

Howard, re letters to Dagan, Wiseman, <sup>Letter on 75-4996</sup> 6/7/76

I do not want you to think or my files to be misinterpreted to mean that in taking these initiatives I'm merely stunting. Quite the opposite. However, I am making use, I think very proper use, of the openings they have given me. They have behaved very badly.

If this comes up in court, whether by Jim raising it or them screaming over it, we'll have a chance to see how it works in court. We may also be able to evaluate whether or not it has anything to do with the rest of the case. If I were Wiseman and Dagan after this I'd be hesitant about more dirty tricks.

Dagan is a no-good bastard. Wiseman's also has a deceptive baby face. Both are deliberate in what they have done. Both have as their purpose defeating my rights under the law and frustrating the law- maybe even again an attempt to rewrite it in court.

Remember, there are new provisions new and new precedents to be established. So what I have done is close upon two grievous offenses both of which mean more work for the judge already overworked by their stonewalling. Each typifies their abuse of applicant. Each typifies their abuse of me. Each in its own way makes it impossible for me to make brief of immediate response.

And the judge knows they know I'm not just going to go away. So she will probably read this correctly: they are frustrating the law and loading work on her.

Where I think they are both likely to find trouble is in this defamation of me. These two have not yet learned how I snap back and bite. It is defamatory, I am the only one to whom it can be addressed (except perhaps Jim) and there is a very clear contrary record, as I specified in my letter.

Meanwhile, there is already a decision that they do not have this claimed "right to privacy" on questions of substantial public interest. So it is as spurious legally as it is factually.

They have, I think, rectified a serious problem their crookedness gave me. I just can't go around hollering liar all the time they lie or ever perjurer when they commit and suborn perjury. This has imposed restraints. We have had to pretend that we are dealing with decent people who would never think of being as corrupt as these are.

By their excesses they have moved me out of that delirium, regardless of what now follows and whether Jim agrees with me as in this case I think he should because the unprofessional attack is also on him. Besides, he has a client to look out for, me.

My resentments are quite genuine. I am not putting any of this on. They have given me the possibility I've aimed upon. This is because they are used to getting away with anything. The very day after the oath was affixed the appeal court shamed them up when they still again sought to try the case on me. (Whether or not the judge knows it Jim does.) Especially when this is the first time they have ever hidden any of these lab names and you have seen many of these pages. I never called any of these people, not once. So how can they defend this? If they say others did we know the agents elected to talk, not hang up. So what harassment?

The only way to try this case is on them. They to now did not give me a good chance. The question is of complicity and this means them. So, they have stupidly given me a context and a stamp.

Whether it works out as I expect and want, I believe that this is not what they teach you in law school as consider a test of practical experience. All such moves depend on the judge. I'm hoping this one has had a bellyfull. I'm also hoping she'll recognize the claim is at once spurious and defamatory. We'll see...

out,