

Mr. Les Whitten  
1401 16 St., NW  
Wash., D.C. 20036

8 /10/76

Dear Les,

By accident I caught Jack's appearance with the Playboy people this morning. It reminds me that this is one subject I've been wanting to discuss with you. There is much that not only has not come out - it isn't even understood to exist.

I wrote two Watergate books. The first, intended to be definitive, grew much too large. I <sup>said</sup> ~~said~~ it aside and close to a year before he resigned started writing The Un-impeachment of Richard Nixon. Except for the conclusions it was completed (unread draft) about 2/74 when I had to work on the Ray evidentiary hearing.

It also grew too large because from my experience publishing is not indicated and I therefore tend to be prolix, to make as full a written record as I can.

Some of what I have is absolutely solid. Some not confirmed by not without reasonable basis. In both categories is what I believe may be more significant today than the story that is known. It can have an enormous impact on the coming election.

An example of the second category is an unexposed CIA domestic operation, chilling to the first amendment, with more than enough proofs to establish it beyond question. It, however, has a second part of reasonable presumption and sensational possibilities. These as it now is I intend to follow in court. When I can.

There is more than one important and untold CIA story in this. Those Playboy characters have done no original work from what they said this morning. From my experiences with Playboy, including with Gonzales personally, they will not. They are in fact professional plagiarists. Gonzales personally paid me for one and they sought to extend that into a license to steal without limit. I have complete proofs on this, even the promise not to steal again to keep me from asking for an injunction, as I told them I would. They lied. Jim can confirm all this separately but I have the proofs. I was Playboy's consultant on a very bad assassinations series. Because we had to do this by phone by pre-arrangement it was all taped. Other proofs, including Gonzales appreciation of my reasonableness, are in writing. They are despite the public rep, on these subject no better than official sycophants. Their theorizing on what was covered is phoney. For all practical purposes it serves CIA interest. Actually, it is an old canard fostered by both left and right wings.

My problem in all of this is my regular problem. I do all this work without any regular income, at great cost in time, and then face a citizen's responsibilities, getting it out, which has come to mean giving it away. I keep hoping that perhaps some day a foundation may provide some support. Not for me personally. Somehow I'll make out. But for helping with the work, initially by some good librarian work on my files, which are to become a university archive anyway. Meanwhile, if I give all this away now, or any major part of it, I kill all the great amount of work in the draft of a book that with cutting and editing could be an important and commercially-successful book.

Of course I have no trouble trusting you. Or Jack if he should be interested. I do want some advice on this. If I do hate the hand-to-mouth existence of the past 13 years and more at my age I also hate sitting on so much I regard as important is the nation's interest. (One of the court decisions I asked there be no attention et is the one actually charging me with meeting the nation's interest in another matter.)

I had to be in D.C. last Thursday. It was possible to drop by. You were not in. Jim has to be away for a month so I will not have the need to go to Washington on any of my litigation. However, I do not expect to be away from home if you can come up.

Best,