7/31/92 Ed, thanks for the toughtfulness of the stamped envelope and the unattributed 7/26/72 "Panther trial "perjury" disclosed", as biased a headline as the matching story. This dishonesty is not relieved by the below-lead quote of Sears. Hapily (for me) he, a qualified lawyer, says precisely what I had earlier vold you, that all of this, whether ouplable, innocent or faked, is utterly irrelevant to the charges before the court or any of the contents of the indictment or evidence presented to the grand jury. This is classic whorehouse music to which the whores and pimps of the press dance to which they expect the readers to whistle.

That Romiti permits them to be considered is self-description. He has to be a Daley pocket, a machine back, for the nost that in my opinion could honestly be done to them would be to give them to respondents in the damage suit, to whom they'd have been available under descovery and to whomthey'd have been delivered if the defense counsel hard had the perspicacity to ask a very obvious question.

If you will look at the chapter The Witmenses you will find that far back I said eye-wtinesses are the least dependable sources in major, drematic events. If there is anything wrong or tainted about the tangiale evidence at the scene of theorize, the taint is 10.2% the fault of the defendants and it is, in fact, the escence of the chrages to which they now answer. I find it impossible to believe they could or would have been able to isolate and destroy the projectiles and the empty hulls allogedly now involving some of the victims. But if they did this impossible thing, or had any mattive for it, have they not thereby proven their own guilt to the present charges and more?

Without knowing more than I do, I't be inclined to wonder at the sudden surfacing of unsigned statements so long after anyone can have clear recall. Real mysterious, even for Crook County, where anything can happen. Again thanks, HW

