIA- you are right but you understate. He also uses tricky writing to imply that he did it whe he didn t.

P. 5, bottom: the 1976 Congressional committee on only one LHO letter intercept. If the citation is convenient I'd like it. I think you've said you have an FOIA in on this. I also have for several years, as does Mark Allen. Mine is more inclusive, all intercepts or any nature or source. Your Angletonian hunch is reasonable at least.

Page 6- is it public that Colby leaked the illegal mail activities to Hersh?

Last graf, you have to correct that "who struck John" part because it is not "CIA jargon" and is not really details, although in some uses this can be interpreted. It is an old World War II slag, to my knowledge Army, perhaps more. It meant talk someone did not want to hear, irrelevant chatter (maybe also from superiors), sometimes almost b.s. If I am not absolutely certain of the definition I am certain it is not "CIA jargon" because it predates the CIA.

Of course you may have no interest in or use for the notes I'll be making. They'll not be organized or systematized in any way until time for use of them here. If you think not please let me know because making a dub may require some time and effort. If you are sending copies to Jim or Howard please let me know. It will be easier for me to mark them up as I read them but I prefer not to do that if I am giving copies to others. Some times I can't make copies immediately. (It is now the next morning and she has not had time to do these.) If you are sending copies to them then I can make what notations I want as I read what I receive from you. As long as the situation in the appeal remains as it is or there may be press inquiry I'd like to read your notes immediately and see what I can learn from them promptly.

Lardner has been assigned to review the book. His initial reaction was not unfavorable, that it appeared that Epstein had done his homework. I've cautioned him about factual error, and I think a out flawed logic. Sylvan Fox is now National Editor of Newsday. I have a friend on his staff who may be here this coming week. Things like these. Yesterday I showed some things to one on Jack Anderson's staff. He was here on another subject, not JMK. My Newsday friend is also coming on another subject.

With so much too much to do what I do at any one time is controlled by what seems to be or most immediate need. But on some work I do have deadlines. We may hear something that will let us know that the transcripts case appeal is in the far future. On the other hand, it now seems that we may have the chance to depose Briggs and others fairly soon. If this is the case then I'll have to work fast to get all possible of paper for Jim. While I expect them to try to stonewall on the depositions (C.A.77-1997) if the judge is fair I think we'll take the depositions. And here the kind of precise work you do could be enormously helpful to Jim, who will be trying to impeach Briggs and the CIA's withholdings. I am sure that anything you have done on this or can do could be enormously helpful. What I'll be doing will enable Jim, if he has the time, to prepare questions to ask. Sometimes the refusal to answer is important. Some of the questions that are relevant are almost self-answering.

I have read more of the book than is covered by the notes you've sent. My original opinion, that the book presents us with some positive possibilities, is fortified by this reading. I've been annotating the book as I read it. For a few pages I was able to dictate some observations. I hope to go back and dictate what precedes and what follows that I've read. Kind of chaotic but that is the way it is. (In many instances we've spotted the same thing but in some with not identical reactions or recollections or citations, as with the name checks, where Epstein has said not identical things.) This reminds me that a list of your relevant FOIA requests, dated, with dates of any compliance, could also be helpful to Jim. While mine are older than the one you note Epstein's are not earlier than mine and if he got what you also did not get the case against the CIA becomes much clearer, as it does with it happening to both of us rather than one.

We have no way of knowing what will happen in any case before we get into it. We have no way of knowing what reaction there will be, if any. But the possibilities provided by the judicial system, if it works, are quite significant and well worth the effort. DJ now recognizes that what happened in my original spectro case, which I lost, turned the law around. It told me this just a few days ago. And if nothing else a court record becomes a permanent historical record. So I think that the effort is more than justified.

Sincerely,