9/23/71

Dear Ned,

The letter to which you referred in your call last night did come this a.m. I have not yet read it, assuming you covered it in your call. I will as soon as I tackle tday's heavy mail. First thing I did was finish the chapter of I on which I was working. Then the usual interruptions, preceeded by a walk. Then, with the old mower fixed, grass a foot high and the forecast of rain, I gigured I'd best mow the worst before it got wet, and now it is about lunch time. My whole purpose in writing is the possibility I'll go into town this p.m. and can mail this.

The reason is to remind you to bring yourPM I with you so that, as far as I will have gone by then, one of us can indicate the corrections and deletions I've made. Ive found no serious ones, almost all atributable to the state of our knowledge in 7-8/67 and tenses because of time lapse. And a few deletions of stuff not now needed. While I presume these are things you'd eliminate anyway, why take a chance? And I'm eliminating all refeecences to other pages of the work, that the index will care for.

As I'd told you, I had defended the Kennedys from the first, alone among the critics. I now note, for whatever good it does you in any dealings, that this is quite explicit at the veryfront end of I. Without sycophancy.

After your call I thought of a possible foundation in being. We can discuss that. And think not in terms of the foundation, if it agrees, publishing the book, but in terms of their supplying the (refunded) cost of publishing. I'm talking about on that does exist, so there is a difference.

I'm skimmed the letter. I'm not against Bradlee in any way. I'm sympathetic to his 11/22/63 spot and treat it that way. I now better understand the position he was in in 5/66, when the Post doublecrossed me on a deal we had. The problems is not how I feel about him but how he feels about me. These boys don't like to be told off. I didn't tell Bradlee off but I did others. They consider themselves all-knowing and anyone who questions them an upstart. And their lives are complicated by what they are unwilling to face (which is also true of the foregoing) by their having lived under and done the bidding of an editor who was a firm partisan. Few will acknowledge this. So, they have quietly passed the word around at the Post that my facts are not to be trusted. How much of this has reached Bradlee I don't know, but at any point I'll compare my accuracy with the papers or any work of non-fiction of comparablel ngth. The problem is that such things do not come up. It is all behind the back, never a confrontation. The fact is, however, that I've been in touch with a reporter and asked him to look at what I've written about Bradlee and get his opinion of whether or not to offer to show it to B. As I would anything else he'd look at. I tried several times with his new national editor, who has been promising to look at this stuff for months and hasn't. His name is Bagdikian and he doesn't believe the Report.

Till youfre here,