

This is not a book on the King assassination. It is a pseudo-non-fictional account, represented as its "true story" in the subtitle, but actually mostly schmalz and carefully designed to be an unofficial but widely-distributed account of the prosecution's version, a popularization of it that is also, pretty clearly, designed as an answer to the refutation case in FRAME-UP. Bearing on this, I have Frank on tape saying that he made revisions as late as January, when the book, from the time of contract and of beginning, as well as scheduled pub date, would have been in manufacture.

It is carefully written to make it seem that he interviewed all the witnesses quoted, but he did not. Examples, he still can't pronounce Canipo's name. He admits he never interviewed Jesse Jackson. (I have this on tape). He says it is all his own work, that everything in it on Ray is new (on tape). His departures from what has been previously written are for literary effect and to hide stupidities in the prosecution case, what in it simply isn't credible, two examples being the absence of the clip in the rifle and but on empty shell, with no bullet, in it, necessitating the hiding of Frazier and his affidavit; and his story not that Ray was in the bathroom for the hour before but was shuttling back and forth to it.

**Prologue:** Unless there is a connection between the racial tension in Memphis before the assassination and the assassination itself, this prologue is dishonest, yokel-bait. Such a prologue, while seemingly intended to give a feeling of the city prior to the crime, is relevant only if there is a connection. Or, if there was a conspiracy, which he says there was not. No matter how smoothly written, if Ray was not all alone, this is verbiage and a designed deception, a prejudicing of the reader's mind for the coming allegation of Ray's racism and alleged hatred of King. It is, in turn, inconsistent with Frank's original thesis, that there had been a conspiracy of the left. In appearances he mentions Havana, Peking and Hanoi, but nothing else of which I know and never the right or the racists.

Early chapters, through III: These are written as though he did visualize a conspiracy of the left and may date to that time in his thinking. It may be that he did and, although changing his view, left them in without basic change because he like them so much. However, they also are counter to his theory and not part of this "true story", called also the first.

PP. 34,37 Gives too expensive a price for the rifle. All <sup>calibres</sup> ~~models~~ of same versions of 760 identical in price. Variations in extras (stock) only. (See p. 19 of 1971 catalogue.)

34-5. Any man who asks "How many inches would a bullet drop" knows nothing about ammo and shooting - and neither does anyone so writing.. It depends on many factors, like weight or bullet, charge of powder, length of barrel. Same with "How accurate is a .30-06". Kopp and Monasco could not have been so ignorant, could not have been quoted completely and accurately. A man who knows nothing about "guns" (36) doing such shooting?

38: Straight from Hue.

45-6 No identification of "red squad" designed as police, prosecution protection and as deception, for this recording and spotting all who visited King was hardly to protect him.

43. Formulation to protect Hoover.

51 on aorta. Compare with Autopsy.

Ch. V All the buildup on the assassination, esp. King's talking of getting killed, out of context of many known threats (admitted elsewhere but not here, where omission is not accidental and is prejudicial). Carefully written so he could point to it later and claim "but I did say that".

58. Says rooming house is "one block north of fire station. It is in same block with only an empty lot between them. Beginning here, it seems he is "answering" FRAME-UP.

In every case, as on 81, he refers to the sound of the shot as a "tremendous blast" and to its shaking the building. Straight from Dealey Plaza and fiction. If the shot were fired from inside, it could not have had this effect outside. Not, especially, 200 feet away on the motel porch or to make a reporter, Earl Caldwell, think "They've bombed the motel." Compare his handling of Caldwell with his omissions from Caldwell's story. He pretends Caldwell got his story in too late but the fact is he did not, which tends to cover this dishonesty.

102: If Frank says the yard below the Brewer apartment was swarming with policemen, they could not have jumped down at the firehouse, as he claims. They would have been there only because they believed they had reason to be there, and at that early moment it could only be because they thought the shot had come from there, from the bushes, not the house itself (which is what he hides from Kyles and Andy Young, from my tape of Kyles, who he quotes in other senses at great length, and from his suppression of the Caldwell story). Least of all could the police then have had reason to believe the shot came from the bathroom to have been there so fast, for the bathroom is the part of that building farthest away, not closest. (All cops should be questioned in any suit, and all there should be identified by the ~~prosecution~~ defense, asked ~~of~~ of the prosecution.) I think the line that follows, attributed to an unidentified, is actually from the Stephens affidavit. Here his version of what Andy Young said should be compared with Caldwell's story, which Frank suppresses. Young said shot came from where cops came from, not window.

Dresser in front of window in such a dark place? And chair in front of window blocked use of window as he alleges it was used. Could see nothing from sitting position, had to lean far out to see King's room. Again, prosecution invention on which, in appearances (on tape) he embellishes.

103, bottom: self-contradictory and not what Canipe swore to.

104: All of room dusted for prints. Reports none, Ray's or others. Ask for results?

How would Ray have gotten grass on his feet? What evidence of earlier cleaning of that room? Grass signifies source other than Ray, and most probably those who got into room through Stephens' and used it free. Here it may be important in a suit to subpoena the first draft and compare with the final version, for it seems to be a prima facie case of his undertaking to answer FRAME-UP, which can serve prosecution only, or deliberate dishonesty, which would appear to bear on malice. (bge. 102?) Where is the mention of the FBI's tracing or attempt to trace that grass. Defense ask for it?

106: Compare this account of hospital announcement with what it really said and Francisco's alleged report to Canale with his autopsy. In both cases he deceives deliberately.

107: If coroner used Abernathy and Young to identify body, why didn't prosecution? Why did they use others? Because of what Abernathy and Young had said, which is opposite what prosecution (and Frank) said about both wounds and conspiracy and source of shot.

With his fetish for unessential detail and pointless specification, why does Frank not name this FBI agent, why did he not earlier identify the white man immediately on the scene of the crime?

Says bullet "did not spread or explode on impact." Here, as elsewhere, he refers to a single wound, "the" wound, and he attributes (108) the enormity of that single wound to "the explosion of air outward as the high velocity bullet struck."

His language here seems designed to protect the FBI (He never mentions Frazier).

The question is not of matching the ~~allegedly~~ bullet to the bore (the bullet allegedly intact, with the "nose" only "deformed") but of matching it to the rifling of that particular rifle or any other, to the exclusion of all others. Neither the condition of the bullet or the wounds are as described here, and he knew it. (On wounds, recall his claim on the Jerry Williams Show that he had not read his footnote.)

110-1: Bud and Jim note: All King's party "dictated to stenographers what they knew." Defense should have. Must include exculpatory evidence, esp. Young and Abernathy.

118: Attorney General Clark quotes indicated that his first knowledge not from FBI but from Laue, dated 7:10 p.m., less than 10 minutes after shot. Quotes Laue as saying one shot "from 50-60 yards". This means it was not uncertain, on basis of what was then known, and not then believed to have been from bathroom. It does not say Laue was conjecturing, had no knowledge or in any way reflects uncertainty. It also says not that the shot came from that or any other building but that it did come from "back of Main Street," whichever way Clark's brief note is interpreted. It is interesting that from Jensen's testimony alone the FBI knew before 7:10, the FBI appears to have told neither Clark nor LBJ, who was told

by Clark, of this assassination when it would seem that it or Hoover should have told both immediately. Even after Clark's reported discussion with LBJ there is no indication of any word from JEH. Clark did not call him. He called deLoach (who, incidentally, was soon eased out). No reflection of any call to Clark until 8:05, to announce probable death, and that from deLoach (119)

Clark directed that he get all FBI reports (119). If true, this means he knew or should have known what was afoot, esp. with the ballistics reports, and shares guilt for what happened. How any lawyer could read the Frazier affidavit and not know they could not tie the rifle to the crime would be incredible. If Clark read, and if his assistants did and told him what was there.

---

121-~~2~~ These two footnotes are the kind of thing he emphasizes in the text. My hunch is that these well-known things are in footnotes and not in the text because they were added later and after FRAME-UP. Resetting would have cost more than footnoting. With footnotes, only the two lines with the marks~~s~~ indicating footnotes would have to be reset.

124: This part is designed to protect the FBI and is false. It did leak, regularly and repeatedly. It silence people to avoid being confronted by the truth, not to protect them, and without exception every single alleged witness was repeatedly quoted by the press. The clear intent is to protect Hoover, the agents and the FBI's experts and to hide the fact that everything was designed to impede the defense and to protect the framing.