

Dear Howard,

7/23/86

John Egerton did call and I think I prepared him for Ray and for questioning him. He's going to phone me again after the interview, which is day after tomorrow. I've not seen Jimmy since 1973 although I've heard from him from time to time, not recently.

I don't know what an interview in and of itself can mean but unless Jimmy has changed much I have a notion that Egerton will not believe he has been alone with a dangerous killer. How I wish I had the energy and assistance (gofer) I need to write the <sup>king</sup> book I have! I'd like to talk to you about this because I've had another venous thrombosis, bestowed upon me by a plumber who thinks he is a surgeon as byproduct of a transurethra resection this past January and I'm now weaker. And less able. And my driving is limited to 15-20 minutes. With 5 daily hours doing what the doctors want me to do. And I do do.

I've been meaning to write and ask you if you know a reporter who might be interested in a story that in my (distant past) reporting days would have made a real story and in which there now is no interest.

I've created an exceptional situation in a lawsuit in which, perforce, pro se, that the lawyers, including Mark Lynch, then of ACLU, feared. Those FBI/DJ Nazi types decided to come after me in a different way when they were before a judge notoriously in their pocket, John Lewis Smith. They demanded absolutely impossible and entirely unjustified and unnecessary "discovery" and I refused it, for many and all accepted reasons. They got a judgement against me from him and threatened to have me cited for contempt when I ignored it. When I sent word back that they didn't have the balls, they went back to Smith and got a judgement against my lawyer- who'd done his best to get me to make at least pro forma compliance. I wouldn't, for many reasons, including resistance to a precedent that would gut FOIS and may yet. We went up on appeal, there was more immune libel and mendacity, a remand, by which time I was no longer represented by Lynch, who'd agreed to handle the appeal only, and because I'm not afraid of the FBI I created a legal situation in which the only issue before the (thoroughly Reaganized) appeals court is whether or not that judgement was procured by undenied and thoroughly documented perjury, fraud and misrepresentation. What is even more unusual is that the major affiant to get the judgement against me is the identical SA who disclosed to a friend of mine the FBI's own documentary proof that he perjured himself in my case. <sup>He</sup> has not only no denial, not even a whimper pro forma. And some of these documents in and of themselves are a bit raunchy. In issuing his last dictat against me his honor flaunted an incredible ignorance of the case and the case record which, self-servingly, he stated he had reviewed in deference to my pro se status. In it he said that this JEK only suit is for King assassination records and three times that it is for New Haven field office records, which it isn't. He also held that undenied perjury and the other felonies are not a fraud against him- and there wasn't a single other word from them before him on this; and besides, it is only "cumulative," a new defense, I suppose in the Reaganized courts.

If when in the saying I have a fool for a client I do not prevail then I fear the precedent that, in FOIA cases only, and perhaps there is wider applicability which would be enormously hurtful, will mean its end when the government wants not to comply.

Without some public attention I expect the appeals court to flail a rubber stamp. I'll then have to decide whether I can risk the consequences of still refusing, once a traditional posture of writers. If I'm up to it I will. And if, as I don't know but do believe, they have to come out to Maryland to collect, I damned well will! I've been seeking a trial all along\* and there hasn't been any. Best wishes,

Harold Weisberg

Why they don't dare a contempt charge, which could get me jailed, as I think they'd love.

JOHN EGERTON • 4014 Copeland Drive • Nashville, Tennessee 37215

July 20, 1986

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

Thanks very much for the information you gave me on the phone today. I'm enclosing a \$13 check for your book, and will call you again after I've talked to James Earl Ray.

Yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "John Egerton". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the typed word "Yours,".

Telephones: Area 615 - 297-8614 (office), 297-8607 (home)