

Dear Jim,

5/29/81

In C.A. 75-1996 and rather early in it I alleged that the FBI was using disclosures and withholdings as part of its gamesmanship rather than in conformity with the Act and that it was successfully manipulating what the House assassins committee could know and believe as well as what the Court could and would. I also alleged that in the course of these ^{na} manipulatory efforts the FBI was withholding from its records what was in the papers, even in its own disclosed clippings files. With regard to informers, I stated that the FBI did disclose them when it had political objectives to serve by disclosing them. It did not fear for them when it could advance its political objectives by identifying them. These matters are included in my appeals that still have not been acted on, save for Shea's having testified that the FBI should not have withheld what it withheld. This, of course, did not provide the still withheld information.

Examination of the table of contents alone of the HSCA's report confirms all I alleged in C.A. 75-1996 with regard to these matters. (xi-xii)

Almost all the phoney allegations of conspiracy within my appeals are those with which the committee was conned.

Under 1. they go into Stoner et al and what I reported to the DJ after Stoner told me about it, that the informer, William Hugh Morris, was trying to entice him into racial violence. (The partial disclosure is false, prejudicial defames me with what the FBI fabricated, and the truth and actual records remain withheld in the litigation.)

Under 2 the report has two alleged Memphis conspiracies, both of which I reported in my 1971 book and neither of which has minimal credibility. The first is the CB broadcast, where the FBI withheld the name of Ed Montedonico, the kid against whom no charges were ever laid, the second John McFerren. McFerren actually crosses over into what HSCA lists as a New Orleans conspiracy, its third separation. First under New Orleans is the late William Sartor. (Also pertinent under 5, Birmingham, the FBI's informer Morris Davis, who plagiarized some of what was public domain of the Sartor stuff.)

Second under New Orleans is Raul Esquivel, who is the subject of a number of my appeals and about whom I also write in 1971. Fourth is Herman Thomson, where what remains

withheld is significant and what is disclosed is entirely inadequate. Next is Jules Ricco Kimble, who also tried to thrust himself into the Garrison fiasco, which was pretty public. I do not have a clear recollection about the other two and cannot state without question that they are within my specific appeals. But I do know that the information was placed in the public domain by James Earl Ray before I filed C.A. 75-1996. The third listed in Raymond Rothen, the sixth Randy Rosenzon.

HSCA's fourth city listed by alleged conspiracies is Atlanta. I do not have a clear recollection about whether or not crazy Edna Lancaster is in my specific appeals, as I believe she is, but there is no question about the public domain nature of that misinformation - she put it there. (Don't confuse here with Crazy Annie, also public domain. Edna is the one who claims James Earl Ray is her illegitimate son.) My appeals pertaining to the other two, when the FBI's intent to deceive and mislead was quite apparent with regard to one, are specific and detailed. The one where the FBI so clearly was playing games is the matter of the brothers ^{Wladek} ~~Edna~~ and Leon Powell. The Robert Byron Watson matter is the subject of Department rather than FBI withholdings and is, at the least, within my GRD appeals that remain ignored. Watson and his mother saw to it that their effort to get him off on the drug charges, the ~~same~~ inspiration of the fabrications about a King conspiracy, got wide public attention.

Two are listed under Birmingham. I have no clear recollection of Walter Maddox but have very clear recollections of my Morris Davis appeals and the specificity of my affidavits and their accuracy. It was quite clear with him that the FBI was going out of its way to plant what it knew was bad information on HSCA. I believe that the FBI's desire to hide this accounts for its withholdings and its failure to respond. Here I remind you that all field office information is within the Stipulation and under it the FBI was required to respond after 11/1/77.

Louisville is next. I have no recollection of Charles ^{Lee} ~~Lee~~, all but am quite clear in regard to the phoney Clifton ^B ~~B~~aird because I exposed him as a phoney when he first went public, before I filed C.A. 75-1996, and because after the committee was deceived over this and there was so much defamation in the Congressional ^{re} ~~re~~cord, I gave the lawyer who

represented the Louisville police will he needed to obtain relief for them.
four

There are ~~two~~ more. I have clear recollections pertaining two two, Miami and William Somerset and New York and Myron Billett. Somerset also includes Atlanta and Billett was in Columbus, Ohio when he launched his fabrications.

I first published Somerset's story, which involves the also deceased Joseph Adams Hiltner, in 1967. I added detail in 1971. Somerset was a self-disclosed FBI informer who also worked for Miami authorities. The FBI itself disclosed ~~Hiltner's~~ ^{Hiltner's} name and other information in the records provided to the Warren Commission. We displayed in court some of the pertinent records provided to a ~~friend~~ ^{friend} of mine and withheld from me, but the FBI since has not provided a single record or replaced a single page from which there is improper withholding, often of what it made public domain.

Billett was the subject of extensive news attention, for which he arranged. Scripps Howard went ape over his fabrication, according to the FBI's own disclosures of its files of clippings. Its own clippings, disclosed, reveal that it withheld the public domain. I gave the FBI a few of its own clippings back, but it then did nothing.

This brief summary, based on the table of contents only, reflects the accuracy with which I informed the Court, while it was going on, of the FBI's operations against the committee, the Court and me. There were and remain withholdings for entirely improper purposes, manipulation of what could and would be known and believed. Where the information is within the Stipulation, as it is with regard to the listed field offices, the FBI was under the obligation to respond to what I wrote it. In all cases it has failed to, to this day, which is a continuing violation of the Stipulation.

Sincerely,