As always there is a rush. Today because I lost yesterday having to go to Washington for an FOIA gearing (the judge caught the government lying), because I lost part of this morning with my weekly blood test, and because shortly I will be picked, up to make a speech to the executives club of the first good-sized city to the west. Neither snow nor more snow nor ice nor more ice...

Having no time I begin with a story. I read your letter while awaiting the blood-testing, at the lab. I think I recall enough because I appreciated the letter.

After yesterday's calendar call the chief of the FOIA litigation section of DJ, who was there with four other lawyers, one from the FBI Office of Legal Counsel, introduced Jim and me to the two newest. One she said was assigned to out newest case. Which one is that, Jim and I both asked. When she told us we laughed and informed her that it was not the newest. She hasn't caught up with them all.

Nor has the FBI, and the enclosed carbon shows.

We have that many. Having no choice we'll have more when it is humanly possible for Jim of the super-human efforts.

As of a short while ago Jim had until the end of this week to complete legal research and file a response to the DJ's effort to expunge an addendum we filed in the suit for the withheld ex. sess. transcripts, now before the appeals court, at the briefing stage. (This, of course, is not all that is pressing upon him now.)

Your questions are very good ones. If you could find time to address them to Readers Digest it could be very helpful. Maybe Barron and Melvin Laird both. Maybe also to WIA, which did provide him what it has gone to court to deny me.

Maybe the p.r. office at the Digest. Or if the Epsteiner's agent is known to you...

Jim and I can't do it. Your ideas are excellent and might, even if without response, be of help in this litigation at some point prior to its end. If we lose at this level we'll have to file a new suit based on the new information blabbbed with so pronounced an Epsteink. (I'm glad you do not follow Leacock on this!)

Policoff was onto this more than a year ago but I suppose for lack of time and market did not follow it as I'd have wished - and tried to prompt.

When the book is out there will be the usual promotional efforts. That you have a copy prior to the appearance of the second condensation next month is in itself unusual unless it was a review or restricted copy. Scott Malone has one but did not tell me how he obtained it.

The promotional efforts, with the yellow Epsteinker, will not be in confrontation. Three Therefore it behaves us to make advance requests of all the network shows like Today, od Morning America, CBS Morning News, etc. I hope you would do this in your own name. You could handly it magnificently, have read the book and I hope have more time. But if you are reluctant, as I hope very much you are not, please offer me from Washington, where all originate and I'd not have to go to New York. I'd ask for a simultaneous airing of the other side before there is another side. If it is agreed to I suspect there will be less bad odor on the airwaves. The next thing for you would then be an airing of sweet truth w/o Epsteink. I am sure he'll not face either of us. If his appearance is worth the air time his refusal to appear and the reasons, the exposure of his book, surely is worth no less.

I do hope you will do this. I understand they've sold the tinif to five book clubs. It is what is left of a CIA job, w/t/t with Epsteinker turning to those I suppose were all along his political peers, those finally ousted from the CIA and now revanchist. He is even unfair to the FBI, I'd have no trouble defending it on this question.

I've read and marked up the New York pieces. I have but have not read Digest No. 1. Thanks and best wishes,