

2/9/71

Dear Jenifer,

Thanks for the N.O. clippings. Between other things I've read them. The Dreher one rings no bell. That Clinton things disturbs, for while there are aspects that do not ring true (This was know to the FBI at the time, but they did nothing, and I suspect that's how JG go onto them), they, most assuredly, do. I was with them, saw and heard them.

Homosexuals: yes, there can be that many in NO without much difficulty, even though that is probable more than 10% of the city population. There have always been many there, a large number of the whore were lesbians, and it achieved a degree of acceptability quite some time ago. Much higher, I'd say, than S.F., and Hal told me that S.F. was the gay capital (I find the word wrong, but it, too, has gotten accepted).

Appeals-Court fire strange at the time it sits on Shaw case, but I know the area and the building (it is in the French quarter) and it is old enough for this be be not sinister. Besides, Shaw's doing fine there.

The obvious omission in the Hattiesburg bombing case is an account of the lawyer's practise and/or clients. Such devices have become quite sophisticated. They can be attached to parts of the car that get hot and be set off at predetermined temperatures, can have the same thing done by the friction of being dragged underneath, even up-the-exhaust ones have been know for some time, to me for three years. If such violence may now be more common there than malnutrition, I'd ben interested if you find any story indicating his connection with blacks, etc.

The Haik case is tragically typical of JG. I remember once when Steve Bordelon and I delivered him to a plane, the night in COUP, Mafia Frame, he touchingly asked Steve to phone his mother so she'd know when to turn the TV on to hear him or about him, and when he is a lawyer, he lets another handle her affairs--and fleece her. Brilliant as he without doubt is in some areas, he had a balancing incimpetence. After seeing one of those clips you set an obvoous ploy by Shaw's lawyers became obvious, as did a counterweight I know he'll overlook, and the others pay little attention to their own files (true of him, too). So, I put in a call. Now considering that I'd just gotten a note yesterday from Ivon that began "great job", for something I'd just done for them that they couldn't do for themselves, and at their request, what better reason for no return on the call? I don't think such things should be decided on ploys, and I do think Shaw perjured himself. There are two better chases than Garrison rush into. My biting letter on the rush indictment is one for which he'll never forgive me, and after what I'd just gone through, I did it on purpose and knowing the consequences....And he still owes me soemthing like \$1,000, so I'm not about to cater. The best defense to a request for a permanent injunction in that federal court is to put into that record two more cases of perjury, in this case, the satk being simple, two FBI reports I gave him and two excerpts from the testimony. He could go farthur and get an affidavit from a respected man he knows, and he'd never interviewed him, but I did, on tape. Having exhausted the improbable is no reason to abandon the probable. Shaw pretty clearly house at least one probably two, possible three, CIA fronts. And at least one does figure in the case.

I've been overloaded again. I got up early this a.m., but not early enough to get swinging on the immediate task. That crooked US ATTY dumped another load of 10-point feces on me yesterday, so long that my response to but two pages plus two paragraphs already runs over 4,000 words. The probleme will be getting it and the remainder of what I'd already done completed in a week. That is, retyped. Lil is working long days, and this is the only time o the year we have any income. She typed the most essential this past weekend by not doing her office work she'd broguth home, and then I get this, which should

been included in that. I didn't get to see it until almost noon. I had other things to which I had to attend immediately in the mail. By the time I got to read it once and make a few notes I've not yet consulted as I did, I started working on that on which I felt I had to focus, at about 4 p.m. I had to pick Lil up, waiting about a half-hour because she had just had to take a new client, and even with time out for a quick supper, had more than 4,000 words done by 11. Sipped a fine Italian brandy (I've called it B in B- brandy in bed-where we share one glass) while watching the TV news, couldn't unwind enough until a bit of Mercuri on the Cavett show, and then solid sleep until 5:30..The problem with what I've done is that no federal judge is about to do what it requires. This time I had just gotten the attachments to the gov't motion of 1/13 on my clothing/pix suit (3569-70), certified as having been served on me 1/13, not provided in response to my first request, not copied by the time of my second. And I can understand that failure to provide it was not accidental. The attorney has to be a fool not to understand what he had to use in his papers. Apparently some nut didn't make an extra copy of my formal appeal and annotated it. The annotations prove that someone inside Archives was doing a job on whoever responded by knowingly misinforming him, which tends to point a stiffer finger at one I've always suspected. In addition, they got Rhoads to sign an affidavit saying what they wanted him to say. By this time they haven't yet learned two things: to look at their own correspondence files and that I will. So, there is an airtight case of perjury against the Archivist, and I've finished the draft of the response that is an indictment. Nice people these scholars. There are two counts of such perjury, both documented, documentation already attached, and this without consultation with my main files, just those letters I'd already selected out as needed for this suit. Nothing could be more material, the test of perjury: had I requested that for which I sue; and had it been refused. In both cases it is completely unequivocal. But I can't picture a DC federal judge putting an important government official away. The extra problem this makes is that unless the defendants get up tight about the prospect and settle outside of court again, the judge will have to face this and he cannot without either charging Rhoads or ruling against me, despite the overwhelming proof of my complete case, of which this is but gilding. So, I'll have something for a long and interesting appendix for PM when I complete it, and contextual as anything can be, the nitty gritty. ...it would be wonderful if I got a speaking invitation out there and Jim had a day or two off and we could just sit and ramble. There is so much, including about N.O., of which I think you'd like to hear. Now to catch up on the rest of yesterday's mail. Lil will write about the trousers (I think she'll want two) as soon as the pressure is off. Thanks.

Best,

