

Mr. Howard Bray  
Fund for Investigative Journalism  
4346 Connecticut Ave., NW  
Wash., D.C. 20036

1/29/77

Dear Howard,

I appreciate your yesterday's call and the letter of the 27th very much. While I await today's mail let me try to amplify what I said, as best I remember what I said.

Each of your grafts is real and none presents any problem at all.

This book began about a year ago, the suggestion of a liberal lawyer friend whose field is publishing and who has been a publisher. He then said he could place a hasty update of Frame-Up. I told him little of it was needed when there was enough new material for an entirely different book. On the train back I wrote out not an outline as much as a series of statements of what the book would contain because it was not then certain what I would obtain under FOIA and by other means and it was fairly certain all of it could not be published. With his agreement I then proceeded to do what we had agreed to. He proceeded to lose interest and I had no agent.

The book was to examine how each of the institutions of society failed to function in this time of crisis and while telling the story, with specifics, of how each failure covered up fact about the assassination and protected the killers. The third part was to be the new "new evidence." Curtis did not return one of the chapters on the evidence that is now following Frame-Up. I have it laid aside for him, who had expected to be here the day after I received it. (In a sense I intend parts to be a sort of text on a kind of investigative reporting, as I recall by giving the means and the sources.)

At the time of the arrangement with this lawyer I had enough once-suppressed evidence from the FBI to be all that the ~~third~~ third section could need. Now I have enough for a lifetime study of the FBI, which presents an entirely different problem. My problem has always been that my work is detailed, careful and successful enough to produce more than anyone can use and I want it all known and available so society can function and people can learn. His, of course, is the impossibility I seek to make as possible as I can.

What I would now do is handle each item of evidence and proof in part 3 in terms of the allegations about the commission of the crime and the suppressed evidence I now have. This will work out to what will seem like an eye trip to some but I do not intend as that. It will in actuality be that everything I had said earlier, in FrameUp and in the investigations for the habeas corpus petition and in addressing effectiveness of counsel, was precisely correct and to the knowledge of all of public authority was correct. This is not an eye-trip because it shows that if there is a decent analysis and investigation the truth can be determined and the fact established. I think it will be clear that if I could do this with no income and in such bad shape, as I do not say in the book, that I spent part of that time living on feed stamps, it is in other cases and with other situations within the reach of those with sufficient determination and a little know-how.

This can be so dramatic if I had a publisher and could plan. It could now be almost entirely in facsimile, and think that would have enormous impact and would be vital in preserving FOIA. Some time ago I asked Jim what I ask you to think about because he has not responded. He has a friend who is a competent lawyer who works a regular day on a regular job. I wanted each allegation separated as a lawyer can identify allegations and then divided into relevant and irrelevant. There are three sources, the extradition, the proffer of the guilty-plea hearing and the personal statement of the District Attorney General to the State of Tennessee bar. I would then take each and every single allegation, whether or not relevant, and show with the once-suppressed official evidence that a) it is false and b) it was known to all authority to be false. I do mean that I will be proving deliberateness, which gets back to the title The King Conspiracies. I believe there are few lawyers who would not find most of the allegations not relevant to the crime.



The final part will be the solution to the crime. I had figured it out and had put the proof together. It is my original work and it is of childish simplicity. Now I have more - the official proof of identifiably what my 1971 investigation showed. I have this in such form that once again I can use facsimiles - this part in a form that would permit facsimiles in even paperback format. It will have everything but the names and it will have clues to them.

I hope this explains that part enough.

Let me here say that I would like very much to be able to discuss this with you in part because as you say you are not familiar with the subject. While we discuss this an outline could emerge and I think would.

As of now I will be leaving here early the morning of the 9th for Detroit. If a friend whom I've asked to meet me there after the taping of a TV show can I'll spend that night in Detroit and leave for DC on an early plane 2/10, a Thursday. I can spend until 4-4:30 in Washington that Thursday. The station will put me up in a Detroit motel. That and a desire not to put Washington friends out are the reason I've decided not to return to DC the night of the 9th. But I could, if the friend cannot meet me there.

You are right on fear of the exposure of publisher failings. I am quite aware of this. But I think that by now you can see that it is not an illusion that there is reluctance to publish solid work no matter how the author inhibits himself. Perhaps you can now see more of what I've been saying about recasting the role in which I could be socially useful after my initial experiences. But I am quite willing for all the editing anybody wants. If you will look at my handling of Temkin and Bantam you will see that I really handled it out of order to simplify the editing. Nobody ever expecting to sell a reprint to Bantam would print that.

However, I feel that the failures of the daily press are not of the same order and that it cannot be criticized in that way. I think there should be some, particularly about TV. But that working it into the conclusions would be adequate.

Cointelpro: I don't recall whether there is part of Chapter 2 or none of it. I'll have all that is necessary, now as I'd hoped more than if I'd written it in April and I still expect even more. I do mean names and I now have proof that the chief fink actually was part of King's party, actually was driving his assistant around and more. Once again, if publishers generally do not see the possibility, suitable for facsimile. One of the decisions I'll have to make with this relates to how and where to handle the committee. You are absolutely right on this and I did plan it but not rigidly because it is still developing. It might have to be more than just a short chapter. Maybe one chapter could hold it but I think part of the second and at least one other later.

The probabilities of an anniversary appearance are not good. After all, there is no publisher. What this would require is a publisher willing to do what it takes for something like a Bantam "Special" and editing to start pretty promptly. I could complete a draft in plenty of time.

After you phoned Jim did. I told him I'd heard that Zebra had a King book under contract and had not told my agent that. He said he had heard something along this line from Fensterwald but without specifics, that his impression is that Zebra did have another book in mind but that the deal had fallen through. (I did tell Curtis to warn them against another McDonald fake.) In addition to what I've sent you I began by writing Curtis that if Zebra was serious I'd go to New York, lay out what I have that I have not written and would edit as they wanted. I had been making extra copies of some of the new evidence for such a purpose and in fact my wife is right this minute making more copies for me. Actually I have several file cabinets full already. Besides my original work.

Maybe this will give you more for added helpful, independent thinking. Maybe the mail is here now, too. If I can I'll be in Washington some day this coming week, not Wednesday. I don't remember if I sent you a copy of what the div. xxx Oregon just wrote me as with undisguised satisfaction I do. Many, many thanks. "