

5/30/72

Dear -ou,

Your mailing of the clips and transcripts came today. I had to be away all morning, so I'm writing a hasty note in the event we do not have the promised thunderstorm and I can drive into town to mail this, with a few reminders and suggestions, before I have time to read what I am glad you (I assume this) sent. As you will have realized, I learned of the general thing earlier. Someone who gets the States by mail sent me the story of a week ago, also by mail.

Whether or not I can sell the story on which I've sent out a query, I'm quite glad to have what you sent. As soon as I can, I'll go over it. I rather imagine that at some point there will be a question of Pershing's credibility. So, I'm reminding you of several things that are not new and that you should have in your files. I don't know whether or not you'll want to take Jim's time with them.

As soon as I saw the affidavits and Pershing's "explanation", I told you that it was exactly opposite his attitude when we discussed his son, Vietnam and the government. You may find a note of a letter in which I asked you to give or send him a handwritten copy of the JFK autopsy because he was so bitter about Vietnam, the government and his son, and he wanted that to remind him and for his son. I am not sure, but I think Bud was with me when this happened, at the coffee shop of the 'bleau, and I think in the first week of December 1968, a memorable time, if you recall. I made the copies for him. I also told you that he is too much of a pro not to have arranged for the stuff against Jim to be at best very weak, and that it could not sustain the charges based on it without his testimony to what is not in the affidavit. If you did not keep what I sent, I have copies, and they are dated. I think this bears very much on his credibility today and is entirely independent of anything current.

I can go even further, looking back and bearing on this. Not knowing he was about to be appointed special prosecutor (and he observed the niceties and didn't give the slightest suggestion of it) there was an entirely different matter on which I thought Ben Smith could be of help, because of some of his previous clients. I saw him the Friday before he was appointed, in his office, and told him there was no federal case against Jim in the affidavits and pointed out the same possible state charge I called to your attention. (He is not the only lawyer I then saw with whom the question, naturally, came up. I saw a number, and I think it came up with all.) Sp, the analysis that told me Pershing was under compulsion and did what he could to frustrate the apparent federal intent to rig a case is not at all new. Not with me. I don't know whether this will interest anyone there, like maybe Bill Read, but I'll be glad to point it out if it does. Pershing is not without corroboration in his confession, although I doubt he is aware of it. He might well know that it was in his mind, but I don't think he would know that it is also in the transcripts used by the government, where I found it.

There is a different kind of substantiation I have. I have been accumulating material for a book sometime in the future, about finks, tentatively titled, "I, Spy". There are other cases like Pershing's in one way or another, where the FBI set up criminal activity, including violence, and cases in which they spent much more money.

If there has been any reporting of the story outside of New Orleans, I have not seen it. I suggest that if the money is available, it would be a good idea to get a clipping service to provide everything in the major papers on Pershing's confession. I think this can be of use later, to show that the prejudicial information was used under official inspiration, but the other side wasn't. In this connection, you might want to bear in mind to ask the local TV net affiliates if they were asked for a network feed and if they were if it was used. I am confident none of the three nets used the story, or I'd have heard of it with ABC or seen it in NBC and CBS. It simply is not credible that WWL-TV would have had such a scoop without offering it to CBS. And here remember what I wrote you about the DJ in DC

sending me the unsigned indictment, the name of the foreman of the grand jury not even indicated, and this long after they were handed down. I still have that in the envelope in which I received it.

Monk Zelden, as a matter of fact, has never returned the copies of the affidavits I got from DJ, and that also was in the envelope in which mailed to me. He hasn't responded to several letters. Jim will remember that on the Tuesday before Thanksgiving, when he and I had lunch at the Roosevelt, Monk came up to me before Monk left. I excused myself and spoke to him briefly and said I'd go to his office after Jim and I finished, as I did. Strange. Can't figure out why he doesn't return it, doesn't respond. I still have the covering letter and the insurance receipt. Which reminds me, when Monk first looked me up at the 'bleau, probably about April 1968, Pershing was with him. Also Judge Shea. I was with them on several occasions there, once with a race-track type wearing a lace shirt and on several occasions with the bailbondsmen Pettingill. Monk and Pershing were friends. Monk could not have looked me up after 4/68 because that was the last time I stayed at the 'bleau and I remember the note in my box, where the clerk had run his name together.

I tried to call you before I started writing this but you have another of those special New Orleans holidays today, and I haven't time for all the thoughts that came to mind when I glanced at your mailing. Mike cases of Department of Justice perjury. FBI and lawyers, Kleindienst lying and that he lied certified by Mitchell first and more recently to federal appeals court by the DJ lawyer, even the subornation of perjury by a U.S. attorney. Got lots of files Lou, but don't know what can be useful. In fact, I don't even know who the defense counsel are now.

Anyway, as soon as I can I'll go over what you sent with care and make notes. If they interest you, you can, of course, have them. Again thanks. Right now, after having been away for a while when everything is growing like hell, I have some mowing I must do not to attract snakes and before we have the promised storm.

One other thing, on the Shaw civil suit: I have what I've never given you that I think can win that case, on Shaw perjuring himself where he wasn't charged. I remember what I did give you. This is NOT that. I also told Sal Panzeca that I have it but wouldn't tell him what it is. When the time comes, I will regard this as an asset. I don't think that in that case Jim is the real target. The moneyed people are. Sal & Co. see possibilities of recovering alleged expenses he told me come to about a half-million dollars. I also know why Sal burned to get Jim. Jim insulted him and it got back to him. I know what Sal has and didn't use, and I'd sure love to have time to be there to see if he'd let me go over it!

What you did send me is what follows. I do hope you can have one of the girls see to it that I can have a copy of everything:

WML transcripts: 5/22, 5 and 6 p.m.; 5/23, 5,6,9:30 p.m.

Newspapers: 5/23 T-P and S-I, each two; 5/24, each one; 5/25, each one; 5/26, S-I on threat.

Rosemary may have a guilty conscience about me because of the dirty deal she pulled when she was on the paper and Oswald in New Orleans came out and because of the crack I pulled on her at the hearing on the state charges, asking, "Plot of Politics, Rosemary?" That she now knows the answer may not make her feel any better about it. But I don't think the same need be true about Bill Reed, if the occasion comes up.

Again thanks, please keep me up to date, and good luck!