Dear Jim, Tomorrow's 226-75 hearing 5/20/75 HW

As of now we do not know what if any response the government will make, too late for me to go over it adequately prior to the hearing or at all prior to it.

While you will address this in court in whatever way you consider proper and necessary, we should also be prepared to address the facts of the case and of compliance and non-compliance. So, these few simple points to bear in mind.

1 We have asked for and have not received assurances that I have been given 100% of what is called for in the complaint.

a. Instead we have the controled evasion of Kelley's letter of 4/10/75, which compounds two subjective formulations, what he considers and his interpretation of what I sued for. Even his formulation is false.

2 From what I have received I know that I have not received all covered by the complaint and thay also know it. Here use the masked carbon of Hoover's letter and the attached lab sheet. It refers to a Jarrell-Ash spectrographic analysis not delivered and miscroscopic tests also not delivered.

We have been told verbally that there were no compiled results such as I asked for but we have not been given this in writing or under oath. Ask for it in open court by one qualified to make such an affirmation and the reasons include our understanding that such a compilation, such a final putting together of all the tests, is the purpose of the testing. In addition, without such putting together of the evidence, how were now technicians, ranging from lawyers to the Commissioners, to understand it and draw conclusions from it. Add that the FRI proclaims it never draws conclusions and the bottom of each form so states.

4. We know that the NAA dates do not jibe and that the most essential NAA testing was not done, according to Kelley's 4/10/75 letter

5. I have been stalled on this from the first. After exhausting the possibilities at the Archives I saked Hoover, nine years less two days age, 5/23/66. He has not yet answered. Then the government went to court with a serious of false representations and deceptions of the court proven in this case to be false and deceptive of the courts. Then they ignored my new request after the amending of the law. Then they pretended I did not want what I sued for and did not send it to me when I was specific, even to the point of asking the cost (NAA). To make this kind of misrepresentation possible they refused to tape or to permit us to tape this meeting. And now, when all of the work was to have been done for the first suit and long before this, they fail to respond to questions in time for us to study them prior to the hearing — even after you asked this so we would not be taking the time of the court needlessly.

So, after nine years and all this litigation and all this trouble and cost to which I have been put, we still, despite Kelley's pretended assurance, have not had compliance at the very least with regard to the known tests their own records show and we have every reason to believe with more. I'd ask the court's help on this and that it hold the Government to account under the provisions of the amended law. NOW.

- 6. If you want to go farthur, and I recommend flexibility on this but favor its use in court if you see the chance, we have official photographic proof that there appears to have been non-accidental FBI fakery on precisely the part the records we have show they have withheld, the surbstone spectro. I think it is clear enough for the judge to understand and see.
- 7. If all this were not enough, they refuse to give us what they consider the relevant communications to the Warren Commission, directing us to the National Archives, and when I explained this to the Archives and said we required for this hearing a) all such communications and b) those discussed as relevant by the FBI with the Archives so we could identify them, we have not received copies. I'm sure you asked earlier. I did eight days ago again, explaining the need. I have had no questions asked and the amount of time required can t be an hour.