

Dear Jim,

6/21/83

In cleaning up my desk I find these extra copies of discovery records I used in 0322/0420 affidavits. Instead of throwing them away I send them to you for the purposes indicated.

While it seems strange that DL waited until 6/2/78 to record shipping the main files 4/19/78 and 24/78 and I doubt very much that this actually is the first record pertinent on discovery (it is the first we were given), the FBI withheld Specht's name under claim of privacy. Actually, as I attested, he was well known and an SA and was in a public role in Dallas. The only purpose served in withholding these names is to hide the identifications of those with first-person knowledge when the FBI was using only incompetent attestations. This record is a record copy. The next one, 11/6/78, is not a record copy. It could come from a duplicate file kept for FOIA purposes and it could be from a tickler. But I can't be from a record copy because, although it was serialized, there is no serial on it. Note that 2 copies were made for DL. Thus they withhold the serialized copy, which can hold notations of interest, and have the non-record copy at hand.

New Orleans 89-68-4713 is serialized and a record copy but the 12/5/78 copy is not. Yet only 2 copies, supposedly, were made for New Orleans, one to each of two indicated files, and this is neither. So they also had other copies. Whether or not Anderson has a special file, which can be indicated by the encircling of his initials, this one could not be retrieved from either of the indicated files and is from another source. RUC on each means that as of each date New Orleans regarded the matter as closed, ROW meaning "referred upon completion." Thus, aside from their attestations, New Orleans regarded what it sent under date of 8/30/78 as complete compliance.

Its 190-34 is this case. The notes I added after 66-2855, indicate that it is not a file searched and records provided from it and it was also used in 75-1996. This can indicate that it is an FOIA file (I doubt only on me), but whatever it is, it is not a file from which New Orleans provided any records in response to my request for the records on me.

The 12/5 record bears on the false swearing to and the phoniness of the search slips. Anderson here "clarifies" his earlier airtel to state what was searched: the three main files and Garrison, Shaw and Ferris only. But the very first name in the continuous search slips is that of John S. Kennedy, the S used on it, not F. Moreover, those phonies include other names. So here is ^{new} proof by Anderson of the untruthfulness of their attestations and the phoniness of what they gave and swore are the original searches.

Do not confuse DL 62-3588, its Commission file, with NO 66-2588. 66 is an admat.

Best,