

6/14170

Dear Ed,

Huie's book, for which I again thank you, remind me that there is no such thing as a completely worthless work of sycophancy. It is frightful, an enormous public disservice, a shameful self-debasement by a man who should have been sensitive enough to realize it, and worse. But it also has some useful information that, hopefully, can and will be of value.

These bad books, of which there are so many, strangely enough often have worthwhile content, if the worth lies not where the author intended. To give you another and not world-shaking example, a young associate of mine was able to parlay something Bringuier dropped into the identification of an FBI informant. In itself it is meaningless to identify an informant, for the police of all varieties have them. But in this case, the informant had another role, which makes that of informant more interesting, whether or not there is significance in the simultaneous performance of more than one role.

Were it not for your kindness, I'd be denied this knowledge, for today I just cannot afford even paperbacks.

I think it likely there will be direct use of the unintended help Huie offers. Because I do not want this personalized, I have eschewed all publicity on it, but after more than a year of effort and without direct contact, James Earl Ray got the idea he might be better off if he asked my lawyer to try his, so it is now fact and much of my work has already been used in new motions in court, the first competent ones filed, I was about to say on his behalf, which would be true only superficially. It is on behalf of truth. The effort is to get a trial. Much of the legal opportunity has been wasted by the incompetents who replaced the crooks as his lawyers, but it is far from hopeless. There was also benefit from the suit I won against Justice for the withheld evidence I could force out. (Justice forced me to file for it, having denied even its existence, but when the moment of ultimate truth came, courtroom confrontation, they wacked down and delivered out of court, thus saving themselves the exposure the papers would have had more trouble suppressing, as they have this.)

Again, thanks.