

Dear Jim,

10/19/73

Because I think several of the things in and with your yesterday's letter are important enough, I'm going to phone you when it is about your awakening time. I read this at the garage this a.m. (let winter come now!). Odd that your yesterday's is here but when the mail left this a.m. there were five bags of mail the route man had not touched. (The pay the city workers overtime, not the rural.)

Jimmy Ray's 10/12: "Weisberg didn't go to the siam did he? it's been quite lately."

I don't think either of your alternatives is what he had in mind. I don't think he had to have had anything special. But you can use it. For instance, tell him, jokingly, he can tell I'm not there because some Egyptians are, or ~~it~~ and that I left there years ago and am working on other things, and that while it may seem that I am quiet, I never am. My not making noise never means I'm quiet. See how he reacts. It may be his idea of a joke or he may have something in mind. I'm not writing him now.

Joh Ray/Hampe, etc. Some of the idea you have are good, some I think not yet timely and the most obvious is missing, one of the things I want to talk about. If we don't get to speak, I think the first steps are a letter to Morgan and a carbon to Wulf or the other way around, emphasizing two things in particular that the Supreme Court has lost a petition that did reach it; and most of all, the repressive precedent in the appeals court decision. This is what I've been wanting Bud to do something with for a long time, so long that I dropped it. I mentioned it to you, I think.

Shattuck, not Wulf, replied. "I think I mailed you my response. No handle."

You have two twisted in the second p.s. Not Cox and HSN, Richardson and Cox. There are reasons why, in this case, I'd consider pro se and not other. One is because it is almost automatic if the ~~the~~ complaint is adequate and the other is the reaction to a pro se victory against that combo. Both need exposing. If the initial move didn't work, I could then seek counsel. Right now, however, I don't have the filing fees.

Cox's Connally's affidavit in the McCord case is a beaut. Surprised you didn't catch the obvious. He omitted the most likely on international calls, NSA. No ref to DIA, none to any of the military agencies, and there is no saying that it was not done for any of those agencies he does list. It says only "by." It is possible that listening in was done for agencies.

Bud and buying Zapruder: he can find or raise money for certain waste but he can't for certain use. He has an infallible instinct for an idea whose time has passed. Zap may have some slight value as propoganda today, but I'm not by any means sure of that. Given the uncertainties of interpretation of 312-3 and the Thompson stuff and the ability to get attention by the other side, it may do more harm than good now. But if this is wrong, I remain convinced that the context is not there, that it is essentially a tawdry or tinselly approach today, and the backstopping my unprinted work can give it is essential- and it will be not available for any use until it is printed. These cheapkate approaches typify what has ruined us. I'm not going to go for one at this late date. Not that I can stop him or would unsolicitedly try. Neither he nor any of his people begin to understand Zapruder anyway. By the time the Spragues, Katzes, Freed, Lanes, Berkaleys and their fellow geniuses finish with misuse, what do you think the score will really be?

If \$10,000 can be raised for that and I'm stuck with some of my costs for work not for myself and by those who have misused my work, I'll be looking for a chance for something to which I have never resorted, a chance to even things up. I'll have more than had it.

Back to Johns I'd soft-pedal on Hampe in talking to other lawyers at least at the outset first because terrible as he has been that is not the crux, next because all lawyers are reluctant to open the locker-room doors and finally because it is a first-rate last resort.

Best,

JAMES H. LESAR  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
1231 FOURTH STREET, S. W.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20024  
TELEPHONE (202) 484-6023

October 18, 1973

Dear Harold,

Enclosed are several clippings and two letters.

How do you interpret the last line of Jimmy's letter? Is he expressing relief or perhaps hinting for you to write him?

The letter from the Clerk of the Supreme Court saying no petition has been filed for John Ray increases my suspicions of Hampe. On September 13, the St. Louis ACLU wrote John a letter (with copies to Hampe and me) saying that the previous day Hampe had told them he would refile the petition with the Supreme Court and would send John a copy. So, after more than a month has lapsed, he has still not done so! I'm uncertain of my next move. Should I write the Chief Justice himself? The ABA? Or back to the St. Louis ACLU?

*Merged  
Wulf*

Bud told me this afternoon (or, rather, yesterday afternoon), that he has all but cinched a deal to buy the rights to the Zapruder Film for \$10,000. This would give the Committee the right to use it in a movie, though royalties from the movie would be paid to Time-Life. I gathered Bud will not put up the \$10,000 himself but will try to raise it from someone else.

Please thank Lil again for the Marigolds and the tomatoes.

Best regards,

  
Jim

P.S. You forgot to tell me--or rather had no time to--whether Wulf indicated a disposition on the part of the ACLU to take the case on the surveillance against you. If a decision has been made, what is it?

I think it would be better not to file the FOI suit against Cox and HEW pro se. But I have an idea that might help such a suit, whichever way it is filed: file it the day after the spectro decision comes down.

*no  
vandal*

*no*