Dear Jim,

9/24/84

For some reason this is a particularly draggy day. After the protime I wanted to go home and nap and I had to force myself through the morning therapy. I picked up the mail on the way to the podiatrist and then told Lil that after lunch I'd better nap. We had lunch on the way home and I then read Whittaker's letter. It made enough adrenalin flow soII now may not be able to nap, although I'll try, heeding the doctor's advice, "Listen to your body."

I anticipate that your first reaction will be to oppose mym sending this letter. Wait and think a bit, and read what I do - and do not - say. And explore what possible harm it might do.

Now that I knoew their fallback position, which I content myself with characterizing as a lie, which it is, I'll prepare Lynch for it. I think it is fine that they do what calls attention to all the other lies, which do not have to be referred to that way, and to the case record, which, I believe, it is proper for Lynch to describe. I'll therefore write and although new stuff is not admissable before the appeals court will attest to, in his interest and for his protection, tell him exadly what I did throughout this litigation and why and then provide a few illustrations.

I'll do this whether or not I send the letter to Whitaker, which I'll not do in any event until I hear from you.

It is as I told you, once they start to lie they leave themselves no other course and now they focus on the case record, where they don't have even a feather for support.

I'll read the rest later. Thanks for it.

Best,

Your letter to Metcalfe was on 8/9. Whittaker's response was not until 9/11. I therefore believe that they'd planned to ignore your letter until Les Whitten asked questions, when they decided to have something on the record.

Dear Ms. Whittaker,

When it comes to my reputation I am represented by no counsel, require no counsel, and I hope I will never get so ill and disabled that I will not be abke to speak for myself.

You lied to the appeals court about me and sought to defame me. Now you magnify that in your letter of the 11th to Jim Lesar's appeals counsel - who does not represent me in any event.

Your "explanation" of your lie is, in my view, no less a conscious and deliberate lie -if as you should you have the familiarity with the case record required for you so state anything about it and have not just accepted verbal defamations from those who preceeded you in the practise - and in itself is a new defamation that, as a layman, I do not regard as within the limits of diligent advocacy.

In time this case will run it course. If it ends without your apologies for and withdrawal of your lies I will then seek to determine whether there is anything I can do.

You people, if I may use a word that suggests you have any human attfibutes, may think it is fun to make sport with serious illnesses and increasing years but I am of an older generation, a generation which in such areas had different ethical and moral concepts. ~~And, of course,~~ to make sport of the courts and the ~~laws~~ laws.

~~[illegible]~~