

Dear Jim, possible flak from DJ lawyers over my letters 1/28/78

If this makes a problem for you I'm sorry. But if they complain don't be defensive about it.

You told me not to before and I didn't. They changed the situation, not I or you.

Pursuant to the obligation they imposed upon me I sought to inform them. Any reading of those letters will make clear that I was pretty fully informative and that in many instances it could be against personal interest in court.

I received not a word in response, by letter or by phone. This is their doing, not mine. They did not, for example, tell me to direct these efforts to inform through you. They did not suggest they did not want that kind of information. They left a vacuum in which I was not about to get suckered by <sup>any</sup> later complaint that I had not told them.

If they complain lean on them about this- even their failure to write back when I asked how much they would be paying me, a question I have just repeated to Lynne.

And also tell them that if they must have hangups I'm determined not to be insulted a single time again. It is bad enough for the authoritarians of the FBI to do this in the dirty ways they have but for the Civil lawyers to do this is an outrage and I do not propose to accept it - in any form or forum.

I said this to Lynne in a different way-that if they have questions to ask them. If they don't they to drop it and stop badgering and insulting me.

I believe I was restrained in this considering the cause for anger they have given me. I did not, for example, compare my word with those they have filed and given to courts.

I don't want to do these things. But they had better understand that I have an incomplete but conclusive record of the Department of which they are part having engaged in a systematic campaign to hurt me and my work, that this effort to leave a false record about me and my work is something I can't accept because it would leave a question about the integrity of that work. This is the Departmental attempt. I draw no distinction between this of the past and their inferences and slurs of the present. I have no way of knowing what records they generate but I'm going to leave an accurate record.

They don't want this - then all they have to do is rejoin the human race and drop their excesses of adversary representation and their expressions of what it has done to their minds.

If they raise this question I would like you to respond along these indicated lines in writing. I'd go farther, ask them to apologize to me or to prove their slurs have some basis. I do mean this in writing for a number of reasons. One is the foregoing. Another is to forestall their making another effort to use this against me, as you let them do with Green. I can see that you regarded it as irrelevant and it was irrelevant. But it made a false point with Green. She then went off on a tangent. A written record gives them no possibility of pulling that again in court. And perhaps it will end this nasty business.

I'm not worried about their not liking this or their non-cooperativeness. All their so-called good offices has meant is another stall of more than a half year. I'd rather have them angry, antagonistic and making more mistakes- in court and every other way. They have again succeeded in a long stall in all of this. From the first this, quite obviously, has been their game.

Don't just get mad and speak in anger to them, as you did and I appreciate. Take the offensive. Put them on the defensive. We missed a real chance when Shea filed that infamous affidavit. I think you really should demand apologies. Don't be afraid of angering them. They have done us no good, only harm. They have wasted you for months and tied me up for a long time. This helps them, harms us. All they have done is get the FBI off the hook for all this time. Their smiles as deceptions. Their more moderate tones deceive us.

Ha tily,