Dear Jim,

10/13/72

Enclosed are the last letter I got from Jerry and my letters to him and James. I read. James' latter to which this responds to you.

I have gone over the envelope containing James' notes on "uie's books, a sheaf of questions without source and the other things with it. I have not gone over the final drafts of the petition and memora, as I explained earlier.

I will make a separate file of James' commentary. I did not check the book on all things he said, feeling most not now relevant and not having his underlininings. However, in checking one, it occurred to me that there are other things we might want to include in my affidavit, such as the refusal of the presecution to let me see any of the evidence where they gave all other writers full access, drove them and Shaw around; my bein; told by Canale that hobody would ever see anything not in the transcript; Canale's speech to the Jackson bar, etc., and get the idea before the court that going along with the propaganda before trial there continued a campiagn after the minitrial. I do this in haste, but I think it is something we should explore. I was James' investigator when Whodes and "ason would not even sjow me dup; icates of pictures in evidence. Anything, in fact. 1 had quite a session with them, as you might recall, having been in Semphis at the same time, and I went back to the motel and made pretty full notes. I think I should refer to the investigation I made, limited as it was, in order to be able to lay a basis for what I'd say about the Stanton investigation. I think this can be, if we agree upon it, a telling thing of a nature you can t put in other papers, that it would be relevant and could be very persuasive in support of some of the other Allegations. I think we should talk this over, making notes as we min do, and then draft it on the spot, while it is in our minds. I do not visualize a long thing. Let this be a reminder of considering what we say about my background and experience, for there are substleties we can in that way get in, such as that we are not anti-police.

My schedule for the coming week is changed. In addition to Tue-Thurs. morning's I'll be gone Honday morning at least, perhaps until the p.m.

Reparazdecision from Law Week: Thanks. We will want the full text for our own work and a new interest I may have developed in use of FOI. "emind me of this when we meet.

If I don't include a memo for Bud on uses of the rifle he may not have thought of, remind me so you will have it. There are some things about the model you might want to know. Remington nowm makes what it calls 760 Gamemaster, but it is no longer identical.

Consider for my affidavit: my inquiry into designed behavior of Lokt-Core acmo (which provides excuse for including catalogue picture, etc.) Perhaps, but perhaps not, absence of clip when found and no reserve ammo in weapon. If any judge is a hunter, this should be zowie! And if any has read Frank...needed, perhaps.

The 3/20/69 memo to Bud on Sprague's call, the first numbered graph of which refers to Eanny Chaits, indicates in Budds hand that you have a Chaits file. If you do check it. If it is not great, anything but clips, please copy for me because of my meeting with him this past Eay. He had an associate of whom I'd like to learn. I would also like to know if Sprague finally turned him off. The files may not show it. Manny could have read what bick later wrote, and that would be more than enough, es. with Fud Ray's counsel. However, Manny can still be very helpful in ways Dick couldn't know or unde stand. Also, see if anything case of this. Manny knows things where he may not know meanings.

In fact, he told me he and his unnamed associate, who I then took to be another reporter, had developed a theory of their own. He said he'd get an ok to tell me and I never heard from him again. Not long ago I wrote him. I knew he was moving to the LA area to take a job with a Jowish organization because he told me so. I didn't know the address and didn't remember the name, so I wrote him through the paper and got a note saying the kt letter had been forwarded. The strange thing is that of the people I saw at the Post-Dispatch, "anny is the only one who was not helpful in some way. I find myself wondering why.

I wrote him about something strange in "ohn's case, a man who was inmediately moved into "ohn's coll when "ohn was arrested. " a knew more about John and that John and seemed to be a federal prisoner. He goes by a variety of names, like Spring, Springler and variations not possible to determine because John is the source and he is indefinite in such things as spelling, but his right name seems to be Sprenz. Turner montions him in his FBI book.

Remind me to talk to you about John and LA.

I have annotated "ay's nemo on his relations with Stanton. I believe that this whole area is more important than we can now make it, although we may be able to make the allegations cerdible. We can discuss this, but I think it can now be but for the future. This is but another example of the terrible inhibitions imposed upon us and the real denial to the client of that to which he is entitled by the sickening combination of Bud's incompetence and ego. I could and should have had all of this long ago, should have been sent to inevatigate it, especially because it is, in essence, in F. AME-UP.

Forcing Stanton upon him when he didn t want him should be enough to mean that "ay was denied counsel of his choice, especially with his record on Stephens, which is also in FRAME-UP. A simple investigation could and should have been made as soon as Bud came into the case, instead of that stupidity of pissing money away taking Flammonde to England looks for Smeyds. I would thing a candidate for law school would have understood this. As you know, just about everything Bud nixed when 4 proposed it has turned out to be a real need and all that has been followed up has been dumped on you when it was too late. There is now nothing that can be done about the past, but there sure as hell is about the future, and at some point I will want some understanding and assurances on this.

The most casual exemination of the alleged Stanton file shows many things I could and should have done as soon as we got it, instead of having it withheld from me. That Bud did not send me or do it himself is hardly short of orininal negligence. What can still be done about this I don't know, but my experi noe of the past tells me that the urgent need is to move fast, to do things because they can't be anticipated and foreclosed. Once somebody finds out that we have copies of some of the Stanton investigation, there is a hazard thmat everyone in it will be spoken to. You saw this when I took you to Canipe. I have seen it often and elsewhere.

Perhaps the most inexcusable thing of all because it is so simple is not identifying the papers with their source and the time, place and person of delivery. Please ask Bud for each of the things you finally gave me after I hollered. Hope your Birmingham trip was successful.

Sincerely.