



2

On 7 there is a similar case and one that while it is not essential to correct should be if there is a chance. You say there were two white Mustangs, "that one of the white Mustangs parked in front of the street was gone at the time that the shot was fired..." This admits that there were two white Mustangs, that one was there at the time ~~xxx~~ the shot was fired, and leaves the inference that it is possible, just possible, that we are arguing the missing one was not Ray's. The facts are there was another white car, not a Mustang, and that it was in a different position, and that Ray's was gone at the time the shot was fired. We have witnesses on this.

On 13 Rather's question includes "You question the evidence that put him behind bars, but where's the evidence the case should be reopened?"

Two bad concepts and you should have told him that there was no trial and there is no evidence that put Ray behind bars. A deal ~~with~~ by his lawyer with the State and with the judge improperly involved put Ray away. Not any evidence. Nor is it only on the basis of evidence that the case "should be reopened." This also gets back to my first suggestion, for he had you in the wrong role, of solving the crime rather than as defense counsel in this formulation. Miscarriages of justice, such as conflicts of interest, improper rulings, suppression of evidence and a number of other factors require that cases be reopened. It is when they are tried that this evidence becomes a fact. Evidence alone is not the ~~ix~~ only reason for a court ordering a trial.

One omission in all of this is that it at no point tells anyone that Ray never had a trial - that this monstrous crime is officially declared solved without a trial, and that especially in terrible cases like this is it essential that we adhered to the American system, which requires a public trial.

A minor point, in ticking off other reasons, you do not say Constitutional rights.

On 15, the interception of Ray's correspondence, if you face this again lay it out in the effective full detail we have, beginning with the ordering of this violation of anyone's most basic constitutional rights and include the actual xeroxing by the named member of the prosecution staff, which also issued the orders.

Down toward the bottom, the kind of thing that always happens to all of us: you refer to the interception of only one page of Ray's notes. There were two that we recovered and each is more than a statement of innocence. It is his worksheets to be active in his own defense, one in which he actually figured out what had to have happened. If this comes up again, don't forget to recall their dive into the toilet to recover his notes. Admitted in the hearing.

Top 20, another of the kinds of things we can't avoid. If this question comes up again we were denied all labor reports, part of the evidence denied the defense and pressed upon the press, including CBS. Of this the autopsy pictures is an example on which I remind you again to get a statement from Esther for use in the appeal.

Not yours but on 22 Rather has his conjectured conspiracy including "investigators." If he meant FBI he didn't say this and we do not say that prior to now Ray had any real investigation.

On 32 I hope the error is in transcription. It has you saying Battle "sort of said, ~~Mr~~ Wow, what's going on here?" You mean "should have said."

34. similarly with "shallow world." (shadowy)

42, unclear where you say "we had to exclude much of the material." You mean we were foreclosed from it.

If there is a retake I urged you to insist that it begin with a distinction between the needs and interest of the defense and that of solving the crime. They can include it and should. Remember what clothes you wore, too.

You did well. I have a suggestion for the future: there is nothing wrong with your asking question and if in interviews of this kind you don't you'll always appear to be defensive. Sometimes questions are the only way. Best,