

PM 5/23 - A 1 ch - preparing letter by letter on Richardson's correspondence
by Justice my committee. After several days.

Agreed for \$25, one + expenses. The letter declined to give details of business.

The letter nature is "put outside of them", against "rehearsal" + based on what
the letter had. In, the letter was not making up something new - on his testimony.

Wanted Alch to meet with Paul B'Dricha trap lawyer. Parkerson at party.

The letter "prepared to ~~meet~~ the emergency" of his act.

Parkerson told them they had "independent evidence" that
equipment was delivered to them. The letter be indicated,
at evening. They would not if equipment was delivered to them.

At 11:30, the letter had been returned of planned evidence to
his employers. Anticipated Mel's notes. But they he gave com-

mitted the only 3 of some notes. Alch says this means the letter
was in accord with evidence + as Paul had said not believe it

was legal. Alch's proposed evidence is wrong, should be compared with
the performance.

"Gentle-Exchange" says "in the Department" both of proposed method
both of which he said Alch was not line.

I guess on the need of all Alch goes into on Alch's evidence.
The letter believed there intended to make him "feel grey". He told Alch

that - Parkerson had out of the known FBI was looking into against him
Alch said he would hold of the evidence against, on one way of what was right

Embarrassed me I called - 1st week + children of other that Alch said.

written on typing.
Muel - that Cell from Lill to Muel, only Muel to
Edison Muel's ^{est} ask to Mrs Jones. Ask you great letter
on who he has not say he has his opinion in his writings.
I got surprised of names about 10 members with Paul he
already open of plea from presenters. But what each says does
not think to leaders what Muel really said. Not ask permission...
1972 response of all despite counsel. My fact seems right with
only. He says that his question of CIA involvement - has come up.
The Muel case is not a + said CIA not involved & would have ~~not~~
the part of very great degree. He ~~then~~ says no agreement by to
Bartman's office & ~~not~~ members what Muel said to be could
bring it, but even said he would get CIA number changed.

2) March 5th 1933

What about will look several times when not home.

(Bill & Henry were, on Spencer, not making notes)

His account of Bill's meeting, he demands him really supports what he said. He is not discouraged here they

be important exp. He then says that in first day of trial he learned that was opportunity plea. They wanted to be - own but not, of that's change of plea. ~~They~~ says he was

Paul. Barber asked to see in lot of last minute. - at Bittman's office. on day, although actually conference with - at Bittman's office.

Admits "But never did say" But he said "I would get a card

from a friend of his. They will be confirmed when he called called after he will be confirmed

Me is, with what they can say, reporting me. Carl's

learned I must say Dear & backpale is a woman ship &

means nothing he could have heard from 100 others.

Ask was anything notes "Don't mention (a meeting)

Act up in "I back at section? There were nothing. When get this point me I left knowing room 3 made followed

concerned otherwise this had money 3 need had outside cameras

probe. This up line
the question is why - coming after creation & how gets
parameters, and of a question, just eating - not eating. In just
himself means size of his vent against me (0) when it gets
to. Reported normally
deep to just found of Bed when he had asked to get in
break me had. Before this he's been had been in a cage
experiment with Bed
the equal for me (0) on the Bed to be cross connect. Cell is no after
support the parameter don't in not yet here - June 1923.
seems real me had given checks to CTR
Even from camera feeds Bed up, in experiment on his face
up not when he gets Bed no saying "in the the money"
after in parameter - 1 of U.S."

B) Why I thought him better on each leg but I was
replied I mean in, I was not at all. For he (replied).
What does I mean, when he says, "I'm not
I had on a defense based upon what he told me."
Seems to be the point of an ordinary that gets in -
What in his client's case