5/21/70

Dear Bud,

I've been tired today. With much that I should regard as pressing, I didn't do any of it. I spent the day piddling around outside, pretending to listen to the news, but really thinking about many things. Some relate to your interests.

When I was in town for the neurological examination yesterda (normal), I had time to phone DJ and I didn't. We discussed it very briefly in the a.m. I think we must take the position they must comply with all the fine points of the law. This includes giving me copies. They could have done that while we waited, on the xeroxes, at least, and decent people would have done it with the pictures from their duplicate files. I realize they may be up to other trickery, and I've been considering what some of it may be. I've decided if they are, there is nothing we can do about it, so why worry.

Therefore, this is what I propose, leaving the legal technicalities to you: We give the a reasonable time to supply the copies. Remember, they didn't even known the fees, were to phone one dsus when they learned (the forms do not include the charge for pictures), and they haven't. I think, especially because they were so incredibly arrogant as to go to court and ask that the case be held moot on their promise alone, we should go and ask an immediate trial on the ground they are either still stalling, which is prohibited and intolerable after a year of waiting, of that they have not kept their word, now a matter of court record. They may be worrying about the two things I asked: a letter saying the file is complete (and you can be sure they've added opinions to it) and the note on the cover saying it is confidential and the reference to the Lyerly letter.

If they come accross, before we file the promised motion to dismiss, we should ask identification of the 12/10/69 letter. We think we know, but it may be still another, prompted by that one. If so, I want it for the book and I can guess who else might have an interest and a proper one.

We have already agreed, as I recall, to go to court if they refuse any single item.

Theyteppear incapable of learning, but since we pay their wages, do we not owe ourselves and our fellow taxpayers the obligation of at least trying to teach them? We'd never had Lyerly without Kleindinest.

Metting with Archibald very pleasant. Seems like real nice, very sincere and honest guy. I liked him and, broke as I am I sure appreciate his treating me.

If you haven't asked Ray for a letter explaining who and how the government offered him counsel, please also ask his permission for me to use it in a magazine piece not so much on him as on the law and his present situation. It is not impossible.

I'll be away Thursday 5/28.

Best,