

9/20/75

Dear Bill,

The subjects of our last two conversations come together in what I think can make an Enquirer story that can add even more impact to that on JFK.

When you told me the story had been agreed to I suggested what I never have before, that you have a companion promotional but legitimate story, of the one-American's, 10-year fight against corrupt bureaucracy to take to the people the truth about how their President was killed and how the government lied about it.

I know from quite extensive and entirely unsolicited mail from total strangers that this strikes a resonant chord. There is virtually no day in which I do not get a letter of this kind and from people I've never heard of, people who have to go to some trouble even to learn how to write me. My books do not say this. I have never said it. But people perceive it, even those whose letters are barely literate.

There is nothing in your story - and I haven't even seen it - that I did not have to fight the corrupt bureaucracy to get. Imagine having to sue as often as I did and then to sue without resources of any kind except determination and knowledge! And then the counterpart that is in the earlier parts of the book, having to contend with the added crookedness of government in denying documents to me, illegally, so they could arrange to leak them to a reporter who lacked my knowledge of the subject to get the kind of story officialdom wanted while denying me the right to my own work and the chance to tell the people the truth. ‡

When I spoke to you briefly from the airport I told you there have been cases. There is one in the book, invoking Fred Graham, then with the New York Times, and the Archivist's denial to me of the CIA-family contract. Giving it exclusively to Graham - and begging him to ask for it under the law under which it had already been refused to me assured an anti-Kennedy story, one that would falsely blame the President's survivors for suppression of evidence they could not and did not suppress.

When I phoned you yesterday it was after Jim Lesar phoned me to tell me that the Star had a piece that clearly comes from my work, which is not mentioned in it. He mentioned one word that tells me there is something of this involved. Until I read the story, probably the series, I can't be sure, but I'll make you a bet at modest odds that I'll be able to make out such a case and provide you with documents that will make a solid case, whether or not of evidence that will meet court requirements, that Szulc has been fed what I'm appealing and would get in court. That one word I had mentioned to you and Rod should remember my mentioning it to him: Nosenko. Remember I told you there is quite a Nosenko story the Enquirer missed and that I had a large part of it? I have the rest under appeal at both the Archives and the CIA. I have records showing both are stonewalling. I have even filed suit for some of this. It is C.A. 1448-75.

The people involved in this story can't know it of their own knowledge. It has to be a case where one of the officials involved violates the law and regulations to leak what will deny me the story and will probably give it a special twist that some official today wants. It may well involve what I detected a long time ago, that the FBI and CIA are now engaged in internecine warfare over this.

Once you start dealing with me on stories on this subject this also involves you. I think it will make a sensational story and an Enquirer story. Until I take the book I'm working on for copyrighting they don't know what I'm working on so they have to guess. The natural guess is the newest effort, the newest suit. It is a hell of a way to have to work, but with each step I have to figure what crooked officials will do and how to outwit them. Ed may remember my explanations of this to him while we were driving, before this came up. I've filed no suit to telegraph your story. Hastily,