

For the eyes of William W. Turner

August 27, 1967

Dear Bill:

I enclose you today an appeal of my letter of August 22 to Stephen Carter. In your successive informal letters you indicate in its first paragraph — that I have decided to reduce my defense in favor of the lower court's position. The letter in his letter to me of August 15 — I should tell you that the reason behind my decision not to inform the appellate court of the issue raised in my memorandum here is not my problem or agreement with his basis for those views. I agree only with their essence, that it should not be done, and I would not recommend it if raising the issue might "confuse" the matter now on appeal. I didn't elaborate on this to Mr. Carter because I thought he might take it as an insult to his professional standing, which it is not.

Although his views show a sound knowledge of the law and legal theory applicable to my problem, that is, what would seem the best grounds in consonance with the law as it is written and how it is supposed to function in practice, they also indicate a naivete as to how the law does in fact function in cases involving a national interest. I do not intend this opinion as an effort to you from S.D.C. It is the exception rather than the rule to find an attorney who has not been blinded by academic conditioning or hoodwinked by most court decisions with only to the occasions. Those who have not been misguided, it would seem, are no longer dealing their efforts to the realm of criminal law. Our jails, prisons and mental institutions house aged slaves of people who are there simply because the law as it is promulgated set in fact to function properly or was deemed unapplicable to them for cause never cited in the open records. Guilt, innocence, insanity, or consciousness of mind had little to do with that. Sometimes one constitutes, as did the evidence presented at their hearings. One sole goal some have on the recovery end of our judicial system in order to opponents and accept what I have just stated as fact. So, I shall dwell on the process further. But you remember, Peter, I have been situated on both sides of the fence.

Hence, you may perceive the main reason for my silence, despite what was intended to be the polite wording of my letter to Mr. Carter. It is going to take a lot more than registering a complaint with the appellate court to get out of this or a new situation which I am fully without fear of reversal. It is going to require much more than the substituted legal aid that the future might dictate; "secretive banks as the "right" lawyers."

So, as the man once wrote: What Is To Be Done?? Well, frankly, I don't know. I know the validity of what I have already written and I expect that there is absolutely nothing I, myself, can accomplish from the confines of incarceration. I suspect that there are others who are quite cognizant of the fact too. And this bank I can count on any real assistance from my dear sister, Eleanor, either. She is a staunch Republican and "conservative" (voted for Barry Goldwater in 1964), and seems afraid of taking any action which might hurt her precious Good-Citizen-Activities reputation. Since January 1964, when the Federal Buggie first interviewed her about me — placing her under oath and swearing her to secrecy — she has been biting little green apples left and right come out covering "the former violent soldier who became so completely altered, etc., etc."

Perhaps the not-so-oblique reference contained in your letter of August 22 would provide the solution or at least disrupt any plan to sent me away permanently in some outhouse. One thing, however, is certain: Any effort on the part of mine will be with my blessings, one-hundred percent, though they would not necessarily be... to be directed & to be implemented since the sum of things as I know them are right generally speaking, as were the persons who were making the water boil. That the poor fool (along with ghouls and all) left holding the bag as he was, was supposed to perform his two soliloquies, they're to be... etc.

... a yu hanosokaga sru zorotitior a tifiduan sas paseani
... i mukintacabas pos et primitivitatu s mukintib. Saya
... di sisaan . . . wajib yg bading atau entar kematian ko aja, jadi wajib
... dianale dit arsir . . . tolovela na dudu beldandi pos'eu kya ntarik sif , alih-alih jadi
... dianale qadu si . . . "7", versiwa bisectro-eta ej possida tembakan gendis maha
... ayan bisa ef kawal, banjir di sisi qabiran", qedekui tsabihui le makaukuwur yg ada yg
... . . . kui ulinakkeri, mit haromutan rasa biles uktung a tumpang sira . . . kui rabi
... mukintib muka mukintib obat lauk a rasa tembakan saw yutu . . . mukintib

* Sometime during March and April 1964 (exact date unknown), Justice caused a letter to be mailed addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations, which requested an audience. Justice informed me of his desire to discuss the aggressions of a company it would benefit him to meet with President Kennedy prior to his departure at the time he was in effect being held unconstitutional. Justice informed me on several occasions he was in effect being held unconstitutional. Justice informed me on several occasions he was in effect being held unconstitutional. Justice informed me on several occasions he was in effect being held unconstitutional.

Also at sometime during the same period (exact date unknown), attorney sent a letter through private channels to the first lady, Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, for the Warren Commission, then conducting an investigation of the killing of President Kennedy. Attorney offered to testify before the commission if she would agree to respond to his letter.

which are now in the hands of the British Government. It is to be hoped that the
Government will take steps to secure the freedom of all anti-slavery
dissidents, and especially those who have been persecuted for their beliefs
in freedom and justice. The British Government has a duty to protect

the first will not be able to exercise before any case out
of Europe, and it will involve the European authority
concerning the national laws. The authority which is to deal with extra-national
behaviour will be also the one which has to decide whether the behaviour of the
passenger in question can be held civilly responsible for damages suffered in the course

est à ce que nous ne le faisons pas. Mais nous devons faire de la place pour les autres. Nous devons faire de la place pour les autres. Nous devons faire de la place pour les autres. Nous devons faire de la place pour les autres.

May 3

On May 1, 1964, Mr. Calema filed the bill, followed immediately by both
counsel who attempted to persuade him to withdraw his commitment to the
U.S. Medical Center for Federal Officers in lieu of standing trial. Mr. Calema advised
that he had spoken to the district court judge about this, and that the judge said
he would agree to such a commitment provided petitioners did not object. Mr.
Bellis stated that petitioners were going to be tried before a "live-jury," and
that he would be waived, hence, as Mr. Calema put it, "I might think anything
who walks into a room with a gun intent to kill," or make similar and to
that effect. On suggestion of the counsel that he ought to withdraw his
petition he should submit to such a commitment in lieu of standing trial would only
be negative and unproductive. Petitioners informed counsel that he wanted to stand
trial, that he had just been found medically competent to stand trial, and that counsel
knew he was "very peaceful".

On May 3, 1964, the day before the trial, both counsel, accompanied by an
El Paso psychiatrist (Dr. Manuel Hernandez) who had examined petitioners previously,
again visited the jail. Mr. Calema stated that he was going to file a motion
hearing "tomorrow" and that he intended to allow petitioners one additional day
competent to stand trial. Whereupon, petitioners asked why and said it is Dr.
Hernandez, "I thought you tell me you thought it was important to stand trial?"
Dr. Hernandez replied, "you are," but that it was important of petitioners keep just
within a hospital or prison; and that he thought it should not be longer.
Petitioners advised there was no difference between confinement or prison.
Mr. Calema, "you know how you acting today," but that it would not be the time
he was not aware. Both counsel and Dr. Hernandez then left. Dr. Hernandez
one hour later all three returned. Whereupon, Mr. Calema told Dr. Hernandez that
he would not try to allow the petitioners not enough to stand trial; and he
would stand trial as scheduled, but that he (Calema) would petition his employer
for a reduction in the degree of insanity. Mr. Calema stated that they had only been
"testing" petitioners.

* Immediately prior to the selection of the jury, a brief meeting was
held at which petitioners were advised that they had only been tested prior.

27-6298-4