

Dear Jon,

9/9/74

No symbolism in the ribbon. Using up the unused part of a calculator ribbon.

When we spoke I asked you to send what you use and see, especially on Livingston, but to let it accumulate. On assassinations in general, no rush, but newer developments make Livingston even more of a problem. At the moment I hope he is only either soaring from publicity or merely insane. It is this serious. Latest is something called "Confidential Flash" and a Val Howard story headed that the King and JFK killers are not according to Ray's lawyer.

"Two black thugs."

I speak and write to you frankly and openly, depending on your trust. I remind you because it is this serious. I'll head it up fast, one way or another. This can jeopardize too much. I've written Bob this, too. And woke Lesar to tell him.

The UPI story you cited to me was his leak. He leaked to two Memphis reporters. You referred to the second one UPI ran, the second day.

This is wrong in every way, I fear even legally. The prosecution had the judge really against him by his excesses and the best this can do, it throw that advantage away. I don't believe the transcript has been "released." I haven't even told reporter friends I have a copy. And I've shown it to nobody.

We are in the stretch, the first of several. The burden falls on Lesar and me because we do all the work, now mostly him. It would be enough were this all we do. There are all kinds of proceedings, motions, countermotions, finking and tricks and each has to be met. Doing all we have to do and doing it well on the Ray case alone is physically impossible within the time limits. So, of course, today the state dumped another time-waster on us. I've proposed to Lesar a direct means of coping with these tricks, tackling them and the Attorney General head on with charges of what he is up to and asking judicial relief. Plus other and legally novel approaches to keep up from falling back and move us ahead and not mooting anything. Lesar and Bud will ponder these this p.m. and I'll be there tomorrow to argue in person. Lawyers (excepting Lesar) tend to be unimaginative.

This is FYI and also to give you an understanding of the situation re: Livingston that requires a real effort to find out why he does only the wrong and after promising and promising to stop. It is also why I ask you to let me know as promptly as you can anything no matter how slight that he says or you see attributed to him or you can stretch your imagination into believing can trace to him. While he does the wrong and invents and permits attribution he also hasn't taken time to even read the motions Lesar has filed, according to Chastain. He asked Wayne his source for some things that Wayne had learned in reading these motions. Or do you get the idea of how vital the local lawyer is and the work he is actually doing on the case? And the problem we face in ending this dangerous course and trying to figure out if he is only nuts?

In one form or another this characterizes all the loud talkers on assassinations, talk rarely good, often hurtful and never with genuine expertise. But those talking can be newsworthy. Isn't a lawyer on a famous case a legitimate source and anything he says newsworthy?

So, I'm concerned.

Best,