

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701  
12/17/75

Mr. Neil Catler, AA to  
Congressman John Conyers  
Rayburn House Office Bldg.  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Neal,

Whether or not you can get me a transcript of the Church committee testimony by the FBI that Hoover forced Dr. King to move to the Lorraine Motel, and it would be helpful if I could go over it, this part is an apparent lie. At first I believed it, partly because it appeared to be an admission against interest. I could even figure out the most likely means because the FBI had a man on the Memphis papers, a former employee whose reputation is that of continuing as an FBI informer. However, as I thought of the testimony, there was a factual error in it that attracted my attention and led me to initiate an investigation through friends, including reporters.

What I report is a combination of fact and analysis. The analysis may be faulty. I do not present it as certainty. I will be following it the best I can when I am almost immobile. However, on the ~~slim~~ chance I am correct I think the Congressman should be aware of it and its potentials.

There was no such story. I believe it is a new FBI "cover" story for a specific purpose and in anticipation of what was inevitable.

The gist of the fiction is that Hoover planted or authorized the planting of a news story that forced King to stop staying at the Rivermont (Holiday Inn) Motel in Memphis and shift to the Lorraine, where he was killed. Everybody knows that Dr. King did make this shift so there was no questioning of this FBI story.

There has been recent checking and rechecking of all the stories in the morgues of the newspapers. I have spoken to reporters whose recollections are clear, too. There just never was any such story printed.

Nor is there anything less than a Byzantine explanation of the FBI's purposes in hiding the truth. The truth is that it was young Black militants who forced the move. Whether or not part of his Cointelpro campaign against Dr. King, I believe Hoover may well have been responsible for both the demonstration against Dr. King at the Rivermont through a plant among the young people and may perhaps even have caused the riot through agents provocateurs.

The group called itself the Invaders.

I expect a phone call later this morning from a white woman reporter who was never a racist, was slandered because of her Black friendships and who may be able to do some tracing through these long-standing friendships. Some of those young people have matured and may have come to see and understand things differently. It is my hope that she may be able to learn something about this whole thing. It is the riot more than the move of motels that set Dr. King up for the assassination. He could have been shot anywhere. My belief is that it was planned for Atlanta until the riot.

When I left the Congressman last Tuesday, two days before the press conference, I whispered to him that there was reason to have suspicions about who was behind the actual killing. There was advance knowledge that it was planned. I have taped interviews on this that may or may not be more than rumor. One in particular is quite unusual and made under the most exceptional circumstances.

Present indications are that the Department of Justice and the FBI are making strong efforts with the Times for new propaganda. Best regards, Harold Weisberg