"o.Wr.Geerge-McMillian Ceffin Peint Frognere, South Carelina-29920.

Re: James e. Ray
V
State of Tenn.
Shelby County. Indictment re. 15645.

Dear Mac.

After due diliteration and cautious consideration I have desided to renv

But first, as I recall I wrote you a brief note semetime age, via Atternev Bud Fensterwald, explaining why it would be imapprepriate and counter to Defendant's legal interest, in pursuit of a jury trial, to speak with you.

However I gather from your latest letter that your the pushv sert.

To the latest letter's contents: I was momentarily left breathless, coming from very by your straight forward but Hellywoodite pitch. In recovering I thought nerhans you must have used the same technique to captivate that innocent Hellenic sirl. Ole Percy would have said Right en.

Considering els Plushbettem a minute: It comes as no great shock that he should gravitate to you for an advocate. Isn't their a common bend, even as to medis-operandi? See- Singleten v Foreman, 12/1/70 LW 2303-2304 U.S. Iaw week.

In reflecting on the Fereman's Re: the Singletens, you would undoubtably ask or say in defense of the Feremans: If their be semething illegal in their faction how do they evade the legal systems scrutiny.

In reply, my opinion is that their (the Foremans) tactics are some-what decentive to the layman, being unethical rather than illegal. I suggest besides occasionally selling out a client, when a prosecutor is frantic for a conviction, which is difficult for a client to prove, the game scheme goes something as follows:

- (a)) Fleecer relieves client-preferably feraffle-of worldly coeds.
- (b). When client wakes up to fleesing and litigates Fleeser precure's lecal Fraternity brother.
- (c). Fraternity brother has litigation manusvered before local Commissrator.
- (d).Lecal Commiserator's first prenouncement, no jury trial; Precedural rules then promulgated to make it difficult for Appellant Court to intropret suit on appeal.
- (e).After due commersing, for the fleecor, suit dismissed with prejudice.
- Last act; Foreman takes to the book tube, where his sort seem to be always welcome, fall's into the arms of 'talk show' Host; wherein after mush enashing of teeth and exercising of lach-ry-mal glands Fleecer receive's absolutation.
 - Note). Semetimes their is still vet another act whereby the An ellant Court desen't buy this humbug.

Before leaving ele plushy to his worldly goods you queate him as saving that you (MoMillian) possess more knowledge of Defendant than anvene in America. Therefore a suggestion to you- see General Canale.

You also write that you are going to write a nevel about the Defendant whether he (the Defendant) talk's with you are not; that you know the worst but, that you would help' the Defendant.

Page(T).

Georgiel de I read a threat of an expess if no economistion is for termine from the Defendant? You must have cadged that ' no concration' line from ".V.'s Ffrom Zimbalist.

Perhaps I should tell you, and thees who utilize you 'Time Too' that I am not considering running for public office and I doubt if the President nominates me for the high Court ... althou their are two vacancies.

As to 'Time Inc' your parent employer, I now understand that prior to 1909 they had a sort of A.C. arraingment with the justice department when it came to krocking-off people they disagreed with or, in the instant cause, an indirent they could'nt use.

You imply that you have recently received some type information from my father. Did'nt your affected friends at ' Time Inc I report via Life Magazine, when they were doing their customary pretrial hatchet ich en the Defendant, that he had died of delirium-tremens in the 1940's under poverty conditions?

Note) by the way what ever happened to you folks contempeary smeal equating poverty with saintlyness?

You do make one valid point in your letter where you saw it will take years of litigation to resolve the suit. But isn't that the prosecution's whole stratagem, to get a conviction in any manner, even if they know the conviction is clearly reveraanle, knowing that the Defendant will be incarcerated for years-especially if he desen't have the support of any pressure groups- before adjudication?

(I suggest Sheppard v Maxwell, 384 U.S. 333-1966- as a classic example.)

In observation I think now, after three years, I can understand the same scheme of the Feremans, Time Inc., and you. It isn't prefound, just sly. I can see I've been associated with your uneducated counterparts in renitertiarys for years; the type that usually end's up seperated from the main orison body for prisen merale. The sert that you been paying meney to too correborate your, and your couch dector's, novel's centents.

Further, it is possible the Feremans, with media help, will make the frame in the instant cause held. But their are signs this may not be the case, after all Foreren did'nt flee that New York 'Talk Shaw'out of modesty-especially when Tennessee Appellant Judge Robert K. Dwyer was en the same show to under-write Foreman. Also the State hasn't went to the unpresedented lenght of suspending the Great Writ to the Defendant for nothing.

Note) If Fereman can't face opposition cana 'Talk Show' how would be fere under cress-exam?

Briefly in summary: Please den't de anything to 'Help' the Defendant: also den't w rite the Defendant any further letters as I've asked nrison officials not to deliver them.

Further, I am not in the same legal position now as when the Defendant stoned thom Contracts with William Bratford Huio; then I was fundless and given no choice by defense Atterneys but to contract, with Muie, to finance what I had been led to believe would have been a jury trial. (Therefore I don't need your money.)

Finally, in the Defendant's spinion legal questions are a motter for the Courts, and jury, to deside not the communications industry.

Truly yours:

F. C. Naturally this letter will confirm all of your couch destor's barn vard speculation.

James e. Rav Hex-72, Petres, Tenn. 2704F. James e. Ra