Harold Weisberg
Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
3/24/71

Mr. John Shattuck
ACLU,

Dear Mr. Shattuck,

The George McMillán case has established as a Constitutional right not that of a writer to interview a prisoner but a right to bribe against interest of the prisoner and a right to override the Constitutional rights of others to whom he is related.

The ACLU can't take all the cases it would like. It also declines some cases because of its hangups, not taking legitimate Constitutional cases for those who can't pursue them because of poverty and taking them for the wealthy when they are not legitimate cases.

George McMillan's Constitutional rights immediately are to deliver what he has not been able to deliver under an old contract that provided him with lots and lots of money. Not principle at all, really. He blew this welath. His wife is independently wealthy.

John Ray is impoverished and in urgent need of help. George has been trying to bribe him for years, trying to get him to make something up that George can use to breathe life into his literary cadaver. And. of course, to deny James all his rights. The project is about James, not John, or others McMillan has also tried to bribe and who have informed me of it.

Were the government not itself in trouble over the Rays it would have produced evidence in the court below of precisely that which I report here only in part. The warden at Leavenworth and John's case worker both expressed their concern over this attempted bribery to me. Both could jave been witnesses.

If you had listened to me when I tried to interest you in the principle that was being established in John's case McMillan would not have had a chance because John was refusing his blandishments. When John was desparate he accepted the bribe. And if you doubt these representations, particularly on the magnitude of the repressive principle being established, as a result of my efforts Jim Lesar, 201/484-6023 is handling John's case before the Supreme Court.

Meanwhile, what about James' rights or those of all other Rays, including children? McMillan's unhidden (from them if not the ACLU) intent and purpose is to defame them all.

John is a racist. He really believes that awful stuff. But he is the victim of the grossest injustice, including by all counsel to Lesar. The lawyer who is supposed to have filed the petition cert with the Supreme Court didn't. He assured John in writing that he had and he assured me of it in May, 1971. And he is getting away with it. So, through a racist who is also a man without means and a vulnerable man the Mitchellisti have already established a fascist principle and now the ACLU is firmly behind them if collaterally.

Priscilla McMillan also got a very large advance on a similar book, on Marina Oswald. It also has not been published, after 10 years.The reporting of the court of appeals decision in George's case is wrong in describing his project as "a book on the slaying of Dr. Martin Luther King." It is a psychological study of the Rays, chiefly James If you want the printed description on announcement, I'll provide it. Priscilla's also was not on the JFK assassination. And she found as did Harpers, who consulted me in June of 1966, that there is no book about bitches on wheels. Marina was also bribed. In her case by the government, by both the FBI and the Secret Service. I have the reports of both agencies, even that of the Secret Service on the financial corruption involved. And Priscilla and George, both in pursuit of the highest principle, presumption of guilt in six figures, both presumed guilt. Now, tragically, the ACLU with them.

I can't help comparing what the ACLU will get involved in with what it won't when political assassinations are also involved. The conclusions that it indulges hangups is not easily avoided.

There could not have been any inquiry in the McMillan case without what I say and much more becoming obvious. Moreover, in the McMillan case, the involvement of James' rights is also obvious. In addition, counsel for James is known to the ACLU, so inquiry was easy.

John tried to interest the ACLU in his case, without success. He would have provided you with McMillan's correspondence. I have some, beginning with his offer of $5,000 to James and James' contemptuous rejection of it. John is now providing it to Jim Lesar.

On the other hand, and on the other side of the subject of assassinations, there is a clear record. The ACLU did not have to inquire. Back in 1966, when I asked for real Constitutional help, with the Freedom of Information law just enacted, I took an ACLU lawyer to the National Archives and showed him enough to shaken him considerably. Then I asked for help. Most recently I told you the evidence of have of violation of my rights. This includes carbons or surveillance on me but is not limited to that.

The difference is that you liberal types don't like the work I do and then don't like my way of being pointed. Neither you nor anyone else addresses the validity of my work, which remains unchallenged. Only disliked.

If you prefer establishing bribery as a Constitutional right and preserve a record of assisting government in persecuting a writer (going back to the Dies committee), you have that right. You have exercised it.

I did not ask the ACLU to file amicus with the Supreme Court in my case. It said it would, as did others. If any such briefs have been filed, I have not heard of it. On my part, the first thing I did after the en banc appeals-court decision was to write counsel and tell him that I consider the principle more important than my personal rights and that I want him to subordinate my personal interests to the principle.

This is not my first reminder to the ACLU of how different things would be if it had not been hungup and had filed the first cases under 5 U.S.C. 552 when it was first possible. I add the suggestion that if it had, much of what the FBI has done since then it might not have dared.

And in the McMillan case the same testing was being done by others, at no cost to the ACLU. So, it seems that taking this case did nothing for establishing principle, meaning other than the right to bribe and to deny others their rights.

If you question my factual representation, I invite challenge and offer proof.

With sincere regrets,

Harold Weisberg

cc:Jim Lesar