

12/31/76

Mr. Stuart Ditzen
Phila. Bulletin
National Press Bldg, #1296
Washington, D.C. 20045

Dear Stuart,

You were not satisfied on one of our five "w's,"

Then save yourself much trouble and concentrate on the other four, which are basic to the fifth anyway.

You may recall I separated myself from those I described as theorizers. My dedication is to fact. I am not off on a whodunit. So after all this work I have not solved the crime. But my work is accurate and I neither mislead nor misinform people.

The alternative is mindlessness. The raves over George McMillan's book ~~ix~~ are the self-debasement of those who are off on the motive kick, with fact irrelevant. McMillan's thesis is actually that fact is immaterial so he lays motive on Ray. What about the million other Rays who had as much or more motive?

It is my belief that one cannot address motive in these crimes until we has at least a satisfactory basis in fact. You may be satisfied with less fact than I, a need of newspapers as compared with books. On the basis of the fact I have, and I am confident it is more than any other has or has developed or comprehended, I would encourage you in meeting this normal intellectual demand to seek the least complicated explanation that you can live with and not decide that it is certain. The literary gutters flow with those who could not or did not.

If you had observed Garrison and his hanger-on as I did you would realize that if one begins with motive everybody did it.

Eliminating LBJ, the military, the specks, the racists, the political ultras and who can imagine what others is difficult if you begin with other than fact. All had motive. LBJ even answered the tradition lawyer's question, qui bene?

I do not know who did it. I do have candidates. But can they all have the same motive?

As of now I'm not at all certain there is a chance of really solving the JFK assassination. The chances are better with King's, and not because Ray can talk while he lives. I am certain he can't say a thing the FBI does not know. If I am close to right or until the crimes are solved can we really ascribe motive, even to the coverup, without knowing what was wovered up and by whom?

Even this leads to another snare. Everybody covered up in the police and intelligence agencies. I mean this literally. You saw how the doctors did it. If you start off on motive it will be hard to avoid the beliefs that the doctors, the top Navy brass with the Army in on it, conspired with the FBI, CIA, Dallas and Texas State Police, Secret Service and even the border guards in the JFK case. This did not happen. There are ways of limiting, and it is these ways I hope you think or look. I am satisfied I have come to such a limitation. In it, as I tried to suggest, it is not necessary to assume the killers and the coverers up are one and the same. I think they are not.

If you heed me you will be able to understand and wover the committee better. It has already made this mistake. The reporter should not or he will not be able to report well.

I take this time hoping to be of help. It is a Byzantine business. Besides, each time there is another deceptive leak, once you understand it is deceptive you'll have new motive. Now the committee has joined the FBI in it and the CIA was already in it. New conspiracies? Don't get lost!

Sincerely,