JL: The irresponsibles/self-promoters/messers up 12/28/75

While resting I read the two-part Ken Rankin interview with Cyril in the October and November issues of Physician's Management. We have also been talking lately about a possible effort to do something about these characters. Whether or not we do. If for no other reason to immobilize Cyril in anything like this, in the event something comes of it in time, I quote several paragraphs with the suggestion that a polite lawyer's letter to another lawyer (cc Bob) Both quotes are from the 11/75 issue:

"The transcript of the Warren Commission's executive session meeting of January 27, 1964, which was classified top secret for more than a decade and released only last year..."(p. 40)

"The FBI performed at least one such N.A.A. test for the Warren Commissin, but the results of that test - and even the fact that the test had been conducted were kept secret. The test results were released only this year, but the data made public by the F.B.I. have not given us any meaningful inconsistencies that would permit us to say that the single-bullet theory had been disproved solely as a result of those tests." (p.43)

On these a polite letter reminding him thatbthere was nothing spontaneous in these"releases,"as he knows; that you were pro bono counsel in both cases that resulted in the disclosures; that you had neither help nor financing when you are just starting practise; and that regadless of how he feels about me - although I did the work and he didn't- common professional courtesy might be considered as calling for an entirely different representation.

You could add that on questions of fact I disagree with him

Then on p. 44 he says, " For example the government claims that they've released all the N.A.A. test data that exists. However, correspondence between Hoover and Rankin J.Lee Rankin, the chief counsel of the Warren Commission in 1863 and 1964, strongly suggests that there were sdditional N.A.A. tests conducted. If this is true, and I believe it is, then we must ask outselves why it was necessary to repeat these tests? Was it because the first tests disproved the single-bullet theory incontrovertibly?"

Here you might remind him of the dangers inherent in second-hand and more remote sources and in not doing one's own work. You could say that I charged perjury in the suit he found it expedient not to mention, although as one lawyer to another you believe mentioning it and the charges would have helped his argument. You could quote me as saying it would make his comments closer to reality and less likely to haunt him in some future proceeding.

(I'm tired and unsure but I think part of the last quotw ia from the executive sessions rather than correspondence. My recollection, perhaps flawed, is that the first reference is a Hoover response to an Eisenberg personal, verbal inquiry.)

If I were going to write him, I'd thank him for not keeping his promise to help in my suits because having to contend with the FBI is more than enough. Having to co-exist and prevail with this kind of "expert" would, I fear, have me working for the FBI instead of putting all and sundry in the position of taking credit for what they did nothing at all about, while prevailing against DJ and the FBI even with adverse decisions.

He is really crazy. He can be ruined in any malpractise case in which he is an expert by a long succession of stupidities, errors of simple fact and overt dishonesties of which this artcile is only the most recent I've seen.

Best,