

Dear George, *L. L. L.*

2/18/77

Thanks for the note and the enclosures. That is the Newhouse piece I wanted.

Before I get to my purpose I suggest you pay close attention to Fauntroy's reformulation of the Portugal irrationality. I can't go far without transgressing into what I learned from another reporter and that I cannot do. I am not suggesting that it points away from Avery or another in a similar position. I am saying it also points in other possible directions.

What all reporters seem to have missed in this is that even if there is a rational basis for it, as on the face there is not, it represents a totality of prejudice that is as wrong as that of the Warren Commission or any other element of officialdom anywhere. Does what is wrong for the inevitable subjects of investigation become right for the investigators, if you'll excuse the expression. In my view this, especially because it is in what is called their report, is total disqualification. With what you and others have told me of Preyer this is a disappointment to me, more because he was a judge.

Trying to go down the middle on this is not easy. Each extreme finds me part of the other and enemy one.

The reason I wanted Jim Lesar to hear what you told me about Lane admitting a deception is one I have to leave to him to explain, as you will see. Remember he told you he got to see Ray by posing as Don Freed's representative. Jim is still Ray's lawyer, by court order. A court that ruled the 14th Amendment does not apply to lawyers like Jim, who is just starting his practice.

This imposes certain obligations on Jim. He is not one who will not attempt to meet them.

In meeting them what you said can be of significance.

He wanted to talk to you further about this and I asked him to let me do it because I understand better than he how reporters and papers sometimes feel about what he would have asked.

Mostly but not always it relates to confidentiality. There was nothing confidential in that but I did not want you to be confronted with a request or to have no time to think or to wonder if the Post has a policy on such matters.

Jim would like to have this simple statement from you, for use, for a use that at least initially would be confidential and might forever be. In my opinion it is for a perfectly proper purpose, I think a necessary one. If you are willing please let him know, not me. If he tells you the purpose be aware that it would impose confidentiality on you.

Also be assured that if you do not want to neither of us would try to accomplish this by offering hearsay. You will not have any such involvement. No coercion. And if you say no I will not complain. I believe Jim also will not.

Separately I'm surprised at the absence of journalistic enterprise with regard to the King side of the "investigation." With all these allegations and innuendoes and with Lane public (as in Newsworks) on having given Fauntroy all his information on the King assassination I'm surprised no reporter seems to have asked Fauntroy if his coming safari, via Brussels, comes directly or indirectly from Lane - who according to the Kup column has a six-figure deal. Prentice-Hall has already had a full page plugging it in Publishers Weekly plus a puff news item. Target, natch, the anniversary, now less than six weeks away. Or for that matter what the taxpayers have in return for that earlier Mexican vacation....I'm sending a copy of Jim. Sincerely,