

FBI-14
Mr. James Earl Ray - 65477
Brushy Mountain Prison
Petros, Tenn. 37845

2/2/80

Dear Jimmy,

As soon as I read that long windup, all the irrelevant speech-making with which you begin your 1/30, I knew something pointless and ludicrous would follow. Why else the elaborate pretense of justification?

There is not a single thing relating to me that follows that is straight.

It is not and it never was my "belief-theory that the late H.L. Hunt, or those closely associated with him were in some manner involved in said homicide." Nor JFK's, either.

So whether in your belief this could find "acceptance...with the intelligence community" is entirely immaterial.

I wont try to figure out how this involves me with Foreman because he was later as crooked for the Hunts as he is for anyone else's money. He does not love me.

You say that Lane "has made at least a prima facie case of FBI involvement in the M.L.K. homicide." That's news to me and I've read and heard and seen a sickening lotz of his constantly changing improvisations, none of which are even tenable. It is easy to cook up theories when fact is irrelevant.

From this you leapfrog to my allegedly never missing "an opportunity to absolve the F.B.I. in the homicide." Putting me opposite Lane on almost anything is to my liking but you are unfactual. What I have said - and it is not, as you also say, in my book or any of my writing - is that there is no evidence that the FBI killed King. I'll expand it for you - or had him killed. But this is not the same as "absolving" them. Have you forgotten the title of my book? It charges them with a frame-up - on you. That is absolution? If I correctly understand you to be saying that a coverup is a crime, how in your terms do I absolve them?

They have never given me any reason to believe that they love me and there is nothing in my writing, especially in the many court cases I have against them, to lead anyone (except, perhaps, you and Lane) to believe that I love them.

You say you have filed recent suits and were going to file another. I'd be interested in any proof you have of those allegations. (Not regarding the political files on King at the Archives, which I've been trying to get for many years and relating to which you imagine what has no basis. If the FBI had what you imagine it would not be there.) Especially about that committee, about which you appear to have forgotten my caution and what turned out to be its complete accuracy.

Your ostensible reason follows: because the spoons did you in and I'm a spoke and I work for them you want to get my CIA and FBI files. For this you need and want a waiver. You better go looking for those missing marbles. (I'm assuming you had them and lost them, more with the recent assistance, not that you never had them.) You've got a heads-I-win-tails-you-lose deal cooked up, a real Catch -22. If the records don't show what you and your shyster want then the records are phoney, which proves your foolish theory. Meanwhile, if the FBI gives you some of its fabrications you and your new pal can mis-use them, with impunity. No deal. FYI, they do have many phoney records and they stopped releasing any once I proved their phoriness. And as Jim can tell you, because he used it in court, they conspired to "stop" me. Which, as you things merely proves that I am their funk. ... When I get all the records I'm making them public, but not until then. ... Do you really think that I file all these suits and was responsible for the opening of their files because I'M one of them? If so, you need help. But I wish you well in your cases.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg