THE FOLLOWING AFFIDAVIT IS TRUE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.
COMMENCING WITH MY ARREST AND INCARCERATION IN LONDON ENGLAND ON OR ABOUT JUNE,6,1968;
AND TERMINATING WITH THE GUILTY PLEA TO HOMOICIDE AND INCARCERATION IN THE TENNESSEE STATE PRISON AT NASHVILLE TENNESSEE.
THE ABOVE PLEA IN THE COURT OF THE HONORABLE W. PRESTON BATTLE,MEMPHIS TENNESSEE,MARCH,IO, 1969.

ON OR ABOUT THE 6th.DAY OF JUNE,1968$ I was arrested AT THE HEATHROW AIRPORT, LONDON ENGLAND, SUBSEQUENTLY I WAS CHARGED WITH HOMOICIDE IN THE UNITED STATES AND ORDERED HELD FOR AN IMMIGRATION HEARING.AFTER BEING HELD INCOMMUNICADO FOR APPROXIMATELY 4 DAYS I WAS TAKEN BEFORE AN ENGLISH MAGISTRATE AND ORDERED HELD FOR AN EXTRADITION HEARING.
SHORTLY AFTER MY INCARCERATION IN THE ENGLISH PRISON I WROTE TO BIRMINGHAM ALABAMA ATTORNEY, AUTHOR J. HANES, VIA THE BIRMINGHAM BAR ASSOCIATION ASKING HIM IF HE WOULD MEET ME IN MEMPHIS TENN, WHEN I WAS EXTRIDATED BACK TO THE UNITED STATES.AT THIS TIME I DID'NT ASK MR.HANES TO TAKE THE CASE JUST MEET ME IN MEMPHIS,AS I WAS CONCERNED ABOUT FALSELY BEING ACCUSED OF MAKING AN ORAL STATEMENT IF I WAS ALONE WITH PROSECUTION AGENTS IN MEMPHIS.
MR. HANES IN TURN WROTE TO THE ENGLISH SOLICITOR WHO WAS REPRESENTING ME IN ENGLAND,MR. MICHEL EUGENE,INQUIRING ABOUT HIS FEE.THEN LATER MR. HANES WROTE TO ME DIRECTLY SAYING HE WOULD TAKE THE CASE.
"ALSO,I HAD WRITTEN TO MY BROTHER,JOHN L. RAY,ST LOUIS,MISSOURI-NOT WILLIAM BRATFORD HUIE- ASKING HIM TO GIVE MR.HANES ENOUGHT MONEY TO MEET ME IN MEMPHIS?
LATER MR. HANES CAME TO LONDON ENGLAND TO CONFER WITH ME ON LEGAL QUESTIONS.
HOWEVER THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT REFUSED MR.HANES REQUEST TO SEE ME.
WHEN I COMPLAINED TO SUPT.THOMAS BUTLER-WHO WAS THE POLICE OFFICER IN CHARAGE OF INVESTAGATION AND CUSTODY-ABOUT NOT BEING PERMITTED TO CONFER WITH COUNSEL HE SAID UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FRED M. VINSON WAS CALLING THE SHOTS.
THEREFORE AT MY NEXT COURT APPERANCE I COMPLAINED OF NOT BEING PERMITTED TO CONFER WITH COUNSEL.
THEREAFTER I WAS TOLD BY PRISON AUTHORIES THAT MR. HANES COULD SEE ME.
ON JULY 5th.1968,MR. HANES DID VISIT ME IN THE ENGLISH PRISON.
HE SUGGESTED I SIGN TWO CONTRACTS-ONE GIVING MR. HANES MY POWER OF ATTORNEY,THE OTHER 40% OF ALL REVENUE I MIGHT RECEIVE-AT THIS TIME NO MENTION WAS MADE OF ANY NOVELIST,AND NO NOVELIST NAME,INCLUDING WILLIAM BRATFORD HUIE,APPEARED ON THE CONTRACT.
THE REASONS MR. HANES GAVE FOR THE CONTRACTS WERE THAT(ONE)HE WAS ALLREADY OUT CONSIDERABLE FUNDS.(TWO)HE WOULD NEED CONSIDERABLE MORE FUNDS FOR HIS SERVICES.

"I HAD ALSO WRITTEN THE BOSTON MASS. ATTORNEY,MR. F. LEE BAILEY-AT THE SAME TIME I HAD WRITT -EN MR. HANES-ON THE POSSIBILITY OF REPRESENTING ME.
IN A LETTER TO ENGLISH SOLICITOR EUGENE, MR. BAILEY DECLINED ON POSSIBLE CONFLICT OF INSTREST GROUNDS"

I SPOKE TO MR. HANES AGAIN BEFORE BEING DEPORTED BUT NO FURTHER MENTION WAS MADE OF CONTRAC -TS.MR. HANES DID ADVISE ME TO WAIVE FURTHER EXTRADITION APPEALS;WHICH I DID.

AFTER I WAS RETURNED TO MEMPHIS TENN. AND CONFINED IN THE SHELBY COUNTY JAIL I WAS DENIED ACCESS TO LEGAL COUNSEL,OR SLEEP, UNTIL I SUBMITTED TO PALM PRINTS.
WHEN SUBSEQUENTLY ATTORNEY AUTHOR HANES SR. DID VISIT ME,SPECIFIALLY THE SECOND VISIT, HE HAD WITH HIM CONTRACTS FOR VARIOUS ENTERPRISES BEARING HIS NAME AND THE NOVELIST,WILLIAM BRATFORD HUIE OF HARTSELL ALABAMA.
MR. HANES URGED ME TO SIGN THE CONTRACTS TO FINANCE THE SUIT.
I SUGGESTED RATHER THAT A SEGMENT OF THE PUBLIC INTERSST I N A FAIR TRIAL MIGHT FINANCE THE

TRIAL.THEN AFTER THE TRIAL WAS OVER,AND IF IT WASFINICALLY NECESSARY TO FURTHER SUPPLEMENT MR. HANES FEE,HE COULD CONTRACT A NOVELIST.
MR. HANES DISAGREED WITH THIS SUGGESTION AND TOLD ME TO CONSIDER THE CONTRACTS AS THE ONLY-METHOD TO FIANANCE THE TRIAL.
AFTER CONSIDERABLE THOUGHT,AND BELIEVEING IT USUALLY NECESSARY TO FOLLOW COUNSELS ADVICE IN THAT TYPE SITUTATION,I SIGNED THE CONTRACTS ON OR ABOUT AUGUST 1st.1968; APPROXIMATELY TWO WEEKS AFTER MR. HANES RECOMMENDED I DO SO.

MY FIRST DISAGREEMENT WITH MR. HANES WAS (ONE)I ASKED MR. HANES AND,WROTE THE NOVELIST, WILLIAM BRATFORD HUIE,REQUESTING $1.250.00. EXPLAINING I WANTED TO HIRE TENN. LICENCE IN THE EVENT I WAS CONVICTED OF SOMETHING,OR HAD A MISTRIAL;AS THEIR WAS SOME QUESTION AS TO WHEATHER MR. HANES COULD HANDLE AN APPEAL OR,A RETRIAL,UNDER THE TENN.+ ALABAMA RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT WHICH MR. HANES DESCRIBED AS A "ONE SHOT DEAL".
I FURTHER STATED IN THE LETTER TO MR. HUIE THAT I WOULD PROABLY BE HELD IN CONTINUED ISOLATION AS LONG AS I WAS INCARCERATED AND WOULD NEED TENN. COUNSEL TO GET RELIEFS.

"FURTHER,I WANTED TO HIRE AN INVESTAGOR TO GO TO [redacted] LOUISANA TO CHECK ON SOME PHONE NRS. AND I DID'NT WANT ANYONE CONNECTED WITH WILLIAM BRATFORD HUIE DOING THIS SINCE I KNEW THEN THAT MR. HUIE WAS A CONVEYOR,AN ADMITTED CONVEYOR, OF INFORMATION TO THE F.B.I.-HENCE THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY."

MR. HANES TURNED DOWN THIS REQUEST AND THE ISSUE WAS CLOSED.

(TWO)THE OTHER DISAGREEMENT CONCERNED WHEATHER I SHOULD TESTIFY IN MY BEHALF.
I FAVORED TAKING THE WITINESS STAND BECAUSE I HAD TESTIMONY TO GIVE WHICH I DIDINT WANT THE PROSECUTION TO KNOW OF UNTIL AS LATE AS POSSIBLE SO THEIR WOULD BE NO TIME TO ALTER RECORDS,SUCH AS PHONE NRS.,AND AT THIS STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS I HAD REASONS TO BELIEVE MR. HANER WAS GIVING "ALL" INFORMATION I WAS GIVING HIM TO NOVELIST HUIE WHO INTURN WAS FORWARDINGS IT TO THE PROSECUTION VIA THE F.B.I.

MR. HANES ALSO TURNED DOWN THIS REQUEST SAYING,WHY GIVE TESTIMONY AWAY WHEN WE CAN SELL IT.AND THAT ISSUE WAS ALSO CLOSED.

THE ONLY OTHER DISCORD MR. HANES AND I HAD CONCERNED PUBLICITY.
DESPITE TRIAL JUDGE BATTLE'S ORDER BANNING PRE-TRIAL PUBLICITY THEIR WERE MANY PREJUDICIAL ARTICLES PRINTED IN THE LOCAL PRESS AND NATIONAL MEDIA.
(AS EXAMPLE)THE STORY BY-LINED BY CHARLES EDMONDSON IN THE COMMERCIAL APPEAL DATED NOV.10th.1968.JUST TWO DAYS BEFORE TRIAL WAS SCHEDULED TO START,AND MR. HUIE'S FREQUENT NEWS CONFERENCES ON MEMPHIS T.V.) THEREFORE I SUGGESTED TO MR. HANES THAT WE ASK FOR A CONTINUENCE UNTIL THE PUBLICITY STOPED.
MR. HANES ANSER WAS THAT OUR CONTRACTS WITH NOVELIST HUIE SPECIFIED A TIME LIMIT FOR THE TRIAL TO BEGIN IF WE WERE TO RECEIVE FUNDS TO PROSECUTETHE DEFENSE.

"ALSO, I WROTE A CERTIFED LETTER TO TRIAL JUDGE BATTLE COMPLAINING OF THE STORIES MR. HUIE WAS DISSMINATING IN THE MEDIA.I TOLD THE JUDGE IF SUCH PRACTICES WEREN'T STOPED I MIGHT AS WELL FORGET A TRIAL AND JUST COME OVER AND GET SENTENCED."

HOWEVER,DESPITE THESE DIFFERENCES WITH ATTORNEY AUTHOR HANES SR. I WAS PREPARED TO GO TO TRIAL WITH HIM ON NOV.12th.1968.
but two or three days before the nov. trial datemy BROTHER,JERRY RAY,CAME TO VISIT ME.DURING THE COURSE OF OUR CONVERSATION JERRY TOLD ME HE HAD RECENTLY SPOKEN WITH THE NOVELIST,WILLIAM BRATFORD HUIE,AND HUIE HAD TOLD HIM THAT IF I TESTIFIED IN MY OWN BEHALF IT WOULD DESTROY THE BOOK HE WAS WRITING.
MY BROTHER ASK ME IF HE SHOULD TRY TO FIND ANOTHER ATTORNEY.I TOLD HIM NO IT WAS TO LATE.WHEN THE VISIT ENDED I WAS STILL ASSUMING I WOULD GO TO TRIAL WITH ATTORNEY AUTHOR HANES SR. ON NOV.12th.1968.

HOWEVER,ON OR ABOUT NOV.10th.1968.MR. PERCY FOREMAN,A TEXAS LICENCED ATTORNEY CAME TO THE SHELBY COUNTY JAIL AND ASKED TO SEE ME.
I AGREED TO SEE MR. FOREMAN ALTHOS I NEITHER CONTACKED HIM DIRECTLY OR,INDIRECTLY,REQUESTING ANY TYPE LEGAL ASSISTANCE.

AFTER THE AMENITIES I SAW THAT MR. FOREMAN HAD THE CONTRACTS I HAD SIGNED WITH MR. HANES&MR. HUIE.
I ASKED HIS OPINION OF THEM.MR. FOREMAN CAME RIGHT TO THE POINT,HE SAID HE HAD READ THE CONTRACTS AND HAD CONCLUDED THAT THE ONLY THING HANES & HUIE WERE INTERESTED IN WAS MONEY.HE SAID THEY WERE PERSONAL FRIENDS AND IF I STUCK WITH THEM I WOULD BE BAR-BE-CUED.
I TOLD MR. FOREMAN I WAS CONCERNED WITH CERTAINED ASPECTS OF THE CONTRACTS,SUCH AS THE INFERENCE OF A TRIAL DATE DEADLINE,BUT THAT SINCE I HAD SIGNED THE DOCUMENT THEIR WASN'T MUCH I COULD DO.
MR. FOREMAN REPLIED THEIR WAS SOMETHING I COULD DO,THAT HE COULD BREAK THE CONTRACTS IF I HIRED HIM;SINCE I HAD BEEN TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF DUE TO A LACK OF EDUCATION IN SUCH MATTERS.
I ASK HIM WHAT HIS POSITION WOULD BE IF I DID ENGAGE HIM IN RELATION TO CONTRACTS WITH BOOK WRITERSAND,RETAINING A TENN.LICENCED ATTORNEY.
HE SAID THEIR WOULD BE NO STORIES WRITTEN UNTIL AFTER THE TRIAL WAS OVERAND THAT IT WAS NECESSARY THAT TENN. LICENCED COUNSEL BE RETAINED TO ADVISE AND ASSIST WITH TENN. LAWS.
I ALSO ASKED MR. FOREMAN HOW HE WOULD FINANCE THE TRIAL;HE SAID LET HIM WORRY ABOUT THAT THAT WHEN THE TRIAL WAS OVER HE WOULD MAKE A DEAL WITH SOME BOOK WRITER BUT THAT HE WOULDN'T COMPRISE THE DEFENSE WITH PRE-TRIAL DEALS.
HE SAID THAT HIS FEE WOULD BE$150,000. FOR THE TRIAL,AND APPEALS IF NECESSARY,AND THAT AS A RETAINER HE WOULD TAKE THE 1966 MUSTANG I HAD,WHICH I SIGNED OVER TO HIM.
MR FOREMAN ALSO ASKED ME TO SIGN OVER TO HIM A RIFLE THE PROSECUTION WAS HOLDING AS EVIDENCE.ALTHOE THEIR WES A QUESTION OF OWNERSHIP I ALSO SIGNED THIS ITEM OVER TO HIM.
I THEN WROTE OUT A STATEMENT FOR MR. FOREMAN DISMISSING MR. HANES AND STATING I WOULD ENGAGE TENN. COUNSEL.

AFTER MR. FOREMAN BECAME COUNSEL OF RECORD, AND ON ONE OF HIS EARLIER VISIT'SHE SAID HE WOULD RETAIN NASHVILLE ATTORNEY,JOHN J. HOOKER SR. TO ASSIST WITH THE LAW SUIT.

"LATER,MR. FOREMAN TOLD ME IN THE COURTROOM-ON DEC.18th1968-THAT THE COURT WOULD APPOINT THE PUBLIC DEFENDER TO THE CASE.WHEN I QUESTIONED THE APPOINTEE MR. FOREMAN SAID HE,JUDGE-BATTLE,AND MR. HUGH STANTON SR. HAD AGREED BEFORE THE HEARING TO BRING THE PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE INTO THE CASE.THAT HE (FOREMAN)HAD ALSO DISCUSSED THE DEAL PRIVATELY WITH MR. STANTON AND IT (THE APPOINTMENT)WOULD SAVE US MONEY BUT,THAT HE WOULD STILL RETAIN JOHN J. HOOKER SR."

IN DECEMBER 1968 WHEN MR. FOREMAN BECAME ILL,AND TRIAL JUDGE BATTLE APPOINTED-ON JAN. 17th.1969-MR. HUGH STANTON SR. FULL COUNSEL,MR. STANTON CAME TO THE JAIL TO SEE ME.
I TOLD CAPT.BILLY SMITH I DID NOTWISH TO SEE MR. STANTON.
HE WAS PERMITTED IN THE CELL BLOCK ANYWAY.
I INFORMED MR. STANTON I DID'NT WANT TO DISCUSS ANYTHING WITH HIM AND THAT I WOULD WRITE HIM A LETTER EXPLAINING WHY.
HE LEFT THE BLOCK SAYING HE DID'NT HAVE TIME FOR THE CASE ANYWAY.

"I THEN WROTE A LETTER TO MR. HUGH STANTON SR. SAYING I DID'NT WANT JUDGES AND PROSECUTING-ATTORNEYS DESIDEING WHO WOULD DEFEND ME."

Note DURING THIS EARLY PERIOD OF MR. FOREMAN TENURE HE ONCE SUGGESTED I CONFIRM,IN WRITING, SOME THEORIES BEING PROPOUNDED BY ANOTHER NOVELIST,ONE GEORGE McMILLIAN WHO, IN COLLABORATION WITH A PHRENOLOGIST, WAS WRITING ANOTHER NOVEL CONCERNING THE CASE.
MR. FOREMAN SAID THE PAIR WOULD GIVE US $5,000.00 TO USE FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES.
I REJECTED THIS SUGGESTION."

THEN LATER MR. FOREMAN TRANSPORTED A CHECK TO THE JAIL FOR $5,000.00 FOR ME TO ENDORSE.
HE SAID HE HAD RECEIVED THE CHECK FROM THE NOVELIST WILLIAM BRADFORD HUIE AND THAT WOULD I LET HIM HAVE THE MONEY TO GIVE TO NASHVILLE attORNEY,JOHN J. HOOKER SR. AS A RETAINER FEE,I AGREED TO THIS.

"ALSO DURING THIS PERIOD I SUGGESTED TO Mr. FOREMAN THAT RATHER THAN PRINTING MORE PRE-TRIAL STORIES WE INSTIGATE SOME TYPE LEGAL ACTION TO PREVENT THE PUBLISHING OF STORIES, ESPICALLY THE MORE RANCID TYPE ARTICLES SUCH AS WAS APPEARING IN LIFE MAGAZINE.
MR. FOREMAN REJECTED THIS SUGGESTION SAYING: "WHY STIR UP A BARREL OF RATTLE SNAKES."

STILL LATER, ON OR ABOUT JAN. 29th. 1969. MR. FOREMAN TRANSPORTED A CONTRACT TO THE JAIL AN -D ADVISED ME TO SIGN IT. "SEE CONTRACT CT. RECORDS!"
MR. FOREMAN SAYING IT WOULD TAKE CONSIDERABLE FUNDS TO FINANCE THE SUIT AND PAY JOHN J. HOOKER SR.'S FEE.

ON OR ABOUT FEBURARY 3rd. 1969-MR. FOREMAN TRANSPORTED STILL ANOTHER CONTRACT TO THE JAIL AND ADVISED ME TO SIGN IT. HE TOLD ME THE LAW SUIT WAS PROGRESSING WELL, THAT HE COULD PROVE I WAS INNOCENT, AND THE TRIAL WOULD START IN THE NEAR FUTURE.
I ALSO SIGNED THIS DOCUMENT BEING REASSURED BECAUSE THE DOCUMENT STIPULATED THAT MR. FOREMAN WOULD REPRESENT ME AT 'TRIAL OR TRIALS' PENDING IN SHELBY COUNTY TENNESSEE; IN EXCHANGE FOR ME SIGNING THE DOCUMENT." SEE CONTRACT CT. RECORDS."
THEIR WAS NO MENTION OF "COP-OUTS" IN THE CONTRACT AND IT SEEMS "COP-OUTS" ARE NOT LEGA ALLY CLASSIFIED AS TRIALS IN TENNESSEE.

BEFORE MR. FOREMAN TERMINATED HIS VISIT THAT DAY OR, MAYBE IT WAS THE NEXT TIME HE VISITED ME, HE SHOWED ME VARIOUS PICTURES. HE SAID EITHER HE (FOREMAN) HAD RECEIVED THE PI- -CTURES FROM TH E F.B.I. OR THAT HE HAD RECEIVED THEM FROM THE NOVELIST, WILLIAM BRATFORD HUIE, WHO IN TURN HAD RECEIVED THEM FROM THE F.B.I.
HE SAID THEY WERE PICTURES OF PEOPLE THE F.B.I. WANTED TO GET OUT OF CIRCULATION.
HE SHOWED ME ONE PICTURE CONTAINING WHITE MALES-SUPPOSELY TAKEN IN DALLAS TEXAS IN NOVEMBER 1963, HE SAID THEY WERE EITHER ANTI COMMUNIST CUBANS OR, ASSOCIATED WITH ANTI COMMUNIST. FOREMAN ASKED ME IF I WOULD IDENTIFY ONE OF THE MEN AS THE MAN WHO SHOT MARTIN LUTHER KING IF THE F.B.I. ARRESTED HIM AND TRANSPORTED HIM TO MEMPHIS.
I TOLD MR. FOREMAN, NO, THAT I DID'NT WANT TO GET INVOLVED IN THAT TYPE THING FOR VARIOUS REASONS.
WHEN READY TO TAKE LEAVE, AND FAILING TO CONVINCE ME TO FOLLOW THE AFOREMENTION ADVICE, MR. FOREMAN ASK ME IF THAT WAS MY LAST WORD ON THE SUBJECT: I REPLIED YES.
THEN AT A LATER DATE WHEN [redacted] ATTORNEY FOREMAN VISITED ME HE HAD SEVERAL DUPLICATED TYPEWRITTEN SHEETS OF PAPER WITH HIM, ONE CLAUSE IN THE SHEETS CLEARED THE NOVELIST, WILLIAM BRATFORD HUIE, AND LOOK MAGAZINE, OF DAMAGING MY PROSPECTS FOR A FAIR TRIAL BECAUSE OF THEIR PRE-TRIAL PUBLISHING VENTURES, ANOTHER CLAUSE, THAT IF I STOOD TRIAL I WOULD RECEIVE THE ELECTRIC CHAIR.

"I TOLD MR. FOREMAN THAT MR. HUIE AND LOOK MAGAZINE WERE ABLE, LEGALLY & FINICALLY, TO LO -OK OUT FOR THEIR OWN INTEREST".

MR. FOREMAN MONOLOGUE WAS VERY STRIDENT THAT DAY, IN INSISTING THAT I SIGN THE PAPERS AS I HAD TO ASK HIM SEVERAL TIMES TO LOWER HIS VOICE TO KEEP THE GUARDS, [redacted] AND OPEN MIKE, FROM OVER HEARING OUR CONVERSATION.
I THOUGHT THEN THAT MAYBE I HAD BEEN "HAD" BELIVEING IT WAS FINICALL,, THE SUGGESTION OF [redacted] A GUI -LTY PLEA SO SOON AFTER SIGNING THE FEBRUARY, 3rd. CONTRACT.

THE NEXT TIME I SAW MR. FOREMAN HIS MONOLOGUE HAD'NT CHANGED SO I SIGNED THE AFOREME -NTIONED PAPERS BUT, NOT WITH THE INTENTION OF PLEADING GUILTY; AS I TOLD FOREMAN.

LATER I TRIED TO PERSUADE MR. FOREMAN TO STAND TRIAL, I ASKED HIM WHY IT WAS NECESSA -RY TO PLEAD GUILTY WHEN I WASN'T GUILTY.
MR. FOREMAN GAVE ME THE FOLLOWING REASONS WHY A GUILTY PLEA WAS NECESSARY.
(ONE) HE SAID THE MEDIA HAD ALLREADY CONVICTED ME AND CITED THE PRE-TRIAL ARTICLES W WRITTEN IN LIFE MAGAZINE AND THE READERS DIGEST; WITH THE HELP OF GOVERNMENT IN- VESTAGATIVES AGENCIES, AS EXAMPLES.
HE ALSO CITED VARIOUS ARTICLES PRINTED IN THE LOCAL PRESS, PARTICULAR THE STORY IN THE COMMERICAL APPEAL DATED NOV. 10th. 1968, JUST TWO DAYS BEFORE TRIAL DATE.

FURTHER, FOREMAN CITED THE RECORD OF THE AMICUS CUREIA COMMITTEE SAYING NEITHER THE COMMITTEE OR TRIAL JUDGE WOULD ATTEMPT TO HALT PUBLIVCITY UNLESS IT REFLECTED ON THE PROSECUTION CASE.

(TWO) FOREMAN SUGGESTED, SPECIOUSLY, THAT IT WOULD BE IN MY FINICIAL INTEREST TO PLEAD GUILTY.

(THREE) THAT THE PROSECUTION HAD PROMISED A WITINESS CONSIDERABLE REWARD MONEY FOR TEST -IFING AGAINST ME, THAT THIS WITINESS HAD ALLREADY BEEN GIVEN A RAISE IN A WELFARE CHECK HE WAS RECEIVING FROM THE GOVERNMENT, THAT THE PROSECUTION WAS ALSO PAYING HIS FO FOOD AND WINE BILLS.
FURTHER, THAT TWO MEMPHIS ATTORNEYS HAD SIGNED A CONTRACT WITH THIS ALLEDGED WITINESS F FOR 50% OF ALL REVENUE HE RECEIVED FOR HIS TESTIMONY. THEY IN TURN WOULD LOOK OUT FOR HIS INTEREST.

MR. FOREMAN ALSO GAVE ME THE FOLLOWING REASONS WHY THE PROSECUTION WANTED, AND WOULD THEREFORE LET, ME PLEAD GUILTY.

(ONE) THAT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERENCE WAS PRESSURING THE TRIAL JUDGE AND THE ATTORNEY GENERALS OFFICE TO GET A GUILTY PLEA AS A LONG TRIAL WOULD HAVE AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON BUSINESS, BOYCOTS AND SUCH.
FURTHER, THAT THE CHAMBER WASN'T UNHAPPY ABOUT DR. KING BEING REMOVED FROM THE SCENE-HENCE THE ACCEPTANCE OF A GUILTY PLEA.

(TWO) THAT TRIAL JUDGE BATTLE WAS ~~ABOUT~~ CONCERNED ABOUT THE EFFECTS A TRIAL WOULD HAVE ON THE CITY'S(MEMPHIS) IMAGE, AND THAT THE JUDGE HAD EVEN DISPATCHED HIS AMICUS CURIEA COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN, MR. LUCIAN BURCH, TO PERSUADE SOME S.C.L.C. MEMBERS TO ACCEPT A GUILTY PLEA.

"ABOUT THIS TIME PERCY FOREMAN ALSO HAD ME SIGN ANOTHER PAPER SANCTIFING HIS DEALING WITH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE."

LATER, AFTER CONSIDERING ALL THAT MR. FOREMAN HAD TOLD ME I SAID I STILL WANTED TO ~~S~~ STAND TRIAL.
I TOLD FOREMAN I AGREED THAT THE MEDIA HAD HAD AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE PROSPECTS OF MY RECEVING A FAIR TRIAL BUT I DID'NT THINK THE PUBLIC ANY LONGER BELIEVED EVERY FABRICATION THEY READOR, SAW ON T.V.--THEREFORE A POSSIBLE FAIR JURY VERDICT.

MR. FOREMAN REPLY WAS THAT IF I PLEAD GUILTY HE COULD GET ME A PARDON, AFTER TWO OR THREE YEARS, THROUGH THE OFFICE OF NASHVILLE ATTORNEY, JOHN J. HOOKER SR. AS A RELATIVE OF MR. HOOKER WOULD THEN BE GOVERNOR.

BUT, IF I INSISTED ON A TRIAL HE (FOREMAN) WOULD HIRE FORMER MEMPHIS JUDGE, MR. BEN ~~H~~ HOOKS, AS CO-COUNSEL.
I KNEW FROM NEWSPAPER ACCOUNTS THAT MR. HOOKS HAD RESIGNED A JUDGESHIP TO ACCEPT A POSITION WITH S.C.L.C.
THEREFORE I TOLD FOREMAN THAT HAVING MR. HOOKS AS CO-COUNSEL WOULD BE A CLEAR CONFL -ICT.

"AFTER THE SIGNING OF THE FEB, 3RD 1969 CONTRACT NO FURTHER MENTION WAS MADE BY FOREMAN CONCERNING ENGAGING ATT. HOOKER ALTHOE ON MARCH 9TH, 1969 FOREMAN TRIED TO GET ME TO SPEAK WITH HOOKER, MAKING THAT, TO HAVE HOOKER PRESENT AT THE PLEA. I DECLINED BOTH SUGGESTIONS"

OF INTEREST,MORE SO THAN THE GROUNDS ATTORNEY F. LEE BAILEY REFUSED THE CASRE ON. FOREMAN REPLY WAS THAT AS CHIEF COUNSEL HE HAD THE RIGHT TO PICK CO-COUNSEL.

BY THIS TIME MR. FOREMAN HAD FINALLY GOT THE MESSAGE OVER TO ME THAT IF I FORCED HIM TO TRIAL HE WOULD DESTROY-deliberately-THE CASE IN THE COURT ROOM.
"I DID'NT KNOW HOW HE WOULD FAKE THE TRIAL UNTIL I READ THE ARTICLE HE WROTE FOR LOOK MAGAZINE, PUBLISHED APRIL,1969"

IT WAS ALSO MY BELIEF THAT I WOULD ONLY RECEIVE ONE TRIAL..THAT APPELLANT CTS. PROABLY WOULDN'T BE LOOKING TO CLOSE FOR TECHNICAL ERROW-THEREFORE I DID'NT WANT THE ONE TRIAL FAKED. IN CASE OF CONVICTION
CONSIDERING I HAD NO OTHER CHOICE,AT THE TIME,I TENTATIVELY AGREED TO ENTER A GUILTY PLEA TO A TECHINICAL CHARGE OF HOMOICIDE.
MR. FOREMAN THEN PRESENTED ME WITH VARIOUS STIPULATIONS TO SIGN WHICH HE CLAIMED HE RECEIVE -D FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE.
I OBJECTED TO A NUMBER OF THE STIPULATIONS:TWO IN PARTICULAR.
THE FIRST,A STIPULATION WITH NO LEGAL QUALIFICATIONS,MET TO BE AN EMBARRASSING REFERENCE TO GOVERNOR GEORGE WALLACE AND INSTIGATED BY A CALIFORNIA HIPPIE SONG WTITER NAMED CHARLES STEIN.MR FOREMAN HAD THE STIPULATION REMOVED. HE SAID THE NOVELIST,WILLIAM ~~THE~~ STYRON, BRATFORD HUIE,HAD GOT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO INSERT THE STIPULATION.
THE SECOND,THIS STIPULATION CONCERNED MY PEREGRINATIONS BETWEEN MARCH,30th.1968and APRIL,4th. same year.
MR FOREMAN SAID HE COULD'NT GET THIS STIPULATION REMOVED AS EVERYONE ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROSECUTION,DIRECTLY AND INDIRECTLY,INSISTED IT BE INCLUDED,INCLUDING ATTORNEY LUCIAN W BURCH AND THE F.B.I.

LATER DURING ONE OF MR. FOREMAN'S VISITS TO THE JAIL IN EARLY MARCH,1969,I MADE A LAST ATTEMPT TO HAVE A JURY TRIAL.
I ASKED MR. FOREMAN TO WITHDRAW FROM THE SUIT IF HE DID'NT WANT TO DEFEND ME FOR POLITICAL OR SOCIAL REASONS."HE HAD MADE THE PUBLIC STATEMENT,AND MENTIONED TO ME SEVERAL TIMES THAT HE WAS CONCERNED THAT THE NEGROS WOULD THINK HIM A JUDAS FOR DEFENDING ME."
I TOLD FOREMAN I WOULD SIGN OVER TO HIM THE ORIGINAL $150.000 WE HAD PREVISOULY AGREED ON FOR HIM TO DEFEND ME,AND I WOULD SIGN ANY FUNDS OVER THAT AMOUNT FROM THE CONTRACTS TO ANOTHER ATTORNEY TO TRY THE SUIT BEFORE A JURY.
"I ALSO ASK HIM TO GIVE MY BROTHER,JERRY RAY,$500.00 TO FIND SUCH AN ATTORNEY."

I STATED OTHERWISE I WAS GOING TO EXPLAIN MY FINICIAL SITUTATION TO THE COURT AND ASK EITHER TO DEFEND MYSELF OR,ASK OTHER RELIEF.
MR. FOREMAN REFUSED TO WITHDRAW AND REMINED ME OF TRIAL JUDGE BATTLE'S RULING AS OF 1st JANUARY,1969,saying, IT WOULD EITHER BE HIM AS COUNSEL OR, THE PUBLIC DEFENDER.
HOWEVER, MR. FOREMAN SAID IF I WOULD PLEAD GUILTY HE WOULD COMPLY WITH THE AFOREMENTIONED REQUESTS
HE SAID THAT I COULD GET A TRIAL IN A COUPLE YEARS IF I WANTED ONE AND HE IMPLIED THAT AFTER THE PLEA WAS OVER HE WOULD DISASSOICATE HIMSELF FROM THE SUIT.
THEN ON MARCH 9th.1969,ATTORNEY FOREMAN PRESENTED ME WITH TWO CONTRACTS -SEE CT.TR.-WITH THE AFOREMENTIONED STIPULATIONS INCLUDING A CLAUSE STATING IF I REFUSED TO PLEAD GUILTY THE DEAL WAS OFF. "[redacted]"
THE NEXT DAY,MARCH10th.1969,I PLEBAD GUILTY UNDER THE ABOVE RELATED CIRCUMSTANCES.
I DID OBJECT DURING THE PLEA PROCEEDING WHEN FOREMAN ATTEMPTED TO USE THE OCASSION AS A FORUM TO EXONERATE HIS FRIEND,FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL,MR. RAMSEY CLARK, OF INCOMPETENCE OR FRAUD,AND,TO EXPAND ON WHAT I HAD AGREED TO IN THE STIPULATIONS.

LATER THAT DAY,MARCH.10,1969, WHEN I SAW MR. FOREMAN ON T.V. NEWS I KNEW HE WASN'T DIS-ASSOCIATING HIMSELF FROM THE SUIT, RATHER HE WAS TRYING TO PRESENT THE PROSECUTION VERSION OF THE CASE.IN REPLY TO ONE REPORTERS QUESTION AS TO WHY MY PAST RECORD WOULD'NT INDICATE SUCH A CRIME,MR. FOREMAN WENT INTO A LONG DISSERTATION ON HOW EVERY FIVE YEARS ALL THE CELLS IN THE HUMAN BODY CHANGE,HENCE A DIFFERENT PERSON MENTALLY EVERY FIVE YEARS."FOREMAN WAS APPLYING THIS SCIENTIFIC QUACKERY TO [redacted] HIS CLIENT."

THIS PRESS CONFERENCE COUPLED WITH MR. FOREMAN'S COURT ROOM SPEIL AT THE PLEA INDICATED I COULD'NT WAIT ANY TWO YEARS UNTIL I MIGHT POSSOBLE RECEIVE FUNDS FROM CONTRACTS TO H/RE

OTHER COUNSEL AS BY THE FOREMAN & HOIS IN COMPANY WOULD HAVE HAD HE CONVICTED VIA THE MEDIA WHICH THEIR TYPE ALWAYS SEEM TO HAVE READY ACCESS.

AFTER ARRIVING AT THE PRISON IN NASHVILLE,TENN. ON MARCH,11 1969, AND HEARING MORE OF MR. FOREMAN'S CONTINUOUS MONOLOUGS I THEN "KNEW" I COULD'NT WAIT TWO YEARS BEFORE ATTEMPTING TO GET A TRIAL.

"SHORTLY THEREAFTER THIS VIEW WAS REINFORCED BY THE REMARKS OF TRIAL JUDGE BATTLE AT A NEWS CONFERENCE WHEREIN HE IMPLIED THAT THE REASON HE(THE JUDGE) WANTED THE GUILTY PLEA WAS THAT THE DEFENDANT ..MIGHT HAVE BEEN ACQUITTED BY A JURY."

THEREFORE ON MARCH,13th.1969,I WROTE A LETTER TO TRIAL JUDGE W. PRESTON BATTLE STATING MR. PERCY FOREMAN NO LONGER REPRESENTED ME AND, THAT I WOULD SEEK A TRIAL.

I THEN CONTACKED OTHER COUNSEL AND ASK MY BROTHER,JERRY RAY,TO SEND COUNSEL ENOUGHT FUNDS TO VISIT ME IN ORDER THAT COUNSEL COULD ATTEMPT TO SET ASIDE PLEA.

HOWEVER DESPITE CONFORMING TO PRESCRIBED PRISON PROCEDURE TENNESSEE CORRECTIONS COMMISSIONER,MR.HARRY AVERY, REFUSED TO LET COUNSEL INTO THE PRISON TO PERFECT A PETITION TO SET ASIDE THE PLEA_SEE CT. TR.

AFTER,AND BECAUSE,COUNSEL WAS REFUSED ADMITTANCE ON MARCH,26th.1969,TO THE PRISON, I WROTE A PETITION TO TRIAL JUDGE BATTLE ASKING FOR A TRIAL=THAT SAME DAY.MARCH, 26th.1969.

"AFTER I WROTE THE MARCH,13th. LETTER TO JUDGE BATTLE INDICATING I WOULD ASK FOR A TRIAL CORRECTIONS COMMISSIONER HARRY AVERY STRONGLY ADVISED ME NOT TO SEEK A TRIAL.
HE SAID IF I DID'NT I WOULD BE TREATED LIKE ANY OTHER PRISONER AND,WOULD BE RELEASED FROM ISOLATION AT THE END OF THE PRESCRIBED SIX WEEKS BUT,IF I PERSISTED IN ASKING FOR A TRIAL HE COULD'NT PROMISE ANYTHING_HE SAID HE WAS SPEAKING FOR THE HIGEST AUTHORITY."

I WAS ALSO CONCERNED AT THIS PERIOD THAT COMMISSIONER AVERY WAS TRYING TO PUT ME IN A POSITION TO FALSELY QUOTE ME AS MAKING AN ORAL STATEMENT.
THEREFORE I SENT AN AFFIDAVIT TO UNITED STATE'S SENATOR JAMES O. EASTLAND, CHAIRMAN SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE,STATING I WOULD ONLY DISCUSS THE SUIT IN COURT.

"LATER I SENT A SIMULAR BETTER AFFIDAVIT TO THE HONORABLE BUFORD ELLINGTON, GOVERNOR OF TENNESSEE.

SIGNED:JAMES E. RAY# 65477.
STATE PRISON
PETROS,TENNESSEE.

FOR ATTORNEYS.
P.C. HEARING.

James E. Ray

Pg. 7