= Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
12/24/73

Dear Mac,

This is to give you a reading on how honest the Post Office Department is with you. It is not to ask anything of you and with all the things that can be done with time, I have no interest in being vindictive.

About a year ago I asked you to ask the Post Office why its inspector's office was not replying to letters and why it had done nothing about what it described to me as a clear mail fraud case. It told you that it had made an investigation and that the facts then ascertained showed there was no case. You sent me a copy of the letter and I told you it was false and that I had and had given the Post Office the proof that it was false.

The fraud is so clear that on my own I have obtained a settlement of 100% of what I had before then claimed. This is less than I was defrauded out of and could have claimed in court. But 100% settlements, plus accumulated interest, are not all that common. They would seem to be even less ordinary when there is no lawyer handling the matter. The amount is large enough to make nuisance-avoidance an unlikely possibility. It is $5,500. While I don't suppose it will ever serve any purpose, I will make a copy of the check this morning before I apply all of it to our debt.

My own belief is that this is another evidence of what you told me back in 1965, when you tried to help me get my first book published. I did not then believe there could be these kinds of federal intrusions into my life and work. I now am without doubt that you were right. I believe that once this matter got out of the hands of the inspector to whom I spoke the same thing became operative. And that is why there was no interest in pursuing overt and repetitive fraud, by mail.

Since 1965 there has been an accumulation of proof of these intrusions. You may be interested in some that I have solidly and some I have reason to believe, aside from intrusions into my mail which are not easily explained and are numerous.

My public appearances have been the subject of surveillance by a federal agency using a commercial service from which it pretends to cut itself off with a front. I have carbon copies of the transcripts, bills rendered, checks in payment and a first-person confession, in writing from one who was part of it and what admits and amounts to a confession from the man in charge. (His added comment was that I have "the all-time track record" for interest in the field in which I have worked all these years.)

Written and taped details of being part of spying on me directly for a federal agency by someone I know as a local-police informant that is so persuasive my phone conversations were repeated faithfully and completely accurately, with such detail that I was told what phones I used.

There are indications of shadowing that are less than proof. For example, a federal attorney once told Bud Fensterwald that I was in to see him at a time he specified. Well, I was then in Bud's office, but he was not there and I had not gone to see him, so my presence was not detected by a phone tap. Actually, I was there to make copies of some Watergate-related FBI reports I had for him and for the Post.

Going back to your insight of 1965 and federal interference in my efforts to get that book published, I think I can now pinpoint a man who was involved in it. He has been much in the news recently. Because I picked up the indications a year and a half ago and have been pursuing the trail as best I can with my present limitations, I have a much more sensational and significant story on him and what he did and was part of and with whom he was related and working than has even been indicated publicly, despite a large number of official investigations all of which, somehow, have been able to avoid the unavoidable. I am writing this story but I have no prospects. If I had the means I'd go to court.

Good speech saying authoritarianism isn't exactly new. Our best to you all,