

11/2/77

Dear Ted,

When you asked me about the "blockbuster" story I asked Jim to please keep all the stories he saw. As I told you I saw him today, after we were in court, about this. Made copies of all of them in Washington so I could mail them in the morning. They are all enclosed, even if they are duplicates. This is so you will know exactly what coverage there was, exactly what was printed. With the NYTimes, there is a different edition than the late city one that gets to Washington so I've included them, too.

I'm writing this in haste, not to get a chance to forget in the press of other work of which I may be able to say something soon. But it was a full court and conference day, with several more scheduled as a result. That and the thinking it requires have forced this to the back of my mind, even though I read the clips on the bus trip home. So I'm not clear on whether the story in which Stokes confirmed what Mark said is here. I do not recall that it was in what I read.

However, George Lardner phoned me yesterday about the Sturgis arrest. As a result the Post did not go for the Lorenz hokum about being with Oswald in Florida, etc. While we were talking I asked him what he heard from the committee. He had seen Stokes, who does not like him or what he has been writing, and Richardson Preyer, of whom he last year expressed a high opinion. Again on part my recollection now is not clear, but I am certain that Stokes, without saying anything more, did say substantially what Mark appears to have said. The blockbuster bit.

I'll be more than pleased if this is not another phoney or not another manifestation of abysmal ignorance of the case and what is and is not new in it. I can make several guesses of what in my work would be regarded as "blockbuster" by those who do not care to let it be known that it is not new.

Please keep it to yourself until this lawsuit is over, and it is far from over and may yet go to trial. But I have received more records than anyone in history with the exception of the Meerpols according to DJ. And I'm still going for more. How many?

More than 44,000 pages!

To make the need for not going public clear, there have been extensive withholdings within this tremendous pile of papers. I'm fighting to get what is withheld from them as well as the remaining records not provided. There is one exception to my not letting any of these records out now. You will become aware of it in a week or less.

Even then I did not do it until the FBI claimed to have complied fully, and in court.

If your story on the blockbuster is different I'd appreciate a copy of it.

Our edition of the Post, which I've not yet seen, did not have the story about the DJ or FBI releasing all those JFK records. I know I've been after them all, beginning in 1968 under the law, and they have 25 or more of my FOIA requests before them. If you got the late city edition of the Times today I'd appreciate a copy of that story. I'd heard a rumor that this was happening yesterday. Boy what a fortune those records will cost!

But I will go about seeking to get them.

Best,