Carelyn armld

## 7/18/75

Dear Howards

In today's heavy mail there is your note of the 16th, the Kelley/Carolyn letter

and the piece on HAAs which I'll read with care later.

As I expected., it having been clearly signalled, the judge ruled against 100% of the evidence and against us and rewrote the law while charging us with ungentlemanly canduct is proving perjury and ignoring the repetitious perjury. We have ordered the transcript. I expected what he did the firsts shounce I had to observe him but not the extreme to which he did it. In the end that may be helpful.

I did get what is prepresented as all the Mia stuff. It can't be but for the moment there is nothing you should do about it. The best bet is to carry this case

through and we'll do it. Somehow, that is!

We have a record mobody can duplicate. Should we in the end not provail I'll ask to be heard by Congress. But that is far shead.

I know their backstop position and I'm waiting for it if we win at some stage and they do not appeal.

There are several apporaches to Kelley without doing the legal research. One is practise, that the FBI did not withhold handwritten statements but made them freely available. (Do not specify.) Another is that they made changes in some of these statements without indicating they had made changes to the VC. Still another is that these handwritten statements have been widely published in facsimile without any such protest as the FBI now registers. Still another is that the FBI reports are contradictory to what Mrs. Armold's affidavit says, therefore the integroty of the FRI is involved and you would hope he would be anxious to resolve any doubt on this acore. Still another is that they were the agents of the Commission and it imposed no such restriction. And that there is no provision of the law authorizing it. There is in this case a direct contradiction and with the FRI's history of altering these statements you feel that the FHI's interest and that of truth as well as Mrs. Armold's should ispel him to resolve this question, particularly because you regard the inference that you would undertake to counterfeit her signature as an unmarranted alander. If you can do it without being offensive yourself I'd note that in all these years after all these facatelle separ reproductions of so much hadraviting no such allegation has ever been made. Perhaps that it comes with partitularly poor grace from the FEI when there were many such pages thatbwere leaked when the FEI had the originals. You could go farther and say the FBI had to investigate, found that some of this was done for commercial and personal profit and then once it had proven this filed no charges. (It was, naturally, with LHO's stuff and for prejudicial pub-licity. But I do have the reports.) I'd less on him heavily but politely. I'm glai you are doing this. You may recall that I started to and warm't able

One of the advantages of this approach is the education it may give Kelley and others new to this ween. If the want to learn. I do it with affidavits all the time. It helps makes a record.

When you are here again I think you'll want to go over the complete files in the last two suits. You are partly familiar with next to the last from WW IV. We went a little farthur this time, and held enough back for new charges before the court of appeals. There is the recommendation of its earlier penel, you may recall.

I am as auxious as I can be to keep the muts as detached as possible.

ANS SI. - C. Arvold 06 - Nole 07. Note from Reffmento FBI Overetar Celley Census 2071975 - Regner for Coneld arrold Statement - original hardwritten