

4/6/69

Dear John,

Although it is "easter, as I said I would I have begun to go over the government's responses in your suit. I have read the appendages, the various statements, affidavits, letters, etc., and made notes. As soon as I can I will type them and send them. However, I do think I should read the lawyer's arguments first. I will try and get on that this evening or tonight. We are about to leave for a family dinner that will take I do not know how much time. I am doing this, friend, instead of preparing what my own lawyer wants in a suit - have filed to collect money owed me!

There are misstatements of fact in what I have gone over, numerous ones; misrepresentations; tricky formulations that serve only to deceive, and in any event, they have violated their regulations with me and others and to deny you access to what I have had access to is to discriminate against you and prove the regulations are not essential. I will detail this to you. It also applies to copyrighted material, which I got from them without the permission of the copyright owner, and more than once.

I can prove a number of things for you, if you and your lawyer wants me to, including perjury about just what you seek. I charge this in POST MONTEN III, which is published in a limited edition. I am under the impression I offered you a chance to read this and you did not respond. However, if I do not have an extra copy of that available at this moment, I do have a manuscript copy, which is either complete or close to complete in the text. It has none of the appendix, much of which you already have.

If there is haste in your making response, I think you should read and use as an index "The Top-Secret Secret Service" in WHITEWASH II (Tom Kelley on the seat of the car), what I say about the spectrographic analysis in WHITEWASH (see index) - Gallagher did it, not Jevons, and it is the subject of the cited testimony I think you should read.

The errors, misstatements, misrepresentations are so numerous I think your lawyer can make them an effective argument for the local court ruling out all federal allegations as self-serving and undependable. I think it is possible to make such an attack on every attachment.

My point in pa. 3 is that it might help you and your lawyer understand what I am driving at and what I say in the par directly above.

If you have copies of these documents to spare, I'd like one to mark up for you, where an underlined word can have meaning, and I think you should ask Sylvia Meagher and Bud Fensterwald for their comments (he is responsible for the Freedom of Information bill. You might want to consult Senator Long of Mo. on this. He introduced it and knows its meaning.

In haste,