

Dear Jim,

CBS/Ray evidence

11/15/75

I had time to skim the request for oral argument on 12/8 yesterday, page 1 only and without much retention because other matters were on my mind. However, I have given a hasty reading to Haynes' Brief to the Court of Criminal Appeals and do have a few suggestions if you and Bud are willing to make more effort. This can be an indirect means of achieving what Bud says he wants in all his assassination efforts. The work it would require of me I would do at the rate at which I have always been paid.

Before getting to what I have in mind a few suggestions.

I can't remember the name of the Boston judge who made a study and a report adopted by ABA on the press' intrusion into the processes of justice. I believe it is relevant in this case.

There is a point we have not made: the restrictiveness of CBS's request. If they are generally interested in reporting fact and if they are genuinely interested as they allege in the question of conspiracy, why do they limit themselves to what eliminate the major evidentiary questions of and evidence relating to conspiracy? I addressed several aspects of this to CBS. In short, the selection of the testing sought disproves the CBS claims. Example: cigarette butts, other fingerprints, FBI reports. Carrying this one step farther, why do they not request any kind of access to evidence known to exist (like fingerprints taken from car and found at the flophouse and motels of the DeSoto registration) not used in the guilty-plea hearing? Or the statements of witnesses would would not and did not say what was wanted of them? What time I could lengthen the list but the phone has gone crazy with the UPI wire story on yesterday's press conference, including ABC and NBC.

On the question of restraint on reporting I'd note there has been no denial of what I asked you to include and think you did, CBS's refusal to report this identical evidence when it was introduced in open court and there subject to cross-examination and rebuttal.

I think the CBS has been the one who has used the judicial process to hide the fact that with its vast manpower and wealth it has come up with no significant evidence not produced by the defense investigation and rather than admit its/this inability has contrived a fake situation to be able to hide the egg on its face by blaming everyone else, from the defense and the State to the courts for its own investigative and reportorial incompetence.

Don't forget that despite the efforts made officially to protect the Sirhan evidence the official claim now is that it has been tainted.

On the CBA and scientific tests: I held a press conference of which CBS was informed in which the release specifically stated that new scientific evidence would be made available on the JFK case (and was) and it is doing a JFK "special" but it was not present and in the next 24 hours (maybe they'll call yet?) had no question. Or, who stands in the temple of the Lord?

I'd then go further and label this all a cheap publicity stunt that a billion-dollar corporation can easily afford in which by its wealth it seeks to prostitute the courts and the judicial process for Madison Avenue reasons. The hearing is not to be until 12/8/75. The show is and was scheduled for 11/30, or prior to the hearing. (We can easily address the alleged questions of future principle if we need to.) I'd add that if there is to be any hearing there should be a full and unlimited one in which the long and one-sided record of CBS in such false claims and use and misuse of "science" and evidence becomes the issue with the intent to be a charge of something like contempt to misuse of the judicial process. They do have quite a record!...I find that Haynes' brief puts CBS in the position of arguing that the whole anti-Ray history is undependable. Hastily,