I didn't think of it while we spoke a short time ago, but it would be a good idea if you could get up a little earlier than usual Wednesday the 13th and be at the GHA optical Dept., 2021 L.NW. <u>Drior</u> to my 10:20 a.m. appointment because I will have a very large stack of stuff for you and a larger one to be xeroxed. This is within walking distance of the place you get the xeroxing done and it is appointment will be I don't know when the second before you I'll just walk to where you are. This is material you'll want to be with while it is copied.

Because you do not need the new stuff I got from the Archives (list attached) I'll give it to you Wednesday. This is a reminder: two, as indicated, had lists attached. All the copies I got are poor. If you want the lists I'd best copy them on my machine where I can overexpose of you'd best have a careful xeroxing job done. There are notations I can't make out. They'll be less legible in a run-of-the-mill job. Those copies I'll give you are more legible because I took more care with the exposure. Even originals are pale. Archives' original carbons are like the worst of the Warren Commission's. I might, in fact, make an issue of these copies, that is, the kinds of copies they provided where they could have provided decent ones. The lists are of CDs about which questions of declassification are asked.

I believe that in toto this stuff will have value in future litigation. And I don't mean ours only.

When I say you have no immediate need, I mean you have higher priorities not that you should not read. I think you should read when you can heed and then do.

Pay particular attention to the Nosenko stuff. I do not think it ever qualified for any kind of withholding, any part of it. There is more of it in these records.

If and when you speak to one of the kids from distant points who has time and the disposition to do some work, I think it would be worthwhile checking the papers we got in the 1970 declassification and those I'm to get with the lists to be sure I have a full set. You may remember that I made arrangements with the 1970 one for Paul, Bud and Dallasites and myself to share the costs to reduce them to each. We got one set and then had it copied. I have mine in a separate file, each by number in a separate folder. I've not yet had time to go over it! If we make a copy of the two lists referred to above we ought to make a second one for this checking. There have been "accidents" in the past.

I hope you realize that the Schur letter enclosed and of which I told you by phone, taken with mine to him, means that ERDA was the source of the mess Ryan hand delivered the evening of 6/30. Otherwise he'd merely have responded, "no spik." It also means that there is a tacit agreement to do it if Ryan agrees. If Ryan does not or they refuse I'm inclined to file on that alone, means separately. It does have values other than we sought so with boths kinds of papers, those covered by the action and those valueteed this is impirtant for the future. Unless and until they do I'm keeping them as they are, which is as you gave them to me, so you can hand them to the appeals court. I think even Tarm would have trouble with this. (Anybody but Danaher, that is.)