

Dear Jim,

10/31/73

I tried not to indicate my full excitement when you phoned with the info on the docket, but I was exceptionally excited for the obvious and for other reason that, if they have not yet dawned on you, will soon enough. Project the potential, with a little pressure. Assume Werdig to be expendible and the pressure can be exerted upon whom? And by whom, in his distress?

So, I found it impossible to do any clear thinking for a good hour.

First, because I didn't want to be too excited on the phone, I must congratulate you. You may have heard me say that the obvious is the first essential. In its simplicity, this is close to brilliant. This stupidity I would not have expected, although I had ample indications of it is 2569-70, where I was pro se. (Remember those gratuities you heard from Gessell and I didn't, not being there? Another aspect of the same thing.)

Frankly, I thought you had done this long ago. Perhaps it is better that you didn't.

What to do is the major questions, and I think we must be exceedingly careful.

I knew you were going out tonight, but I didn't know you would by a little after 6, when I phoned to get the night rate. There are some things that came to me after we spoke. First and foremost, and tomorrow I'll try this by phone, don't put people in a position to blab, especially those who do blab and say they do.

Next, I think you should phone Sattuck and NOT tell him what you have but indicate you regard it as exceptionally significant and ask him to direct Morgan to set up a meeting, pronto, with you. Do not discuss the details on the phone, yours or theirs, and with all Morgan and the ACLU have been into, if he is not paranoid about it, it would hurt nothing if you and he went out for a cup of coffee, even if his office has it ready.

The Nader boys, of course, and as soon as possible.

Now it is possible to see the need for filing some kind of stop action in CS, as I asked last week. The need should be apparent. This means you can't safely and decently move as fast as the rules require. Someone might get hurt.

If we have to move fast, and Wednesday is very close, I think it imperative to move fast slowly, which means to stop action first and get time, the purpose of my last weeks call. It really is essential NOT to do the wrong thing, and if we do anything in haste, no matter how good it seems when we do it, it may be wrong. It is the absolute need to do nothing wrong, bracketed with the need to keep this close and from getting above CA too fast.

In the present situation, there are two very expendible people, Sirica and Werdig. We do not want either expended right now. Our Glorious Leader ought not get his kicks from us!

On the other hand each has a strong interest in not being expended, and we must not lose sight of this. With Werdig it can mean (and should) trouble with the bar.

In short, the basic principle I gave you, that my getting the spectre is not now necessarily the most important things, is not to be lost sight of.

While I was a settin and a thinkin I heard something about two of Nixon's tape having disappeared. I'll have to stop in a minute to take in the evening news.

One thing I want to remind you of is my earlier expressed belief, before you got this great stuff (salutes to right and left, front and back) that I must file a civil action that permits depositions, for damages. If Shattuck had not been so hungup this could have been started (Ditto with "All O more than a year ago). Our friend Hirschkop might be willing to file the suit of which I asked him-he said it looked good- long ago. He had a money-maker and would not take time. This could now be that and more. The amount for which I could sue on this is not virtually limitless and the exerts to testify on value should be limitless.

Evening TV news on missing tapes shocker but not surprising. Called Post to suggest how they could find relevant and await call from NBC friend. Both nets lacked knowledge details, but Stern sick and I guess Schorr not there, if he would remember the relevant.

This wrenched my mind from what it was one so I'll try to remember bits.

I think this makes what could have been a very good civil suit for damages and with depositions even more promising and potentially very productive.

when I told you to look for the Archives special regulations Danaher quotes. As I said, they are in 2569-70 - but twice, one as they exhibit, once as mine. It is theirs as Exhibit E to Rhoads' affidavit. It is Exhibit one to my Opposition. In the paragraphs numbered 2 and 5 it is precisely as I told you, these regulations prescribe exactly the opposite to Danaher's use. Both say "copies will be provided." Maybe "furnished." You have xeroxes, for I supplied them, so if you check with Simmons, what I can't find so fast may be relevant, their change after this suit. I do have it.

There is a covering letter to Bud with my 11/9 on Williams. He has.

In my file you should read 11/6, Hammon to Bud.

From the unsigned Williams copy I have, I think I can give you some grist for the fine-grinding mill: it is not in black because it is a carbon. It is a xerox of an original. Look at your copy. This can't really be a carbon unless there are carbons of a quality with which I'm not familiar. Or, the copy we got was prepared for sending to us before he executed it in August. Or worse, huh?

Relevant in general on how good their word is, on CE399, I have a 3/12/70 letter from Rhoads saying they never took a picture for me! They tried to tell me that they gave me Nichols', before his was made yet. It took some doing, but I got it straightened out. The point of relevance to the spectro I think I do not have to argue. The picture they claim not to have taken is of the BASK, of which they had NEVER taken any. atbc?

They did not, ever, send me the Williams affidavit. I got it that fast only because I went into Bud's office. What I wrote I did that night after getting home.

I think this Rhoads affidavit is the perjurious one. Johnson drafted it. GSA's counsel went over it before Justice got it. The perjury is specified in my book-length papers. I think it is toward the end of the affidavit, where he says I didn't even ask, the initial requirement of the law and enough to get the case tossed out. This bears on what you have found. But the exhibits include my requests and their rejections. It exceeded the minimum requirement of the law. Now why would they swear I did not ask? Same reason served by Williams' perjury.

Maybe at this juncture we should be consulting some Hill people. EMK won't want to see anyone, nor will his staff. I think their interest requires their knowledge, not their doing anything, which I would not ask.

...I think we should have copies of the House Armed Service Subcommittee (Hedai) Report and CIA/WG, in this a.m.'s Post. can you please get?

11/1 a.m. You were interested when I told you that rather than giving Texas authorities the results of their work the FBI did the opposite and I gave you some of Henry's letters. Also, in my memo, I do not recall if I referred you to Curry's book. I have loaned my copy out. He complains about the opposite of help, what I've told you. After you left I remembered there is more of this, stuff from the FBI files that I gave Henry that it never did. Furthermore, I have gone over all his files and can swear that they didn't give him 10% of what they have. Moreover, the Executive Sessions disclose the fierce determination, headed by Rankin to do the opposite. And so does something else suddenly very topical. But on Henry, I have more I've been intending to send him. DON't tell anyone, but if I gave him a case, he'd take it to court because as his letter shows, he always believed there was a conspiracy. I may have fortified this belief but I didn't cause it. Well, I have an envelope of stuff I didn't mail once when I was out of stamps, forgot it and just saw it the other day. I'll be sending it now that I've remembered it. It deals with what is, in a sense, involved in this, leaks. Prejudicial stuff was leaked from his office and I gave him the proof who did it, who paid and was paid how much as it was commercialized, etc.

What becomes relevant is Nixon's fixing upon Jaworski, who was counsel to the Texas Commission, who was then on a CIA foundation's board, and LHO was accused of having been a federal agent? AND, the Texas commission was aborted by Washington. I have written this chapter of Agent Oswald. We can produce the documents showing how the feds kept stuff from the Texas commission. Except that again what is relevant, they all no longer exist. I have Archives letters on this. HW