

Bob,

You did not ask me merely to take "30 minutes" to talk to this man on the parking lot. Your exact words, which you uttered at least three times were: "You should talk to this man... take a hour or two and go somewhere."

At one point, you said: "Have you eaten anything...you ought to take this man and sit down somewhere and talk?"

What irked me the most was that I had tried to explain to you on the phone that I did not have much time, and that if I was as hot as you made it sound on the phone, I would take time off and go to parking lot to discuss it, as you insisted your phone was tapped.

As far as being prepared to talk to the man on the lot, I was prepared to talk--that was why I went there in the first place, although I carefully explained to you on phone, I had only good four hours study time, before I had to be in bed at 10 p.m., as I get up at 3:30 a.m. on Saturday to be at work on news desk at 4 a.m. (you are a bad listener, as you never seem hear what the other party is saying.)

It has apparently been a long time since you took the bar exam. I had four days before bar, and I had to work three 8-hour days of the four days left. That's why every minute was precious.

Shawn
I thought you would have ~~some~~ a little consideration for someone who, like yourself, as spent as much of his own time and resources, ~~working on the James Earl Ray case~~ working on the James Earl Ray case and would have allowed me at least a week off to study for something as important as the bar exam.

FOR THE RECORD, I OBSERVED YOU WERE NOT GOING TO TAKE THE TIME TO TALK TO THIS MAN YOU DESCRIBED AS HAVING VITAL INFORMATION ON RAY CASE. YOU HAD A DINNER DATE AT HOME WITH YOUR FAMILY, SON AND HIS GIRL FRIEND, BUT YOU ONLY HAD A FEW MINUTES TO TALK TO THIS MAN, AND THEN DUMP HIM OFF ON ME WHEN I HAD TO BE IN BED AT LEAST BY 10 P.M. SO I COULD BE UP AT ~~2~~ 3:30 A.M.

If you are as inconsiderate and insensitive as that, then it is just as well that we sever our relations and end our arrangement right now. As far as the two boxes of documents, as I understand the 1970 arrangement, you loaned those to me upon request and urgings of Bernard Fensterwald, chief counsel. If Mr. Fensterwald is demanding the return of these documents immediately, then I can deliver them to your office at my first opportunity, along with the criminal law book that you loaned.

ALSO, I PRESUMED THAT IF THIS CHARACTER YOU BAILED OUT OF JAIL WAS SO IMPORTANT TO RAY CASE (I got letter from Jimmy today

and ~~he~~ seems to agree with my gut reaction--namely, the guy was a con man), THEN YOU AS TENNESSEE COUNSEL FOR RAY WOULD HAVE TAKEN A COUPLE OF HOURS YOURSELF AND TALKED TO HIM. AS FAR AS CONFLICT OF INTEREST, MY UNDERSTANDING WAS THAT FRANKIE ALD AND TESSIE TESTIFIED YOU ONLY NOT TO MAKE ANY DEALS ABOUT IMMUNITY. THOSE INSTRUCTIONS HAVE NOT PREVENTED YOU FROM THOSE MARATHON TELEPHONE CALLS TO CLIFF IN CANADA, SO WHY WOULD THEY PREVENT YOU FROM TALKING TO THIS MAN? AT LEAST LONGER ENOUGH TO GET THE SUBSTANCE OF HIS STORY?

I did attempt to question the man on the lot, but you kept interrupting: "You ought to take this man somewhere and sit down and talk to him," ~~xxxx~~

The only straight answer I got was when I asked him if he knew James Earl Ray, and he said "No." That's when you interrupted again, and told him to show me the passports, one for Canada, and another for Luxemburg. (I once had a passport to Europe including Luxemburg; does that make me a material witness to Ray case?)

Every other question I asked, you interrupted, or he would respond with such unresponsive questions as: "Are you financially ~~xxxx~~ secure?" "Do you want to get rich?" I went there to get information on Ray case, and not be interrogated by a total stranger as to my financial resources.

The only other matter he contributed was an inarticulate exposition of the possibility or probably of conspiracy, an idea that is hardly new to someone who has been investigating the JFK and Martin Luther King assassinations for the past 11 years.

My gut reaction was the man was a "con man." However, if it had been after the bar exam, I would have taken a hour or two and talked to him. I took a hour to talk to your Little Eagle friend, whom I am convinced ~~is~~ is insane. Because of my confidence in your judgment, I have reserved judgment on "cliff," as I have never met him. There is some evidence to suggest--including an occasional doubt expressed by you--that he is also either ~~xxxx~~ insane, or a rip-off artist.

I have spent the sands--and that is not an exaggeration--interviewing and talking to people about the Kennedy-King murders and I have must have spent a 100 hours talking to ~~xxxx~~ some of them reliable nuts, some of them not so reliable and some of them absolutely worthless.

Thus, if it had not been for the pressure of the bar exam closing in on me, I would have taken time to talk to the man.

Also, you took at least 10 minutes on introductory minutia, such as the exact time he first called your office, the time you returned his call, the time he called back, the time you called the jail, etc, etc,

With about only three to four hours good study time before me before going to bed, to pour over and ponder analytical

page 3

questions pertaining to such esoteric and abstruse subjects as destructibility of contingent remainders, doctrine of worthier title, rule against perpetuities (property was my subject for that night), I may have seemed unusually irritable and restless that you weighed me down such minutia before getting to the meat of the matter.

You never told me why he was important. You expressed something about your phone being tap, etc, etc...

As for your resolution not to share any information in the future, remember that is a sword that cuts both ways. Any other reporter in the prison who heard you describe certain conversations with the media as "hogwash," could have cut you up pretty good in print the next day.

I was prepared to tell you about two excellent leads--one I gave you the bare substance of--developed in the past 10 days, one that may take me to New York and Boston next month. Because of your declaration, I am now relieved of passing this information on to you. I HAVE INFORMED JAMES ABOUT THE GENERAL NATURE OF LEADS AND RECEIVED A REPLY FROM HIM TODAY.

But as I am no longer obligated to share such information with the distinguished Tennessee Counsel for James Earl Ray, you will have to obtain it indirectly from your client, or Mr. Fensterwald or Mr. Lesar, whom Ray said he would inform of any developments, which I intend to pass on to Ray directly.

WAYNE CHASTAIN, JR.

cc: James Earl Ray,
Bernard Fensterwald...

Wayne Chastain Jr.