

FEB 15 1972

Notes on Bynum Shaw's "Are You Sure Who Killed Martin Luther King?", Esquire 3/72

Clearly an uninformed man, not knowing basic, most basic, fact, not even able to quote transcript accurately and quoting as the official transcript that which appears in Blair's book, complete with typo. error at one point checked, where I thought I recalled the error.

If not designed as answer to Frame-UP, is intended as defense of prosecution/government (indications of indirect or direct federal connection, masked with care) and a coloring of public attitudes, esp. with exceptional timing, when the subject is entirely dead except for a pending court decision, not referred to in article, as also earlier hearing in the process of getting a trial is not mentioned. In fact, the effort is ignored entirely, as I recall, which in and of itself is exceptional for one who says he is a reporter. Whether or not legally plagiarism, he has used P-W as source material, using what is in it alone in one case, and taking emphasis and interpretations that are in it alone. Considerable factual error, including on elemental details.

It is incredible that anyone could write any kind of article today on the Ray case without reference to me, my work, Bud, Bob Livingston and then to pretend that Stoner is the only defense lawyer when he is not, in fact, a defense lawyer. The effort to poison is obvious. The reason is not, but it can't be an accident, as few of these things can be.

Canale showed him the physical evidence, which he also says and Blackwell says, the prohibited by court order, and his office refused even to show me duplicates of pictures that are in evidence.

Canale and staff met him at airport, drove him around, let him tape, and they knew in advance what he would write. Contrast with refusal to let me have even the public evidence and the letter saying nobody would ever see what is not in the transcript, meaning that only the testimony, no exhibits, could be seen, ever.

He can't even have read the transcript. He has, for example, Canale presenting what Sawyer did. Someone took him by the literary hand, and the errors! Like saying he was there long enough to look at it and saying the retaining wall, which is concrete, is of brick! Or that the new law under which the conspiracy charge was contrived (lifted from P-U, is 10 years old. Or the point at which Ray departed from the script. Or the jazz about the rifle. Or that all the shrubbery had been removed, when only the two bushes that would, in fact, have hidden the car, had been when I was there a year ago. If they are all out now, that would ~~handsafechange~~ feels that Ray really intended to shoot King while on Main St., what about the essence of the alleged case, that he shifted from a front to a back room only so he could shoot King from there? (Canale also is quoted as saying there was positive identification of Ray renting the room, and there was not.)

All those in the Mo. pen when Ray was there were interviewed?

Business of buying the pistol by an ad is nonsense.

The black militants bit is emphasized now because that has for some time been the line the government would use when this case came apart. They did not jump and try to kill him in Memphis and he was not afraid of them. He returned, in fact, over the objections of all his people.

Stephens is quoted as saying he saw a stick in the man's hands, not what the official record shows. Source of quote should be located. Gracie is not the one paid for talking. That was Charlie, and it is not Hanes who found and interviewed her at the asylum.

Shaw Univ. Ill journalism student under present reporter for Wash Post.

Stuff he quotes from Hanes nor original Hanes re evidence.

Pretense of the other side very poor, as bushes had to be cut away for shot, nonsensical. Or, straw man?

If Hane did not put something about Battle in his book because Battle was dead, why does he give it to another to publish?

If Canale never heard the story that Ray expected a pardon, he never read the papers.

Deliberate, prejudicial use of Jerry. (Of the kind I'd warned him against.)

Spurce stuff serving of legal papers on King at Lorraine-true? Source?

How could a holdup in England have financed that long hejira in the US, Mexico and Canada?

And its net was negligible, as was that of the single other robbery attributed to him but not proven, in Canada, which leaves open all that US, Mexico and earlier Canadian travelling.

Further study should show more. BW