

18 November 1968

Dear Tom,

Like you, I was impressed by the first Huie article on James Earl Ray in Look, except for one distinctly false note: Ray's explanation of how he happened to select the alias Eric Starvo Galt. The closing remarks by Huie at the end of the second article disturbed me even more, with its suggestion of trying to exonerate Dixie racists and to incriminate unnamed parties, perhaps foreign (Chinese communists? Castro?) or merely domestic (Black Power? Oswaldian Marxists?) who are anathema to the Southern doctrine. I was somewhat reassured by a radio interview of Huie the other night, in which he seemed down-to-earth in his judgment, very cautious in vouching for Ray's story, and extremely exact as to factual matters raised by the interviewers or in his own replies. Huie has a good reputation as a journalist/investigator; but I am keeping an open mind on the case, as I have tried to do from the first.

However, I feel, as you do, that the lone assassin thesis is hard to apply to Ray because he was a fugitive whose greatest concern was to avoid recapture and to make a new life for himself elsewhere. Additionally, there were indications from the beginning of a well-planned conspiracy, in the liberal supply of Ray's funds, the diverting of police pursuit through intrusion on the police radio, and the hokey-pokey with the fingerprints, among other items. Huie said something on the broadcast that was not in the Look articles, by the way—that he believes that someone in MLK's immediate entourage may have been in on the plot, with the function of getting him to step out of his room at just the right time. That had not occurred to me, I must admit, and it is hardly a welcome thought. By the way, an acquaintance mentioned to me yesterday ~~that~~ about 10 days or two weeks ago she had seen a newspaper story reporting that one of MLK's lieutenants was found shot to death in his car, she thought in Chicago—but she just could not remember the man's name. Have you heard anything like that?

No, I have not heard from Epstein nor seen any mention of his book, which should have been printed by now. Nor is there any indication of Turner's book. I did see press reports on the refusal to extradite Bradley, which I think was quite right but which will relieve Garrison of one embarrassment and give him a further excuse to berate the establishment for withholding cooperation. I still get occasional letters from pro-militarists on Garrison's behalf. They amuse and exasperate me. Apparently the writers of these letters assume that I have taken a capricious stand and given no thought to the implications of my anti-Garrison position. Hence, they reason, it needs only a few homilies and platitudes to make me see the error of my ways. The last such letter (five or six pages single-spaced!) blandly referred to the widely-known fact ("fact" indeed!) that Garrison had come to New York to see me and I had refused to see him. One might add that I have never met Warren either...but I do not look to Garrison's admirers for such logic. I have declined membership in the Garrison/Fensterwald committee ("CIA") for obvious reasons, and also because the undemocratic by-laws offended me no end. TMO is not yet out of the financial woods, but I am hoping it will be able to continue publication. Can't think of another thing by way of news, and I had better feed the cat...she is getting restive. All the best,