

Dear Jim,

7/15/82

Here is the new affidavit for 789226.

I think I know why Le Haie, who has never met me, hates me so much. If he didn't he have to hate himself. Of all the dishonesties we've faced in these many FOIA cases, I can't recall one that approximated totality of dishonesty as close as he has, and there is no possibility of doubt, it is knowing and deliberate. So, if I'm a bad guy, in being so dishonest he can tell himself that in it he is the good guy.

I've been thinking about what you said, that we should not move to expunge the reply but should to expunge Phillips' declaration. You are right. And the same thing is accomplished, without unnecessary offense to the closed corporation of which you are part, ~~XXXXX~~ as practised by the LeHaies the illegal profession.

With this we have the best case we've ever had to bad faith., already proven in my undisputed affidavits. I think there is not a single allegation they have made in this case that was not incorrect and frequently knowingly false.

It may well be the case, if there ever is one, that they will not want to go to the appeals court. If they ever stop to think.

Take a reading on LeHaie from it. He is more completely dishonest than Cole or any of the only bitches we've faced.

He's not going to like it. But he's also not going to be able to do or say anything on the basis of fact. He'll probably try to go after me, and if he does, ever, in court, I will want to be there. Somehow I'll find a way.

Take a reading also on his/their reading of Judge Smith. He/they have to believe that there is nothing he won't except and there is no insult to him from them that he will not accept, too. They have insulted him terrible in this and the other lies they've heaped on him. They have to be crazy or reasonably certain.

Smith, on the other hand, may visualize this going to the appeals court and may be less than happy about that. Not because he is concerned about a reversal but because he may be unhappy about the reflection of him as a judge in it - to other judges. As you've said, this kind of thing gets around among them.

Preparing this was a problem for me because I'd forget to get up and walk around a bit, until the left heel was painful. Then it was too late, so I remained uncomfortable for the rest of the day. I have to learn from that. I did by the time I got around to reading and correcting. I'd do it after each page of the draft and it wasn't as bad.

I'm serious about being there is he makes any noises about me. You can tell him and Smith that I've told you that difficult as it is, I'll find some way of getting

5D

there. As a parking place for a cab near the courthouse can be arranged, remember, I have a handicapped persons parking permit, or rather license, which says it is good in the district.

If there is a hearing in the future at which he starts running off at the mouth about me, please ask that it be suspended until I can be there, which would mean until the next day.

Of course if he will want to question me. I'll be willing. As the Hailes and Jurgans learned and as Cole was not up to. Despite their corruption, it is a great comfort to be solidly based on fact.

He will not want me to be there because he can't contend on truth and fact and knows it. So please insists that ~~he~~ if he is going to impugn with unmanly immunity it at least be to my face and under oath. You might even suggest the unheard of, with him and me both under oath.

He and Phillips both were careless, thanks to their estimate of Smith, and they've both crossed the line, as I make clear. Lofaris made up all he said about 75-226, which is at least careless, and Phillips should never have said that the two field offices do not even produce ticklers when as an SA he knows very well they can't get along without them. Happily, I remembered that I'd made copies of records showing the existence of ticklers for appeals and it was in the second file I went to. We have them in the King case, too, but there was no need for more.

As always, I wish there were time to edit these things, as once I did have time in your case. But once again I'd been retyping while I was still writing.

There is something that may be only coincidence I want to call to your attention. And in this connection, perhaps you will want to call to the attention of the Jack Wasserman law firm, meaning the part about stealing records pertaining to the defense and not letting even the Ad and Criminal Division know the content. You will see that where I refer to "cc. 697" pertaining to Comstock I've also pointed out that he was not applicant for a job with the FBI. Maybe it is just coincidence but of all the 67 files in which they could have filed the Hosty stuff at Fort, it is in 67-698, so close to the same number. I wonder if it suggests a special series of numbers within those files for such special records.

There is a place near this point where I am a little elliptical. It is because I did not have time to check what they finally gave me from the Dallas 67 file they said was all on Hosty - and can't be. Inevitably, for example, they have to have the records pertaining to disciplining and his appeals. However, I'm sure I didn't get the long memo with the airtel, if I got it and the other things of 1963. The early one might be in the assassination file, pertaining to what Mack Revill said. Hoover made a real fuss over that and they boycotted the Dallas police for a long time.