

Dear Jim,

7/20/75

As you are aware from some of the carbons I send, mine is a broken-up life. There is no telling what I'll have to get on at any moment or what kind of interruption there can or will be. This, of course, is hardly conducive to writing either logically or comprehensibly. It makes handling complicated matters, details of evidence, much more difficult if simple, comprehensible writing is to be the result.

I guess I'm too old now to try to make a major change. If I could see a way, which I don't. I don't see how I can abandon those things that are intrusions into writing.

One can't be an activist, if that is the word, and a writer without one intruding upon the other.

And if one is a publisher at the same time, then the needs and intrusions into everything else are worse.

In addition there is the breaking-story problem but with a book, which makes it more difficult because all must be done in a manner that will survive as far into perpetuity as the mind can conceive.

Whether or not it is the best way, my way of trying to cope with the combination of unusual problems, needs and situations is to sit down and get something on paper and then hope for time to go over it.

With Post Mortem and the new close it requires and the new evidence in the appendix, I got an earlier than early start one morning and got onto paper a large part of what I want to say. It includes the way I think this new material should be introduced but quite likely not as broadly as it should be. I have to handle together the results of this suit, the FBI/official conduct, the judge and the law, and emerge with what is appropriate as a new conclusions to a four-part book or considerable size and scope.

Successfully or not, I got a large start and then had to stop.

Then when I had time, again early mornings, I started work on insertions of details. On the last two of these it occurred to me that you might be interested in what I did get out of this suit that will continue for some time. We will go to the court of appeals and we will go higher.

(It was the certainty of this that impelled some of the considerable detail and what to the stereotyped lawyer what would appear to be redundant in some of the affidavits. We had to build an overwhelming record on many fronts. On the last we were cut short by the judge but we can still use that in arguments and I do have it in the draft.)

So, on these last two, the second not finished because I intend it to lead into something I wrote initially, I made a carbon. I've merely skimmed the one that feeds into the existing stuff.

You may not want to take the time to read what is so loaded with errors but on the chance it will interest you I've ~~done~~ made these carbons.

You will be able to ~~gather~~ gather for yourself whether I "lost" this case in which the judge ruled against me and whether the FBI really "won," regardless of what happens on appeal.

I regard it as a large victory and the results as of great value, factually and as evidence for future investigations, official ones.

I never file a suit I can lose. Not winning in court is not identical with losing. There has been no case in which I have not won what I went for, if not always completely. This is little understood. In my suit for pictures of the clothing I got all I wanted except copies of those pictures and perhaps not having them will be more exciting to the average reader. (It forced the destruction of evidence and giving me proof of it.)

In this case I regard the yield as enormous. Others might also regard it as dangerous but there is a kind of protection in the record and the essential evidence now being a permanent official court record. With scattered copies.

If it remains to be seen whether this particular one is enough to compel or contribute to some official action, the yield is more than enough, legally and factually. I did force the FBI into repeated false swearing and it is perjury and Congress is supposed to be investigating. I'll be writing a short relevant note to Lesar. Best,