

Dear Les,

6/29/76

What follows is something I once started to talk to you about but never finished.

I'm sorry I didn't think of it earlier, when I first got up, because soon I'll have to take lil grocery shopping, then there will be the mail and then the work for on FOIA suit I started 10 days ago and had to lay aside for other to me emergency work on other cases. There has been no writing for about six weeks, that many other needs. This also means my advance apologies for typos: I won't have time to correct.

For some time I've been sitting on a series of I think important stories on the JFK assassination. I haven't had much choice. While for the most part I'm willing to give these away, there today are few takers. This within my experience is the state of the press today.

The one thing certain to cause identification as an odd-ball is a genuine concern for the state of the country, its institutions and the press as an institution.

I don't recommend your taking the time to read the Schweiker report, which is as Orwellian an operation as I've seen since the Warren Report itself, but if you have a copy, read the first paragraph under the first italicized ~~xxx~~ subhead on the first page and ask yourself how come you saw nothing about that totally disqualifying limitation in any news account. I think it makes all that follows irrelevant as in fact, save within narrow confines not even suggested, it is - totally irrelevant. I can go into this is anyone has any interest. I've annotated a copy of the report for the future, not likely for my own writing.

The major-media attitude has reduced me to making attempts with the Enquirer. Pope is a mad genius. In the area of his own original developments he has been remarkable. In solid news he is crazy. Once I sold them a major story that was without possibility of libel or any other problems. You know me and documents. They had 'em. But they sent a really fine reporter here to check that one story out for three days. This is enough to eliminate any possibility of profit for a story for which the pay is good. However, I've had no real choice. And their record on news judgement, if that is the factor, is incredibly bad. I gave them the documentary leads on the CIA and mind-toying with drugs several years before it broke. They did not see it. I've been trying to get back the secret records on the testing of the casts made on Oswald. They prove he did not fire a rifle. Despite the Enquirer's record of specializing in simplicity, they get something like this and they complicate it out of their own comprehension.

The people I've been dealing with are friends and good reporters. Pope is just a dictator not trusting anyone else's news judgement. He may have a few political hangups.

About two months ago, maybe a little less, they sent one of their best men up. It was when there was the leak from the Schweiker operation that the agencies had withheld evidence from the Warren Commission. Well, I've plenty of that. So I thought of one that should have been aure-fire and with any attention should break the whole thing wide open. Their man, now free-lancing but one of their former top editors recently retired, went for it big. Since then they've been sitting and thinking of crazy things to do. That particular editor had a day of Friday, a reporter friend sat in his slot, phoned me and told me they had nixed it. He said he'd talk about it more because he sees it as a major story. Yesterday he could add nothing but said he'd try the approach I suggested to begin with, very simple.

What makes it all crazier still is that they obtained the one thing that could be helpful on their own in the first thing they did.

What I'm talking about is proof positive that all the agencies knew at the very beginning that the official account of the assassination was false, proof that it was beyond the capability of any one man, meaning conspiracy, and continuing suppression of it with an added twist, CIA spooking.

You should recall this as the official account of the shooting: The first or "magic" bullet struck the President in the back of the neck, transitted it and then inflicted five non-fatal wounds on Connally. The second missed entirely, struck a curbstone and a spray of concrete wounded a bystander a block away. The third blew the head open. And this is all the shooting.

You probably don't know that the records indicate the CIA never saw the Zapruder film, the basic one of the assassination. They asked for a copy after the end of the Commission's life. I got Hoover's letter asking Raking what to do and published it in my third book. The ostensible purpose was "training." Naturally my footnotes ask whether for training assassins or teaching them how not to be caught.

Now I have those CIA records not earlier purged. They had the National Photographic Interpretation Center, their operation and we're told the world's best, study this film. What the Enquirer's checking with CIA established is when: within the first two days. And as of today this is unpublished, as are the results of that professional study:

The first bullet hit Kennedy in the throat, not the back of the neck.

The second one hit Connally.

The third was fatal, to the head.

The film cannot, of course, show missed shots.

By itself this is totally destructive of the official account. People have become insensitive, but I never forget this was the account of the killing of a President, with all that means.

The photo studies are further destructive in saying the first shot was much earlier, at a time when it could not have been by Oswald or from that window.

Of all those who have suppressed this, beginning with the CIA by 11/24/64, the day Oswald was killed, the two most recent are the Rockefeller Commission and the Church/Schweiker committee. I have the papers the CIA gave both. They are in this form:

A typed covering letter to Olson on the Rockefeller Commission explaining the limited enclosures. Naturally on something as utterly inconsequential as the assassination of a President they did not take special pains with their files. So they can find no typed analyses, reports, etc. Only they did find these few pages or handwritten notations.

However, they could not be more explicit, more definitive. They say more than the simplification I think is by any standard a major story, more so today with the overtones I'm not mentioning to keep it simple.

To me it is gruesome that a decade after the crime we have a Presidential commission appointed by the man who failed his 1964 responsibility, in charge of his then associate, they elect to go into this aspect and totally suppress such evidence; and then a Senate subcommittee run by a man the same President's men leak may be a possible vice-presidential selectee, the Senate is supposed to investigate these intelligence sins and it, too, suppresses the same evidence - without which it could not have written the report that issued. And separately if there is interest what that accomplishes. "let's keep it simple."

The papers have this thing that they do not buy information or pay non-staffers. They pay wire-services, janitors, secretaries and others but have this excuse for not doing what generally they just don't want to do. And I have this thing of having no regular income and considerable expenses in developing this kind of evidence. I also have an opinion of the wealthy elements of the press who will do nothing to help bring hard news to light and then take it free.

After your first Invaders story I wrote Ken Brief, you may remember. The lack of response does not encourage me to believe your people will go for this. But I'd like to know before I turn elsewhere. And much as this cost they don't have to pay me. Instead they can make a contribution to meet unsupported FOIA expenses, for work that will be

given away as soon as I obtain results. There will be nothing for me or for Jim in it. We still work without regular income or help or ease and will. But we do have legal expenses we right now can't meet. Some time ago I mentioned to you the costs of copying and perhaps deposing in the King case. Yesterday Jim reminded me of the costs if as we hope and think we establish a precedent in a precedent suit, the first under the new law, the one over which it was amended to begin with - all without a single news story, I add, by the major beneficiaries, the major media.

We have already won the right to discovery against the CIA - unheard of. This is the work I had to lay aside, preparing for interrogatories.

We expect to win the right to depose those FBI agents whose early retirements we forced in the coming appeals court decision. These are the guys who fudged up all the scientific evidence for Hoover.

This may seem unimportant but it is vastly significant in principle and in what it means to papers when they go after stories and suppressed evidence. It is vital to the viability of the law, which the agencies are already lobbying to gut.

So I'm not asking for payment, much as my everyday needs cry out for it. I'm asking only for something pro bono - a contribution to what serves all the press and is absolutely without meaning to me in my own writing, which is paying heavily for the work I'm doing to try to make it possible for the major media to do better and more.

In fact, I wouldn't even want to see the check. If necessary Jim could set up a separate account, draw on it by check only and have receipts for everything.

~~Those~~ <sup>Those</sup> who do not live as we do may not understand that we do and have to shoe-string it all against this enormous power. Small xeroxing costs mount up for people we are without support or regular income. For example, yesterday \$53.00~~00~~ to the Archives for papers we have to present in court, plus the cost of quadruple re-xeroxing. Fortunately a Hollywood friend had just sent me \$250 and I had already sent it to Jim, so the \$55 that was in my despit account at the Archives remains there for the next emergency.

I guess I don't have to make these explanations to you. You know how it is.

Would you please see if there is any interest with your people and let me know as soon as you can? I don't expect to hear from the Enquirer but I may. If I do not soon and have heard nothing from you I'll make other efforts.

I haven't gone into the unnecessary fortification I have for this story that stands alone. But I have from the Warren Commission's own files the initial analyses of the same film by the FBI and Secret Service. They both, independently give the same sequence of hits also without accounting for the missed shot and neither permitting one bullet to have struck both men.

For all the evil in the agencies Schweiker has been grossly unfair to them. He has deliberately exculpated the Warren (Ford) Commission, which was in charge, and has placed the blame for the failures of the inquiry on those not in charge. How better serve the candidate if not history and a decent society?

Hastily,