

Dear Jim,

3/25/83

I've read and annotated the DJ Response of 3/22/83 in C.A. 75-1996.

My belief and fear are that if you do not make a vigorous assault on the deliberate dishonesty of this outrage there is a real probability of their prevailing on its untruthfulness, misrepresentations and distortions. I also believe that if you do not we will be at the very least severely handicapped at the appeals level.

In some areas they have gone too far and you can recapture some of what we lost by a forceful addressing of it, like not whether they had authority but whether we believed they did or reasonably could have believed it.

As liars can't avoid doing, they contradict themselves, admitting now that I was to have worked at home but having initially prevailed by alleging the exact opposite, that no place had been agreed on.

The give three different and I think contradictory versions of their supposed purposes in the consultancy, twice on one page and again on the very next.

They lie about not having made any use of it, and in this regard I think they misrepresent both what Shea said and what we said he said, and use can be pivotal. (They never did return my report, did they?)

We have these problems because to now we never really had addressed their permeating dishonesty with vigor.

When I say with vigor I do not mean by screaming and hollering. I mean forcefully and without mincing words.

Once again you've sent me two copies of the same thing in C.A. 78-0322/0420. One is returned herewith. Each time I wonder if you forgot to put something in and sent a second copy instead.

I find it interesting that they refer only to having an unnamed agent in N~~o~~.O. execute an affidavit. It is my recollection that Anderson is the one who attested earlier, I am certain his name is on the search slips, and we should reject any attestation not from him because he did make and attest to the searches. Their language also provokes wonder in other ways: like claiming they had to figure out what I was talking about when I attached their record and it is specific in identifying the neutrality file by number and refers to the existence of prior searches the search slip of which should be on file. They had no problems at all and none in prompt response, except that they have what I think is perjury to try to cover up. I think that it is really because they recognize the perjury question that they need more time and want someone other than Anderson to prepare their affidavit. I look forward to reading it!

If we discuss this 1996 mendacity by phone I'd like you to be prepared to tape it so you will not have to depend on incomplete notes. I regard it as very important and a matter about which we dare not take any more chances. That is why I'll be making a special trip into town to mail this so you can have it Monday.

in haste, and some disgust,