

JDLW 3/2/75

I have not yet seen The Washingtonian issue. As soon as I heard of the kind of story Goulden had written, having recollection enough on Truth Is the First Casualty to jump to a tentative conclusion, I read Superlawyers. You know what I spotted on first examination, confirmed by reading the whole thing. Discussed this with Lesar. He saw Goulden's book on foundations being remaindered, read it and lo! as I told him when he said he had read it: not a mention of the CIA and foundations. Lesar laughed and said more, not a single reference to the CIA. In a book written so long after public exposure?

The pattern is there. If it is less than 100% proof it is enough to make suspicion reasonable. Especially given the 100% inaccuracy of the original article and the total nonresponsiveness of the rejoinder. He did write 180° from what he knew to be true and this is not easily explained away in an experienced reporter who also flubbed the first major assassination story despite the best local contacts. Unless you consider his having written that LHO was FBI only when the original report was either FBI or CIA or both not flubbing.

It comes at a good time. We'll be able to depose him in time. And others.