

Js, HR only and only FYI- This outburst was triggered when I said that if anything more was being withheld from me and he responded lets not waste time and money on that now. When I asked him, Lesar, if he'd read the file of so-called investigative reports, the Stanton (i.e., public defender) file lately he said he hadn't. It addresses most of the points in the petition and the doctrine of the petition, especially effectiveness of counsel and conflict of interest by counsel, as nothing else can. and he should have read it before beginning to write the petition. Bud, of course, should have written it. Meanwhile, he is, while a very decent guy, such a slob with papers he has to call me up to interrupt me and spend money on a phone call when I've given him the number he wants at least twice. And then he tells me about a few seconds of cost on that call? The letters to which I refer, to others, are to those who have evidence to which the defense is and has been entitled since the days of Aaron Burr (precedent that far back), from the original official sources or the unofficial ones to whom they gave it while denying it to the defendant. Huie offered everything he had to me two years ago and Bud wouldn't pay the fare, but he is chief defense counsel. Now they want it, after I've clobbered Huie, and then only after I've reminded them. When they'd planned to file the petition a month ago and it is not yet drafted, and the addenda are much more extensive and haven't been begun, can you begin to understand? Bud is so disgustingly lazy that in May he asked me to draft the affidavits for all the Rays and others I interviewed and get them notarized while I was off on that trip (unpaid). Maybe I'm just ill-tempered, but I find all of this in all its aspects entirely intolerable. Especially when I've found more evidence of Bud's integrating my personal files in with those of his abortion, CTIA, and god knows which of his nuts has copies. HW

Dear Jim,

9/5/72

It is perhaps just as good that I was in the middle of a letter I want to be able to mail if I have to go into town tonight when you phoned a few minutes ago to get Carol's phone, which I'd already given you at least once.

You have received what you may properly regard as intemperate letters from me, but I can't recall one that was intemperate with regard to you. However, when you start reading me lectures about things not being withheld from me when it took so long to get that Stanton file to me after I asked for it and when it was never given to me, even when I was in Memphis to investigate, that is a bit too much.

You, personally, then had that file. You were reluctant to let me have it. Naturally, since I am doing the investigating for which the whole fucking fuckup of the CTLA had taken public credit (and if you want the voices on tape you can have them). If you don't remember, I do and you should. All you gave me was the single line of the single report, Canipe's, and you then accompanied me when I went to see him, at my request. You typed this line only for me.

So, in addition to whatever else is involved, YOU had them, I was doing the investigating, and YOU did NOT give them to me.

Now, if knowing what fact you are dealing with becomes relevant in the preparation of a petition and you reread these reports, I don't think the need for my having them THEN, when for the first time I had access to some of those witnesses, will be lost upon you.

That was in February 1971. You sent them, finally, after several requests, in late August 1972, ~~more than~~ a year and a half later, after I had gone over several drafts of the petition. This was more than that after I should have had them. From before Bud became counsel, I was supposed to have been investigator on the case. From the time all of you collectively were able to do nothing I have been. I therefore see nothing unreasonable in my use of the word withheld and everything unreasonable in your reaction to it.

I don't give a damn about the others, considering the treatment I have gotten from them, but I have liked you and have tried to understand the position in which you find yourself. However, this does not mean I'm about to take any shit. I'm too deep in too many difficult situations to want to, have been tolerating the intolerable for too long and in public silence, and am just plain too worn out. You, personally, have contributed to this by something less than a faithful representation of why you couldn't debrief me and go into the dubbing of the tapes and the preparation of the affidavits in May. There is no legal research reflected in any draft of the petition, and that was the reason you gave. But this kept me on the hook until you finally did start to dub, two months later.

Were my purpose to fight or even argue, I'd give you a few more samples of what has been withheld from me. I can. But this is not my purpose. I raised the question today when you phoned because, as you must know, every time I see something new I see something missing. Do you not also want an end to this? Do you not want all this work you are doing to be as good as it can be? If it succeeds, there will be nothing in it for me, but much for you and Bud. As the beneficiaries of my work, beginning with getting the client and then giving you a case to which if any of you has added a single material thing I have no knowledge of it, I think common, ordinary intelligent serving of self-interest would have required something better than the record of which I have complained.

It is of no interest to me, personally, but I think your and Bud's personal interest, to say nothing of the client's, indicate that when, in some cases more than a year and a half after I first said certain letters should be written, you finally write them and then too late and again only on my reminder, you might have wanted me to go over them. And, you have NOT sent me copies.

Nor do I like it a damned bit when you complain that the extra seconds my asking if there is anything else I should have and don't you tell me about the cost. Remember, I'm the guy who spent 500 miles of travel of which you know and money I don't have to get pictures you now admit you need and Bud said he'd go to \$50.00 on it. Insult enough? I'm also the guy who asked Bud to repay the cost of the phone calls only in getting his client and he told me he didn't have the money. It cost me more to write the two letters I mailed you last night than it would have cost you if I'd called you, but I did take the time and I did incur the

cost of a special trip to the post office to mail it to you. I had no other reason for the trip. So, as I did on Friday by making a trip into town to save you the time when I know you are under pressures, I have been willing to forgo other things and increase my indebtedness to try to help you. But I am not willing to be ^{insulted} for it.

Not only am I not being paid, in any way, when Bud pays for the shit he gets from others, but I can't get all my expenses back. And without complaint I have done the work lawyers should have done. Who the hell is supposed to collect material for affidavits but lawyers? Want more examples?

Want examples of what a real defense of the client requires and was refused when there would have been no salary involved for the work? Some with which you agreed so much you said you'd see if you could raise the actual costs?

To spare me the insults and the lectures. Especially at this time when all of your collectively had been part of one of the more unconscionable and predictable (yes, predicted) fuckups of all time and I have been silent - I didn't even tell you "I told you so", did I? I want to help, I am willing to help. I have avoided everyone but you to make it possible. But I'm not about to be offended any further by any of you when the gross incompetence and the neglect are all down there and when there is the glory all down there and there is nothing up here but cost, trouble and the sacrifice of other things I want to do and for which I have much less time than you.

Jim, because I know you all need this help I am trying to give it. But you all live well and just refused to consider the conditions of our lives. A month ago you said you'd see to it that I got paid for my work and trouble in getting the pictures - more than a year ago - that you now acknowledge you need (which is also a measure of the judgement down there). Not only has this not happened, but when I showed you more, offered them and said I could get them done better and cheaper than you, you didn't even offer to pay me an estimated cost in advance. I'll be putting that money out when the little I have I need for day-to-day things. I've just had to use the partial recovery from a fire at my Hyattstown property to prevent foreclosure on my home. In return, I'd have the insurance on my Hyattstown property cancelled. I've not been able to write new insurance on it. Does this give you a context?

So, don't let this happen again unless you are prepared to show me I'm wrong or unreasonable.

Let me show you the other side, in just recent cases. For perhaps the third time, last time I saw Bud I asked him to make an appointment of five minutes with Lysterly. They know each other. It is a month and I've heard nothing. The second weekend since I made a simple request of him has passed and I've heard nothing. I asked that he phone and let me know when I could see him, preferably when he was going to his weekend place above here. I said this, too, would take less than five minutes and was connected with nothing, we had every discussed. I have heard nothing. I offered to drive to where he would pass to wait for him to get there. As you well know, I also was in Washington Friday and could have seen him before you awakened.

Each time I've gone to Washington to see one of you on this case I had personal matters to attend that I let go for this. That will not happen again. I will not go to Washington again on anything connected with the lay case. At the same time I tell you straight, if one of you messes up on any aspect, you'd best be prepared if it is avoidable. As I just will not have my poverty, to which if in relatively minor ways, you have all contributed, rubbed in my face, so also will I not tolerate the most minor negligence or error in the preparation of this petition or any of its addenda. I have no inheritance keeping me in grand style, nor have I any subsidy, so don't ever tell me about the waste of pennies again. Especially not when I am talking about incompetence and negligence other than mine. Pennies mean much to me, but not to Bud or to you. Obviously, I am offended and angry. But you misread me if you think it is only that or that it will blow over if there is more incompetence. And on this question of incompetence, why don't you read that Stanton file, which I just got and which is where this all began, recall what is not in your draft - any one of them - of the petition, and then ask yourself how you could have ignored it. You did, as you also failed to discuss this petition with me before you began working on it. The record - yours, mine and Bud's - since then is pretty clear.