

JL - 1997 and the great attention the GIZ/DJ are giving it

HW 8/1/78

1997 ~~1997~~ While shaving this morning an idea came to me. While I'm waiting for the towel to absorb enough of the water in which my supports are rinsed these few ideas about ~~1997~~ and the Memorandum filed by the government.

Let us tackle them head-onk in their field of supposedly unquestioned expertise.

Let us do what they have just done, load the record with attachments. Including the ~~1/22~~ 1/22 and 1/27 transcripts. Let us give them the Heine affidavits, which have never seen the light of day. Let us confront JoAnn directly and with her in another court Robinson by giving this one the new evidence we gave appeals in 1448, plus a few later items. Let us give them what we have done with government withholdings, specify the illustrations where I've filed affidavits showing the records withheld and where they are.

We can do something with these phoney "national defense" claims. In this case I can now even ridicule the frightening generality of NSA because they went a bit too far in this new affidavit.

Only yhis time I propose an affidavit from me in which I have some unillustrated items, like giving the descriptions of the withheld files in O322 without giving my source, as well as giving the demensions of other records the existense of which is not only not disclosed but represented as non-existing.

The real reason they obscured and obliterated with the records alleging King was ~~chicom~~, for example, was to hide the component involved outside of security and to hide the files they have not searched. There can be no doubtg that such information was not limited to "Security," as there is no doubt that interest in my book was not limited to "Security." Here we can specify with the case of their withholding records from Warner so he would like to use. You can at ~~the~~ the same time do an Axelrad.

Instead of sending you the tape I'll first see if Lil can type it. If she has time I'll pick some things up from it. We can have fun.

JoAnn went too far. She should not have quoted dishonestly from the Gesell transcript. Meanwhile, we have the case where we have forced a review based on my knowledge in that subject, the 1996 case, where I fill ij their omissions. We canlobber them on this because they made me their consultant and it is my work as their consultant that has forced the review, all based on what JoAnn sought to belittle and misrepresent.

I'll do thesame thing with some CIA records, also never done, with the first JFK releases, and give the judge something to shudder over, how there characters from their political paranoia and political objectives that are utterly improper for an agency whose function is to collect intelligence almost started World War II. (There may be some point in this vis-a-vis the House assassins now, too.)

Think it over. I think we should do it. To this end I'll want some assistance if I can get it and I'll make some effort today or tomorrow to see if I can find a gofer.

Hastily,

JL - 1997 and the great attention the CIZ/DJ are giving it

Hw 8/1/78

1997 ~~1997~~ While shaving this morning an idea came to me. While I'm waiting for the towel to absorb enough of the water in which my supports are rinsed these few ideas about ~~1997~~ and the Memorandum filed by the government.

Let us tackle them head-onk in their field of supposedly unquestioned expertise.

Let us do what they have just done, load the record with attachments. Including the ~~1/22~~ 1/22 and 1/27 transcripts. Let us give them the Reine affidavits, which have never seen the light of day. Let us confront JoAnn directly and with her in another court Robinson by giving this one the new evidence we gave appeals in 1448, plus a few later items. Let us give them what we have done with government withholdings, specify the illustrations where I've filed affidavits showing the records withheld and where they are.

We can do something with these phoney "national defense" claims. In this case I can now even ridicule the frightening generality of NSA because they went a bit too far in this new affidavit.

Only yhis time I propose an affidavit from me in which I have some unillustrated items, like giving the descriptions of the withheld files in O322 without giving my source, as well as giving the deminsions of other records the existenee of which is not only not disclosed but represented as non-existing.

The real reason they obscured and obliterated with the records alleging King was ~~chicom~~ chicom, for example, was to hide the component involved outside of security and to hide the files they have not searched. There can be no doubt that such information was not limited to "Security," as there is no doubt that interest in my book was not limited to "Security.2 Here we can specify with the case of their withholding records from Warner so he would like to use. You can at ~~the~~ the same time do an Axelrad.

Instead of sending you the tape I'll first see if Lil can type it. If she has time I'll pick some things up from it. We can have fun.

JoAnn went too far. She should not have quoted dishonestly from the Gesell transcript. Meanwhile, we have the case where we have forced a review based on my knowledge in that subject, the 1996 case, where I fill ij their omissions. We canlobber them on this because they made me their consultant and it is my work as their consultant that has forced the review, all based on what JoAnn sought to belittle and misrepresent.

I'll do thesame thing with some CIA records, also never done, with the first JFK releases, and give the judge something to shudder over, how there characters from their political paranoia and political objectives that are utterly improper for an agency whose function is to collect intelligence almost atarted World War II. (There may be some point in this vis-a-vis the House assassins now, too.)

Think it over. I think we should do it. To this end I'll want some assistance if I can get it and I'll make some effort today or tomorrow to see if I can find a gaffer.

Hastily,