12/26/72

Dear Arch,

As he was about to leave for his Texas vacation, Lesar photocopied the bottom of the first page of my letter to you, omitting the rest and leaving enough room for a note that I know must have made him feel better. If he did not send you a copy, it was a polite and self-serving lecture about friendship, how easy friends are to lose and how hard to make.

He had no complaint about the substance or what I said of either of you. I find it conspicuous that he attributes no single factual error to me. I am not surprised that he resorted to self-deception and I'll not be surprised if he distributes this childishness. His pose is something like that of the rapist who feigns tolerance of his victim's protests, fooling nobody but himself and the like-minded.

Tragically, for all of us and for the future of our country, the realities are as I put them, not in this kind of self-deserving posturing. His vacation at this time is but another example of this. He had no more to do with the writing of and information in the May habeas corpus which gives us our first chance of taking an assassination case into court, than you did. Oh, he talked big enough about it, convinced himself how important and brilliant he is, but the investigation and most of the legal thinking is mine and the drafting and the legal work is Lesar's. He knew that the time for response by the State was limited. So, he went off on vacation to be sure he would not be on hand, mine untroubled, pocket full and ego inflated. This is one way to meet obligations to a client and to history, one of showing true dedication to the work, and it is limned by his not paying Jim to stay around to cope with what the other side would do. Lesar was hardly airborne before they made two moves, both of which, thanks to this great dedication of Lesar's, were left to a young man who has yet to try his first case, yet to make his first appearance in court. Frankly, I don't think Ray suffered a bit for it, but my point is, I think, clear.

These, not the fictions with which you wealthy ones console yourselves, are the realities. What you do with your wealthy is entirely your affairs. Nor it because the proper interest of others is when you misuse it or your positions because of it. I did not ask you to invite me to Dallas to see if we could work together. That was your idea. It wasted time for me and my work. That you should not have done. You were under no obligation to send me word that you would finance the acquisition of the remainders of Frame-Up for me, but you did and in doing it lulled me into the false belief that this one problem had become one with which, desperately broke, I would have to cope in a real emergency situation. It became an enormous problem and a serious emotional strain, one of those we had too many without it. Although the books are legally mine and I was able to arrange the required down payment, I have yet to receive the first one after almost three months and many have been sold illegally and widely advertised at a price at which it will be impossible for me to sell them - if I ever get them. Your part in this was wrong. You should not have deceived me and made these needless problems for me to cope with while I had other, urgent ones to meet at the same time, like borrowing money from a friend who would not need its immediate return just to prevent being wiped out entirely.

Lesar did not have to take the job when I asked him if he would if I could arrange it. But he did have the obligation to live up to the stipulated and agreed-to conditions. They were unselfish and all in his interest, by the way, and if he had lived up to them he would not have plissed away most of the money he wanted. It cost him money to be less than honorable. He has never paid me a cent for any of the work I did for him and he has stuck me with some of the expenses. I have never asked him for pay, but I will not again work for him without it and if I do at all, it will be only where I feel an obligation, not generally. If you have heard anything to the contrary, I have never asked him to lend me money, either. I am not blessed with the wealth either of you have. But I do dispute the license both of you have asserted to waste money I don't have for me, or time. If money means more to you than honor, that is for you to decide.

I have answered Lesar's childish sermon on what he describes as friendship, a condition that elicited the need of emotion. He will receive it after his return from restoration of the great supplies of energy from doing nothing. I have made an extra copy if he does not return your "courtesy" to him. (What you did was to be an effort at mischief-making in which you counted your self into thinking yourself pure.) If you want this version, I will send it after he has had chance to read it and, although I do not expect it, request and send you a copy. I don't really care about this mischief-making. I do regret that I or anyone else holding of your money greater importance than putting a fraction to your use.