

Mr. Howard <sup>a</sup>Ray  
Fund for Investigative Journalism  
1346 Connecticut Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036

11/3/77

Dear Howard,

Thanks very much for the Pacific News Service puffery of Lane by his bedmate Don Freed. Only a subject expert would recognize this for what it is, the effluvia of the Freed-Lane operations. Even for the immune Lane it is a virtuous confession of incredible subject and legal ignorance.

As was his argument in the Ray escape trial, his newest supposedly new legal approach has already been ruled on by the courts. It is not new. It was, in fact, the first basis on which Ray's then racist lawyers tried to get him a trial. The judge who sat on that is named Paquin. <sup>a</sup>e succeeded Battle. What makes this even more incredible is that Freed and Lane are both familiar with my Frang-Up, which reports it.

It is typical for Lane to claim as his own amazing "discovery" what he reads in my work. But in this case it also is in the papers and in court records - a line of appeal that has run its course. While the statute is fairly reflected, that there is an automatic new-trial right if demanded within 30 days, the corrupt Tennessee courts held in Ray's case that this right existed only before the sentencing judge, who in Ray's case had died.

In the escape trial Lane seized upon and new, and got extensive coverage on it, the very issue Jim Lesar had carried to the Supreme Court - over Ray's objections but at the direct order of the sixth circuit court of appeals. This is was Ray legally in jail. The habeas corpus proceedings and the evidentiary hearing ended, if unjustly, in the judicial decision that he was legally in jail.

Lane now claims Ray claims he was coerced. I am aware of Ray's allegations now. He never told me then. If these new ones, that the FBI threatened his father, are true they also represent an issue we raised in elaborate detail at the evidentiary hearing. Sadly the coercion question has been ruled upon - all the way to the Supreme Court.

That the original judge died with Ray's "petition" under his chest is not attributable to the clerk of the court. It comes from my work, which Jim and I followed up for and at the evidentiary hearing. It is in fact in the transcripts of the evidentiary hearing. Now Lane knows about it is from one of Freed's flunkies, one Jeff <sup>a</sup>chen, who attended the evidentiary hearing and with Freed has been busily engaged in literary thievery since.

The danger to justice and its possibility of working in such historic and sensational case when the whores like Lane come along to commercialize them and as in this case Lane did, ambulance-chase his way into it, is exemplified by the description of the Ray affidavit he filed. It alleges that then Memphis SAC Robert Jensen went to see Ray at the jail to intimidate him into not seeking a new trial. It was not until after Jensen went to see Ray - then at Nashville, not Memphis - that Ray made the first of his efforts. Jensen was there for an entirely different reason. I do have the relevant records, including Jensen's own. (He is chief of security for Holiday Inns now.) He was following up on the only reasonable interpretation of Ray's intrusion into the guilty-plea hearing, that there had been a conspiracy. With Ray having alleged this several times since should there be a hearing on the Lane scrimshaw, which I doubt, it will kick Ray's teeth farther down in his intestines. Why if he is now charging there was a conspiracy did he not tell the FBI when they asked him?

Ray did not go "to trial in 1969." He has never been tried. The FBI agents did not visit "both he and his brothers" as this Freed version has it, "two days before he went to trial." Both brothers were in Memphis and in continuous contact with counsel Percy Foreman. (I have long taped interviews with both and with James on this.) The FBI was careful to stay away from Ray from the moment they turned him over to Tennessee authorities after extradition. Jim and I have the jail logs, in addition, so we can tell anyone to the minute

when who was with Ray and for how long. Even when Ray ate what, which pills he took and why - how and how long he slept even. In short, this is totally false. These kinds of baseless charges against the FBI are used by it to exculpate itself of legit. charges. (Some of what they have made up and attributed to me so they could appear to do this is precious - and ludicrous.) have their records on it and me.)

The House committee part is accurate. Lane arranged it notwithstanding the disaster they have been to Ray. All their King work, beginning with their original allegations based on which the committee was established, is predicated on the assumption that Ray is the killer. The Members have been explicit on this, in their reports and on the floor as well as countless public statements. If getting Ray before the committee can't reasonable be expected to help Ray, it can reasonably be expected to promote Lane, who is working on a movie about himself as Sherlock. Could Lane has less unselfish motive in dealing the stacked deck to Ray?

I have gone into this detail for a number of reasons. One is to let you know that sending me what I would not see is helpful, at least useful for the future. Another is to permit me to make a record and thereby, if there is later interest, to inform others, including reporters. Jim Lesar, too, in this case.

So thanks very much,