12/1 .... ridiculous. I never did mention his name. In fact I er.. I didn't even know he existed while I was in Missouri Penitentiary, but as I was going to say there are - when I was in Missouri penitentiary probably sixteen hundred prisoners there, it would be a very - very easy matter for the F.B.I. to go there and get six - six to eight hundred of those prisoners to testify that I threatened bodily harm to Martin Luther King, but those - those are .... statements and they were never, none of these people could afford to testify under oath in court about them.

REPORTER When the time came for your trial why did you turn down the offer of a twenty-year sentence which was arranged by your first lawyer and then hire Mr. Foreman.

RAY Well, I told the first lawyer he did mention the guilty plea in exchange for a twenty-year sentence and I would be some type of state witness against some individual that the F.B.I. had staked out in New Orlens I believe it was.

REPORTER What - what kind of deal was arranged? - was talked about?

RAY Well, that would

JERay's statements, something new and a lie HW 8/6/78

The BBC Panaroma interview is longer than I'd expected. David Lomax was the questioner. For the most part if was old stuff. What is interesting there is it is the same story, no variations. This tends to make it credible because it is impossible to memorize all details.

However, there are two points where there are differences.

One is on the 20-year deal Hanes relayed. I believe that what he says Hanes never told us and I'm sure Jimmy didn't. It is that there was a quid pro quo, "I would be some type of state witness against some individual that the F.B.I. had staked out in New Orleans..."

I recall nothing like this, only the relay of the 20-y ear offer in return for the g.p.

The deliberate lie is about the British bank robbery. He was asked about this. He replied, "No, that's incorrect. No robberies at all."

He told me otherwise, in some detail, and the British police found his prints on the brown paper bag used in the robbery of the Fulham bank.

Of course there is no proof of the N.O. angle to the g.p. But there is no question that Jimmy knew he was lying on the no robberies statement.

I find myself wondering why. One possibility is to disown his partner in that minor affair. He did have one.