JW,LF My source is a photo service. Please tell me if you disagree with my interpretation of in-court use if restricted to an appendix to a petition habeas corpus. Please keep confidential for there are unindicated hairy areas. HW

Dear Jim,

7/29/72

I've been weary today and feeling a bit slow in the head, so I made a special trip into town to get copies of the pictures you want. I was unclear on whether or not you want the sketch pictures on Stephens so I thought it best ti make them because, if you do not want them now, you likely will later. Those are two, one with Herrington and one at the Mexico City airport with the sketch showing. You have the tramp pictures so I did nothing with them. One of the things that made me decide to do this is what we enevr really discussed, what Jimmy couldn't really understand but told me, that Foreman tried to get him to make an identification for LIFE- and money.

My photographer is a but jammed at the moment but he expect to have the copying done in the early part of the week.

There are six pictures involved. With each I'm getting a negative as you asked and an 8x10 glossy. We did not discuss the size of the negative, so I decided to get that which permit the best copies. He'll use his Speed Graphic and I think this will mean a 4x5 negative. The cost of negatives and prints will be $16.00

There is one thing we didn't discuss on which we will have to be clear. I got these pictures under certain restriction control over which I lose once I give you copies, therefore, for the protection of my word, I must ask the same restrictions of you. No public use, no copies to anyone (an this means none in CTIA files) and above all, no publication or use on TV. If any are used on TV, it will cost me $75.00 per use per station per picture.

Court use, in my view, is an entirely different matter. However, as these pictures will bear no identification of my source when you get them, I ask that you avoid identification of the source, which does not seem to be a necessity. That will simplify my life, too. More, and I would take the small chance of this apprehension seriously, these pictures come from negatives in dead storage. I was not able to buy all of the series. We may at some time find value in those I didn't get. Therefore, any attracting of attention to the source can prompty an official effort to cleanse all such files. I think you realize I know of some of which I haven't copies and have seen them and know of others I have not yet seen. Returning to my source on these, it is part of an organization not in sympathy with our views on such matters and this subsidiary is in direct control of a man who holds the anti-view in exaggerated form.

I also wonder if you will want an affidavir from me attesting to the fact that the picture is a copy I have had made from the print delivered to me by Kleindienst and after you left I wondered if you might want to consider attaching a copy of the summary judge-ment pursuant to which I got it. With a judge like Taylor, that summary judgement might provoke quite a bit of wonder and interest. He hasn't awarded many against DJ and he might, as I'd think any decent judge would, wonder exactly whey all the official lying about this material and the refusal on the picture when it was part of a court record and basic to the extradition, in which it was used repeatedly. The more this comes off the top of my head, the more I think you should have an appendix on this alone. It utterly destroyes either Canipe or the prosecution and with either or both the integrity of Justice.

With Werdig's recent blabbing, I'd be inclined to suggest there be no in-the-office discussion of the other pictures I've seen and don't and can't have for two reasons: the only duplicates of them are in the hands of the FBI, and the owner hasn't the slightest idea of the significance of what he has. I'd like for nothing to happen to them. If at any time you and/or Bud want to know anything about them, and I would encourage you not to until after the habeas corpus, I have detailed notes and a numbered, positive identification of each negative. I studied contact prints of the negatives. This, unlike enlargements, does show the numbering on the unexposed film. In each case I also have the roll identification. And with this in the possession of the FBI and NOT given to the defense, we might get inside the "new evidence" rulings in court or out when the time comes.

In short, as I told you yesterday, I am trying to accomplish two things: make available everything that is really needed for the present and preserve in secrecy what can be used in the future. As I told you, I have made no use of any of these things when it served my personal interest to do it. And over and above all this, you are well aware of my views on the unauthorized use of my work by others. This reminds me, I will have a new source of "new evidence" for you when the time comes, in this case evidence I know exists but haven't seen. If you coandier Blackwell as good a source as I do. Sincerely, Harold Weisberg