

HAROLD WEISBERG

7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

9/29/94

National Editor
The Los Angeles Times
Los Angeles, CA

Dear Editor,

A friend has sent me a copy of Eric Harrison's Column One story of 9/24/94. It is too bad that neither he nor his desk thought to consult your own morgue.

This is not a criticism of Harrison. He was not in a position to understand that most of those of both sides who talked to him lied, did not know what they were talking about or both. And I'm astounded that none of you noticed the difference between Jowers as the assassin and as the man who hired someone else to be the assassin, this one man I knew when I was Ray's investigator and used him as a very probative witness in the evidentiary hearing Nick Chriss covered for your paper.

I write because the King assassination is another of the stories that is not going to go away, like the JFK assassination, and for the same reasons: the crimes were never really investigated officially and were never intended to be and the people understand this, continue to care (at least in the JFK assassination on which my mail is heavy) and trust the media and the government less because they know neither told them the truth or made any real effort to.

There is one and only one body of King assassination evidence tested in our traditional way, under oath and subject to cross-examination. That was at the evidentiary hearing Chriss covered, with preconceptions visible, perhaps his own belief, perhaps what he believed was wanted of him. I have the transcript of those two weeks of hearings and when I am no longer able to make them and all my work on the JFK assassination available to others they will be a permanent free archive at local Hood College.

I know Pepper and I do not believe he has a chance with what he is up to and has been doing. I made all I had available to him, provided a student to do the searching for him and the use of our copier, and he never had any interest in the body of the crime. So while I have no doubt that Ray is innocent, I also do not expect him to walk.

Your morgue should also reflect the decision in that hearing, which was to determine whether Ray would ^{get} be a trial. The judge held, literally, that guilt or innocence were immaterial. His justification for saying that is that it was not before him. And on what was before him he held in contradiction to all the evidence, to deny Ray any trial and his local pals and the federal government the embarrassment of Ray's inevitable acquittal.

While I did not use at that hearing all the evidence I obtained, I did use enough so that had that been Ray's trial he could not have been convicted. After that I used


FOIA to get about 60,000 pages of previously-withheld government records on the King case, mostly the FBI's. They along with the quarter of a million JFK assassination pages I got from about 10 other suits, will be in that Hood archives. Several of those FOIA cases, by the way, were precedental and one was cited in the legislative history of the 1974 amending to make FBI, CIA and similar files accessible under FOIA as establishing the need to amend the investigatory files exemption. It was Teddy Kennedy who saw to it that this is in the legislative history and I do not know of a paper that used it. I have that Congressional Record.

Harrison falls into the characteristic misuse of the media and the government in referring to all who do not agree with the official "solutions" as conspiracy theorists. There are some of us who deal with fact only. There is no single theory in any of my eight published books. That on the King assassination, originally published by a Dutton subsidiary, was reprinted last year as a quality paperback. It was originally titled Fragn-Up. As Martin Luther King: the Assassination I understand it is now being reissued. That one comes entirely from the public domain. There is but a single error in it, one I believe I picked up from a news story. I said the flophouse office was on the first floor. It was on the second. Not another error in it, either. It was, after all, tested under cross-examination to the degree it was in the evidence I prepared for the lawyers to use.

So, you may want to know that there is this body of tested evidence that does deal with the nuts and bolts, not theories, and that the State could not and did not refute any of it. One thing it proves is that Ray was not at the scene of the crime at the time of the crime.

I do not presume you have any interest in talking to me and I am not seeking any personal attention. I'm past 84, unwell and because I cannot avoid getting up early must retire about 6 p.m. our time. I've been working since a little after one a.m. this morning. But if you or any of your people want to talk to me about any of this and to learn more about what will be available in the future, I'll be glad to respond. 301/472-8186. And if any of your Washington Bureau, only a little more than an hour away, wants to see what there is for any use you may but not likely want now but may in the future, they are welcome. They can get an idea from George Gardner at the WxPost and the researcher he and Pincus used on their 30th anniversary series, Anne Eisele. Jeffrey Frank on the Post's Outlook has looked at them but not used them.

If you should want credentials what is on the back cover of my current and butchered book Case Open (Carroll & Graf) is the truth. The FBI did tell a federal court that I know more about the JFK assassination than anyone working for the FBI. I proved in a different court in a different suit that this is true about the King assassination too.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

P.S. I also enclose two pages from an FBI filing in one of my FOIA lawsuits against it. As it states, I had alleged, myself under oath so if I lied it would be the felony of perjury, that the FBI was filing perjury by its agents in that litigation. As you'll see toward the bottom of what is page 3 in that filing, rather than deny that it was filing perjurious statements in federal court to withhold the records I sought for myself and for all the people, it admitted the truth of what I'd stated. It actually then said that I could "make such claims ad infinitum since he (I) is perhaps more familiar with events surrounding the investigation of President Kennedy's assassination than anyone now working for the FBI."

There are rare credentials that I knew more about the assassination and its investigation than anyone in the FBI, but it is not a response to sworn proof that the FBI was perjuring itself - even though that court did accept it as exculpation!

I cannot attach the Sheffield Edwards memo to those above him in the CIA after Bobby Kennedy chewed him out because the CIA refuses to let me have any more records, law or no law, and I am no longer able to file suit to get them to live within the law. Not even with that record having been disclosed.

WU