

10/6/72 Such things as the stupidities, inefficiencies and harshness of the workings of the law on our nephew's past have given us the kind of worry about him and his mother that sometimes makes reading and concentrating difficult. On these occasions we have looked to the tube for solace. Last night was an example. A paper that should have been delivered to or served on the kid on the 21st was taped to the window when his mother got home from work before he did. It calls for his appearance in court first thing this a.m., without time to get a lawyer and before the worst of possible judges. We'll be with him and there early to try and work out what should be possible. He's done nothing new that is bad or even wrong. But this is har on Lil through her sister, too. So, we looked at the TV program, and there was this new show, The Men (ABC). This segment, a full hour, The Delphi Bureau. Under similar circumstances we'd seen The Streets of San Francisco maybe a week ago (ABC). I think I've been wrong in the past to believe that TV had sunk to the bottom of the muck. Most of the crap of the past was done with a little professionalism. Some is the most professional on commercial TV. But this was as though beginning with the script and continuing through the casting everyone believed the only way anyone would look would be if a caricature emerged. I think the work was almost up to the nickelodian level. If ABC survives such new-season programming there will indeed be a testimonial of the American people to absorb any kind of abuse. And willingness too. However, one or two of the shows, you non-TVers, have had what for TV is radically new tolerance of touchy subjects. Not too long ago we saw some doctors program (the lawyers have lost out, but the doctors linger). It featured an abrasive American who had gone to China after getting a PhD in oriental languages and come back an expert in acupuncture and a Communist. It was one of the most open and thoroughgoing condemnations of the AMA, by name and repeatedly; of doctors as creatures of the past; of political stuffiness; of commercialism in medicine. Really ripped everything up. And the self-proclaimed red was really the hero. One of the doctors was so farright and a central character that there emerged a condemnation and exposure of the far-right, super-patriotism, anti-Communism, etc. One of the best scripts I've ever seen in terms of honesty and directness. Imagine that on NBC. ...Another show dealt with what was falsely advertised as wife-swapping. Again what an exposure of the workings of the radical right and individuals in it, with a real blast at those opposed to sex education in the schools. It wasn't wife-swapping but a single "indiscretion" by a bouncing wife. Some news story said there would be some of these changes. If they are not enough, I wonder if they betoken anything? There was a news story on how the administration is gutting public TV, but I think I forgot to clip that for you while intending to. The little that gets on those stations through the net they want to eliminate and the formula is to call it "local control" of programming. Meaning no net stuff available to local public TV

Just suppose you were somehow involved in the King killing and you heard Ray's lawyer say that Ray was going to talk as soon as he got into federal court (something already said by another lawyer who represented Ray and who you have to know is and was close to him), what would you want to do, what would you think your interest if not survival required? Or if you were the government and want to keep the lid on all of this? It isn't that Bud doesn't know this. I have gone over it in many ways and on several occasions. And I am responsible for his being Ray's lawyer!. H

OCT 9 1972

10/7/72 Unexpectedly I got a copy of the Enquirer dated 1-15 interview with Wecht. If it is less explicit on the CIA doing all the assassinations and Robert's alleged investigation than I'd been told, it is explicit in other scientific garbage and does confirm my earlier analysis of Cyril's ignorance of the most basic fact and what he seeks to commercialize. It is explicit in the potential for further harm; further exculpation of the guilty; further interpretation or misinterpretation as support of the official fiction (as in repeating that Oswald was one of the assassins and never suggesting he wasn't or could not have been); in saying that the brain and tissue slides "could settle whether the wounds resulted from shots from the rear"(!!!). It is all crappy rehash, with the retailing not selected with any discrimination and in no sense even indicating that he learned anything from his examination (which can be interpreted by others as meaning he had not). It would be less disagreeable if one could merely "hm, hum". HW

OCT 9 1972