5/14/71

Dear Jim,

Relets 12/13, sorry I forgot raincoamt. I've read Miller and last graph majority and have call in for Paul V. Hope Stoner's 5/9 evaluation is correct, as I would think. As for my publisher, there is no hope of any kind. However, if you don't mind wasting a bit of effort, this copy already being pale, if you would not mind sending them the page that includes the last graph of the maj. op. and Millerbs, with a note saying you are doing it at my request, I'd appreciate it. Also, and tyoe this one and use a plain envelope with my return address, the same thing to John Leonard, ~~xxxxxx~~ editor of the NYTimes Sunday Book Review, that might help. They are going to do something at the soomer they get it the better. I'll read the entire decision later. Jimmie had told me of Miller's at the time, so I presume it was in the papers and I assumed you knew it. I was away then.

The penultimate paragraph of Stoner's letter interests me much. I confirmdd independently at least part of what is here involved and do not know what the rest is. It is not all Jimmie told me he'd be giving me after Stoner did it. I'd like to latch onto all of that as soon as possible for the time may come when Stoner has a kind of impersonal conflict of interest.

I haven(t time to write Levine now, but I'm glad to have his address. If you are in touch, as you now know, there is a legit Angela Davis angle, Kaplan having done a job on that case for the USIA. Leonard should have that by now. Sorry, I've spent too much time persuading people to continue it indefinitely, and the cost of my most recent failure was too great.

Wrong/Esquivel: I spoke to Sen Long's AA. He had read all the books on Huie's assassination, all the unpublished ms, and the name was entirely unknown to him, too. Silence from him is interesting, however. Guess Bob doesn't read the papers and Wayne and Glenn are discouraged if we haven't heard of this newest Canale speech. But you are right about my request. I did it at U Va and got no answer. I will make the challenge and if it isn't answered, I think I can get it aired down there, at least on the black stations, which have a large audience share.

While Jimmie has been hinting for some time that I should go down, only hinting, until his present situation is improved I do not want to. I also think that were it not for the recent past, which is enough, it is not a good thing for Bud and me to see him simultaneously. Bud is one compartment with him, I am another. I also think that if Bud does not have something quite specific to take up with him, he ought make it a point to say he just stopped off en route to see his family, or on other business that required him to be nearby. Jimmie has a thing about people holding his hand, and he is really tender on this.

This is not one of the charts Jimmie and I had in mind, but contrary to what you say, it tells me quite a bit. I'll file it under "leads" and we can discuss it when you are next here. On the subject of charts, when Bud sees him have him ask that Jimmie duplicate the one he made for me involving a gas station or give him the one he made in my presence. I will want it for the future. If this happens, make and file a copy, for eventually you will need it.

Just remembered: Paul told me he had a week of overtime coming and was taking it so he is not there. If you fear seeming pushy, please mail him a copy with a note saying that because he was away I couldn't read it to him and that I asked you to do it not only so ~~xxx~~ he could read it but so he would have it on file. I think from our discussions beginning two years ago he agreed on conflict, too.

Please send me Glenn's address and I'll write him when I can.

Best,

May 13, 1971

Dear Harold,

Enclosed are a couple of letters to Ray which I don't think got included in the batch I mailed the other day. Also enclosed is a sketch which Ray drew. I think you've already seen it and reacted negatively to it. As soon as I get the time, I will hunt for any other sketches we have. I only seem to remember one, though.

I called Levine last Friday night. He promised to send off copies of his exchange with the New York Times to both me and Leonard immediately. Six days later, I have yet to receive a copy. Frankly, I'm not sure Richard can be counted on to do what he promised. Perhaps you should drop him a two or three line letter. His address is 1319 Rutledge, Madison, Wis. If you want to make it sting enough so he gets the lead out, tell him you are writing because I told you I wasn't sure he would carry through on his promise. If you can throw Angela Davis into it, that ought to be additional incentive.

Wrone is Professor David Wrone of the History Dept. of Stevens Point, Wisconsin. I've known him since we were both history students at the Univ. of Illinois. Once dated his wife, a charming Lebanese-American girl. In fact, I think I introduced the two of them to each other. Wrone has reviewed all the critical literature on the assassinations. I think sometime next Fall he will be publishing a review of the assassination literature in the Wisconsin Historical Review. His main passion is philosophy (especially that of Elijah Jordan--The Good Society, Forms of Individuality, Business Be Damned--the name probably won't mean anything to you. He is better read in cold war and anti-cold war literature than anyone else I know. He is thoroughly reliable. If you ever get up in Wisconsin again, I'll arrange for you to spend the night at his house out in the woods. I asked him to search out what he could find on Esquivel. The result, as you saw, is that the foremost biographer of Long has never heard the name.

I am in touch with a law student here who has dropped out temporarily to earn some bread so he can go back. He may be of some help as he is from Memphis and knows some law students there. He says a friend at Memphis State Law School wrote recently that Canale had given a speech there on the Ray case. I will try to get some more details to see if you can challenge for equal time and get back down there. Bud will go down to see Ray in a couple of weeks, if his present plans hold, but I don't think there's any chance of your being taken along. At least not at this juncture.

Best regards,

jim

May 12, 1971

Dear Harold,

I am enclosing a copy of the decision handed down by the 6th Circuit in Ray's civil action. The decison is much more helpful to us than the radio and newspaper reports indicated. In fact, there was even a dissenting opinion, which I don't recall from any of the reports I heard or read.

If you can persuade your publishers that they ought to act like people with an IQ of 60 or 70 instead of 25 or 30, maybe you can get them to publish a quote from or allude to Judge Miller's opinion in any further editions of Frame-Up or any future PR which may chance along.

I read the letters you gave me yesterday. I think some of the points you made on the brief were taken care of in the additional material which was added to the draft. I am sorry that it was rushed and that I didn't get a chance to consult with you more before we put it in. A lot of things intervened to cut down the time I had to do it in--the trip up to your house, a broken typewriter, your trip to Baltimore, etc. My own slowness is a big factor. Before I even started to write it, I went through all your memos and read the testimony of Frazier and Gallagher. I did not, of course, have time to think it through as thoroughly as I would have liked to. Bud was originally opposed to putting in any more pleadings at all. Both Bob and I dissented vigorously to that, and I told Bud to wait and let me write something up before we made any decisions about what not to do. Once he read the draft through he changed his mind completely, said he thought the reply brief really did improve our legal position greatly.

I'll comment more at another time on some of the things in your letter. Right now I have to run downtown to the Corporation Counsel office. I will send the "Boggs thing" to Sylvia and Paul, as I have intended to do for sometime for their independent evaluation.

I think it may be worth while for me to send a copy of the 6th Circuit opinion over to Paul Valentine. The thing he seemed to grasp best in our conversation yesterday, or at least be most interested in, was why Foreman did not take such a case to trial in view of his reputation.

Next time you come in, bring my raincoat if you can. The rainy season is upon us.

Jim