



You may remember that he got even in his "review" of Frame-Up. I told him partisans don't honorably do such things and that men who have had a fight also never do. He can't like that, either.

It is not necessary for him to defend the Warren Report to defend Ruby, but he does that, too, and can't distinguish the two

So, he is in doubt about the Bay case and he said so in that review, that was one of the more vicious ones.

I think, if I were to ask him for what he has that could be of help, he'd let us have it. If I can't get it, you may have a better chance after he turns me down than before. His self-concept is the only thing that will get him to do it, if anything does.

And, of course, if it is worth it. He has a very large amount of research and pleadings of assorted kinds on the Constitutional issues.

The Schiller record had not yet been aired, when I was with him. It was the first time that night, in D.C., and I took it and Schiller apart. Remember Schiller when you read Elmer's tome. Remember that Larry was Jack's agent and fleeced the Jack for whom Elmer proclaims this noble love. Eva said of more than half of what she knew that Larry got. You'd never know this from Elmer's book. Larry, too, is a noble soul, not one of the more wretched of two-legged swine.

The story of how the Ruby tape was made is the story I remember his telling me that afternoon in Chicago. Imagine the chutzpah of this rolypoly nobleman, he spends a tremendous part of his book and his real-life effort trying to establish what was obviously true, that Ruby was insane, and then he says the tape is the truthful account because Ruby says it is, in his own words. An insane truth, one might say. But how the hell can a lawyer say, at one and the same time, that his client is unable to tell right from wrong, can't make a responsible judgement, can't help in his own defense, ought not be allowed to talk to anyone but his family and lawyers (and not all of them) -with elaborate quote to prove it - and then say he is rational and trustworthy when his mental illness has progressed to its worst stage and thus must be believed? Before writing this, Elmer also knew that there really was brain damage, too, as the autopsy showed.

You may also get the flavor of some of what will come from the prosecution, more than you have picked up already from Rusty Rhodes in court and their pleadings. Elmer's representation of it may not be as faithful as he would like you believe, but even exaggeration might help prepare you. Frankly, I think Henry Wade is an able man, and I don't think that of Rhodes. He is just dirty. Mason is, I think, less uninhibited in his dishonesty and as of the time I saw him was just a little embarrassed at the need for it. Alexander, who also is not exactly rational as you understand the word, is closer to the personality of Rhodes.

I know Henry, know some of what he knew of Ruby and didn't use, and I am without doubt that after Belli was out of the case there would have been no trouble making a decent deal with him, for a rather short time in jail. So, when Elmer gives indications of this, I find myself wondering about the defense team, mostly Gertz and Dann, I'd guess, that would not make such a deal. I don't think Ruby was their chief client. Nor truth.

Sincerely,