Times King-Ray series ended 1/3/76 HW 1/10/76

Crewdson's "news analysis" is consistent with the earlier stories and the intent with which the national desk turned this story around. It began with my offer of the new evidence I obtained under FOIA. It made no mention of this evidence or the suit. John refused personal invitations to look at it. The Times refused to send anyone to the press conference discussing it. And having refused to consider evidence it returned to the preconception of Ray as the killer, with the sole questions thereafter, were others involved ina conspiracy.

How is existence of a conspiracy determined? By identification of the conspirators. Not by evidence. And how is the identification of the conspirators determined? By the confession of a man who says he is innocent and has nothing to confess. If an innocent man refuses to confess he is ipso facto guilty and alone guilt.

The way this is proven is to haul him before a grand jury (which I would think has no right to exist under the present situation), force him to take the fifth amendment and use this "refusal to cooperate" as new proof of guilt.

This is a polite-worded update of the Inquisition.

The Times account is that it spent six week investigating. What? Not whether or not Ray committed the crime, the beginning point of any real investigation. Instead it searched for co-conspirators. When it learned that a psychiatrist found Ray incapable of this kind of crime, under hypnosis ended a month earlier, they suppressed this and immediately, from my contact with Crewdson, who was my source, turned around.

The day before they were to have access to the ballistics evidence Crewdson spoke to me about it. I told him what to look for. I told him what there had to be, had to show, had to have been done and had to have been recorded. There never was any mention of any Times examination of any ballistics evidence or the reports by the FBI on any. Nor of any other evidence.

There is an uncontested court record that the ballistics evidence alone can and be and is definitive. No mention. Other scientitific testa have the same capability of definitiveness and from the scientific literature are enough for acquittal. No mention even of their having been made and I offerer what I have on this.

The new diversion is an alleged investigation of whether the FBI was involved in the assassination. If it had been, would its files diclose it? And where is the so-called investigation being made? By lawyers of the Department of Justice, from divisions with involvement, going over what they can get of the FBI's work.

But at no point I can remember did anyone on or in the Times, on or in the FBI or Department of Justice, address what today is the basic question: is Ray guilty?

At no point was there examination of whether the FBI investigated anything else.

If it investigated nothing else, how would its filed be able to contain evidence it did not want, did not get - doesn't have?

It told Ramsey Clark before any investigation that there was no conspiracy. But It has to have known from the first examination of any evidence that there was. It is not a question to begin with of who the conspirators were. It is simple: was there a conspiracy? The planted evidence itself immediately established this - there was.

Whatever the Times learned from its staff investment and other costs of six week is not reflected in the articles. John has not answered my request for what he got. What the stories and "news analysis" amount to is a propaganda jib for the government, another predetermined major-media coverup.