

read his &
return

3/7/69

Dear Steve,

The verdict is in and, as you may recall I feared, I am satisfied we do not have a judicial determination of fact, not in the Shaw case. Again Jim went off half-cocked and again he has an inadequate charge. There are two other perjuries of which I know and of which I earlier gave him evidence. Why he did not use it during the trial I cannot even guess. The inadequacy of the presentation you cannot imagine for you know little about the N.O. end.

Try and get off the pendulum.

If this makes a cynic of you, you will have wanted to be and will be using this as an excuse. The trouble is not because people are "stupid, cruel and inhuman" but for entirely other reasons. In what troubles you, it is because one in particular was irresponsible (for whatever reason) and not honest. However, I repeat you did have warnings you would not accept. Your trouble is within, because, whether or not you concede it, you are troubled that you did not understand, did not question, and you realize you should have. Is not at least part of your guilt feeling, from having been part of what was so ruinous? If it is, it should not be, not because it is not true but because your lack of experience made you more susceptible than with more experience you would have been. And need I point out all those so much more experienced, more mature, of whom this was no less true? If nothing else can be blamed, it is this self-seeking sycophancy that is largely responsible. Jim had nothing but "yes men" around him, save one, and this not only led him where he went but seriously diminished the ability of that one to exert any influence.

The wonderland of which you speak is also, in each case, internal. That, too, is but an excuse, for we did not all live in that wonderland and too many of those who did merely pretended so, for they knew better.

I am not about to engage in epistolary defenses of charges against Shaw, nor am I about to predict that Jim will suddenly become rational and reasonable. However, I tell you the area of the perjuries: in swearing that he handled the rentals and this kept him too busy to do anything and in swearing that he left the ITM completely voluntarily. I have the proof in my possession. Jim had it and failed to use it. Can you imagine the impact this would have had before a jury?

Did you ever hear or hear of Lemarzo using the additional names of Patrick (middle) or Terrand, perhaps mastronymic? Or any other of that group?

The books at question are not those I gave Mark. You and I were at your metal locker at school and I gave them to you there. I believe I gave Mark only personal copies, for him and others in his family. I have again spoken to the P.O. and they insist they have a record of delivery. It does me little good to chalk up a loss against a defunct CCI. Unless Louis gets that set fixed, what kind of spot am I in when both of you destroyed the P.O. receipts? I have written you about the rifle and asked that he send it, with the clips and ammo I had.... Jim Lawrence phoned me earlier in the week. If you taped his commentary, I'd like them. As you perhaps know, I have the highest regard and the warmest feelings for him and Art. regards to everyone, and do not permit yourself to get too discouraged. There will be temporary adverse effects but in the long pull we have materially advanced, not through any responsible act of any of the principals. And ask yourself of your continuing help to those you knew lacked intellectual integrity. Is this part of your problem? Best, HW

1 March 69

Dear Harold,

Received your letter today. Thanks. The verdict is in and I can't say I disagree with it. Have done a lot of thinking with few decisions. I guess that this whole thing is so ingrained in me I won't "quit" but I'd at least like a vacation. I'll tell you one thing; this case has made me a real cynic. By that I mean that I think people are stupid, cruel, and inhuman. But also I mean not to take them so seriously. People don't think and say, much less do, what is true and just so why fool ourselves? I still must do what my conscience tells me to and I will do it. But I don't expect any help even if it is offered.

We're playing in a wonderland where black is white vice versa and most of the time we can't tell which is which. The Shaw case is supposed to be o.k. -- then it turns out to be a farce -- then you say it really is o.k. but wasn't used. Don't be offended if I say I'll believe you when I see the evidence.

I'll have to check with Mark Grossman about the books you left with him. We never used them because we never needed them (we used Dell editions by that time). The books I'm returning are not from that group. If the p.o. needs proof, I don't have it. Since we spoke by phone there is not even a written record. If they won't come through on your insurance chalk the loss up to CCI. It's defunct (and broke) and the books I'm returning will just about even that account. The little radio was paid for by me, personally, so that account must be kept separate. I'm almost broke too (band account = \$13.00). I dept my receipt on that shipment for several weeks until Louie said it was received and would be fixed -- that I shouldn't worry about it. Where is it now? The rifle was sent immediately upon receipt of your message via Jim Lawrence (whose done seven superb commentaries on KABC TV!) via air rea.

take it easy for awhile,

Burt