

So, in the hardback Davis and McGraw-Hill have a "top" mafioso's "top" layer "foraging" with the free run of my place for much of a year and it is knowingly and deliberately false.

What ~~had~~ actually happened is that I wrote Wasserman, not Marcello, after that house report came out, he replied and I replied to that, enclosing a few records. It was my initiative, for perfecting the historical record only, and they've stolen one of these three letters that I don't have an extra copy of and won't return it or a copy.

The complete and vicious fabrication you'll see if you read this carefully, is "solid evidence" in support of Davis' overall fabrication.

If it is libellous I can't do a thing about it but I am wondered whether it is under the law today a libel and whether it is, from the history I've given you, malice, or malicious, in either the original form or in combination with it in the crap I expect to be in the NAL edition.

NAL has not responded to either of my letters and neither was returned. They were delivered and the indications are that the first triggered the belated Davis/McGraw-Hill response. There has been not even pro forma denial of my description of the writing as deliberately false, fabricated and without any basis for the fabrication.

Even the "correction" is not true. Those files were not "released to the public." In their complete form they are available from me only but ^{some} some are accessible in the FBI's reading room.

I'm 76 now, even more limited as the result of negligence by a urologist in 1/86, which gave me new and more limiting venous thrombosis, and I couldn't even think of the cost of suing. But I would like to know whether you think it crosses the line and is libel. Or anything else.

I hope you are all well and happy, that Jill's ^{er m} project when I last heard of you was successful, and unless I've lost track of time completely, that the boys are well started on satisfactory careers and the other good things in life.

Best to you,

Dave