

The Case Against Ray, ch 22

- 148 Says Foreman and Canale worked out the deal.
- 149 Quote from Kyles testimony those I used in F-U and taken from my transcripts given him by committee in violation of agreement, pretty certainly. Illustrative is that nobody else referred to his volunuttering about the tie being blown off.
- 150 Eskridge and right ear also from me.
- 151 Omissions in Francisco's testimony also from F-U.Only.  
While he quotes what I did of Zachary he does not point out the falsity of it. That Zachary "foubd" the bundle.
- 152 Strains to belabor the FBI for not putting up a roadblock on the ground that when there is danger of a ~~border~~ state border being crossed "no local police roadblock was likely to prove effective." He knew there was no all-points, which is not federal but local, from F-U.  
Having been able to steal the transcript only, not the exhibits, Lane claims the date of the Rebel registration is not in the record. It is.
- 153 He says the state said the shot came from the direction of both a clump of bushes and the rear of a rooming house." It said the rooming house only.  
I call it Peasley's "narration," so does Lane.
- 156 I say no fingerprint from Ray in room, transcript does not address, Lane repeats me.
- 157 Days case again Ray presented "thoroughly". It was not. It was lied about.

Ch 23, The Defense

- 158 Despite Foreman he says that in a trial the facts would have come out, "tested at the trial."  
"anatomy of guilty plea" to test truth.
- 160 Says "we agreed to pay Ray. It was to pay Hanes as used here.  
Says Hanes investigation was diligent and he went through their files.  
He pretends it is original with him that the jury would not have convicted, his conclusion, not that to his knowledge the case had been tested in court before him.  
He attributes an "affirmative defense" to the Haneses. I do not recall it.
- 161 He gives himself away on the absence of a case from Hanes' files in referring to the pathologist. He is not in the Hanes files. They were out before this testimony.
- 162 He uses my stuff on Frazier's story as presented by Beasley.  
He has no source on his "expert who saw it but was not allowed to examine it under microscope" But I suspect this is his carelss theievery. This is my work and I did arrange for and McDonnell did use a mircroscope. The testimony was not the the bullet was "sufficiently undamaged" but that sufficient marks of identification existed, He says that the State failed " to prove the 'death slug' was fired from the " Ray rifle but this was neither in nor necessary in the guilty plea. It is in the evidentiary hearing and the habeas corpus petition, again my work,  
He says there was Frazier's "refusal to inform the State." There is no basis for believing the State ever asked and I have every reason to believe it did not.  
But in context this is Mark phoneying up a case of his own expertise about the ridiculous, a statement of his elemental ignorance of the case.
- 163 He keeps talking about the misleading of the jurors, which indicates he has not even taken time to read that transcript. All had agree to a finding guilty prior to any representation of evidence.  
The great man has an opinion, the State could prove that Ray bought the rifle. With plenty of witnesses and a receipt and fingerprints, what else. But "I believe."  
Yet he says the State could not link Ray with the rifle, in the same paragraph.  
He says that "we" writing of the finding of Ray's prints in the rooming house "inclined Ray to believe his defense would be more difficult than he had conceived."  
As proof Mark cites the book which was not written at the time of the plea!





flophouse entrance "one will be able to see the Lorraine" from 422 1/2. This is pointless. There is but one entrance to the two halves of the building and in fact the view of the Lorraine would have been better from the other half. 422 1/2 is immaterial. Anyone walking around the block would know that this particular entrance was to both halves either one of which suited.

He extends this to what amounts to saying that Ray was part of a conspiracy. None of these factors defend Ray. All incriminate. Yet he is winding up for an assault on Jim in particular, obviously—all falsely.

No greater ignorance of the most elemental fact of the crime than ~~ix~~ to say that by examination of "the autopsy documents ...with eyewitness testimony...reconstruct the exact ~~position~~ posture of Drk "ing" when hit, which "will (emph added) establish the angle of entry and thus the origin of the shot."

184 He then pontificates in a vacuum that the defense should have explored the possibility of the s or coming from the bushes behind the flophouse.

On the Solomon Jones story he goes for the "something white" across his face. He follows this with the falsehood "yet the police did not interview Jones until ten months had passed."

Then using Hays from Hanes' files without checking at all in his great investigation. This is a story Hays invented to hassle the police with details that on the face are impossible, the detachment of the stock and the stepping down onto an absent barrel with all the people at the Lorraine looking on—and not being seen.

184 Hays described as Ray's "one investigator."

Claims Hanes told him the police radio tapes show the white Mustang broadcast began at ~~6:22~~ 6:10. This is in direct quotes and is false. The claim is that there was nobody who made this statement. The reports show several. The fake broadcast did not begin until, after 6:30. What Hane does here is pick up from Waldron's story what he read in "—U.

185 He has Ray driving Raoul away, out of town," "according to Ray he drove out of town in the opposite direction with the ubiquitous Raoul huddled in the back seat."

Ray could not have said this and it is hurtful to Ray and any possibility of trial. "To this date no adequate official explanation of the police radio broadcast has been offered." He then follows this with questions I asked in "Frame-Up. But he calls it a police radio broadcast and of that the truth is an adequate explanation and it is the "official explanation." A policeman rebroadcast a CB broadcast. He then says that the Hanes defense would have been exploring conspiracy with this broadcast as evidence. Conspiracy with Jimmy= Jimmy guilty.

Here he quotes from police broadcasts in a way indicating he obtained this from the committee. I do not recall it from Hanes' files. He then makes a deliberately false interpretation, that homicide had completed its on-the-scene investigation, to emanate from the police had finished their work." without knowing the content of official files he says "the unexamined clues the unfollowed leads...today remain unexamined."

186 He uses sources quoted from "Frame-Up as his original work, as on the Aron bank robbery He carries this further, again attributed to Waldron with the four aliases. All this is attributed to Mo's 7/13/67 story.

"The prosecution failed to address this intriguing question." It had no need to with a guilty/ plea, as the lawyer Hane knew. It was not part of "the case against Ray."

187 He account of the deal is that Foreman "offered no resistance to an arrangement." Followed by what is in F-U on this, no death sentence in many years.

#### Ch 25 The Plea

188 "when closely examined, the plea itself, in fact, support the other evidence...conspiracy." Says Ray said then and always said there was a conspiracy. Not exculpatory and not factual. "He explained the details of the conspiracy to his lawyers", false. This whole section should be examined to see if it holds anything not in F-U, if twisted a little, as above.

189 His two gals are quoted as asking Hane what he read in F-U, on the cell and conditions. No more than what I used.

- 190-1 In quoting from Jerry what we had said in court, I in the book, about the effects of the conditions of confinement Lane says that the consequences "should have been quite clear to counsel," for all the world as though counsel had not pursued Jim's rights before all available judges. It is part of a vicious attack based on innuendos that are baseless and made to seem reasonable by the most deliberately dishonest writing. He quotes from Jerry in 12/76 what he does not say Jerry heard us put on as evidence in 1974.
- 191 He pays the Hanes back and prepares, I think, for further attacks by saying the Hanes "were adequately prepared to represent Ray at trial." Without test-firing the rifle, for example? Lane doesn't know enough about the case to have an opinion. He certainly knows nothing not in the guilty-plea. "Adequately prepared" with the Cornbread Quarter garbage as part of their defense? Lane got it from them. From Frame-Up, not from Foreman's record: "Once Foreman entered the case the inexorable march toward a deal..." Also from guilty-plea hearing but not from any other sources.
- 192 Says Ray himself prepared 8/31/70 affidavit filed in court to avoid counsel who did. Not only did Lane know this, he knew the language, typing and spelling are not Jimmy's, no matter what the form in which he saw the affidavit.
- 194 Here he avoids the appearance of duplicating my work by use of a device, his personal interview with Jerry in which he repeats the testimony I prepared for the evidentiary hearing. There is no way the reader would know that all of this that is not false or fabricated is in my writing, my work or Jim's or in the evidentiary hearing. (His Cohen was there and he got transcripts from the committee, mine)
- 195 He knows so little of the fact: "Unexplained by that testimony is how Foreman was able to secure the contracts among Hanes, Huie and Ray before meeting any of them. Ray did not have the contracts. Jerry has some, not all. He gave them to Foreman, as F-U reports. This was when Foreman reached Memphis first time, at airport.
- 196 Dates "this writing" at "February 25, 1977." Probably additions by a date at which at the least he could have made changes. Others are indicated, others needed. This relates to capability of correcting error.
- He even claims that Ray charged in 1969 that Foreman coerced him into remaining silent about the principals... Ray went to jail, remained silent, and the principals were not revealed." This says that Ray could name them or is guilty of a Murder One charge.
- 198 and earlier, unnoted: Lane is up to his old tricks going back to Rush to Judgment, alter transcripts he pretends to be quoting verbatim, here in bold face. He uses Foreman's name instead of A and uses Q to avoid identify Ray's counsel. The transcripts are never this way. Those of court are Q and A, without Foreman's name. The contracts Lane cites are in facsimile in uncredited F-U. The quotes from Huie's book in Jim's court work, uncredited.
- 199 "I believe" Foreman was not ready to go to trial. He did not read this in Jim's court papers? How can he know otherwise, Foreman not having told him anything about his preparations or lack of it. This, however, can be an important citation in terms of motive and malice in his attack on Jim.
- The quotes from Huie are from Jim's work only, of the entire book. Ref to Ray's criminal past also from F-U: not this kind of criminal. Lane does not cite the rap sheet, does not even claim to have seen it and then says "A thorough examination of his record by the FBI revealed one fist-fight." This is false, whether or the criminal record alone or of the overall record, including in jails. He lists what Foreman had to do, says he did not do it and cites no source. There are two only, F-U and the record Jim and I made in court.
- 200 To hide this he attributes it, as though for the first time, to Hanes telling him. There is nothing here directly attributed to personal interview with the Hanes that is not in F-U, the trial record we made or both.
- He said "renfro says said he was never asked by Foreman" for his work, implying he spoke to renfro, no indication to here than he did although there is earlier pretense of it.

In saying that "Foreman's description of his investigation was made under oath" Lane does not say where, when or how thus avoiding saying that Jim deposed him on this and used his earlier deposition in the evidentiary hearing and court pleadings. Lane can't say Jim did all he says Jim should have and didn't unless he masks as he does here.

(How opposite all this is of his earlier techniques, repetitious footnotes and they calling his arithmetic on the footnotes means solid, original work. In R to J the first 10 footnotes are a single one. Liebetter claims his inquiry into them shows Lane lied. He did in Citizen's Dissent, even inventing sources.)

201 210 "Ray told me that Foreman never asked him if he had fired the shot." This is in F-U, from Foreman, and in the evid. hearing, in Ray's testimony. It is not, as in all prior cases not of invention, uniquely what Ray told Lane.

He again infers guilt in criticizing Foreman for not asking Ray "if he had been in a conspiracy ~~to~~ with others to kill Dr. King."

"It ~~appears to me~~ is apparent to me that the most significant aspects of the case are: Was there a conspiracy to murder Dr. King? And did Ray pull the trigger?" Again the presumption of guilt. In any concept of a defense is not the "most significant aspect" whether or not the client is guilty? If he did not have proof of a conspiracy, as Ray did not, and if he had not pulled the trigger, as all available evidence indicates Ray did not, he could still be guilty of murder first first without regard knowledge as proof of conspiracy and he could be ~~innocent~~ guilty if he did not "pull the trigger."

202 The usual "Ray told me again" about my work and the court record Jim made over life and the pix. Jim also deposed Foreman on this but Lane pretends it is his original work.

Whether Ray lied or Lane put words in Lane's mind and mouth his use of the so-called Frenchy sketch and picture with "I remember," "I have seen" and other such claims to original work is a direct steal from F-U, where I use the two side by side. As proof of his own ignorance and the impossibility of this being his work Lane says, my emphasis, "the artist's sketch ... used by the local and federal police in a search for the murderer. It was created by an artist employed by a Memphis newspaper." He does not even use Herrington's name. But each and every allegation of fact in the quoted section is false.

Here Lane says the opposite of what Jim says the warden told him, that Warden Stoney Ray Lane "met me at the gate and had driven me to the maximum security section of the prison where Ray was confined." (Aside from this different representation, the warden having told Jim that if he'd been there he'd not have let Lane in, that it was late and he'd gone, is not the entire establishment "the maximum security section?") Is this the warden or an assistant.

Again the Ray told me bit with the court record.

203 He has Jimmy saying that all the money he got was from Raoul: "He paid me for various jobs I did." This is not Jimmy's earlier story.

The same with Foreman's effort to exculpate Huie and look-all from sources other than "Ray told me," and hidden by Lane to pretend originality.

He follows with a reference to Foreman's testimony in "United States District Court in Tennessee," without saying which or citing the name of the case. He then follows with quotes that have to come from F-U, the court record we made or both. The conclusion of the quote makes it seem like from Jim's work.

204 At the bottom of the page he again has his gals duplicating the courtroom work we did while pretending it is their work. It is only part of what we did but we did do it, Lane and his CCI did not, despite the ~~exp~~ representation here.

205 Is not this story of Foreman's thinking the Stephenses were the owners of the flophouse also from F-U?

He persists in not naming "Foreman's successor" as Ray's counsel. To here there is no mention of Stoner, Hill or Ryan. Here it is with Foreman's knowledge of the McCraw real story, Stephens drunk, also in the evid hearing for ripping off with pretenses.

- Lane's offense is the more grevous beginning with the bold-face here because knowing better and being critical of "lesar he here attributes to Ray's telling him what Lesar developed and put in evidence. Tjis in fact began with me and my work on the habeas corpus. But it is bet ween Jim and me and is independent of Ray, who did not really understand it. Knowing of the e id. hearing and the habeas corpus petition Lane knows this while representing g also as uniwely his original work.
- 206f This continues with more of the "Ray told me" for what is my work, jim's or twice-told tales pretendedly original with Lane except for Lane's original error never original or new. One such is about "ooker, "his candidacy play ed an important part in ultimately convincing Ray to plead guilty." Entirely false. No basis, either.
- 207 Confusion between police 40mile statements and allegation that police said Ray was "not within four miles" when King was killed. This is another sign of ignorance of tje case and unoriginal work. Besides, on the face it is unreasonable. The rest is false because Foreman did make an effort to get those 4-mile statements. "Ray was unable to sleep" because of the lights. With the most cursory knowledge of the case he'd know the opposite is true, Ray averaged a long night sleep. The question is no related to length of sleep.
- 208 He can't even get the law straight. Foreman was not arguing the "concept of felony murder." He was explaining Murder One. This was not dependant on his purchase of the rifle and was not a felony-murder extension. He did not persuade Ray that Ray as guilty, even of a non-existent gun-smuggling conspiracy. He again has Ray filing affidavits, as though he had been his own counsel and had even written the affidavits himself, neither true, as Lane should have known.
- 209 The fear that Foreman would destory Ray in the courtroom comes from Jim and the records in courts. But this one has no date. It may be Ray's own. But the content is Jim's of earlier date.
- 209 marked ? not helpful to Jimmy and the argument here. That the use of Foreman's letters is from Frame-Up and not from knowledge is clear from the language with which Lane introduces one of the March 9 letters, "On March 9, 1969, Foreman sent a letter to Ray which had the effect..."(emph added.) Of Ray's interruption he quotes only what F-U does
- 211 After quoting what I use in F-U Lane adds his unique capability for twisting and delibe ately misinterprets what Ray said, "Ray had remained loyal to the only concept which he said might legally establish his guilt. There was a conspiracy and becausethere was he was legally guilty." In fact what Ray did is the one thing he could that said he was not guilty. If there was no conspiracy, which is what Foreman extended the argument to be, Ray had to be guilty, there being no other.
- 211 he manages to restrict himself to the same quote from Battle I used.
- 213 So uninformed is he that when he uses my quotations from Gavzer he identifies Gavzer as "of the Washington Post" (F-U,90) He can't give the date because I do not. I say it was for papers of a certain date. However, it was not as Lane improvises to hide his cribbing, "Just one week after" the sentencing. The story was in the Washington Post and other AP papers 11/17, the date I use. (Above I mean I do not use a date for the interview, as Lane does.) The interview was before the Monday papers of the 17 went to press the evening of th 16th.
- 213 The interview with Roger Aldi of 10/10/76 refers to "the book...by somebody with a Jewish name" as the origin of the evidence on ballistics. So on this added ground Lane knew four months before he was writing the end of his book.
- 214 Instead Lane pretends the book is not known, top page here
- 216 Ch 26:"They/He Slew the Dreamer"
- Naturally to Lane the two most important books on the case are Huie's and McMillan's. Of books of this nature far and away the most important is Frank's. And then there is the one, the only one, that provided the defense. That is not important? McMillan's is when it has not on the case or the evidence? He says that without doubt Jimmy knew Huie had prejudged from the first. Not helpful and not true.
- 218 In his haste in stealing Lane did not check and says the contracts with Huie are of

rather "entered into during July 1968." They were signed in August. Ray was not in the United States when they were drafted and agreed between Huie and Hanes, in a side deal.  
 219 On the title, that is first from F-U, then Jim's court work, neither credited.

- 220 Here he really goes bananas to make himself Perry Hercule Spade Holmes. He says that "prior" to the publication of the WR "almost every major publisher in the United States declined" one is led to believe his book alone. Well, Rush to Judge, ent was far from the first book after the WR. He did have a contract for a different book prior to the report and he did not deliver it and he did not return the advance, as I recall \$1800. Below, here, he says his is a 1964 book by deliberate mixing of all of this with an alleged lack of publisher interest in 1964. He also says he was offered an advance of \$5,000. He does not say by whom or if he took it. He goes farther and says it is only after he made a success of his book that "other manuscripts on the subject were more easily able to find publication. (There were at least 7 before his, so he lies.)"
- 222 He can libel even a Huie through his ignorance and disinterest in readily available fact. He says Huie was paid more because he turned around and said there was no conspiracy.
- 225 Of the entire content of the third Huie piece Hane just happens to fix on what I did, that "little conspiracy."
- 226 FBI in "grand conspiracy" Hane says Ray "found to be directed against the United States." (Ref could be to Huie but literally and contextually to Ray.)



4/5/77

Dear Les,

When you did not call me as you said you would after the Redditt re-interview I assumed that whether or not with something from him to follow up you might have gone to Memphis for the observance. You still were not home tonight.

You know I had some questions of fact with regard to Redditt but attributed them to the normal workings of the mind, normal even for police intelligence officers.

I have had access to Lane's account of what one is led to be his-alone interview with Redditt. No matter how much I distrust Lane there are omissions and errors in it that I cannot attribute to the frailty of human recall.

There are substantive differences. As I recall Redditt told you he was introduced to this Secret Service agent from Washington. In Lane's account he is not. In Lane's your checking with Secret Service is assigned to Redditt's personal investigation.

Whatever he told you Lane says that Redditt told Lane Richmond was there only to spy on Redditt. Not like if not impossible. The heroics are showing. With an irrational exaggeration of Redditt as the lone protector from the distance and his plan not including what you said, the perimeter plan.

Lane makes a single reference to you, where he uses your Invader story. He uses this to attack your credibility and to say you are in error about the infiltration. He does do some stretching, even for Lane. He quotes John Smith and the Tri-State one, selectively and in a way that inspires belief there were among the finks.

When he gets back to the Redditt story there is no mention of you, no indication of the Newday piece on it, all pretense that it is exclusive and original with the most intrepid of investigators, Mark Lane.

Naturally nobody had ever spoken to Holloman before either. It says.

Pretty dirty. Prentice-Hall knew. I sent xeroxes of your pieces and have their letter of thanks. Also Brief's letter to New Times.

To the point I've reached, p. 148, in this book about the King murder there is no description of the murder. I meant nothing.

If there is more Redditt-related I'll let you know if it is significant.

Best,

Dear Jim, Code-Name Zorro, Lane and Ray

4/6/77

I have been reading and marking the proofs and annotating. I made thenotes on the irrelevant parts in ~~habd~~. This actually is most of the book. To 185 in his account of the murder Lane has no account of the murder.

I interrupt this because it has been growing on me that if Lane is called as a witness in any proceeding and cannot claim an immunity, as he cannot, he'll have to lie in a way that will be ruonous to Jimmy.

This is clear at the top of 185 where he has a different version of what he claims Jimmy told him. He is not concerned about consistency and it appears not to have been a Prentice-Hall editorial consideration.

Here he makes Jimmy a conscious conspirator calmly driving Raoul away from the murder.

His pluggigg of this being a personal book when it is not and of his contact with Jimmy make this much worse, if not actionable.

My hunch is that after his February interview with Jimmy he made some changes in the manuscript but not enough to make them consistent, that this part was written earlier.

If you think you should I think you should ask Jimmy if Lane taped their interviews. Except for indicating hurt to him from Lane do not say why. Not under any corcumstances.

Even for Lane the display of ignorance is virtuouse.

Beautiful with the pontifications about law, the practise of law and evidence.

The part that I like best in his lecture is how he could have established the point of origin in the bushes with the autopsy-materials and eye-witnesses.

Next to that how the one entrance to the double flophouse would not let anyone know he could see the Lorraine from there. Here he forget he had already said that trees and bushes hid it, & getting carried away in embellishing on false representations attributed to Kay. These include that King never stayed at the Lorraine!

With a fine judicial attitude he takes the Hays fakery from Hays files, on Cornbread ater, at face value, without looking Hays up. I got Renfro to admit that he invented the whole thing to annoy the police. Lane says Carter was registered at 422 1/2. I think not.

I could be tempted to write a book called the investigator!

But there is great danger here to Jimmy and to the establosing of truth. Lane draws a distinction between the two, you should note, just before the cited page, part of his beginning of an attack on us.

Hastily,