

Dear Dick,

4/12/91

This is a new proposal. I hope you can tell me what you think of it soon because that can have a major influence on what I do.

Remember, I told you I was writing more than might be used because I want to make a record for history, of the failure of all out/basic institutions in those times of great stress and since then.

Last night my friend Jerry McKnight, the local history prof., came over. He asked me what I was doing and how it was going. I told him I was writing more than could likely be used but that I felt I had to get it on paper. But that it was growing to where it would be close to the length of a small book.

We then talked about the need for such a book. Professionally, he believes there is this need. So does Dave Wrons, Wisconsin history professor. He and I have talked about it often. Especially in terms of criticizing the so-called critics so many of whom have been so dishonest and misleading in so many ways. The most dramatic form is the Oliver (T wist) Stone.

I'll not now try to encapsulate it but what I'm into now is the failure, and this word is a kindness, of the professional historians.

It will not be difficult to expand on what I've done if ~~it~~ that seems like a good idea. It also will not be difficult to add to what I've had in ^{my} mind on the failure of publishers as their part of the major media.

There also are a number of other critics I could add to the samples I've used and what I would add should make informative and interesting reading besides making a better record for history.

As I was walking this morning I thought some of this. There is the untold story of the non-publishing history of Whitewash, the first book, which got more than 100 international rejections without a single adverse editorial comment. My God! If a president were a boor and an idiot how could publishers so universally refuse to consider a book that merely raised questions about the official explanation or solution, leave alone what Whitewash did, which is destroy that solution, definitively.

I also have what would be quite suitable on the RFK assassination that could be used.

I do not have in mind expanding what I have done on Garrison.

I think the book could be quite interesting, new and despite the breadth of the criticism be well received today. This thought came to ~~me~~ when early this morning I read the prologue to Haynes Johnson's excellent criticism of the Reagan years, "Sleepwalking Through History." Not long ago such a book would not have been considered. (His Norton ~~was~~ editor, who wanted me to rewrite Whitewash into blaming the government, is the one who made up my mind for me to self-publish.)

It would require extensive editing but I think that would not be difficult. Some

could be cut-and-paste and the rest would not require any subject-matter expertise.

As I think about what the added content can be I get pretty excited.

I recognize that the editing will be a cost. On the cost I will be no problem. All I will want aside from what one assumes, competence, is fidelity to fact and fairness.

I won't mind moderating some of my harshness but I would mind amplifying any of it without basis.

I can't now think of any adverse criticism I have made that is not documented or is other than really understated, however strong it may appear to be.

In what I'd say about the DJ and FBI, particularly what the FBI did to Lil and me, that is an Ameriform moderation of the "estape and the KGB. You have seen or perhaps have the Katzenbach memo to the White House, saying that the crime was solved the minute that Oswald was killed and the world had to be convinced that there had been no conspiracy and that Oswald would have been convicted at trial from the evidence they then had. This is virtually unknown and I have many FBI documents along the same line. None ~~is~~ ever used.

As you can see, I've not tried to organize what I'm saying because in part my mind keeps retrieving what could be exciting, useful, etc.

David said you have a good editor available. If this will fly I'd be quite willing for it to be a sort-of coauthor thing, with on the cover "as edited by," whether or not such a thing has ~~is~~ ever been done before.

David reminds me, I've gotten my notes on the King-related files back and Helen is now making cards on each one after which I'll put them in order and we'll have a list of them for him.

You and he have both mentioned reprinting Whitewash. For now I think that would not be good but for the future I think it might well be. We can talk about that some time.

Best,

On Oliver's twist, I thought of a different title:

"Hoax: ~~the~~ Hollywood/Mardi Gras Solution
to the JFK Assassination."

Helen has gone over Lesar 's copies of my notes. They are incomplete. But they do include my ~~FBI~~ notes on FBIHQ Murkin if David would like them. If not I'll give them to McKnight. David may also want to remember what they do include, a copy of the OPR's Murkin notes. Stack of about two inches. I'll be going over them because OPR may have disclosed what the FBI withheld from me in some instances.