December 6, 1984

Dear Harold,

Enclosed is a piece of mine. I've been very busy with the RFK Assassination collection that we have acquired at my library. The collection, from the west coast, arrived last week and we've been unpacking and cataloguing.

I got my chat with Ray last Saturday. I now know what you were trying to tell me about him: he is smart in his own way. He mostly wanted to talk FOIA, but let me give you some highlights and querries:

1. He stonewalled on the Galt alias as he has always done. Even when I pressed him: he insists it was from a phone book.

2. He was very rambling and confusing about whether he had N.O. tel. number(s) for Raoul. He claimed that the FBI had interviewed two black maids, something about a gangster-owned motel. He also claimed that he gave Percy Foreman the last four digits of a N.O. number. I thought Ray was sitting on the secret Raoul phone number(s). Can you clarify?

3. Ray is in FOIA pursuit of something he calls the "four-mile statements"--statements made by all Memphis cops within four miles of the Lorraine. Do these exist? My impression was that Ray was going on heresay--that no one knew if these existed. Do they? If so they would indeed be crucial.

4. Despite a half dozen very sympathetic entrees, he would not discuss or elaborate on in any way the conspiracy or conspirators, he wouldn't even make general references to anything beyond Raoul. Do you think he has ideas he's too scared to share?

5. His "security" seems extraordinary. "Segregation"--locked up 24 hours a day behind nine gates. Has he been "segregated" since his last escape?

6. He claims that when he has enough new data via FOIA, Mark Lane will return with a white hat and defend him at his new trial. He seems to have blocked out the Cowden debacle.

7. He didn't seem at all interested in the stuff I passed on to him about the Jim's Grill witness and the Raoul data turned up by the two Canadian reporters.

But it was worth the trip to get a feel for his mentality--at least as it exists now.

Gus

December 7

After our phone conversation last night. Enclosed is Ray's letter and the material he sent me. Please consider the letter confidential and give it to no one, since he wrote it to me and the dimensions of in-confidence are unclear.

Any thoughts or clarifications you have on Ray's letter or his enclosures will be greatly appreciated.

Best regards,

Phil

3 December 1981

Mr. Philip H. Melanson
18 Partridge Place
Marion, MA. 02738.

James E. Ray # 65477
Station-A
Nashville, TN. 37219-5255.

Dear Mr. Melanson:

After you left last Saturday I located the JD document about Blakey & the perjury charge against my brother John Ray. It is enclosed herein. This bank robbery charge had it beginning some where around May 1968 when an FBI informant I onced knew, John Gawron, told the FBI that I and another robbed the Alton Bank in September 1967. Subsequently the FBI discovered that the other alleged robber was in jail at the time of the robbery. Gawron then brought in another robber(apparently my other brother Jerry), but by then the FBI no longer relied on Gawron. (I have seen these FBI documents but don't have them in prison). Anyway later the SElect committee picked up the chase and charged me and Jerry with the robbery. This was on August 16 when I appeared before the committee. Thereafter Jerry turned himself in to the Alton police (see enclosed date Aug. 18th), and offered to stand trial for the robbery. The police said he never was subpect.(In fact he was working in Chicago the day the robbery was committed but the Select Committee said he couldn't prove it since his work records had been "lost". Thereafter on August 25th Blakey decfied my other brother had committed the Robbery (John), who didn't have an airtight alibi, and went to the JD seeking the indictment. However, the aforementioned document also read that Blakey had been to see an Atty. Silbert on May 24th about the indictment so one wonders why the committee charged Jerry in August with the robbery while talking about indicting John in May about the same robbery unless the committee wanted to charge them both with the robbery. John finally was convicted of aiding & abetting in a bank robbery committed in 1970 and was sentenced by Judge William Webster (now FBI director), to 18 years in federal prison where he still is.

Also enclosed:

1. Three pages from the Interrogatories I filed on the NARS where the Archives say they have 58 cubic feet of records under seal.

2. A receipt from the Shelby county jail where I noted what ph. nrs. I had backwards. The "no.7573" was the last 4 digits of a New Orleans ph. nr. Raoul gave me. There has been considerable speculation about the first three numbers. Someone named Webberman got the number out of a court document and wrote me about it. (see two enclosed lette from 'Independent Research". The other number (483-4429, also backwards), I located in a Baton Rouge telephone director after Raoul had given it to me as a 'back-up numb I never called anyone at the number, I suspect it was given to me in case I was arrest and Raoul & his associates wanted to throw the police off--sort of a diversion. Anyway I didn't remember the number, rather the name matched up with it that I found in the directory; one, Herman Thompson; and after I was arrested had Jerry get the number by calling or asking the operator for Thompson's number. As to the phone numbers Percy Foreman has and said he got them from me or indirectly from me, they are refered to in his deposition he gave in the 1974 HC hearing I had in Memphis, Ray v. Rose, C-74-166 US Dist. Ct. The deposition is reproduced in vol. v. of the Select committee final report. If you have V check out pp. 234 through 240.
The address on the receipt down backwards, 0811 N.W. River Drive, Mi. Fl., is one Randolph Rosenson. I found Rosenson named (original thought Rosen), in my car in Mexico in November 1967 just before crossing the border into the US. The name was written on a business card (backside), and had fell or been planted between the front seats of the Mustang. I'm sure Rosenson had nothing to do with the MLK case. He was in the Andrew Johnson hotel in Knoxville when I escaped in June 1977. His cover story was he had been having car problems, but I'm sure the committee had him there for questioning since the hotel was owned by, ~~[illegible]~~ Boyd Cloud, Gov. Blanton patronage chief for the Knoxville area, and the committee probably threw a little trade his way. There is more to the Rosenson story in Knoxville which you might obtain from the Knoxville police dept.; Reporters Stan DeLozier & David Lyons of the Knoxville "Sentinel. His record evidences he was an informant & I suspect he was being used by someone or agency.

In respect to the stabbing on June 4, 1981, I sued but the district court would not even permit discovery. The suit is now on appeal to the US sixth circuit. There were 4 involved, 3 blacks & one white. The white, apparently at the instigation of the prison administration directly or indirectly told ch. 5 tv in Nashville that I had paid to have the stabbing performed. The story was aired on ch. 5 the 27th of July 1981 on the evening news by reporter, Larry Brinton, who has a reputation as a mouth piece for the establishment/ the informant's name isWilliam Wynn. I named Brinton in suit but he refused to directly answer, rather he relied on a technicality to have the suit dismissed.

In re: Blakey. As an ex-prosecutor I'm sure he thinks everything I say is a fabrication. Usually the same type thinks everything an informant say's is true. He may very well have suspected that I was someway involved in the 'Galt matter you mentioned. But since he could not prove it through me decided to say nothing. He is extremely hostile and I suspect it has nothing to do with whether or not he thinks I'm responsible for the MLK incident. Instead he thinks I didn't "cooperate" with him to make him look good. When I filed for a pardon based on "substantial evidence of innocent" 3 years ago the "Tennessee" quoated him as saying "Unless Ray admits to murdering Dr. King and actually names the people who worked with him, he shouldn't get a bucket of spit..."

I think that covers about everything. I doubt if you are interested in all of the above but may be interested in some of it. I'm also enclosing two letter from Webberman mentioned above; and a clipping about the stabbing. Don't bother to return the stabbing clipping. And as I mentioned, I'll forward to you via my brother any information about the pending FOIA suits, ect. Good luck with the project.

Sincerely: James Ray

note. For information about Thompson & Rosenson mentioned above, see "The final assassinations report" Bantam Books, 1979, pp. 512 & 519 respectively.

Percy Foreman is now 84 years old. He is listed in the phone book in Houston.

Dr. Brecht Bruce

DATE: Dec 27 1967

[illegible] AVE. MEMPHIS TENNESSEE.

Received of Sheriff William N. Morris, Jr. the sum of $10.00. Said monies being sent by mail to James Earl Ray, with aliases, from CARROL POPE who resides at 1035 BELLEVUE MARLEWOOD, MO. 63143

SISTER. The above sum was received in the form of No. 7573-4534429

cash, check, money order. (circle appropriate)

VERA C. STAPLES
[illegible] N.W. RIVER DR. MIAMI, FL.

ROSEN LEE
Hanes, Attorneys

BY: [signature]

James Earl Ray, County Jail

JERRY RAY - 710 ANN AVE
LOUIS, MISSOURI. 63104

JAMES RAY 1982

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY
J. FRANKLIN REID, CLERK
BY [signature]
DEPUTY CLERK

EX-A

from Nelson 12/6/84

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JAMES E. RAY, Plaintiff, v. NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE, Defendant.	Civil Action No. 79-1887

ANSWERS TO INTERROGATORIES

JAMES E. O'NEILL, Acting Archivist of the United States, being duly sworn, hereby responds to interrogatories propounded by plaintiff:

Interrogatory no. 1: Has the United States District court for the District of Columbia ordered pursuant to, Lee v. Kelly, no. 76-1185 & 1186, the sequestering in the National Archives & Records Service ("National Archives"), for a period of fifty (50) years tapes & transcripts thereof resulting from the Federal Bureau of Investigation ("F.B.I."), electronic surveillance commencing in 1963 until April 1968 ? [sic]

Answer: The United States District Court for the District of Columbia has placed under seal in the National Archives for a period of fifty years commencing in 1977 the tapes, transcripts, logs and other records pertaining to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's electronic surveillance and investigation of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference during the years 1963-1968. The inventory of these FBI records, prepared at the Court's Order and also maintained under seal, reveals the existence within the National Archives of tape recordings covering the period January 5, 1964 through October 30, 1965; transcripts covering the period January 5, 1964 through January 23, 1966; and logs covering the period October 24, 1963 through June 13, 1966.

Deponent's initials JEO'N

A.

Interrogatory no. 2: If the answer to the preceding question is affirmative, describe the inventory or volume of the material ordered sequestered by the court. [sic]

Answer: As noted in defendant's answer to the first interrogatory, the Court ordered the FBI to prepare an inventory of records then placed under seal in the National Archives. The inventory, also under seal according to our interpretation of the Court's Order, is 838 pages long, and pertains to the entire corpus of materials which total approximately 58 cubic feet of records, including 83 tape recordings.

Interrogatory no. 3: Briefly state the reason(s) for the Court order sequestering said tapes & transcripts thereof. [sic]

Answer: Defendant has no knowledge or information responsive to this interrogatory.

Interrogatory no. 4: Are all of the conversations on said tapes & transcripts thereof of a personal nature wherein Dr. King is always one of the participants in the recorded conversations. By "personal" plaintiff means the contents of said tapes & transcripts thereof are limited to male/female or family communications as opposed to business, political, philosophical, ect., oriented endevors Dr. King was engaged in in promoting his goals ? [sic]

Answer: Defendant has no knowledge or information responsive to this interrogatory.

Interrogatory no. 5: Describe the term "personal" as interpreted by the court or others who were instrumental in having the tapes & transcripts thereof sequested in the National Archives. [sic]

Answer: Defendant has no knowledge or information responsive to this interrogatory.

Deponent's initials JRG.

Interrogatory no. 20: If one or more of the preceding questions cannot be answered by the National Archives, will the Archives seek the assistance of appropriate authorities in answering said Interrogatories? [sic]

Answer: No.

Interrogatory no. 21: Briefly cite the purpose of the National Archives & Records Service as reflected in the National Archives charter, or what ever authority the Archives is operating under. [sic]

Answer: With certain inapplicable additions, the functions and purposes of the National Archives and Records Service are based on statutes which have been codified into positive law as chapters 15, 21, 22, 23, 25, 29, 31 and 33 of title 44, United States Code.

I have read the answers above, and they are true and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

James E. O'Neill
JAMES E. O'NEILL

Subscribed and sworn to before me at Eighth and Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C., on this 21st day of September 1979.

Francis J. Hepner
Notary Public

My commission expires: Aug. 31, 1984

Philip B. Heymann
Assistant Attorney General
Criminal Division

August 25, 1978
ALE:RLC:jad

Alfred L. Hantman, Chief
General Crimes Section
Criminal Division

Select Committee on Assassinations - United States House of Representatives; John Ray; Perjury

This is in response to your request for our views as to whether John Ray should be prosecuted for perjury, 18 U.S.C. 1621, as a result of Mr. Ray's alleged false testimony to the House Select Committee on Assassinations. We have concluded that prosecution should be declined because (1) the allegedly false testimony was not material and (2) all surrounding circumstances show that prosecutorial discretion is best exercised by declining prosecution.

By letter to the Attorney General dated June 15, 1978 (Tab A), the Committee specifically referred John Ray's May 9, 1978 testimony that he did not participate in several bank robberies. The referral was specifically authorized by Committee resolution dated May 17, 1978.

Prior to formally referring this matter to the Department of Justice, Mr. Blakey met with United States Attorney Earl Silbert and a representative of the Criminal Division on May 24, 1978 concerning this allegedly false testimony. At that time Mr. Blakey advised that the primary reason that he wanted John Ray charged with perjury was to convince James Earl Ray to testify before the Committee concerning his knowledge of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. In other words, Mr. Blakey was desirous of being in the position of telling James Earl Ray that if he does not cooperate with the Committee and tell the truth, his lack of cooperation will result in the incarceration of members of his family — i.e., John Ray will be prosecuted for perjury by the Department of Justice in connection with his false testimony to the Committee.

On May 9, 1978, John Ray appeared before the Committee in Executive Session after having been granted immunity pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 6005. Mr. Ray had previously appeared before the

General Crimes
Cubbage (2)

Committee on April 17 and 18 in which he exhibited a remarkable lack of memory of anything specific (the transcripts are attached — Tab B). At Mr. John Ray's May 9th appearance he was advised by Mr. Michael Eberhardt, Assistant Deputy Chief Counsel, that he was going to ask Mr. Ray a series of questions about crimes, particularly bank robberies, which had previously occurred. Mr. Ray was further advised that this line of questioning was being pursued to determine if James Earl Ray received monies from any source during the period of his fugitivity - from April 23, 1967 until June 8, 1968. John Ray was advised that a determination as to whether or not James Earl Ray was financially assisted could ". . . bear on the question of whether or not James Earl Ray, himself, was involved in the eventual assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King." (transcript of May 9 attached — Tab C)

During his examination he was asked a series of questions relative to his knowledge of and involvement in the robbery of the Bank of Alton, Illinois on July 13, 1967. This robbery of $37,000, which remains to this day unsolved, may explain James Earl Ray's source of funds during his fugitivity. James Earl Ray, as well as his brother, John, is known to have been in the general vicinity of Alton, Illinois on the date of the robbery. (James Earl Ray purchased an automobile for $200 cash on July 14, 1967 within 30 miles of Alton.) The FBI, acting on informant information after Dr. King's assassination, considered James as a suspect. However, the now deceased informant, John Gawran, proved somewhat unreliable (although he persisted in his contention that James was involved) and the FBI could not develop evidence corroborating the allegation.

John Ray was convicted of the 1970 robbery of the Bank of St. Peters, Missouri. He received an 18 year sentence from which he was to be paroled in late June, 1978. His May 9, 1978 Executive Session testimony, however, contains denials of any involvement in the St. Peters robbery. The FBI also carried John Ray as a suspect in a series of bank robberies which, according to the Committee, contain remarkable similarities to the modus operandi of the Alton bank robbery (attached memorandum and chart provided by the Committee — Tab D). These other bank robberies in which John Ray denied any participation are as follows:

Bank	Date of Robbery
1. Farmers & Traders Bank Meredosia, Illinois	1/28/70
2. Laddonia State Bank Laddonia, Missouri	6/11/70
3. Bank of Hawthorne Hawthorne, Florida	7/29/70
4. Farmers Bank of Liberty Liberty, Missouri	10/17/69

In addition to denying any personal involvement in, and knowledge of, these bank robberies, Mr. Ray generally denied ever being involved in any bank robbery or engaging in any armed robbery with James Earl Ray.

The following evidence has been developed demonstrating the falsity of John Ray's testimony:

(1) James Russell Rodgers has testified before the Committee (Tab E) that he and John Ray participated in the robbery of all four of the above banks;

(2) Clarence Haynes when interviewed by the Committee advised that he and John Ray participated in the robbery of the Laddonia State Bank, Laddonia, Missouri (Tab F).

(3) Ronald Goldenstein when interviewed by the Committee advised that he and John Ray participated in the robbery of the Farmers & Traders Bank, Meredosia, Illinois, and the Bank of St. Peters, St. Peters, Missouri (Tab G).

As can be seen by the above, there currently exists two witnesses (James Russell Rodgers and Ronald Goldenstein) who can testify that John Ray participated in the robbery of the Farmers & Traders Bank, Meredosia, Illinois, and two witnesses (James Russell Rodgers and Clarence Haynes) who can testify that John Ray participated in the robbery of the Laddonia State

Bank, Laddonia, Missouri. Further, there is sufficient evidence to charge John Ray for perjury for his denial of committing the St. Peters robbery for which he was convicted and sentenced. In addition, Ronald Goldenstein can testify that John Ray participated in the St. Peters bank robbery. No evidence exists that John Ray, James Earl Ray, or anybody participated in the Bank of Alton, Illinois, bank robbery that occurred on July 13, 1967 during the period of time that James Earl Ray was a fugitive.

Our recommendation to decline prosecution in this case is based on the following reasons:

(1) If John Ray were indicted for perjury, the charges would be of a "bootstrap" variety: i.e., the charge arises from sworn testimony recently elicited about events which occurred eight or more years ago. Since we can no longer prosecute John Ray for the bank robberies themselves because of the five year statute of limitations (see 18 U.S.C. 3282), we would be bootstraping ourselves by going after John Ray for perjury concerning those same bank robberies. 1/ Although logic indicates that a prosecution for perjury about crimes that occurred beyond the statute of limitations will lie, there is little law directly on the issue. Judge Wyzanski stated in dicta in United States v. Worcester, 190 F. Supp. 548, 569 (D. Mass. 1961), that a federal perjury prosecution may be based upon a willfully false statement about a matter not punishable by the federal criminal law. In Worcester, the defendants argued unsuccessfully that it was "fundamentally unfair to put them under oath as witnesses to testify to matters occurring many years ago, many of which [were] barred by the statute of limitations." Cf. United States v. Rayor, 204 F. Supp. 486, 492 (S.D. Cal. 1962), aff'd, 323 F.2d 519 (9th Cir. 1963), cert. den., 375 U.S. 993 (1964).

1/ See attached copy of former DAG Tyler's memorandum to former Director Kelley in which the bootstrap principle was used to decline prosecution of an FBI agent for obstruction of justice in connection with perjurious statements given during an FBI internal investigation into the destruction of a note from Lee Harvey Oswald that Mr. Oswald had left at the Dallas field office approximately a week before the Kennedy assassination (Tab E).

(2) Only one of the bank robberies, the robbery of the Bank of Alton, Illinois, on July 13, 1967, was committed during the period of James Earl Ray's fugitivity — from April 23, 1967 through June 8, 1968. There is no existing or anticipated testimony or other evidence to link John Ray or James Earl Ray to that robbery. It appears that the real issue concerning the remaining bank robberies is that of establishing the materiality of the testimony, a necessary element for a perjury prosecution. The traditional test of materiality of a false statement is whether the testimony has a natural effect or tendency to influence, impede or dissuade the investigating body. United States v. Parker, 244 F.2d 943 (7th Cir.), cert. den. 355 U.S. 836 (1957). Although the authority of the Select Committee is broad (see H. Res. 222 — Tab I), John Ray was advised that the purpose of the questions into the matters of bank robberies was to determine James Earl Ray's source of funds. The bank robberies that occurred after James Earl Ray was arrested on June 8, 1968 could not have been a source of funds for James Earl Ray while he was a fugitive. Therefore, it could be argued that the broad authority of the Committee had been limited by the Committee's own statement in connection with the questions concerning the bank robberies. Even if it could be argued that the questions asked about the bank robberies that occurred after the Alton bank robbery went to credibility and were therefore material, it would seem that a relationship or similarity in the bank robberies would be necessary.

The Committee has taken the position that because of the "remarkable similarities in circumstances between the five bank robberies in question and the Bank of Alton robbery, John Ray's denials are undoubtedly relevant to the question of his own participation in the Alton robbery. John's involvement, given the known, alleged and inferred relationship between John and James during 1967-68, is relevant to the specific inquiry into James' possible involvement in the same robbery." (page 14 of Tab D). However, my review of the facts surrounding the bank robberies as set forth in a chart supplied by the Committee (Tab D), indicates that the only real similarity is the fact that the banks were robbed by armed men wearing stocking masks. In fact, a review of the two bank robberies for which we have two witnesses indicating John Ray's participation (Laddonia State Bank and Farmers & Traders Bank) indicate many dissimilarities. In the Bank of Alton robbery, there were two bank

robbers who used a blue automatic pistol and a sawed-off shotgun. Their clothing and stocking masks were later found burned in the woods. There was no getaway driver and the robbers fled on foot. In the robberies of the Laddonia State Bank and the Farmers & Traders Bank there were three and four bank robbers respectively and a chrome revolver and a sawed-off shotgun or rifle were used. The robbers stocking masks were discarded along the getaway route. (The Committee's interview report of Goldenstein indicates the stocking masks were burned after the Farmers & Traders Bank robbery.) The robbers did not flee on foot but used a getaway vehicle. Since the Committee has no evidence of anyone being involved in the Bank of Alton robbery, and because of the dissimilarities in the bank robberies, it appears that it is immaterial to the Committee's inquiry whether John Ray admitted or denied his involvement in any of the bank robberies other than the Bank of Alton, and that his false testimony with respect to these later bank robberies did not influence, impede, or dissuade the Committee. In other words, only the Bank of Alton appears to be material and we have no evidence, direct or otherwise, that John Ray lied about his participation in that bank robbery.]

(3) Returning an indictment against John Ray in order to pressure his brother James Earl Ray into cooperating could and should be viewed as an abuse of process. It is one thing to use the criminal laws to pressure an individual into cooperating with the government. It is another thing to use the criminal laws against someone to pressure another individual into cooperating with the government. This is particularly true when the individuals involved are close family relatives such as brothers.

The facts of this case have been discussed with United States Attorney Earl Silbert who concurs in our recommendation. For your information, on two occasions, June 23, 1978 and August 24, 1978, representatives of the Criminal Division met with James Lesar, John Ray's attorney, in an unsuccessful effort to obtain Ray's truthful cooperation with the Committee. This approach of attempting to aid the Committee has been a paramount guideline in reviewing this entire matter. [In that regard, it must be noted that on August 8, 1978, Claude Powell, Jr., was indicted in the District of Columbia for contempt of Congress.]

(2 U.S.C. 192) for failing to obey a subpoena requiring him to appear and testify before the Committee. Further, Mr. Keuch's June 13, 1978 letter to Parole Commissioner Robert Vincent was instrumental in having John Ray's parole retarded for approximately one month. (Tab J) A subsequent hearing resulted in several months delay in Ray's parole (Ray is scheduled to be paroled on September 18, 1978). The Committee has been advised that we stand ready to assist them in all matters of importance to the Committee wherever appropriate.

Attachments

.... THE ATLANTA CONSTITUTION, Thur., Nov. 16, 1978 7-A

House Probe Can't Prove Sources Of Ray's Money

WASHINGTON (UPI) — House Assassinations Committee investigators reported Wednesday they have been unable to learn where James Earl Ray got $8,300 of the money he spent as a fugitive before and after Martin Luther King's murder.

They called this "negative evidence" and not proof of a conspiracy but said that — because of such background gaps — they cannot rule out the possibility Ray may have had financial help from unknown accomplices.

Nonetheless, chief committee counsel G. Robert Blakey and chief investigator Edward Evans told the panel it is their opinion Ray probably got most of his funds from a still-unsolved bank robbery in Alton, Ill., his hometown, on July 13, 1967.

That was three months after he escaped from a Missouri prison and nine months before King was slain in Memphis.

Two gunmen in stocking masks netted $27,000 in the Alton holdup, and the panel investigators said authorities suspected — but could not prove — Ray and one or more of his brothers pulled that job.

UNKNOWN FUNDS
James Earl Ray

'But what we have here is negative evidence. It is always possible tomorrow new evidence will develop . . . . If there has been a conspiracy, there is no evidence yet.'

ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH Fri., August 18, 1978 9A

Jerry Ray Visits Alton Bank To Deny He Robbed It In '67

By ROBERT J. WEHLING
Of the Post-Dispatch Staff

A brother of James Earl Ray popped into the Bank of Alton, Ill., today and told startled bank officers he had no part in robbing it 11 years ago.

Then Jerry Ray went to the Alton Police Department and repeated the denial for amused officers.

Both visits apparently stemmed from the appearance of James Earl Ray before a congressional committee in Washington. The committee is investigating the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, for which James Earl Ray is serving a prison sentence.

In questioning, Rep. Floyd J. Fithian, D-Ind., strongly implied that James Earl Ray and brother Jerry could have robbed the Bank of Alton on July 13, 1967 and used the money to stalk King before the assassination 15 months later.

Standing before a local television camera and a newspaper reporter, Jerry, in a powder blue sport coat, told Bank of Alton Vice President Paul E. Utterback that he had no part in the robbery in which $27,230 was taken. Ray said he was enroute to the police station to waive any statute of limitations and to be charged with the 1967 armed holdup if police wanted.

At police headquarters, Jerry Ray told Police Chief Rudy Sowders, Assistant Chief John Light, Lt. Walter Conrad, and others, that he would take a lie detector test if they desired.

Police declined the offer.

"He was interviewed briefly by Lt. Conrad and was told he is not, and was not then, a suspect in the holdup," Sowders said.

Two masked men rifled two cash drawers in the 1967 holdup at the bank at 1520 Washington Avenue and escaped without harming anyone. It was the first bank robbery in Alton's history, and remains unsolved.

"Conrad asked him if he wanted to confess to the crime, and he said he could not confess to something he did not do," Sowders said. "Then we took his name and address and told him we'd call him if we needed him."

Conrad said Ray told him he is now 43, unemployed, and living with relatives in the Mehlville area of south St. Louis County. Then he left, accompanied by cameramen.

APPENDAGE # 2.