Dear George, 4/15/83

Here is another affidavit in the JFK filed offices cases. combined under Smith.

There is no single paragraph in the DJ/FBI motion that is not untruthful, which may be a record, unstiinting as they always are with their lies.

Jim has not yet filed the other one and he may want changes in that as in this, so if you have any interest please check with him.

And as I said, if you have no interest, please let me know.

I've kind of loss track of these affidavits so I don't know whether I sent you the one to which the enclosed record is pertinent or not. I needed a copy for another purpose, someone else's interest, so I thought I'd make one for you.

The date is that of the assassination. Thus, inevitably, before an investigation and even before Oswald was charged. When police report another suppect to be considered, "Not necessary to cover as true subject located." (Naturally there has to be a lone assassin, therefore "not necessary to cover as" there just can't be a conspiracy, either.)

It happens that there were not fewer than three thrqts against JFK reported by that gang as of that approximate time, so naturally they can't be suspects.

The file is the Dallas main assassination file and this is from its first (of qbout 200) volume.

I'm sorry that the papers and their reporters haven't given any thought to the precedent involving them if the DJ/FBI/Smith effort works. Smith did order discovery. Jim was, I think it is not unfair to say, afraid, because Smith also can assess costs against us and DJ has asked him to. I've refused to participate in any discovery against any FOIA requester, basically but not entirely beduse this negates the Act and was not intended by the Act. But oh boy! can the Post and its lawyers find much to keep them busy if they get away with this and have a precedent.

Best wishes,

Bc