

Dear Wayne,

3/10/77

As you say at the beginning of your letter of 3/6, here today, I do try to respond promptly and do stay busy. We usually do have similar views. Because it will not be possible for me to respond in full I'll answer as I read. By way of further explanation my current interests are by no means limited to King. I have about 5,000 pages of CIA records I've not been able to read, almost that many from the Archives, about 1,500 I obtained last week, have 300 in today's mail and expect between 400 and 500 tomorrow. And would I like to be able to return to writing.

I do not believe there was a real Secret Serviceman from Washington. As Les Payne notes, who ever heard of Washington sending a man in the interest of a black cop? I therefore agree with what I think Les believes, that Manuel is an improvisation and has no relationship. I would not say this about his being in Memphis then. I believe Les said the report was from a Mississippi State trooper.

I find it interesting that you believe Holloman "is the one man in the Loeb administration" most likely to have any "guilt as a knowing member of a conspiracy." I have no real trouble with this because there is no base from for Lane's fabrications. When you say you think that "Hoover manipulated Holloman into removing Redditt from the scene" it is more interesting. Can you elaborate? I do not believe that this removal and prior knowledge of the coming killing are necessarily related, thus I ask.

I have no proofs about the reasons for the Redditt removal. I do believe there was no hit contracted and I know that Redditt's surveillances were known to blacks.

There was no need for more than the police spying on the Lorraine. Unknowns were not likely to be visiting his rooms under those conditions. Photographing from the fire station could not have been kept secret. All my information from inside it dating to the week of the assassination has proved out. What you and others are not into is part of it, as you should recall from the minute part I felt it was safe to use in "ramp-Up."

Believe me, King and much of his part were under constant surveillance of one kind or another in Memphis.

To keep it simple: all you say about your eggs and sausage man is predicated upon what is non-fact, his having a connection. He is irrelevant with a connection. I see none and I see no reason for any.

I don't know what kind of lawyer RXT is but he is no investigator. I know he has promising materials but I've never had time to go over his files with care. The one time there was a possibility he kept talking so I could not even comprehend his tapes. I asked him for dubs without response. He also is not good at figuring out. He should have been able to limit those who set him up with Battle over his trip to NYC and the NAACP legal defense fund. It could only have been Stanton. Yet RXT continued to trust Stanton.

On Galt at the LA St. Francis 4/19 or 20/68: the conspiracy charge vs Galt was filed 4/17, with all the hoopla Hoover could arrange. No sense to that report. The whole world knew how much Galt was wanted, including all the people who you say are reported to have seen him there. In silence? Don't believe it.

In response to your questions:

I am still in case. Ray has not fired me or Lesar, although we have both been leaning on him, Jim a little, me hard even for me. I know nothing about Kershaw and could use all the info possible because he is clearly a) an ambulance chancer; b) unethical; and c) of extremist views. He kept his involvement secret until everybody except JER realized JER was being crazy over the petition cert, when I told Jim how to get his name and address. Jim then called him, not the other way around. He has never been in touch with me.

Nothing that I know of has happened to Lesar. He would be happy if Ray fired him.

I know nothing about your two reports and on the most urgent possible basis solicit every fact you can provide because when I quote them back to you you will see their import: "Lesar is under investigation from the ABA concerning the Ray case. This report comes from a Washington source with connections to the new Carter administration and Justice department sources close to Pottinger." And, "There's also a report that Lesar's wife is under investigation and has been questioned concerning the disappearance of sensitive X-ray materials from the hospital where she works."

These reports that have reached you, as you should be able to perceive, are consistent

only with an effort to ruin him and his wife. The people who have motive for this range from Mark Lane to the Department. But I am certain there is no basis for either report. They also represent one of the few ways of offsetting my work since the evidentiary hearing. I cannot imagine the possibility of exaggerating either its potential significance or Jim's indispensability in it.

There also is no doubt in my mind that if Lane survives it with any reputation at all his book will not. There is no doubt in my mind that neither the FBI nor the Department, particularly Kottlinger's division, do not like either of us. In time you will learn more of the reasons. They include my proving in court that one of their lawyers is a deliberate liar, a perjurer.

I don't know all about Jim's practice. I do know that because of his Ray work it is scanty except for me, and that I cannot pay him for the work he does for me. The work for me includes some powerful non-governmental people. Who can be hurt badly by truth. One of these has the closest spook connections of long standing.

You may not remember it but Jim asked to be relieved on the Ray case and the sixth circuit refused. So he is in it by their direct order. If this is not of his own will you know as a lawyer what obligations it imposes on him. He is required to try to protect Ray's interests. He did not oppose Ray's appearance before the House committee under any circumstances. He did ask for guarantees of protection of Ray's rights. I was there and he was given verbal but not written assurances. I took him there, in fact. To my knowledge he has been fully proper as a lawyer in trying to serve Ray's interests. I not only have no knowledge of his doing anything wrong but I cannot conceive of it. I know Jim well. I have been with him under the most trying of conditions. If decency and honor be faults they are the only faults I can assign to him.

His wife has no involvement in his work if only because it is impossible for her. She not only has her own full-time career she has the most wonderful of babies. Between them she has no time for anything else. Not only can I not conceive of her taking any "sensitive X-ray materials from the hospital where she works," I do know what this can be corrupted from. However, as you will see, it is indicative of the most detailed surveillance if this is not a fabrication and if the story I tell you in confidence is relevant.

You are aware that I have had serious thrombophlebitis. You are not aware of all the circumstances. It was serious only because of the persistent neglect of my medical insurer, most of whose business is with the government in Washington. I reported the symptoms regularly and was told they were signs of getting old only. When the manifestations finally could not be ignored, I was hospitalized, entirely by accident in the hospital in which Jim's wife May is a radiologist. My insurer selected the hospital. It is less than a block from the insurer's clinic, from which I was sent to that hospital. After I had been hospitalized for several days the hospital staff, not the insurer's physician, decided that certain X-ray scans of my left leg were indicated. I was wheeled to the X-ray department where I did not even see Jim's wife. Others did the work. The pre-requisite injections were so difficult - at first impossible - those people decided to do both legs. I think these are called vein scans. They involve a radioactive dye of some kind. They are snapped almost as fast as frames in a movie. I now skip ahead.

I was hospitalized about the middle of October 1975. I had a contract to debate David Belin at Vanderbilt. Now it just also happens in this string of coincidences that when the lecture bureau phoned me the staff hospital physician was giving me a rectal examination. A college student who was with me answered the phone while the doctor was palpating my prostate. It later turned out that Vanderbilt preferred postponing the debate to accepting a substitute for me. I recommended Howard Roffman. The clinic physician said I would be able to do this about 11/19 and it happened. But by the time it was over I could barely walk. Braniff single-loaded me through the rear door and sat a nurse next to me and another student who had accompanied me, happily having wanted to.

It also happens that I have a wealthy friend in New York who was considering a business arrangement with me. When I told him, after not having been in touch with him for some

time, about my medical situation, including this added untoward experience, as an old friend he became deeply concerned. He offered a consultation at his expense with a New York physician. One of the results was a recommendation for regular cardiac consultations. There ensued a period of my seeking to obtain these without extra cost, my insurance already costing about \$1,200 a year. When this was denied I then proceeded locally, which also took some time. I'll never forget the anxiety with which the local doctor phoned the only local vascular expert in my presence and expressed amazement that there were no visible gangrenous symptoms. The vascular surgeon saw and examined me immediately. He then gave me notes to both the clinic and the hospital for the release of my records to him, the X-Ray's, of course, being most important. I handed delivered these X-rays to him, he examined them, he then explained them to me, and I ~~then~~ he returned them to me and I returned them to the hospital. Quite obviously it served my interest to have all the medical records of that hospitalization in the possession of the hospital in the event I might be hospitalized again.

Now if this is what someone has in mind two things are obvious: any disappearance of them ~~later~~ was later and any knowledge of any of this has to come from the closest possible kind of surveillance. Almost nobody knows about it.

This is an encapsulation but I believe you can see for it that any added information you can supply is an urgent need. Please do what you can promptly. Please also be specific in any need for confidentiality. It is obvious that someone is out to hurt Jim and his fine wife and what I am trying to do. I do have a current FOIA/King case in federal district court in Washington. It dates to 1969. Jim filed it for me in 1975. Our circumstances preclude any more vigor than we have exercised. There has not been a hearing on it this year. There were perhaps 10 last year. This means that the government has been able to stonewall us quite a bit. But it is a nitty-gritty suit. In my belief Jim has built an exceptionally good record in it, important if there is an appeal. This record is adverse to the FBI and the Department, particularly the Civil Rights Division.

I tell you these things as a trusted friend.

Now Lane has a six-figure deal, according to a Kup column, and a book with Prentice-Hall, according to their full-page ad in Publishers Weekly, that is due to appear next month. This means it is frozen and review copies should be in the hands of reviewers now. But he knew and still knows nothing about the King assassination. Doing a real work he has time for all the conniving in the world. Desperate when he really made a mess of the efforts he was making in the Congress with JFK he turned to King. Through means I know but won't take time for he was given a bob-tailed version of Lee's work and mine. He and Abby Man, who knew each other previously, then went to Memphis, you will learn briefly. Their mission was to do with Lee's work and mine what little they could. Some of what they did, including with Redditt, was pretty unscrupulous. This with the inevitable and as usual false Lane fabrications really is what led to the passing of the resolution for a House inquiry. Consistent with the committee's subsequent history it an all else that persuaded the House was pure bullshit. So, inevitably, is any part of the book not stolen with fidelity. Lane seems to have his own compulsions. These keep him from being an accurate crook. The by-product is exculpation of the guilty, particularly the federal agencies.

With seeming indifference and aside from the Manuel business the DJ had already struck a hard blow against the Lane fabrications. He appears to be a little desparate. While he is most adept with the nails and knees behind the back he made a personal attack on me over some accurate quotations of me in the WxPost on 1/25 - he also lured me with the spooks in it - he also refused to confront me with me on the phone during that broadcast. It was on a Washington station whose pattern precludes my receiving it. He declined to appear or even respond to station calls when I was given fairness-doctrine time to respond toward the end of last month. He has not accepted my proposal for a subsequent in-studio confrontation. He will not and he dare not.

So what is left for him? Can you see my basis for assuming that directly or indirectly these reports that have reached you can connect with him? Extending the dirtyworks to Jim is vicious but including his wife is unspeakable. Please inform. In hast,

March 6, 1977

Dear Harold,

Glad I got a prompt response. Usually, there is a slight delay in your responses, and I understand why, as you are a very busy man.

Your explanation about the Manuel story was interesting. As you say, we usually agree on facts, but sometimes disagree on interpretations. I always find your logic persuasive, and usually, I do accept your interpretations, at least tentatively, after thorough consideration of all other inferences that may be drawn from a set of facts. The trouble is, that each of us, regardless of past experience, political beliefs, etc are ~~are~~ subjectively susceptible to particular conclusions, at least tentative conclusions. I do not believe our political beliefs are so vastly different that we should have such wide, varying frames of references to view any given set of facts. I believe, at least from our many enjoyable conversations, (at least I enjoyed them), our views are the same on the essential principles of political democracy, racial equality, and administration of justice. I also concede you probably have an arsenal of information, which you have not, and should not, reveal to me. I may, or may not, have access to same information. Some key fact that I may not be aware of may be the missing part of the jigsaw, that prevents me from arriving at the same conclusion you have reached. Had I known this particular fact, I may have reached the same conclusion you properly arrived at ~~earlier~~ earlier.

For instance, the removal of Redditt. You expressed the belief that this was a local decision. This suggests that perhaps you have knowledge concerning the true identity of the alleged "secret Service man" from Washington, D.C., who was in Holloman's office when Redditt was told he was being removed and that a murder contract had been let on him through a St. Louis, Mo., man. Do you know the identity of the man? Was he local? Or regional? (Mississippi, West Tennessee, Missouri

The fact he was introduced as a man who had flown in from Washington suggests a Washington, D.C. connection? Manuel's identification--either made falsely or properly--as the source of the report that a hit contract was let on Redditt would seem to buttress a Washington connection?

While you may be more familiar with the Washington, D.C., scene, I am more familiar with the Memphis scene. Frank Holloman did not have the autonomy to make any major decisions that would have aided a conspiracy plan without the approval of his superior, Mayor Henry Loeb. Although Holloman did violate one of Loeb's security orders immediately after the assassination, he is one man in the Loeb administration I feel is innocent of any guilt as a knowing member of a conspiracy. It is ironic that I have reached this conclusion, because I feel that none other than J. Edgar Hoover manipulated Holloman into removing Redditt from the scene through a ~~man~~ a conduit, either a member of the FBI or private party, and while I have no direct evidence this is true, I suspect that ~~the~~ the so-called Secret Service man from Washington was that conduit. The next question: was this a Washington man? Or a representative of a private party in the Memphis area?

I know you did a ton of investigative work assisting Les Payne in developing the truth concerning the Invaders and the Redditt removal. Is there anything you can tell me to convince me to believe that the decision to remove Redditt was made locally, not from Washington?

Another perplexing fact was ^{that} ~~the~~ Holloman told Redditt that the hit contract was going to be executed by a St. Louis man. Redditt does not recall Holloman saying he was a black man from St. Louis, but only ~~assumed~~ assumed the hit man was black, because Holloman said the contract was let by a radical black militant group from Mississippi.

Could this be a coincidence? That is, Holloman talking about a man coming to Memphis from St. Louis, and the fact James Earl Ray was from St. Louis? It would be ~~inconceivable~~ inconceivable to me that a black militant group would let a contract through a purportedly white racist to kill a black leader, unless there was something other than a political-racial connection: say, a black-white underworld operation, etc. Of course, there is no evidence of the latter.

Your explanation concerning the panel truck seems convincing enough. Especially, because of the limited space in the Lorraine's parking lot. But how about at the fire station? This would have been an ideal spot to photograph every one coming in and out of the Lorraine. This was a standard FBI Cointelpro procedure. But, on April 4, there were no FBI agents that I know of, who assisted Redditt and Richmond in surveillance of movements at the motel. In fact, there were no FBI agents near the scene of the Lorraine on April 4. According to Sullivan's and Murtagh's statements, King was under constant surveillance, night and day, everywhere he went, in every city, from 1964 to the day he was killed. The fact that Dr. King was at the Lorraine most of the day did not ~~seem to eliminate~~ seem to eliminate the FBI's imagined need to know who were coming to see him on that day, especially as ~~the~~ King and the SCLC were not only making plans for the Memphis march, but the ~~for~~ coming Poor People's March, to Washington, D.C.

Again, I can't prove it, but I believe the FBI called off its surveillance on early April 4 because key FBI leaders knew something was afoot. This might constitute knowledge that would be incriminating to charges of accessories before the fact, and again, this knowledge might have been so sketchy, it would be insufficient to ~~be~~ described as guilty knowledge. If King was killed amid the massive surveillance of the day before, it would be impossible for the assassin to have escaped. One might want to argue that if there had been a FBI conspiracy to kill King, it would have been better for the FBI to ~~have~~ had King under surveillance at the time the fatal bullet was fired, so that FBI agents could have moved in at once and ~~kill~~ kill the fleeing assassin. The only thing wrong with that conclusion would be that the FBI would have egg on its face for two reasons:

1) The FBI's ~~invincible~~ invincible reputation would be severely damaged, if an assassin slipped through its security net and killed King.

2) The FBI's covert surveillance --illegal surveillance, that is, -- would have been revealed to the public at that time. Note, the illegal surveillance was officially admitted only as late as 1975, although Murtagh and other former FBI officials had privately conceded to reporters as early as 1969 that King had been illegally subjected to massive electronic surveillance.

Also, it would have been difficult to ~~recruit~~ recruit a willing assassin, unless he could be convinced that security was lax.

Hence, another fact emerges which we have different interpretations. For a hit man to have assurance ~~that~~ that security would be lax, he must have confederates to conduct recon ~~of~~ of the murder scene prior to the hit. Thus, this might explain the presence of the eggs and sausage man prior to the hit. But, then the question arises--the one which has apparently convinced Lesar and you that this man could not have been part of the plot--why did he return the very next ~~morning~~ morning?

You admonish me to always keep things simple. The answer to that question is simple. The man returned to the scene the very next day for the express purpose of exonerating himself of any suspicion in that case. He could--and did, so I hear--say: "would I return to the scene if I am involved?" And to make his cover perfect, he had a legitimate reason for being there in the first place: he was in the business of buying and selling slum property. At least, that was ~~what~~ his prospectus to potential stockholders described his business operations. However, an investigation has failed to ever turn up one business transaction that his incorporated firm had ever handled. Furthermore, the business was apparently dissolved the following year, with an entirely different business name on the glass doors of his suite, with the person in question stepping down as President to Vice President. That business went out of operation a couple of years later. Again, ~~ostensibly~~ ostensibly, the business was supposed to be matching ~~potential~~ potential sellers with potential buyers of real estate by use of computers and an air service. The man in question was quite prosperous enough at that time, but there is no evidence unearther that he ever sold one tract of real estate. Gerold Frank visited him in late 1969, and spent five days with him. I have a transcript of an interview conducted with Frank--not by me (Frank knows me), but by another party. Frank said he went to this party's home on a story not connected with the King murder, but somehow the King murder came up. Frank said he decided on the first day that this man had nothing to do with the King case and knew nothing useful that could aid him. Frank, however, concedes he stayed four more days with him, gathering material for a story of how a successful ex-convict hired ex-convicts to work for him in a legitimate business. Such story, or book was never published, if written. Also note, AP carried a story in 1969 that Frank had drawn a \$150,000 advance to write a comprehensive story on the King assassination. And with \$150,000 in his bank account, would Frank be wasting five days with a man whom he really thought had nothing to do with King case?

Also, for the record, Frank presents every conspiracy possibility for discussion in his book ranging from CIA to KKK(not the FBI). He discusses the Penavides-Bonnevecche reports, etc. But he makes no mention of the eggs and sausage incident, nor ~~the~~ the man who was ~~picked up~~ picked up.

As far as the questions you asked me, the only time I heard about the labor leader from Carolina, was from you. You ~~swore~~ swore me to secrecy about the incident, so I haven't asked anyone about him, nor have I ever revealed what ~~little~~ little you told me about him. Dusty the Breadman has long retired to a comfortable real estate law practice in East Memphis, the bailiwick of the Memphis affluent. So has his former mentor, Phil Canale. I am very careful not to discuss these matters with other Memphians, especially attorneys such as Sabella, Thompson, etc, because I am trying to dispell the appearance of having any active interest in the case. An incident arose recently which indicated to me that RXT still has an interest in probing the King murder. He denies that the NAACP Legal Defense fund is his client, and I believe him on that score, because his successful representation of police union members accused of brutality against blacks has alienated him from his old black clients. But I have a statement from a man who claims RXT and a black Los Angeles newsman tried to set him up in Los Angeles last year. He claimed the newsman set up the interview ~~in a hotel room~~ in a hotel room. When he arrived, there was

full of people--a condition he expressly forbade when agreeing to the interview by the newsmen. Thompson tried to get the man to sit in a comfortable easy chair ~~and~~ ^{party} exchanged pleasantries in order to warm him up. This party got up when Thompson ~~started~~ ^{started} to delve into what he knew about the King case, ~~and~~ ^{and} pulled back a cushion to the chair to see that it was bugged. He left. This party claims to be an expert in electronic bugging. I asked Thompson about the last time he was in Los Angeles. Thompson said he had not been in Los Angeles for several years but had been on the West Coast for two months last year, mostly around San Francisco, on what he described as a "hot case." I then asked him if he had tried to bug someone there, and despite Thompson's ability to convincingly appear innocent, I think ~~it~~ ^{it} got the response I needed. He did try to bug someone there.

This party may or may not have valid information ^{about what} about the King case. I may not believe every thing he has told me ~~and~~ ^{and} he thinks he knows about the case. I do believe ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ him when he tells me RXT tried to bug him in a hotel room in Los Angeles last year.

as fact So this leaves the last item: ~~the~~ ^{the} presence of Ray, or an imposter, in the St. Francis hotel three weeks after King's murder. Again, I take your advice. First, I have only considered these reports: I have not accepted them. Why would a man use the Galt alias after it had been announced as the alias of the man charged with King's murder? If the man really was not Ray, what would he have to fear? First, he could be a sensation seeker. Second, he could have been a nut. Third, he could be part of a disinformation scheme, aiding and abetting the escape of Ray via Canada and London. Why would a man want to implicate himself in a ~~scheme~~ ^{scheme}, and involve himself as a suspect in a conspiracy to murder King? I can't answer the question. I can consider the possibility that it did happen. After all, similar incidents occurred in Memphis with the Benavides and Bonnevecche incidents. Why would they want to expose themselves in what may have turned out for them to be accessories to murder or obstruction of justice by aiding and abetting the escape of a fugitive?

I have learned somewhat more about the LA incident. Here are the bare facts:

There are signed statements from several persons, some of them residents of the St. Francis Hotel, others from employes and ~~guests~~ ^{guests} of the ~~Sultan~~ ^{Sultan} Room, that a man calling himself Galt checked into the hotel on the 19 or 20 of April (about the same time Ramsay Clark announced that Eric Starvo Galt was the chief suspect in the King slaying. He stayed several days until the police made the raid. The FBI questioned these ~~persons~~ ^{persons} and took statements.

Thinking simple is good advice. But sometimes in simplifying ^{if any} speculative situations, there's a danger of oversimplifying. And after all, so many things that happen in this life aren't really so simple. Complicated situations ~~usually~~ ^{usually} constitute the norm. Just reading the facts in most of the outstanding cases prove how complicated situations can become.

Sincerely

Wayne

Wayne

(SEE BACK)

