

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg, King Assassination Records 11/15/78

John Ray, withheld records

Amplification of my earlier memo of today

Enclosed is a copy of a Sunday St. Louis Post-Dispatch story that relates to still withheld FBI records relating to John Ray, to other informants and to one of the real reasons for withholding the names of FBI SAs in this case, their activities other than straight investigating.

The information in this news story relating to Clarence Haynes is less than John Ray provided to me before this story was published.

The FBI also arrested Earle Sattlefield (approx) for the Maddonia job it was trying to pin on John. This despite the fact that he was far away at the time of the robbery and aside from John the other two known to have been involved were accounted for. Meaning without John, the two others, the actual robbers were two.

It appears that SA William Duncan was quite active in this, past the point of acquittal in federal court of the innocent man whose life was ruined.

As John explains what happened, quoting sources that include a U.S. Marshal whose name he gave me, the FBI was careless in rehearsing Haynes in the false story to incriminate John and was observed and overheard. Haynes' contrived story included both John and the innocent Turley, subject of the enclosed story. Haynes was not a good perjurer, so he was caught at it. Haynes was not ~~seen~~ <sup>tried</sup> for perjury because that would have involved those who arranged it.

If there is any official interest in this I understand that after Haynes received a heavier sentence than he had been led to believe he would get he obtained an evidentiary hearing. This was some time later and I believe at a different location. As John points out, Mr. LaPrade was then SAC in St. Louis.

I have no way of knowing what the FBI gave the committee but it appears that the FBI did not identify Haynes as a perjurer or the committee did not care because it took testimony from this perjurer and was using it against John. It did not cite its alleged sources but it made the identical representation today.

After John swore to no involvement in ~~xxxx~~ <sup>bank robberies</sup> the committee sent him what it called a biographical statement to sign. If he had he would have confessed to the robbery reported in the enclosed story and to three others, all long after the King assassination and long after the James Earl Ray guilty plea, thus without relevance or legislative purpose.

These explanations are not intended to argue the John Ray case. They are intended to suggest reasons for incomplete searches and phoney claims to exemption to withhold what is embarrassing. In addition, it does seem that Turley was seriously damaged.