

4/22/70

Dear Hal,

Just noticed I hadn't mailed the enclosed to you, so I bring you up to date on other things that seem to hold no good. I've heard nothing further about the enclosed and do not expect to until after the pleading.

On Skolnick: everything not invented in his "suit", which can only make the government look good and like guys who would never think of suppressing anything, save a record of an Oswald phone call, which Bud gave him, he stole from me via Russ. In the course of doing this, aside from the obvious damage, he blew any chance of doing anything about Groth, the man responsible for the Panther murders. So gross was his distortions of what I had, so rotten his fabrications, the end result was to make Groth look like a martyr in the papers. I have drafted a suit to be filed in the same court, against him, but lack means of filing it. If I can do this and it gets any attention at all, it will to a large degree neutralize the damage to all of us when, as is inevitable, he gets tossed out of court. If you can get me the AP "A" wire story on it, I believe filed 4/7, I'd appreciate it. If I do not hear of a way in which I can get someone to file it, I'll write the clerk of the court and ask him if and how I can do it by mail. Meanwhile, someone is seeking to arrange a TV confrontation between us. If this comes off, I'll be there and do it myself and, I think, take care of him at the same time. The lousy egocentric skunk didn't even trouble to get his own copies. He stole what I got for myself, what Paul got for me and what Russ got for me at my direction, without awareness that there were certain distinguishing marks not added by the government. So, I've got him dead to rights. On camera it would look like he's an agent.

Nichols, who is strange in his normal state, is up to something I haven't yet entirely doped out. I think it is a way in which he can justify stealing from me what he'd like and couldn't get for himself and what I showed him on his word he'd not use it. I've caught him duplicating the pictures I had made and he had not and a few things like that. He got up tight when I found out he was intending to sell some of my stuff to LOOK, and I wrote them, hating to, but his refusal to respond left me no choice. Besides, he has some weird notions on the case. It is beginning to look, despite his earlier denials, that he may be Dave's source on some of my stuff Dave claims to have knowledge of. If you get any glimmer of this or anything like it, I'd like to know, for there is no telling what either or the combo might do.

I'm about to file another suit, this one on the panels. Here I'll have to be my own lawyer. My problem, once I get into court, will be to afford the witnesses I want, whose costs would have to be paid; Hynes, from Detroit, would cost most. Several of the others are closer and would cost less. I'd like to think some help might be available. I think you are aware of the potential if you have read PMIII as well as the earlier work. And I'm laying the foundation for other suits, to begin with vs DJ while I let the Archives waste time and make themselves look worse when I get to them. I plan a number, each for a single thing. They may go bats defending and in each case my only doubts do not relate to fact or what the law should be....I look forward to seeing Paul again. I've not heard his schedule. I should have told him if he goes to his folks first, if he catches a bus to here, I'll take him to DC ...There was an enormous missed opportunity on the Featherstone case but nobody seems interested, typically, I've heard nothing further from Garry and will do nothing further unless they take the initiative. I, personally, am past the day of one-way streets. Best to all,

4/20/70

Dear Hal,

If this begins with what sounds uncomplimentary, it isn't intended that way. I've 20-25 minutes before breakfast, just finished reading "Tales of Hoffman" (Bentam-you should), don't have another book I especially want to read, and this interval is not sufficient for any new work. So, I write to update what I told Paul he might tell you. While I want no use made of it at all without my permission, for use may have consequences not apparent out there, I see no reason people who may be interested and who can be trusted should not know the background to the coming new James Earl Ray appeal, which may not even get mentioned in the press but which will, I think, make a record.

Joe DeLoach
John Evans
Howard Hughes
and

You know the story of how I waited a long time, about or almost a year, before making an approach to Jerry and how I did it through someone I knew he trusted but who feared me while respecting me-almost always auditioning my live shows in that city but always fearing to leave me on his own. This relationship ripened, and as I spoke and wrote very straight and called shots with (Harrumph!) unflinching accuracy when in each case his political concepts seemed to lead to opposite expectations. As I asked nothing of him, he knew I wasn't in it for what I could get out of him (I did get several things I could and did check out independently and I did use, having them also from other sources). Meanwhile, I kept telling him to come here and see what I had written. Finally I told him that in my view when his brother didn't have lawyers who had other interests more important to them he had fools and incompetents and I could supply him with a better lawyer and free. So, he asked it (after speaking to James, who he had been telling about me) and James asked it of him. Bud, to whom I had spoken much earlier, asking him if he'd do this if I could swing it, had agreed. So, Bud is the newest member of the "legal" staff and I am in the role of "investigator" on the case.

When Bud went down to see Ray for the second time, having raised the question the first time, he carried a copy of COUP II, with the understanding I'd like (not a precondition) Ray to write comments on it. A rather strange thing I will not articulate, there is one of a number of things I left out because I thought them not needed in a work already too long, and one got fed back in a reaction. It deals with a place I have spent much time. Catch? No mention, please. But not with an identifiable person. So, James read the book, flipped, and spoke to Jerry; the next person he saw, asking Jerry to ask Bud to ask me if he could use parts in his defense. I told Bud, who would be seeing him (this means requires no censorship-even the book was hand delivered, which Bud, as lawyer can do whereas Jerry cannot), of course, but under certain limitations which I would and did put in writing also for hand delivery. Again, I asked nothing of Ray.

So, it finally dawned on the other lawyers that they were lost and when it was too late asked Bud to come in on the appeal, due this week. Bud heard from them Friday, knew of some of the legal aspects I'd gone into, phoned me and asked me to prepare them for him, came here Saturday, and we went over them. He will make the final decisions, but I rather suspect I know what the petition will say and allege, and I think it will be original, imaginative, hot, and had a chance, too-late as it already is, that much having been loused up already. However, it will, if successful, advance concepts of what constitutes a free trial, the rights of the accused, the responsibilities of defense counsel, and can result in the severe limitations I think should be placed on the merchandizing of the accused in sensational trials. It will be an aggressive petition, going after every lawyer in the case, accompanied with solid proof of each charge, including threats against the accused, his bribery, and violations of the canons of ethics by every single lawyer to the ministerial and the judge himself. In some cases, Bud now has the actual voices on tape where I had them. Time's up. Best regards. *He*

3/24/70

Dear Hal,

Paul sent me a transcript of the appearance of Judy Bonner on KKHI. Real gushy, like diarrhoea. If there is one who of the sycophants knows least of what has appeared, what is in the official record, it is Judy. She has the traditional p.r. attitude (if you do not yet have the book, she is no longer a "reporter"- if she ever was - but is in the p.r.business): she doesn't care. So, she says what she pleases and decides that what she wants to be is. Thus her rep is all new to her because she knows nothing, hence everything is new and because she wills it that way, this suiting her purposes.

This is not to say there is no value in her book. Because she knew nothing and had to get what she did have from others, where she reflects the beliefs and statements of these others there may be some value, the question there being her questionable ability to accurately reflect them. I have written Paul about this.

But the things she singled out on that broadcast can be a fun thing: the mistakes of others. With me it can be fine, for what she says I do not have, which makes me erroneous, the Worrell bit, is exactly what I do have at the point she cites! And what she criticizes Lane for saying is what she also says. I have these noted in an unanswered letter I wrote her in Feb. Paul has a copy. She knew these things before she broadcast, which is also traditional among her profession(s).

What does interest me about her is that she appears to have been making a live broadcast, which indicates there is some advertising money behind her. For that book? Hardly strictly commercial. I am aware that she could be doing this on her own. But with such a lousy book, I am interested in the extent of p.r. effort behind it. It is being distributed by Roberts' publisher, so it has a background. I am not suggesting it is important to answer her, or even worthwhile, though for your own local purposes it may be.

If she does any of the better shows, I'd be interested in knowing which. And if any answer should be made, and if you do not want to, I'll be glad to. However, I usually ignore this kind of claptrap these days, for I think noconstructive purpose is now served by taking time for them, generally speaking. I've not asked SBS for time to respond to their puff for "Special Unit Senator", for example.

Nor do I know the kind of or extent of audience KKHI has. Offhand, I presume it is little or none. But, this kind of thing, where you can be so overwhelming in refutation, where the ridicule can be so powerful (as in the alleged skill and science of the police in picking Oswald up!)), can provide you the means of attracting people to your group, if you still maintain it.

Nothing new here. The only good attention my suit got is from Joe, in advance. It was about completely suppressed elsewhere. Which is a disappointment, for it means the press is much more dishonest than I'd believed, much more the willing, spontaneous creature of government. However, I plod ahead on others and I am ready to go to trial on this ~~the~~ one, and subject to my lawyer's approval, plan to subpoena two present cabinet members and one former, which may attract a little attention to it.

Haven't heard from or of the Whites for a while. Give them my best.

Sincerely,

3/20/70

Dear Hal,

I have just heard from Olam. His new address is 322 Athens.

He would like to read what I have on the NSRP. I told him it is in part 1 of COUP and he could borrow your copy. If he asks, okay.

Those things related to the Brown case are rapidly assuming the proportions of a frame. Enough is already prepared. Remains to be seen whether they'd pull it off.

I told Olam you have a copy.

Best,