

Dear Paul,

5/11/78

Your 5/4 came while I was in Washington for three days. For the first two this was to help Jim in representing Carol Pepper and John Ray before the House assassins. The second was a status call in my King FOIA case. So I'm also a bit farther behind. And now we face new battles on new FOIA fronts with the old DJ. These will take time, as will overloaded Jim's representation of Ray's sister and brother. (I do not know what happened to or with Jerry Ray yesterday. His champion, the indefatigable Lane, was off slaying dragons before some camera or audience.)

The House assassins are much worse than I'd believed. They are zealots and absolutely crazy, with more insanity and more zealotry than I'd believed. They are also authoritarians, distinguished from the Gestapo or the KGB in degree only. I hope in time to address this separately but I think all would be wise to have no additional contact with them and to prepare for what lies ahead. I can also address this separately later. Perhaps you will hear from Bob Katz or Jeff Goldberg about this. I believe it is going to be necessary for me to respond when they hold public hearings. This will require that I know what goes on and what can be said about it. If the directors of the press are willing I think I can be heard in debunking them. I believe debunking will be easy. They are that wrongheaded if the Ray case is a fair sample, as I'm sure it is.

Jim battled them effectively if they saw to it that this was in total secrecy. If they do not destroy or succeed in keeping the transcript a permanent secret it will expose them.

My meeting with Evans of the Senate Intelligence Committee was all I could expect it to be. He is a properly cautious man, mature, well-reasoned and as of the extent of our discussion seemingly interested in, if I can paraphrase it with my own earlier description, Legend as for all practical purposes a spook black book. While I am under no restraints I believe it better not to flaunt this contact around. I have told only Howard and Jim besides you. I have also told him how to get in touch with you and urged this on some matters. One is the evidence that Epstein did in fact receive records from the CIA that had not been released to others. I could not recall any illustration from the book but I said you might.

Please do try to dub the Scott-Epstein tape because what does not attract your attention may attract my interest or may have some significance to Evans that we do not see. If you are in touch with Mark or Golz, please encourage them in the same direction.

Epstein has fled the country. This departure, this abandonment of the normal promotions of his book, coincides in time with the motion picture filed for a "new" trial in the transcripts case. It also is for the duration of the time originally set by the appeals court. It means he is not available to a subpoena server.

Because the United States Marshals did not serve the other subpoenas as of this early-morning moment I do not know if we will be taking depositions tomorrow, the date Jim had selected. Please include a dupe of your summary for me to give Evans. I agree that it is good and will serve to focus his attention. It is merely that I do not want to limit his interest to your mind or mine.

The Chi Sun-times review is from Mark Allen. If I did not send you a copy I presume it is because I thought he would. It is on the copier for when Jim next uses the machine and will be enclosed.

I believe your CIA No. 76, 11/27/63, is the report of the defector I had in mind. I'll read it and the other enclosures later in the date, perhaps when I'm at the lab for the regular blood tests. Perhaps I'll also add comment. I'll send a copy to Evans.

Your perceptions on the second memo are good. This coincides well enough with the known subject matter of the 1/21/64 executive session which also is in issue in the suit. I should say with what is known about the content of the transcript.

Re Epstein's suggestion that Nosenko represented a message the CIA expected from the KGB, and he did suggest or state this, nonsense. It just does not work that way. It is not good novel material, either. There were other and better means available of there had been this deal or interest in collaboration. In this connection you might want to

outgoing - 41

consider the tone and content of the Epstein text of the CIA's questions. You may also want to recall that State and I think FBI opposed later questions of the Soviets proposed by the CIA. No foreign government would have responded to them. They are deliberately insulting.

The enclosure from CD 49, pp. 41-2, re Derjabin, reminds me that it would be good to know the names of all the defectors known to or of interest to the WU in connection with the CA 75- 1448 suit for the transcripts. This is because of the withholding of the 1/21/64 transcript. Do you recall any others? I'd forgotten about this one.

I think it would be better if you also had your own contact with Evans. So please send him your notes, any review you think he should have and say that I asked you to do this if you have not already done it.

He is the nominee, I think they call them, of my Senator, Charles Mac Mathias. I have known Mathias and his family for years. I wrote Mac about Epstein's book and I heard from Evans. Mac has and has had a genuine and long interest in authoritarianism. While there are political restraints on what those who want to be re-elected can do, I am without doubt about Mac's genuineness on this.

Your 5/2/78 notes: I read the Church testimony on mail intercepts. In general, not on LHO, there is little doubt that just about all USSR mail was intercepted and that it was done, at least in large measure, for the FBI. This means they should have all of LHO's mail.

I do not ~~remember~~ remember seeing your 48, Cohen, and would appreciate. Ditto 64, Dave Williams, 55, 56, 58 (you missed the same thing in Wrono's review), I forgot 42 (where you make the same comment) and 59.

More later.

Thanks,