

The original documents are located in Box 6, folder “Cleaver, Eldridge” of the National Security Adviser, Kissinger-Scowcroft West Wing Office Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald R. Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

OPTIONAL FORM NO. 10
JULY 1973 EDITION
GSA FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.6

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

*Find letter from
lawyer in San*

TO : Philip Buchen
The White House

DATE: June 16, 1975

FROM : Harold R. Tyler, Jr.
Deputy Attorney General *HT*

SUBJECT:

Dear Phil:

I submit more precise information concerning the two separate criminal problems faced by Mr. Cleaver, if and when he returns to the State of California:

(1) First, Cleaver would face a return to prison to complete a term imposed in Los Angeles in 1958 on two counts of assault with intent to murder and three counts of assault with a deadly weapon. In 1966, he was paroled, apparently under the sentence, but this parole was suspended two years later, at the time when he took flight. While he will be entitled to a revocation hearing, I would suspect that the grounds to revoke are all too clear. There remain about four years to be served if the maximum term is fixed under California law. Furthermore, as I understand it, should Cleaver be returned to prison, there could be no release on bail in that particular case.

(2) The second problem Mr. Cleaver would face upon return stems from a 1968 Alameda County indictment charging him and others with two counts of attempted murder and two counts of assault with a deadly weapon upon a police officer. Parenthetically, I believe this arises out of the protracted gun battle in 1968 with police in Oakland, wherein two officers were wounded. Bail in this case was fixed for Cleaver at \$50,000. He jumped that bail. Should he return, I believe that California law would entitle him to ask for bail in this case. Presumably, it could be argued that his voluntary return off-sets the other negative aspects. On the other hand, one could assume that bail in this case may be moot in light of the problems inherent in the case discussed above.



5010-110

Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

6/17/75

Confidential material attached

Dear Carl:

Please excuse my lengthy delay in responding to your letter of May 5. It was not for want of interest, but I find that the wheels of bureaucracy grind exceedingly slow in matters of this nature.

As I am sure you know, Eldridge Cleaver has gone public with very much the same line which he presented to you. I am not sure how to assess the significance of that, but I am inclined to feel it probably serves to enhance the chances that he is sincere.

Careful consultations and review with both Justice and the Counsel here have produced the following suggestion for a reply to your query:

"The suggestion you have made presents a very interesting prospect and one that should be explored. However, except for Federal jurisdiction arising out of flight from the applicable jurisdiction to escape prosecution, the primary jurisdiction would be with the state of California. Under these circumstances, it would be better for someone representing Mr. Cleaver to contact the prosecutor's office in California where the charges are pending to see whether that office would agree to meet Mr. Cleaver's desire that he not be incarcerated pending trial. Through the same method it could be determined whether there are any other state charges that might be brought against Mr. Cleaver should he return. Another issue that would probably have to be resolved is the matter of reimbursing the bonding company, if there was one, for any forfeiture which may have occurred.

"Only after satisfactory arrangements have been made with the state authorities would we be able to consider the Federal aspects of the matter."



I am not sure whether or not you will find this helpful. I would be pleased to do whatever else I can to assist in what could be a worthwhile enterprise. If there is anything more you think would be helpful, please let me know. In any event, I would appreciate hearing what further steps you and Eldridge may take.

With warm personal regards.

Sincerely,

Brent Scowcroft
Lieutenant General, USAF
Deputy Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs

Mr. Carl F. Salans
Law Offices of Samuel Pizar
20, Place de la Madeleine
Paris 8, France



24

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 10, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Brent Scowcroft

FROM: Phil Buchen *P.W.B.*

Returned with this memorandum is the original you sent of a letter written to you on May 5 from Carl F. Salans about Eldridge Cleaver.

After consulting with Deputy Attorney General Tyler, my suggestion is that you reply to Mr. Salans substantially as follows:

"The suggestion you have made presents a very interesting prospect and one that should be explored. However, except for Federal jurisdiction arising out of flight from the applicable jurisdiction to escape prosecution, the primary jurisdiction would be with the state of California. Under these circumstances, it would be better for someone representing Mr. Cleaver to contact the prosecutor's office in California where the charges are pending to see whether that office would agree to meet Mr. Cleaver's desire that he not be incarcerated pending trial. Through the same method it could be determined whether there are any other state charges that might be brought against Mr. Cleaver should he return. Another issue that would probably have to be resolved is the matter of reimbursing the bonding company, if there was one, for any forfeiture which may have occurred.

Only after satisfactory arrangements have been made with the state authorities would we be able to consider the Federal aspects of the matter."

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526 (EXEMPTED) C12 63
1720 11/20/00, 11/20/00, 11/20/00, 11/20/00
by HR 3/21/11

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

2c

LAW OFFICES
SAMUEL PISAR

20, PLACE DE LA MADELEINE
PARIS 8 FRANCE
TEL. 742.23.31
TELEX 28885 CABLE PARLAW

SAMUEL PISAR
LAFOREST E. PHILLIPS, JR.
CARL F. SALANS
MARIE-CLAIRE LACHAUD
ELIANE HEILBRONN
ROBERT W. HAMILTON
JEFFREY M. HERTZFELD
GERARD DELILE
ELISEO GARLATTI
MARC GIRAUD
JEAN-CHARLES BANCAL
IWAO SHIMIZU
DANIEL PAYAN

WASHINGTON D.C.
1100 CONNECTICUT AVENUE
TEL. 293.1903

May 5, 1975

LONDON
STONE HOUSE
128 BISHOPSGATE
TEL. 247 56 22

Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft
Deputy Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
The National Security Council
The White House
Washington, D.C.
U.S.A.

Re: Eldridge Cleaver

Dear Brent:

It was good to talk to you last Wednesday during my visit in Washington, although I felt terribly guilty intruding into your time at such a crisis point in Vietnam. As agreed, I am writing this letter to give you the essential points regarding Eldridge Cleaver's desire to return to the United States.

Mr. Cleaver came to see me several weeks ago with the following story. He had been indicted in 1968 by a California grand jury for assault against police officers with intent to commit murder arising out of an incident that occurred on April 6, 1968. At the time, he was on parole from a prior imprisonment. Pending trial for this new charge, he had been released from jail on a writ of habeas corpus; but when an appeals court reversed this decision and ordered him to surrender to prison officials, he jumped bail and left the United States.

Since that time, he has been living in Cuba, Algeria, and now France. He has also travelled to the Soviet Union, China, North Korea and North Vietnam, among other places, during his seven years absence from the States.

Mr. Cleaver says, in effect, that he has been all around the radical world and has become disenchanted with it. He has rejected the Marxist-Leninist world view which he formerly advocated. He no longer wants to tear down the American system; he wants to come home and live with it. Nor does he any longer want to separate black people from the system. While other political radicals are seeking to destroy our system, says Cleaver, most of them have not been exposed to the radical undemocratic



LAW OFFICES
SAMUEL PISAR

Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft
May 5, 1975
Page Two

systems they seek to emulate as he has. He has seen them, and they are not so great after all. He has come to realize the importance of democratic institutions and processes in the life of a nation. He is optimistic about the United States, and while he still advocates change, he no longer advocates political violence.

Mr. Cleaver has already been speaking out publicly along these lines and if he is able to return to the United States, he will continue to do so.

As regards his return, he says he is willing to stand trial in California for the charges pending against him. His only real condition is that he does not want to be thrown in jail pending the trial and its conclusion. He would also like to determine whether there are any other Federal or State charges that may be brought against him should he return.

The idea which I had was that it might not be bad for the United States, particularly in the current rather depressed state of affairs, for Cleaver to "come back into the fold" saying that he has been everywhere else and has concluded that the United States is still the land of opportunity. This might be particularly fitting in the bicentennial year. It also coincides with President Ford's effort to turn the American people away from recriminations and despair about the past to the hope and opportunities which America offers for the future.

I have discussed this with Elliot Richardson who reacted favorably and encouraged me to talk with you and with authorities in the State of California and in the Justice Department. At this stage, I have done nothing more than to make the preliminary contact with you; and as I understood it, you would prefer to make some discreet soundings of your own prior to my doing anything further.

I am convinced that if the proper circumstances can be created for Cleaver's return to the United States, the fact of his voluntary return and the public statements he would make as to why he was returning could, coming from him, have a significant impact in bolstering confidence in the United States not only among Americans but abroad as well.

As for my own role, while I am not a criminal lawyer, it occurred to me that it might be better for me to represent Mr. Cleaver in



LAW OFFICES
SAMUEL PISAR

Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft
May 5, 1975
Page Three

this matter rather than having the usual radical representation. I would gladly play such a role -- without publicity -- if there is any public interest in the course of action I am suggesting in this letter.

I will await word from you regarding your preliminary soundings and, if they are positive, perhaps you could suggest what next steps should be taken. The American Embassy in Paris knows how to contact me so that if you wish to use that channel of communication, please do so. I would only suggest that in that case, you slug your messages "eyes only" for Galen Stone, who is the DCM, or Bill Connett, Chief of the Consular section, in order to preserve the confidentiality of the exchanges because I don't believe publicity will be helpful.

With many thanks for your assistance and best personal regards to you.

Sincerely yours,

CS

Carl F. Salans

CFS:tj



THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 28, 1975



General:

Wa Mr. Carl Salens, formerly Deputy Legal Advisor at State and now in Paris, called you at the suggestion of Elliot Richardson. He is in Washington attending an ABA conference through Wednesday, April 30, and would like to talk with you either in person or on the phone concerning a problem which has come to his attention. It has to do with Eldridge Cleaver, which was all he would reveal, except to say that Richardson suggested that the subject was one worth discussing with General Scowcroft.

We can either reach him at a time convenient for you at the Mayflower Hotel, or he will call in from time to time in hopes of getting a moment on the phone with you.

Do you wish to speak with him?

Yes

No

Lora

Mayflower Hotel
Ask for ABA Conference
and then Mr. Salens

*Per A
Jacked at
11:25 am, 4/30/75.
Mr. Salens sending
etc from Paris.
LRS*

LAW OFFICES
SAMUEL PISAR
20, PLACE DE LA MADELEINE
PARIS 8^e FRANCE



REPUBLIQUE
FRANCAISE

0270

POSTES
NA10213

Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft
Deputy Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
The National Security Council
The White House
Washington, D.C.
U.S.A.

PAR AVION
BY AIR MAIL

LAW OFFICES
SAMUEL PISAR

20, PLACE DE LA MADELEINE
PARIS 8 FRANCE

TEL. 742.23.31
TELEX 28885 CABLE PARLAW

SAMUEL PISAR
LAFOREST E. PHILLIPS, JR.
CARL F. SALANS
MARIE-CLAIRE LACHAUD
ELIANE HEILBRONN
ROBERT W. HAMILTON
JEFFREY M. HERTZFELD
GERARD DELILE
ELISEO GARLATTI
MARC GIRAUD
JEAN-CHARLES BANCAL
IWAQ SHIMIZU
DANIEL PAYAN

WASHINGTON D.C.
1100 CONNECTICUT AVENUE
TEL. 293.1903

LONDON
STONE HOUSE
128 BISHOPSGATE
TEL. 247 56 22

June 24, 1975

Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft
Deputy Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
The National Security Council
The White House
Washington, D.C.
U.S.A.

Dear Brent:

I appreciate your letter of June 17th concerning Eldridge Cleaver and am happy to know that both Justice and the White House Counsel believe my suggestion is of interest and deserves further exploration. I would like to discuss with you, and perhaps Justice and the Counsel, the kind of approach that might be made to the California authorities. The problem, as I see it, is that my suggestion of May 5 is based on the assumption that there would be a national interest in having Mr. Cleaver return to the United States espousing his renewed faith in America. This national interest may not be apparent to a local prosecutor in California and might not be taken fully into account unless it were properly presented.

May I suggest that the next time I come to the United States I let you know in advance and see whether you, the Counsel and/or a representative from Justice might meet with me for a few moments to discuss the whole matter. I would not plan such a trip until September at the earliest. After such a meeting, I could contact the appropriate California authorities and go to the West coast if that seemed worthwhile.

In the meanwhile, let me express my gratitude to you for taking the time to look into this for me.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Cam

Carl F. Salans

CFS:tj



LAW OFFICES
SAMUEL PISAR

Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft
June 24, 1975
Page Two

P.S. I have questioned Mr. Cleaver pretty closely on the sincerity of his new philosophy and the fact, as you note in your letter, that he has gone public with it. He says the very act of going public has meant burning many bridges with the past and alienating many former radical colleagues. There is no turning back for him at this point.



WASHINGTON STAR 31 AUGUST 1975

'Make U.S. Second to None Militarily'

Eldridge Cleaver Turns Into a Patriot

Eldridge Cleaver

Interviewed by
Curtice Taylor

Question: Can we talk briefly about the Third World? It's such an amorphous phrase, such an illusive concept. How do you see it now, after your travels throughout Africa?

Cleaver: It really has come sort of full circle. You start out with being very preoccupied with the events and happenings within your own country. Then we got linked up with the international thing. We started thinking in terms of the international ideology that encompasses so many people. There was the capitalist world, the socialist world, the Third World, and there was the international struggle with everyone linked arm in arm; everyone supporting each other. But the situation has changed; it's no longer like that. I am not really sure that the whole thing existed in the first place.

When I left the United States I went first to Cuba, then to Algeria, China, North Vietnam and North Korea. Face it, people are nationalists more than they are internationalists and they use internationalism in a very cynical way in order to further their own nationalist aspirations.

So, in other words, you think that a lot of the talk of a Third World, the united struggle, etc., is just another phrase.

Yes, it's an empty phrase. It's not a homogenous Third World. Now they're beginning to talk about a fourth world in order to differentiate the poorer Third World countries from, say, the richer Arab countries [laughter]. I mean, they're right — there are incredible differences. They do have different needs and priorities. It just helps to further point out the many differences between the needs of the various countries involved.

It seems that one by one the things that you believed in — the ideologies,

Eldridge Cleaver, once a main figure in the Black Panther party and widely known as a radical, has been living in Cuba, Algeria and elsewhere since 1969. Now in Paris, he hopes to return to the U.S. if California parole violation charges are dropped. Interviewer Curtice Taylor, a freelance writer, has known Cleaver for years.

Excerpted from Rolling Stone, © 1975 by Straight Arrow Publishers Inc. All Rights Reserved. Reprinted by permission.

the individuals — all seemed to be fantasies. Cuba was not what it had appeared, the Algerians played with you and it seems that a lot of the socialists were just sort of entertaining you, using you as a PR image with the people's struggle. How do you feel about all that and was there one particular point when the whole thing just turned sour?

Yes. I was being disappointed and constantly exasperated. The final shock came the day I saw Richard Nixon shaking hands with Chairman Mao. When you see Nixon and all that he stands for shaking hands with Mao and all that he supposedly stood for — well, it marks a turning point in history and a personal turning point for me. It completely exploded the political spectrum that has dominated the world since 1850 — since the First International — when Marx defined the nature of the capitalist system, provided an ideological framework for the restructuring of society and, most importantly, gave people an alternative to capitalism. Well, it had gone through a lot of changes. The Russians could even become revisionists and betray that ideology but as long as you had Mao proclaiming the people's struggle, an alternative still existed. But after that visit and Chou En-lai's apparent dominance in China, it's all just gone.

We need another International, we need some new fathead to define and to analyze the nature of the world today as it exists now. There is a new left-to-right spectrum that no longer can have the socialists at one end and the capitalists at the other. There are progressive forces separate from that ever-growing power club but they mainly exist out of power, as provocateurs jabbing at the powers behind the helms. Because, you see, the socialists have betrayed the liberation movements, they have dropped out of the struggle. As far as I am concerned, they are wallowing in it up to the nub of their hammers and sickles.

What we have really been talking about . . . is ending the '60s, tying up all those ends and putting it into the perspective we never seemed to get around to. It was a time to react and experience, not to reflect.

I disagree with that. It was a time to reflect, it's just that we never did it. . . . We have to look very hard at what we did and listen to the criticism that people laid against us. We have to be prepared to do some turn-arounds. For example, after all my travels and seeing the socialists' world up very close, really seeing how the Soviet Union and China function, well, I now think that the United States should be second to none militarily, that we have to strengthen,

not demise, our military, and that really causes a lot of people's mouths to drop open.

My mouth is gaping.

I really think that things are lining up for a big showdown sometime between all of these islands of power: the socialists, the United States and most of North America, Europe, China, Western Europe. The Arabs are trying to form a center. And, finally, you have that unknown quantity, all of those elements which could be centers but they're all being screwed by the big guys. I think in terms of these centers having show-downs and I think it is very important that the United States be militarily strong. I think it is a point on which all contradictions between left- and right-wing factions in the United States can be aligned.

Because of the Vietnam war the American left took a shotgun blast at the military and in that case we were right. The war was hideous, immoral; the worst thing this country has ever undertaken. What we need, now, however, is a Vietnam post-mortem where we can put down our defenses and look at the whole thing. Sure there was a time when I was freaked about Vietnam, when I wouldn't even talk to a soldier; they were all pigs. I'm still furious about Vietnam but I'm more concerned about the destiny of the United States, about the future, about making it work better, so I have to, as you say, move into the '70s. It's the responsibility of the left to initiate this, to start to analyze the situation with regards to the whole world. To continue to have these onslaughts against the military without looking at other interests . . . well, you're just going to get kicked in the ass. And I'm tired of getting kicked in the ass.

How does what you're saying differ from John Foster Dulles?

We have tremendous guilt, positive guilt about all the evils the United States has done to the world. Wherever there seem to be forces of fascism and repression, the United States always seems to side with them. That has to change, of course. Because, you see, I think in sort of evolutionary terms — that the United States is really the most highly evolved nation in the world. I use the rights of the people as barometer for that. Again, change — a lot more change — has to occur. The people need more rights.

But these days socialism is always shown representing the future. However, experience has shown Socialists-Communists strap onto people the most oppressive regimes in the history of the world. Regimes

CLEAVER -- CONTINUED

that are dictatorships, dictatorships in the name of the proletariat, not by the proletariat. And these regimes are very hard to get rid of because they give people something everyone longs for and that's economic security, if you will, economic democracy, which is so lacking in the United States. But political democracy, which I think is the more important of the two, doesn't exist in communist countries. It is, in fact, looked on as subversive.

Can the two exist together? Can they be brought more into line?

In the Soviet Union, the people have almost no way of bringing their will to bear; Solzhenitsyn and Medvedev have shown us that. It is the main reason why the Soviet Union is in so much trouble. In the United States we still need more political democracy, so we can't lower that factor. We need to have more say in economic matters. Our will must be brought to bear on that. I think that the United States has more of a chance at working the balance out. I think that most Americans know that and that is why Americans have always been so anti-Communist, why they have always been so antitotalitarian and why they made the shift from hating fascists to hating Communists so swiftly in the '40s.

The left has really blown itself because we always felt compelled to embrace the opposite extreme. Why should we have allowed Nixon to wrap himself up in the American flag? We should have taken it away from that ———. But instead we grabbed the Viet Cong flag and there went any hope of large support from the American people.

I can agree on that. Let's get on to the military itself. I consider them madmen.

They're not madmen!

Come on, Eldridge, it's my turn to be insistent and pragmatic. I consider them to be as evil as the Soviets. They are very, very strong. The CIA, when it was formed in the '40s, was made up of liberals, men who really believed in a positive form of internationalism, but damned if they didn't all turn into paranoid commie-under-the-rug types.

But there were commies under the rug.

Jesus, Eldridge, you know they were never a threat to the U.S. except maybe during the early '30s.

I think you are wrong. If the war had not come along to save the American economy, I think that they might have had a chance. And I'm glad that FDR blocked them. I really am.

OK, so am I. Most of the American Communists I know are totally out to lunch, we are agreed on that. Let me finish my CIA analogy. I think that the military mind so dominated the CIA that what we have now is, well, a can of worms that is so fascistic I can't see any hope for them.

You're right, but I can't blame the military so much because they just went on by themselves. The left turned its back on them. It should have fought more. I think that the left really has to look at the political forces at work in the United States and has to

work out an understanding, has to reanalyze its position. I, for one, intend to develop a new relationship with the U.S. military. I'm on a honeymoon with them myself. I love 'em [laughter].

What about the military mind, what about a reorganization of the military? Is that what you are getting at?

Yes. If the left had not backed out on the military, written it off so completely, it might not have gotten so extreme. It is going to take a major purge of the officers, rewriting of the manuals and a lot of changes. It's no easy process. Military people are very patriotic people and that's not a bad trait. I'm turning into a patriot. These people are professional people and they have a certain political line that has been dominated by the right wing. These people are Americans, they should be treated that way. If we are going to really talk about progressive change in America, then we have to talk about moving on the military, not excluding it. Because without that support, brother, there ain't goin' to be no revolution.

Okay, so you are saying that the military mind is somewhat malleable as far as political ideologies go?

Sure. Just like other people. We have to work on the younger members, they have to be thinking differently after Vietnam. What if there had been some favorable support for some of the dissenting military officers to stay in the military during the war? We encouraged them to drop out. Well, it can change. That's all I am saying. We just can't ignore them anymore.

I think sometimes that some of the stuff that the right was saying about us was true. They said we were traitors selling the United States down the river, moving toward the Communists. And you see, Communists aren't plotting just to wipe out the right in America; they're talking about doing in the whole thing. And I can't subscribe to that. I want the United States to be vastly improved, not be done in. We have to maintain a vigilance against people who want to destroy the United States.

But what about the internal forces, the people who are harnessing the United States for themselves, for their own ends? The cynical military industrial boys, what about them? Aren't they a threat?

Yes, of course. We have to be vigilant on that level too and, so far, the progressive forces have been moving in on those people very effectively. I'm talking about new areas, the ones we have overlooked or been afraid of in the past, and the military is one of them. Also, we have let the big powers control our world view. That too has been a matter of left versus right and we have not looked at that very closely. I mean, instead of moving toward detente with the Soviet Union I think we should be resolutely opposed to the present regime. I want to see the American military establishment's power supporting people who are being screwed in the world.

Since you have brought it up, let's talk about U.S. relationships with the Soviet Union and China.

Like I said, I think it would be

AIR FORCE TIMES

3 SEPTEMBER 1975 (11)

All So Serious

WE DO NOT, for a moment, discount the seriousness of the social movements under way in the services and in the country as a whole. Women's rights, racial equality and the struggle of minorities certainly demand sober support.

But we wonder sometimes if, in our anxiety to appear fair and liberal, we have not become artificial in our relationships.

We've sensed this in some of the letters from readers. It seems almost impossible to say anything lightly on certain subjects without someone's nit-picking every word and phrase for some hidden slight or slur.

That's rather sad. Certainly we should have outgrown the mean ethnic jokes and the vulgar sexist putdowns that hurt and divide. But, for heaven's sake, have we become so sober-sided that we cannot treat the common human experience occasionally with the humor it deserves?

We hope not. We would hate to think that human relationships had become so tense that we no longer can share the small, foolish experiences which make life bearable.

Our prejudice itself is, after all, one of the more laughable elements of our natures. Perhaps we will never be quite natural in our relationships until we discover that bigotry is not only destructive and morally wrong but ridiculous.

Certainly we do not suggest that we take basic human problems any less seriously. Only that we not take ourselves so seriously that we are unable to tell the difference between sharing the joke and being the butt of it.

reasonable to make concessions with the Soviet Union. I agree with Scoop Jackson on that. Only he just used the Jews like all politicians use issues; he didn't take it far enough. Because the Soviet Union is very shaky at this point and we should not be trying to hold them up, and that is just what we are doing with detente. The stuff we are saying, that Kissinger is saying, about not interfering with the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, well, that sounds like Chamberlain kissing Hitler's ass all over again. If we are truly the force for democracy in the world, then we have an obligation to help in the disintegration of the totalitarian Soviet regime. They have to go just like Nixon did; they are the same. Who of the world leaders were most upset at Nixon's passing? The totalitarian leaders. Now, that is a very frightening switch. Unfortunately Nixon's ghost lives in Kissinger, but I think that if people like Jackson keep up that pressure, the American people will side with them.

LAW OFFICES
SAMUEL PISAR
20, PLACE DE LA MADELEINE
PARIS 8^e FRANCE



Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft
Deputy Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
The National Security Council
The White House
Washington, D.C.
U.S.A.

PAR AVION
BY AIR MAIL

5a



Gen S. saw attached

56

LAW OFFICES
SAMUEL PISAR

20, PLACE DE LA MADELEINE
PARIS 8 FRANCE

TEL. 742.23.31

TELEX 28885 CABLE PARLAW

SAMUEL PISAR
LAFORST E. PHILLIPS, JR.
CARL F. SALANS
MARIE-CLAIRE LACHAUD
EIJANE HEILBRONN
ROBERT W. HAMILTON
JEFFREY M. HERTZFELD
GERARD DELILE
ELISEO GARLATTI
MARC GIRAUD
JEAN-CHARLES BANCAL
IWAO SHIMIZU
DANIEL PAYAN

WASHINGTON D. C.
1100 CONNECTICUT AVENUE
TEL. 293.1903

August 26, 1975

LONDON
STONE HOUSE
128 BISHOPSGATE
TEL. 247.56.22

Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft
Deputy Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
The National Security Council
The White House
Washington, D.C.
U.S.A.

Dear Brent:

My trip to Washington has been postponed until late September or early October. When my plans are firm, I will take the liberty of getting in touch with you again to see if meetings can be arranged on the subject of Eldridge Cleaver.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

CS

Carl F. Salans

CFS:tj



LAW OFFICES
SAMUEL PISAR
20, PLACE DE LA MADELEINE
PARIS 8^E FRANCE



Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft
Deputy Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
The National Security Counsel
The White House
Washington, D.C.
U.S.A.

PAR AVION
BY AIR MAIL

August 28, 1975

Set up mtg
~~Sept 7 or 8 w/~~
late Sept or early Oct *
① Scowcroft
② Bucher
③ Dep Atty Gen Tyler

Dear Carl:

It was good to hear from you, and I apologize for this tardy reply. I have been away with the President on a working trip and have just now returned to Washington.

The meeting you recommend sounds like a good idea, and I see no reason why we could not assemble the group during the time you are in Washington.

Please do feel free to contact my secretary a few days ahead as you suggested and let her know your preference for date and possible meeting times.

I look forward to seeing you soon.

Sincerely,

Brent Scowcroft
Lieutenant General, USAF
Deputy Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs

Mr. Carl F. Salans
Samuel Pissar Law Offices
20, Place de la Madeleine
Paris 8, France



LAW OFFICES
SAMUEL PISAR

20, PLACE DE LA MADELEINE
PARIS 8 FRANCE
TEL. 742.23.31
TELEX 28885 CABLE PARLAW

SAMUEL PISAR
LAFOREST E. PHILLIPS, JR.
CARL F. SALANS
MARIE-CLAIRE LACHAUD
ELIANE HEILBRONN
ROBERT W. HAMILTON
JEFFREY M. HERTZFELD
GERARD DELILE
ELISEO GARLATTI
MARC GIRAUD
JEAN-CHARLES BANCAL
IWAO SHIMIZU

WASHINGTON D.C.
1100 CONNECTICUT AVENUE
TEL. 293.1903

LONDON
STONE HOUSE
128 BISHOPSGATE
TEL. 247 56.22

August 13, 1975

Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft
Deputy Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
The National Security Counsel
The White House
Washington, D.C.

*Do you wish mtg set
up w/ WH Counsel,
Justice dep. + yourself?
Yes No
Pls draft reply. B*

Dear Brent:

I am tentatively planning to be in Washington on September 8 and 9 and would like to discuss the Eldridge Cleaver case with you, the White House Counsel and the Justice Department at that time. May I telephone your office a few days ahead of these dates, and perhaps you could leave a message with your secretary whether such a meeting (or separate, individual meetings) can be arranged? Then, depending on the outcome of such discussions and recommendations as to whom I should see in California, I could go on to the West coast to speak with the appropriate California authorities.

Many thanks and best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Carl

Carl F. Salans

CFS:lm



Chicago
312/HA 7-7800 70

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 24, 1975

General:

In the attached letter, Carl Salans indicates he will be in Washington from Wednesday afternoon (Oct 1) through Friday (Oct 3).

Shall I attempt to set a meeting among you, Buchen, and Asst. AG Tyler for sometime on the afternoon of Wednesday, October 1? (October 2 and 3 will be taken up with the visits of the Emperor and the Chancellor of the FRG.)

Yes No

Lora

*Harold
Tyler*

739-2101

Miss Polanski



*4:30 pm, Fri.
Oct 3*

LAW OFFICES
SAMUEL PISAR
20, PLACE DE LA MADELEINE
PARIS 8^e FRANCE

Attn *Lora* *W. Brent* →



Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft
Deputy Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
The National Security Council
The White House
Washington, D.C.
U.S.A.

PAR AVION
BY AIR MAIL

LAW OFFICES
SAMUEL PISAR

20, PLACE DE LA MADELEINE
PARIS 8 FRANCE

TEL. 742.23.31

TELEX 28885 CABLE PARLAW

SAMUEL PISAR
LAFORST E. PHILLIPS, JR.
CARL F. SALANS
MARIE-CLAIRE LACHAUD
ELIANE HEILBRONN
ROBERT W. HAMILTON
JEFFREY M. HERTZFELD
GERARD DELILE
ELISEO GARLATTI
MARC GIRAUD
JEAN-CHARLES BANCAL
IWAO SHIMIZU
DANIEL PAYAN

WASHINGTON D.C.

1100 CONNECTICUT AVENUE
TEL. 293.1903

LONDON

STONE HOUSE
128 BISHOPSGATE
TEL. 247.56.22

September 18, 1975

Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft
Deputy Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
The National Security Council
The White House
Washington, D.C.
U.S.A.

Dear Brent:

I now plan to be in Washington from Wednesday afternoon, October 1, through Friday, October 3. Therefore, if we can get together during this period with some of your colleagues to discuss the Eldridge Cleaver case, I would greatly appreciate it. I will telephone your secretary, as planned, early in the week to see if we can set a time for an appointment.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Carl

Carl F. Salans

CFS:tj



4:30 p.m., Friday, October 3, 1975

8

Meeting re Eldridge Cleaver

(Phil Buchen & Asst. AG. Harold Tyler)

