TV "The Trial of James Earl Ray," more on 7/22/92

Bill Pepper phoned me from London last evening our time. We spoke for about an hour, ending about 4 p.m. here. He said (again) that he'd like to keep in touch and when he was in Washington to come up again. I said OK.

He is involved - and I did not ask him how when he did not volunteer it - in this coming TV show that he says has been publicized. Jerry Ray had asked me to keep it confidential and I did not tell him what Jerry had told me. He says it is by Thames TV, which he undertook to puff up over a Waldheim show, with problems with HBO's US involvement. Except for getting him to confirm that meant Warner I asked him nothing about that, either.

He wanted to involve me, for pay, and without asking how much - told him I would not be connected with anything I thought might be irresponsible so the answer was no. When he tried to say they were different, without referring to my experiences with them on "The Trial of Lee Harvey Oswald" I told him simply that was what the last three Brits had promised me and all had not kept their words. He asked me who and I told him. He said nothing further about that. When he asked my opinion of what he believed and some of what Jimmy had told him I had no reluctance in offering my opinion. Honestly.

In the course of the conversation he told me that an effort he had made in court to get Jimmy a trial had failed, rejected by sixth circuit without comment, cert refused by the Supreme Court. I asked him no questions about that.

Nor did I tell him that I'd heard years ago that he was working on a TV show (when he pretended to me that he was working for Jimmy as his lawyer only) or that I remembered that when he was first in touch with me decades ago he was writing a book on the case.

I did tell him thay I believe I could "walk" Jimmy, he asked me what it would take to get me to use that, I told him that I was sitting on it rather than risk having it misused and when he asked I said I would not for nay money give it to TV. How would I use it? I said possibly on a book, coauthored. He said nothing further about that and I did not either. I wanted him to be clear that I wanted no involvement with what I could not control, that there was no possibility of doing this with TV and that despite what he said about Thames, they would go for the sensational without regard to truth or fact or consequences. What I remmember about specific questions he asked is about the second Mustang and I said that as of the crucial time it was not relevant, that the second one was a white Fairlane. He asked me about Jimmy not being at the scene at the key time and I said I believe him. Bill mentioned two people who said his car was not there. This leads me to believe that he has not bothered even to read the evidentiary hearing transcript to get the witness I produced on that. I did tell him that - had started "The King Conspiracies" and why it wasn't finished, in general about 75-1996 and that. When he mentioned Melanson's book I was comtemptuous if Phil and his book and warned him not to trust a word of it. I

gave him as an illustration "the fat man" and what he did with it. I told him that the name was public, that I'd gotten it in 75-1996 and gave that record to Phil when he was here pretending that his only interest was for his class teaching, without ever telling me he was working on a book and that what Phil built out of McDoudlton's alleged fear was ludicrous, that among other things no spookery would work that way and that if Jimmy had been given any money by one, it would not have done it that way and he would not have found himself in Portugal with only about $100 less that required for passage to then Rhodesia. Bill professed not to know how Jimmy had gotten the money he had. I told him I believe what he told me, that he had knocked off a whore house.

He was interested in the Piedmont Laundry receipts for Jimmy's laundry and dry-cleaning and in Jimmy's inistence that he had not left it there. I told him that because he is a lawyer he did not think of any explanation for that? He had none. So I told him that someone else could have taken the laundry there that day when Jimmy said he was on his trip that ended in Memphis. He did seem not to have thought of that.

He asked me if I would "testify" and I told him I would not and that I would not even be driven to DC to be on any TV show, again telling him why I've been refusing this, including of the hazard to me of a simple accident.

I have the impression that like so many others he begins with ax theory and works on that instead of seeking fact and proceeding from that basis but I did not go into that with him. But from what he said, for the time he has been working on this he seems to me to have come up with little or nothing. He need not have if he developed it but he said nothing that leads to the belief that he has developed anything at all that is new and he did reflect ignorance of some of what is available.

7/23:"control" on previous page does not refer to my control over program. It refers to my inability to control what was used of what was taped of me and that in the past these interviews of me were used in support of what I do not support, as my crediting them.