

# CBS NEWS

*A Division of Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.*

524 WEST 57TH STREET • NEW YORK, N. Y. 10019 • PLAZA 1-2345

LESLIE MIDGLEY

*Executive Producer*


Dear Mr. Marcus:

Thanks for your informative letter of June 19, 1967.

I am afraid you are very much mistaken in attaching the importance you do to my alleged immediate identification of the picture as the man who shot Meredith. As you are aware, Mr. Richter had been in the office for several hours showing these pictures and had repeatedly pointed out the Meredith picture. When you showed me what you believe to be a picture of a rifleman, I then said--having just been over it with Mr. Richter--that it was a picture of the man who shot Meredith.

We appreciate your efforts to aid our project.

Yours very truly,



Mr. Raymond J. Marcus  
1249 Hi Point Street  
Los Angeles, California 90035

June 23, 1967

97 Beaumont Street  
Newtonville, Mass.  
July 14, 1967

Mr. Leslie Midgley  
CBS News  
524 West 57th Street  
New York, N.Y. 10019

Dear Mr. Midgley:

Thank you for your letter of June 23, 1967. It confirms fully the incident detailed in my letter of June 19, 1967, wherein I showed you an enlargement of the #5 image from the Moorman photo, and you promptly recognized it as a human form; despite your previous denials that you saw any man-like images in the several Moorman enlargements--including this one--shown to you earlier by Mr. Richter. The fact that you confused the Moorman #5 man with the man who shot Meredith is obviously not relevant to the question of whether or not you observed a human-appearing figure in the subject Moorman enlargement; a question which your prompt mis-identification answered immediately and affirmatively.

(In fact, and as you know, no portion of the Meredith photo--including his assailant--was visible to you when I showed you the Moorman #5 man. Therefore, your statement, "That's the man who shot Meredith" was made when you could see only the #5 man, and no other)

Since we are in agreement on the essential facts of the matter, our area of disagreement is limited to a matter of opinion; you feel the incident was not important, and I feel it was--and is--very important.

Of course, since our previous exchange of letters, the four-part CBS program on the assassination, of which you were executive producer, has been presented to the public. It is not my purpose here to undertake a detailed critique of this alleged documentary. To fully expose the entire patchwork of distortions, half-truths, evasions, invalid tests and irrelevancies would--quite literally--require a book-length study. Suffice it to say that the programs employed, in fullest measure, all the techniques normally utilized by sophisticated Warren Commission defenders, as enumerated in my June 19 letter. Also, it fully confirmed the substance of Eleanor Roberts' article in the Boston Traveler, April 19, 1967, which indicated quite clearly that the CBS project was inspired less by concern for the truth, than by a desire to resuscitate the Warren Commission's conclusions.

Central to CBS's theme, no less than the Warren Commission itself, was the denigration or avoidance of the numerous indications that some shots were fired from the direction of the grassy knoll. It is quite obvious that all of CBS's efforts to support the Commission in this regard would immediately have been placed in serious jeopardy, had you decided to include in the program--under proper viewing conditions, and with appropriate commentary -- the enlargement of Moorman #5 man, which you yourself had observed with sufficient clarity to have confused him with Meredith's assailant. This is particularly true, not only because #5 man

appears to be holding a straight object, but also because of the stated position of an important Warren Commission spokesman that there were no people in the subject area -- a position which was known to you.

Of course, it cannot be said that your program completely omitted the Moorman photograph. In the third installment, Mike Wallace briefly showed a reproduction of it, one of a number of duplicates Mr. Richter had ordered, in various stages of enlargement, as a result of his earlier meeting with me in Boston. Contrary to Mr. Wallace's statement, what he showed was not a ". . . blowup of an area . . .", but the smallest version of the Moorman photo from the many furnished through my cooperation to CBS.


Mr. Wallace said of the picture, "If there are men up there behind the wall, they definitely cannot be seen with the naked eye".

I would differ with him on that, with respect to man #2 and man #5; for I submit these two images are visible, with careful study, even in this small version. But it is unquestionably the case that, as displayed on your program, the television audience had no chance of observing the subject images; because in this version of the photo, their faces are little more than 1/16" in size.

Your decision to show only that version of the Moorman photograph in which the subject images are the tiniest and least visible, instead -- for example -- of showing the enlargement of #5 man which you mistook for the Meredith assailant, indicates something less than enthusiasm for an objective presentation of this important evidence.

Regardless of how you or I may evaluate this matter, the importance of the "Midgley incident" will remain for others to judge.

Very truly yours,



Raymond J. Marcus