

Dear Jim,

11/20/86

The Opposition is good but there are a few ^{brief} omissions that, when possible, I would like in the case record. Their omission can be prejudicial.

There is no explanation for my long delay in the record but the reason is, if not to the judge, quite obvious.

The week after my last letter to the FBI, in this appendix, I was admitted to Georgetown hospital, where femoral arterial blockages were diagnosed and were operated on the next week. I've been severely limited by the post-operative complications. I did not delay doing anything - I couldn't.

The FBI's nasty letter to me begins with a deliberate misrepresentation, that I was attempting to use Gesell's decision as a means of getting a waiver. I never did, I never thought of doing it, I knew exactly what he had said, and there is no basis other than a wrongful purpose for the FBI's reference to his decision. Moreover, as I now recall, at the time the FBI wrote that letter I'd been granted the broad fee waiver so there would have been no point in any invocation of the judge's decision. The FBI is dishonesty and dirty not only from long habit - with purpose. When they pull something like this where it has no relevance it cannot be from ignorance and it can be with a future purpose in mind. Such a purpose could be to prejudice Gesell. It is for this and other reasons that I asked you to please make that explicit and I would like you to at the first convenient and appropriate time.

You can't assume that other minds works as yours does or that any judge will be aware of all that is in the record but you can assume that if Gesell read their letter to me there is a likelihood of his not liking what I imputedly did but in fact never did or even thought of doing.

If there is another reference to the tapping of Jerry "ay's phone call to me a clause that could have been included in that footnote could be of significance where the integrity of the FBI's representations is in question. The FBI had requested permission to wiretap all the Rays and the AG refused permission. Despite which it did wiretap or had it done because there is no other possible source for that info. They denied having any such info on me in 1996 although they knew very well that they did. They could not admit having it when they had already disclosed that permission had been requested and denied. Which also is how they make searches.

That footnote does not make it clear that I filed requests with those two field offices (and all others). It is merely implied. That the FBI did have such info and did claim not to after search again addresses their searches, which are now in question.

I've just received the old, enclosed clippings, have no interest in them and send them in the event your archive would like them.

Best,