

12/22/75

Dear Jim,

After reading his yesterday's story I phoned Chapman at the Post national desk, knowing he did not work Sundays, and left a message to the effect that he had been imposed upon, with some specifics. I was told he'd be phoned and would phone me. He did today, after lunch.

He could not believe that he had been "used," the word I employed, because the interview, with Pottinger personally, was his idea. By coincidence that of the LA Times, too, because they had a similar story on their weekend wire. I was told of it today.

I can't take time for the entire conversation. However, it is even more clear to me that at least the FBI is ~~xxxxxx~~ uptight about C.A.75-1996 and that nowhere within DJ is there not awareness of this and among some a feeling of guilt and a need to bypass all that is relevant by focusing reporterial attention on the irrelevant. Pottinger can't have looked into the King case at all without knowing that he was engaging in deliberate deception with an underinformed reporter in what Chapman wrote.

Chapman may think he conducted an interview but I don't. All he did was let Pottinger tell him what to write. There is no innocence in all the false postulates and deceptive answers. And the wrong questions not answered or answered less than honestly.

It also appears that Chapman asked no questions about the new evidence I offered the 11th. If he did not leave with a copy of all of it that was his election because everyone present was offered a set. And that Pottinger pretended it does not exist. ~~He~~ <sup>Chapman</sup> was aware of but apparently asked no questions about what he called a 1971 review by Civil Rights. I updated him, telling him they call it 1970, say ~~that~~ it was then inspired by Ray's efforts (at that time there were none) and that it had to have begun in 1969, in reaction to C.A.718-70, which began much earlier than it was filed.

I've been interrupted a couple of times, more recently with that crazy Eddowes stuff Earl Golz wrote about in the Dallas Times-Herald. So, I've no time for more. However, the Pottinger/Levi operation, whether or not to be keyed ~~into~~ into one of the sort Eastland would do, is becoming more and more apparent as a cover for the FBI. The timing with C.A.75-1996 may well be no more than a coincidence but palming a spurious story off on the Church committee isn't. Nor is using that to lead everyone off in the chase of wild geese. In all of this there is no single question of the FBI's performance. It is all tied to the question nobody who isn't crazy has raised, whether the FBI killed King. This is hardly what Levi or Pottinger should put before a grand jury ~~of~~ for which find a special prosecutor.

It tells me that C.A.75-1996 is assuming more importance and that we have less time to let them waste for us. I suggest you phone Tyler, whether or not you have written him (I did, certified and have the receipt) and ask when they will respond and when they will deliver what they are still withholding. In this connection I want to raise a question about a provision of the new law. They have given me all those pictures and 70 some pages after so long a delay and after I filed the action. Does this not put us in a position to make charges/claims under the punitive provision? I'd make a few hints if you believe this is within reach. I'd also include Wiseman and Bresson by phone. A written record can be made later. Bresson ought to be a bit worried about C.A.75-226 by now. To the degree we can we should try to exert pressure. A few hints about 6th circuit might leave the idea there is no protection immediately above. As you realize from the documents, nobody connected with the can be at all innocent without being totally ignorant of the most elemental facts.

Eddowes is improvising on the old Osborn, Bowen and Mexico stuff with the addition of the study I'd had made by a friend of the contradictory descriptions of Oswald. I gave it to Garrison before I realized what he is. He gave it to everybody who would take it. If you have set up not afternoon appointment for tomorrow and we don't get this to this at lunch I hope we can soon find time. I fear a fairly large disinformation operations. Best,