

Mr. Phil Lerman  
Fox TV  
5152 Wisconsin Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20016

1/27/93

Dear Phil,

An undated Times clipping in today's mail reminds me that after <sup>vi</sup>riting you in haste I'd intended writing you again. The haste because I'm to be admitted to Johns Hopkins for what I hope will be only five days and I want to keep up to date before that happens. It was in talking about your show to others that I said what I should have said in the letter, despite what I regard as diminishing it, it is still the best commercial TV has done with any of the political assassinations.

**'Who Killed Martin Luther King?'**

Fox, tonight at 9; 8 central time

Possibly inspired by the renewed commotion over conspiracy theories about the assassination of John F. Kennedy, Fox Broadcasting has resurrected a conspiracy theory about the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. The thesis — advanced by Mark Lane, the veteran conspiracy theorist, and Harold Weisberg, an assassination buff, and supported by the sometime comedian Dick Gregory — fingers the Federal Bureau of Investigation for setting up James Earl Ray, who was convicted

of the crime.

Ramsey Clark, a former Attorney General and no great admirer of the F.B.I., says the evidence against Mr. Ray, who is shown denying any guilt, was strong. The Rev. Jesse Jackson does not exactly take a position but comes out decisively in favor of truth. The program offers dramatic re-enactments meant to demonstrate that it would have been difficult for Mr. Ray to do the deed from the bathroom of his motel. Attention is called to a figure in the bushes.

The hourlong special will be of particular interest to viewers who put confidence in Mark Lane, Dick Gregory, television re-enactments and Fox Broadcasting.

I presume the clipping is of the 22d. It allows me to illustrate, partially, what may have seemed unreasonable to you (pl), my insistence on not being on any <sup>show</sup> ~~show~~ with anyone who theorizes any assassination conspiracy.

One reason, as I told you, is that it usually means I am used to accredit them when I oppose

them, meaning what they do and say. I'll not argue with you about your doing that with me. Instead I ask you to see for yourself how in the paper of record your show led it to put me down as a conspiracy theorist, which I've never been ("Fox Broadcasting has resurrected a conspiracy theory...") It says of this theory, "The thesis— advanced by Mark Lane, the veteran conspiracy theorist, and Harold Weisberg, an assassination buff..." and then it links me with Dick Gregory, too, in his assassination nuttiness, "supported by the sometime comedian Dick Gregory—" to which it adds, nothing omitted in quotation "fingers the Federal Bureau of Investigation for setting up James Earl Ray...." As you know, I told you the exact opposite and never ever suggested anything else or anything like this.

This is hurtful to me and to my reputation particularly because the Times is believed and is the paper of record. And not a word of it is true. (about me.)

Don't tell me you didn't say it. That is not the point. You made it possible by doing what you said you'd not do as a condition of my appearance.

Nothing we can do about it now but perhaps you can see that when people like me don't care about being on TV and in my case why, which I told you, it is not without reason and with me it is from experience now added to.

Best to you all,

