

4/8/71

Dear Jim,

I don't like to keep anything entirely to myself, and I've just thought of one thing I've been keeping from those with whom I work for a variety of reasons, the most obvious and innocuous of which is to avoid feedback. By this means I make a separate record and one to file.

One of the perplexing things is Percy Foreman's entirely out-of-character performance in selling Ray up the river, in not going to trial. It will be obvious to you that in court he could not have lost, Ray could not have been convicted, and this was a much easier case than some I cited, where he had gone to court, against great odds, and won.

Since writing the book I've collected overwhelming proof, not then available, that he never conducted any investigation. Makes no sense. I won't take the edge of what you will read.

But why? And here I note what I felt I'd best not conjecture in the book. And for what? This, as you will see, is Mr. Money himself. He can't have enough or grub too much.

One possibility is for money, not his fee, and on behalf of invisible clients, the principals in the case.

This, in turn, can raise questions about Jerry, who admits responsibility for getting Foreman in. I can't answer them, but I do not believe that if he had any such involvement it was deliberate, conscious.

After you have read the book, I'll tell you what I have already recorded and shared, what I believe to have been the mechanics and involvements.

Again, thanks for the pleasant surprise last night.

Meanwhile, if you ever see any suggestion, no matter how faint, that Foreman's practice has included organized-crime figures (I've got to get his King of the Courts), please let me know. Anywhere, but especially in the South.

Best,