

Mr. Martin Waldron  
News Room  
New York Times  
229 W. 43 St.,  
New York, N.Y. 10036

Dear Mo,

We both had the same suspicion when it was reported that Hoover planted a story that forced King to shift to the Lorraine through a reporter. The more I thought about it the less it seemed right. I think there is a bigger story in it. I don't remember if I mentioned Cointelpros and the Invaders to you but it seemed to me more likely. I asked a Memphis friend to do some checking and to ask another to do some checking, in return for which I'm giving the second person a story tomorrow having nothing to do with anything you or John discussed with me. I may return to this later if I don't forget. It is a reporter.

That King was going to the Lorraine was not secret but not well known. In fact, the Lorraine was strange to local reporters. I have a friend in the press group that met King at the airport April 3. Had he not been told by a TV man he'd have gone to the Rivermont, where most of the press and all the national TV crews were or went.

In your checking I think you missed one graf in the Press-Scimitar of the 4th - too late so why did they put the Commercial Appeal in evidence, that day's? - that said King was at the Lorraine. However, it was on TV the night of the 3rd. The one graf was buried at the bottom of a general roundup.

Sorry if I skip around. I'm tired. Had to drive to Washington yesterday and it actually exhausted me.

Getting back to the report that I think is an FBI fake planted on the committee, a typical spook operation, my source believes the Invaders started this at the time they started the riot. (And whose interest was served by the riot?) My friend says he remembers Invader demonstrations against King's staying at the Rivermont while King was there. Demonstrations at the Rivermont. I'm not clear on whether he said it was just before or just after the riot. If this is true or even close to it the account to the committee is false and has to have had a purpose. It was inevitable that some of the King operation was coming out so there was time to prepare it. I suggest one is FBI involvement in the riot as well as forcing King to shift. I have no fact. This is just what I believe possible and not inconsistent with what is known of what was going on then. I would like to be able to address this with you more openly. You are not the reason I will not.

Although none of this ever appeared in the papers, there was the identical campaign from the other side, with one difference I believe is significant. Remember I told you my recollection is that the black complaints were over cost not color? Well, the story about the Invaders is over extravagance. However, Loeb's people, again without press attention, were spreading the version the FBI gave the committee, why was King staying at a white motel. (Bob Jense, then FBI SAIC, is now an executive with Holiday Inns.)

Where I refer to the Invaders' castigation of King for staying at the Rivermont it is supposed to have been the day of the riot.

I may learn more tomorrow. If it has any significance or appears to I'll phone because that will be closer to the time of your first story. Right after we spoke about this I asked a friend with black connections to see if anything can be picked up. No



word back yet.

While I have no idea how these things can be checked in the short time remaining, I do think it was worth more time that the Jim's Place bit that so excited John. He found it an indication of conspiracy. If he needed that as evidence of conspiracy he'd do well to carry diapers when he travels. When I told him what I could and said I could not tell him why he was on the wrong tack he made cracks about my observing my obligations and as much as called me a liar again. I told him as much as I could of the truth and took time to try to explain what I could that might have had some meaning to him. He doesn't listen. He argues. When I tried to explain he then accused me of being patronizing. I told him it was patience, and he taxed it. Bud and I rarely talk and less rarely agree. But on John we both found the same word: antagonistic. John's explanation when I mentioned his attitude is that he uses me as a sounding board. Some of the stuff he spouted last time was juvenile and disputatious, not reasoning or seeking. I have the strong feeling his mind is set and has been set for him.

Since his return from California I haven't gotten anything from him I can recall on which I could have given him good feedback. Only an arguing of the prosecution case and an unreasoned, often unreasonable refusal to consider anything else. He hasn't even asked himself obvious questions about what he appears to be sold on.

His last call was night before last. He then said he hoped to get to see the ballistics evidence yesterday. When I tried to prepare him for this he was not only negative and antagonistic he disclosed that he hadn't even read Post Mortem. It was my impression the Times had assigned this to him, from you. There is in it what he should have known and more I could have told him in preparation.

He even argued that the FBI made no neutron activation analysis (he didn't know what it is) because it hadn't been invented yet. It took several pointed repetitions before I reminded him it was used in the JFK case, that I had sued for it, that he is supposed to have read a letter from AEC in which they yearned to do the work for DJ, which is in Post Mortem, and that 1963 was before what his federal sources had told him had not been invented in 1968.

In fact, I can't think of anything he didn't argue. Nor did he stop to think even when I asked him to. Like why would the FBI show him what they denied me under FOIA when under the new law I can claim damages? And he not only expressed no interest in what I'd gotten recently but said the Times sent nobody to look at it. Yet there was manpower for three men to go try to get some nonsense from Bud.

I don't know what the result of yesterday at the FBI was but I do know that seeing me prior to it or having been at my press conference would have upped the prospects no end. I tried to tell him as much as he'd listen to. If he paid attention and saw what he was supposed to see and asked what I suggested and asked for what I suggested, he should have come out with a good story and I do not believe the one he gives every indication of not wanting.

He asked me questions. When he didn't like the response he'd shift to another question. If I tried to come back to complete the answer he'd say I was evading or not responding. It is distressingly consistent.

Back to the beginning: if it was known that "ing was going to stay at the Lorraine rather than the Rivermont, then as I suggested long ago the reason for exchanging the .243 for a .30-06 is provocative at least. It was not in the papers. How, then?

Before this witch by John, when so far as I knew you and you alone were working on the story, I spent what for me is much money on it. I did not ask you in advance to repay them so you and the Times owe me nothing. But if you or they feel otherwise, it must be close to \$100 on phones alone getting things cleared and gathering info.

I do feel badly about the dishonesty with Post Mortem. Not you. John just wasn't honest with me. Had I not trusted I'd have turned elsewhere...I'm uneasy about the stories but for you my regards are still the best,