10/13/72

Dear Jim,

I'm not surprised your trip turned out as well as it did, but I am pleased. My regret is what the scum may have skimmed is not available and that what should be used now can't be, with few exceptions. I know some people who should learn from this, but with one possible exception, these are people without capacity to learn save by violence. Hence there has been violence in the past, alas.

We have a bell and cat situation, and we'd best consider it carefully when there is time for consideration.

In between other things, ask I begin this with but ten minutes to spend on it, I have been thinking. An ambitious thing that may not be impossible has occurred to me. I'll think about it more when I can and in time we can discuss it. It has to do with Hooker, so you can remind me.

I believe Hooker is also Huie's lawyer, or was in this one instance. I believe Huie so told me. You have the letter. That can but need not complicate our lives. What will complicate it is the miserable timing. I am still talking about things that should have been done beginning two years ago when I first asked that I be enabled to do them. Once the papers are filed, some people will be unhappy. They are people who should have been spoken to in advance. Not as much Hooker as Huie here.

The tragedy is that all was easily seen. It required no genius. It required the capacity for simple, direct thinking and the removal of blindfolds. To think that this little was not available!

Even the negatives are helpful. And they need not have ended as negatives. Perhaps some can still have the charge reversed.

I do appreciate your phoning me to tell me how it turned out.

As I thought, I wondered if I should write Hooker separately. If you think I should, I will. If not, do as we discussed both times, you refer to what I can offer them. It makes no difference to me. The one thing that occurred after we spoke is that you might desire some isolation, and if we begin that way and if they want to see me, it might make other things more flexible.

If you write the Hooker firm before we speak again, may I suggest asking for a copy of their complaint against Foreman?

Later: there is a standard I press upon you when you are tempted to load the petition with what Hanes' files yielded it limit it strictly to the essential of the legal-oriented, except for what you may think the Hanes' will affirm, in affidavit. Like that Huie letter demanding a guilty plea. You have already left out of the petition and papers what I think should be in. Thus doesn't mean I have to be right, but it does mean there is already too much. I think we have to have a reserve, for court of other use. Once we overkill in these papers we have done enough. Besides, there is little doubt that most of the new stuff requires both work and thought.

Bud didn't believe it when I said I thought it was possible to get Ray as a client. Maybe you won't be willing to believe it, but I do believe we now have possibilities of new allies, I think they may be important after the petition, very important, and you and I should find time after you are rid of all the papers for some serious talking and thinking. The only impossibility in all of this is making the nuts rational. Controlling some is not impossible. If it can't be permanent, it can be effective and on occasion has been. We are not entirely without means. That Hooker suit can mean an enormous difference. If I am right in thinking that Hooker is not suing for $2,000 only, then he is suing for something other than money, and here I have what he can't duplicate for much more than the amount for which he is suing. I don't think he or anyone in the firm would dream of what I have, that it even exists. This I offered to help and to talk and thus I think the complaint may be important to read.

Good luck over a rough weekend.

Sincerely,