

Dear Chris,

3/10/74

If he did not tell you, your editor did not get back to me the end of the week he and you spoke to me.

This is not atypical. Nor need it be bad manners. It is more likely embarrassment.

Whatever explains it, and I don't really care, it has been common in my experiences over the past decade.

My chief purpose in writing at a little after 4 a.m. on a Sunday morning is to encourage you not to be too discouraged and to try to encourage you not to get too turned off at the cowardice and dishonesty that characterizes the control of all the media today. It is important that what truth can reach them be available to the people, and this requires reporters willing to persevere.

Besides, and this is not intended as discouragement, where is it better? Or where can you do more good?

What brought you, your editor and all this back to mind is the story about the newest in the series of things I predicted could be expected to follow upon the SLA and ARA deals. (If the Akron Beacon-Journal is a night paper, then one of your editors also was a target, of an arrested guy named Blake, as I recall.)

The brief account I heard on radio news is that Gary Trapnell is alleged to have been involved in a Los Angeles plot against an unnamed foreign diplomat. Garrett Brock Trapnell is in my files, too. News accounts of his various exploits along this line plus FBI reports plus psychiatric reports. He comes from a southern family, a military family (generals) and is as brilliant as he is sick.

You will recall that I said it is inevitable that these couple of crimes that by their nature attracted the attention they justified would trigger more. About the sick nothing can be done. About those who consider themselves principled and have prepared for such things something can be done. They include the dangerously ill and they can exploit them.

The danger is not to the ordinary citizen. It is to the Establishmentarians. And they are the ones who can do something, what little can be done, and won't.

There is a kind of reverse Orwell in all of this.

Not that control of the past is the thing. Knowledge of the past shows the future.

And if I can't have everything in my files, that I have stuff relevant to Williams and Trapnell, specific on Trapnell, is at least an indication of anticipation. (I have never written about Trapnell and do not expect to myself.) There are other cases that will mean nothing to you, having to do with arms and smuggling.

In the six decades upon which I can look back, there has never been a time when the press, in the broadest sense, has been less entreprenizing. There is nothing I can do about this except to try from time to time, as I do. You alone, your editor alone, can't do much more. There are good stories and significant books in the kind of material I have accumulated. Perhaps movies. I don't believe commercial success or its probabilities is the controlling factor.

The amount of harm done by police informants is another of these untold stories. It is also an official semi-secret. I have turned the research over to a young lawyer friend, who wants to write that book. His problem is finding time. There is such a book in what I have on the paramilitary right, a frightening book and ~~xxx~~ a significant series of articles. When your people did not get back to me even to say "sorry" by the time your editor said, I spoke to a friend who is an editor with a major book publisher to see if he knows someone who would like to try the book. No response yet. But he knows a writer who has a general interest in the subject of violence.

Thanks for trying and best regards.