

Dear Jim, *white*

1/10/74

Time pressures ease a bit today with a sharp reduction in book orders, only three special packages to make and fewer to be put in ~~subcases~~ envelopes. So, while I've not yet had time to read the clips you sent with several earlier mailings or to respond to them, I do want to consider your well-taken points of 1/6 re chicken.

On the visit to the spookery, your preceptions are precisely correct. I was open, honest and forthright, saying exactly what is so and giving completely accurate if less than fully specific leads.

Odd that you should completely independently conceive a danger with the chicken when in my own thinking going back to immediately after our recent period away together I felt it was necessary to take precautionary steps, only part of which are committed to the epistles of which you have copies. I've actually been hoping to find a student who might be willing to break my extensive file down and put it in chronological order. The devil who loves scripture was aware of the need to write it, so there is a very long, detailed and quite specific record of the past.

Just this last week Art Kevin was fed a report that he is company. I told Art what I happen to believe, that he is not. Nonetheless, I am not unaware of the possibilities that the contrary may be the fact.

On the second I had a long talk, in his absence, with his partner, who again noted how right I had been and confessed his own lack of any rational explanation of the misconduct I had alleged. He does not dispute the fact of this behavior but rather agrees and is aware of the potential - and is worried.

By my being right, it was more than on the legal questions, with which he had agreed in mid-October and taken the time to put them in the cliched forms. He was quite surprised and impressed by the subsequent confirmation of my specification of the files that had to exist where they exist. Nobody knew it, but I made an issue of the need to keep the ~~file~~ ~~back~~ away from the proceeding and was specific in stating why. Partner has been aware of the potential conflict since 1969 or perhaps 1970, when I first discussed it with him. He and I have had a good relationship since the time of Louisiana v. Shaw in Halleck's court when I told him where to go, off the top of the head, one midnight, that before the hearing, to get evidence he found to be exactly what I said it would be. After that he made a motion that resulted in a summary judgement vs. DJ, a rarity, so he has since had his own respect for my suggestions and analyses. This is to say that I take his recent representations at face value because he knows the record.

Jim has a copy of everything I write on this and we have discussed it. Part of the unseen objective I have is to ease things for him and to make possible what he needs. This part has worked perfectly. The pressures I have applied are as great as the absence of any response to specifics indicates. Another part is to deter other insanities. I did break up a copout the official Veterans' Day weekend. I had to and it made what has ensued inevitable. The reasons for that planned copout are not certain. Many explanations are possible. The negative reaction to the interview would probably have existed without it, but my analysis is that chicken ego required it. (Jimmy, however, clearly feels otherwise because he does not drop the issue. I have a long letter I've not had time to answer.)

You are correct in referring to his entrees. I do not think he will do as you fear not because it is impossible but precisely because it is I who have and have built the record. His vacuity about my needing medical help would do him no good and irrational as hemay seem to be, he knows deep inside that I have an absolutely solid record he'd rather not have mentioned anywhere. On this, remember my references to malpractise. That also is a matter of record. The charge can be made. He knows me well enough to know that if he tries anything along the line you suggest I'm capable of making the charge and then proving it. (Recall my vigor on non-investigation and not filing motions.)

This, however, is merely my belief and it is based on logic and reason. When one deals with the irrational, and on this he is irrational. logic and reason need not be relevant. Therefore, I would appreciate your sharp eye in focus if there is any more of this. I expect nothing in the near future. The first possibility is when the decision is made. I believe it probable but not certain that this will not be until after the Supreme Court decides on cert. State appeal. Wladron expects rejection, reversed on appeal, for us. This, if it happens, could be a trigger. I think we'll prevail, that it will be interlocutory, and that other problems will follow. Part of the reason for my course of strong protest. Best,