

**Welcome to *Black Op Radio*, the voice of political conspiracy research.  
And now your hosts: Anita Langley and Len Osanic.**

**LEN**

Hello, Anita. Good evening.

**ANITA**

Hi.

**LEN**

Another show. Show Twelve.

**ANITA**

Yes it is.

**LEN**

Great. Tonight we're privileged to have Mr. Jamie Scott Enyart. He was at the Ambassador Hotel the night Robert Kennedy was assassinated, and we're just going to try getting him on the line now.

Scott, are you there?

**SCOTT**

Hi, Len.

**LEN**

Great! Can you hear us okay?

**SCOTT**

Yes, I can. How are you?

**LEN**

Not too bad.

**SCOTT**

Good.

**LEN**

And our co-host, Anita...

**ANITA**

Hi.

**SCOTT**

Hi, Anita. How are you?

**ANITA**

Great. Great to have you here.

**SCOTT**

Good. Glad to be here.

**LEN**

Let's just go back and give listeners a brief overview. When Robert Kennedy was in the Ambassador Hotel, you were a young photographer there taking pictures. You ended up in the pantry...?

**SCOTT**

Well, yeah. I was fifteen years old. I was on my high school paper and I was assigned to photograph the victory speech of Robert F. Kennedy, as well as I was campaigning for Robert F. Kennedy out of his campaign headquarters here on Wilshire Boulevard. So, I was familiar with the candidate. I'd met him before.

And I was very familiar with the Ambassador Hotel, because I'd spent a lot of time there swimming in the swimming pool there with a friend of mine who I went down there with, who belonged to a club there. It was called the 'Sun Club,' it was an athletic club. So I used to hang around and I knew my way in and out and all the different rooms and

all the doors and everything around the Ambassador Hotel.

So we made sure to find out exactly where Kennedy would be. We were up in his room before he came down. We knew where the pantry was and we were prepared to sneak into the Embassy Room if we had to. It ended up [that] we got press passes, so we had full access to it.

**LEN**

Oh, so did you get to meet him beforehand?

**SCOTT**

I had met him the day before, when he was walking around on the grounds there at the Ambassador, or next to it. We would say hi to him. He was staying down at the beach, at John Frankenheimer's house; and then they would have rooms there at the Ambassador Hotel, sort of for official functions and things. And he would come there during the day and do things. His kids would swim in the pool and stuff. Then they would go back to the Frankenheimer house. John Frankenheimer dropped him off at the hotel, in fact, for this event -- for the speech -- at around five thirty, I think.

**LEN**

Right, and then he would have what you would call a hospitality suite.

**SCOTT**

That's right. They had three rooms up on the sixth floor. They had two adjoining suites and then a room across the hall. Across the hall they were set up with an interview room. They had lights in there and everything. So ABC News and -- there were a lot of reporters who were assigned to him for the campaign, so they would be -- he would pop in and out, back and forth, across the room.

So we went upstairs. We took the fire escape stairs up. We knew what room he was in. We would hang out in the hallway and when he would walk back and forth we would say hi to him or something, just sort of poke our heads in the room.

It was a very friendly atmosphere. There was no Secret Service at the time. There was a little bit of private security, you had a few guys that sort of took care of -- a Rosie Greer kind of thing. People who would, you know, move people out of the way. But there was no official bodyguard situation for the Kennedys.

**LEN**

So it was probably exciting to meet him, then.

**SCOTT**

It was very exciting. For me, it was an opportunity. I wanted to be, you know, the big press photographer, and all the big photographers were there. There were about two hundred photographers from all around the world, big guys from LIFE Magazine, Bill Eppridge, people like that, and so, you know. I had a press pass on; we could go anywhere. We could go in the press room, we could go backstage, you know, and mingle with these guys, and ask for tips and advice and stuff, and watch what they were doing.

So after we saw Kennedy upstairs, we went downstairs.

Kennedy was involved in three primaries -- there was the California primary and then two others -- and so they were waiting for the returns to come in on the other primaries, even though it appeared he had won in California. So he didn't come downstairs until after midnight. And we arrived there around six or seven o' clock, so we were all over the hotel. And then finally, starting around ten o' clock, I took up position right in front of the podium -- about five feet back from right in front of the podium -- and just held my ground there until he came back, until he came down at a little after twelve o' clock.

**LEN**

And they announced that he had in fact won.

**SCOTT**

Right. They announced that he had won, then they brought him on stage. They brought his wife up on stage with him. He gave a speech, it was very exciting, everybody cheering and everything. A very casual speech. I was very impressed with how -- you know, he didn't sit there and read some scripted thing, you know, he related to the audience. He spoke about all the people: Cesar Chavez was on stage with him, Paul Schrade from the United Auto Workers union, and so he referred to everyone. He was very comfortable with everybody.

And then time came to leave the stage. And normally they would have gone off to stage left out to a doorway to the parking lot. They were supposed to go off to an event at a nightclub called The Factory, in West Hollywood, for a victory party. And what happened -- because Kennedy came on stage so late, he was advised by someone on stage not to go out into the parking lot but to come back through and go into the press

room where the radio guys were, because if he didn't go back and talk to the radio people and the print press people, he wouldn't make the morning papers. Because he had come down so late, everyone was behind schedule. So as he left stage he went off to the right to go back to the press room, instead of leaving the auditorium. And that's really what, uh, you know, sealed his fate. Had he gone out the other way, he would've missed Sirhan entirely.

So he went off stage, and went off to what would be stage right. All the press photographers and all the film photographers and -- you know, there was no video tape back then, so there was no cameras running -- they all went off to pack up their equipment and were headed for their cars.

Because I didn't have the same kind of deadline, I followed the candidate and went backstage through these two doors where you go back to the kitchen area. And I followed Bobby Kennedy back into the pantry area and, uh, was photographing him along the way as we went. And that's when, you know, everything broke loose.

I was about ten feet behind him taking pictures and he was being escorted by a security guard, Eugene Thane Cesar, who was holding his arm. And as he was walking through and had his back to me, I was photographing, and all of a sudden there were all these popping noises -- and, you know, people were stomping on balloons and everything, and I had no idea what gunfire sounded like. I was fifteen years old.

**LEN**

Now -- I hate to interrupt you so let's just try to do this politely. First of all, you said that he was led by a security guard?

**SCOTT**

Yeah, there was a security guard, Eugene Thane Cesar, and there were a couple of off-duty guys from Lockheed who were private security force who were brought in. There were no police there. And so, to help him get through the crowd, this guy Eugene Thane Cesar was holding him by his right elbow and sort of escorting him through the pantry, sort of clearing people out of the way. And, uh, Rosie Greer, who was in front of him, kind of pushing the crowd out of the way.

But Bobby Kennedy stopped there in the pantry area -- there were all these hispanic Mexican workers who were working in the kitchen, who couldn't come out and hear the speech -- and Bobby Kennedy stopped and spoke to all these people, and started shaking hands. I remember being impressed with the fact that he would stop and after, you know, this long evening here, when he could go off and party with his friends, he was spending

time talking with these people who he was obviously concerned with, you know, being involved in the political process.

**LEN**

I think for those of us who, uh, looked into it, we know the name Eugene Thane Cesar. But I was not aware that that's who escorted him.

**SCOTT**

Yeah. Yeah. He was holding him by the hand -- by the elbow, and moving along in the crowd. In fact when Kennedy was shot, and finally ended up on the ground, he was holding Eugene Thane Cesar's tie in his hand. It was a clip-on tie and he had ripped it off, grabbed hold of his tie on his way falling to the ground, and was holding it in his hand as he fell to the ground.

**LEN**

Yeah. Right.

Now, at what point were you taking photos? Right when this was happening?

**SCOTT**

Yeah, I was taking photos as they were walking. I saw him, you know, in silhouette, and he would turn from side to side shaking hands, and I was getting him -- his profile, as he was shaking hands. He turned one time to the left and was shaking hands. I remember all of a sudden he just dropped from the frame, he just fell. And so I followed him down, and it was all this chaos. I took a few pictures then.

Uh, people started falling backwards on top of me -- in fact, Paul Schrade fell backwards and knocked me down. He was shot in the forehead. And as I fell backwards, I got up and jumped up on a table which was in the corner of the pantry, and I continued taking pictures of everything that was taking place down there where Kennedy fell.

But I thought he had slipped and fallen, I thought he had fainted. I had not related to the fact that he'd actually been shot at that time.

Once I was up on the table and people started screaming, and there were other victims -- 'I've been shot, I've been shot' -- it became very evident that it was much worse than it was.

**LEN**

That's astounding, because -- for those of us who may not feel that Sirhan Sirhan fired the fatal shots, that means that everyone behind him -- you had clear photos of that.

**SCOTT**

That's correct.

**LEN**

You know, and more than one -- a series of photos you were taking up to there. Approximately how many do you think you took?

**SCOTT**

I took about eighteen to twenty pictures in the pantry area.

**LEN**

Eighteen to twenty in the pantry?

**SCOTT**

Yeah. So during the actual shooting there was probably four to six pictures as he's falling, and then the rest of them in the chaos afterwards, as people are scrambling and moving around.

**LEN**

And -- in what time frame, would you say, from when you first noticed Kennedy falling to when the shooting stopped, how long would that interval be?

**SCOTT**

The actual shooting probably took place in a period of just a few seconds. It was very rapid. I know that people immediately jumped -- I mean, there's no doubt that Sirhan walked in that room with a gun and emptied it in the general direction of Bobby Kennedy. Whether or not he had blanks in the gun, whether or not any of his shots hit Bobby Kennedy, you can argue about, but there's no doubt -- and there are a lot of witnesses -- he came in there, he pulled his gun out and he fired.

The problem is, he was standing in front of Bobby Kennedy the entire time, from about

three feet away from him at waist level, when all the shots that killed Bobby Kennedy were point blank behind his ear, to his neck and to his back. And that's where Eugene Thane Cesar was standing. And Eugene Thane Cesar pulled his weapon. That's an interesting thing about -- once I was up on the table and all of this chaos took place, what I saw was -- I never saw Cesar pull his gun out and shoot Kennedy, but I did see him get up and his weapon was already out.

And so he had drawn his weapon at some point, and so -- whether or not he accidentally shot Bobby Kennedy trying to return fire and kill Sirhan, or whether he attempted to assassinate Bobby Kennedy, you know, nobody could tell at this point. But we do know that there was more than one gun in that pantry. We know by the bullet count -- the official bullet count from the LAPD and the FBI which is, you know, anywhere from ten to fourteen bullets. Well, you know, that's more than eight, and there were only eight bullets in Sirhan's gun. The bullet that came out of Bobby Kennedy's head could never be identified as having come from Sirhan's gun. So we know that the bullet that killed Bobby Kennedy could not be tied to Sirhan's gun either in caliber or weight, nor in position of how it was fired in the pantry that night.

**LEN**

Right, due to the powder burns on the back of his head.

**SCOTT**

That's right. It was a contact wound. And Sirhan was nowhere tall enough and nowhere near enough to Bobby Kennedy at that time to get in that position.

**LEN**

And this is astounding information because, as you say, if anyone looks into it, they find that the police recovered up to fourteen possible bullets.

**SCOTT**

That's correct.

**LEN**

And then, when they take out the ceiling tiles and the frame of the doorway and whatnot, where the bullets were lodged in -- these things have subsequently been destroyed.

**SCOTT**

That's right. And the bullet -- there's one bullet that was supposedly in pretty good shape, that they could have tested. [It] was recently checked up at the Archives and it's been covered in grease. Once it's been covered in grease you can no longer test fire the bullet.

So, bullets have been moved, you know. They've been altered. The evidence at the Archives that we proved during our trial, they changed evidence numbers, they took my photographs and Evidence Number 24 and 25, which once held a bullet and a shell casing, now all of a sudden were a proof sheet and a roll of film. So all kinds of fooling around up there at the archives from the LAPD and the FBI, which came out in our trial. The evidence has just been altered and changed in so many ways, and that trail of evidence has been so poor, in terms of who touched what and who signed off on what, that the police have pretty much made sure that nobody can come to any other conclusion other than the one they came to, which was that Sirhan was their sole assailant.

**LEN**

Yeah, but this destruction of evidence goes almost past the word 'malicious,' it's, you can't -- it's like the Warren Commission. You can't say that they made mistakes. They have purposely --

**SCOTT**

They dry-cleaned Bobby Kennedy's suit. Before trial. They took the wood door panels where bullets were fired and destroyed them because they said they wouldn't fit in the file cabinet. This is the kind of excuses they're giving. They burned two thousand four hundred photographs three weeks before Sirhan's trial in a hospital incinerator. Uh --

**LEN**

How many -- how many was that again?

**SCOTT**

Two thousand four hundred photographs.

**LEN**

Right. And I think, uh, somebody said it was a stack a foot and a half tall.

**SCOTT**

Exactly. Of photographs. And they had no I.D. numbers, there were no recording of

these photographs. And we put these police officers on the stand -- not only did they acknowledge doing this, but they said they did this on a regular basis. And so this is destroying photographic evidence before Sirhan even goes to trial, with evidence that hasn't even been logged in an official way.

**ANITA**

So would you say, from what you've seen -- and I guess you would say -- that this is a normal way that police treat evidence?

**SCOTT**

Well, you know, when you talk about conspiracies -- and my trial was never about conspiracy, otherwise we never would have gotten to court. We kept it as a simple property case. The police department took my film, they didn't give it back and so either replace it or pay for it. That's how we were successful in the courts.

In terms of a conspiracy, you can be part of a conspiracy without knowing you *are* part of that conspiracy. People can operate in a way because they're given orders which fulfill the needs of a conspiracy, without them consciously going, 'Hey, I'm a conspirator, and I'm trying to do this to, you know, upset the government,' or whatever. And I think a lot of that took place in this case.

There was this rush to judgement. You have to consider that we have had Martin Luther King killed, we have had John F. Kennedy killed, and so the order came down in this Bobby Kennedy shooting, from Washington, from the FBI, within moments of the assassination that, 'We don't want another Dallas.'

And so they wanted to make sure, the LAPD, they say, 'Well look, we caught the guy with his gun,' collect all the evidence and say, 'This guy did it. And let's just get this guy to trial and get him into a jail cell and we've done our job.' And so they destroyed everything that didn't point directly to Sirhan having done it.

And so they weren't so much malicious in what they were doing, they were really convinced they had the right guy, but in the process they destroyed all this evidence of all these outside influences that would have told us why Sirhan was there and whether or not there were other guns or any other thing involved in this and whether it was a much larger thing than just one, you know, crazed Jordanian immigrant with a grudge.

**LEN**

Yeah, but -- I wouldn't hold that opinion. I would -- from what I understand of [Special

Unit] Senator, and testimony from some of the cross-examination of witnesses and how they brow-beat people -- I would say that there was several insiders that, like you say, using people that may not have known they were used, but -- this was an operation. A covert operation. Which was rampant, I think, in L.A.

**SCOTT**

Right, I'm just saying, at the level that I was operating, and at the level we kept our trial and everything, we stayed away from all that. That's the only way we were able to get a trial to the court. Had we raised these issues like you're talking about, they would have said, 'Oh, they're crazy conspiracy nuts, get 'em out of here.' So we used basically they're own tactics -- 'clean police work' -- to bring this thing forward and expose enough of it.

So we were able to get into trial, seven weeks of trial, and put these people on the stand who had never been on the stand before and, like you say, willing or unwilling participants in a conspiracy -- and get them to lay this story out and put it into the public record.

**LEN**

Right.

So let's talk about your trial, now. When did you first take the police to trial?

**SCOTT**

Well, what happened was -- I was taken at gunpoint, at the hotel. Someone had told the police that I was taking pictures during the actual shooting, a woman named Joan Barr. There was a police report filed. So I was taken by police. I was held at the hotel. I was transferred to Ramparts Station and questioned. My film and my camera were taken. They told me that my film was sealed for twenty years. That it was used as evidence at Sirhan's trial and that I could not get to it until 1988.

Well, in 1988, I -- I waited all that time and then I wrote letters and officially asked for my film back. One of the first things we found out was that there *was* no twenty-year sealing of the evidence -- that was just the LAPD saying that there was because they didn't want anyone to go near it. But no judge, no government body had officially sealed this evidence. The LAPD just decided that the public and the press shouldn't be able to look at this.

So in 1988 everything was transferred to the California State Archives. Through my letters the archives were searched and, as a result of that, I got a letter from the

California State Archives, from the chief archivist Mr. Metzger, stating that my photographs -- not only were they not there, but it was the opinion of the California State Archives that the police had burned -- they'd destroyed my film along with these two thousand four hundred other photographs that were destroyed at the time.

It was then that I took legal action and actually sued the LAPD, the State of California, FBI, whatever entities we had to sue in order to get them to produce the records and produce the witnesses to discover where my film was.

**LEN**

And this is 1988?

**SCOTT**

1988. So we wound through the courts, through the appeals courts. We were thrown out on statute of limitations. They said, 'You waited too long.' Well, we waited twenty years because we thought the film was theirs. So we were reinstated by the courts, so that our trial could go through. We didn't go to trial until 1996.

**LEN**

I have a quick question -- did you have that in writing, then, from the L.A. police? That there was a twenty year limit on it?

**SCOTT**

No, they never admitted that. It was admitted in court, so it's in our court records, but the LAPD had never admitted to that fact, other than on the stand.

**LEN**

Right. And to back up further one second -- when you were detained, and the film was confiscated, what would you describe that treatment like?

**SCOTT**

I was treated very well. I was taken along with, you know, Rosie Greer and George Plimpton, a lot of other witnesses who were there in the pantry. The police treated us, you know, actually very well. I was fifteen years old, I was all shook up and scared. At that age, you know, the police department was my friend. You know, uh, in every aspect of my life. I'd never had bad dealings with them or anything. And so, uh, they were very

comforting to me and, 'Oh, we're going to take care of you,' and they called my parents and everything. They questioned me at great length and they gave me back my camera and said, 'We're going to take care of your film,' and everything and then, you know, I went on my way.

It was after that point, when I came back to the LAPD the following morning and said, 'Gee, I'd like a receipt for the fact that you took my film,' and it was the following day that I noticed things were a little bit strange -- when they said, 'We have absolutely no record of your ever being here.' And that continued on through the twenty year period, where they were less and less likely to return my phone calls and, you know, came from, 'Oh yeah, Scott, we remember you,' to, you know, 'We don't know who you are,' after twenty years. And that's why we ended up filing the lawsuit, because of the way we were being treated.

**LEN**

And was that always by a certain spokesman? Did you talk to several policemen, or --

**SCOTT**

Well, I spoke specifically with the police officer who took me into custody and then specifically with the detectives of Special Unit Senator. And most of those guys retired along the way, there. So by the time we got to twenty years out I was talking to absolute strangers and whoever the political officials happened to be who were in charge of getting rid of this -- which ended up being the City Attorney's office. And that's where things started to get ugly, when the City Attorney's office not only -- uh, when people who were working in that office started, you know, sort of ignoring us, but they then hired an outside law firm -- this guy Skip Miller out of Century City, which they paid, you know, over a million dollars to. To, uh, basically just get rid of our case. And that's when things started turning ugly.

**LEN**

Hold it -- so they paid an outside attorney --

**SCOTT**

Yes.

**LEN**

Not the City Attorney.

**SCOTT**

That's right, and the City Attorney's office has, you know, over two hundred some-odd lawyers. Apparently none of them were good enough to fight this simple property case. So they hired this guy Skip Miller, who is Mayor [Joseph] Reardon's personal attorney. He got the Rodney King cops off on their trial, on their federal trial. He got Nate Holden, the City Councilman here, off on sexual harassment charges. He got Michael Jackson out of his child molestation charges, bought his way out of that. This guy's, you know, a real wheeler-dealer, and charges big bucks.

So they spent well over a million dollars during our trial, close to two million dollars now, going into a second trial, uh, in trying to attack us. Basically it turned from trying to find my film to personal attacks on me and my integrity and what I do for a living and me as a human being. And it got very ugly.

**LEN**

Oh my -- I can't believe that, a *million dollars*. Okay, so we're in 1988 --

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

And you're taking your first case to -- who'd you subpoena?

**SCOTT**

We brought in Thomas Noguchi, we brought in Ted Charach, who's the great granddaddy of conspiracy theories. Uh, you know, we brought in my father, photographic experts, uh, you know, absolutely everybody who was pertinent to this case. We even brought in Bernard Parks, because he was the assistant deputy at the time. And the judge refused to allow him in. Half the LAPD brass showed up on the day Bernard Parks was supposed to be on the stand -- no one knew that he was going to be our new police chief. Of course, they knew within the *government* that this guy was up, but it would look bad for him to be on the stand and have to expose any secrets. So they moved, you know, mountains to make sure Bernard Parks was not put on the stand during our trial.

It was a tremendous amount of political influence that went along with this. And the city, what they didn't realize -- they thought this was a simple property case and that they

were going to be able to crush me and get rid of me. And we were very well-prepared for this trial and had all the research.

The problem was when they hired this guy Skip Miller out of Century City, he knew nothing about photography, and he knew nothing about the Robert F. Kennedy assassination. And they claimed at the beginning of the trial that there was no way we were going to talk about what took place during the assassination that night. All they were going to talk about was what happened to the film afterward.

And every witness we would put on, we were able to bring out everything that happened that night, during the Kennedy trial. Paul Schrade testified for us -- he was shot in the forehead during this whole unfortunate thing. So we had a lot of people who were there that night. Ted Charach, who brought to life exactly what happened, what happened in that pantry.

The opposition brought in Bill Eppridge, *LIFE* -- uh, *Time* photographer. Um, Denson, a photographer from --

**LEN**

Okay, you're going very quick! [chuckles] We've got to slow you down a bit. You subpoenaed these people -- did you bring in any of the detectives that interviewed you that night?

**SCOTT**

Yes, we brought in two of the detectives who were there.

**LEN**

So they were still on duty? Or were they retired --

**SCOTT**

No, no, they were retired. Um, Shields was one of them. And these were the guys who we put on the stand, and they admitted that they'd took me into custody. They basically admitted everything, all the way down the line.

**LEN**

So they confirmed what happened.

**SCOTT**

Exactly. They always would confirm what happened. We had so many documents out of the California Archives that the LAPD had turned over, part of the problem was -- during the trial was that we couldn't produce the officer who signed these documents. The other side would claim, 'Well, that's, you know, how do we know that's from the LAPD?' Well, the LAPD put in the California State Archives and said it was from the LAPD! But we had to bring in the people who actually signed the documents, many of whom were retired or dead, in order to bring that in.

So they stripped our case early on of documents that stated, 'he was in the pantry,' 'he was on a table,' 'he was taking pictures during the shooting,' a lot of that never got to the jury, we had to prove that through other means. But fortunately we had the actual tape recording of my interview with the police, and we got that from the California State Archives, and on that taped interview I draw a map for the detectives as to where I went, where I was, and what I was photographing the entire time, and once the jury heard that and that was confirmed by the officers who were there, that's pretty much what sealed the fate and that's why we won that jury trial.

**LEN**

Okay, so that was in 1988?

**SCOTT**

That was in 1996 that the trial took place.

**LEN**

Oh! So it took -- several years --

**SCOTT**

Twenty years for us to --

**LEN**

No, but you first started in 1988, it took another --

**SCOTT**

That's right.

**LEN**

Eight years, or whatever.

**SCOTT**

That's right. Before we got to trial.

**LEN**

In '96 you got a jury trial.

**SCOTT**

We got a jury trial. And we won that, a jury verdict. We won over half a million dollars from the city.

**LEN**

So, okay, can you tell me a little bit more about the final verdict on this one?

**SCOTT**

Well, the final verdict -- they found that the LAPD had altered and changed evidence, that they had not been honest, and the value of this film was tremendous.

And that the, uh -- well, the other thing that was interesting was that, during trial, just before trial, they claimed that they'd found my film. They claimed that in the California State Archives they found my film. Now, they went up there on their own, they took a police officer with them who was with me the night of the assassination and all of a sudden they claimed, 'We've got a roll of film here that's Scott Enyart's, and we've got a piece of paper here signed by the police officer who took him into custody, a police report that claims this is his film.' And so we insisted that these documents be brought to court for us to examine.

Well, it was brought to court and on the way to the courthouse, the courier was robbed. He was robbed just out of LAPD jurisdiction, up there by the airport. And this poor courier was sitting in his car and all of a sudden some guy slashes the tires of his car, he pulls over, they reach in the back and steal the briefcase with the film and the evidence in it, and this guy shows up in court with nothing.

So they conveniently created film, they brought it down to court, and when it came time

to get it to court it conveniently disappeared.

**ANITA**

Wasn't this the second attempt to bring the film to court?

**SCOTT**

This was the second attempt they'd had to bring it to court. The first time they attempted to bring it to court, the courier brought it in, the police courier -- and the package had [already] been opened and examined, so the judge said, you know, 'This is spoiled evidence. Send it back.' So they sent it back to the California State Archives. It was re-inventoried, and it was sealed again, and the second time it came out it was stolen on its way to court.

Just ridiculous. And then we put this officer on the stand and presented the document to him that he had signed, and we asked him, well, when did you sign it? He said, 'Well, I don't remember.' We said, well, did you sign it twenty years ago, or did you sign it yesterday? And he could not remember, he just wouldn't talk.

**ANITA**

You mentioned Skip Miller before, and all his connections. I understand -- correct me if I'm wrong -- that he placed a call to find out what car company --

**SCOTT**

Oh yeah -- his office called that courier company. They wanted to know when the courier was arriving, what car he was renting, what color the car was, and what the route was he was taking to the courthouse.

So the suspicious stuff just goes back incredibly towards Miller and his boys.

**LEN**

I'm going to cut you off here for a second, okay? Can you go over that again? How did you find that out?

**SCOTT**

We put the courier on the stand. And we deposed him on videotape. And played it for the jury. And he stated that Skip Miller's office had called, and they wanted to know what

time the package was supposed to arrive, they wanted to know what time the flight arrived, they wanted a description of the courier, and they wanted to know what car he was renting and what color the car was --

**LEN**

What color the car was...

**SCOTT**

Yeah, and what route he was taking from the airport to the courthouse. Which is just ridiculous --

**LEN**

That's beyond unbelievable...

**SCOTT**

Yeah. We talked to the courier, the owner of the courier service, and he says, you know, 'In twenty-five years of delivering packages, the only questions I ever get are, when is it going to get here and how much is it going to cost. Nobody asks me what the route is, or what color the car is.'

So this was tremendously suspicious, and of course it took place in Culver City outside of LAPD jurisdiction, so we couldn't say it was LAPD cops.

And, you know, same thing happened when we went to appeal. When time came to appeal this, all of a sudden the entire clerk's record *disappeared from the courthouse*. It was stolen. The entire record, the clerk's record of our trial, had been stolen from the courthouse. So this had to be reconstructed through attorney's notes and things like this for the appeal process.

So they've been playing fast and loose with the facts through this whole process.

Skip Miller contacted the jury foreman. Took him to his office and took a statement from him. Well, while this guy's an impaneled juror, during deliberations.

**ANITA**

Isn't that strictly forbidden?

**SCOTT**

It's strictly forbidden. Skip Miller was taken before the California State Bar. He was charged with this crime, he was found guilty of it. His defense was -- oh yeah, the First Amendment. He had the right to talk to anybody that he wanted to. And he blamed it on an associate. He claimed that another lawyer in his office had looked up the wrong statute and given him the wrong information.

And that associate has since then been made full partner in his law firm. If somebody had actually caused Skip Miller to jeopardize his license, he would have been found dead in the parking lot of that law firm. But instead this guy's been promoted to full partner.

So Skip Miller was found guilty by the California State Bar of what amounts to jury tampering. Illegal contact with a juror. It was just outrageous. His punishment was -- originally the prosecution wanted to take his license for at least two months. And he negotiated a deal, because he's Mister Hotshot, he ends up with one day of ethics training class -- was his punishment for contacting a juror in deliberations during a trial.

**LEN**

[laughs in amazement] Wow. I can't... unbelievable.

**SCOTT**

Yeah, it's just outrageous. The abuse of power, it's just... just truly offensive the way this thing has gone down.

**LEN**

Well, uh -- you're one of our quickest speaking guests, I've got to keep backing you up --

**SCOTT**

Sure.

**LEN**

Um. Pardon me about that. Now you mentioned the word appeal. So, the first trial, the jury found in your favor.

**SCOTT**

First trial jury found in our favor. They were found guilty, I believe it was fourteen different counts. So we were awarded over a half a million dollars from the city. And basically, since supposedly this film had been destroyed, there was nothing for them to hand over or anything like that. So we just waited. We went into the appeals process, the city spending more and more, you know, hundreds of thousands of dollars of city money --

**LEN**

Well what you're saying is the city appealed the decision --

**SCOTT**

That's right, the city appealed the decision.

**LEN**

They didn't want to pay.

**SCOTT**

They didn't want to pay. That's right. Despite the fact that they spent two, three times that in court [of] what the judgement was, they were not going to pay me one dime.

So we went into the appeals process, and in the appeals process they used the fact that -- they claimed the jurors had preconceived notions about the LAPD. One of the jurors had mentioned that members of the LAPD have routinely taken advantage of people in the minority community, in terms of falsifying evidence. Which ends up being true [in the case] of Ramparts Station, which is where I was taken, in fact. So the appeals court overturned our decision, based on juror misconduct. Juror misconduct, which was inspired by Skip Miller contacting the jury!

**LEN**

So they overturned your award --

**SCOTT**

That's right.

**LEN**

On juror misconduct, when *he* had been charged with -- he'd been charged --

**SCOTT**

That's right. He'd been charged. He'd been charged and found guilty --

**LEN**

He'd been [assigned] one day --

**SCOTT**

Of illegal contact with the jury.

**LEN**

And I haven't heard a word of this in the news.

**SCOTT**

That's right. That's right. It was all buried. Nothing came out.

So now we are facing our second trial. We are in preparation now to go back into court and fight this battle again. That's the decision I have to make right now, as to whether or not I want to go back into another seven weeks of trial and the kind of abuse we've been put through and the stress on my family and finances and everything.

They've been talking about settling out of court. There are negotiations going back and forth. But it's the same old dirty tricks. The same old ugly -- trying to silence me, 'Well, if we settle then you can't talk about it,' you know, this kind of thing. So we're back up there for round two.

**ANITA**

Sounds like quite a fight you've got on your hands...

**SCOTT**

Yeah, you know, you talk about thirty years out of my life here. It's something I really didn't want to do. I just wanted my film back. Every step of the way I turn to my attorneys and say, I don't want to go to court, I don't want to do this, and they keep going, 'Hey, we're winning, we keep winning! You can't back out now.' And if we hadn't

won at every stage of it, you know, I would have walked away a long time ago. But it just became so offensive the way we were being treated.

Originally it was about getting my film back. Then it became, you know, how can you treat me as a citizen, here? I come *voluntarily* and give you my film, shut up about it for twenty years -- go ahead and use it -- don't ask for anything, don't ask for anything back, just return my film. And instead of saying, 'Hey, let's go look for it,' and 'Thank you, you're a good citizen,' they start attacking me and my character.

I was forced to see a psychiatrist before trial. They claimed that I was, you know -- they went through my school records and claimed that I was, you know, a liar and a thief --

**LEN**

I'm going to cut you off here -- so, they were attacking you *personally*?

**SCOTT**

Oh yeah --

**LEN**

What kind of questioning would be brought on?

**SCOTT**

I was forced to see a psychiatrist. They claimed that, uh, because it took me a long time to read in elementary school or something, that I couldn't tell time, and I was some perpetual liar -- so my testimony couldn't be trusted. I had to see a psychiatrist and was forced to take all sorts of humiliating, insulting examinations, you know -- 'Do you hate your father?' 'Did your dad kill your puppy when you were a kid?'-type questions. Over and over again, before trial. Of course, this was all thrown out by the judge, but I still had to go through it and I still had to hire my own psychiatrist to prove the opposite side and everything.

This was just done by Skip Miller's office as a way of wasting taxpayer money, a way of intimidating me and my family and trying to stop me from going through with this process.

**LEN**

That is unbelievable -- you mean, you were forced by a court order to --

**SCOTT**

Yes, to be examined by a psychiatrist.

**LEN**

For claiming the recovery of a property.

**SCOTT**

That's right. That's right.

**LEN**

You couldn't get your lawyers to get that --

**SCOTT**

The only thing I could do was by going through the examination and proving that it was false. That's how ridiculous this system is.

**ANITA**

You know, I think just hearing you say this you basically answered a question I had, that being, what would be gained by the city for drawing this out a second round, instead of just settling with you?

**SCOTT**

Well exactly. And they never even offered a settlement. I may have gone away for three rolls of film and an apology if they had asked. But instead, because this guy Skip Miller has no motivation to have this thing settled, every time he goes to them and says, 'Hey, we're gonna win, you can't let this guy win, if he wins...'

The other thing is -- if we had won, it would have changed the law on how they handle evidence. They would have had to actually ask your permission to take something out of your house, they couldn't just come and grab it. They would have had to take care of it, and they would have to give it back to you and if they didn't they would have to pay you back the value of it.

And up until now the LAPD does not have that restriction on them. This was evident right after the riots, here in Los Angeles. The police went door to door confiscating

video tapes and still pictures that people had taken of people during the riots. They want to use this stuff so they could get people who were looters, and ruffians on the street and put them behind bars. They went door to door confiscating this stuff with no warrants. Just taking this away from people. And it's one thing if you come to my door and say, 'Hey, you have some evidence here we could use in trial. Can we give a receipt for it, can we borrow it, make a copy of it and give it right back to you?' That's one thing, but to say, 'Give us your film, give us your scrap books,' you know, 'Give us your personal stuff, we're gonna use it in trial,' is absolutely against everything I was raised -- uh, in this country, in terms of right to privacy...

**LEN**

So in that case did the jury make recommendations -- like sometimes they do, you know, meaning that the L.A. police was gonna have to be responsible...?

**SCOTT**

Exactly. As the result of our trial, the statute was going to be changed in terms of 'standard of care.' Which now is, that the LAPD has a *slight* standard of care. What does slight mean? You know, throw it in the trunk of the car, maybe it's there when we get to the station?

It would have elevated that standard of care to 'reasonable.' In other words, they would have had to take care of it, give you a receipt for it and make an effort to return it to you, and store it in a locked-up fashion.

That was one of the reasons all this weight came down on my trial. It was, 'We have to defeat this guy, if this guy opens this door, this is gonna create this... this is gonna shackle the police department.' In terms of their being able to investigate crime here in Los Angeles. Just because you'd have to ask, you know, somebody's permission before you knock down their door and take their scrap books and home videos.

**LEN**

Yeah, that's one way of looking at it. The other way of looking at it is that, um, there's evidence in your trial that Bobby Kennedy was killed by someone other than Sirhan. You had photographic evidence of that, and they wouldn't stop at any length -- because what you're saying about the changing of the law in L.A. County, of how they handle evidence -- that wouldn't explain the, uh, all the records of your trial being stolen.

**SCOTT**

That's right. Exactly.

**LEN**

So there's one way to look at it, an apologist point of view saying, 'Well, we had to bring this weight down, because we don't want to handcuff our police from making their illegal searches,' right --

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

And give people, like you say, a receipt. So if somebody does have a videotape of something they wanted for the news or something, or they want to put their hands on it. But I think it's a deeper, um -- I can't think of the right word, but -- *subversive*...

**SCOTT**

Oh yeah, in an effort to silence, you know. And that's really what came through in this trial. They don't want a citizen speaking out like this. They don't want me to have this venue, this right. It was a very evasive process. Once Skip Miller and the City turned their attack toward me personally, as opposed to just dealing with this simple property case... they towed my car away out of my driveway and they didn't return it, they lost it. It's a very expensive car. So pay me for it. Instead it turned into this personal attack on me, and whether or not I was a photographer and all these other things. It ends up just bleeding me and the city dry of money and accomplishing nothing.

The other thing is, you know, they got the press banned from our trial. Court TV wanted to cover this, there was all kinds of news coverage and they got the press thrown out of the courtroom. We came in right after the O.J. trial, so they threw the press out of our trial. So we had only very limited press coverage. People were allowed in there basically with a pencil and paper to cover this trial. All media is pretty much electronic now, or at least audio. So they banned all that from our trial.

That was ridiculous. If we go back in a second time, it will not be banned -- we've already talked about it to Court TV and a number of other people who want to cover this trial, so that people see what's going on behind closed doors.

**ANITA**

What was the excuse for banning -- was it just the O.J. thing?

**SCOTT**

Because of all the fallout that happened with the O.J. Simpson trial. They claimed that they would have to sequester the jury and they couldn't, uh -- it would taint the jury pool, all this other stuff. All that's been overturned since then, but because of all the furor following the O.J. thing, with everybody camping downtown and everything, we lost a lot of ground there. And yeah, it's absurd, the press was thrown out.

**LEN**

I was under the impression that two weeks ago something was up --

**SCOTT**

They've offered -- they're offering settlement, they want to go to a -- we have a judge, who's a pro-settlement judge, and he would like us to negotiate. So things are going on between the attorneys and between the city right now, as we speak, in terms of whether or not they're going to come to us with a reasonable settlement that doesn't include gagging me, saying that I can't speak about this or I can't write about this.

And I don't want to put the city through another trial. I don't want to put the city through the expense of it. I don't want to put my family through this, or have to put my friends and --

**LEN**

I wouldn't worry about the city's expense because it seems like they didn't care about it at all.

**SCOTT**

Exactly, they didn't care about it at all -- but I do, as a taxpayer. I don't want to see them run up another million, two million dollars behind the scenes. If this was out in the open and everyone could see what was going on, that would be one thing, but to just have this behind-the-scenes, you know, money machine, running the tab on both myself and no information getting out...

I'll fight this thing in the press like I have before. That's what I told them. I said, this second trial will be about Ramparts Station, which is where this took place. This will be about Skip Miller, who was found guilty by the Bar of illegal contact with a juror. This

is going to be a much bigger case than just whether or not they lost my film. It will be about film being stolen. It'll be about court records being stolen. I'll try this on the courthouse steps if I have to. No matter how much they gag me behind closed doors.

**ANITA**

It must be very hard for an average citizen to go after justice. These trials cost a lot of money, even if you don't have the super high-priced lawyer.

**SCOTT**

That's right, that's right. I've been fortunate in that I've had the resources, I've had a lot of friends and attorneys that have come forward here, political activists like Paul Schrade and stuff -- I'm sorry, Ted Charach and Paul Schrade who have come forward to help with this. I've been able to muster a lot of forces behind me. But to do this again, just to know we're gonna go back -- and if we go back to the appeals court we go back before the same three judges who threw us out the first time! It automatically goes back before those same guys.

**ANITA**

There seems to be something wrong with that...

**SCOTT**

Yeah! There's something seriously wrong with that system.

**LEN**

Well maybe that's what you need to get out in public...

**SCOTT**

That's right. So I'll be fighting this, you know, like I am on your show -- and I appreciate the opportunity to come on here, because these are the forums in which we really get the points across. I'm not gagged by my attorneys or the judge telling me I can't talk about this stuff.

The other thing, we get to bring out all the issues, and the public gets to decide. You know, the public is not stupid, and that's the way we're treated. We're treated like we're idiots, like we're children, and that we're not capable of handling this information. And we certainly are. We're capable, after all these years, and we're entitled to a review of

what happened that night, to a review of this evidence before everybody is dead. I was fifteen years old at the time. We've lost four or five witnesses who were there that night in the pantry there. So before all this evidence and all these people disappear, we're entitled to a clean airing of this and -- just get the information *out* there.

I've never claimed conspiracy, or ten bullets, or the other thing. I just want the facts out there! Let the people decide for themselves! Come to whatever decisions they want to on this, but we're entitled to that information. And now, with the internet and so many more people out there, investigative reporters -- people like you, doing a job like this -- we're going to get that information out there to the public where it belongs.

**ANITA**

Well, as hard as it's been on you in the court of public opinion, this sort of case makes a big difference. It might not get into the mainstream media, but people take an interest when leaders are assassinated, and that doesn't die down in just a couple of years.

**SCOTT**

That's what I've found, and it's been very encouraging when people like you call me up, or -- people will stop me in the courthouse and say, you know, 'I've been following this case,' because it takes tremendous *effort*, you know, to go out and research something like this. It doesn't show up on the cover of [the] *Los Angeles Times*. You've got to dig for this stuff. You've got to find people like you on the air, or these little journals that come out, or go on the internet, or go research the archives yourselves to really get the information and make up your minds for yourselves what's taken place here.

**ANITA**

You mentioned that you had the coroner, Thomas... Noguchi?

**SCOTT**

That's right.

**ANITA**

Can you tell us what he had to say about the gunshot wounds?

**SCOTT**

Well, Thomas Noguchi stated that these were contact wounds, and that he was not satisfied that they had come from Sirhan's gun, and had he had my photographs it could

have entirely changed the results of his autopsy report. He would have had the information of what took place *behind* Robert Kennedy during the shooting. And when all three bullet wounds entered *from behind* Bobby Kennedy, he said that this information would have been the basis for bullet trajectories, and who was where and firing what, and at what height and what distance, in this case. He was adamant in saying that had he had access to these photographs, this could have very well changed the outcome -- he would have had that much more information to add to his autopsy report.

**LEN**

Okay. Because I understand, there's a lawyer fighting for a new trial for Sirhan right now.

**SCOTT**

That's right. Lawrence Teeter has been battling away. We've given him access to a lot of our court files and things. And vice versa -- they've fed us a lot of information. They have [Rose] Lynn Mangan, who's a tremendous researcher, who's done a lot of just *real* good research, going up there to the California State Archives.

She discovered these -- this evidence being opened up, numbers 24 and 25. Evidence being moved from one book to another. She would go up there and photograph the logbook, and then go up there a couple of years later to that same logbook and photograph it, and it had been *changed!* Something from the California State Archives, from the LAPD. All of sudden somebody's going up there and altering this evidence. It's just been absolutely shocking. There's a tremendous amount of stuff.

There's no doubt that Sirhan walked in there and emptied his gun. How he got there, why he was there, whether he was hypnotized or not, whether or not his gun fired the bullet that actually killed him -- these are *huge* questions! You may have some guy in there who's -- certainly he's guilty of going in there and starting this whole thing, but he didn't kill the guy! Maybe he didn't fire the bullets that killed Bobby Kennedy; maybe none of the bullets he fired hit *anybody!* The point is, we just don't *know* right now. It's a tremendous injustice. I'm not out to free anybody, but I'm out there to free our minds and to find out what information is there. And then whatever happens, happens.

**LEN**

Well, I think one telling, um, tale -- you talk about being hypnotized -- is that Sirhan has no memory until; I think, up until this day, of really what happened.

**SCOTT**

And that's an important thing, you know, because Sirhan would sell out anybody to get out of jail. This guy's pretty unhappy, and if he could remember anything and go, 'Hey, that guy did this, that guy did that' and he could get a little chunk knocked off his jail time -- he would *do* it. He desperately wants out of jail. So in that sense I have to admit he has some credibility when he says, 'I don't remember.' Because this guy would turn in *anybody* to get out of jail.

**LEN**

That's pretty amazing. And there hasn't been any press, really, about that effort.

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

You mentioned his lawyer. Legal team. I forget -- did you say it was actually his lawyer?

**SCOTT**

Lawrence Teeter. His lawyer, who's handling the case.

Well, the press stays away from it. *Los Angeles Times* -- you know, we've got a one newspaper town here. Everybody -- other than that, you watch 2, 4 and 7, maybe channel 11 for a little bit of video news. People don't dig deep for that, and that's why radio news and that's why a lot of these alternative journals and things like that really make a huge difference when you get into these deep political issues that aren't, you know, the eye candy of the day. They're not the -- I turned on the news today and it's, you know, another guy outrunning the police for forty-five minutes instead of sitting down there and analyzing some hard-hitting story that effects all of us -- like who's killing our leaders.

**LEN**

Yeah, or completely subverting the justice system...

**SCOTT**

That's right, that's right. Instead we're distracted by bright shiny objects, here. Like a bunch of squirrels. People here deserve a great deal more, here. The people out here, and

the generations -- I've got kids now in college and their level of understanding and their level of research they demand before they make a decision on something, is such a higher standard than there was when I was a kid. It really hurts me to see the media pandering to the lowest common denominator.

**LEN**

Especially the *lying* that you see.

**SCOTT**

Yeah.

**LEN**

I mean, today the recent news is, uh, what they think the flight -- TWA Flight 800 --

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

Is now some kind of fuel tank --

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

And there's all sorts of people that are calling out for -- none of the eye witnesses were called to testify.

**SCOTT**

Yeah.

**LEN**

And I think there's over fifty, and there's -- I think it's Commander Donaldson and a few other people. They won't get into that whole --

**SCOTT**

That's right. They're afraid of --

**LEN**

Yeah! The thing is, they're so used to getting away with it, and they've been able to pull the wool over our eyes, you know. Ted Turner sold out CNN to that conglomerate that bought it...

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

That was the last, uh, the last time they had any independent news reporting.

**SCOTT**

Right...

**LEN**

And they totally, I think -- as April Oliver had mentioned, it's been confirmed that -- don't quote me on this but I think it was... eighty...

**ANITA**

Thirty...

**LEN**

Thirty people from, uh, you know, [chuckles] black operations were in there in the news room doing training on how to color the news.

**SCOTT**

Right, no, we're in the midst of a very quiet revolution, you know, and what you're doing here on the internet, and the small radio stations and the independent magazines, the zines that are coming out and everything -- this is really the future, they can't control information, they really can't put a cap on it here. As much as MP3 files ---

**LEN**

Well --

**SCOTT**

Are stealing copyrighted music -- at the same time, that same type of technology, when you apply it to newsgroups or to transferring information or immediate response from the scene from people who really know what's going on, real witnesses and stuff -- I think we're on the verge of something tremendous here, in terms of liberation, in terms of information being taken out of the hands of the big publishers and the big networks, and being put in the hands of people who can sit literally in their garage and disseminate --

**LEN**

Oh, you've seen our studio.

**ANITA**

[laughs]

**LEN**

Well, you know, I'd love to agree with you -- except that what we're up against is very well-financed machinery...

**SCOTT**

Yeah.

**LEN**

And it takes people doing low-key -- I mean, if we had a little wireless station they'd call us, you know, 'pirate radio' or something.

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

Running twelve watts. Luckily we're able to broadcast and, uh -- even better, we're able to archive the shows.

**SCOTT**

Yes.

**LEN**

So we may have a limit on how many people can log on at one time [but] we don't have any limit on how many people can listen to archived shows.

**SCOTT**

That's right, squirrel it away and -- it's like *Fahrenheit 451*, you know, everybody memorize a book.

**LEN**

Yeah.

**ANITA**

Well, I do have to agree with you. I think that the Information Age that's coming on right now is probably taking a lot of people by surprise. I know for myself, and Len, and for a lot of people around here who are more into the computers -- we were into this *years* ago, and I know I couldn't have foreseen how fast it would grow and how quickly information would change hands.

**SCOTT**

Well, what's terrific is, the older generation -- and I'm talking about the generation above me, and me to a certain degree -- the fact that I don't *understand* it is tremendous. Because so much gets done under my nose, and under the nose of the old establishment. By the time that this thing is out there and wired up and everybody's on it, they don't even know what hit them.

**ANITA**

Exactly. I'm very optimistic about that myself. [chuckles]

**SCOTT**

Yeah.

**ANITA**

We have some gloomy topics on here, but the bottom line is the information gets out and people are aware. And that's what makes change.

**SCOTT**

The information sets you free.

**ANITA**

Exactly.

**SCOTT**

Absolutely.

**LEN**

Well, hopefully.

But another reason is that -- there's a few people that I've wanted to speak to, and you were one of them. And I don't see any news coverage -- I don't see *anything* -- so it's been up to me, actually, to go out and [chuckles] make a call and say, could I talk to you.

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

And by the same token, I'd love to talk to William Pepper, who just did the Martin Luther King trial in Memphis. Once again I'm scouring the internet and I can't find any articles. I find one or two kind of, uh, rather uncomplimentary articles from Memphis. Of course there's this famous Gerald Posner...

**SCOTT**

Sure.

**LEN**

I hate bringing his name up. 'Poisoner,' I should call him.

**SCOTT**

[chuckles]

**LEN**

But on this topic of this film and the Robert Kennedy assassination, I think the only conclusion that *I* draw is that they're *worried* about uncovering what really went on, and making that more in the mainstream. And -- with that, have you ever been approached by Oliver Stone at all?

**SCOTT**

Oliver Stone has kept track of what we were doing through the whole thing, because JFK was produced during the prep time during our trial. We've been able to get documents back and forth between [us]. They've fed us a number of documents and things. Yeah, that's all a real closed circuit. I've been approached by many people to do books and TV movies and things like that.

I've always wanted to keep this trial a very pure thing. I've never taken a dime for an interview or the use of a photo or anything like that. Until this thing finally concludes, you won't be seeing a movie or a book or anything like that. Until we wind through the courts and come to a reasonable conclusion. Once that happens, then we'll probably go to that next step. Starting with -- I've been taking notes, obviously, my journals and things for a book. We'll see what happens from there.

But I wanted to be very careful about this. Exploiting somebody's death for a profit has always been a very ugly thing, and there's a very fine line you have to tread there -- in terms of whether or not it's worthwhile to get that information out. You get someone like Oliver Stone, who has at least a background, who has a strong political point of view, [and] a certain purity to it whether you agree with him or not. Has that certain power to get that message across. If I find that kind of medium, and it's not exploitative, then we might take that to another level.

**LEN**

Right, because you had mentioned you'd been approached by Court TV.

**SCOTT**

That's right.

**LEN**

So is that something you would get -- if they did cover the trial, you would get any compensation?

**SCOTT**

No! We get no compensation at all. Basically --

**LEN**

This has got to be costing your side hundreds of thousands of dollars, though...

**SCOTT**

Well, Court TV comes in there and they basically put their cameras in and they cover the trial. The cost to me is the cost of putting on another offensive. Whether or not that's worthwhile -- we've already won our jury trial. Whether or not we want to do that, whether or not we to cause the city to cough up that much money in their absurd defense of it -- we'll just have to see if that's the best forum for it. Sometimes the best forum is on the radio with guys like you, or maybe in book form. That's what I'm having to mull over now, at this point in my life. I've put a quarter of a century into this battle. It's time for me to sort of wrap this thing up and move on to the next one.

**LEN**

Right. But saying that, I think that if you did have financial resources behind you, if we made this a little more public, I think there's a lot of people who'd be surprised and actually want to know what had been going on. Especially in your case, when you had first-hand evidence of mistreatment of something as simple as -- as you say, wanting your film back --

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

To turning into personal attacks -- psychiatric reviews --

**SCOTT**

Yeah.

**LEN**

And on and on. I mean, [chuckles] you must have more stories that you want to talk about --

**SCOTT**

Yeah. In that sense, you haven't heard the last of me yet. Whether or not the best forum for that is another trial or something else -- that's what I've got to figure out. We're reigning everything in now and looking at the damage this has caused, and the emotional turmoil that this has put all my family through and everything. My wife, who -- she was my girlfriend at the time this thing happened. We've been together since we were thirteen years old. I didn't put her on the stand in the first trial, and she's all ready to go now on the second trial, going, 'Put me up there' --

**LEN**

Oh, that's great, you have support.

**SCOTT**

Yeah, 'I want these guys to know what really happened.' But that's exactly what I *don't* want. I don't want to drag my family into this.

**LEN**

'Cause there's been people like Jim Garrison and, uh --

**SCOTT**

Yeah, we saw through that what a toll it takes. Watching that movie was hard for me, because I became this, you know, monster in my house, you know, obsessed with these other things, these bigger issues. The main thing is -- to let something like that be affecting how your family moves forward, over that amount of time, it's a big sacrifice. You gotta be careful.

**LEN**

You could debate that. I would say -- that really should be worth it. You're trying --

**SCOTT**

Well, that's the thing, it's been worth it so far. So now, what do I do? Do I wind up and do this thing again, at this point in my life? That's why I've got to say, 'Gee, maybe there's a better way to do this, maybe it's a book, maybe it's a movie.' I don't know that it's necessarily the arena of the courtroom, where all the benefits are on their side, because they have unlimited resources and attorneys ready to go. Is that where I want to fight this battle.

**ANITA**

You do make a good point. Because this has already been brought out in court, in the public eye. It could make a movie or a book --

**SCOTT**

That's right.

**ANITA**

Actually a movie would probably reach more people.

**SCOTT**

That's right.

**ANITA**

That would probably get to the people's ear more quickly than another court case.

**SCOTT**

Yeah. We've already fought it in the public arena. We've already won, and we have that record. I have tapes here of the entire seven weeks of trial. Seven weeks of trial! They put mass murderers away in two weeks.

**LEN**

I have a question for you. With all the official court records being stolen, are your records -- I can't think of a better word -- legitimate?

**SCOTT**

Oh yeah. We have the audio recordings of every day of court. So that's what we had to do. We had to reconstruct through these audio recordings, had to re-transcribe everything

--

**LEN**

Right, to backlog --

**SCOTT**

To recover what took place in that courtroom for the appeal. So, it's a tremendous amount of work, but I've got a box here of about a hundred two-hour tapes in it. That'll be the next thing for me to sit down and do. At least that's within our control and the record is clean and clear. We can basically convict them with their own words.

**LEN**

Right. Was there something that stood out in the first trial, when you had these people and you were able to, as you said, pull out evidence about the actual shooting -- never mind just the property issue -- that maybe isn't public knowledge?

**SCOTT**

Well, I think a lot of people don't realize that the LAPD was not there before the shooting took place. They did not arrive until about twenty minutes after the shooting took place.

That there were three guns in that pantry, there was -- Sirhan had a gun that held eight bullets. Rafer Johnson took that gun away from Sirhan and put it in his pocket. The murder weapon supposedly left the Ambassador Hotel in his pocket. There was another FBI agent who had a gun, who was with the Kennedy family, the same guy that was involved with Ted Kennedy during the rape trial of his cousin.

So we know that there were three guns in that pantry that were waved around and possibly fired and emptied. All of them left that pantry out of the control of the LAPD. Rafer Johnson handed over the gun to the police at the hospital where Bobby Kennedy was dying.

There were at least two guns booked into evidence at Ramparts Station. I've seen

autopsy photographs where Bobby Kennedy is on the autopsy table and right next to him they have the murder weapon. Well, we've blown up that murder weapon, and it does not match the murder weapon that was presented at trial -- entered by the police.

**LEN**

That's astounding.

**SCOTT**

Yeah.

**LEN**

So you're telling me that they have records of two guns...?

**SCOTT**

They have records of two guns, conflicting records of two guns. Different sight, different barrel length. Entirely different weapons. Both hold eight shots. And I've had these analyzed by weapons experts.

You can't dispute a photograph that has Bobby Kennedy's *shoulder* in it and the supposed murder weapon.

And in the official court records from Sirhan's trial, which show photographs of the gun booked into evidence by [De Wayne] Wolfer, who was the ballistics expert -- those guns don't match, they don't match by serial number and they don't match by profile or description.

**LEN**

That's amazing. I did not know that.

**SCOTT**

Yeah, people should know about this.

**ANITA**

Okay, so it's one thing to say that people are just doing their job and they believed Sirhan's hands were guilty -- and probably like you say, on the ground level most of

them did feel that way, but at some point somebody had to be making a concerted effort to bury evidence.

**SCOTT**

You bet.

**ANITA**

And that's not a theory. When it comes down to it you have actual evidence --

**SCOTT**

That's right.

**ANITA**

So, let people say what they want -- I know a lot of people involved in research get called conspiracy theorists and they get --

**SCOTT**

Right.

**ANITA**

Rightfully offended when they're dealing with facts.

**SCOTT**

Sure. A lot of this took place in those hours, you know, late at night, between when the LAPD was in control of the scene -- as weak and as inefficient as that was -- and then the guys from Washington start showing up, when the FBI starts calling up and calling the LAPD going, 'We don't want another Dallas.'

There was one investigation where the LAPD came and tried to get everything under control. You've got a bunch of ground-level cops doing the best job they can on the night shift -- and I don't begrudge those guys for making mistakes, doing the best they can with the resources they have. I do blame Mayor Sam Yorty for not having police at the Ambassador Hotel, protecting Bobby Kennedy to begin with. I blame Sam Yorty for -- the police department calls up, and on the recorded call from the Ambassador Hotel they, the LAPD, has to ask 'Senator who?' And then has to ask directions to the Ambassador

Hotel, which takes up nineteen acres, five blocks up from Ramparts Station.

So, that's one lousy part of the investigation. But this second wave that comes in from Washington -- the power of the Kennedy family coming in there, not wanting another Dallas; the power of the FBI coming in there, wanting to control the situation, and with all the information they had on the Kennedys and the political ramifications of what may come of this -- that's when things got ugly.

And then the formation, politically, of Special Unit Senator. Who was put in charge of that? A lot of really ethical, hardcore cops coming in there, trying to contain an investigation that was already out of control. A bunch of guys who, you know, if you'd left them alone they probably would have done a good job, but you've got the FBI coming in poking their nose in, the CIA going 'Hey, we want to come in and examine this evidence.' They go in and examine the evidence. And they leave and there's one gun missing, or there's a piece of paper missing, or something like that. This entire investigation, this entire situation is just chock full of stuff like that.

**ANITA**

Well doesn't that actually make it then more like Dallas? And they wanted to avoid Dallas.

**SCOTT**

Exactly.

**ANITA**

But it seems -- the parallels keep getting stronger.

**SCOTT**

That's right. They created it with this rush to judgement, you know. And, 'Hey, we grabbed the guy, he had the gun, you know, there was seventy people in that pantry, the gun's empty, the guy's dead -- who could argue with that?' Sam Yorty came out and claimed, 'We got the guy!' the next day. In a simplistic way -- that's the other thing. the public *wanted* that conclusion. The public did not *want* another Dallas. They wanted a simple explanation for this.

**LEN**

Now I --

**SCOTT**

You know, when you've got the public wanting that conclusion, and then the government gratifying that need of a grieving country -- Martin Luther King killed two months before that -- that's what goes into the American consciousness and that's a hard thing to erase.

**ANITA**

I imagine it's pretty difficult to go from *Leave It to Beaver* and *I Love Lucy* to the startling political reality of having your leaders murdered.

**SCOTT**

That's right, that's right. You bet. It's very upsetting generationally, to know the generation, my father's generation, going out there and fighting World War 2, you know, and then my generation of, 'Hey, I'm gonna go to Canada, I don't want to fight in Vietnam.'

And now we have this third thing here, you know. My children, two generations from having to fight a war. Being able to look back and go, 'Gee, well, Grandpa went to war, and you decided you didn't want to go war, and now where do I lie, here? Somewhere in the middle? Where is my government? Where are my boundaries? Where are my moorings, here? Where's my compass, my moral compass?'

**LEN**

Yeah, but then, you know, the kind of subversion here is that if you lose faith in the government --

**SCOTT**

That's right.

**LEN**

There's some kind of subversion going on here. But when -- and these aren't my words, but when that loss of faith is actually *justified*, that's the real deep subversion, in that --

**SCOTT**

You bet.

**LEN**

Not only can't you trust the police, but they already have somebody. For instance, drop off Sirhan, have him hypnotized, he was just there to pull out a gun -- and somebody else, working under the guise of the Lockheed Corporation --

**ANISA**

Actually, that leads me to a question. You mentioned earlier that Bobby Kennedy was late for his speech. Do you know why?

**SCOTT**

He was late because he did not want to come down and announce victory without having these other two states come in and be assured of that victory. Today you go the polls and -- I remember during the elections when Bush was being elected, I'm on my way to the polls here on the West Coast and they're announcing on the radio who won already.

**ANITA**

Okay.

**SCOTT**

So, 'what's the point of voting'-type of thing. In this case we had a much less accurate system. Bobby Kennedy was sitting up there in his hotel room until the returns came until he was sure -- I think it was Montana, California and one other state. If he'd gotten that block of three, then it was pretty much a shoo-in that he was the candidate.

**ANITA**

You sorta -- you did sorta mention that earlier, but what I found odd was that if he had been earlier he would have taken the other route. Does that mean that somebody who knew he was going to be late and had to take the other route had Sirhan Sirhan there? I mean, not knowing how the Ambassador Hotel is laid out --

**SCOTT**

Yeah.

**ANITA**

Would it've be easy just to ferry him there when they saw what direction Kennedy was going?

**SCOTT**

Well that's the thing, is that I think that Sirhan had showed up at other events where Kennedy was, and missed him. So I think that, you know, Sirhan, was he hypnotized, he was sent out and sort of given a map: 'He's gonna be here, here and here, and you try and get him'? I think Sirhan was pretty much on his own once he got to these locations.

I think it was just a matter of luck and happenstance as to, in the last few minutes of his campaign or making these decisions on the run -- 'Are we gonna go to the party or go to the press room?'-type of a thing -- it was just a matter of then coming up with the most likely circumstance in which he would run into them.

But I don't think there was any collusion between Kennedy's people and the people directing Kennedy in terms of directing him towards Sirhan. I think that was a lucky stroke for the Sirhan forces, uh, in an unfortunate move of a disorganized campaign on Kennedy's part.

**ANITA**

Yeah, actually I was even wondering if perhaps someone outside the Kennedy campaign might have suggested they take that route or -- that's pretty much determined --

**SCOTT**

Yeah, yeah, it was -- from what I understand, it was like this throughout the entire campaign. It was like, 'Should we do this, should we do that' -- his campaign was a much looser... you know, 'What's best for the people, what's best for the crowd,' 'Oh, so-and-so's here, you've got to shake hands with so-and-so.' And he would backtrack and go do that.

That was one of the frustrations in keeping track of Kennedy as a candidate -- was that he was so headstrong in terms of -- you know, he would stop and he would get involved in something, or 'Oh, gee, I promised somebody I would come over there and say hi to them,' or something, and he would throw the whole thing off. I think that the randomness of that, and the lack of security, made him a target. If you went out there two or three times, eventually you were going to bump into him. And that's what happened in this case with Sirhan.

**LEN**

Now, I have a question that I, um -- I may want to correct you or myself on. I was under the impression that -- you were telling me about entering into the pantry, that it was the maître d' that actually took Bobby Kennedy by the arm.

**SCOTT**

The maître d' was on his other side. You had two men taking him by the elbows, you had the maître d' and --

**LEN**

Okay.

**SCOTT**

And now on the other hand you had Eugene Thane Cesar who was the security guard. The maître d', Karl Ueker, knew the way through, and the security guard had the official -- you know, the gun, the uniform, and was assigned to Kennedy to get him through. So you're exactly right. One was on each side of him, moving him through that crowd.

And that's why Karl Ueker was the first guy to grab the gun, because he was standing facing toward Eugene Thane Cesar when it happened. Sirhan came up between the two of them, in the middle.

**LEN**

Yeah, right. Okay then. Thanks, you cleared that up. Because I remembered just when you brought that up, I was thinking, oh, something's wrong here, I don't know how to ask --

**SCOTT**

Yeah. No, it's like -- Kennedy really is being led to slaughter, here. He's got two people leading him directly right toward where Sirhan is hiding.

**LEN**

Right, and -- there's some people that feel that, even though Eugene Cesar had a gun out, he might not have actually been the one that pulled the fatal shots. Somebody else was right behind him.

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

And your photographs would have showed that.

**SCOTT**

Exactly.

**LEN**

You were there.

**SCOTT**

The photographs would have shown that, and that's what's a shame about this whole thing.

**LEN**

And seconds before. And then for the rest of the night, this person *isn't* there --

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

'Who was that, right behind him?' And then he's gone.

**SCOTT**

Yeah, and one of the difficulties here too in terms of a conspiracy is that there's really no way that you can connect Eugene Thane Cesar and Sirhan as being both part of the same conspiracy.

**LEN**

But you wouldn't, right?

**SCOTT**

Yeah. They were totally different. Eugene Thane Cesar was way off here, a Wallace supporter, totally out there to the right, and then Sirhan, here, you know -- 'RFK must die' and against him approving the sale of jets to Israel and everything like that --

**LEN**

Well... yeah.

**SCOTT**

And if Sirhan and Cesar were together on this and they planned to kill Kennedy at this point in the pantry -- if you and I were gonna kill somebody, would you say, 'Okay, I'll get behind him and you get in front of him and we'll both shoot at him,' and basically be shooting at each other?

**LEN**

Right, right.

**SCOTT**

Now there's a pretty lousy plan. So, you can't connect them politically, you can't connect them logically in terms of a plan. But then again what forces outside of the two of them got them into that same situation at the same time? It's still assured, the death of Kennedy, which was the ultimate objective.

**LEN**

Yeah, exactly. and I would say, from my investigation of people in the JFK assassination, these are skilled professionals, that have taken months at this kind of --

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

Clandestine... covert work.

**SCOTT**

Yeah, and that's what's important that people understand, that you could be a willing participant in a conspiracy without knowing you're a part of it.

**LEN**

Right. And as you even mentioned -- did Sirhan's gun contain blanks? Maybe he was told, 'This is just a warning, you're gonna scare the guy, don't worry about it.'

**SCOTT**

That's right.

**LEN**

Hypnotize him and -- there's a lot of area for discussion here. And many points of view. But I think one main point you can't escape is that they would not be fighting tooth and nail if your photos didn't show something, and the destruction of evidence -- like you say, *a foot and a half* of photographs ---

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

Twenty-four hundred?

**SCOTT**

Yeah, two thousand four hundred photographs.

**LEN**

*Twenty-four hundred photographs.*

**SCOTT**

Burned in a hospital incinerator.

**LEN**

Right, and you have evidence of tampering with the Archives, grease on a bullet, phony logs... I mean, if that isn't trying to protect L.A. police from having to draw up a new law about how they gather evidence, and how to keep it -- this is about complete corruption, and keeping down any effort to expose it.

**SCOTT**

Yeah, and this comes from the chief archivist and people working at the Archives. It comes from LAPD officers. It's not coming from outside -- you know, wacko conspiracy nut people. It's coming from people being put on the stand who now look back, going, 'I was an unwilling participant, here, and I was taken advantage of, here, and I was duped, here. Here's my story.' So that's why a lot of this has tremendous credibility. We were very happy to get guys like Noguchi and things like that -- on the stand, able to tell their story because, you know, Thomas Noguchi was not allowed to testify at Sirhan's trial. The LAPD didn't like what he had to say. So the chief coroner, the guy who examined and determined the cause of death of Robert F. Kennedy was not allowed to testify at Sirhan's trial.

**LEN**

As I recall, I think he was threatened.

**SCOTT**

He was threatened, exactly. We were able to get him on the stand for the first time and let him testify in terms of what his conclusions were -- of his autopsy, and the death of Robert F. Kennedy, for the first time. And this takes place in 1996?

**LEN**

And these records have now been stolen.

**SCOTT**

Well, we have the recorded records. The official court records -- well, there's two records. There's witness testimony, that's intact. The clerk's record is everything that takes place outside of the ears of the jury. So, motions that are brought up to the judge, discussions in judge's chambers, things like that. All the testimony is intact, and is clean. That was not taken or altered.

But the clerk's record, all of the judge's instructions to the jury, Skip Miller being

admonished for talking to the juror -- and that was the other thing, the reason why those records disappeared was because all of the testimony against Miller, in terms of how he behaved in that courtroom, that would have convicted him during his bar trial -- that's why those court records disappeared. So there wouldn't be anything to prosecute him with.

**ANITA**

So that got him off the hook.

**SCOTT**

Exactly. That got him off the hook. So he used our trial and those circumstances -- and I feel they were able to engineer the disappearance, the mysterious disappearance of these records, first of all to destroy our ability to respond at the appeal, as well as clear Miller in the investigation in which he was found guilty anyway. But he would have been found guilty much more *harshly* had they not been able to destroy these records.

So it's just fishy from day one.

**LEN**

Unbelievable, again.

**SCOTT**

Yeah. You know, exactly. 'Eliminate the press coverage. Cheat and lie and use all kind of underhanded ways to hobble our opponent here. We don't have the facts on our side, so let's attack him personally.' Closing arguments were just brutal. My daughter, my wife were in tears over what this man was saying about me in the courtroom. It was embarrassing. But in effect, his attack on me personally is what made the jury rule in our favor. The jury saw right through this.

**LEN**

Was there, like, an exit poll of jurors?

**SCOTT**

Oh yeah, we talked to the jurors afterward. And as much as I would like to give credit to my attorneys, and say we won this case, I have to admit that Skip Miller came in there and he lost this case. He lost this case big time, by taking the tactics that he did, and by

attacking a citizen who did nothing but offer up his film in cooperation for twenty years and simply came back after twenty years and said, 'Could I please have my pictures back.'

I think the jury was truly offended by the way we were treated. And they only heard a microscopic portion of what took place, because so much was hidden from them until after the trial.

**LEN**

Right. And you have audio record of some of that.

**SCOTT**

That's right. We have audio records of the entire trial, all the testimony, everything that took place in front of the jury we have audio recording. Everything that went into the record. It's what took place -- side bars, judge's chambers, in conversation between counsel and the judge, from time to time -- that we had to reconstruct. And we were still able to reconstruct that. The point is, we didn't have the transcripts. This is specifically what Miller said at the time, specifically what he said with the judge at this time. It made prosecuting Miller that much more difficult. It made our appeal process that much more expensive, and it had little gaps and holes in it. We were able to be overturned.

**ANITA**

Has anyone been able to come up with an explanation for how the transcripts could vanish or be stolen?

**SCOTT**

No. We talked to people. They said it's possible during a trial, you know, it's big files and everything, you'd lose a file, you know, a particular envelope. Or something gets kicked under a file cabinet. You lose a couple of things. But you don't lose the entire clerk's record from an entire trial. The records keeping people, attorneys we spoke to, other judges said that's absolutely unheard of. This took place during a strike -- a clerks strike at the courthouse. They took advantage of a time when these things were relatively unguarded.

And we were described by other attorneys -- you go into the file room and say, 'I am looking for something on so-and-so case.' They give you a pass and you go back there. And you can move things around willy-nilly and do whatever you want, basically, and if there's not enough people there to watch, or whatever, you can move an elephant out of

there. So they managed to make sure that the entire transcript of the clerk's record from that trial just disappeared. An entire cart. Three shelves full of documents. Just gone from the courthouse.

**LEN**

Three shelves full.

**SCOTT**

Yeah. Three shelves full is how it was described. Just disappeared. They said, 'Yeah, you lose a file here and there, you know, that happens.' But they'd never heard of a case where the entire record disappeared from the courthouse.

**LEN**

It's just staggering. Eye-opening and unbelievable, having this discussion with you. The scope...

**SCOTT**

Yeah, we really walked into something [chuckles] in this case. For me it was really simple -- I wrote a letter to the police chief at the time, Daryl Gates. 'Please, sir, could I have my three rolls of film back. You've had twenty years.' And it just escalated and moved into this big huge thing. I am in no way some political activist or some guy with a bone to pick with the LAPD. I've never been arrested. Never been in jail. Never had any conflict with the City whatsoever. Relatively mild-mannered in terms of my politics and my political efforts in the past. My wife and I live here in Santa Monica. We feed the homeless. We do what most other families do, on a nice sort of low-level political involvement for people of our age, very typical. So to be drawn into something like this -- I was brought into this kicking and screaming. But after a certain point, after they turned on me, when they hired Skip Miller and this turned from 'Hey, let's go try and find your film' to 'Hey, you vile creature,' here -- they referred to me in court documents as 'lurking in the kitchen with Sirhan.'

**LEN**

With Sirhan.

**ANITA**

Lurking.[chuckles]

**SCOTT**

'Lurking in the kitchen with Sirhan.' You know, where did this come from?

**LEN**

I have one other question that I forgot, I wanted to bring up. Had you heard, or have anything to offer, about this supposed woman in the polka-dot dress?

**SCOTT**

Oh, woman in the polka-dot dress is interesting. I have a photograph here, in fact, which the LAPD kept under cover, which shows Kennedy at the podium speaking, and Sirhan standing in the crowd.

And the woman in the polka-dot dress is standing right in front of him, and he has his hand on her shoulder.

**LEN**

You're kidding.

**SCOTT**

No. There's so many photographs like this. There definitely was a woman in a polka-dot dress, or close to that description. Probably a number of them. The Sandy Serrano tape, which you probably heard, where they --

**LEN**

Browbeat.

**SCOTT**

Browbeat, just this hideous, horrible way. That was one of the things -- when that tape was played for me, that sort of turned the tide for me on the LAPD. In the sense that they weren't all nice and dealing above board with this. Sandy Serrano was threatened with this, she won't speak. She was accused of stealing funds from -- I think Gloria Molina's campaign, or something like that. Some ridiculous trumped up charge. And the LAPD came to her and basically told her 'Well, you can either go to jail or not talk about the Robert Kennedy case for the rest of your life.' She cut that deal. Now -- that's not

legal. That's not the way you do things. She's been, in effect, silenced. She's been threatened and silenced in this. You won't hear from her again. And this woman in the polka-dot dress, supposedly running from the scene of the crime -- 'We shot him, we shot him' -- that's just another thing that makes conspiracy people sound crazy, and there's enough evidence for them to go in and actually come to a conclusion on this. And they won't do it.

**LEN**

Well, there could be a conclusion that she's the one that brought Sirhan.

**SCOTT**

That's what I'm saying. But that will never be explored because they made it out to be, you know, this one key witness Serrano is this lunatic who's stealing, who's this, that and the other thing. And okay, we silenced her just like so many of the others. They're just going to wait these people out until they die and then they can bury this whole thing.

**LEN**

Well, I would -- we're probably gonna wrap up in about four minutes, here, but I would say to you that when you first heard the Serrano tape, as myself, the reaction was [laughs] I can't think of a another word than unbelievable.

**SCOTT**

Yeah, an absolute shock, this visceral, you know -- it's like, you're doing this to somebody? This is absolutely horrible, because I was treated with kid gloves! 'Gee, thank you for coming in, your father's here, we're going to take good care of your film and your pictures and stuff. Are you okay? Can we get you a Coke, can we get you a cup of water?' kind of thing. And then to realize that woman like this, brought in like that, and then browbeaten, treated like that, 'You're a cancer,' 'You're a Catholic and Kennedy was a Catholic,' all these horrific things to weasel out of this --

**LEN**

Oh yeah. 'Think of his spirit looking down on you.' 'Think of the Kennedy family, this is what they want, and how can you go against them?'

**SCOTT**

Yeah. That's right. This type of thing. Just unheard of.

**LEN**

Well I would offer to you that, uh, when you're thinking of the funds of L.A. County, then, think about *that*. Because if they were spending over a million dollars to bring in this hotshot lawyer when they already have a staff of fully qualified -- over two hundred, as you mentioned -- they have an agenda here.

**SCOTT**

You bet.

**LEN**

And that money may not even be coming out of L.A. County -- maybe coming [from] higher up the chain.

**SCOTT**

Right. And that's one of the things we want to expose. We want the records brought out. Let's see the billing records for this trial.

**LEN**

Oh, yeah. That would be perfect.

**SCOTT**

Let's lay that out and let the City Council justify that.

**LEN**

Well, I'll tell you one thing -- are you familiar with April Oliver?

**SCOTT**

No.

**LEN**

She did the Operation Tailwind [story] on CNN.

**SCOTT**

Right...

**LEN**

She exposed nerve gas in Vietnam.

**SCOTT**

Oh, okay.

**LEN**

She recently had spoken to us and -- she was fired, as you may recall, and she sued them for wrongful dismissal, saying she had covered the story for nine months. You know, they had boxes and boxes of statements videotaped -- interviews. They went back against Admiral Moorer, who said they misquoted him. And she won a settlement. Of course, now she's not allowed to say a word about it...

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

The last we've heard, though, is that she has a new car and a new home [Scott laughs] and her family's doing well. She's just refused to comment. And that's something -- I'm glad I got to speak to you ahead of time because I'd hate to hear that a year from now, you did get a settlement that at least was worth your twenty years' abuse, and of course the abuse having to go, uh -- abuse from Skip --

**SCOTT**

Right.

**LEN**

And others in that department, which should have said 'Listen, we've lost it,' or 'It's been destroyed accidentally by well-meaning people' --

**SCOTT**

Right!

**LEN**

Or, 'Listen, shut up, take the buy-out, we know we did wrong.' So at this point in time, for what they put you through, I think you do deserve either, you know, something, or make a book or make a movie --

**SCOTT**

Yeah. Even in settlement we've always come forward and said, 'You just pay what our costs are. You know? No damages, no nothing, you just pay what my court costs are, pay my attorneys and I'll walk away from this.' And they don't even have the dignity to do that.

**LEN**

Well, I would withhold that offer now.

**SCOTT**

Yeah. No, all bets are off right now.

**ANITA**

Yeah, it seems like you've had enough damage lobbed against you, that you have a right to at least see this through one way or another.

**SCOTT**

Yeah, as long as they can't silence me, in terms of my being able to speak out and lecture on this and bring this out to other people, and now take the records that I have of this trial, in their own words, damning themselves, and bring them out to the public, that'll satisfy me quite well.

**ANITA**

As you said, this trial wasn't meant to actually expose what happened in the assassination. It was really about your film.

**SCOTT**

Absolutely. We engineered it specifically as a property trial. A property loss case. And that is why we were successful through the court.

**ANITA**

And I was going to say, maybe you didn't intend for it to go that way, but from the exposure perspective, for the case in general, you know, there's a lot of people who're gonna owe you thanks in the future just for actually getting the history on record. Some of these facts on record and publicized, because -- as you said, people like the coroner weren't even able to testify until they had another venue which wasn't directly involving the assassination.

**SCOTT**

Right. Yeah. That's what we're hoping for.

**LEN**

And worst case, I know -- I'm not talking about myself, for instance, but I produced a CD-ROM for Colonel Prouty, which had documentation, nine hours of audio, video, etc. And that may be something maybe in your future -- that you'd decide, 'Well, listen, I can make a CD-ROM now.' With the size you can put on a disk.

**SCOTT**

That's right.

**LEN**

In which you can detail what happened to you. And I don't think Skip could do anything against that, because he's already been found guilty of jury tampering and wrongful --

**SCOTT**

That's right. All we do is go by the records, and lay it out there. That's what I'm hoping to do, to still this room full of boxes of court documents and audiotapes and videotapes and everything, bring it down into some manageable form, and putting it out there so people can see for themselves --

**LEN**

I think there's a lot of interest.

**SCOTT**

Yeah.

**LEN**

Well, what I'll do in the next year or two is get your address and mail you my CD-ROM  
--

**SCOTT**

Terrific, I would love that.

**LEN**

And in the meantime, we just wish you luck in your effort. I don't know what support we can do, but we'll have the show archived, and I'm sure a lot of people are going to be interested. This is a really fast-paced and eye-opening interview.

**SCOTT**

Great.

**LEN**

I think we just skimmed the surface of it -- just judging by your comments. There's so many instances of wrongful, completely malicious handling of records. In almost every avenue.

**SCOTT**

Yeah, and it's hard to keep focused and going in one direction on this, because you get pulled off to the side so many times. That's what I have to keep clear, you know -- what am I really after here -- and keep on a true course.

It's always a pleasure to be able to do things like this, because we're not bound by the restrictions of the courtroom, and we have enough time to actually lay out the story and everything. People get a chance to think about it, and come back to it.

**LEN**

Yeah! Maybe we'll do a further interview down the road and see what outcome you have.

**SCOTT**

That'd be great.

**ANITA**

Well, it's been a real pleasure having you here.

**SCOTT**

Good to meet you, Anita.

**ANITA**

You too.

**LEN**

Okay. Well, thanks again for being on, and we'll keep in touch. Hope things continue to go well for you as your first trial ended up [chuckles]. I can't believe the city had the nerve to even appeal it.

**SCOTT**

Yeah. Yeah. That's the way it goes.

**LEN**

Yeah. All right then. We'll talk to you again.

**SCOTT**

Thank you, Len. Thank you, Anita.

**LEN**

Thank you.

**SCOTT**

B'bye. [hangs up]

**LEN**

Well.

That was unbelievable.