

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg, King assassination appeals 3/7/79
OK appeals, p 49.

For the past four or more months, because of new and then pressing priorities, a large amount of incomplete work and records of various kinds (copies) have accumulated. I am no longer able to recall the purposes for which some records were copied.

In the course of working my way through part of this accumulation I have come across copies of King assassination records relating to the Ray family members. These are from not fewer than three different sources other than copies provided me by the FBI in C.A. 75-1996. Carol Pepper and John Ray appear to have obtained copies from the FBI and from the House assassins committee, which in turn obtained them from the FBI.

The processing is entirely inconsistent. Many records not provided to me were provided to the Rays. In no instance have I determined any privacy matter involved in or that can explain this withholding.

To complicate it even more, and I believe for special and improper FBI purposes, such information as file identification, *like* MURKIN or bank-robbery file designations, never removed in copies provided to me, were removed from Ray copies. *Even page numbers on*

~~As I have skimmed these records,~~ *these pages* It is apparent that they reflect improper processing and withholding, that this is not of accidental nature, and that intended non-compliance and intended inflation of costs resulted. *Folk*

I believe that the FBI should explain and justify all of these matters. If your limited staff is required to take this time that means the FBI has accomplished additional non-compliance and other deliberate frustrations of my effort to use the Act and to obtain public and PA records very long overdue.

I believe also that the FBI owes all other parties an explanation of why it deleted information ~~the~~ the FBI itself put into the public domain, as in 44-38861-1725 and many other records. (This one happened to be the top one on the top stack. *Listed records enclosed*)

To ~~make~~ trying to keep it within the Act more difficult the FBI did not post its claims to exemptions at the point of excision. Obviously I cannot do this with copies the FBI did not provide me and therefore are not on the worksheets it provided to me.

Of course I also find myself wondering how all of this conforms to the official decision that this is an historic case and standards of disclosure required by it.

While in some instances the obliterations I note are not of personal interest to me, where they are not they relate to entirely unjustified withholdings and to information that should be available as part of the historical record. *They make for unnecessary confusion.*

More than the foregoing appears to relate to 44-38861-2897. It appears to relate to surveillances, including those the Attorney General refused to sanction and which I believe ~~were~~ *were* immaterial at the time he was asked, except as a cover for what the FBI appears to have done. However, that request did not ~~cover~~ *include* all these people. If the names were not already public I believe privacy claim would be inappropriate in ~~such~~ *such* a case and that if it is made it has other purposes, like covering the FBI. Checking the St. Louis Filed Office copy might produce other information, I think ~~it~~ *it* should. *(This in records provided from by the FBI)* I do not recall seeing ~~it~~ *from* ~~these files~~ *records* but with so many ~~files~~ *records* I can't be certain. Because of the FBI's refusal to note serial numbers when claiming "previously processed" there is no way I can check. (In this connection I note that without a page-by-page check of such records the FBI cannot know whether there is additional information, ~~and~~ *that it* I believe in just about all instances there is ~~and~~ *and* ~~is withheld by this "previously processed" claim.~~ *is withheld by this "previously processed" claim.*)

The next copy is identified as from the St. Louis file, from a record of which it is page 45. Melba Ray's condition has been well publicized.

Carol Pepper's then address, obliterated on page 247, is not secret. The withholding of the SAs' names does not protect their privacy. It hides the identities of those against whom Mrs. Pepper had complaint.

The ridiculousness and inconsistency of at least some of the obliterations on page 256 are so obvious no comment is necessary.

In addition to the withholdings on Serial 3354 please note the kind of record that was routed to Mr. Long and no longer exists in the Long tickler. The obliteration by xerox reflects existence of a record that now cannot be identified with certainty, if lack of a Serial Number ~~enabled~~ *was* positive identification. If the note refers to the judge, years ago I appealed the withholding of the information he provided. There has been no response. (Actually a large volume of records ~~was~~ *was* routed to Mr. Long.)

Xeroxing also eliminated information on the next record. When the FBI expanded this technique to large areas of pages I made more vigorous complaint and the practise ended. I do not now recall my reason for making a copy of this record, to the AAG, CRD. Perhaps because it indicated the nature of CRD records not provided. In any event, it does reflect that the FBI was feeding CRD bad information, including untruths about its investigation ^{results.} It also reflects a selective description of Arthur Hanes, who had been an FBI SA ~~along with~~ This is not conveyed to CRD with indications of his racist prejudices. (Those that did not disqualify him for the FBI.)

The copied sets are not identical. In the ~~more~~ more complete set there are several other memos to CRD not included in the one I'm providing you. A single page of one follows next in your set. It shows that copies also were sent to Criminal, where I believe I have an old appeal. (Vinson was the top DJ official ^{active} in the extradition.) This page is from 4585.

While I do not now recall the purpose of copying the cover of the large St. Louis Field Office report (4760) it indicates distribution of many copies, including from components that have not provided their copies and I think have denied their existence. Please notice the special notation "INDEX" on the FBIHQ copy. Ordinarily, from the Central Records book, this notation is not necessary. So, where is the index referred to?

I believe all the foregoing are FBIHQ records and thus were provided in C.A.75-1996.

All or most of the following (I'll note exceptions if I can) ^{are} are not from FBIHQ and and copies provided to me by the Rays. If any FBIHQ records were provided to the Rays I do not have an independent recollection of it. ^{However} ~~at the same time~~ they were given records I was not give ^{my}. It is not possible for me to attempt any correlation because the FBI withholds record identifications, from me under the "previously processed" ^{and by other means.} contraption and from the Rays, as you will see, by excising even file identifications.

I number these with my initials for identification and for making copies of what are not duplicated already.

Ordinarily on what I've marked HW 1 there would be filing indication and serialization in the large white space at the bottom of the page.

With regard to John Ray, because of the coming House assassins committee report (of

which there is more indication of FBI manipulation) ^{because of} and the withholding of records under claim to consideration of prosecution (already appealed) I ask for prompt reprocessing of all the records the FBI can identify as those from which these come.

The withholdings are so outrageous I ask that the FBI justify them in writing, including of the bank-robbery file identification and the identification of the case of the murder of Dr. King (see p. 2) *The Court also may have an interest in this kind of processing.*

~~The~~ ^{FBI} also should justify the withholding of the name of James Earl Ray (from HW 2 *and disc. where*) along with the rest of the harassment.

The FBI's withholdings make it impossible for me to determine now whether all the pages I has stapled together and have marked HW 3 are from a large report or were stapled together by me for reasons I do not now recall.

In assessing the compliance and the withholdings and the integrity of the records, please recall that John Ray was charged, tried and convicted on a charge of driving a switch car for an ^{alleged} acquitted robber of the bank of St. Peters, Mo. This robber's name and that of the others, one dead, two treated as though they could have been FBI informers, are either missing from the original records, seemingly an exceptional kind of initial record, or are withheld. *But very well known, obviously. There were trials.*

Even page numbers are withheld. ^{withholding of them} I'd like to know what exemption covers them. (b)(2)?

Thanks to the FBI, I also have to number these pages.

Now of all the unsolved or known and solved or known and convenient bank robberies after James Earl Ray's arrest the House assassins committee fixed on three only with which to charge John Ray. Earlier, and this has significance, it sought to get Jerry and John to confess to these in the form of an alleged "biographical statement" after both had denied participating in them under oath.

Identically these bank robberies are tabulated on what I've numbered page 1. No more, no less. *charged by HS Ct to John.*

I leave justification of the excisions to the FBI.

But with Jerry an alleged suspect in these, an utter irrationality, to dignify it given what the FBI by this much later date knew of him and his resources, including financial, and with me in bank robbery files over his phone call to me, as I've alleged,

how can it be that once I called what it should have notice^{4/} in processing the Long tickler to its attention that the FBI did not search these and the other similar files, like those indicated in what is withheld on this page 1, in compliance with my PA request?

Good FBI faith? Due FBI diligence?

More of this nature of previously uncredited committee debt to the FBI follows.

Absence of a date leaves me uncertain but this has to be at least a 1970 record.

On my page 15 I find interesting confirmation of John Ray's ^{account of his innocence} ~~story~~ when he was thrown in jail and charged with attempted murder ^{- just intine to sensationalize his public house testimony.} ~~of the House~~

~~...in the ... deny his access to his family~~
~~...~~ (You may not be aware but all charges were dropped, there having never been any basis for them. ^{Meaning legitimate basis.}) The first entry is of a man he said he was looking for and later found on that occasion, Earl Truelove. ^{of where he was and why} This does indicate that he knew Truelove long before it became a convenient explanation ^{late last year.}

(Odd the impartial FBI did not claim privacy for all these names yet removed those like that of James and other family members.)

It may indeed be that bank robbers wear gloves only for leaving tips as clues, as page 7 would indicate. More on this also follows.

The date of the arrest is not indicated here and the interview or inquiry is of ^{four} days prior the typing. ^(That was the date of the robbery.)

Although allegedly a piece of glove was found, page 8, which lists what the FBI obtained from the sheriff, does not include this.

Of passing interest, on page 10 is the fact that John Ray did have his own Social Security card, which the House assassins committee claims he gave to James the day before James escaped from MoPen. The only privacy ^{concerns} appear to have been for ~~...~~ FBI SAs on this (and other) pages. Do you suppose those ^{5/2} who interviewed the Rays used false identities?

With these and other records giving the FBI the identification of John's bank account and with him a suspect in all those other bank robberies, do you find it strange that there is no account of his financial status after all those allegedly successful heists?

I take it from page 14 that the AUSA's in St. Louis are not known, especially not those why else withhold the name? who were part of a public trial. Naturally John, who was tried, would not know any of this.

On page 15 it appears that the US Commissioners are also secret in St. Louis, including the one who got bond, another secret record, I'm sure. (Bail was well within range of norm, only \$100,000.)

From HW 5 it appears that contrary to what I was taught in school and lived all my life believing, in addition to secret AUSAs, Commissioners and the like, there is also secret evidence after trial in which the evidence is used.

I leave the other matters to you. The examinations requested were of two samples of glove. No trick having identical samples if they were planted. But there is no report of the Lab examination here or in anything else given to John Ray. (That I was to get all Ray records is still another matter, and I got none of this Lab stuff.)

Same with most of the excisions in HW 6. Here secrecy and need to withhold extends to those found guilty in a jury trial. (I guess there is an FOIA other than the one I read. And that perhaps I never fully appreciated the FBI's concern for the privacy of the convicted.)

Unknown AAGs too, from HW 7. Or is that they require Secrecy ~~privacy~~ to be AAGs?

This record also indicates that perhaps my feeling that the FBI processes inconsistently may have been a bit misplaced. Here again and elsewhere the FBI has such great concern for James Earl Ray (perhaps his privacy?) that it continues to withhold his name. (The stuff about John visiting him in jail nine times is false. The FBI forgot to employ its ~~usual~~ usual semantics to mask misrepresentations. John and those others using his card, which includes Jerry, were there a total of nine times ^{during} all the time James was in jail, quite a few years. Real close family, the Rays.)

Spoke too soon. In a series of other records duplicating some of the foregoing that I'm not taking your time with a series of FD302s lets the cat out of the bag: John and James are so brothers, too. Two pages of this sheaf marked HW 8 will let you know ^{how} that the FBI did not permit itself to get carried away: it withheld Jerry Ray's name. And whether or not she owned the Grapevine, the FBI was more concerned for sister Carol Pepper's privacy that her accounts would lead one to believe. See HW 9.

As I said earlier, I have ~~the~~^{FBI's} records from HSCA and FBI compliance with the Ray requests. If you'd like I do not have to let this hang on mere happenstance, of my finding these in a stack. There are more. If you or the FBI enjoy this and if for some reason it does not want to further inflate its ^{time + cost} FOIA statistics maybe I can find time and let you have a little more, if you or they enjoy it.

I regret presently available time does not permit retyping.