

3/29/72

Dear Jim,

Sorry you and Bud haven't been able to get here. I have a stack of stuff piled up on a table I'm going to have to file and forget about. I need the space for work. And there seems to be no point.

I had not seen the 11/4/71 Elias Hadsock letter to Ray before but would be inclined to dismiss it as meaningless.

I do not know the case James refers to in his undated letter of which you sent me a copy. It is among the things I gave you when you and Richard met me at the airport when I returned from my last trip. I had not had time to read or even look at it. He can, I guess, give you the title. It is my recollection that he asked for its return because it was not his but that of another prisoner and I had attached a note to this effect to it.

James is almost but not quite right in saying I have covered the withholding of exculpatory evidence insofar as I know of it. Aside from that of which I do not know but only suspect, I am certain there are several witnesses I have not interviewed, one of whom I had located a year ago but thanks to baby-sitting with Renfro had not been able to go to see. There may be others. I think so say that perhaps we have enough cases would be more precise. I'd prefer to have each and every case they used nailed down, and I think it is not impossible.

As a non-lawyer may because he doesn't know the law, I also disagree with him comment on Hanes and whether or not that conflict can now be raised. I have admissions from Hanes on a TV show that I think together with the contract, that was not in our hands and we could not get, could constitute "new evidence". I think James is entitled to a copy of all papers he signed with Hanes and doesn't have. In fact, I think a number of new avenues are now open.

The Walter Bailey mentioned in the clipping about the public defender's office James met you is probably the black political boss of Memphis. I met with him while I was there, did a radio show with him, and entirely by accident, sat next to him when Bob and I flew up to see James after you and Bud had left. He is Mr. Balck Establishment. If he is complaining it has to be pretty raw. When Stanton refers to "maintaining its standards" it is like a whore talking about maintaining her chastity. I think James told me it had finally won its first case when I was there in November.

I have a letter from Jerry this morning in which he says that because of a shift in a case in which he is involved, ^{Stoner} ~~he~~ is not going to see James until 2 weeks from Monday, or on the 10th. The reason does not make sense. It is because of the delay in a case scheduled for the 20th. However, earlier Jerry had told me that Stoner had to make a trip, so that may account for the delay. I expect he will send me nothing until after he sees James. He hasn't in more than a year.

P.S. In Yesterday's Post story of the previous day's Court of Appeals decision in the Burka case there is a quotable excerpt from a California case you might want to have in hand for the spectro argument, on secrecy as "the antithesis of the orderly operation of a public institution, breeding either suspicion, mistrust, rumor and outrage or apathy indifference and neglect."

Best,