

4/11/89

In a 4/1/89 memo I noted that the dust jacket is written to suggest that it is through Melanson's efforts that what was released under FOIA was released. I also noted that in his acknowledgements he makes no mention at all of the abundance of records that are available or how they were made available. (FBI, D J, CIA.)

Before beginning to read I made a further perfunctory check and it confirms what I suggested, that he wants it believed that he discovered sex and invented the wheel, or that he personally dug it all up. I'm sure the average reader and probably book publisher and editor have this impression. It is false.

The copy of the book he sent me has what is superficially a very fine ^{hand written} comment to me on the first blank page. It says that all are indebted to me for my "unwavering commitment to the public right to know." It says nothing of my FOIA litigation that forced the MURKIN (and other FBI and DJ records I've not yet seen mentioned) out of oblivion or even that the suit, filed in 1975, is still before the courts in 1989. Not does he mention the great labors and investment of time and money by Jim Lesar in pursuing this costly and extensive litigation by means of which the Melanson's of the world and of so-called scholarship have free access to those records.

This led me to check the index under my name. There is no reference to any litigation, this or other, and no reference under bibliography to my other books. (Most of what he there lists is not relevant and appears to me to be the padding of phony scholarship.) I'll comment on some of these bits of text as I comment on the book but I here note that when he finally gets around to saying something about me he both lies, and I use this word because he knows the truth, and employs what can be regarded as a childish effort at deprecation: "Assassinologist (which I am not) Harold Weisberg has had extensive access to Ray. Weisberg served as an investigator for James H. Lesar, a Washington, D.C. attorney, when Lesar represented Ray for a period of years in the 1970s." He continues with other comments, such as the time I spent with Ray, etc.

I regard it as just plain and deliberate dishonesty, ^{NOT} to make any reference at all to the great and difficult labor of Lesar in the Ray evidentiary hearing, ^{to} which I've seen no reference, not even a hint that it took place. Again, the only apparent reason is to pretend that ^{he!} Melanson alone did it all. This is really outrageous because Jim carried most of the work in those two weeks of hearings. (page 27)

In this regard note that Melanson makes no reference to them or to the transcripts of them he could have gotten from Lesar or me. (This suggests that as with the other exploiters, like Scheim and John H. Davis the crime is immaterial and their theories are all that matter.) What in the hell kind of scholarship is it when he ignores the one adducing and testing of evidence under the American judicial system, with live witnesses and cross examination? This is not in his bibliography but "ony Summers "Conspiracy," which is on the JFK assassination, is?

Then there is the bit about me being one of Lesar's investigators, a reasonable interpretation of his employing "an." He has none and we did not have that relationship, as Melanson knew very well. I was the defense investigator, Ray's, working with the lawyers, of whom Jim was one of three.

This kind of writing and these misrepresentations serve to and clearly have the intent to deprecate what I did and to suggest still further that Melanson did it all. ~~Lesar and I.~~ * * * *Returned later. Drafted over a two-week period*

On an unnumbered page before the dedication page Melanson has an asterisk after "MURKIN" in his title and a footnote reading "The code name MURKIN is used to suggest a conspiracy manifesting a clandestine modus operandi and involving elements of American intelligence." He also has a quotation from an Alex Rosen (General Investigative Division) to "Assistant Director De Loach" when in fact Rosen also was an assistant director, as apparently Melanson did not know and when in fact that was his channel to

Hoover, in which Rosen suggest^s MURKIN as the code name. The implication is of intelligence but only to the ignorant and it is not reasonably or honestly subject to any such suggestion. It is standard FBI practise and it is, as Rosen states, an efficiency in reference and is "utilized in order to more efficiently handle the mail." As the self-portrayed expert Melanson apparently does not realize, ~~is that~~ "mail" has a special meaning to the FBI in its record-keeping. All records reaching FBIHQ are described by the short-hand "mail." These code names are standard practise. The Senate Intelligence Committee was known as "Kensalt." "MURKIN" was selected as a contraction of "murder" and "King." Now if by any chance Melanson means to say "I use MURKIN to suggest..." he should have said that instead of implying that the FBI visualized a conspiracy involving a clandestine modus operandi and American intelligence, which the FBI without question did not and did not have in mind in suggesting the short-hand for a much longer title.

On xiii, under "Acknowledgement," Melanson thanks "Attorney Dan Bernstein, who assisted with Freedom of Information Act requests." This can be taken by the reader to include MURKIN, particularly because Melanson has avoided any mention of how MURKIN became available. It will be interesting to see what, if anything of significance, ~~was~~ ~~is~~ obtained by these requests and uses in this book. If all he did was request, he accepted what was given to him and foreclosed suits by others to obtain what was within those requests and not disclosed. (In the notes I've examined to this point, when I've read only to page 19, I've seen no citation to any such FOIA information he got on his own. This prompted me to read the balance of his notes and I did, rather I skimmed them seeking a citation to his own personal FOIA requests. There is only one and it was not a request of the FBI. It was of the CIA and he is either ignorant or dishonest in it, as I go into. First I want to note that there is only one FBI record cited that was not from my litigation and I am ~~sure~~ confident it is and that Melanson has a typographic error in citing it. He has a few errors, such as saying that the McCullough file was in the Invaders file. (He thanks Jerry McKnight for making it available. I gave it to Jerry and I'm sure if the question came up Jerry did not say otherwise. But in fact there is a McCullough file that is separate and there is no McCullough file that is part of the Invaders file. There are McCullough records that are in the Invaders file and they do not identify him by name.)

What he got from the CIA it had already released to me through litigation, and some of those mentioned in the note clearly were, if not all, and some were disclosed to Dave Garrow. As the note makes clear, Melanson would have done better to merely ask Garrow for copies than making a duplicating request of the CIA. Unless, of course, he wanted to claim as his work what was not his original work. *(He does, throughout.)*

I gave some of these records, those that they wanted, to Jeff Prugh of the Los Angeles Time and George Lardner, Jr., of the Washington Post, both papers carried long stories and both provided them internationally on their news service. *long, long ago.*

Incompetence or dishonesty, take your choice. It is not actual scholarship and it is not handled and presented in what we understand to be a scholarly manner. It is the taking of credit personally for work he has not done.

Obviously, when I've not completed the book, far from it, I can't be certain but *(true)* all the indications are that he got nothing under FOIA that had not already been disclosed. There seem to be a small number of CIA pages that Garrow got that I did not but that may well be because he filed a different request. He did not sue for those he got but I did sue, if he later got only what I had already gotten, meaning made available. All of the FBI records cited I forced out in C.A. 75-1996, which is still before the court.

Introduction:

He says there have been "three versions" of what "passed for ^{the} truth" about the King assassination" (page xv) One is the official story of Ray alone, the next is that

Y/10/1/19

of the Church committee, and it did not do such thing. It discussed what the FBI did to King. The ~~second~~ third he does not even identify, the DJ Office of Responsibility's. He says it was "released" and it wasn't. Only a summary was. Jim Lesar filed suit for the papers of that inquiry and Melanson could and should have known this and he could have gotten the records from Lesar or from me. He didn't ask for them.

For him the court record, the only information produced as the result of the working of our judicial system, also available to him through Lesar or me, is not worthy of mention.

His last paragraph is his version: that Ray was the assassin. And the FBI's and the OPR's and the HSCA's. "Version" indeed!

Chapter 1

In a very bobtailed manner he goes into what immediately preceded the assassination in Memphis. And he is wrong. This part (page 2) is not sourced. Had he really known and used the MURKIN records he would have known that King's "aides" did not "whisk" him off to the (unnamed) Holiday Inn. The police did that and they, not the aides, selected that motel. *the River motel. (The police used good judgement in this choice.)*

Melanson represents that during the violence of the demonstration the week before King was assassinated "(a) 16-year old black youth was shot and killed." His name was Payne and it was neither during the demonstrations and violence nor at that place. It was later and at his home.

Melanson then says that "the Memphis strike was by no means atypical of King's involvements...seemed to galvanize political passions wherever he appeared." The violence was "atypical" and that situation was already galvanized before King's advent.

He avoids ^{again} my work by saying that although Marrell McCullough was "not revealed by official investigators" (page 4) HSCA went into him. I had earlier forced disclosure of his file and records relating to him in the Memphis and HQ records. So why the structure of "official investigators?"

He says it was "Bessie Brewer's rooming house." It wasn't. She worked there. Modest to a fault, Melanson concludes this chapter saying "there is now (i.e., in his book) overwhelming evidence that the assassination...could not possibly have been the work of one man." (He has already disagreed with HSCA's conspiracy theory.)(page 5)

Chapter 2

Conspicuously, there are big hunks that are not sourced. Of interest to me on page 7 and later he refers to John Willard as a Ray alias as a Canadian alias. Neither here nor later, where I'll cite the page, does he indicate that there is any reason to believe that the only John Willard in the world was this one Canadian. He does not even give any reason to believe Ray was using the name of a Canadian - especially when he used it before he tried to escape through Canada. ~~where he tried to escape through Canada. where he tried to escape through Canada. where he tried to escape through Canada. where he tried to escape through Canada.~~ He returns to Willard on page 10. Willard was surprised that HSCA did not interview him. Why in the world should they have?

Absent any evidence that Ray used the identify of this Canadian all of this part is a large waste of time. And it misleads the reader.

He theorizes on page 11 that because Willard did business with an auto repair shop near where Ray roomed in Toronto "it would have been very easy for Ray to spot him entering Bart's, then get his name from the business card." Did Willard leave a card with an old customer every time he visited? And how was Ray to get that card or to select that card from whatever cards Bart had? Silly conjecturing added to an invalid assumption but perhaps basic or important in Melanson's theory.

He says (page 12) that ~~Ray~~ ^{Galt} faced more "risk" than others whose name Ray used. He does not say what risk there was for him or for others and there was none. Publicity, embarrassment, perhaps but not any risk at all. *He has much more on this later*

In an effort to hide that he cribbed from Fragnup, where alone it appeared, he goes through a rigamarole about the "St. V" in Galt's middle name appearing in his signature in a manner that can be taken as "Starvo." In so doing he refers to Galt's quite legible but somewhat flowery handwriting as a "scrawl." It wasn't at all. He says that "the press noted" this. Maybe my recollection is wrong but he gives no citation and I do not remember any story pointing that out. He has a big "discovery" of his own, his word on page 12, that Ray in 1968 stopped using "Stravo" and instead used "S" and "this is the same switch the real Galt made in 1966." No more. The reader is to provide the meaning to this great discovery. The reader has to because there is none.

Melanson finds it "incredible" that HSCA never spoke to Galt. In only one sense could this be reasonable, and Melanson gives none at all. Perhaps the committee might have asked Galt if he had any idea how Ray got to know his name. But it is not incredible that the committee didn't, with all the legitimate investigations it never got around to making.

He concludes this chapter by asking how Ray got his Toronto aliases before he'd been there. To the best of my recollection the only one he had earlier is Galt. The question as it relates to Galt, as he does not formulate it, is quite legitimate, but there is no evidence that Willard is a Canadian alias and I don't think he used the others before he was in Toronto. (page 14)

Chapter 3

He quotes HSCA as saying it had "evidence" to connect Ray with the Byers fabrication (he says nothing at all about Byers criminal record) and he says it concluded that James could have learned of that alleged contract to kill King through his brother John. He greatly exaggerates John's puny bar and ignores the fact that there had been no contact between John and James for a long time and that James did not even know how to get in touch with John. In short, he lacks factual knowledge. (page 16) On the next page he quotes Cong. Chris Dodd as saying that he can't with certainty say who conspired with Ray. Or, Melanson does not question that Ray was the assassin and Dodd does not entirely agree with what HSCA said. (He assumes Ray's guilt through.)

Melanson criticizes HSCA for not investigating "the possible involvement of CIA or military intelligence or some quasi-federal intelligence aparat (whatever that may be)" yet he has given no reason for this other than King's position against US Vietnam policy. Is that a reason to investigate them, were that at all possible, for killing him? Him and not so many others?

He says HSCA's investigation was "seriously flawed" but he does not say that it ^{assumed} proved that Ray was the assassin. It is the alleged conspiracy part that was flawed. (18) This was easy for him when he ignored the court evidence in the evidentiary hearing. It was also easy for HSCA because committees can do whatever they please. Melanson did not have those transcripts but I forced them on HSCA. It did have them and it ignored them and that evidence uncongenial to its preconception of Ray's guilt. This is not a theory on my part. They made this clear to Jim Lesar and to me before they began to, excuse the word, investigate.

4/12/89: It appears that he is making a big thing of the aliases without beginning by saying why he regards them as this significant. He imposes it is some kind of intelligence business and does this in a Pink Panther concept of how intelligence agencies work: The so-called "fat man" whose name he has not yet given (through page 33) served an intelligence agency function in delivering cash to Ray. This no doubt explains why Ray lacked only a few dollars for passage from Portugal to Rhodesia, which had no extradition treaty! He had the generous funding of the spooks so, even after a ^{robbery} robbery, he was broke!

My recollection is not clear and I've not consulted the file of my correspondence with Melanson but I have the impression that he regarded the real Eric Galt as some kind of sinister person with an evil past of some kind. Treatment in the book is quite different. (He never told me he was waiting on a boat.)
So we have this plot he visualizes and it is based on Ray's guilt yet Melanson has

not addressed the facts of the crime, has not questioned the official story that Ray fired the fatal shot, has not even bothered to place Ray at the scene of the crime, which no official ever did as of the time of the crime, and this, too, is scholarship of so high a quality it justifies his criticism of other inquiries. To the point I've reached he hasn't had a word to say about the FBI's investigation or that of the Memphis police or any of the literature with which he inflated his bibliography. (He never criticizes the FBI.)

He concentrates more on Ray's aliases beginning in Chapter 4, particularly the Galt alias. This is what interested him most when he was in touch with me. My present recollection is that he cast Galt in some kind of nefarious role, perhaps illegal and of police interest, but my recollection may not be faithful and it is not the picture of Galt in the book. The subject of aliases is certainly a more than merely legitimate area of inquiry but any real inquiry is compromised by preconceptions, which get to be like horse blinders. He never told me he was working on a book. He did tell me he was investigating the aliases. I learned about the book relatively recently. I imagine that had I known I'd have helped him more and there are many places he could have used help, particularly from the MURKIN records, every word of which I've read and have.

What he recounts is pretty amateurish investigating and he missed obvious opportunities by not asking the right questions of the right people. One I'll come to is Jules Kimble. He spent time with Bud Fensterwald, who may well have all that Jim Garrison had, and he did have information on Kimble. I could have told him this. (I don't think I kept a file on Kimble but had I know what Melanson reports later I would have.) He apparently did not speak to Garrison, who is not in the index. (See 5A)

And he persists in building a case for an intelligence agency conspiracy without even indicating any real reason for one to want to kill King, other than Vietnam, where such targets would have been numerous. (My recollection of the Pentagon Papers is not clear enough for me to pinpoint when some in CIA grew disenchanted with the Vietnam war.)

An example of how he stretches to advance this notion is where he refers (44) to what I said about Raoul. He eliminates what I regard as the most important thing I'm sure I told him, that without someone like Raoul what is attributed to Ray would be impossible. What he does say is that I believe that Ray cannot make a specific identification of the man he knew as Raoul because such a person would make that impossible. What he does say suggests intelligence as I never did, that Raoul "would employ every trick of tradecraft to hide his identity." "Tradecraft" is gradually associated with spooks and I was talking about crooks.

On the same page he suggests that Raoul was a real person in a reporter's investigation, which turned up a mysterious person near where Ray says he met Raoul, the "eptune Bar: The man turned out to be Jules Ricco Kimble." On reading this I made a note, "How established" because he does not indicate this to begin with and it is less than really established that Kimble is the man who was seen and taken to be Raoul. What follows, however, does make out a reasonable case that Kimble was in Toronto.

In complaining that there is no access to the HSCA's records on Kimble he reflects ignorance of normal Congressional practise. He says not that withholding such records for 50 years is the practise enforced by the Congress but that HSCA "succeeded in locking up all unpublished records..." (46)

At the bottom of page 47 he refers to Joseph Oster as a Louisiana private investigator. Makes no reference of his early association with the Garrison "probe," which he also abandoned early,

In referring to the phone numbers through which Ray made contact with Raoul (50) he says that were Ray to disclose them "he might get a lucky bingo that could provide strong corroboration for his story." How this would help Ray he does not say but does imply to the uninformed reader. Were Ray to prove he was part of a conspiracy it would hurt, not help him, and "bingo" describes what he could expect to happen to him. Any co-conspirators would be endangered and could be expected to retaliate.

Add on Jules Kimble, p. 5

Kimble would be hard to believe if St. Peter was sitting on his shoulder while he spoke. After reading what Melander says about him I got from the AARC some of the Garrison Kimble records Bad got years ago.

He says he flew with Ferrie, met with Ferrig and Shaw together and knew that Shaw was Clay Bertrand. Only Garrison did not use him at the Clay Shaw trial.

He does not, however, claim to have been present at the immaculate conception.

My recollections of what Garrison attributed to Kimble in the JFK case are far from clear and certain but I think that Kimble was one of about 10 who were arrested in a raid on a Minuteman camp near Lake Pontchartrain. Connecting him with them and the Klan does provide a motive for assassinating King. *But does not connect with the crime itself*

Chapter 7 "In Search of the Fat Man, #4 Without Tonto, too!

All of this is amateurish, overwritten, conjectural, self-contradictory and silly. He makes much out of nothing and has to mumble a bit, too. He writes it like a real-life detective story. He is the detective. Grwasay kid stuff. He even makes on he has to hide the name of the so-called fat man and he is outside his regular pattern in this book in saying how he learned who the man is.

He has made ostentatious reference to his use of the FBI's records and he has cited them fairly precisely on occasion. But in this instance he fudges it all over (page 59), while referring here only to "released documents." Not FBI, not CIA, not gangbusters'. He says our authorities kept the name secret, which he knows is a lie. Otherwise he would not have had it. He says also that "released documents delete his identity. But one document obtained by the author (emp. added) had failed to delete the name: William Bolton (a pseudonym created by the author)."

I got what he refers to in my King BOIA case and made what was in my writing file available to him. ~~ABUT I DID NOT MAKE COPIES OF ALL FOR THIS FILE.~~ Only enough for identification. What he makes this mysterious reference to is the FBIHQ NURKIN file, ~~44~~ 38861-4396. It does not delete the name, as others of which I made duplicate copies do. But this record refers to others of which I had no interest in making copies, beginning with a Buffalo (conduit from Canada in FBI) teletype of 6/11/68, 8:11 p.m.

The name is Robert ^{Mc}ouldton. The text establishes, I think, "Melanson's dishonesty in the mumbojumbo he makes of a straightforward matter, the letter Ray forgot in a phone booth. I'm not checking all the pages but Melanson pretends it is a letter Ray wrote. *It was an envelope that had only a typed name on it, he argues, that Ray had no typewriter, etc. The FBI text says what I had always understood, "found envelope there addressed to Sneyd at Dundas address."* Toward the end of this chapter this is the essence of what he attributes to "Bolton." But all he goes through to contrive a phony case! *(See page 6c)*

I don't want to forget: I know of no other case where FBI records are not cited properly, only this one instance, and here he has something to hide, that he got it from me for one thing and that there was no secrecy for another. What I got the FBI puts in its public reading room, so he is merely phonying up synthetic excitement along with synthetic fact.

He begins (52) by describing "the 'fat man' incident as the most provocative episode in the fugitive phase of the King case." If he really means this, and I think he does, he flaunts his ignorance.

As he mumbles about the envelope he says (56), criticizing the police explanation, that the letter "related to Ray's seeking employment." What is obvious that if as is apparent the letter was written to Ray, there is no indication of when he had sought that employment. Melanson assumes it was just then and that it is not reasonable because the day he got it back is the day he flew to England.

Melanson says that this envelope, which was opened when found, held cash for Ray's getaway from his coconspirators. Awful nonsense! and that this must be so because that is the day Ray left. It is ridiculous to believe that either spooks or crooks would use that means of delivering cash- leaving it in a phone booth. (Unless Melanson wants to say that Ed D was in on the crookedness, as he doesn't. Nor would anyone in either field of endeavor considered delivering money where observation was possible. A side street, a back alley, the seats of autos in the dark, all kinds of places where there would be no observation.)

7
(understand)
He also doesn't know Jimmy or any of the Rays. Any of them would be able to lose the ticket and passport. Jimmy, aside from Melanson's fictioneering, had just lost a letter written to him in a phone booth. Did he dare carry his ticket and passport until his plane left? Of course not when there was no need, so he left it where it was safe, at the travel agency.

To advance his childish fiction he quotes the landlady, Mrs. Loo, as saying that it was a white envelope "with only a typewritten name on the front." He knows this is not true, as shown by the message he got from me, the FBI's. So, he attributes the fiction to a reporter.

Melanson tries to make something of Ray's remaining in his room the day he was to leave rather than leaving earlier, as he had other days. When when he was leaving Canada that afternoon? He says it is explained by Ray's waiting for a delivery of money! (58) And, not entirely consistently with the later reference to it with which I begin above, but consistent with his failure to cite any source or FBI number, he refers to Serial 4396 by saying "an FBI teletype from headquarters to Memphis on June 12 states that the letter was to Sneyd at Dundas address." In the next paragraph he does not say that this is the record with McD's name in it and not withheld. He writes as though he is referring to two different FBI records.

So, making it seem like diligent investigation was required to locate "the fat man" rather than the record I gave him, he went and spoke to him. He was paranoid as hell, and Melanson apparently has not encountered this commonplace fear in this field.

McD said the letter was about a job in Portugal. (60)

Melanson asked to whom the letter was addressed- what a question when it was returned to Sneyd because that was the address -"and whether it mentioned mercenaries. (Ray ~~in fact~~ was, in fact, trying to make contact with mercenaries in Portugal.)" In fact this is not fact. Ray had been in Portugal seeking a way to Rhodesia. He was going to Belgium to make contact with those mercenaries. He then says that this letter was "penned by Ray," which is false and opposite what he has just quoted McD as telling him, and, his concept of "fact" and "true" again, "It is true that Ray was headed for Portugal when arrested in London." He had just come from Portugal. He was ticketed to and was going to Brussels. (60)

These are simple and well-known facts and there is no reason for there to be any confusion about them. It tells me all over again that like the others engaged in exploitation and theorizing and not uncommonly ego-tripping, Melanson has not bothered to learn even the simple facts of the case.

In a sense, though, Melanson is right in saying this is the most provocative business: it is provocative as self-description, self-characterization.

Chapter 8, "The Window of Vulnerability" (4/14/89)

The title is apt as self-description. To this chapter I've been wondering whether Melanson is ignorant or dishonest. He is both in this chapter. This is in addition to the inevitable problem created by a preconceived solution when enough is not known to justify this approach. There are many things in this chapter that are plain dishonest, of which I've marked and will cite some. And there is ignorance of basic and established fact from the very file from which he takes his title, MURKIN, and of police procedures, a field in which he considers himself an expert and in which he has published. These and his omissions of what he has to know are also unfair, but all these wrongs are essential to his development of his preconception of an intelligence conspiracy. Throughout he assumes Ray's guilt as the assassin and never gets even close to any of the basic evidence in the MURKIN file alone or in my work and litigation, all available to him and some known to him. He also assumes much of the official mythology in other areas, without any questioning at all. He also depends throughout on the always questionable HSCA even when what they address is also in MURKIN.

Selectively, however, without citing any source, he draws on my work, as in the first sentence in this chapter, on the failure of the police to issue an all-points bulletin (APB). That comes from Frameup. Where he does cite my book, page 73, he says, making me plural to begin with, "It has been implied by some researchers that the time of the (TACT units' rest break) timing of the rest break may have been of conspiratorial design," cited to my page 166.

In the one relevant paragraph on that page I am ~~am~~ ^s specifically addressing the honesty of the prosecution's representations in the guilty-plea hearing and my only source citation is to that transcript. Although I do say, lacking knowledge at that time that the TACT units consisted of three cars operating as a unit, that they gathered "rather magically," and do refer to culpability, I am referring to police negligence and to the dishonesty of the representations that, as then was not generally known, "police were secretly stationed in the fire station." My topic is not conspiracy, it is the "deliberate deception" of the prosecution's statement at that hearing, and I begin the first sentence by saying that it is "still another deception." He thus appears to cite my work only when he can misrepresent it to advance his theory. (I've not finished reading this chapter as I write this, am at page 75, but I fear if I don't make these notes I'll forget what I perceived beginning two days ago.)

His second paragraph in the chapter states what predominates in it and is so basic to his untenable preconception, "so conspicuous was the collapse of the police presence at the crime scene that even Memphis police officers suspected that the fix was in." He does not identify them and instead cites the HSCA report. I've marked a number of places where he is ignorant, dishonest or both on this but I'll begin with a general statement that relates to all of what follows on this matter. First, however, note that he assumes in the sentence I quote that all police officers, no matter how high or low their rank, know in the most intimate detail what is known to any. Ignorance could have led either a rookie or an inspector to wonder about the absence of visible police at the Lorraine motel. The truth is stated unequivocally in the very file Melanson misuses in using it in his title. I was also able to confirm the accuracy of these particular FBI reports in my own inquiries that ranged from members of the King Memphis Party to a police inspector.

Aside from I think misspelling red-squad policeman ¹ Kedditt's name Melanson also omits entirely any reference to what he had been doing and to black knowledge and resentment of it. He was the preeminent black spy on black activities, his acts were well known and he was both disliked and distrusted for them. He was seen by these Memphis blacks at the airport when King's plane landed. I think but I'm not now sure that he partner in anti-black spying, Officer Richmond, was with him. Richmond also was disliked and distrusted. So, there were immediate and very vocal protests about their presence and they left as a result, going to the fire station where they had a spying post set up from which they could observe and report who visited King, which they did.

Also at the airport was the official police "security" detail. The legitimate complaint that could have been made about it Melanson apparently doesn't know. It was composed of high-ranking police, including inspectors, not the young and vigorous and specially trained police required for such a function. These top brass also were known and distrusted by the blacks and they protested immediately. Despite this the police did escort the King party to the Lorraine, where the protests continued. As a result of these continuing protests, ultimately all visible police were withdrawn. Whether or not it was wise it is more than merely unfair, it is dishonest to represent anything else, particularly when it is fully set forth in the MURKIN files he claims to have full knowledge of and uses in his title - again to imply a "federal" conspiracy, MURKIN being the FBI's code name for its King assassination file. He can't both know the MURKIN file and be other than deliberately dishonest in these pages I've read to now. (I believe but I'm not now certain that there is additional such information in the FBI's relevant Invaders and strike files which are also publicly available now as the result of my unmentioned litigation that I here again note is the means by which MURKIN itself became public.)

9

So, whatever he may mean by "the collapse of police presence at the crime scene," there was never a time when there was no police presence and the short distance away that the police always were was the insistent demand of the King Memphis party.

I next note (64) that he is using HSCA as a straw man to ignore what else is public. This means more than the FBI's disclosed records. There were published public statements about this.

He misrepresents (64) that the only radioed reports of the shooting were by the police, by the TACT unit, and by Richmond's phone call. As I'm sure he'll not get around to saying, the bundle attributed to Ray was found by a sheriff's lieutenant whose name, now escapes me and who I interviewed and we used as an evidentiary hearing witness, was immediately reported by him by radio along with the shooting, which caused him to rush to where he found that package. He next says that on the police radio "the getaway vehicle was described," as "possibly" a white Mustang. Nobody saw or even claimed to see the so-called suspect but a white car was reported to have been at the crime scene. (He continues to cite other sources for what he first learned in frameup.)

In going into his version of the failure to issue any APB he pretends what was true was not true, attribution of this to "the massive confusion." If he thinks there was no "massive confusion" he is nuts. But he is trying to build an intelligence conspiracy case when there is no basis for it in what is known and he cites, which are not identical. He then stretches this (66) to represent that the FBI had the responsibility for issuing the APB, based on a police comment that does not relate to the APB but to disseminating "fugitive data" Lt. Kallaher said that when a fugitive crossed a state line (which then was not known, of course) "it was the" FBI's "responsibility to disseminate fugitive data." Melander follows this, nothing omitted here, saying "such a preeminent federal role was not mentioned by the public safety director, Holloman, who'd retired by the FBI. Disseminating fugitive data is not the same as issuing an APB."

He next cites HSCA for a hidden FBI record later used by HSCA which, after considerable time, effort and cost we got in C.A. 75-1996. It was hidden by filing outside of MURKIN. He says the FBI passed this threat on to the FAA, police, military intelligence and the Memphis police but, again by ignoring the original source, he is limited to what HSCA chose to use: they did not notify King or any of his people about the threat to kill him when he returned to Memphis. (This illustrates the deficiency of his scholarship by his dependence on secondary or more remote sources when the original source was available to him.)

He next says (66) that "MPD's sudden and unexplained withdrawal of King's security spawned a great deal of speculation concerning conspiracy." It was neither sudden nor unexplained because the detail lingered long at the Lorraine and there is a full explanation in MURKIN. He follows this by saying it was a "four-man police security detail," referring to but one of the two cars of what cannot, a point important to him that he missed, be described as a security detail when it was limited to ranking and older police.

When he does get around to mentioning the black opposition to any police presence he attributes this to police action at the riot of a week earlier, without reference to the continuous spying of which the black King party was well aware. This serves to foster the falsehood that Redditt was "security" when he was a spy reporting on who went to see King. He continues to be unfair and inaccurate along these lines and actually says, cribbing the falsehood from Mark Lane, that King was "stripped" of his "security." He also (67) attributes this to "King's distrust of the MPD" and King's concept of his own image. In fact on occasion King had demanded police presence. He also describes the detail as "regular policemen" when in fact they were higher officers and not "regular policemen."

He next says that the "withdrawal of King's security was unjustified." (68) This is quite unfair to the police. Quoting HSCA he says that the detail was increased at the Lorraine whereas it was composed of two cars at the airport. (68) He here next says that there was a precedent for King's request for police "help in escaping the violence" of the

week before. He is unfaithful to the ~~reality~~ reality by again depending on HSCA rather than MURKIN, which he uses selectively in a footnote and again it could be to hide the fact that he got that record from me. There are a number of which he could have selected that one. The week before, those with King asked to be led to the famous hotel the name of which I've forgotten and nearby. Instead the police (and I think their decision was good) elected to take the party to the ^(nearby) ~~Vermonst~~ ^{Vermonst}, which Melanson does not identify. He also fails to note what also is in MURKIN, that FBIHQ deliberately misrepresented this in a Cointelpro that was done for it by the Memphis papers, attacking King for going to a white motel in stead of the Lorraine, which he always had used in the past, and in a nasty cartoon of a cowering King captioned "Chicken a la King."

Here for the first time, and he repeats it often, he refers to the threat against the red-squad cop Redditt as "a false threat." It was not. It was real and he never gives it source, apparently so he can misrepresent it, which he does without fail, every one of the many times. His description of Redditt's function, which he learned from Fraefup, he attributes to HSCA. He does not say that when Redditt was removed his fellow black police spy Richmond remained and he concludes the first paragraph of this Redditt section by saying, again citing HSCA, all Redditt could have done was give chase to fleeing suspects, as numerous other officers attempted to do." False. Nobody saw any suspect and there was no chase of any suspect. There was a false chase and there was a quick examination of the immediate area, in which no suspect was seen.

He quotes HSCA as saying that Redditt's lying about what happened was "exploited by advocates of conspiracy theories," directed at all critics of the King investigation. In fact it was one only, Mark Lane. (68) In this he fails to report the story Redditt made up and Lane swallowed, obviously a false story. (Here I noted that possibly there is another reason for Melanson's use of HSCA as his source - not to be criticized for error if it was the HSCA's error. One of his bibliography is Lane's book on this.) as I now recall it is that he had recommended a "perimeter" defense, posting cops at the nearby corners to prevent any escape by any assassin.)

He continues to refer to the allegedly "false death threat" (69) and its allegedly "mysterious federal origin." It was not mysterious and it was not of federal origin and here and from the index he makes no mention of the actuality. The Senate Internal Security Committee was informed of this threat and took it so seriously its investigator or perhaps staff director, named Manuel, flew to Memphis immediately after phoning. The Senate is not an executive agency, as a professor of political science knows very well, is not usually considered "federal" but Melanson is building his phony intelligence conspiracy case, his book. He again is quite unfair to the Memphis police in his account and in its decision to get Redditt away from his spying job. What would have been the result if he had been killed, particularly with King there and Redditt and the police spying on him? The police had little or no choice. (His misuse of "federal" continues at every possible point. He never refers to the Senate.) All of this, too, is in MURKIN.

(71) He quotes the officer in charge of the TACT units as saying that they were kept several blocks away "by an instruction from an unidentified member of Dr. King's entourage." He and that officer know very well that no member of King's "entourage" could or did give orders to any police component. If this loose description of a request, the word that same officer next uses, instead of "instruction," there is truth because there was such a request, yet Melanson (72) ~~says~~ refers to its "basic improbability." He then argues based on what he says is the "relationship" of the TACT units to King's presence in Memphis. He says that unlike a security detail, they were not there to protect King but to protect the city of Memphis from King. Well, first of all, they were to quell violence, of course, but for that they did not have to be and would not have been stationed where King was, as they had been. There is no such thing as a single purpose under the existing circumstances. Despite the antagonism of the police toward King stationing TACT units where he was did give them a protective purpose. (His line about protecting Memphis from King appears to come from the black preacher Rev. Sam B. Kyles, from his footnote.)

Melanson next argues that "It is highly improbable that the MPD would comply with" a request to move the TACT units to where they'd not be seen from the Lorraine. He adds that "there is no evidence of any such request," which is false from the MURKIN records. Absent a formal, written request there would be no formal written request, but the fact is clearly recorded in those MURKIN records I'm beginning to think Melanson spent little time with and that he checked what he found cited by HSCA in MURKIN. The contemporaneous records of the FBI are an at least satisfactory source and they reflect both the demand to remove "edditt and the moving of the Tact units.

(73) Stretching for nits to pick he argues (73) that Tact Unit 10 "was not in compliance with the order to remain five or ten blocks from the Lorraine. Instead it came within a block only minutes before the shooting." The instructions to the TACT units related to their duties, where they would patrol, and they were in motion, on patrol. What he is talking about and misrepresents is that the fire station was a rest place for these units, where the officers could use rest rooms, get something to drink or nibble on and just rest. This is precisely what they were doing when King was shot and it was not a violation of any order. Moreover, where in that area and at that time could three cars have been parked safely and the 12 officers be able to do these things in the few minutes of a rest break? What he argues is nonsense, except as a reflection of him and what the caliber of his reasoning and writing is. Where indeed could 12 men use toilet facilities simultaneously in that rundown area? There was no such place. Now the Lorraine is but a short block from the main street leading to the police station, headquarters, the courts and DAs office. Would he argue that using that street for such a purpose violated the order? The cars would have been just as close to the Lorraine because they were parked on the parking apron of the fire station, on South Main St. at Butler Ave. They, as it happens, could not be seen from the Lorraine and if any of King's party had walked past, as none did, they'd have found the cars entirely empty. (It is at this point that he has one of his rare citations of Frameup, cited above.)

His next subtitle (74) is "The Long Arm of Federal Intelligence." It did not reach to Memphis in the King assassination. But as he tries to make fact of falsehood he launches a series of misrepresentations about normal activities and relationships. He represents that a "very cordial and cooperative" relationship between the police and FBI is out of the usual and is attributable to the fact that the public safety director, Frank Holloman, had been in the FBI for 25 years and had worked in Hoover's office. There have been places where the FBI relationship with local police displeased the locals, but what is supposed to exist is a close and cooperative relationship. This is ~~AAAA~~ NORMAL.

He represents as unusual that the federal government assists and trains local police and that "the richness of federal-local intelligence links" is illustrated by the fact that Lieutenant Arkin had received training from both the FBI and Secret Service - which are NOT intelligence but are police agencies. To further this he quotes Arkin's crediting FBI Agent William Lawrence with teaching him "everything about intelligence work." I do question the honesty and accuracy of this quote, which has no specific citation but can be taken to be what Arkin told Melanson. What Lawrence could have taught Arkin is limited to keeping tabs on dissident groups and no more. Not "intelligence" in the meaning of that alleged "long arm" and federal intelligence, usually taken to mean what is represented by the CIA. And what makes all of this even more dishonest is the fact that the FBI is charged with the responsibility of providing training to local police and has an academy for that purpose. Diplomas must be prominent in most police offices.

He then quotes Arkin in what is a lie, whether or not that is what Arkin said, "that he was the only police officer who could walk into an FBI field office and have access to the files whenever he wanted." In fact even SAs are denied access to files under many circumstances and have to give written requests to get them. He quotes Arkin as adding, "Mr. Hoover knew it and he approved, 'cause he knew I was good." This can't be believed and Melanson ought have known all of the above is bull.

To make an untrue point he adds that "Arkin also claims to have helped federal

agents conduct intelligence-gathering activities in "emphis, and that in return ~~XXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ " he generously shared intelligence data with the Bureau." Because Arkin helped them "in return" he helped them more"- garbage! The actuality is that such cooperation is absolutely normal. Note that "intelligence" is not defined, that "federal officers" are not defined and the "intelligence" in which they cooperated was nothing at all, like political assassination. Melanson has misrepresented and distorted the norm into a case of "the long arm of Federal intelligence" reaching down to "emphis.

Reflecting his ignorance of the FBI files he pretends to use as a major part of the basis for this book he cites a single FBI memo from the HSCA's use of it. There are in Murkin and the Invaders and Sanitation Workers strike literally hundreds of these that still exist and even more that were destroyed with citations to other records in which the information can be found and that still exist.

He quotes without citation, so I take it this is from my files of from HSCA's use, an April 3 memo "from Arkin's surveillance team ~~with~~ inside the firehouse," which is to say what he does not say, "edditt and Richmond, saying that "Federal Officers (his caps) were ~~XXXX~~ noted arpund the Lorraine Motel." He does not even indicate what kind of "federal officer" but he links this with the preceding sentence,"(W)hen I asked (Arkin) about a CIA presence he went to another subject." There was no CIA presence and there was nothing Arkin could have said to indicate one. Assuming he went on to another subject, we have to assume from Melanson's writing that Arkin said nothing at all in response, which I think is not likely the fact. There is not a single indication of any CIA presence in any of the FBI's files.

This is dishonest writing. It also is dishonest to omit what could have caused "federal officers" to be there. Not that cops refer to the FBI or SS as ~~XXXX~~ federal officers. I can't remember ever having seen such a reference. They say FBI, SS, etc., However, as even Melanson has to know if only from his reading, the federal court had issued an injunction against the planned demonstration. This required the presence of "federal officers" of the judicial system or the U.S. Marshals, also "federal officers," to serve papers and for other such purposes. And what does "round" mean? As Melanson uses it it means at that motel. But the word does not have to mean that. Especially when used by those who ~~had~~ little education.

By these dishonest means he argues that "the log arm of federal intelligence" reached down to "emphis when King was killed and before that.

He next claims that HSCA was "ignorant" of the fact that the FBI had a symbol informer (he uses the word "spy") inside SCIC headquarters. If the ~~FBI records~~ HSCA read books and MURKIN records it certainly did know. Garrow identified him by name. He is all through the MURKIN records of that period, without his name being used.

I assume that because Melanson attributed the long arm to this FBI informer's being in Memphis the day before King was killed. He cites Garrow as his source. The records were disclosed to me in C.A.75-1996, these MURKIN records, but there is nothing in them to suggest that Informer James A. Harrison had anything to do with the assassination of any information relating to it. He merely spied on King and SCIC. However, largely by ~~XXXX~~ questions he doesn't realize are really silly, Melanson argues that Harrison was there to pinpoint King's schedule. Well, there was no schedule at all! King was there for the demonstration, he stayed at the motel all of the day of April 3 until he went to speak that night, which he had not planned. He'd sent Rev. Abernathy to ~~make that speech~~, His "outnaintop" speech when the audience demanded him. King also remained at the motel all of the 4th, until he was to leave for supper at the Kyleses, which is when he was shot. (Melanson criticizes HSCA for ignoring what had nothing at all to do with the crime and then himself is dishonest in how he uses what HSCA ignored.)

On the same page (75) Melanson misrepresents what I'd gotten earlier from the CIA (and he could have gotten here although he made his own request) and what Garrow also got, to suggest that the CIA "could have manipulated the Memphis police" because "it had an operational interest in monitoring King's activities." It is not easy, but Melanson

succeeds in being unfair to CIA, too. The disclosed records, as I recall them, are mostly if not entirely on two things: the possibility of civil disorders during the Poor Peoples Campaign, which King had launched, in Washington, by such means as blocking the bridges, which could come close to closing the government down, and to information pressed on it by a man who hated King and who refused its suggestion that he report to the FBI instead of it because he was violating its charter. Garrow has much on him. He changed his name to "Kennedy" and I've forgotten his real name. He was an ex-Communist. The records disclosed to me include the contents of King's pockets but there is nothing in those records to say that the CIA stole them from King's hotel rooms or his pockets or got them from the FBI, which is likely. Before reading further, seeing some of what lies ahead in this book, I note that I gave copies of these records to Jeff Prugh, of the Los Angeles Times (stationed then as Atlanta bureau chief) and George Gardner, of the Washington Post. Each used one of these two kinds of records and both of their papers syndicated the stories they wrote. This is to say they got wide distribution. As I now recall this was a 1976 or 1977 FOIA lawsuit I filed and Jim Lesar handled for me. It was later that these stories appeared. I have copies filed but do not recall the dates. My point is that it was not possible for Melanson to research the matter without knowing that this information had been disclosed by the CIA. He also knew when he read Garrow. (At this point I stop to read more because when there is too much time between my reading and typing I can forget. This is why I did not complete the chapter before typing. I may not have noted some of what I'd intended but because this bears so much on Melanson's personal and professional integrity I felt I had to make these notes as promptly as possible. In retrospect, Dave, it would have been better if I'd used my microcassette, although that would have likely meant greater length.)

Resumed 4/15: I'd sat too long, was uncomfortable and skipped a few things. On 75, again reflecting dependence on secondary sources that ~~was~~ like HSCA had their own agendas, he misleads in saying that when Harrison, the FBI's informant in SCLC headquarters, got to Memphis "(h)e immediately checked in with Robert Jensen," SAC. He cites Garrow. In fact Harrison did not go to the FBI office. He phoned it from the airport. Melanson then says that he left at 7:30 and "(w)hat, if anything, he knew about King's April 4 agenda and whether he reported anything" remains unknown. This reflects his ignorance and his avoidance of primary sources that would require disclosing what I did. What Harrison reported is in MURKIN. Now that agenda nonsense, repeated often after this point, ~~reveals~~ reveals that Melanson knows nothing at all about the actual situation, also disclosed fully in the FBI's records I got and he had available and claims to have used. There was no agenda. He stayed at the motel until suppertime, which I'll come to later, waiting to hear from the federal court, which had banned any demonstration.

Next he makes a big deal about police training records he got from CIA in 1982. In fact, save perhaps for a few details, that ^{was} published much earlier. What he then goes into about the CIA and local police training is not relevant absent proof that Memphis was included, as in what was disclosed it had not been. There being no proof he conjectures that there had been such a relationship apparently because without it he saw no basis for any claim to that "long arm" and an intelligence agency conspiracy to kill King.

On 76, as he tries to hoke a case up, he again flaunts his ignorance, of reality and of those same disclosed MURKIN records. (It may be and you'd best assume that where I say "MURKIN" with the passing of time I may be including the other files I got as MURKIN.) "There are two significant conspiracy-related questions regarding Marrell McCullough's presence at the Lorraine. First, what did he know about King's agenda? (The one that didn't exist at all!) Could he have passed on ... information that King would be exiting the motel during the early evening? (He meant room, not the motel. I think that here I'd best give you the necessary explanation missing in the book as far as I've read, 103. The new wing of that motel's second floor had rooms with only one door, onto the balcony. So, the question was not would King be going away but would he even leave the room at all, a self-answering question, of course.) Second, did any federal authorities or networks have access to "McCullough's intelligence data?" First I note the prejudicial and misleading use of "intel-

genc data" to suggest CIA when in actuality McCullough spied on the young blacks mostly in the Invaders. It had no formal structure, as he never notes and probably didn't know. He did not provide what Melanson means ~~as~~ by "intelligence data," not even about King, and there was and is no rational basis for any suspicion that he did. Only gross ignorance of the files he exploits in his title or intended dishonesty can explain this part of the book. Second, as MURKIN shows, the ~~MOB~~ did give the FBI, which is "federal," copies of his reports and discussed them and McCullough with the FBI. (More on King and supper below.)

(McC) In arguing that HSCA did not properly look into the nonexistent "possible federal linkage" he adds the committee's ignorance, dishonesty or both to his own when he quotes it as saying that because of the way he was treated after the assassination the FBI "was unaware of his ties to the Memphis Police Department." First he does not know and cannot know more than the FBI released, which he doesn't know in any event, and it is without question that the FBI was well and thoroughly aware of McCullough's role and connections. (Later Melanson says that SA William Lawrence, of the intelligence squad, was one of the FBI SAs who questioned McC. after the assassination and about it. He is so tied up with

the zany theory and so ignorant of criminal investigations he fails to note how great a length of time the FBI let go by before questioning McC. It was not until after they'd taken many other witness statements and better understood how to steer the McCullough interview and what to get him to say. He was, after all, the first person to reach the body and a trained policeman. *Lawrence had been getting words of McCullough's reports, he knew!*)

He then has the silly conjecture that because the McC. interview "appeared normal" this could mean it was protecting his cover. That they did by eliminating his role from the report. There was no reason for any other part of it not to be whatever Melanson may mean by "normal."

As he continues with his fiction about a federal intelligence conspiracy, still on 76, Melanson says that "the crucial question" is "whether he had information that, if it ended in federal channels, could have been tapped by conspirators in order to plan the assassinations." It could hardly be more ridiculous.

The kids McCullough was not assigned to spy on King and he not only did not, he could not and still do his job, other than by accident, seeing or overhearing something. The Memphis cops and the FBI wanted very much to do something about them, as the MURKIN records show. Moreover, contrary to fact, Melanson assumes that such information existed. It didn't because King was just sitting and waiting for the court's action on his effort to get the ban on the demonstration lifted. The only plan was for supper, to which I'll return below, but here you should not that if McCullough knew the "plan" he'd have been misinformed because when King was always tardy they gave him the wrong time by an hour to have him close to on time for the cooking to be over without a long wait. The whole thing is really cockamamie and there was no information to pass on to the feds or anyone else. *As MURKIN shows.*

However, in avoiding telling the reader that the only way into and out of King's room Melanson has contrived a phony basis for his nutty and baseless theory. It made no difference when King left the "motel." All an assassin where Melanson and the governments *(both)* say he was had to know was whether King would ever come out of his room. He did many times after he checked in and nobody took a shot at him. He visited in other rooms, for example, as MURKIN records show.

Next (still page 76) in both the text and notes he thanks Jerry McKnight for giving him one ~~record~~ FBI record on McCullough showing that the MPD did give the FBI a McC. report on what little he knew about, my description, not Melanson's, "what was going on at the Lorraine," information incidental to the report's real purposes. In the footnote he misrepresents what Jerry told him to have it mean that the FBI's "file on McCullough" held "over a thousand documents." Melanson doesn't even know what the FBI's McCullough file was and is and what Jerry clearly was referring to ~~is~~ ~~the~~ files in which the FBI filed information from McCullough. There was a separate McCullough file that I finally did get in the lawsuit. Jerry was clearly referring to the Invaders and Sanitation Workers 5 strike files, HQ and field office.

In this, however, Melanson discloses his intent to hide the fact that my lengthy, difficult and costly litigation is what brought all this King assassination material to light. He knew, as probably Jerry told him and I did - and as Jerry's South Atlantic quarterly articles do state - that I am the only one who sued to get that information out. So he is effusive in his thanks to Jerry and can't even get the simplest facts straight.

There is further dishonesty in the writing, where the simple reports on what the Invaders were doing and the little he saw or heard at the Lorraine are described as McCullough's "intelligence" information. He sure strains to make a phony case!

On 77, continuing with this stupidity, Melanson asks, "Did McCullough know when King would emerge from his room at about 6 P.M.? Such knowledge, if it reached a federal data network, would be crucial for a well-orchestrated assassination plot hatched by some elements of American intelligence." This again suggests that there was such a plot, as there was not and as there is no factual basis for believing there was. But again Melanson's ignorance. Was the only time King would "emerge" be at 6? Hadn't he "emerged" at any other time? And why at 6, other than that was when he was killed? He was actually lied to about the time of supper, which was for an hour later, so he might not be too late, as he always was. So, had there indeed been such a plot, the plotters would have been miniformed and misled! And only ~~ignorance~~ ignorance or worse can explain this language and this childish thinking. Melanson says this kind of intelligence, which he suggests was in the federal intelligence network, was essential for their plot. Meaning the one he imagines.

Here and elsewhere he plugs his own derring-dox in getting CIA documents. Not unreasonable for an author. But what are the documents he is hippodroming and how much scholarship and effort are reflected? The documents were released to me (not counting those he got on police/CIA collaboration, ^{release} which I didn't ask for) but only after I had to file and pursue a lawsuit. Apparently later they were given to Garrow. He used them publicly, as I also did, before Melanson wrote this book. As I've indicted, the uses I arranged reached the greatest number of people, readers of the LA Times and WxPost and their international syndicate. So, Melanson's accomplishment in getting the records is no accomplishment at all, as he knew by the time he engaged in this un scholarly self-puffery. More, in his note he complains that Garrow got seven documents withheld from him and it took another six months to get them from the CIA. Yet in thanking a lawyer for his FOIA help, Melanson did not go to court to ~~enforce~~ ^{enforce} compliance and disclosure and complains properly against the CIA's misbehavior while ignoring what is obvious, he could have gotten or had already gotten those documents from Garrow. (Not to say me.)

His conjectures about McCullough (77), critical of HSCA, are whether unwittingly through his "intelligence" he could have helped an assassination - by the American intelligence community. These kind of repeated and entirely unsupported suggestions tend to lull the reader into believing that up is down, that there was such a plot about which he has not produced an iota of evidence. As he ~~says~~ ^{says} later, McCullough ~~was~~ ^{was} the so-called Minister of Transportation of the Invaders. It had no organization structure at all, no officers, and the title was a joke about his real function that did further his spying for the police. at the time in question he did drive King's people around but there was no agenda, no schedule, no timing device of any kind that he could have picked up silyly because despite Melanson's hints, there simply was none to pick up for the intelligence gang.

Instead of scholarly pursuit and examination of disclosed records, particularly those of the FBI, he sticks to HSCA and criticizes it for missing the point as he sees the point in its questioning of McCullough. (77) So he is insensitive to their factual errors one of which he here quotes, that all McC did was meet with the Invaders. He drove King's people around and spent more time doing that than anything else. Only, Melanson's repeated hint at this point, there was no "agenda" for him to learn about. The most superficial examination of the FBI's abundant records leaves this without question, as well as what Kings associates have said and was published.

This is his second mention of the Invaders. The first is on page 4 where he says

only that they were black and militant, the latter only superficially true and then limited to the verbal, and that "they helped ignoute the violence" of March 28. In fact, fearing this, they stayed entirely away from the demonstration and had no part at all in that violence. Melanson also does not say what is important to understanding, that the Invaders were very young, all young, with a fair percentage of their small number still in high school.

There is a misleading ambiguity (78) in this reference to the Invaders and to "ev. Bevel's assignment to work with them in connection with King's Memphis activities." What "activities? Demonstration? Litigation? Public appearances? The whole idea was to keep the Invaders calm and nonviolent, to give them something worthwhile to do and to get them some income for their own activities. (The had made exhorbitant demands on King the 28th.) My point in going in this minor point is that he is an unscholarly scholar who also has not troubled to learn enough of what is readily available to be both complete and dependable to his readers. Once again what I say about the Invaders above was readily available from me or from the FBI reading room to which he gives such fulsome praise in his acknowledgements, which strikes me often as his exploitation of rather than thanks to them. He remains grossly ignorant of the available information.

There is further reflection of this gross ignorance in the question he asks as a means of furthering his conspiracy theory, "Did McCullough's spying on King's staff give him knowledge of the 6:00 departure?" There was no scheduled departure at that time, as I've already indicated, and there was nothing at all to prevent an earlier shot at King when he left and entered his room, available only from the balcony.

It gets even wilder as he invents questions to suggest what he cannot state, like (78): "It is true that while standing on the balcony (a few minutes before 6) King asked Ben Branch... to sing a particular song later that evening. Did McCullough believe this was why King was on the balcony at this precise moment? HSCA's questioning failed to zero in on this key point relating to what federal intelligence could have known."

Does anyone believe that a request for a song to be sung later was planned so long in advance for being made from the balcony, despite all the other means of communications, like phones, that the supposed federal intelligence network could have been informed and have issued whatever instructions he imagines were issued? This is both childish and sick. And withal, he never says or suggests why King was there at that time. He was bantering with his people while Abernathy completed dressing so they could leave for dinner at the Kyleses.

He gets so carried away with his role of novelist pretending scholarship he ends this page with: "It seems logical that in McCullough's capacity as a spy posing as "minister of Transportation..." He did not "pose" as "minister of transportation. He had long functioned in just that role, long before King's first effort to support the strikers.

So, he drove King's people around. Melanson ends this graf with another of his endless conjectures, "It seems unlikely that the ministers (Bevel and Orange) would ask for a ride and yet keep secret plans for going to dinner. Federal-intelligence of King's six o'clock appearance is a definite possibility." There was nothing secret to begin with, there was no reason for the ministers, engaged in other business, even to mention King's dinner arrangements, there was no scheduled "6 o'clock appearance" so what is more than merely a definite possibility" is that as usual Melanson is full of outhouse stuffing. (King had been told 5, not 6.)

Not content with this he suggests that contrary to the evidence of which he also is ignorant King was the subject of electronic surveillance in Memphis- all to get that "foreknowledge" of when he'd be on the balcony to get himself shot.

He next goes into his account (79) of how he was given access in 1982 to a MPD 1969 report on its activities during the King assassination. It complains that it is not accurate and that there are different and inconsistent versions of it. What did this supposedly sophisticated professor of political science expect, that after a year those cops would let their hair down and confess all their transgressions? They did what he

should have expected them to do, prepared a story to cover their own asses. And why in the world did he expect any more when he was being shown a copy when he was writing a book that could hurt them all?

Chapter 9, "The Evidence Reexamined."

(82) the evidence of the title is ^{limited} ~~limited~~ to Ray's guilt and ^{Melanson's} (assessment of it. "Re" I am inclined to question. He assumes throughout that Ray is guilty and was the assassin and nothing in this chapter is any deviation from his preconception.

He continues to be vague and suggest he doesn't know much in saying that the balcony was "accessible" from the second-floor rooms. The fact is that those rooms were accessible only from the balcony. "Brewer's boarding house," which was not hers at all, he says was "a run-down brick building with a wooden interior." It was two old buildings, both of brick, and I can only wonder what he means by what it did not have any more than other buildings, "a wooden interior." My recollection is that the walls were plaster and only the floors, windows and doors were of wood.

He has a sketch of the area (83), adapted from HSCA's report. As he should have expected, he could not trust anything from HSCA and as I'm not surprised to see, he either did not correct HSCA's errors and omissions, added his own, or both. Of the omissions that are essential to the official story and to his own thesis. the location of Room 5-B, Ray's, and those of others in the flophouse ^{are} ~~is~~ not indicated in any way. The stairs is an essential part of all stories and of the Stephens' affidavit he goes into, so they are left out, as is the connection between the two buildings at their top of close by it. The bathroom window from which the shot was allegedly fired is indicated only with an arrow, nothing ^{is} ~~is~~ and that arrow moves it significantly far from the wall to about the middle of that building, an essential lie that can help credit the official yarn that he accepts. He talks about what Bertie Reeves told him he heard yet there is no indication of where

Bertie's room was, or the office, or Brewer's rooms, all part of his story. When he gets to the firehouse, he shows the wrong exit for the cops reacting to the shot and for Sheriff Lieutenant Judson Ghormley to take, one that enormously lengthens any time reconstruction. He has Main Street but he does not show where Jowers or Canipe's businesses were or where the White Mustang allegedly was parked. I could add more but is there any need? Using this kind of inaccurate and inadequate map of the area makes it clear that whatever was in his mind it was not authentic scholarship. The omissions, many of which I've not gone into, are essential to understanding by those lacking detailed knowledge, but they also tend to discredit his and the official story, that Ray was the assassin.

Here (83) he has his straw-man assessment of the evidence of Ray's guilt. Evidence of which he has reflected gross ignorance, evidence he made no effort to get and assess for himself. He doesn't know the evidence so he says that in this chapter he will "examine in detail each of these areas of evidence," forensic, ballistics, eyewitness and polygraph. What he is really talking about does not include an examination to make out a case that Ray was not the assassin, only that he was.

On the sniper's alleged location (84) and on too much else he depends on HSCA, which he has criticized enough to indicate it is not dependable. In this and in the other evidentiary matters he ignores the MURKIN records he exploits and the court proceedings that he has entirely ignored. He seems to parody JFK investigation criticisms in such things as says that the fatal, of the fatal bullet was not probed. The purposes are different, although in general they are not, because the facts are different. As this eggtripping ignoramus does not know, the firing bullet, or what remained of it, came to rest just under the skin on the back and is visible and was photographed. There is no way of getting a precise beginning point for tracing the path of the bullet because on impact, was his Ignorance does now know, the bullet exploded. (He gives a different version, the official mythology. The bullet, as he should have learned in Frameup, was designed to explode. So, there really was no need to dissect any more than was necessary to remove the remaining fragments. (Melanson says the coroner " removed a flattened bullet from "ing's

back" but it was not a complete bullet and it was not flattened. As per design, what was recovered, what remained after the designed explosion, is deformed and largely of the base. If Melanson had even asked about the evidentiary hear^{ing} where there was cross-examination, he'd have known that the expert ¹ produced testified, after examination of the remnant, that with it and test firing he could state unequivocally whether that bullet had been fired ~~from~~ from the questioned or so-called Ray rifle.

He also does not understand ^{and} misleads the uninformed readers about tracing a trajectory. He implies that if the precise position of King's body at the moment of impact were known, the phony line of the Memphis prosecution, it could be possible to project a line to the point of origin. Doing this requires more than two points. It requires three and for there to be the third there must not be any deflection in the flightpath, which is impossible when, as happened in this case, bone is impacted. That deflects the bullet. He also goes for the official line that the bullet exited King's jaw and entered his neck but the lower wound is from the exploding action, never officially acknowledged. (MURKIN again, with the results of the testing Melanson does not know and could have ^{had}.)

Only because the coroner didn't "probe" (85) he says the trajectory cannot be calculated except on estimates of King's position but he says certain areas can be eliminated, including the parking lot or the street below King. He is wrong and there are other things he did not consider, apparently because they were officially ignored. Like the roofs of buildings across the street or other buildings there.

Fire

(86) He apparently does not realize the important of what ~~Fire~~ Fireman Joenneke told the FBI (he cites HSCA), that when shot King was turning slowly toward his left. While I am not alleging that there was a shot from the firehouse, he has just said that one from there is ruled out by what is known of the trajectory. With King turned toward his left, it depended on how much whether or not he could have been shot from there. I am sure he wasn't but I'm addressing the writing.

He says that the official case against Ray was powerful but circumstantial (86). Although it was circumstantial, it was not at all powerful, as was established at the ^{cross} hearing and under ~~cross~~ examination before he wrote his book. He pretends to give his own summary but it in fact is HSCA's. (He hasn't mentioned the prosecution now so he can't use what was presented in court.)

He begins (87) by ignoring the fact that Ray's first Memphis area appearance was at the Soto Motel. (82) So, knowing this, Melanson begins with the next day. He then is knowingly dishonest in saying that at the flophouse Ray "rejected a room that had no view of King's motel in favor of one that did." Aside from the dishonesty of assuming that Ray was guilty and thus was there to kill King, he assumes that Ray knew where King was and ~~he may not be off if he weren't the assassin~~. What is clearly of dishonest and prejudicial intent is saying that Ray wanted only a room that let him spy on King. What he in fact did not want and would not use and didn't want to waste money on was the kitchen of the apartment he declined. He then took the only other vacant room that, by real stretching, could be said to give a sort-of view of the Lorraine. and although he has been there he has this chart and recollection, his writing does not reflect it and he is both wrong and confused, here and later. Here he says that the man walking past Canipe's store merely dropped the alleged Ray package. For it to be dropped a large detour was required. The alternative, pretty clearly ruled out, is that it was heaved. What he avoids in this is the utter improbability of the official story, made up by the MPD, that in walking past with that bundle Ray saw the police cars and just dropped the bundle. He'd have had to make a fairly long detour to drop the package at Canipe's door. (I think later Melanson says it was inside the door. The police posed such a picture but in fact it was just outside the closed door. There is more - do not now go into refuting the official story but Melanson is uncritical in this representation of it and he should know better.

He says that Ray's story, about being at a gas station, lacks corroboration and from his limitation to the official mythology as well as his own ignorance this is true but in

~~189 fact there is unique corroboration - do not now go into.~~

in fact there is unique corroboration I do not now go into. He then says that Ray's first alibi was given to his then attorney, author Hanes, and that they are not consistent. In this he again reflects lack of knowledge of the hearing (evidentiary) record. Hanes has made a deal with William Bradford Huie for the literary rights without consulting Ray and Ray later agreed to get Hanes paid but with the restriction Huie would not ask him any questions about the crime itself. Which, of course, on publication could have been used against him. It was when Huie persisted in violating that agreement and in getting Ray to tell him what could then have been used against Ray that Ray made this ridiculous tale up in the belief that it would be apparent that he did not mean it. (It is that "aoul ran out of the flophouse, jumped in Ray's car and hid under a white sheet - in broad daylight - in the back of the car. Under a white sheet?)

Melanson's explanation of the whole odd lawyer-writer arrangement is that Huie was writing the book because of his interest in the Klan. He attributes that to Ray. (88)

The ~~polo~~^{49044h} tests section is not worth any space or time. ~~Ex~~ ^{Poste} facto, too.

"Renting the Room" begins on 89. He begins by saying that HSCA makes it appear that Ray renting that room was part of his assassination plan. On his own Melanson describes the room he rented as "well-suited for his plan of assassination." (90) This again presumes guilt and it is false because that room was not "well-suited." It might have been the best available but it was far from well suited. Because it was on the narrow passageway between the two long buildings and to even get a glimpse of the Lorraine one had to get the head and upper body outside the window. For shooting one had to get even more of the body out in the open, holding the rifle and being able to ~~aim~~^{aim} it when there was no way of knowing whether King would even be visible from that window, leave alone being able to hang out a window and fire a rifle.

(I forgot, from the previous page, where Melanson says that Ray gave that guff to Huie because he was afraid Huie would leak it to the FBI. Melanson may not know but the FBI's files disclose that in fact Huie did leak to the FBI, all he got from Ray, seeking his own kind of deal with the FBI. The FBI gave him nothing but took what he gave it. Once again, only ignorance of the files he boasts about having used or dishonesty keep this out of the book.) *I refer to that guff*

Melanson's description of the situation of the room Ray took misleads the reader (91). He says its window faced directly onto the south wing of the boarding house, which is true, but he also says that "In order to see King's room it was necessary to lean out the window at least slightly," which could be conspicuous. This also assumes that Ray knew King was there and which room he had. And only a ~~awkward~~^{awkward} view of the motel was possible from that window because of the walls of the two buildings. (see his ^{Part 1} chart, where it is clear.)

Melanson is quite wrong in his theorizing about shooting from the common bathroom. He says (91) that "the bathroom could ^{only} be used if the assassin positioned himself inside an old-fashioned bathtub with steeply sloping sides." It was an old porcelainized cast-iron tub on legs and it is the back that sloped steeply. If Melanson stood in it he knew that what he visualizes and suggests happened is not possible because the only footing is too far from the window and thus the rifleman can't get to sight and shoot. The only way possible, and I was there and I tried all I could think of, is to stand on the inside top edge of the tub on the left leg, let the right leg dangle, and then stick the rifle out the window, where it would have been pretty conspicuous. There just is no way of bracing the left arm that holds the rifle other than on the windowsill. That rifle would surely have been seen by the King party on the parking lot level of the motel and by others. If he was there and just looked it should have been apparent to him that standing in the tub made it impossible to sight and fire the rifle at that target. The window is too high and the angle to the right that is necessary makes it impossible. But if he goes into this he can no longer theorize on the basis of Ray being the assassin.

~~as I did, reports what D.J. Reeves, known as "Artie" said but not having interviewed him,~~

He reports what D.L. Reeves, then known as "ertie", said but he is limited to what the FBI chose to record of what he responded to those answers the FBI asked him. I did locate him in a hospital and interviewed him on tape and the FBI omitted what was so inconsistent with its preconception. He was alert and of clear recollection. And, of course, Melanson, like all, made his selection of what the FBI put on paper. Reeves told me more than Melanson reports and it is important.

He does say that James H. Laue was in the room next to King but he never gets around to say that Laue was of the DJ's community relations service.

He does not point out that HSCA's handling of the serious problems of palming Stephens off as a witness was akin to the WC's with Howard Brennan. The truth is, as James McCraw, the cab driver, told me, Stephens was so drunk even for Stephens, who he drove regularly, that he would not take him to a liquor store. In my own inquiry I learned that he and Gracie had no idea why they were outside the DA's office waiting to be called and questioned that night. He quotes HSCA's report: "Stephens' sobriety on the afternoon of April 4 was called into question by a number of sources, and the committee did not rely on his testimony for an eye-witness identification of the assassin." There was nobody else it could pretend was such an eye-witness, and only HSCA dishonesty in going over the FBI records that I made available denied it or the truth: Stephens saw nothing at all.

Going on about Stephens, he says that "Two months later he provided an affidavit used by U.S. authorities in extradicting Ray from England." He cites this to the partial reproduction of it in Frameup. Well, there were three inconsistent Stephens affidavits, one drafted by the FBI and the other two by the DJ Civil Rights Division. It is the second of these that was used in the extradition. (I ignore what he has on Stephens' unsuccessful legal efforts to get the large reward that was offered. Not worth the time or space.) I also skip the subchapter "Fingerprints," having addressed this earlier, until he gets to his tabulation of prints in the bundle, page # 98, and what he never gets around to, where any Ray prints were said to have been lifted from the rifle, was there a single one where there had to be in handling and firing the rifle without gloves? No, not a one. This also was in the same part of Frameup. His listing does not, for some reason, include the FBI but it did not find a single Ray print in that flophouse room and nobody was ever able to place him inside it from the time he rented it. (He freely admits it, however.) He does talk about Ray moving all the furniture around in that room and never wonders why with prints elsewhere none were on any of that furniture, either. (99)

He doesn't know much about "Ballistics," which starts on 100. He again depends on HSCA, despite all I got from the FBI, and his only other notes are one to Frameup, one to a text and one to Michael Kurtz. (I don't care but he took more than he notes from Frameup.) He also knows very little about neutron activation analysis, of which he says that HSCA decided not to conduct any. (101) He does not say of what or whether there were other tests that could have been performed or whether, in fact, any had been done, as they had been by the FBI. I got them in CA 75-1996. He is shaky on interpretation of what is possible with NAA and I'm surprised that he didn't learn more from Post Norem, which goes into the testing and its capabilities. I'm not now clear on NAA but I am without question that the FBI conducted spectrographic analyses and that I got the results so they were available to him through me or the FBI's reading room. He says that the FBI did tests in 1968 and that they remain "classified." (102. They were of subject to classification and I sure as hell got the results of some in the litigation.)

That he really does not understand the tests is clear (102) when he says that "the five bullets may not have ~~substantively~~ been similar, but basic comparisons could still be made: fragments of the fatal bullet could be compared to each of the five bullets." The FBI says under oath that it never used "similar," the word it used to the Commission and in my litigation, because that does not mean what the test shows, whether or not two compared specimens are identical.

I can simplify this by saying that if they are merely similar they are not of common origin. In a sense all bullets are similar and clearly all bullets of the same type, caliber and manufacture are similar. In short, once again he does not know what he is talking about and is wrong. He does not even ^{UNDERSTAND} understand the text he cites. Moreover, he postulates the wrong and essentially meaningless comparisons. What was necessary was to compare the recovered fragments with the traces left on King's clothing. Only when this was done and it was established that the fragment had caused that damage was there any point in comparing with the correct variety of the several varieties of unfired bullets left at the scene of the crime. That this was not done ought have given Melanson pause but he is unaware of it. That the so-called fatal rifle was not even tested to see if it had been fired since the last cleaning, also beyond his ken, expert that he represents himself as being, should have been a meaning^{ful} clue to him. As well as the fact that this rifle was never test fired by the FBI while it did test fire a wide variety of other rifles it knew had not been used and were irrelevant.

Here again the information he lacked was readily available to him but he did not seek it. He could have gotten it from me and from my FOIA litigation, which goes into these matters in considerable and unrefuted detail.

Once again I add again that all the information on what was tested and how and what was not tested is in MURKIN, thousands of pages of it, and once again by his ignorance of the actual data and his use of the FBI's codename he is in the position of an exploiter.

Chapter 10, 103ff 4/19/89

He calls this chapter "Time and Motion: the Double Image of James Earl Ray." He begins by not defining what he means while saying that no official investigators "bothered to attempt a systematic, logical reconstruction of Ray's alledgetime and motion." He says this is because they had serious doubts about how the crime was perpetrated. And once again he is wrong and his ignorance still another time comes from his ignorance of MURKIN. It holds several details FBI chronologies, even one in long-hand. As a matter of fact, Melanson would look better and his readers would have been much better informed if he had used the FBI's because his own chronology (Appendix B, 165ff) is a sick joke. ((Bill comment on it later.))

His concept of what the official investigators should have done is next on this page (103), where he says that once King appeared so he could be shot, "Ray had to ~~scram~~ ~~thrust~~ gather up the bundle containing the radio, beer cans and cartridges, add the binoculars, and go up the hall to the bathroom, hoping not to be seen. That would have been more than insane. It would have been a physical impossibility. That bundle could not have been handled that way, in and out of the bathroom, particularly not after the rifle was added to the box and the box was added to the bundle. (His expert and detailed knowledge later has him describing this as a rifle box, with the label showing, and in fact, if I remember correctly, it was not that at all and I think was a shotgun box. It is on 104.) He also say, stupidly and ignorantly (104) that each of the conjectured Ray trips to the bathroom "he had to carry the weapon and the binoculars." The rifle has a telescopic sight so the binoculars did not improve visibility and besides, at about 200 feet, did anyone of reasonably normal sight require any magnification to recognize Dr. King?

Next he revels in the physically impossible again, saying that "(t)he only way an assassin could fire at Dr. King was to step into the bathtub and angle the rifle toward the right (resting it on the sill)." If he wanted to fire at the moon. If he even was there when he was in ^{the} bathtub he has to know that standing in the bathtub, impossible for other reasons, and resting the rifle on the sill would have, depending on the shooter's ^{height} height, not been at a downward angle and could not have been to the right and at King. Also, he ignores the claims made by the police and FBI, of a mark made on the sill by the muzzle of the rifle. This would have required that the rifle not project outside the window. This also makes a shot at King impossible. Moreover, it could have have been

made even in King's general direction by anyone standing in that tub. I was there and I tried and there was only one way in which a shot could have been pointed toward King: by standing on the rim of the tub toward the wall, on the left foot, with the right dangling in the tub. Even then, it was not possible to have the muzzle resting on the sill and still point the rifle toward King because there was not enough room and both the assassin and part of the butt of the rifle would have had to have been in the wall.

I return to the NAA for clarification. There can be variations between different batches of bullet made to the same recipe. and what Melanson says about all of this beginning with the third ~~para~~ paragraph on 101, comes, uncredited, from ~~FP~~ ~~aneup~~, which was written before I'd had to learn about these tests. Including spectrographic, which he does not mention and might have been preferable on the shell casings in 1968. He does not give the caliber of the other type of ammo found and describes what was used and duplicated in the box as "commercial", the other as military-type, which, if true, there was no point in testing. His account of the NAA tests is garbled. He says that after NUCLEAR bombardment "the radioactive characteristics are then compared." It is the decay-time that is measured. He then says that the comparison is "in terms of the trace elements that make up each bullet or fragment." It is the quantities of each element that are compared. He says it is (by comparing the number and proportion of the various trace ~~elements~~ elements (is lead a trace element, or copper?) it is possible to determine the probability of common origin." You do not compare the number of elements. There can be 10 in each specimen but they may be different and this not possible. It is the elements and the amount of each. He says "(t)he greater the variation in composition, the less likely bullets or fragments had a common origin." This can be confusing because for purposes of the test there are established parameters that are not regarded as variations although, obviously, the measurements are not carried out to the sixth decimal. There are minute-scale variations in some bullets within individual bullets, depending on such things as ~~the thoroughness~~ the thoroughness of the mixing.

see comment 22A
 Going back to the previous item, Melanson says that *from Ray's room* ~~standing in the bathtub~~ "he would have had to lean (~~physically impossible~~) out the window in a somewhat ~~(see)~~ manner in order to shoot, thus exposing himself to view." (974) Here ~~he~~ ^{he} is assuming Ray's guilt and without any question, he knows that all of King's party and King and Kyles at the very least, looking that way, and none on the ground and none on the balcony saw a man leaning out the window with a rifle? None of the others ~~at~~ or around the motel and in its parking lot? What he is talking about here proves that it was not possible (not all the proof, however) for the shot to have come from that bathroom window, yet he either does not understand this, which raised questions about how much he does understand, or is simply dishonest about it because he has the preconception of Ray's guilt, which I think is a precondition of publication. (In this sense I note the almost complete absence of direct or indirect criticism of the FBI.)

finding that paragraph
 He goes along with the official federal fabrication relating to timing (and to Vernon Dollahite, a Sheriff's patrolman. (108) He says that Dollahite provided no time frame but that one who supposed he saw Dollahite (he had on brown clothes, some identification!), Talmidge Martin, estimated it could have been as little as a half minute and not more than two minutes after the shot that the alleged escape car left. He cites the correct Dollahite FBI interview but he can hardly have read it if he can begin to believe that Dollahite did all he said he did before, after going around the entire block, he was back at the bundle in anything like two minutes. This is not the first time I've wondered if he really read the records he cites. The alternative, again, is dishonesty. And what is interesting here is that he a) does not note that the testimony used at the guilty-plea hearing has a ranking police officer who was not even there as the one who found the bundle where he says correctly that Sheriff's lieutenant Judson Hornley (the name I could not ~~mention~~ ^{mention} earlier, actually found it and b) the testimony relating to this at the evidentiary hearing which, in even Hornley's expansion of the time, shows the impossibility of the official concoction that, for the moment, I here do not go into.

Instead he argues that "it is indeed possible" for Ray to have done all the things

I misread where Melanson skips from the bathroom to the bedroom to say that Ray could have both surveilled and fired from the bedroom, albeit in a somewhat awkward position. Despite the narrow passageway between the two halves of the flo^{or}house, anyone leaning out that window would have been quite conspicuous to all the people at the motel, more so if he had a rifle and was preparing to shoot. First, there is a real question in my mind about whether he could have been out the window far enough to use the rifle and hold it steady enough for shooting and not risk falling out. Then there is what Melanson ignores, I suppose from knowing nothing about shooting. If Ray did not lurk there with the rifle in position, King would have to linger quite some time in one place, a limited area of the balcony, all that was visible from that window, for Ray to get the rifle out, get King in the sights (if he had already adjusted them for distance, that being necessary with a telescopic sight), steady himself and the rifle and still in this more than awkward position be able to squeeze the shot off. Any jerking, no matter how minute, and the shot is off target. Either way he was certain to attract attention and be both foiled and caught. A shot from there had to be close to parallel with the wall of the building, so he'd have had to be pretty far out that window. It is almost certain that his grip on the rifle would be more than just awkward and would interfere with his aiming, assuming, of course, that he was skilled in using the rifle and its sight, which he was not and could not have been. It is a radically different position than one that could have been practised. (There is no evidence at all that Ray ever practised with that rifle and its sight, both absolutely necessary for accurate shooting.) The probability is, had he tried this, he would have had his weight and the pressure from it on the windowsill on his stomach at the least. He'd have had to get farth^{ur} out the window than his lowest ribs to even try the shot. These considerations mitigate against even thinking of it and he'd have had to be crazy to depend on it without holding the rifle out the window and aiming in general at that part of the motel, and I can't imagine him doing that without being seen because he was never there except in broad daylight, when there was considerable activity at the motel. I believe Melanson dreamed this up in part from ignorance and in part from necessity because he knows and comes close to suggesting that a shot from that bathroom was also impossible.

he had to have done from the time the shot was fired through completing making the bundle and getting into the car and starting it and taking off without being seen. Of course it was not possible, but Melanson argues, say, that even if Ray had to have detoured to his bedroom to make the bundle, it was still possible to do all he had to do and run the distance and the steps inside and outside the flophouse within two minutes. What he really says is that even if it took longer, it didn't take longer. Otherwise he is admitting Ray's innocence and tangling with the FBI. (He clearly preferred tangoing with it.)

Had he spoken to "in or me about this he'd have known that we timed what Ghormley did in about 45 seconds. Perhaps from ignorance, and I don't think he lied about this, he says that Ghormley "sprinted" as he proceeded from the firehouse to the front of that building. Ghormley is crippled, had a pronounced limp, feared even going down over the wall in the back of the flophouse, as all the other officers did, and instead walked as fast as he could walk, which is what he testified to, toward Main Street and Canipe's.

In his version of "The Bundle Drop" (beginning on 109), which is the repetition without question of the official mythology, he doesn't even have the simple geography straight. This is supposed to have happened on the east side of South Main Street, with the car parked at the curb near Canipe's and pointing north. He says that looking at the man in the car, which Canipe never said he did and denied having said to me in Les Payne's presence, Canipe was looking at "a bit of the left side of the face." after getting this far in this book, I'm not surprised that Melanson says that Canipe could not see the side of the man's face toward him but could see the side away from him. Driving north, with Canipe to his east, only the right side of his face could have been visible. (110)

He represents that there were three witnesses, Canipe and two black customers named Finley and Graham. They were not witness to anything, especially not of Ray's driving his car away. So Melanson says (141) that "(m)ost implicative for Ray is the fact that three witnesses associate the bundle drop with the screeching departure of ~~the~~ a white car." If this were true, as it is not, how could it implicate Ray at all without an identification of Ray at least as the driver and really also as the one who was seen to drop the package?

He then goes into what he says is HSCA's conclusion, that Ray saw a police car protruding from the firehouse parking space and thus "threw the bundle of evidence down in a moment of panic." While physically this is impossible as he presents Ray's flight, for he'd have had to turned toward Canipe's from the sidewalk and then return toward the sidewalk, for heaving it would have completely destroyed the bundle, which was not tied, // was merely wrapped in a bedspread. It is not HSCA's conclusion but the fiction it adopted from the police and their apologists and the FBI. His own sketch of the area, which seems to greatly reduce the distances because it reduces an entire city block to the width of the printed page (4 1/4") shows that the distance from the curbline to the door of Canipe's store as 1/17 of a city block, quite a space! And what he also does not go into and does not label on his sketch, is that a dense hedge blocked any view of the parking apron of the firehouse from Canipe's door almost to the curb.

On 112 he actually says that Ghormley "ran" to Main Street after ~~running~~ going to the Lorraine. He did not go to the Lorraine and could not run. In saying that Dollahite ran to the Lorraine and then to Main Street, he omits all else Dollahite did at the Lorraine and the fact that he ran to the opposite end of Mulberry, then examined both ways on Mulberry, then ran the block to Main, also looking both ways, and then retraced his direction to Canipe's, most of an additional block. Or, even if it didn't and could not happen, it happened anyway.

Next on this same page he is lost in simple geography, saying that with Ray's car allegedly parked "beyond" (apparently meaning from the flophouse) Canipe's on the same side ~~of~~ of the street" that Ray approached (it) from the south. The exact opposite. But when he could call the right side of the face its left, he can't really be faulted for not knowing north from south. *On South Main St. yet.*

Still trying to make sense of the nonsense about that bundle (113) he becomes a shrink to point out that at fires people do irrational things, like delaying "departure" for retrieving some possession. So, that's what explains Ray, of whom he says he "surely had a propriety interest in the bundle." Of course! Why else would he jeopardize himself to gather it all up if not to leave it assembled to be discovered by those anxious to capture him?" ~~Yes~~ Elementary, my dear Watson!

Still on this page, he reflects ignorance of the photographs of the crime scene that I got in my lawsuit and he misuses without saying how they were made available. He says of Canipe's that it had a large, glass front, which is true, "and the door was open (the bundle extended into the doorway) so that the door must have been opened when the drop occurred." Now here is a demon investigator, who has read ~~frameup~~, which has a picture of the bundle as ~~found~~ ^{found} in it, and the door is closed. Of this he can't be ignorant because besides all the uncredited use of that book he has many citations to it. And then there is MURKIN, the MURKIN of his title, and it includes copies of the police photographs. It has both the picture as the package was ~~located~~ first seen, and the picture the police staged, the one that Melanson refers to here and only it. Moreover, if he'd read the various interviews he cites of those he calls "witnesses" when they say nothing, he have known that the door was closed, not open.

~~Now~~ "Two White Mustangs" begins on 114. Before going into this I note that although the initial reports were of two white Mustangs there was only one but there were two white cars, the second probably a Ford Fairlane from the documents I've examined.

Departing from his usual dependence on other sources some of which are not reliable, Melanson this time says of Ray's alibi, that he was at a gas station at the time of the crime, "(n)o evidence has been generated that corroborates his alibi. ~~He~~ He did not ask me about this and it is not true. He merely is ignorant. There is a crucial part, not that Ray is confirmed at a gas station but what he saw when he got back to the area of the flophouse, that is confirmed. He then quotes a variety of records on the second Mustang without realization of the other importance of those records or worse, understanding and ignoring them. They are exculpatory.

Subchapter "The Paradoxical Ray" begins on 123. It is based on the presumption of Ray's guilt rather than any real assessment of this. In saying that an in-depth analysis, presumably his, makes Ray more rather than a less puzzling figure he reflects his own pre-conception and his lack of understanding of James and all the other Rays. They are not at all puzzling once you know and understand them. They are quite predictable. Illustrative of the undependability of the professionals he quotes "political scientist James W. Clarke" and his book American Assassins as saying that Ray is "a coldly rational and shrewd, if not highly competent hit man." There is no indication of any "hits" or even violence in Ray's history. Or if Clarke's having seen and studied Mrs. ~~Arthur~~ ^{Arthur} b "political scientist."

Chapter 11, "Notive: The ~~Reking-Line~~ King." (This nonsense comes from Jay Kennedy ^{and} is CIA records I got in FOIA litigation against the CIA. These are the records I refer to earlier that were used in widely syndicated stories by the WxPost and the L.A. Times.)

Melanson begins by listing groups he says had ample motive for assassination ^{of} JFK. Some just are not reasonable although others have held such theories, like Castro and "oil barons." (From the SDECE fraud, Farewell America, ^{and}) He also includes the KGB, of which there is not only no evidence, there also is no precedent and it grossly misrepresents, for a professional political scientist, the relationship between JFK and ~~Ahrushev~~ ^{Ahrushev}.

On 117 he refers to a "typical" FBI record on King as a red without indicating that rather than this single record with that caption, Communist Infiltration of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, that is the title of a massive file at HQ and the field offices. (I have a 400-page inventory of the field office holdings on this and related files.) I next citing Jay Kennedy's political diatribes against King from

the above-mentioned CIA collection, he gives no background on Kennedy at all. This is not an oversight because he quotes Garrow, who is explicit and detailed on that paranoid. For a political scientist in particular this is dishonest but he still strives to make a case of a CIA conspiracy and this is one of his means. Kennedy was so paranoid an anti-Communist former Communist that his judgement had to be questioned. If he read all that was disclosed to me without knowing who the source was, as to begin with I did not ^{know} the content of those reports made it apparent that the source was not dependable and was very biased.

"Another CIA file obtained by the author," he says (130) "contains a potpourri of notes and receipts apparently obtained from King himself." This and the rest of what he says makes ~~it~~ it apparent that what he got from CIA in 1982 is precisely what it ^{earlier} disclosed to me in FOIA litigation against it and was the basis of both the Post and Times articles, as he cannot easily have avoided knowing. Obtain from King is ambiguous. King, clearly, did not just give the contents of his pockets away. It was part of a bag job. (There is no indication that this was or was not by the FBI or the CIA, itself.)

It is apparent that all he got from his FOIA requests is an excuse for claiming in his book that he brought something new to light. He didn't. He got only what had already been disclosed as the result of difficult and costly litigation by others he does not credit, a measure of his scholarship.

I really wonder if he got all I got because what is missing lends itself more to building a case that the CIA conspired to kill King. It was the records relating to projected civil disobedience, closing down all the bridges, for example, which could close the government down. Instead he says that King objectives could have been seen by "elements" of intelligence as a major Communist effort. (132). He makes no other reference here to what King planned for that spring, *For Peoples Campaign, March on Washington*

Other such CIA records I got and were public before he got anything at all include intrusions into the funeral, Kennedy's refusal to report to the FBI rather than CIA and if I remember correctly, plans to replace King with someone more amenable to "the intelligence communism." In so slim a book and so flimsy a case against the CIA I would think he'd not omit these things if he had them. And if he did, I'd wonder about his judgement if he had them and omitted them. Unless he wanted to try to hide that he had accomplished nothing with his FOIA effort that was limited to a request and acceptance of what the CIA chose to let him have.

Chapter 12, "T_hreads from the Web of Conspiracy" (134ff)

Having not a single fact to show the existence of this imagined intelligence conspiracy he begins this chapter by saying that, "(g)iven the state of the evidence, any attempt to outline certain dimensions must necessarily be speculative. But speculation has its place in exploring the meaning of known data, and pointing the way for further investigation." Whatever he means by "dimensions" he does nothing but speculate and he does this without any factual basis at all. He then, again without any factual basis at all and only as speculation, treats the Ray aliases as selected by an intelligence agency.

His ignorance and lack of understanding of Ray is further exposed (135) when he says Ray had "shaky power of memory." Ray has a good memory,

Resumed 4/24 To give credibility to his theory he says that Ray had the nose job done to look more like the real Galt and the other aliases. Ray had it done to change his appearance so he'd look less like the mug shots. He was an escapee. As he embellishes nothing it remains nothing so he has the alleged conspiracy intending "to implicate the real Galt just long enough to allow Ray to escape to Angola, where he could be comfortably disposed of." In the light of what is known in particular this is not even good fiction. There was no need to implicate the real Galt in any way at all and when the name was disclosed nothing happened to him. It also had no effect on Ray or his escape. There was no connection and there need have been no connection. The purpose is always to escape and that

did not require implicating anyone else. In this case Ray had not used the Galt alias for weeks and used Sneyd from the time he took the plane in ~~Canada~~ Canada. This silliness also breaks down, as it has elsewhere, in the fact that Ray was broke and could not get to Angola. If he had had a few more dollars he could have taken a boat from Portugal, but he didn't because he lacked a few bucks. Certainly any intelligence agency conspirators would have seen to it that their pigeon could fly and that Ray would not have been broke. And if the intent of the supposed conspirators had been to dispose of Ray in Angola, no reason being advanced for this imitation La Carre, why ^{didn't they get him there first} have they not since then? (As he notes, from my ~~writing~~ telling him, murders in jails are easy but it hasn't happened in more than two decades.) The nonsense continues as he says, for no reason given or imaginable, that the other aliases were "to further implicate" the real Galt. Cheaper and cheaper, he follows this by saying that the other aliases could have been picked up by physical surveillance in the general area around Galt's home." It gets sicker and sicker, sillier and sillier, with less and less point or reason. He crescendos (136) with more of this gibberish, that "Galt was more than simply a cover. He was a man who could be implicated at least temporarily while Ray made his escape. The real Galt was fortunate not to have been arrested as the prime suspect." (That he had a perfect and proven alibi - he worked - is immaterial to Melanson as is the demonstrated lack of need for such a swamp from actual events.) and if all of this is neither silly nor stupid enough for him and for Praeger he then says that the description of King's killer - who was not seen by anybody (and if the so-called flophouse identifications are taken as dependable, which they weren't) ~~was~~ ^{was} were meaningful ~~instead of~~ ^{when it was} a description of millions of men, not one of whom was picked up for questioning. (30 instead of 50, 5-10 dark to dandy hair, medium build, ruddy complexion, black suit white shirt.) In all of this fantasy he reflects his great ignorance of the MURKIN files, which show that the Galt alias rather than doing what he conjectured it was schemed to do resulted in a massive manhunt limited to the US for all the Galts there were, including at least one Eric, if I recall correctly, and a father and a son - exactly the oppose of his nightmare.

Ignoring the considerable lapse of time (137) he says that the trail led to Canada, that "the authorities might have hypothesized that Galt shot King and then fled back to Canada, using as aliases the names of solid citizens who lived near him." That this did not happen or need to happen is immaterial in this convoluted thinking, and that the last thing, had it been real, that the real Galt would have done would have been to use aliases that would have led to him does not occur in this novelist's concept of real crime. Nor does he give any reason, for there is none.

Further flaunting his MURKIN ignorance he says that on 4/17 the DJ "issued a press release designed to focus ~~attention~~ increased attention on the hunt for Galt. The department filed a complaint with the U.S. Commissioner in Birmingham" charging Ray with the crime, "This was done to secure an arrest and to ^{generate} ~~give~~ additional publicity for the flagging manhunt." Well, flagging it wasn't. Merely unsuccessful. But in the rest he misses one of the most ridiculous of the FBI's heavy-handed and self-describing stupidities. First of all, he didn't have to be charged to be picked up. He wasn't charged for two weeks. All of this was not by the Department, which the FBI froze out, not trusting it. It also did not trust the US Attorney in Memphis, which is why Birmingham was selected. The Commissioner there, it knew, would be compliant and ask no questions. And there should have been questions. A conspiracy is required by the Civil Rights Act in a murder case, and the only allegation of any conspiracy is that Ray planned to go hunting with his brother in Wisconsin! This is actual, not my joke. So the real reason was to make a claim to the jurisdiction that the FBI had not had for two weeks. Then he did not even trust the Birmingham field office to handle even the release, so it dictated the release by phone to B'ham. Rather than the department doing any of this there was an internal fight after the fact because the FBI kept it in total ignorance and the worst place to file the charges was in B'ham, the best was Memphis, where the crime had been. That an intention could have been to make it appear that the FBI was on the ball, when it knew it was not, escapes his thinking and theorizing.

He then puffs himself up in saying that "CIA documents obtained by the author~~par~~

on the case. This

under "FOIA" show that" they got their "field offices," which is not what the CIA calls them at all (stations and bases) so he knows this little about the CIA. and these are among the records I'd already gotten and used years earlier, so great is his actual accomplishment ~~with~~ FOIA and the CIA. Then he says (137-8) that the next day the FBI finally identified Ray, with a MURKIN record I'd gotten years earlier. Having made no reference at all to the massive Galt search by the FBI limited entirely to the US and its earlier refusals to have the Mounties search in Canada, he refers to what the FBI calls its teletypes as its "cables," which it never does, this one from Kansas City, citing the Toronto phone book, precisely the search FBIHQ had earlier rejected. (He seems to be going way out of his way not to say a single word critical of the FBI and this need not be because of his thoroughgoing ignorance of the MURKIN records.

Next he says that because the real Galt had never to then been questioned by authorities, "his alibi had not in any way been established." He appears to mean the real Galt and the utter irrelevance is lost on him and any editor. (There is no sign of any editing other than possible of language despite the crying need for injections of some sense of or contact with reality in all of the gibberish.)

Without any realization of how it dissipates all this silliness he finally, in a different context (139) reports that by the time the real Galt was known Ray's fingerprints were complete exculpation in and of themselves. Without realizing how any intelligence agency would have avoided it he says that by then Ray was only 15 miles away from the real Galt. Instead he conjectures that the Mounties might have thought they had their man by an "interrogation." No interrogation could have led to such a conclusion and there were the Ray prints and Galt's payroll records.

He follows this stupidity with another claim to his derring-do accomplishments, getting Ray's letter to South Africa under FOIA. Not only has it been disclosed to me years earlier and was at the time of he supposed search readily available to the entire world in the FBI's public reading room, the FBI had disclosed it to the press, which had used it contemporaneously.

He then tries to give this nothing of an accomplishment some meaning (140).

Later. I knocked off about 5 a.m. to go out ~~go~~ and get and read the papers but while doing this the above paragraph was on my mind. He has puffed himself throughout in the same way. I was reminded that when we spoke yesterday you asked me if I really believe he is ego-tripping. As you know from what I first wrote you, before I read the book I was sure of it from the dust jacket and then from as I now recall, the acknowledgements. So, take this refrain of according to documents obtained by the author under FOIA. To what has he referred? Only to what was already out as a result of my litigation, 100% as this relates to the FBI and almost certainly as it relates to the CIA. The one question with the CIA is did Garrow get anything I had not already gotten? I do not have total recall of what I got and don't know what Garrow got but what I've seen referred to I did get. Now there is no question but that Melanson knows enough about my King litigation, from me certainly and probably from Lesar. So here he is a decade, perhaps more later, and he is telling the trusting reader (and editor and publisher) that he did all of that FOIA work. He has no reference anywhere in the book to my litigation and even in his flowery inscription to me is general only and omits any mention of King, leave alone thanks for it. If he ~~was~~ ^{was} a student and did such a thing, how would you regard and treat it? Are the standards for professors, professional scholars, any lower? Why would he be so dishonest except if he were on an ego trip? And is it not even worse when he says that what he does not know isn't known, particularly when it is in the FOIA records I got? When he speaks of FBI records he got under FOIA he is really talking about what was freely available to all in the FBI's public reading room. No, I have no doubt on this score.

In trying to give his nonexistent accomplishment in getting the letter Ray wrote to the South Africans (I picked it up from the newspapers first, in 1968, then got it under FOIA), he says that all the Galt paper Ray generated had not been collected and

the handwriting examined to be certain it was Ray's. What in the world for? Only his sick theory that the CIA was behind it. Of all the things to be done in a real investigation, there is almost nothing that could have served less. If in fact the CIA had been behind it, there is no doubt they would have seen to it that Ray wrote all the things out so they could be traced to him.

He quotes Rays as saying he did not remember writing this letter in 1986. (I have no trouble believing that. ^{or that Ray had to write} Melanson says that Ray "ignored the real question of what had motivated him to respond" to an ad soliciting immigration to Rhodesia but that is silly because Ray's earlier explanation, borne out by his efforts, was that if he got to Rhodesia he'd not be subject to extradition. Is there any more reasonable explanation? And this was public. So, if Melanson saw something being hidden why did he not ask Ray about his earlier explanation - and why does he ignore that here?

Melanson says (142) that "Ray was captured because "the unseen hand that had guided" him had failed. There is no reasonable indication at all of any guidance of any kind from the moment King was shot and the earlier "guidance" appeared in Frameup.

He follows this with nonsensical misinterpretations, like "Ray's behavior in London and Portugal contrasted rather strikingly with his smooth, competent fugitive activities in Toronto," which Melanson then proceeds to misrepresent. He then says that "(f)urther evidence (sic) that Ray had lost his lifeline is provided by his possible participation in a London bank robbery, four days before his capture." Ray was, without question, getting desperate in Lisbon. He was broke and feared trying to pull a job because he knew no Portugese. This is the reason he returned to London, to get funds by robbery. There is no need to conjecture that Ray was a robber of the Fulham bank. He admitted to me there was another man in on it with him. They split what they got, \$100 each. That was a paltry sum and it did not relieve Ray's desperate situation. The bank note demanding money was disclosed in my litigation ^{and} the footnote is to HSCA. Melanson is wacky when he says that Ray "denies the crime." If he did, and there is no source noted, he was having sport with Melanson. He never denied it and couldn't. His prints were there, as H. does note.

By the top of 144 he is erecting straw men. He says that "lone-assassin mythologists would probably tell us that in Europe Ray's ^{desire for} ego-gratification as a famous assassin came to the fore (that is, he wanted to get caught)." When after two decades this had not happened, what honest purpose is served by the conjecture that has no basis at all? He uses this to say there is a better explanation. One not better is not possible, which is why Melanson made it up. His better explanation is that Ray had lost contact with his handlers and was on his own.

He gives no source for the misrepresentation that Ray's sole contact in Portugal was with a whore. (Much more, aside from MURKIN, is in Huie's articles and book and he got most of that from Ray, the rest from his own investigation. He cites Huie as a source, so the omission is hardly an accident.)

He says there is no corroboration that Ray was seen with another man in London, in his hotel, that there were no corroborating witnesses. Who asked for any witnesses? I got what + published about that in Frameup from the papers. Moreover, if I recall MURKIN correctly, it was corroborated. Besides, there is no real point in Melanson's argument.

Next Melanson pontificates that if Ray had gotten to Angola he'd have been assassinated but had this been done in Canada there would have been too great a stink. This is entirely loony. If his "handlers" wanted to assassinate him in Angola, they'd have seen to it that he got there so they could knock him off. And is there any rational reason for believing that were he killed anywhere they would not have been the identical sensation he says would have existed in Canada or England only? Of course not.

As he tries to argue this silliness, at the bottom of the page he refers to the "string of unsuccessful efforts to assassinate Castro" by the CIA, citing a limited and questionable source inaccurately. He says it is the Church committee. It was in fact the

Schweiker subcommittee. But if the CIA had not been able after all those efforts over all those years to kill Castro, how does that persuade they'd do any better with King? Or that they'd use a Ray—especially when there is no evidence that he was any kind of shot at all and all the evidence is that whatever kind of shot he had been many, many years earlier, he'd not done any rifle shooting in many, many years?

(145) He says, citing no source, that the CIA has an "Executive Action Unit (formed to eliminate troublesome foreign leaders)..." I do not believe that there is such a formal "unit" in the CIA and certainly not one so titled officially. He also says that it "dispatched its premier hit-man, code name WJ/WINN(sic)" to kill Lumumba. I am certain that it has no such staff hit men and I believe that the man he refers to was a free-lance it picked up. His footnote lower down is to the Senate Intelligence Committee and he says that what he says is taken from its account of the scheme to kill Lumumba. However, ~~there~~ there is no source citation to what I quote from his own words above.

At the bottom of this page, on his own authority, no source cited, he says that (t)he fact that Ray did not get to Angola, or that his competence as a fugitive seemed to evaporate on the other side of the Atlantic, or that he lived to stand trial, cannot be used to dismiss the involvement of American intelligence or its networks or offshoots. In reality, intelligence-based assassinations plots are not always as flawless as their fictional counterparts." He has and he has cited no basis in fact for alleging, as he here does allege, that there was such a plot to kill King of which Ray was part. The rest, about Ray's not getting to Angola, where there also is no evidence that he was to have been killed, Melanson having just made that up; about his alleged incompetence in Europe; and that he did live to stand trial, has no meaning at all and certainly is not a basis for alleging that there had been an intelligence plot to kill King.

This is irresponsible writing. He does not use any conjectures here, does not say it is his theory, and even if he had that, too, would have been utterly irresponsible because despite all his over-writing, conjectures, imaginings and theorizing, he has not presented a single bit of evidence even indicating that there has been such a conspiracy.

Chapter 13, "An interview With James Earl Ray" 146ff.

He begins by saying that he had been warned "by sources in Nashville" that just because he had permission to see Ray he would get in without difficulty. He says that he was "stalled" at the ~~the~~ "checkpoint." Crap. At the front desk, which everyone has to go through. I never heard of anyone having any trouble at all seeing Ray once there was permission. I never had any and no reporter ever complained of any to me. (In prisons there are delays)

He says (147) that Ray was paler because of "segregation." He knows ~~little~~ little about jails. Paleness is commonplace among prisoners who do not get to spend much time outside. "Segregation" is immaterial, although if it means less time outside, possibly there could be more paleness. Only he has no basis for any comparison.

He then wonders if there was a "new" Ray, whatever that may be imagined to mean. Why should there have been? When he gets into his interview (148) he refers to himself as "the interviewer" and says that when he got to the more "sensitive areas - the ~~the~~ Galt alias, the fat man, to conspirators - the second Ray emerged." "Sensitive" only in terms of Melanson's fabrications, particularly of that unestablished conspiracy, the existence of which he states unequivocally again here, "the conspirators." To Ray there was absolutely nothing in any of that. To him it was nonsense. How else was he to have treated it? Did he have to be as looney as Melanson not to be this "second Ray?" "his second Ray did not speak as well (not that Melanson had ever spoke to him before), "his power of memory all but disappeared" (again because he had not been interested in what Melanson imagines and presents as fact)" and he rambled (as he always did) and sometimes was not as close as Melanson would have liked to what he was talking about - all fictions that have to be fact for Melanson's book. But even if this were not true, how could he expect Ray to say what could later be used against Ray's interests?

Next he imagines again that the fat man delivered money to Ray. There is no chance that any intelligence agency would use that method and there is no reason to believe that

the man he tries to make into something by making out he has to keep his name secret when it never has been secret had any such connection. From Melanson's description of him and how his mind works there is even less possibility ~~of~~ any such connection. But once again, had the spooks given Ray any money he would not have been frustrated in his efforts to get where there was no extradition and he certainly would not have been broke, as he was when captured.

It is only because Melanson imagines there is significance in what was of no significance to Ray that he can make all this gooey kid stuff up. To Melanson what is unreal is real and what is real is unreal. No wonder he was so disappointed in his Ray interview and doesn't admit that he got nothing, that he blew it. How in the world could he begin to dream that he could get any information Ray had not already given to so many skilled, professional interviewers and reporters, had not given to his ~~the~~ defense when his life was at stake? Nonetheless, if he came away with nothing at ~~it~~ all, that is the fault of this "second" Ray. It could not possibly be that there was nothing for him to come away with. ~~Hadn't he already in his own mind~~ ^{had} transformed his nutty theory into the only fact? *From his own account Ray had reason not to trust him & to lie to him.*

As he embellishes his stupid concept that the fat man was delivering money for the spooks he says (149) that Ray had to lie about meeting the fat man at his rooming house, that Ray was afraid. Why in the world should he have feared getting money if there had been a money delivery he was expecting? Or if there had been an intelligence conspiracy, why should he have feared a contact with it when he so desperately needed help? Crazy writing, crazy thinking. He ends by saying that Ray was not scared and the reason for it was "that he was expecting a delivery." *That money he did not have.*

McDauldton (called "Bolton") gave a contemporaneous story to the police, that the unsealed envelope Ray had left in the phone booth and he returned, had to do with seeking a job. Nothing unreasonable in that. Only Melanson prefers this nut's 1984 story, that "the letter had sinister conspiratorial overtones relating to Ray's escape to Portugal." Ray in fact escaped to England, and no spookery in the world would have put anything at all relating to a conspirator/murderer's escape in a letter that it then mailed!

He concludes this crap by trying to make something of the fact that Ray did not go to the travel agency for his passport and ticket for two weeks, until the time he was scheduled to leave. Melanson says this is because Ray had to wait to get the money the fat man brought him from the spooks. Not that Ray had to rob to get the money, not that he wanted to avoid too much unnecessary exposure, not that he had no need to get the ticket until he was ready to use it. Only that he had to await for the spooks to get money to him ~~without~~ without even suggesting that there would have been any reason for the spooks to run risks by delaying the delivery. Or that they also could have gotten him a ticket and passport. (They made them all the time!)

On the Galt alias part of the Ray interview, which must have made ^{Ray} wonder what in the world Melanson was up to, he says that Ray muttered something about "the matching scars" that sounded like he was humoring Melanson. He probably was by then.

"Talking about what he describes all this crap as, "the sheer weight of the data" he laid out before Ray, he says "there was a brightness in his eyes and a trace of a smile." (151) The wonder is that Ray did not burst out laughing. There was no ~~data~~ of any meaning and it weighed a lot if it weighed a feather. When Ray did not respond the way Melanson thought he should and wanted him to, there was something wrong with Ray, that "second" Ray again. The nut Melanson does not realize that there was nothing Ray could say because Melanson is so sold on his insanity that he really believes is fact when it isn't.

Perhaps most irrational of all is Melanson's expectation, assuming that there had been a conspiratorial involvement in getting those aliases for Ray, that Ray would tell him all. What in the world for? To Ray Melanson was just another jerk he would try and get some use out of and, of course, once again didn't.

When Melanson gets to the John Willard alias he assumes that there was only one man by this name anywhere and he lived a mile and a half from the real Galt. Maybe that is the man whose name Ray took as an alias but I know of no reason to assume it and I think I recall that it is an alias he had used years earlier. He did, whether or not the genius Melanson knew it, use many false names earlier in his trivial career of petty crime. I'm not bothering to check because the whole thing is incredibly silly and immature. And as he continues with his own account (150) of what he asked Ray about what he says he learned about the real Galt, he actually believed that Ray would be responsive, as he could not be if it made no sense to him and would not if it were real.

That there is no rational limit to what Melanson can imagine and then put on paper is illustrated in a different way with his comment on a letter from Ray saying that Blakey may have suspected that there was something in the Galt "matter" (in fact Blakey didn't) but Melanson ^{is} if this could be Ray's "cryptic way of suggesting that there is indeed more to the Galt matter than official investigators knew or that he is willing to divulge." What a colossal ego Melanson has to have had to undertake the interview in the expectation that he could or would get something new and to really let himself think that Ray would make a cryptic suggestion of truth in his nonsense that must have amused Ray.

He actually expects Ray to tell him who asked for the duplicate Alabama drivers license (153) Ray told him he never got that license. I don't know whether or not he did, but I can't imagine an escapee driving across the country without a drivers license, either. Melanson says he expected "another stone to be added to the wall," and, Ray said, after a pause, "Maybe Raoul" got it. This is, Melanson says, an admission "Ray has never made before." At last! He has an accomplishment! But he does nothing with it! So if true it still means nothing. *and is not an admission!*

In winding this grim and unrealized self-exposure up in the section captioned "On Conspiracy and Conspirators (153-5) Melanson begins, "(b)y the logic of Ray's version" (and I'm sure that Ray gave him no "version" of his title) Ray's version of his role in this case, it was undeniably a conspiracy." In this he confused between the way Ray's ~~mind~~ mind works, which he does not understand in any way at all, with the way he thinks. He says that Ray claims he was a fall guy, which ought be obvious to anyone with any factual knowledge of even the official story, yet he then says he gave Ray "several clear, sympathetic opportunities - if not direct invitations - to ruminate (sic) on the conspirators whom he insisted framed him." He apparently never asked himself why, after two decades, Ray should have done this or how it could have helped Ray if he had - why Ray should have to him of all people. By the "theory" that others believe Ray was merely making smoke screens to "hide his own guilt" Melanson says Ray "should have been eager to impress this interviewer"-Melanson. Why? How could he possibly see himself as this important to Ray? His answer is that he is "a professor who writes books," after all!!!

In winding up Melanson says that in his efforts to get Ray "to open up about the Galt alias, I mentioned one of my hypotheses was that if Ray succeeded in getting to Angola, the conspirators would have tried to neatly dispose of him there." He next says that "Ray's reaction was silence but singularly intense in comparison with the rest of the interview." He says that when Ray nodded, that was "agreement." Of course he can imagine anything but Ray must have wondered what in the hell was going on in Melanson's mind.

Then Melanson ^{is} says that "logically" followed by his special interpretations of Ray's nodding, "if Ray can agree that the conspirators planned to eliminate him in 1968, he cannot be sure he has nothing to fear now" This is really rabid, crazy. And above all this stupidity and nonsense, why should Ray be more afraid of getting eliminated after two decades in which it didn't happen? Why should he now be more afraid and spill his guts to the professor who, after all, writes books? (Not the only author Ray spoke to - Only the least known one!)

Thank God the end is close - only ^{from} ~~five~~ pages of Chapter 14, "Toward Historical Truth." It is not toward it and it is not indicated here. (156-9)

This also begins with a flaunting of professorial ignorance, when Melanson says that "a good deal of whatever Ray knows may be counterproductive to his pursuit of a new (sic) trial." He has never had a trial, and the only available avenue under the law for him to get a trial is "new" evidence. Anything Ray knew is not new and can't be used in any effort to get him a trial.

Melanson says that in this book he has "illuminated" the conspiracy. He actually writes that he has established it.

He says that even without Ray's help "the King assassination can be effectively pursued by investigators" with Subpoena powers "and an adequate field staff," whatever in the professorial mind that is.

There is, as he does not indicate, quite a limit to official bodies with both jurisdiction and subpoena power and I know of none that would even dream of this now, regardless of Melanson's firm belief that his silly theory is real. (His important new leads and neglected only leads.) He, assuming Ray's guilt as he does, says that the purpose would be "justice." What would track back to his spooks, of course.

In his noting the "versions of truth" the country has been given he omits one: that Ray was innocent.

He still again says the spooks did it. "If as is posited here, responsibility lies with ~~the~~ men of clandestine sophistication who viewed King as the ultimate red menace...."

The last words I marked in reading this awful book is fairly regarded as Melanson's epitaph on himself and his book but he uses them to address HSCA: "mired in its own presumptions and incompetence." Melanson began with his own presumptions and never departed from them and his incompetence is classic.

I'm not enough interested to take the time to check, as I told you when we spoke yesterday, but I believe that when Melanson first started taking to me about these aliases he was satisfied that Galt was a spook and was one of the assassination conspirators. That is the opposite of what he now writes. But if this is of interest to you, I'll take the time. For any future check, I have a Melanson file and it would be fairly early in it.

after finish ^{part} the preceeding pages I decided to make a perfunctory check of my file of correspondence with Melanson because of the seriousness of some of my criticisms. I just skimmed his letters, without reading them, for a few clues. This is reflected in the few selections + made after this cursury examination. There could well be more like these illustrations. I am not integrating them with the preceeding pages. ~~press with~~

On 2/20/84 he was aware that although in the book he credits the "Starvo" in the Galt name as Ray used it, he knew very well that it is I who figured that out. (33A)

As I now recall he had his weird theory about "the fat man," before he knew the name and that he got the name from me when he asked what + have on the fat man. His 6/14/84 reflects that I sent him those of the FBI's records I'd gotten in the FOIA litigation of which I'd made duplicate copies for subject filing. ~~33B~~ He thanked me for them 6/14/84. As this comes out in his book (59) "...one document obtained by the author had failed to delete the name," ~~for the sake of a cheap trick~~ ^{the name by hand} because the name was freely available to anyone from me, as he got it, or from the FBI's public reading room, he invented the totally unnecessary pseudonym Bolton. He then, having gotten all the information from these FBI records I'd given him, pretends a major investigative accomplishment. "I located William Bolton in 1984," the feat magnified by the false pretense that he was ~~hidden~~ ^{hidden} by US and Canadian police so the press could not find him. (33B)

I indicate above that he got nothing from the CIA by his request except copies of (only some of what) ~~he~~ knew I had obtained by litigation. We had discussed this before he wrote this letter and despite knowing what I say he uses what can be taken as ambiguous language ("CIA MLK documents pleased to me", emph. added.) On 6/19 I let him know that he had gotten only some of what I'd gotten via that litigation (33C) and his book holds no indication that he made any further effort to get anything else from the CIA. (In this letter I also identified Jack Kennedy to him, with a description of Kennedy's politics and views.)

With regard to the duplicate Alabama drivers license gotten by someone else for Ray, I decided to refer to my reference to what he says about this and cannot locate in by means of his index. +t is a pisspoor apology for an index and is also inaccurate. For example, what he says about the fat man begins pages before the first index citation. Ray told Melanson that he did not get that license, that someone else did, perhaps Raoul. Melanson says, "this is a suggestion which, to the author's knowledge, Ray has never made before." (153. He also quotes Ray on all the mail being laid in the open on a table there, where anyone could get it. He knew nothing at all about this and wrote asking me for information 9/18/84. (33 D2) I replied two days later (33D1) Before this I'd discussed with him at some length what I indicate in frameup, that I was without doubt that Ray was being manipulated up until the time of the assassination and that there had to have been someone like Raoul and that he had met Raoul at this Birmingham roominghouse. My reply, without any checking, from recollection, and, of course, what I'd gotten from Ray is a description of how the mail was handled there, my own belief that this was one of the indications of a conspiracy, and that someone in B'ham ~~or~~ who went there for that purpose did get the license.

I refer to his ignorance about the matters he lumps under ballistics. He reflected this ignorance in asking me about the shell casing 2/26/85 (33E2) I began my reply with what he should have taken as a caution, "Re the shell casing, I ask again if you've read frameup or is your reading diet limited to junk?" I then go into what was in MURKIN, as if he'd done any real research at the FBI reading room he'd have known. (33E1) He does not reflect his source in his book. (I responded to him in some of these letters in such haste I did not read and correct them.)

I do not recall what he says in the book about Ray's letter to South Africa and about which he asked me 3/2/85. He claim to have been responsible for disclosure of that letter (139): "Under the Freedom of Information Act, the author obtain" this letter, and he hippodromes this in a childish way by giving the FBI's identification of it, "334" (he does not explain, probably because he doesn't know, what this number represents.)

In my response (these are 33F1 and 2) I told him I lacked means of retrieving it. As I'd told him, I'd supposedly gotten all the lab records. I also told him the matter had been widely reported, what Ray had told me and my opinion of it, that his was a credible explanation. I'd also told him that what HSCA had done was to simply remove the FBI identification numbers from copies of its records already disclosed to me. In this instance HSCA had not, perhaps because it was not easily done. In any event, he did know that what he claims he got under FOIA had been published earlier by HSCA with this FBI lab identification number. So much for his claims to have brought anything at all to light!

I refer to his lack of honesty in crediting Jerry McKnight with what Jerry had gotten from me and that Melanson knew this. It was easier and cheaper for the copying to be done at Hood than on our primitive machine, so in response to several of his letters I wrote him on 3/7/85 that Jerry had copied my ~~books~~ Invaders and Sanitation Strike files that I'd gotten from the FBI and even that an honors paper had been done on them that he might want to read. So, he knew what he was doing, as he did throughout with all such dishonesties of varying degrees. (Doing the copying of my records at Hood is always cheaper because of the difference between their copies and ours and the costs of copies on them. The Hood machine is also faster. Currently this is being done for another who has sought and gotten help from me without telling me he is writing a book on this and after telling me that he represents Ray in some legal matters, Bill Pepper. He's had a student searching here and I suggested that in those two files it would be cheaper and faster if they use the copies + let Hood have. I'm not concerned about the lack of credit but I am addressing honesty, principle and standards, personal and professional.)

Whether or not a reading of this correspondence file would disclose other such illustrations, I consider that the few in which special words caught my eye are adequate to confirm the serious allegations I made above.

33A

February 20, 1984

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Harold:

I am in the process of doing some background research on the Martin Luther King case and there is one particular facet which really intrigues me, and which you raised questions about ("Key Questions, Major Doubts," in The Assassinations, Dallas and Beyond). I have a hunch that the Toronto aliases used by Ray are crucial to the case. I have the Toronto newspaper clippings from 1968, pointing to the similarities between Ray and Galt, Bridgeman, and Sneyd, etc. And I have read the HSCA hearings: The interviews with Ray only succeed in his restating that he got his alias from the library. As you probably know, the real Galt evidently greatly resembled Ray, even including scars, and was eight years older but looked younger (this can't be devined from newspapers and birth announcements). Toronto papers report that Galt: was a crack rifle shot, had traveled to Memphis, had worked on a secret Canadian Gov. project (the latter may explain how he ended up as a Ray alias).

Do you have any information or insights on this angle that you can share? I notice in your article you refer to Galt's signature, in which St. V looks like "Starvo," and I wondered how you discovered this?

I'll appreciate any help you can provide.

Best regards,



Philip Melanson

33
C

To Phil Melanson from Harold Weisberg 6/19/84

The CIA King copies you sent (thanks) are from those I got in the FOIA suit for its King records.

The source was not disclosed to me, either. It could even have been the FBI, although disclosing them if the FBI was the source ordinarily would have required FBI approval. For example, just yesterday I got from the FBI some old records that the CIA had. They referred them back to the FBI for disclosure to me. (Thus far I've seen nothing new in them.)

Using an affidavit before the appeals court is exceptional, but so also is our situation when the DJ lies to it and misrepresents on basic legal facts. I've prepared an affidavit for Jim's use but as of the last time we spoke he'd not made up his mind. I favor attestation, because it is subject to the penalties of perjury and thus more fearful than a lawyer's argument. Jim by now may have completed the draft of what he'll file, and I presume will have drawn heavily on that affidavit, whether or not he uses it. You may want it as well as a copy of the DR's Supplemental Memorandum, so you can see and if useful make use of its lies and their nature. Often there is a page limitation, so Jim may be restricted in the number of pages he can file. Or, feels would receive attention. I've suggested to him that in a footnote he refer to other misrepresentations and overt lies than he has in his text, to give the court an idea of their totality, as far as he can tell).

Why is always a question when the government lies to a court and engages in the most basic misrepresentation.

Strangely, it does not necessarily have special significance, although in this case I'm inclined to believe that it has. These people are rarely not untruthful in FOIA matters they contest. It is a way of life for them.

Best regards,

By the way, according to David Garrow the withheld source on King as an alleged hicom is Jack Kennedy, who married Levison's divorced wife.

Handwritten note: ... with ...
address

Handwritten note: 13 ...
...

33
B

June 14, 1984

Dear Harold,

Thanks for the McDouldton documents. Regarding the list of CIA MLK documents released to me, I enclosed a copy of page 1 item 3 (671005-A) in case you don't have it (you asked about it in your 6/4 letter). Regarding page 3 item 3 on the list (93087-68) there were no composite photos released. Regarding item 660715, I copied it and sent it on (it does not reveal what the source of the notes and receipts was, so far as I can tell).

Thanks for letting me know about the appeals brief. It would be of value to me, so I shall do as you suggest and get a copy from Jim later on.

Best regards,

Phil

Please read all mail to my home address

*18 Partridge Pl.
MARION MASS.*

02738