

Roger Feinman

8/18/78 11<sup>30</sup>pm

Dear Sylvia

After we spoke at the conclusion of today's (Friday) final session of the committee's hearings a thought which had been germinating made its way through the labyrinthine corridors of my conspiratorialist's mind: We both remarked upon the curious fact that affidavits of the rebuttal witnesses had been taken only within the last 2 weeks; I now have a theory why that is so. I think it was to avoid giving Lane & Ray copies of these witnesses' statements in advance of Ray's testimony.

Apparently, Lane & Ray were provided with certain documents a number of weeks ago. But Blakey (from now on Flaky Blakey) probably wished to avoid making any

(2)  
formal record of Courden, et. al., until the  
last possible moment so as to give himself  
and the Committee an excuse not to have  
provided those statements to Lane. In other  
words, if Lane did not know that these  
witnesses had been contacted (and his remarks  
indicate that this is probably the case), he  
could not have asked to see their statements.

This, of course, would go further toward  
indicating a deliberate and deceitful plan by  
the Flake to destroy both Ray and Lane. As  
I think we both agreed, there appeared to  
be a stage-managed quality to the latest session  
in that Ray's testimony was cut short so as to  
prevent rebuttal witnesses while the TV cameras  
were still "hot". Talk to you soon  
Best,  
Roger (OVER)

P.S. I think it extremely noteworthy that all this was done before any questions directed at the finances or aliases. Perhaps to impress whatever testimony Ray will have in the future on these two crucial matters... Fournier's readiness to yield his time (which he presumably planned to devote to these subjects) irks me, and leaves me somewhat disillusioned as to his commitment to a factual inquiry into the conspiracy question. More significantly, the Committee has now put Ray into a tight little box. Since there is no adversary procedure whereby the rebuttal witnesses might be challenged or additional witnesses called by the defense, (at ~~for~~ Ray to refuse to testify further (and I wouldn't blame him) would give the appearance of cowardice and defeat, so that (b) Ray must now be more candid about his post-prison escape contacts.

Note well; The Committee did not call Charles or Grace Stephens.

R.F.