

Mr. William Ohlhausen
910 16 St., 6 fl.
Washington, D.C. 20006

1/5/75

Dear Bill,

Although neither you ^{nor} Bud had a chance to receive my yesterday's letters by today, I do not think the world would have been rent asunder if that epitome of the most courtly and mannerly of the south had placed a call to convey a small part of what I "learned" in a conversation with Jim I delayed until after 5 p.m. I can ill afford such calls and on this matter there will be very few. Whatever the prospects, that money invested in other ways, like lawyers, holds more promise.

To simplify what Jim said about Bud, it is that the story was old (true) and that it was unfair and/or unkind ~~to~~ to Jim and/or me (true). But what I cannot and do not believe is that a reporter of Paul Valentine's experience made up all those quotes and paraphrases. It is not only that I have faith in Paul's integrity but I have too many cases of Bud saying the same thing - on tape and by witness statement.

Jim told me that he and you had spoken, that you had ~~agreed~~ that the ~~best~~ consideration now is peace and tranquility until after the 6th circuit rules because this is Ray's interest. Perhaps. But I see it as the primary interest of the Bud who has messed this case up from the very beginning. Were his that Rays. Were Bud to quit or be involved in anything having to do with the case, the deficiencies of the record would be more, not less ~~apparent~~ comprehensible to 6th circuit. In no way except inadequacy of counsel would Ray be involved. The inadequacy of counsel would be that of Bud. This in the actualities before 6th circuit does not appear because there were those like I, who put Ray's interest first. Bud certainly didn't.

To put this another way - and do not take it as an accusation - if you had set out to see our trusting friend Jim there was no better approach. We spent close to an hour discussing this tonight. I made no such suggestion to him. I wanted to learn what he knew and had been told. Not argue or accuse. If this is to happen there is a different forum for that. As I recall it, and I'm quite tired and may be wrong, you said to him that we have to hushhush all this to protect Ray's rights until after 6th circuit rules. Maybe Jim buys this but I don't. They rule, Bud resigns, leaving us the impossible job of making up for his deficiencies, and, helmed, rides off into the sun.

Maybe Jim goes for this but I don't. I see Ray's interest as lying in an immediate and unequivocal addressing of this most recent of my complaints. There can be legitimate differences between men of honor, and I can conceive of the partner of the villain as a man of honor, but the way I see your explanation to Jim is service to Bud's guilty interest, not to Ray's innocent interests.

Quite aside from this is my own. As I've said, I think, enough of this, but if you want more I can come close to guaranteeing you'll vomit.

It is not possible to persuade me that it is Ray's interest that is served by nobody doing or saying anything until after the 6th circuit rules. The only interest served by that is Bud's and perhaps the partnership's. Not Ray's, not Jim's, not mine.

Jim says that you believe Bud's gratuitous, gross and deliberate lie about me to ~~you~~ ~~was~~ ~~id~~ ~~nit~~ ~~libel~~. Maybe. I won't now argue the point, but I will tell you it is not isolated and that libel is not the only wrong.

The last time I talked Ray out of firing Bud Bud told me he was not sure he was better off for it. I can now see this better. But I surely cannot see Ray as better off if, after the 6th circuit rules, however it rules, Bud finds some lawyer's politeness and bows out and leaves to Jim ~~as~~ ~~and~~ me, neither with resources, the job of undoing all the close to irremedial harm Bud has done the case.

Bud and I did have any agreement. There is proof of it. There never was adherence to it. Now he has provided me with proof other than from me of his violation of it to buttress what I had before now.

By the time I obtained most of it Ray's interest was involved, so I was limited if not precluded. Believe me or not, I have not indicated to you the true nature of what I later learned and can prove. All are not related to the Ray case only. Some are related to Bud's supposed representation of me in a case that he surely blew and I think it could be fairly alleged threw. If he ^{wants} to argue incompetence, I'm of a mind to give him the chance. But if he does I'll produce letters from me asking a different approach to which he repeatedly agreed only to then do the opposite. And this is/not all.

Bill, I've more than had it. I've been silent because of Ray's interest. Now I see silence as not serving Ray.

And quite separate from this is my own rights.

I am not going to be satisfied by this city slickerism, this smooth talk, this invocation of principle. The last time for that was more than a year ago. And of that, too, I have more than ample records.

Let Jim believe what he wants. I don't buy the story he gave me. And I'm not able to afford the cost of these long calls to him to learn the last news job he had.

I know you have just returned from vacation and have much to catch up on. Well, I don't know what a vacation is and thanks to Bud I'm further behind in what I have to catch up on. I'm older than you and sick, but I'm certain that today I work a longer day. So, if you have any interest in this remaining a private matter, let Bud take a little less time for touting himself to the world or taking other vacations, as in preparation for the Ray case, and let us talk meaningfully. The time for smooth talk and con jobs is past.

I'm not going to try to kid you and tell you what I will do. But I am telling you that this last obsequy leaves no light to what within reason and propriety I am willing to try to do.

What Jim was told about Paul today can't be true. But if it were, at the very least Bud could have had, say Garcon, call me with an apology. I heard nothing. And I don't believe Bud, whose record of lying is rivaled in mythology only. I do trust Paul's integrity. I'm confident he can produce his notes.

If there is to be a serious word, I'd like to hear it. If there is ~~not~~ not the sooner I know the sooner I can explore my alternatives. Only no greasy kid at all.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg