

6/10/72

Dear -ou,

It is not my intention to write you a daily letter. However, there are some things I'd like to have, feel I need, so I ask for copies, please.

I do not have anything (either side) on the effort to stop the printing of the original 113-page affidavit. In going over some of my files and in some writing I did this morning, I have become convinced that this may serve further legal usefulness especially because of the adverse decision and I want to be able to use it in the writing. I'll add to what I've done.

(It may not be of use to Jim or his lawyers, but in case they think this is a precedent, except for the complete printing it is not. The Department of Justice did the same thing with some Mafia types in New Jersey, making much more extensive interceptions available. I think their purpose when they did this several years ago was to make it seem that there just had to be legal authorization for tapping and bugging - that crime couldn't be fought without it. Somewhere I have some files on this, ~~ix~~ and I could find them if needed. It may be - and I'm not sure - that they made 100% of the transcripts public.)

In his interview with the Los Angeles Star Jim refers to the charges he was handed. I'd like a copy. The first is pretty far out, that he travelled as a representative of pinballers. A man'd better be careful if he takes a vacation! Or makes appearances in connection with a book.

Here also he refers to the smashing of the desk. If there is the picture I've already asked for, I would like it. If not, if Jim keeps bills and it isn't too much trouble to find it, I'd like a copy of that, showing how much it cost to repair. There really wasn't all that rush, especially since they had the key anyway.

Jim says the feds have to have an indictment. I presume this means unless a federal agent personally sees commission of a criminal act. Have you a copy of the law on this? That is, is one available to you without much trouble? This <sup>es</sup> address something I have already written, pretty much the same thing, but in an entirely different way.

Monday there will be this hearing. I presume you will have a transcript. Regardless of what happens - and having thought about it a bit I am by no means certain that pinning a perjury rap on Pershing is all that may be the plan or hope - I am anxious to study it as soon as possible.

I have evolved several of my own theories. You may recall those things that troubled me when I first read the affidavit. I think I am developing an answer. If I am correct, I think it can be important to the defense. For one thing, although I am sure he feels otherwise, I am confident the government had in mind much more than getting Jim (which they did desire). More than their to me obvious (party) political objectives. An over-simplification would be to say it is part of an overall design of making repression legally acceptable. I told you I have quite a file on Kleindienst. That is not the end but a beginning. I'll be using some of this in my writing. In fact, I think I wrote, contemporaneously, what I then observed and think I correctly understood. So, I hope you can find time to ask Linda or someone to copy anything you may think I have even a remote possibility of using or in which I might find knowledge or understanding. If it sounds immodest, I will say I have in the past seen what others, including some pretty good lawyers, have not.

Thanks, and best,