

Dear Jim,

9/24/74

This is not quite off the top of the head. We have spoken of it before, recently I wrote more comprehensively and my thinking of it while I was taking a walk this morning was ended by another attack from the damned loose-running dogs.

There are two cases of proof of improper federal interest in me, others with reasonable presumptions. With the Air Force, I know the identification of their file but not its contents. I do have a false letter from Buzhardt before Nixon decided he needed Buzhardt's talents closer to him falsely telling me that there are no such files. The time was of the Army intelligence hearings. The CIA stuff is, as you know, solid and there is a reasonable basis for believing there is more ~~stuff~~ will come out in any trial or hearing.

My thoughts this morning turned back to the original proposal I made to Bud when he had a friendly relationship of the past with the man who was then CIA general counsel. Bud then seemed to look with favor on the idea but did nothing.

I have in mind an approach to the CIA about this, a quite open one to their new general counsel. I mean letting him know we have proof so that he will also know that if he is lied to he should expect to have this proven to be a lie, perjury if under oath. I do not mean letting him know the proof we have. I do, however, mean to include two things: that we believe more proof is available and that if they do not produce it we expect to be able to; and that it is in an area from which they are not only precluded but of a nature that makes impossible their traditional excuse for crossing the line.

We ask for a meeting to discuss this. We say that the Watergate record makes it impossible to believe there need not be secret taping so lets tape it out in the open, each side having a tape. (The CIA had an automatic taping system, not dependent upon machines in drawers.) We say also that we want to know what they are willing to do about this and what assurances, backed up by what kind of credibility, they are willing to provide that once and for all it is over.

I think we should do this fast, first on the chance they would be willing to agree to what we could find acceptable and second in the event they don't. There is added reason for the second: they'll repeat on me with WW IV and we'll be able to provide the proof in court, unless they have made basic changes. If they repeat, and this time they'll see the need, the offense then would be the greater, I think.

I believe this can be accomplished by a letter from you to begin with, saying that you represent me and are aware of the proof and the fact.

What happens thereafter, if anything, is what would determine what we would then consider and then do.

This morning I made another effort to avoid an unpleasantness over the damned dogs, copy enclosed. I have a file on this and there is little doubt that I do meet the requirements of the law. If you are uncertain about the ellipsis, it refers to the FBI. Where else would local police turn? Who else would feed them political crap?

In it there is a real due process question. But the Maryland ACLU is hungup on its opposition to handguns. (I am against them, too. I could carry a rifle legally but I won't.) It doesn't recognize that the Maryland law is worse than none because of its approach and because a long enough history shows it doesn't work. It is this that started me thinking along these lines, when I saw a block ahead a dog I knew to be dangerous and started to return home, only to have to race for the second time one I had had to when he charged me on the way out.

When we can I think we should discuss this. Bear in mind that when the contract for WHITEWASH was broken, not realizing that Praeger was CIA, my first stop thereafter was at Praeger, sent by a friend to a friend of ~~mine~~ <sup>his</sup> who was all for the book. They had a copy.