5/21/72

Dear Jim,

Wish I'd know of your studying for the bars earlier. Just got finished telling Hoch to consult you about something . When he does, I've also suggested he can file more than one appeal to Mitchell, that he file a pro forma one saying little and when that gets turned down, having had a chance to think it thru and consult, to ffile an appeal from the appeal. If you agree, just tell him what you are doing and concur.

I, the front of the file drawer in which I have the declassified CDs I have a folder labelled list of. I'll put the Hoch list of missings there. If I have any dupes, I&ll let you know. But I'm writing and have other things to do, so I don't know when I'll even touch them again.

I think it a misteke to hold my letters to Jim ie for a month and what you report is exactly opposite what his letters to me indicate. The first thing he did when they locked him up was write me a long one, blunt pencil and all. I'd like to see his exact way of putting it, for although I know he has this super-manly thing and doesn't want to feel that his hand is being held, he has always responded quite promptly. Even that he needn't do. Right before 4.4 he also wrote and said he'd refer by date to each letter as he got it, etc. But the real reason I think it ought not be held up is because he tells me things he doesn't tell any of you. He doesn't trust any lawyer as a lawyer, that is. Stoner may be different). You'll see some of them. There was good stuff in his last letter. He has never written me a note or even what you could call a short letter. And you have all my answers, so you know there is no "coming on strong" in them. If this is what he said, there is a different reason for it. But Bud should have told me this when I phoned him before answering the last one. I think it was just yesterday.

I'm well aware of the great amount of work putting those CDs together was. I8ve never done that big a batch, but for some six years now I have duplicated everything I've gotten, and for the longest time I spread copies around like there would soon be an end. But this is the one you said you'd said you kept to work on. The first was perfect, unless there are skips or omissions. I listed them as I put them in file folders. As I go over them, I'll be taking one set out for subject filing, and I'll be able to tell then. If any of you has any notes on them, I'm especially interested in two things right now for going over: medica/autipsy and Oswald as an Agent and his various strange operations, like the literature, N.O., etc. You were right about the bottom of the pile. They were in reverse order.

I never had Ted Glenn's address, but his dad's phone is 398-7204.

Found some real good new stuff for the spectro in court. With a good press, could be something!

I agree/disagree on law enforcement, but lets let that wait until your bars are over. Read JEH carefully. This spectro was not undertaken until after LBJ's directive, so whether or not he gave it to the police, he had this federal commission. And that can't apply to some in any event, unless they want to argue conspiracy. I'd like them to. This is one of the things I mean by the problem or nobody having time to learn basic facts, which is not criticism but recognition of reality. You can quote Hoover also on future law enforcement. But one of the reasons to keep after this is to have a judge accuse Williams of perjury. Not us, but an uptight judge, feeling imposed upon.

Check on rest. Good luck on bars! And do study for them.

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

May 20, 1971

Dear Harold,

Since you wrote there have been some developments here in regard to Ray's mail. First off, because the mail is now being directed to Bud, we are getting all mail, including your letters to Ray. If you want to avoid having it sent to Tennessee, then returned here only to go back again, I suggest you send it to Bud to be forwarded. I believe Bud and Ray have currently agreed on a proceedure to forward mail to him on a once a month basis. Bud has received a couple of handwritten (in pencil) letters from Ray which which mention that he doesn't want too much mail. He specifically mentions you. I think you must have come on too strong. He is very sensitive about this, as you know.

Bud says he also received some handwritten letters addressed to Ray and mailed in Bessemer (outside of Birmingham) which could be interpreted as threats to Ray. I haven't yet read them myself.

Before I forget, last night on Cavett's show he asked guest Pierre Salinger a few questions about his position on the Warren Report. Pierre followed the standard Kennedy line. But I thought it very interesting that Cavett asked at all. Incidentally, Salinger's only thought of conspiracy was on the plane about an "international conspiracy".

I have send copies of Judge Miller's opinion to Valentine, Leonard, and Outerbridge. I will send copies of Mardian's address to Sylvia, Paul Hoch, and Schoener, among others. This afternoon I am also sending copies of the Boggs thing to Sylvia and Paul this afternoon.

I'm sorry the second batch of declassified CDs is so mixed up. It took a tremendous amount of time to get the batches I sent to Paul and Arch and the first batch I gave to you in order. The Archives was not much help. I had to separate all the CDs and put paper clips on them, and it sometimes was quite a bit of effort to tell where one CD left off and the other began. I was ordering the second batch as I studied them, but as I only got up to about CD 100, only those are really in order (or should have been), and I think they will be found at the bottom of the pile.

I am enclosing Paul's list of mishaps in the batch of CDs I sent him. I'll probably reply to it tomorrow. Paul says he got two copies of CD 667 & CD 1149. I believe your second batch

I leave Tatum Post Mortem Copies home with me. Next time you come in let me know and I'll bring them in for you.

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

or perhaps the first, will be missing these two CDs, so I'll have extra copies made for you.

I do have a Memphis phone book but I cannot recall the name of Ted Glenn's father, so I have to reach him through Professor Marcus Orr, History Department, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn. 38111. I'm really not sure the mail is getting through at all, as I've written both of them twice without answer and sent each a copy of Frame-Up. But having been a student for a very long time, I know the way pressures mount on students and professors as the semester goes along, so that could very well explain why these Memphis folk don't write.

Thanks for the notes on the Spectro Reply Brief. I agree that organization of the brief could be improved somewhat. I am glad, however, that I changed the original format to put the no law enforcement purpose ever section at the end. After much reflection, I think that is probably the weakest argument we have. Fortunately, however, the Government brief is unusually incompetent. There best argument would be that the FBI was exercising its adjunct function as an aid of the local police. That would at least gum up the works with a lot of sticky factual questions. Instead, the Government keeps shifting its position--"human or natural law", "common sense", adjunct to local police. But the Williams' affidavit contradicts the adjunct claim and the "human or natural law" has been abandoned on appeal, perhaps because of the ridicule heaped on it in the first brief.

If the Government harps on law enforcement purpose at the time of the assassination, I think it may be best to pass over that and concentrate on what I view as our three strongest arguments which, in order, are: 1) no present or future law enforcement action, 2) scientific tests, 3) Americal Mail Line, Ltd. There are cases on each of these points that give you something solid to go on. What's more, they are cases decided by this court which will therefore not only be familiar with them but find it embarrassing to overrule or distinguish.

I omitted Wellford because the relevant passage from it is a quote from the Bristol Myers case decided by this court. I probably should have cited Wellford as having quoted and relied upon Bristol, but in any event, when the clerk sees the Bristol quote he will, if he has any doubt about its present good standing, Shepardize it to see if it has been overruled or followed by other jurisdictions, in which case he will come across Wellford. And we can mention it on oral argument as we did in the court below.

More about this later. I'm going to be very, very busy for the nextmmonth on other matters. I have to take the bar exam June 24 and haven't begun to study yet.

P.S. Can't make out warden's comment on Ray letter original either.