Dear Jim, 5/6/74

As you know, what people think of me is the least of my concerns. Were it not, I'd not be doing and would not have done what I have.

Odds and ends of what you attributed to Larry Wilsworth of Nader's outfit have been coming back to me for years, almost always from strangers of those close to total strangers. It has been particularly widespread where it can hurt, as in publishing, where agents have been told what you were.

I have in mind that at some point where it is both convenient and not awkward you might ask this man what it is that prompted that kind of crack because he and I have never met and to the best of my knowledge he has no knowledge of my work.

Or, for that matter, that I was fighting their kinds of fights all alone before most of them were born.

There was a time, and I think you have carbons, where exactly this was, according to what I had been told, was done by FBI agents. I thenk wrote Mitchell promptly demanding an explanation and that it end. He said it would be improper and that he was referring the matter to Hoover, from whom I'd hear. Hoover never responded nor did the Department of Justice ever again, despite my repeated requests for an answer, if only a pro forma denial.

Why would Hoover not make pro forma denial? Why would he not make a big speech about his loyal, dedicated, 100% American boys never doing such a thing? The most obvious possibility seems to be that he didn't know what proof I had and had no reason to believe it had not been done. Wouldn't have been the first time, either.

Back in 1965 my then Congressman told me what I was then unwilling to credit, that when I walked about of a publishing house, a federal agent moved in.

You know enough of the crookedness to which I have been subjected to make up your own mind on whether even as corrupt a land as this can be that totally dishonest.

So, I think it would be good to know and that one way would be to put it in terms of your interest because you do represent me and because you have agreed to handle other things for me. So, you should know.

Now my memory isn't what it once was but as you have seen it isn't all that bad, either. There are some things I do not remember, but what comes back returns clearly and I think you have reason to believe, accurately. Something that just may be relevant came back as soon as we finished talking.

Danaher. You may remember ehat I do not, whether I wrote or spoke it, but I then told you that I believed I detected signs of intrusion, of animus, of something external.

What I have in mind is that if there has been this kind of carrying on, if it is by Gessell only (in which event he was obligated to disqualify himself and he did not), it represents the kind of weakneess on the part of the sronger the weaker can use against the stronger. It is one means of weaker survival. But it is also much more in the context in which when you return I hope you will be able to find time to examine it independently. It may be the means of accomplishing what so many of us have attempted in so many different ways, of exposing this whole rottenness.

I am willing to risk sounding paranoid. But on your side consider how many different suggestions I havemade that have t is unity in them. I am either imagining all these things or there is something to them. You have seen enough tangible evidence to know I am not imagining. However, there remains a questions, are these natural coincidences. You may not share my view, but is is that coincidence can'r explain enough, if it reall explains any.

I would not expect this cat to speak franjly to you, but I would not assume that he would tell you nothing at all. So, I would make it possible for him to say something.

What I believe should take precedence in your thinking I will not be telling you for the first time. It is your interest. You are not and I do not regard you as some kind of kid. But you are a dedicated man, one who believes in decent things. Thus you may overlook what I really think you should not, and I emphasize this so you will not. This can be very dangerous to your professional future, as with success it could also make it. So, begin please, by thinking selfishly.

If you then decide that you want to think further, add Williams to it and many other things. They all have a centrifugal force that may or may not be coincidence.

If you then want to think farthur still, then I suggest your thinking turn to money. The return can be enormous.

There is something I have never told you, so I do it now because it addresses that which was possible for the first book on the Warren Commission. It involves two men neither of whom you would want a son to copy. One is Ivan Obelensky, son of the White Russian prince, the other a Greek who had Anglicized his name to John Ledes. I had a contract with Ivan, whose manager Ledes was, for Whitewash. They were actually drooling over the money they were about to make AFTER reading the manuscript. I had to deliver it 2/15/65 and I did. Thereafter I went to NYC. I am certain we can produce records on the dates. The first night Ledes was ecstatic. As I drove him to a NYU postoffice I could still find, it it has not been moved, he told me that without advertising, from what the salesmen alone had said, there was an advance sale of 25,000 or 35,00 copies, of which, unless I made notes, I am not now sure. He described this as a "gold plated best seller." Then he made a to me mysterious trip to Washington, as I now recall the next day or the one after that. His attitude changed abruptly. They not only rejected the book but they did not ever, to this day, return the manuscript. What a job Lil and I had reconstructing it!

There is no doubt Ledes went to Washington and I am certain it can still be proven. They did advertise the book while I was writing it.In Publishers' Weekly. I am absolutely certain I can produce contemporaeous records sufficient for any legal need, including the dates on which I mailed which chapters. I did that damned thing in a month. I can produce the friend who introduced me to Obolensky. I have countless letters on the literary merit and the commercial possibilities. And there is what I think would be legally decisive, the money the first two commercially-published books made. Esp. Lane's. Now I am not talking about so much later, Lane's appearing September, 1966. This was under a contract calling for publication in March of 1965. The market then was limitless. I believe that the hardback print of Lane's was something like a qarter of a million US alone. Plus reprint rights that then would have been much more valuable. Plus what it could have meant to my subsequent work. And in addition to this you have seeen unassailable proofs (and heard me make one) of federal improper interest. To this I can add the actual identification of federal files on me. Or, I am really talking about a fortune for both of us. Aside from this business that I think of as intellectual judo. Any interference with Whitewash at that date emant money. Much money, as its later record as an undergrounf book and Dell reprint also indicates.

You may not see this as I do, but I now see a package that addresses two things: personal damages and the possibility of an entirely different approach to and to bringing stuff out about the assassinations.

I think the possibilities are there, that deposing and interrogatories will yield much and that, given the time, the prospects are better than those we usually face.

When you have time, I'd like to hear from you on these things.

Have a good rest and relaxation,