

JL; He King/Ray CBS Special aired 1/2/76 EW

I think this show was as close as any so-called news show can be to a total plagiarism.

The questions may be of law but not of fact.

Aside from some of the works of the Hanes and Foreman, much of which still come from Frame-Up, there is nothing in the show that doesn't.

There were a few things that come from my subsequent work, clearly indicated in Frame-Up, like the scenes of Q-64. But essentially all is from this one copyrighted work. One of the more interesting sidebars is that they had Stephens on film denying he had identified Ray prior to the guilty-please hearings and I recall no use of it before this. If true, CBS suppressed exculpatory evidence. If the State of FBI did, well....

Now I go back to my relations with CBS in this. You will recall I insisted on having it taped. When Esther was not prepared to tape, I made the tapes, gave them to her, and she returned them to me. I have them in the envelope in which she returned them. (I note she is up from researcher to assistant producer in the credits.)

So the stipulation was that I'd help CBS all I could but in return they would not without a normal arrangement for literary rights, quite common in TV, as distinguished from paying people to appear, use any of my work directly or as leads for following up on their own. This meant that they could be backgrounded only, could not duplicate the work regardless of its form, and would have to go out on its own and have an entirely new show. On this I offered to be a consultant, but not without pay (also normal) and noted that they paid non-experts like Schoenmann. There was no agreement to pay me for the time I spent with them and the tapes begin with my saying this, which protected both Esther and me.

Quite aside from the viable copyright I have on Frame-Up there is this added understanding with a proper and authorized CBS representative that was totally violated.

Now there were ways CBS could have gotten around this. They have no right to use my work without authorization. But they do have a right to use it with authorization. They did not seek authorization, in any form or at any time. They merely in effect stole in not only knowing it is mine by copyright but in direct violation of the pre-conditions of my talking to them at all. Moreover, there is the advance notice to Midgley whose response was that he did not understand. He could not have understood and aired this show. We can get a thousand experts to testify that they took the content and the line of the book and suppressed all mention of it, how and by whom it was done, and went farthur and at several points not only call it the result of CBS's own investigation but added that there had never been any real investigation. Yet in saying this CBS also knew that it was my investigation alone that provided the basis for the successful habeas corpus appeal, with a ringing decision like few ever; and my investigation and your courtwork that resulted in a truly sensation record, one hell of an investigation, in the evidentiary hearing. They covered this hearing and made no mention of it or the evidence in it on the show. They even cribbed my owrk on Ghormley and attributed it in part to Hanes. I recall no mention of him in Hanes' notes.

More detail can be added. I'm laying out a belief to raise the question what can be done under the law. This is not the first time CBS has done this. Here they went farthur in two other ways, consistent with the allegation above: they didn't even mention there was a defense investigation, investigator or such a book; and they pretended that the least significant part of the documents Rather quoted they got as a result of their Freedom of Information action. They fudged, saying under the law. However, to their knowledge it was my action, which they followed, and since we got what they didn't even ask for and I gave it to them, it becomes more deliberate. Actually, the segment to have been Cronkited the night of 12/11 says that I and they got it under the law. As aired I'm sure cut the next morning on TV it says this but eliminates my reading of the significant portions to have me saying something I said was not my purpose for being there, having to do with a short from somewhere in the bushes. All bears on intent. EW

JL; Re King/Ray CBS Special aired 1/2/76 HW

I think this show was as close as any so-called news show can be to a total plagiarism.

The questions may be of law but not of fact.

Aside from some of the works of the Hanes and Foreman, much of which still come from Frame-Up, there is nothing in the show that doesn't.

There were a few things that come from my subsequent work, clearly indicated in Frame-Up, like the scenes of Q-64. But essentially all is from this one copyrighted work. One of the more interesting sidebars is that they had Stephens on film denying he had identified Ray prior to the guilty-please hearings and I recall no use of it before this. If true, CBS suppressed exculpatory evidence. If the State of FBI did, well....

Now I go back to my relations with CBS in this. You will recall I insisted on having it taped. When Esther was not prepared to tape, I made the tapes, gave them to her, and she returned them to me. I have them in the envelope in which she returned them. (I note she is up from researcher to assistant producer in the credits.)

So the stipulation was that I'd help CBS all I could but in return they would not without a normal arrangement for literary rights, quite common in TV, as distinguished from paying people to appear, use any of my work directly or as leads for following up on their own. This meant that they could be backgrounded only, could not duplicate the work regardless of its form, and would have to go out on its own and have an entirely new show. On this I offered to be a consultant, but not without pay (also normal) and noted that they paid non-experts like Schoenmann. There was no agreement to pay me for the time I spent with them and the tapes begin with my saying this, which protected both Esther and me.

Quite aside from the viable copyright I have on Frame-Up there is this added understanding with a proper and authorized CBS representative that was totally violated.

Now there were ways CBS could have gotten around this. They have no right to use my work without authorization. But they do have a right to use it with authorization. They did not seek authorization, in any form or at any time. They merely in effect stole in not only knowing it is mine by copyright but in direct violation of the pre-conditions of my talking to them at all. Moreover, there is the advance notice to Midgley whose response was that he did not understand. He could not have understood and aired this show. We can get a thousand experts to testify that they took the content and the line of the book and suppressed all mention of it, how and by whom it was done, and went farther and at several points not only call it the result of CBS's own investigation but added that there had never been any real investigation. Yet in saying this CBS also knew that it was my investigation alone that provided the basis for the successful habeas corpus appeal, with a ringing decision like few ever; and my investigation and your courtwork that resulted in a truly sensation record, one hell of an investigation, in the evidentiary hearing. They covered this hearing and made no mention of it or the evidence in it on the show. They even cribbed my work on Ghormley and attributed it in part to Hanes. I recall no mention of him in Hanes' notes.

More detail can be added. I'm laying out a belief to raise the question what can be done under the law. This is not the first time CBS has done this. Here they went farther in two other ways, consistent with the allegation above: they didn't even mention there was a defense investigation, investigator or such a book; and they pretended that the least significant part of the documents Rather quoted they got as a result of their Freedom of Information action. They fudged, saying under the law. However, to their knowledge it was my action, which they followed, and since we got what they didn't even ask for and I gave it to them, it becomes more deliberate. Actually, the segment to have been Cronkited the night of 12/11 says that I and they got it under the law. As aired I'm sure cut the next morning on TV it says this but eliminates my reading of the significant portions to have me saying something I said was not my purpose for being there, having to do with a short from somewhere in the bushes. All bears on intent. HW

Dispute what Stephens told Bill Stout
The government had Stephens begin an
affair of alleged interest in
Stephens say it was not & would not
have been Roy

They have included what I got
7-18-70 & printed in F-4 - No money
else - & do not credit.

Even Hanes/ who had & read F. 4) does no more
than report what F-4 said of F. 4
& did not pursue efforts to do like work
in front of we did. My idea

Q. 64 altered price we saw it - then jacket
& lose me only. Now seems to be 3 pieces

"The truth of course could best come from T. E. R."
only if known by guilty & know this
Evan on "Chiff" - "He told me" - Not wrong
not already in print

Approach straight from F. U.
No evidence of their own - only re-arrangements
of mine, with Hanes's substituted on
occasion

Even glorifying my work product

Claimed only their Felt use but mine
dates to 4/15/75 - before they started -
& they knew it & dated it 11/12/75

Hanes said they outside 5:30 - not 6:01 - &
not what he said in hearing

No evidence at hearing - for which I was
in vestigative - mentioned. Even hearing
at sup not mentioned although CBS had Ed
Rohlf & an artist there.

Did they use the picture I held up of the
slip as their own - not admitting?

No single new witness - not enough to
new evidence. Omitted most significant
FBI statement on window - no powder, etc.
Did they get this from me? Felt said I gave
them what they had not gotten.

Styled "A CBS News Inquiry"

WMAR-TV 10 p.m.
1/2/76

"It never came under the same searching scrutiny ... not until November"

Levi did not order inquiry into FBI conduct in King case

Is central question did Ray alone kill Dr King?

Bathroom duplication unfaithful completely - knowingly. I told Esther.

Bathroom windowsill replaced? Can't tell in our set.

Bud said he refused to be on it.

Tried to get full audio tape of Kyles. Purpose, confirms what he told me

not on tape that Rather and CBS do not understand and to see

what else he said following conversation with me 2/71

Our inquiry on the day of the murder reported that Dr King was at the

Lorraine Motel.

Question of Ray's room having "view of the motel"

escape

~~6:06~~ 6:06 police radio noted package in front of Canipe's

Get exact words

Ghormley came out front doors

get Ghormley tape

reenactment of packaging eliminates all small objects

lights out in hallway. Said he should have seen police car. Places auto

in front of Canipe's

They have police tapes

Our search for amateur operator not fair search

on chase, FCC

says of Huie only that he bought the rights to Ray's story

shows fragments with slug

omits Ray's objection in court

state's case:

Stephens says not Ray

Windowsill:

their FOIA request only mentioned

Picture of Q64 not given me by FBI; where did they get it;

Motive:

Our inquiry has disclosed

misdefines conspiracy eliminating hard evidence and making it contingent

upon identifying conspirators