Mr. Jemes iudeens
wron Broaderst ifouse
Hachington, D.C.
Dear inir. Hudgens,
Once egain RMP-TV hes teicon opartisan position on a controversiel subject, presontine the preconceptiona of tis coners ant the lect of information and understandine of ite eteffes "fact".

I refer to Edalo Gellugher's broedcest of clay Dlair, Jr, tocey, in which, as is hic richt, he presentod a cheap pot-boilar as the detinitive work on the zay case and the trial as the meana of anding suppreastion of the fact. The bo $k$, elso, is $\% \mathrm{r}$. Gallagher's sycophontic vien, ends suppression. Actuelly, the author knows as 11 tile es tha book sfye soout tho merains of the mistitriel nd what mas there peosentea.

In eny evort, you $h$ ve atain presented a folso view of g controversial neticuel isaue, presented a pertisan one, and acin ask for an ecual
 be out of town.

Your stetion in onsistant fin taking : aisguised editorisl viem an
 pertienar, suphressed whet it onull o: citicten 6 the oficiel crcuined "fact", hae ordered ite reviewars not to revie: boosis not consistent rith ite agreomant ith the ofticial line and hes evoideu reporting tas nombon tise
 Sincsrely,

