Valentine, WaPost

4/29/73

Dear Paul,

Because you have personal knowledge of some of what will follow I write you instead of Bob or Carl. If I haven't time to correct the typos because of a pressing deadline in urgent personal matter, I hope you will forgive it.

Essentially, except for the personal involvement of the President and the scope of the subversion called The Watergate, there is nothing new in it. Rather it is that the papers have elected to ignore such things. To illustrate this and to present what I think your people would ordinarily find relevant (were it not for the subject and my involvement) I'll restrict myself to my own Freedom of Information suits. My central purpose here is to give the records of the new people at the top for integrity, for dedication to the law and to proprieties and I think it not unfair to say for twisting the truth and the law to serve wrongful political ends.

In my suit for the suppressed King assassination evidence Kleindienst lied deliberately and very clumsily. You have this letter. I gave him a chance to be truthful and he rejected it. The State Department pulled the plug on him and he ignored that, too. And Ruckelshaus sat still for all of this. More, knowing it, he took the case to court. As you know, I got a summary judgement, a rarity. However, in their desperation, under Ruckelshaus and really for no useful purpose, Anderson filed a perjurious affidavit in court. I have showed this to you. And you were there with me and then remembered that contrary to his representation under oath Anderson had not only given me nothing, he had refused to when I asked it. This and the subsequent letters of transmittal make his affidavit perjurious. I so charged in letters. Mitchell, Kleindienst ignored it and Ruckelshaus actually wrote me ignoring it and pretending it hadn't happened. On this alone what fidelity to law or decency can be expected of him as head of the FBI? I'm sure the Nader people and many who would have to be protected inside EPA, of whom I know some, would give you a different picture of his career there than his political successes, which is what the papers report, would lead you to believe.

My suit for the pictures of the President's clothing was also under Ruckelshaus. He provided the court with a knowingly perjurious affidavit by Dr. Rhoads (just promoted to replace Eisenhower on the supposed declassification of withheld information). The crux, under the law, was had I made a request. There is more I believe is perjurious, but the Rhoads affidavit swears I had not. My requests and their answers are in the court record. This, too, was Ruckelshaus-responsible perjury and subornation of perjury.

In my suit for the spectrographic analysis there is a case just like these. Again, Ruckelshaus. The affidavit by the incompetent (legally speaking) FBI agent Williams is deliberately deceptive and is perjurious. This affidavit is quoted in full in the court of appeals decision, where the majority, with consummate subtlty (read footnote 5) directs Sirica on remanding to give me full opportunity to explore this. Interesting that suddenly Justice in this case has no confidence in Sirica and has done what they never have before under this law, asked for an en banc rehearing (on which nothing new to my knowledge).

Peterson is criminal division. They supplied the affidavits to get Ray extradicted. At least two of these are perjurious, and the perjury was suborned because it was known they are perjurious. Charlie Stephens' and Ballistics Expert Frazier's. Frazier knew he has examined no intact bullet, that he had only a fragment, but he swore a complete bullet had been recovered from the corpse and that he had examined it. This was the central evidence and the sole possible link between Ray and the crime. So, for political reasons, all these people suborned and committed perjury. And nobody would do anything about it.

If you, Bob, Carl or anyone else doubts my representations, Jim is a lawyer and knows about just about alls of this. You should have most of the documents. Jim, too. I do.

Or, the more cunning of the foxes now guard the same chickenhouse. No more Gray [illegible], Kleindienst arrogance, etc.

Best,