

Dear Dick,

9/8/74

The postmark on my letter in answer to your questions about what would happen with Nixon will show that it was mailed prior to the announcement I heard on the radio a few minutes ago. If in detail I was not 100% correct the analysis was correct and what I forecast is what has happened. The expressions of views, which is to say justifications, is along the lines I indicated.

And at after lunch on a Sunday, when there is no available text, I'll forecast with confidence that a careful reading of Ford's full text will disclose hedging against what he knows the future will hold. He has to know - and I say this with certainty if without proof of his knowledge - that Nixon committed many other crimes. This statement will lay the basis for arguing that blackbird pie.

If you read my explanations with care you also find the basis for belief that this had to be soon, before the superb Ford public-relations campaign is halted by the inescapable realities. Of course I did not expect it to be today. Sunday is a great day for it: nobody in offices to be reached for indignant quotation. Even God wants it! Of course there is scanty electronic reporting "undays, too.

On that public relations and the preparations I say were beyond the Ford staff capability, I have learned since writing you that U.S. Steel's and Proctor and Gamble's Washington vice presidents (or p.r. men-lobbyists in charge) were in on the planning that began not less than three months before Nixon resigned.

Also before Nixon resigned, as I recall as soon as he had to release the last tapes, I made notes that in essence forecast what has now happened and established an "Immunity" file.

It was visible. The trouble is people don't want to see.
Publishers and agents, too.

The first chapter of The Unimpeachment of Richard Nixon, dating to April, states his problem explicitly and it now turns out accurately. It will have to be condensed but the draft has no error and now clearly.

(Legal problems on the Ray case have taken time and delayed my return to that writing. There is going to be a precedent come of what we have accomplished against the greatest odds on the rights under discovery in habeas corpus. Before the lawyers began to outline their legal responses I have provided them with the draft of a factual response in the form of a draft of an affidavit I can execute and to which I can attach relevant exhibits. I have also drafted the philosophy rather than the legal approach, the political thinking I recommend.)

The years have numbed my feelings so I am without strong feelings about either the expected development or the inability of publishers to meet their responsibilities in a society like ours. It is in adjusting to the latter that my thinking and writing have changed because it is almost certain that I can't be published.

To make this more comprehensible, there were literary problems with the manuscript I sent to Peter Shepherd despite the liabilities of sending a lengthy but far from complete draft. That work is more than a year old. The whole world has changed in that year. Yet there is no error in that draft and it holds a truly enormous volume of the significant that remains unknown. How many people do you suppose can write on a breaking story, most of all one of this unprecedented character and scope, and after most of the major developments followed that writing have been completely accurate and have written what after many secret and two sensational public hearings is still new, still unknown, unexposed?

And remain unpublished, without even a note of sympathetic regret from the agent?

In order not to forget I followed the practice of making hasty drafts of what I would later go over when the events were clear in mind, often right after what triggered the thinking and without having time to outline. There were two of these I sent to Shepherd without even taking time to correct my typing on the assumption he might see in them what would later evolve that should be exciting content. When he returned them it was with unfavorable comment on the content. One dealt with the CIA cover-up and

was explicit in saying that the Ervin committee was deliberately hiding the known story of the Hughes-Nixon-Robson deal that it set forth in such detail only a few other details have since been added. And to date not all that was in that hasty draft has been put together anywhere.

Well, the Ervin committee did deliberately suppress (Shepherd said this was tendentious), it was obvious if unreported that it had this intent, and while it dared not for the reputation of its members ignore the thing entirely, it held no single public hearing and delayed holding even a secret one until it had decided to hold no more in public. How much evidence was there? It has published four volumes of it. At the same time it delayed issuing subpoenas until it was also obvious that lawyers could stall until it was all moot.

Of this great volume of words all that is known is that "he used crooked campaign money to buy Pat some savings." Probably most people don't know this.

This may seem like boasting but that is not my intent. Learning was hard for me because the reality was contrary to my belief and, of course, to theory. As I look back and try to remember I guess my recognition of the reality found its first and limited (if passionate) expression in the Epilogue to White Wash II. I went a little further in the foreword or introduction of the next book.

On the visceral political nothing fails like success. The surest way to be wrong is never to fail at being right.

And on the most topical of issues, especially the two most topical on which I have worked, the certainty is greater.

But topicality, we are supposed to believe, is what publishers want?

Take aspects, what I earlier told you would in the future be the basis for these that could make books. Nixon had an official police state plan and there is no record it was even killed. Have you seen a book on something of this magnitude? There was what Gray and the FBI did to protect Nixon and gang. Have you seen or heard of an interest in it? Nixon is now fallen. He has been a real, literally real crook all his life. Not even the left has the interest and the nucleus of a book is in what Shepherd read. Expansion will make it a book. No new material, only more detail.

(Have you seen a Times editorial saying Gray should be charged for either perjury or the assortment of charges that can be laid on him for destroying evidence?)

So my learning - old dogs do learn - tells me that there is nothing about which publishers care less than the kind of world in which they live. This certainty and that I do care are what dominates me and what I attempt, and what I will not accept.

With almost anyone today's news would hasten him back to The Unimpeachment. But I have to live with realities, so I will now go out and hope to start a mover that is three different junked ones put together and now because it has to be done and I can't think of hiring a boy with a small tractor to do it. Not even a boy will do by hand what I still do.

It is all so crazy!

Even the current Number 1 Best Seller is an "expose" that was possible only because of a deal to cover the CIA. This, naturally, will make exposure of it in The Unimpeachment an even greater handicap.

Does this not also mean that dishonesty is a prerequisite to financial success?

Sincerely,