

Jim Lesar
918 F St., NW, #509
Washington, DC 20004

9/16/95

Dear Jim,

I take this time, although I believe I waste it, in an effort to get you to step back for a moment, so to speak, and try and do some thinking divorced from so much you have been involved in.

First, you misrepresent to yourself what I asked of you so long ago and to which you agreed then. I suggested that you say that you were holding the press conference for me as my former FOIA lawyer^{to} and because I cannot get to Washington. I also was specific in suggesting that you refer any questions you were not prepared to respond to to me. And I gave you documents to give out with the books. Those documents pretty much speak for themselves and the focus I suggested was on them. None of this required any knowledge of the contents of the book. But I do find myself wondering why, if you found time to read anything at all, you did not find time in five months to read it.

Dan Alcorn phoned yesterday just as we were about to leave for Hood for the formal induction of its new president. I took all the time he wanted, tried to be as informative as I could, and that made us late for the special arrangements for us as handicapped and that tired us both excessively because of the distances we had to walk. We also missed the special luncheon. I knew these things were probably but I still did nothing to hurry ^{an} up nor did I not try to inform him as fully as I could.

I suggested to him that holding that press conference now and shifting the focus of it to the FBI's perjuries and other offenses, including in particular by its Lab, and told him if he wanted to you still had the books and he could use them for that. I did not expect^{expect} that he would but I did offer it and take the time to give him pages^{pages} citations in it and to other FBI records I've published. I also took the time to read some of them to him.

But what does it reflect about the state of the collective knowledge of information, of established fact about the assassination, when for all of you in AARC he had to ask me for it?

Does this not tell you something about what you, collectively, have been doing and learning and not doing and learning? Past and present?

Including with ARRB, which he, not I, raised?

The devotion and dedication^{to} what it dignifies most of them to refer to them as assassination conspiracy theories is self-defeating and has and will continue to confuse the people, destroy all credibility, and cover up for the official miscreants.

And I cannot think of any of those "theorizers" save Lifton who could claim

enough factual knowledge, knowledge of the established official fact of the assassination, to begin to theorize responsibly about it. And Lifton knew he was perpetrating a monstrous fraud.

You've had no interest in it but this includes Newman and his coming JFK and Cuba, or is it Kennedy and Cuba? Which I believe all of you supported to the ARRB when it clearly is refusing to go after actual assassination information and is boasting of all these irrelevancies you all are pushing it to get disclosed and using that for the false claim that it is leaving no stones unturned.

What has anything it has forced disclosed to do with the assassination itself? Most recently Michael Paine? In the recent past those CIA Cryptonyms and file numbers? Or any of those mafia records?

If as I think Dan will make efforts with individual reporters (and I got no call from Reuters) I believe he will find that both reporters and their agencies or papers will think of what the FBI has on them or will do to them if they go with such a story alone. This is why from the first and as recently as yesterday with Dan I emphasized the need for a competitive situation as in a press conference so they would not have that as a special worry.

Is it not past time to try and think this through not in dedication to Bud who lived for it but in terms of what support for all the nuttiness and worse has meant and done and what more of it will mean more of?

By the way, Ken Smith is still trying to palm off some of that particular nuttiness from letters I have just gotten.

It never ends and it never fails to do harm.

You could have held the press conference with the formula I suggested and prepared you for. You did not need Aguilar or Robertson and they in fact are in radical disagreement on what is basic to each. I like Gary and I like what I know of Robertson's work but you had no need for them. That was a copout as you groped for excuses not to do what you said you would do, wasting that much time for me when I have so little. Randy's work confirms mine on there having been a second shot to the head, by the way.

Bringing records to light via FOIA is worthwhile, little use as I've seen made of any of the fact brought to light. But pursuing theories is worse than wasting time. It deceives and misleads the people and covers up for those who did wrong as they cannot do for themselves.

I hope you are capable of trying to think of this without seeking self-justification and so that all the great effort you expect can be more useful and meaningful and not continue to do harm.

Best,

