

Jim, notes on your version of my affidavit, by page and graf

2:5 and Williams 4: this disproves, utterly and completely, if not perjurious, the Danaher invention of a law-enforcement purpose in Texas, a point you have missed. Or, in grasping for a straw, the decision is in direct contradiction to what Danaher and the majority say is the only evidence before them. Instead of "many" say "thousands of" or "thousands of pages of" for I can take one full filedrawer in to the court that is of those I haven't even read and filed. "Take the offer?"

This is intended to have the broader meaning Danaher gave it. Since he ~~stretch~~ stretched so hard and so far, why don't I make a simple comment like Shade of Watergate! 2:5 calling this simple false is too tame. Hit the bastards hard, but leave them an out, save their faces. "Like it is a deliberate falsehood if not perjury to misrepresent to this court, successfully deceiving it from its decision, that" etc. it is, in fact, incredible that it would be alleged even if not under oath.

2-3:7 I think it is important to begin by saying that I have asked for nothing that can be described as "raw data from investigative files." In fact, the raw data would be incomprehensible for me. I want the results. You seem to be avoiding use of the word "perjury" but this is at least a deliberate misrepresentation to the court. Remember, this is me saying it and not you and I have already charged it to the AG, so that won't be new.

3:8 Add at the end a strong statement along the line that disclosure of the results of the analyses cannot possibly disclose any secret process, technique, investigative tool or source of information of any kind or description. All it can disclose is the results of a well-known, non-secret and largely outdated scientific test.

3: 9 Begin "In 1967 or 1968. Before I go into a specific correction, and we'll have to make this more relevant that it appears at the beginning, I want to note a different kind of faking that can make current headlines, where Jaworski is among those conned. I have corrected the text. The other faking is quite relevant to what you have omitted for reasons I do not understand, the false claim based on no evidence that Danaher makes, of assistance to local law enforcement officials. When Rankin learned that Texas had reports that Oswald was an agent, he arranged a fake "hearing" at which two members of the Texas group, Storey and Wade, told me what would have been obvious in any event, that they thought it was an executive session of which a transcript was made. There was none and the court reporters records show there was none. Instead, the Texas people, whose chief investigator and "special counsel" was Jaworski, turned the report over to the federals so the federals could investigate themselves.

In general I think you have leaned over too far to keep Bud happy and the result is a less substantial affidavit than is easily justified. I'm not going to reread what I wrote before. I'm going to reread Williams now and make a few notes on each of his graf. I begin with the strong belief that we must call this perjurious, with the intent to deceive the court successful. I think this is overdue, needed and now serves the added and also-essential purpose of giving the probably embarrassed judges an out. Also Sirica if there ever is a remand.

1. That he is an official with access to the records is not enough. They can use and should have used the agent who performed the tests.

2. He evades, for the issue is the results not what he says he reviewed.

3. If this is anything but a deception of the court he is saying that they know there was a conspiracy, the case is open, and it can't be for any other reason. There is no point in repeating the law-enforcement thing I believe should be attacked. I have other notes on that, aside from the only ones that were ignored.

4. Makes a deliberate liar out of Danaher or a perjurer of Williams. Confront them with it. It can't be both, not possibly, and if the other judges were intimidated or if Kaufman gets his back up, this helps and gives what they need, an out.

This is a deliberate lie as I can prove because Hoover personally leaked these things, and I have that under oath, and the papers of the day and the numerous

investigations of "leaks" prove it. The Commission held a hearing on the leaking of the first paper they got before they got it! I have this.

After Watergate this just ought not be let alone. Christ! All those memos of what should be leaked and all that raw stuff given to the convicted who had no federal connection, by high officials, too. Allege it strongly! Make them confront the Danaher invention and they'll have to confront him. He can't survive it with them. They took his word. Make him have to defend it to them. He deserves it and it is so terribly false the papers may go for it. It should be in what goes to the Supreme Court anyway.

5 I think we should include a treatment of this as the ridiculousness it is, as other decisions do politely. What is in these files is utterly irrelevant. They can put used toilet paper in what they later call an investigative file. But I have not asked for used toilet paper. I have asked for no more and no less than the results of a non-secret test that never had or could have had any law-enforcement purpose. One wasn't even made until more than a half-year after Oswald was dead. But there is deliberate misrepresentation here, which is reason for remand, so the court can take evidence on it, what I have been denied.

I think you should include here or in an argument what will be obvious to the other judges, that Danaher had invented what he wants to overcome the deficiencies of the government's argument. We did ask what law was being enforced. The government when asked to state what is not true did not make the false statement he makes for it about law-enforcement purpose. Quote Werdig's deathless words, for they should be isolated for the papers and the Supreme Court. I think it is important to show that Danaher is an adversary not a judge and I believe this is comprehensible proof of it.

Besides, what is relevant in this graf is included in the exemptions whereas what I seek isn't, therefore his deliberate deceptions of which the tricky language here used is a sample. I would press this because if they overrule Wellford the other people can go back to federal court in Baltimore and might tear this whole thing up pretty publicly. That is, they may have the chance and may want it. Untested it has the practical effect anyway.

I think the attack on this graf should be much stronger, much more specific and in terms of open ridicule.

This gives me an idea for the future. We have a spectre made and wave it around in court and ask if the FBI is about to crumble.

In summary, much too tame and not as good a record as should and can be made for any further court or other use.

However, I can think of a compromise. Make the charges strong enough, include enough so there seems to be a basis, and then file a supplementary affidavit with exhibits attached.

I also think we should say here that the summaries are released publicly (they did in the Rap Brown case, and I mean Hoover, personally, did and I have a copy of his released telegram. So all I am asking is for the results and if they substantiate the release, there is no reason to deny it. If all Williams allegations were true instead of deceptions, they apply equally to what was released, which is in evidence. It also is part of that file and bears the file identification on it. QED?