

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
11/22/73

Dear Marc and Richard,

One of the few surprises of the past year and a half is that you scholars did not ask if I knew anything about the Watergate, in either sense. From the first I knew what has not yet become public and little by little learn^{ed} more that has not and shows no signs of getting out. I am, consistent with the past, finding it impossible to give away what on almost any other topic would be the most sensational news.

This is another way of saying do not be deceived by the Nixon attack on the press or by the amount of space devoted to the story. Nor should you be deceived by the awarding of the Pulitzer Prize for "investigative" journalism. The reporting deserved the honor but it not only was not "investigative", the Post has from the first refused to really investigate. Here it has no monopoly, and here is another facet of the value of my files to scholars of the future. I will not take time to tell you all that I gave various people, including Bernstein and Woodward -yes, I even tried the national desk- that the Post would not touch. They have been sitting for more than two weeks on the 40 pages they wanted of my files on Jaworski. The little that has appeared dealing with his past (whitewasher and CIA money launderer) has appeared in few places and nobody in Washington would touch it. Same on Ford, where I've initiated another tack. That Ford swore falsely 11/5 is the least of it. However, it is not easy having to sit on the mountainside, figure things out, get the few willing friends to do what I ask and still write on other aspects all the while with no income and accumulating problems.

There has been no time since before the first indictments when I was not in a position to produce what could have caused great sensations if given proper attention. The timing in Nixon's defense is essential to it. However, everyone is hungup and the papers are dominated by pseudo-statesmanship rather than traditional news judgements.

Not until this May did I decide to lay other work aside and do a Watergate book that would put the story in context, with the break-in the least significant part of the concatenation of crimes. Since then I have been reliving my experiences with Whitewash and the subsequent books with this exception: my (same) car and I are older, a little less vigorous (although I still at 60 work a day none of my young friends can last through, and the repeated trips to New York are beyond me. I'm too deep in debt and can't now run the risks I then did.

First in May and then a little later I had approaches from two different German publishers of whom I'd never heard. The enthusiasm of the first and his interests controlled how I started the writing. Were I to start again, I'd start differently. Now there is so much to do I can't go back and start over again. I have about 500 pages of what will be the world's longest book retyped. Of course, I have no editing. And I'm not into the hottest yet.

After initial, excited inquiry, probably based on Whitewash, these two Germans fell silent. I wrote Inge Feltrinelli. Giangiacomo published Whitewash and then demanded an excessively polemical J'Accuse of me which I told him could not then be honestly written. Her reply was to express great concern for my personal safety and ask for an outline. To this I responded that with a breaking story I could not honorably supply an outline to which I could guarantee I would adhere but I would be glad to show what I already had and to explain what I expect to be able to do and prove as well as what I had already written. She has an American representative. No response. I then completed what I call a chapter but is really a "part", dealing with the American Police State and what you have not yet seen out together as I have done it. This is close to what Giangiacomo wanted of me. I asked if she'd like to see this and no response again.

So, I learned about hot irons as an infant and I know where I am.

Meanwhile, I also know that I am doing what nobody else will do. By now you should know that when I say this there is a history to substantiate it. Aside from whether I can ever be publishable there is the question should these things await the coming generations.

Indulge what may seem like a boast but really isn't, really is an indictment of what we can expect in time of great political crisis. In all these words that my wife has already retyped, there is but a single factual correction to make and a single error. And these are heavier than usual pages, to save time and even the cost of paper, which is a burden to us. After I wrote it I realized I had reversed the two names of CREEP and after Segretti testified one small alteration became necessary. (The stuff that has gotten major attention is minor in what I am writing. I do not, for example, treat his operation separately. That is appropriate in a relash of what has been published but not in a book with context for the crimes.) More, my notes accurately forecast developments, to this fineness of detail: I wrote some of Nixon's statements before he made them. This for my own information and so I could test my analysis and for the guidance of a few who I had assisting me. However, by this I really mean you should see how easy it was to anticipate him and developments.) Perhaps I am wrong, but I think that to have put so much more than the volume of information than an average book has on paper and with a story that is still breaking and after all this time need editorial work only tells me I am firmly on top of the whole thing.

One of the problems of dealing with a breaking story is to deal with what has least chance of being altered by developments first. This, of course, I have done. However, in what I have yet to write, there is new information only, not information that means my analysis was wrong. I wrote large hunks in advance as they occurred to me and as I found moments of time and they stand still. This includes big hunks on the suppression of information, even the covering-up of the Ervin committee. I had my own way of testing this. I did anticipate it. What I wrote in June and July stands today.

Beginning in 1967 I had to change my approach in my work. By now it has become part of me and it is not good. By then I had two very intensive years of learning the hard way that I and what I write are the closest thing to unpublished. This has required of me, as I see my obligation, what is generally considered prolixity. I make a record for history. In some cases it is by little more than ellipsis. But I leave both a record and a guide where I can't responsibly do more. In this book it means that I am combining perhaps a half-dozen. One of my objectives is to make the incomprehensible comprehensible. Another is to make the incredible credible. In short, I am trying what the one agent I've spoke to says is beyond the capacity of any one man: I'm telling the entire story in context. And for fairly thorough treatments of Nixon's past I did not have to leave home. I have not once been in a library on this. The only work I've had done for me in libraries is minor checking of the kind that occurs to the analyst and investigator, not the scholar. Xeroxes of pages of the index of the writing of others that interests me. To see what is omitted. The complexity is greater than this agent visualized but the project is not impossible.

The title on which I decided in May is Watergate:Fascism's Floodgate. The double entendre was intended. You never read the book from which Frame-Up was edited out. I called it Coup d'Etat. What I ~~was~~ saw earlier and started writing in 1968 is so topical today that I have incorporated two hunks of it in what I have written. I even anticipated the misuse of demonstrations by the fascists. And some of my own sources now tell me that inside the intelligence community there is concern by those who do not want it that there may now be a coup. My view is that we have been having a growing Ameriform one since 10 years ago today.

I do not know what you may be willing to try to do. I do know that you have your own not inconsiderable problems and that even without them there would be limits on the possible. However, I do believe that what I am doing should be done and I do not believe it will be by anyone else. If you had the slightest idea of what the papers, and I mean many, Time and the TV nets, too, have refused to do anything about; what members and committees of the Congress will not touch and worse, have suppressed when they had it (I have generous samples), you might find this more comprehensible. Again I invite you to come up and learn.

Aside from literary evaluation I believe I have enough to make the difference with both Nixon and Ford, even today. If there is not 100% abdication. (In the House

I have written Waddle, who does not know me, and Conyers, who does, without response. A friend who has been checking some of the newer leads I have on Ford tells me it yielded more than I expected and should be enough to block confirmation. Substantiation of what I had should have been enough. He tells me it is much more than I hoped for. Over my phone I discouraged any details, so this is all I know and will know until tomorrow. In ordinary times what I had before these leads should have been enough. However, today you have seen no reporting of his perjury or his personal crookedness. You have not seen any reporting of my recording of this in a freedom-of-information suit I filed. I believe it is a not unfair evaluation to say what I have can be the same with Nixon himself and if I do not have all of it, I have enough to account for his visible nervousness when he is before the press. He knows the questions to fear. I have a number of them, with answers, and I can tie him and Ford to what they have not been tied to. They should worry and we should worry about what can happen when it is known.

I think you can understand my reluctance to speak of such things on the phone or to send them through the mail where there is reason to believe interception is possible on both ends. I have a number of proofs of interference with my own, as I have carbons of surveillance on me and confessions in one case so precise I was told what I said when, to whom and over what phone not my own. No, not yours.

I will mail this when I go into town to meet someone who is coming by bus.

Tomorrow and Saturday I will be in Washington, Bud having euchred me into speaking at his Georgetown conference by the false assurance that there would be no nuts on the program. I feel I must keep my word if he hasn't. And I will be at his cocktail party Friday night on the chance that someone of substance may be there. If you have any interest, I can meet with you after the mess is over Saturday, before I come home. I will also be in Washington Tuesday the 27th for my annual checkup and conferences with Jim Lesar on FOI suits, including more I want to file. However, I will not discuss these things in your offices.

So you will not have to take everything on faith I specify two items that eventually did become news that nobody would touch when I tried to get them used in advance.

I had my own ways of knowing about Nixon's crookedness with propriety and I also remembered he had a public record of this I have not seen recalled anywhere except in what I have written. I could get no journalistic interest. So, I tried to use the FOI law with this with the White House. My response is from John Dean, when his hair was still fair. I gave copies long before the wrong story broke to the Post, LATimes, Time and a number of political figures, including on the Senate Judiciary committee. Among those who did not respond is Sam Dash personally. I made more than a dozen mailings with and without enclosed copies.

Hunt wanted to be an assassin. It was about February when I had the proof and started making offers, without asking a penny. Two Post reporters, Carl and Bob, were aghast but declined to accept a non-clandestine tape with Hunt saying it. CBS did not respond. I knew the inevitable so I gave it to a friend on The Times of London and stopped off and left it at NBC News on the way home. Four letters asking its return were not answers, so I finally had to go retrieve it and the related evidence. The Times of London front-paged the story and no American paper picked it up.

I could go on and on this way, but there is no need. If you know your business as I think you do you know this without proof.

So, have you any ideas where I can get any kind of help?

Sincerely,

Barry Sussman has a contract with Random House. His focus is on the obstruction of justice and I have been encouraging him to deliver.