

Mr. Roger Feinman
CBS News - Radio
524 W 57 St.,
N.Y.C., N.Y. 10019

Dear Roger,

You are under a number of misapprehensions I hasten to correct so I can mail this when I have to take my wife into town this afternoon. I can save a day by rushing but it means less detail. I have an abundance of legal ~~xxx~~ records to work over from Jim in the same mail and we are in court. In all cases, I add, with considerable success.

It is natural to assume that there is much that Ray can say and prove. I am certain it is factually incorrect and that while he without doubt has some suspicions, he is without proof and is today in jail only because he has no proof. He was offered several deals, one with a threat, the other to turn him loose in England if he would talk.

I will come to my knowledge of the Rays. First I want you to know that while I am not going to give the contents of my new book away I am certain that Ray was not at the scene of the crime when it was committed and for this reason alone can't prove anything. I'm now saving my proof of this for the book, which is neither a revision nor an update and in fact has few references to Frame-Up.

I am also certain that he was in the hands of any organized and well-financed gang whose interests were best served by letting him know as little as possible. He may be able to identify a few people but I doubt it. Not by name in any event.

Right now he is desperate and will say anything. I know from the past what some of this will be and it is not what a responsible journalist would want to air. What he and his brother Jerry used in the past is crap. It was checked out. Jimmy's knowledge comes from checks made for him by others who in no case were either dependable or capable. I don't know one I'd trust on this. He would not provide me with these leads. This in itself is suspicious. There will be unsubstantiated suggestions of union involvement and allegations of far-left and mid-east connections. Two reporters with whom I've worked for years checked the latter out and concluded there is nothing to it. He can't prove the first, it is my own idea and I've done my own work on it. This work is not complete but has yielded some sensational stuff it would now be premature to use in any way.

Despite what I regard as poor manners, given CBS' staff facilities, and an unjournalistic lack of appreciation of a fellow journalist's concern with principle and integrity, I agree with your estimate of ~~xxxx~~ Rather. I have no basis for not agreeing with you on Werahba. And I have no objection to your showing this to them. If I thought for a minute that what you have in mind would be or even could be honest journalism at this stage I'd be for it. I am positive that anything of this nature at this time would serve the interests of those who for so long have been obfuscating all of this. Besides, aside from the lousy journalism it would make it would be a serious intrusion into the processes of justice. The combination is bad, hurtful except to those CBS won't expose and never has on such subjects. If you insist on making the proposal and they want to talk to me I'll be as frank as I can be but I'll have the need for some of it to be in complete confidence. You know how frank I can be and how informative.

Remember that unlike CBS, which had the financing and the other capabilities and did not really use the FOIA, I am in court on this, with serious requests only and for significant evidence only. Showmanship is not one of my interests. I do not believe that now and on this it serves any national interest. I don't want any creeping around by people who may be of exceptional professional competence but lack the basic knowledge

required for responsibility and discrimination on this complicated subject and with these complicated people of complicated motive. So I do have an interest in not having all the work I've done, countless thousands of hours, ruined by a spectacular nothing. Nor do I want any pressures of this kind in the current litigation, which is progressing well without any help from CBS or any reporting by anyone. This, too, is an enormous and costly effort I believe it is not unreasonable to want to be left alone so it can work its way to as natural an end as the court and the power and the disposition to use that great power against me will permit.

In time, as you know, I will be making all of that available.

As you also know I have my own way of measuring CBS in this. I gave them much. They were too yellow to use it. It was solid, official evidence, not just my own opinion. I did give them copies. Naturally with this experience I have not provided any copies since. In time I will, not pieces but whatever I get in the end.

In this I am not suggesting suppressing anything. I am saying that it just is not possible to not intrude wrongly into the processes of justice with such an interview and I am saying that the interview itself will be without journalistic value or substance and will be a sideshow-freak approach regardless of intent.

I intend nothing personal with the following comment. I speak fact only. For all its wealth, power and influence CBS has been dishonest in its journalism on the political assassinations. It not only has turned fact around and refused to air what by any legitimate journalistic standard was news it has never, for example, asked me if I have anything newsworthy it can have. Often the answer might have been "yes." It might be now if something on which I'm working, the sale of a piece for fairly prompt appearance, comes to nothing. (Any ideas along that line?) It is something pretty definitive on JFK and never published. Very simple, too. Uncomplicated. I have a chain of possession on how I got it, as properly as one can get anything. No tricks. No leaks. Covering letters, checks in payment, etc. And some of the records are even handwritten. These are all copies of originals.

Ray has not fired me. He has not broken with Jim. He has to be in the hands of irresponsible and incompetent lawyers in his pending civil action. He has not been in touch with me on it but I do know his formulation. I'll have copies tomorrow. It is not good and it speaks very poorly for those who would file it. It is, in fact, incompetent, often irrelevant and in places from what was read to me unfactual. He is not only in a position that drives one to try anything, he also lacks first-hand knowledge and is, without the best of underinformed reporters having any way of knowing, what he has been told by the underdependables, some with the poorest records for integrity.

I don't know if he'll ask my opinion or listen to it as he has in the past. But I strongly encourage you to abandon this because the best one can hope for out of it is more whoring around. It can't possibly be helpful. At this juncture, with what I cannot now tell you about but is very real, it can be exceedingly bad. Neither you nor I would want to engage in what can be as bad as even good intentions will leave this kind of interview. In time you'll know. It is very current. It involves courts.

My specific knowledge on the surveillance does not involve you but also is not complete. My source does not know you or of you and the files are quite extensive. I was not being paranoid. I have pretty much assumed this but not its extent. We have walked much together but you have never seen me look around. You know how free I am on the phone and in letters. However, there is surveillance not as an exercise but because it can yield information. Sources is one, knowledge is another, and then there are plans and other things. Litigation is not self-indulgence or meaningless. It is one way of accomplishing legitimate objectives with some promise of its being a dramatic way. My concern with this is not my past which would have to be seriously misrepresented for it to defame me in any way. And my concern is with freedom. And why the hell all this extensive surveillance on one who writes non-fiction if the official story is true?
best,

Mr. Roger Feinman
CBS News - Radio
524 W 57 St.,
N.Y.C., N.Y. 10019

Dear Roger,

You are under a number of misapprehensions I hasten to correct so I can mail this when I have to take my wife into town this afternoon. I can save a day by rushing but it means less detail. I have an abundance of legal ~~mark~~ records to work over from Jim in the same mail and we are in court. In all cases, I add, with considerable success.

It is natural to assume that there is much that Ray can say and prove. I am certain it is factually incorrect and that while he without doubt has some suspicions, he is without proof and is today in jail only because he has no proof. He was offered several deals, one with a threat, the other to turn him loose in England if he would talk.

I will come to my knowledge of the Rays. First I want you to know that while I am not going to give the contents of my new book away I am certain that Ray was not at the scene of the crime when it was committed and for this reason alone can't prove anything. I'm now saving my proof of this for the book, which is neither a revision nor an update and in fact has few references to Frame-Up.

I am also certain that he was in the hands of any organized and well-financed gang whose interests were best served by letting him know as little as possible. He may be able to identify a few people but I doubt it. Not by name in any event.

Right now he is desperate and will say anything. I knew from the past what some of this will be and it is not what a responsible journalist would want to air. What he and his brother Jerry used in the past is crap. ~~It~~ was checked out. Jimmy's knowledge comes from checks made for him by others who in no case were either dependable nor capable. I don't know one I'd trust on this. He would not provide me with these leads. His in itself is suspicious. There will be unsubstantiated suggestions of union involvement and allegations of far-left and mid-east connections. Two reporters with whom I've worked for years checked the latter out and concluded there is nothing to it. He can't prove the first, it is my own idea and I've done my own work on it. This work is not complete but has yielded some sensational stuff it would now be premature to use in any way.

Despite what I regard as poor manners, given CBS' staff facilities, and an unjournalistic lack of appreciation of a fellow journalist's concern with principle and integrity, I agree with your estimate of Mark Rafter. I have no basis for not agreeing with you on Wershba. And I have no objection to your showing this to them. If I thought for a minute that what you have in mind would be or even could be honest journalism at this stage I'd be for it. I am positive that anything of this nature at this time would serve the interests of those who for so long have been obfuscating all of this. Besides, aside from the lousy journalism it would make it would be a serious intrusion into the processes of justice. The combination is bad, hurtful except to those CBS won't expose and never has on such subjects. If you insist on making the proposal and they want to talk to me I'll be as frank as I can be but I've have the need for some of it to be in complete confidence. You know how frank I can be and how informative.

Remember that unlike CBS, which had the financing and the other capabilities and did not really use the FOIA, I am in court on this, with serious requests only and for significant evidence only. Showmanship is not one of my interests. I do not believe that now and on this is serves any national interest. I don't want any crawling around by people who may be of exceptional professional competence but lack the basic knowledge

required for responsibility and discrimination on this complicated subject and with these complicated people of complicated motive. So I do have an interest in not having all the work I've done, countless thousands of hours, ruined by a spectacular nothing. Nor do I want any pressures of this kind in the current litigation, which is progressing well without any help from CBS or any reporting by anyone. This, too, is an enormous and costly effort I believe it is not unreasonable to want to be left alone so it can work its way to as natural an end as the court and the power and the disposition to use that great power against me will permit.

In time, as you know, I will be making all of that available.

As you also know I have my own way of measuring CBS in this. I gave them much. They were too yellow to use it. It was solid, official evidence, not just my own opinion. I did give them copies. Naturally with this experience I have not provided any copies since. In time I will, not pieces but whatever I get in the end.

In this I am not suggesting suppressing anything. I am saying that it just is not possible to not intrude wrongly into the processes of justice with such an interview and I am saying that the interview itself will be without journalistic value or substance and will be a sideshow-freak approach regardless of intent.

I intend nothing person^{al} with the following comment. I speak fact only. For all its wealth, power and influence CBS has been dishonest in its journalism on the political assassinations. It not only has turned fact around and refused to air what by any legitimate journalistic standard was news it has never, for example, asked me if I have anything newsworthy it can have. Often the answer might have been "yes." It might be now if something on which I'm working, the sale of a piece for fairly prompt appearance, comes to nothing. (Any ideas along that line?) It is something pretty definitive on JFK and never published. Very simple, too. Uncomplicated. I have a chain of possession on how I got it, as properly as one can get anything. No tricks. No leaks. Covering letters, checks in payment, etc. And some of the records are even handwritten. These are all copies of originals.

Ray has not fired me. He has not broken with Jim. He has to be in the hands of irresponsible and incompetent lawyers in his pending civil action. He has not been in touch with me on it but I do know his formulation. I'll have copies tomorrow. It is not good and it speaks very poorly for those who would file it. It is, in fact, incompetent, often irrelevant and in places from what was read to me unfactual. He is not only in a position that drives one to try anything, he also lacks first-hand knowledge and is, without the best of underinformed reporters having any way of knowing, what he has been told by the undependables, some with the poorest records for integrity.

I don't know if he'll ask my opinion or listen to it as he has in the past. But I strongly encourage you to abandon this because the best one can hope for out of it is mere whoring around. It can't possibly be helpful. At this juncture, with what I cannot now tell you about but is very real, it can be exceedingly bad. Neither you nor Kathar would want to engage in what can be as bad as even good intentions will leave this kind of interview. In time you'll know. It is very current. It involves courts.

My specific knowledge on the surveillance does not involve you but also is not complete. My source does not know you or of you and the files are quite extensive. I was not being paranoid. I have pretty much assumed this but not its extent. We have walked much together but you have never seen me look around. You know how free I am on the phone and in letters. However, there is surveillance not as an exercise but because it can yield information. Sources is one, knowledge is another, and then there are plans and other things. Litigation is not self-indulgence or meaningless. It is one way of accomplishing legitimate objectives with some promise of its being a dramatic way. My concern with this is not my past which would have to be seriously misrepresented for it to defame me in any way. And my concern is with freedom. And why the hell all this extensive surveillance on one who writes non-fiction if the official story is true?
best,

Mr. Roger Feinman
CBS News - Radio
524 W 57 St.,
N.Y.C., N.Y. 10019

Dear Roger,

You are under a number of misapprehensions I hasten to correct so I can mail this when I have to take my wife into town this afternoon. I can save a day by rushing but it means less detail. I have an abundance of legal ~~xxx~~ records to work over from Jim in the same mail and we are in court. In all cases, I add, with considerable success.

It is natural to assume that there is such that Ray can say and prove. I am certain it is factually incorrect and that while he without doubt has some suspicions, he is without proof and is today in jail only because he has no proof. He was offered several deals, one with a threat, the other to turn him loose in England if he would talk.

I will come to my knowledge of the Rays. First I want you to know that while I am not going to give the contents of my new book away I am certain that Ray was not at the scene of the crime when it was committed and for this reason alone can't prove anything. I'm now saving my proof of this for the book, which is neither a revision nor an update and in fact has few references to Franz-By.

I am also certain that he was in the hands of any organized and well-financed gang whose interests were best served by letting him know as little as possible. He may be able to identify a few people but I doubt it. Not by name in any event.

Right now he is desperate and will say anything. I know from the past what some of this will be and it is not what a responsible journalist would want to air. What he and his brother Jerry used in the past is crap. ^{It} was checked out. Jimmy's knowledge comes from checks made for him by others who in no case were either dependable or capable. I don't know one I'd trust on this. He would not provide me with these leads. This in itself is suspicious. There will be unsubstantiated suggestions of union involvement and allegations of far-left and mid-east connections. Two reporters with whom I've worked for years checked the latter out and concluded there is nothing to it. He can't prove the first, it is my own idea and I've done my own work on it. This work is not complete but has yielded some sensational stuff it would now be premature to use in any way.

Despite what I regard as poor manners, given CBS' staff facilities, and an unjournalistic lack of appreciation of a fellow journalist's concern with principle and integrity, I agree with your estimate of both. Rather, I have no basis for not agreeing with you on Werabba. And I have no objection to your showing this to them. If I thought for a minute that what you have in mind would be or even could be honest journalism at this stage I'd be for it. I am positive that anything of this nature at this time would serve the interests of those who for so long have been obfuscating all of this. Besides, aside from the lousy journalism it would make it would be a serious intrusion into the processes of justice. The combination is bad, hurtful except to those CBS won't expose and never has on such subjects. If you insist on making the proposal and they want to talk to me I'll be as frank as I can be but I've have the need for some of it to be in complete confidence. You know how frank I can be and how informative.

Remember that unlike CBS, which had the financing and the other capabilities and did not really use the FOIA, I am in court on this, with serious requests only and for significant evidence only. Showmanship is not one of my interests. I do not believe that now and on this is serves any national interest. I don't want any crawling around by people who may be of exceptional professional competence but lack the basic knowledge