2/12/75

Dear Les,

"Prejudiced against you [my]" and "hangups," my word and applicable also to the areas of my work, are not really identical.

I want to say nothing now and I now want nothing said about what I have on CIA subveillance of me. It could not be more solid and I'll use it my way. I have never sought personal publicity and I don't now. I want use to accomplish more and other purposes.

I'd have thought you knew Joe Goulden (not Goulding). When you say you found the Washingtonian story "intruiging" I am left to wonder how.

For whatever it is worth to you for reasons having nothing to do with mistmist of him - and I did not mistrust him- I asked that he tape the interview and return the tapes to me. He says diamertically opposite what I told him, and in very considerable detail, conspicuously on "conspiracy theories," a subject on which I have been in dispute with almost all others working of merely claiming to be working in these areas.

In short, he lied deliberately and I cannot but wonder why. Especially when he returned the tapes as he was supposed to have, prior to the appearance of the piece. When I heard of what he wrote I wrote him and Lempert. Both have been silent since. Not even pro forma denial of my accusations. I've since read the piece and it was reported to me faithfully: he intended and he wrote an ax job.

You seem to have accepted his bullshit uncritically in saying what you do about "conspiracy theories." None are mine. I deal with fact.

In this letter you show no concern for readily available fact with regard to the JFK assassination. It is not "theory" to say that it was the result of a conspiracy. It is theorizing to claim to know who the parties to the conspiracy were. I make no such claim and never have.

If you have any doubts about the King assassination they can come only from indifference to the readily available fact. By this I again mean not who did it but was there a conspiracy. There has already been more than enough of my work on this tested in court. And it stacked - wasn't even attacked by the State.

Should you doubt this and want an impartial opinion, try Mo Waldron. The last thing he said before the State copped out on rebuttal in the recent evidentiary hearing was a fine compliment. He wrapped that big bear arm around me in the corridor and said, "Harold, you old bastard, don't you know what overkill is?"

See, sometimes I don't mind being called a bastard.

(Between us Jim Lesar and I had "kidnapped" each and every one of the State's rebuttal witnesses, all also surprise witnesses. They submitted a fake list to the court, which had no objections.)

Most people have a notion that belief should be based on fact. Mine is that those who give people in a representative society what the people need to make representative society work ought have enough familiarity with fact not to tell people what is not helpful to the working of representative society. On the more important questions, what will not frustrate the working of the kind of society we are supposed to have.

If before this disgraceful Goulden performance someone told you that I hold those kinds of belief, I'd be interested in knowing because it was a deception that could not be accidental.

Sincerely,

JACK ANDERSON
1401 Sixteenth Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20036

LES WHITTEN

Feb. 10

Dear Harold,

Like you we are totally swamped. Chuck left us two or three years ago and I don't know what he did with the material.

The column isn't prejudiced against you. And if you have some proof of the CIA surveillance, we'd love to break it. But it would have to be solid.

I saw the stuff in [redacted] Washingtonian by Joe Goulding and found it intriguing. While I'm personally dubious about the Kennedy's and King conspiracy theories, it does seem like something was whacky in the King case.

Best,

Les Whitten