

4/30/74

Dear Walter,

A psychologist who knows me once told me that he has never met a man as impossible to deter once he has decided there is something he must do.

Of course it can also be argued that there is a decade of proof that I am crazy to persist in a work so unwelcome.

When I add to this that with regularity I see and do what others do not, I need not be told that I am adding to the crazy description what can be taken as an astounding self-concept. (My own view is not that I am so great but that incompetence is so common.)

So here I am, so soon after a conversation the import of which was clear, writing you first thing the morning after our Glorious Leader's imperishable words.

I am not easily deterred. When I finish this I will go down to the broken dam and resume my lone efforts to repair it with logs so heavy two strong men can't lift one end. (This is the work that sent me to the hospital two weeks ago and as a consequence of which I still have pending medical appointments.) If I do not do this - and I can't hire others to do it for me - then our beautiful golden trout and bass so tame they come at the sound of my voice will not have fresh water.

And if this sounds truly crazy, well, I've figured out how Archimedes will help me.

Given the need and the will, there is always a way.

Of these two immediate tasks, the dam is the easier one.

My immediate inspiration is what Nixon's speech of last night means and the enormous potential it adds to the work I discussed with you, the new Watergate book that means junking all the great amount of work I have done except, possibly, as an historical record. (Yet because you have read it, I ask you if after a year there is any error in it you can recall and if what did not then seem prolix is not now in point - even to having a chapter on Nixon as a Cannibal, and another on him as a common crook long before the stories on it broke.)

What Nixon's latest means is that the importance of my new project is incalculably greater. Until I read the text of his speech I can't be certain, but it is my belief that he focused on each part.

What he has done is dare the ultimate in dishonesty, corrupt the evidence and then offer it under conditions that preclude proving it is corrupted. He has then utterly and completely misrepresented it. Aside from what I will write and so there can be an independent assessment of my "instant analysis" I'll note a few things jotted down while I was watching him. The postmark will make my timing obvious. I'll mail this when I go to the dam, which is near our mailbox.

There is no power that can make him give up the original evidence, so how can it be proven that he has corrupted it? Power can't, but I can. I have the documentary proof in my possession and it is entirely beyond any questioning. (Here a few omissions in his speech will add point.)

His whole game, as you may remember I wrote a year ago, when it was not clear and never mentioned in the press, was to stall and to divert. This is exactly what he did again last night.

Among the side issues on which the country will again be torn apart are whether he edited the tapes and then is releasing selections of the edited transcripts; whether (and the answer is "no") this is legally acceptable; whether he made full response (no on all counts); whether what he is offering is competent evidence (no); whether he is in open violation of other law (yes, the Jencks Act, and it alone is enough to exculpate his

already charged criminal associates like Haldeman, Ehrlichman, et al.; whether he will permit technical experts to examine the "original" tapes for evidence of doctoring (again no because he dare not); and whether he will permit the only ones who can be competent (and not in my terms but those generally accepted) to examine the tapes against the transcripts (normally only counsel does this, not judges); and a number of other items I need not include for this is enough to establish credentials or lack of them.

We get the bulldog edition of the Washington Post and I've not yet read it but it can't possibly address these things because it did not have time.

Other side issues will be varying interpretations of meaning (as on hushmoney, which was paid almost the minute he claims he said it must not be \$75,000 more to Hunt; whether or not he is cannibalizing others for his own survival; whether or not he is unfair to others or has damaged them; and again I need not add.

I take his appearance to mean that he expects this seemingly daring act to be not only one he can and will get away with but one that will give him a reasonable prospect if not the certainty of being able to stall everything through the balance of his term.

He knows neither the Congress nor the courts can accept his diktat, so he will battle endlessly on that

I hope you and others will recognize that I am, in effect, laying a reputation on the line in this kind of spelling out before there has been the possibility of getting the opinions of so-called experts save for the comment, limited as it was, at the end of his shining from the tube. (Not one of the nets filled up the balance of the hour with it. I know. I switched to all.)

Except to claim that I have the answers, each with proofs, to most of those questions that have not been answered and from which he has already led almost everyone away, I am telling you nothing about the proofs I have. What I have I will show to anyone with a serious interest in publishing. I have every reason to believe this can't include Sartan. But with the future of a country at stake and with all its money and all the writers on whom it can draw having come up with nothing of substance, why not make another effort?

As I have told you, if anything can make the difference now, I have it and it is absolutely solid. In almost all cases I expect to include the sources with the documentation. There are a few in which I can't, but I will, of course, show them. I can't print the names of those who gave me secrets.

It would be irresponsible for anyone to consider this kind of book without examination of this kind of evidence and it is physically impossible for me to transport it. (I do have copies of the hottest out of my possession, so it will not be lost by accident.)

I am also talking about crimes that are not only not charged but are not even indicated. In each and every case of this I have documentary proof. This includes but is by no means limited to all three top honchos at the CIA. It includes the common crime Nixon described as of the highest priority in national security (Hunt called it "sissy" and it was not limited to the Kilsberg job -again, I have documentary proof that has been suppressed, official documents internally identified beyond question).

I could continue this but I'm getting to the bottom of my after-breakfast coffee, the dam calls, history of me and publishers is clear, and there is a forecast of 90+ temperature again today I'm not going to be completely foolhardy. In fact - and with apologies - I'm not even going to correct my typos because if you pass this on I still expect nothing.

I will mention my plans. I have just been able to pay the bank off by collecting enough of the small fortunes out of which I have been gypped. I will not go into debt again for another underground printing (the earlier ones were profitable.) But I will do this as another underground book, in the hope that at some point there may be financing for it. If I were not confident that despite the many enemies it will make and without a penny for advertising and promotion I can and would make a success of it I would not begin. There are enough in Congress who need it to assure this. I have done what they haven't.