

6/23/88

Jim Lesar
918 F St., NW, #509
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Jim,

I've read and enjoyed the Southam "ews papers and the Barron's story on the cabal in the Department of Justice. Thanks.

Maybe the Mowat papers will be enough for him to do another short book on his exclusion. The one he did was great fun! I have it.

The Barron's piece is excellent. Although I'm a bit surprised that they appear to be surprised that DJ runs vendettas. Could we tell them!

I see that Michael Shaheen got a money reward in this stink, for defending the stink. Not new for him. Some enterprising reporter, and perhaps Bud knows one, might find it worthwhile to make a study of Shaheen's decisions. Someone ought seek them under FOIA.

It is a decade since he let it be known that he was going to return to "emphis and practise law there. So, may we wonder what reward kept him at Justice in such a rôle? His record there is hardly its own reward.

If anyone looks into Shaheen, I believe that he has not kept some of the records that could be interesting - that he didn't act on. Some of mine will still exist in FBI files and I have at least one from them.

These will show up on the see cards.

You and Southam are fortune with a judge like Harold Greene. How different so much might have been if we'd had him or one like him in the earlier cases! We almost had a good one- Oberdorfer - but he had a former partner who'd been on the Warren Commission. Too bad he felt he had to recuse himself because the Commission was not at all involved in that case. Wonder still why he waited until the day of the first calender call to recuse himself. He knew before then of his former partner's former associations.

Or, was there another reason?

All of the Meese (I've forgotten my German but in Yiddish this means ugly) in the Barron's piece reminds me again of his epochal lie at the White House press conference announcing officially the Iran-Contra scandal which was to a degree known before then. That lie gave time for the North and other shredders to work overtime. He said, pretending to be a civil libertarian, that it would have been wrong to send the FBI into the case because there was no reason to suspect any law violation. He then had to know that the FBI is required to make special and not law enforcement investigations for the president. Which is what J. Edgar Hoover testified before the Warren Commission, Volume 5 page 98. With Hoover as authority it seems to me that this is a not insignificant thing. Why not tell Barron's Washington office?

Thanks and best,

Harold