

Dear Jim,

4/12/78

Thank you for calling to my attention the part of Jimmy's letter of April 8, 1978 that refers to me.

There are a number of reasons why I'd prefer not to write and correct Jimmy in person. Not the least is that while I can understand the kind of thief he has been all his life I cannot either understand or approve the kind of thief Lane is. I hope I am wrong in believing that in Jimmy Jimmy will learn. But I want to stay out of anything with which Lane is in any way associated, coming from a dozen years of personal experience and close observation.

What you sent me reads, "Concluding, Weisberg has also apparently told Jack Anderson that the FBI didn't burglarize my sister house. There also has been reports that Weisberg is now a consultant for the justice department, which is apparently goes along with his public statements that the FBI is beyond reproach in anything related to the King case."

The totality of falsehood in this is but one step from perfection. Jimmy had better have questions about who feeds him this kind of stuff - as well as about his own state of mind when he credits it.

I have never seen Jack Anderson in person, have never spoken to him by phone - have never had any kind of contact with him. I gave one who works for him a copy of a record I had obtained relating to the FBI and bugging and wiretapping. Period. I not only did not say there was no break-in at Carol's, I believed there had been and I so told Jerry in suggesting that Carol and he might want me to pursue this but if they did you'd require releases from them. (Maybe I sent you a copy of that letter in case you heard from either one of them, I'm not certain because it was some time ago, maybe in 1976.)

When the Department of Justice represented to a court in a civil action that I am a subject expert of more knowledge than anyone in the FBI the court directed me to act as the Department's consultant against the FBI. That was last November. To this very day, as you know, I have not received a penny from DJ. I had been asked to serve in this role by the Civil Division, which then went to the judge when I did not agree to do it. So in the sense Jimmy says it he is wrong, as he is in addition because I am not a DJ employee. My unwilling function is limited to the directive of the court. You know all about this but I see no reason to amplify it, given the twists and turns apparent in what Jimmy has written. He has been fed much poison and it shows. It surely has taken his judgement away from him.

Where he got that bit about my "public statements that the FBI is beyond reproach in anything related to the King case" I can't imagine. Can this be the man who read Frags-UP? The only thing I have ever said that can be taken as a defense of the FBI in any aspect of the King case relates to the Lane fabrication which has been hurtful to Jimmy and will be more hurtful to Jimmy. Lane says the FBI killed King. After the publisher got into the act he softened this to "has to be considered the prime suspect," which says almost the same thing. In either formulation it is false, as is each and every one of the supposed facts that supposedly support this fabrication. So when I was asked if the FBI killed King I replied that I have no reason even to suspect this. However, Jimmy, who also knows that it is not true in his own way and pretends otherwise, like the Lane fabrication and the attention it has gotten. (So does the FBI, which is helped, not hurt by such easily disproven lies.) So if anybody disagrees with lies that help the FBI he becomes their defender. This is pretty sick, even for Jimmy with all of his many problems. In all other aspects I have never been other than extremely critical of the FBI for anything and everything connected with the King case, as Jimmy has to know.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg