

Denies knowing of Flammonde's book, but others on CIA speak of it openly. This is an irreconcilable conflict with his role as my lawyer in FIA suit, as author who is his client, and as Ray's attorney, where it is the opposite but equivalent to "rule's role. Only ~~Flammonde~~ Flammonde is, in a sense, much worse.

Has spent time on CIA foolishness to detriment of clients, Ray and me, Ray is real issue. He has had basic evidence for a long time and hasn't even read it, yet he is and has been in court on it. In my case, after he said he didn't want to hand letart of suits vs US he said he'd read my drafts and comment and in two months hasn't found time for any of this, which is to my, if not our, detriment. Last of emmy cases, when I went in to see him on this, then he still was not familiar with basic Ray evidence, he spent entire morning with Charach & Flammonde (careful not to introduce me) and never saw me, his client. This is also costly to me, and he knows I cannot afford.

Has engaged in publicity to make it seem his creepy bunch of nut are and have been doing the Ray investigation, when he knows better. This is but part of what I forecast to him to begin with had to be the truth: they'd be worthless. Here it is evil, for I had already done the work and he says they are doing it. Meanwhile, when I accurately described his saps, his response was that he didn't expect them to do any real work, they were window-dressing because their names would bring money in. I suggest it hasn't been this way at all and no sensibleman, knowing the facts, could have believed it could or would have been. Sprague, for example, terrifies people, he is so irrational.

Breaches of confidence are not those above alone, for example Davison, where I asked him to get Atlanta's story only and to make no mention, particularly not to send anyone to see Davison. So, he sends Smith. What could they have expected of Davison, that he fall on his knees and confess all? So, they blew it, forever. No possible excuse. Ego-trip only. And waste of money, yet he said there was none to take me to Penn or to repay costs Ray phone class.

More personal things:  
Asked me to plan to spend 1st 2 wks N.O. 12/68, I made necessary arrangements, and he backed out, never once telling me in time, so I was stuck.  
Telling others he is helping keep me when he is not. (Mary). Asking me to do costly and time-consuming things and then doing nothing about it. Recent examples, copying my government cores files, which took close to a month of work and some cost. Going over Tenn court papers right away so he could learn what I found and never again looking at them. I had to and

Agreement when I refused to join committee

I could not trust board, others, some proven crooks, others nuts, some sycophants  
I would work with Bud personally, conditional upon his keeping whatever I gave him separate, secret  
I would be in on everything

I would be investigator, meaning only investigator (unless, as is likely, I would have agreed to others for some things.)

Purposes explicit: protect Bud and Ray and because I alone had certain knowledge

I would be taken to Tenn every time jeopardy to my enormous investment, book, collats. Bud undertook to be my lawyer in case against Govt.

I had to copy all my files-enormous time & expense, and he has accessible, which is wrong as my lawyer and also under our orig. understanding.

He then said to separate cases, and I did, and he then said he would handle only spectro, but he kept everything, including losing copy spectro.

I must ask is it lost or taken by one of his butts. But I now have no copy.

Conflict between him as my lawyer and his association with those who have stolen from me. Lit. His giving some (Turner, about whom he knows all he needs but prefers to like) (Computers & Sprague) (Flammonde) (Popkin) (Cook) And he has steadfastly refused to look at evidence, preferring his own wrong judgement, for whether these are pleasant fellows is immaterial.

While he has the right to quit as my lawyer, he has no right to then hold onto what I have given him for this purpose only and then let others have. If there is another, single, misuse, I'll sue, for this must end. Otherwise we cannot survive.

He was allowed to go through my files and copy what he wanted, on basis of orig agreement and because he had agreed to be my lawyer.

Sprague says he and all other CIA members have free access to all files, which, obviously, include mine, they having used and Bud saying he didn't give.

Flammonde - Bud knew he was crook for I'd asked him to handle suit vs Meredith long ago, based on blatant plagiarism. His (Bud's) response was that I am a "litigious person".

No single part of Ray agreement kept and others put in that position. Information was withheld from me and misrepresented

and did drop everything in each case. Making appointments with me and then having those I could not accept, like Sprague, in on them, and in that case I had to give up waiting for them who was to lend me money to keep this appointment. The insult that followed. Now, while we rings Sprague in on our lawyer-client conferences, which is wrong, when Chiracu and Flemmonde are there, he is careful to close his door and not even introduce or tell me who is with him and I was scolded to be that way time. He was not given me what I should have had as investigator on Ray case, and I did ask for it, more than once.

His time on conflicting CIA work has kept him from meeting his minimal responsibilities to Ray (and me). If this is not immediately and completely ended, I will do what I can about it, with absolute no inhibition, including bar, judge and press. Prime example, he has not prepared case but has spent much time on conflicting CIA activity, all a joke in any event and can consist, if it has any meaning, in little more than giving my work away and failing his responsibilities to Ray. Not reading COUP is one example of what he should have done. Meeting with me to go over work he asked of me on this case is another. Ditto on completing my going over Rule.

When I asked him if he'd be Ray's lawyer and when Ray asked him he agreed to either or both: a name lawyer and/or a Tenn. lawyer. I made approaches to which he agreed. He did not do this, although he knows lawyers I do not and as I cannot.

When he got Tenn counsel, he did not inform me. He was supposed to get Ray to agree to letter I wrote on giving him permission to use my material and he didn't. He was to have gotten Ray to return COUP II and he hasn't. If he has paid Paul for replacing copy, as he agreed (the one you have), neither has told me.

Even the Eugene stuff he got for me and as I told him how to. Letters to Mitchell and Rogers my ideas-even my drafts. Ditto those on which we have (only, to my knowledge) Leonard's response.

When he asked me, on less than 24 hours notice, to prepare him for his first brief, on what I told him and he left out, I was right and he was wrong. Even the decision quoted (Sanders) of which I had no knowledge I told him had to exist, he never told me when it was found. Example of what I mean by my judgement being right and his wrong: Bottle. I also included Stanton and others, here again I had to drop everything and did. He was then late coming and had social engagements and didn't finish. I have notes and L11 for witness.

With this record, among the things I consider minimal is being told fully and frankly what support, including financial, everyone, esp. Flemmonde has had, what they have been shown and told about, and that they be directed to return everything and not use anything they were told. With Flemmonde, I expect him to be directed to suspend all writing that can in any way no matter how indirect, relate to anything I have done, from my writing and research to and including getting Ray as Bud's client. The alternative is that I will sue and I may yet over his earlier plagiarism. This must be all in writing, with copies to me, and to include, any approaches Flemmonde has made to any source of publishing, magazines, publishers, etc. (Aside from this, we'll never survive another Flemmonde intrusion.)

Return PM, filling any other books immediately. Does he have my Flemmonde? It and my Jay David are missing. Also any files he does not need for court-end all of them. Letter to committee to say that there was access to my work, that it is not to be used, no copies to be retained, any distributed to be recaptured and returned.

As sample of what he regards as cooperation, he long ago agreed to make copies for me to pursue work re Ferris and hasn't yet done it but has supplied copies, without their requesting them, to others. I have no objection to the letter, but it is a demonstration of one-way cooperation.

All my medical-autopsy material to be returned immediately. Anything I supplied or supplied leads to or done from me to be given me or placed where no one can have access and no one to be told of it.