6/12/70

Dear Bud,

Glad to hear from you yesterday and to learn that my reading of the decision was not without warrant. I hadn't phoned you because there was no emergency and I thought that after the relatively long absence, you'd have lots of catching up to do.

I didn't go into it by phone, but I think there is at least one other quickie we can slip in, establishing another victory and another point with little effort and without the likelihood of a real hearing in court. There may be a second. I've filed the DJ 118 forms on both and have had a negative response to my appeal on one. Without checking the files, I believe there has been more than enough time on the other, that I did appeal.

The first has to do with FBI Exhibit 60. All I want is a photographic print and this they will not provide. The Archives doesn't have it. All they have is a printed copy supplied the Commission by the FBI. I haven't appealed the Archives decision not to make a print of a similar picture of their own, but if you think I should, I will. This is a picture of the front of the shirt. The reason they will not permit me to have a clear print, without the photoengraving dots, is because they will not permit one that can show the slits were not made by a bullet to be in circulation. I did appeal to Burke Marshall, and he sided with the Arch. They told me to appeal to him, as I recall, which, if true, can be the waiver of the need to appeal to their public-information office. And they have supplied me with utterly meaningless pictures. This is so simple and so comprehensible, I think you'd want this one to go to court, and fast.

The other is with the spectro. My efforts to get that go back to my first unanswered letter to Hoover, 5/23/66. In this case, while it is not what they claim, part of an inv file, that is also effectively waived by two things: its use by the Warren Commission in substance (alleged but palpably untruthfully) and the fact that it was piblished in essence (also alleged but clearly unlikely) by both the Commission and Curry. This one also gives us a safe way of testing and losing on what is an inv filembecause there was no federal jurisdiction because we can show it was waived by use and not lose there. I gope you can find time to come up here on this and other things, for I cannot haul all of this down there and it provides opportunity for a short complaint with a few illuminating attachments and, I think, good prospects. There are also other things I'd like to be able to discuss with you soon, where there will be no interruptions, on the Ray case. New possibilities, I think, exist from the Mice book, which I've not yet finished. I think you ought have both him and Manes as witnesses in the invisible role of defendants.

I had written you, as you know by now. I would like to read the new Tenn. court papers, if possible, before I go to DC. You didn't copy because the machine wasn't working. Of the decisions for which I asked, that of Skolnick is of most immediate interest for a simple reason: it should have told him to be sure to sue the right agency, and he didn't, a second time. Therefore, it makes his suit less innocent. I would also like to talk to you without interruption on a quick suit on the memo of transfer, which has a special status. While I am willing to go it alone on these, I would like to go over them with you and hope you can either prepare or revise the complaints. This has a unique status that is all our way. We should be applying the intellectual judo, possible in this case also a kind of legal judo, while it is possible, as with the Ray case. Hurriedly,