

1/3/77

Dear Phil,

The note you appended to the C-A 12/31/76 I think misreads some of the most deliberately dishonest journalism I've seen in years of looking for it. "Getting interesting," you say. Only it simply isn't true that "Panel Accepts Ray's Offer to Talk."

About what? Under what conditions, if he was being more than bitterly joking.

He said if all those writers who were official propagandists were also under oath.

I have been busy on other matters but I do read the Post and I saw no report of those whores standing in line to testify - or to what? To your officials leaking their plumbing to the ranks of whoredom? (40 meetings with Dwyer, being Canale's house guest and indulging in all the other trappings of impartiality.)

Can you imagine the former pseudo-liberal McMillan subjecting himself to questioning? This, too, is what Jimmy was talking about, if not really clearly. I suppose I get mad enough not to be clear, too, so I can't criticize Jimmy for it, although he should have gone through counsel, who could have eliminated all of this nonsense.

Maybe I have the Tony Lewis review but I do not have the rest of what you ask for and for your purposes you do not ask for all you should. You will need the Jeremiah O'Leary Star story that started this latest disinformation. Lewis and the Times ignored it <sup>but</sup> angry, desperate Jimmy actually carboned O'Leary, admittedly one of the CIA's reporters in the domestic press and a favored of the FBI. See his Readers Digest story of 1968. I do not have the O'Leary story, which is the one that triggered all the foolishness of several days ago. Burgham of the NYTimes called him when he was here @ 12/30 or 31 having nothing to do with Ray - I was able to make some savings for him on supplies where the overhead is lower. So I answered the phone and was in on the conversation. It began with Burgham saying he was calling "about this crazy committee."

Jimmy has not sent me his letter to the Times. I do not know if he sent it to Jim. But I will forward your card to him and a carbon of this.

NOW can you understand why I said that if it were up to me Jimmy would not see anyone in the press, give any interviews?

If you really want the truth to be accepted or to give it an establishmentarian angle, if you want emphasis ever to break put of the cage it helped the feds make for it, you will want poor Jimmy, who is as lost in all of this as he is desperate, left entirely alone <sup>so</sup> the system can have some slight possibility of working.

As you can see through the haste these clips are important. Again thanks. I had heard nothing about this story. Never heard of Cunningham. Or want to again. It is pretty disreputable stuff.

Have a good year,