

Mr. Les Whittan
1401 16 St., NW
Wash., D.C. 20036

12/24/76

Dear Les,

Good friend, sometimes wise one, I'm sorry to be so late with my Xmas present. It can't reach you in any form until after tomorrow. But I'm sure you'll appreciate the spirit.

This morning's column provided the reminder.

And it really isn't personal, as you will see. Swelled with the season my heart send it for you all.

I am giving you what I've just invented. Not the Peter Principle or Catch-22 or anything simple like them.

Nope, it is Anderson's Law:

"If ya gotta source and ye gotta leak ya don't need a head or a mind."

Now if you really like it I have a student friend who recently send me a nicely-lettered quotation from Edmund Burke:

"All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing."

Would you like it lettered suitable for wall mounting?

The column "reports" that House "investigators reported this startling development confidentially" to the committee members. There was no other safe way because everybody might not live by Anderson's Law! What was this great scoop? Ray got as far as Portugal, where he received 'further instructions' from a secret conspirator."

Well, you sure have solved one of the mysteries, how come Ray did not have enough money to get to Africa and instead went back to London because he was almost broke. Naturally a co-conspirator with whom he met would see to it that he was broke. What other way could spell success for a conspiracy?

And this is how he "was finally tracked down." Don't take that beagle when you want real rabbits.

I like the fine impartiality of the lead: House investigators have uncovered dramatic new evidence that the convicted killer of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. may not have acted alone. The FBI will like this and your sources there will not be offended. Mark Lane and Walter Fauntroy will like it because it fits their scenario that Ray and the FBI combined. Sprague will like it so you can be leaked more because he has already told the committee it can solve that crime because the killer is alive.

Too bad your investigators or leakers did not let you know about the staffer who had been in charge of the King part, the one who got nasty with me right off and with whom I had to tangle, in private, of course. My sources tell me the committee has suffered its first departure. If you want to know what he considered "investigating," what he pulled on the committee, send one of your interns up. I won't be able to help with the column's line that Ray is the killer, with or without a conspiracy. I won't be able to help Mark with the stunt he is not up to, having Don Freed make a movie called The Investigator, with Mark the hero for having proven that the FBI, through Holloman, got Ray to kill King. (You'll love the story of how he Kojaked in to see Holloman when we see each other again.) In fact I won't be able to help you, much as I'd like to because I can't get in under Anderson's Law.

The one thing I can do and as a friend I do do is caution you against the kind of overt propaganda that this morning's column is on this subject. Keep the eggs for the

the belly and the bullshit for the barnyard or you, collectively, will have both all over your faces. I mean before very long.

Jack has his hangups and they are controlling. Maybe you all fear trying to save him from them. But what happened to that other ~~Max~~ maxim, Whitten's Advice to Interns, for them to check assassinations facts with me? You have never found me wrong.

Not only have you pulled this booboo with the King assassination but you get back into what you once were almost conned on, the CIA's gadgetry with Oswald in Mexico. That is played straight in this column, too.

"Oswald's conversations, according to our sources, were monitored by the Central Intelligence Agency."

What sources you do have! Can't be my longoverdue FOIA request for all of that or the CIA's efforts to talk me out of it. Can't be the ^Baltimore News-American or the New York Times, both of which carried that story last year. Can it be "Richard Sprague, the panel's brilliant staff director," directly or indirectly?

I know it can't be the Post, which was gulled on this one on the front page a month ago. (Great for your steak with the Post, huh?) And after that story the "brilliant staff director" called in Phillips and questioned him, duly reported. But presented as new in the column. Then, quoting not the contemporaneous newspaper accounts but this supposedly secret report, "staff members were dispatched to Mexico City, where they conducted further interviews." Wanna bet with those the CIA made available?

You really do have to be "brilliant" to send ignorant people to a foreign country to question people about what they know nothing about. Especially when airplanes go both ways and committee's can summon and it would have been cheaper and better if those witnesses, a typist and a translator, both spooks with embassy cover, had been called to Washington. In that time, if ~~it~~ it had wanted to know what to do, the committee could have learned.

So on December 24 you have this great scoop with one thing new in it, the meaningless word "Portugal." Those of your editors with memories as good as mine will recall as far back as three days before this column was written, when essentially the same story was on the wire, a longer version in the Memphis papers. (Naturally, one of the top editors owes his education to the FBI.) In those stories, as AP said, "investigators are examining a transcript of the...hearing of March 10, 1969..." In the Commercial-Appeal this way, "In an interview Wednesday, committee counsel Richard A. Sprague produced the transcript and noted that Ray pointedly objected to courtroom statements that the killing was not part of a conspiracy."

Would you like to know the one source for this? My Frame-Up. Would you like to know how those daring investigators supervised by this "brilliant" chief got the transcript? I had to force it on them, with 13 others. If you examine the transcript of their hearing of 11/16 you will find that Robert Ozer, the departed one, led them to believe that this was all possible because Ray's prosecution, not his investigator, was so cooperative. This DJ lawyer with the "brilliant" one present told that panel of lawyers that he had no more because they had to subpoena the public record! The only reason they had no more is that Jeremy Akers, the lawyer who came here and was here until about 8:30 p.m. 10/22. He felt that was all they could handle for a while. Well, they couldn't even handle that. They lost one on me right away. But they are "brilliant" because you say so. So brilliant they could read and understand the one of my books with which Akers left.

Anderson's Law will help you soon, though. The spooks will have to open up when the new session is here. Now they are only leaking to misdirect and feel out. They need no more readings. The committee and Lane are not mysteries. They'll have their fun. And so will I. I hope you can avoid being part of it.

Merry Xmas,