

Mr. Donald McLaughlin  
National Enquirer  
600 South East Coast Ave.,  
Lantana, Fla. 33462

6/27/76

Dear lucky friend who actually got a day off,

when Rod phoned me with what is more than just bad news to me. He was to have phoned me back. I presume he got tied up.

I have not had time to think it through because I work a long day, limitations or no limitations, and still can't keep up with what I want to do. My thinking time is limited to when I walk for exercise and when I sit to let the sweat run its course after exertions like mowing.

I look back on some incredibly bad editorial judgements down there, some super stories that have been muffed, and I wonder why when your paper has been so successful. Without knowing I'm inclined to believe that it is because for so long the orientation, which accounts for the spectacular success, has been away from the serious stories that attract all readers and because the standards that have earned this unprecedented success cannot be applied to serious yet popular stories.

If your best brains and management ever really seriously think through what I suggested to Bill when he was here, building and earning prestige at the same time, I am sure this will change. Until then it is hard on me and costly.

If I do not for a minute think that "ope's rejection of what by all normal journalistic standards with which I have been familiar for those of my 63 years in which it was possible for me to discriminate is because he is some kind of secret CIA agent, I do believe he has again blown a live one. I remind you that two years before it came out I gave the Enquirer a CIA record the pursuit of which would have given it an unprecedented international scoop on the CIA's toying with minds, leading to the killing of one of their own. Now you have for a very long time in which I was foreclosed been sitting on a major, serious and absolutely solid while completely simple story on one of the Enquirer's major interest for years, the JFK assassination. It is only in the totally unnecessary complicating of this story that the Enquirer has bogged us both down to where I now just do not have time to go elsewhere with it.

To be honest with you, I probably would not have tried to sell it. I'd have given it away. My experience with the straight press is that it is neither honest nor without a past with which to live on this subject. With the Oswald paraffin casts you've been sitting on for a year or more I would have made an effort. Here again you specialists in simplicity lost yourselves in a combination of needless complications of a very simple story and consultation with a man who is parti pris in it. Had I been consulted you'd not have made that mistake. I've been trying to get that material back for a half year.

Now, when I'm too pressed for time to make any efforts with it and when the time is not propitious, Rod tells me it is being returned.

What changes all of this is the appearance of the Schweiker report. I'll return to this with what I hope will appeal to you (pl.).

I appreciate the hundred dollars you promised me as a consolation prize. It will repay two-thirds of the xeroxing cost alone of getting those records. There were other costs. Six to eight weeks is a long time for a decision on topical matter. It hurt me.

The Schweiker report is an outrageous, deliberate, knowingly irrelevant dishonesty. It accomplishes what I once would have considered impossible. Most people who know my work will also consider what I'm going to tell you impossible. I believe that of those whose criticism and exposures are solidly factual I am the foremost critic of the spooks. Schweiker was grossly unfair to them. He invented a non-existing case by taking a CIA ploy and running wild with it, so wild that he was quite unjust to them. He is entirely

without factual foundation when he pretends it and one side of the pretense is based on a factual error in time and circumstances.

A so-called "liberal" Republican manufacturing a case against the spooks while totally exculpating the Commission that was in actual charge of that investigation? And doing it on a tangeant that, were he not in error, still assures irrelevancy? The media boys who live on leaks and handouts, not knowledge and personal work, have missed it all, even the sycophants.

There are enough people there who know that when I say I have something I do and when I represent something as fact they have never found it to be otherwise. On this one I can even go into what I offered Schweiker last October, no strings attached, even no credit to me. It was on a day in which I was, literally, in agony. I then went to the hospital with this serious phlebitis. He is witting. He suppressed. He even suppressed known names, like that of the guy in Mexico who fabricated what he hoped would lead the U.S. to attack Cuba - probably the first nuclear war. Russia was bound to defend Cuba.

I have not had time to read my way through all those files Bill saw. I understand they include the unpublished admission that the man on whose perjury half of Schweiker's non-existent case is built also was CIA.

If this is of interest let me know. But this time I want conditions that do not guarantee me problems and loses no matter what I'm paid. I will want to know when it can appear and how much it will mean to me. If either is not acceptable I'll just forget it. Without hard feelings. I'm in four current cases in court, I'm preparing to file others, I have a book two-thirds written and I've not been able to touch it for about two months and these things mean something to me.

So that I may be able to understand what I now cannot, it would be helpful to me is when we speak sometimes you can explain to me how it is not a story when the CIA lies about now having a copy of the Zapruder film (and from the know record their having a copy is impossible except if Time-Life is one of their "assets") yet within two days completes the world's most competent photographic analysis that says exactly opposite what the President's Commission said and thereby proves there had been a conspiracy:

The President was shot earlier than admitted;

He and Governor Connally were not hit by a single bullet.

Without the latter, as I believe you know, there is nothing left of the Warren Report. With the former the same is true plus the certainty that Oswald could not have fired that shot.

There is more but I'm restricting myself to the simple.

This is new, entirely unknown and unpublished, and I'm baffled that it is a non-story. Especially to a paper that came to me for examples of what was withheld from the Warren Commission, as this was. I'm also perplexed that when it was in the possession of the Rockefeller Commission it both suppressed it and reported otherwise and that also is not a story.

This old dog's gonna have to learn new tricks if I'm to be able to give you what you can use.

Excuse the tupos I think you'll understand. I'm tired from a long hot day and have more to do before bed.

Best regards,