

1/16/74 Better is a lie on Taxes. He agreed to 100%
on personal benefits as a jurisdiction

got interview of 10/18/71 full file

Statute had not seen. I was ^{from} on above

7/28/70 Bureau & my HR 7/20/70 ~~to be attached~~

Govt. no ~~is~~ ~~the~~ ~~necessary~~ ~~reference~~ to 10/27/71

7/27/70 "157-35-412" Settlement negotiations
pending" full me statute had not seen
ditto 7/30/69, 8/2/68

Some investigatory responses drafted 1968!

Talks 3/21/66 - does not indicate copy to me. - on
Statute

8/65 my ans. Motion More Dep. Statement

p 6 Talk says M.I. Claim Act & that I was "un-
aware of the names of the statutes to which the defense
was referred". They underscore agreement of M.I.

Amung Act

small diff: Morse's letter should have won like

5/7/65 code for Inv. Report. not approved

Stephen H. Shuler was my counsel for a while
Archie Cox no official 9/13/61

Earl. Reuch. C.P.C.

7
Old case best file - has great stuff on number flights,
use as from my center

admission of flight goes back to 8/30/57 - Nicholas

11/15/58 File to ANWAD - info not found

(Personal Service Branch, Child info)

Beall's father complained. 8/8/58⁵?

10/9/57 - 243 copies! - military

5/11/59 - proof of investigation

11/25/58 Bond - confirms all my allegations

Belmont - denied but numbers here

Dear Jim,

Williams and our FOIA/PA on personal files

4/10/77

Years ago, before encountering some of the tycoos we have in FOIA cases, I was a male chauvenist pig who actually believed that women were better humans than men. I guess there is this atavism in the attached letter to Ms. Babcock of Civil Division. This did not occur to me until after I wrote her.

I have made a few notes on the records she provided. I hope you find that what I did specify, far less than what I could have, is persuasive of non-compliance.

I think there is fantastic Williams stuff in this, especially on the running of the statute. I've made a few notes on this I'm not taking time to type up now. But their internal records show not dependance on the running of the statute but a litany of "settlement negotiations pending," including particularly when I was pro se. This is to say that even the government was not depending on that argument.

The Williams/ Taft record is now even more grevous, one of greater negligence, in not going after this stuff. If my wife and I could get it wit out counsel, so prestigious a firm could not? Believe me, it is a record of deliberate fraud, especially in the first case. From gross and deliberate misrepresentation of what the Beltsville poultry experts said to certain knowledge of the fact of these overflights and at elevations other than testified to. Once it was when they were chasing a general for Ike by helicopter! They even pinpointed the source of these overflights involving special helicopter, Lt. Wade, and withhed it from me and lied in court.

There is even a Taft record that states I was not familiar with and did not understand the various laws. There is a Taft record that specifies Military Claims Act, regardless of his filing under federal torts. There are even internal records stating he was asking for response to the interrogatories - and then he dropped completely dead on this.

This is also great on negligence. These records, which Williams did not either obtain or try to obtain, contain the most complete admissions of my claims and allegations.

Let me give you some names.

The Beltsville expert is Dr. Bond. They corrupted this by pretending that there was a constant stream of choppers, around the clock. On all relevant and real questions he said he would expect exactly what I alleged.

Those lawyers of the 50s who figure in the FOIA cases are L. Patrick the Very Gray; Ruckelshaus and good old ~~Harley~~ Hardley.

Records not provided include what are described as "investigative reports." There was no possible law enforcement purpose in this civil action.

In this I have learned that I was also represented by Stephen H. Sacks. His name should be familiar to you. He was Baltimore counsel with Williams. Hunt and he shall find, as the good book does not say.

The decision not to appeal, despite military opportunities, was by Archie Cox. Signature.

The admission of the overflights goes back to 8/30/57 in writing.

I'm going to have some fun with the Pentagon stonewallers. I have found a DM record that lists 243 military copies, of which they have found not a single one. As of this week. In a lecture I'll enjoy addressing. (10/9/57) Also code designations of military files.

I think there is what you may want to show the insurance company's lawyer. If not Webster.

There is vindictiveness in the lies. Like the AUSA, Balt., Better (ugh) on taxes. You have the records proving him a liar, as the transcript will. Hastily,