

Dear Jimmy,

11/7/86

Hasty response to your 11/1 in the few minutes before leaving to get an appeals court brief stapled and a medical appointment.

You ask about the number in the second sentence of the FBI London teletype. That it ~~states~~ the PHIK file number for the HSCA. The London number, about which you did not ask, pretty clearly is a reference to that office's file on you and you may want to ask for it. The SS classification is for unauthorized flight, in your case UFAC, or unauthorized flight to avoid ^{confinement} ~~persecution~~. If I think of it after I come ~~back~~ back and have time I'll enclose a list of their file classifications as of about 7-8 years ago. If you ask for the London file, and get it, make a list of the documents and send it to me. When I get the copies they should send me, I can then compare them. Part of this list record is familiar and part seems not to be, but I could be wrong. I'll wait until your family's gift to Georgia politics can do the xeroxing before I compare this release. If you are not familiar with it, the abbreviation "NSY" means New Scotland Yard. They added the word when they got a new hq building.

I've not missed hearing from Jerry, but he had a New York City admirer? Do you really mean admirer? Which sex?

I'm sure Foreman had pull but I'm also inclined to believe that he'd done *fa vora* that earned him dismissal of that open-and-shut case. Case just like yours in Conn., framed man named Miller, with drugs from Canada, old car, etc., for one. By the time a decent lawyer took over Miller was ruined, although free.

I don't know if you want to sue Hise and I'm not a lawyer. But how about fraud? He contracted to provide your defense and you have the grand jury transcript we put into the record at the evidentiary hearing where he swore that he believed you guilty from the first and considered that he had bought your ~~man's~~ confession.

I'm pretty sure you can't sue HSCA or Stokes except for something not at the hearing or in the Congress because Congress arranged that they all have total immunity for anything that can be considered official business. So, they can get up on the floor and libel and defame and they can't be touched. Remember John's hearing, when Stokes was badmouthing Jim? Jim dared him to go outside the hearing room and repeat what he'd said. Stokes didn't dare and he gave up the chair. I don't know about suing for the sequestered records, but I'm sure that the House leadership would oppose that. They won't do you any good in any event because they never conducted any investigation anyway. Don't you remember that I warned you in advance?

I don't think there is any connection between the dismissal of the case against Foreman the his HSCA testimony. We had a fight with HSCA, mostly Jim, when they wanted your release so they could call Foreman. Did you ever give such a release? Mark Lane was ~~going~~ on Sprague and pushed him for HSCA counsel but in fact getting that release was Sprague's idea and he turned it over to a young prosecutor type names something like Ozer. He wore his read hair in an afro then.. He and I did not get along but I think the real fight against it was by Jim, who refused. During my first meeting with Sprague I warned him about the course on which he was set and told him that among other things he'd get his throat cut. The guy who succeeded him, before Blakey, was there and he called me up after Sprague got it, remembering that I'd called that shot. Forgot his name. From Florida, I think Ken something. They were almost all finks and those who remained with Blakey or he got more so. You muffed that one badly, Jimmy, confusing hope for reality. In more ways than one. Think about the record you send and ask how come it wasn't demanded before the session was over, for example. The whole thing hurt you badly....When you were at Brushy, you sent me a cute Hallowe'en card, vampires, saying "We need new blood in the organization. You should have been a doctor because that's pretty close to what mine just told me.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

1 November 1986

Harold Weisberg
Frederick, MD.

James E. Ray-65477

Dear Harold:

I have your letter dated 25th October. I'll enclosed a couple of documents you ask about. I'll have the wondering Jew mail them from the outside since he can duplicate now whereas it could take me a month. The 'wonderer spent 5 years in docow, 20 in Gulag antartica, 5 at Vandy, and just recently escaped from a NYC admirer; however, he can still xerox & mail material.

I know you sent the information about Jon Kelly before. Then later I got some clippings from a Dallas newspaper, then filed the FOIA request. Enclosed is the clipping citing the dismissal of the indictment. He evidently has more pull than the Hunts apparently due to his JD pimping.

I'm not sure what I could sue Huie for except maybe obstruction of justice or violating my rights in some manner. I was thinking about having the attorney representing me in the post conviction contact Huie for an affidavit against Foreman plus Huie might have other useful info. Huie don't like Foreman since one time Jerry called Huie collect & gave him Foreman's name and before Huie found out it was Jerry he said "you sob why are you calling me collect". Actually I think Jerry could sue Percy for Percy indicating to the progressive that Jerry was in on the MLK business. As to the HSCA, I would sue to have the records they sequestered released, I couldn't win but could "talk about" Stokes et al in the law suit and attached as exhibits records such as the enclosed EIST papers. The other Eist papers just say I confessed the K assault to him and implicated my bother John--before it ha been Jerry, so Eist must have got his facts as the committee stated wrong. Well that's about it for now. If you want the rest of the Eist papers I'll try to get them to you later.

Sincerely,



what do you make of the second sentence of the Eist paper: Reference is made to.....(was the FBI in contact with HSCA and if so where is this file?

You think Percy's indictment dismissal had anything to do with his subsequent testimony for the HSCA ?

Asst. Dir.:	
Dep. Dir.:	
Asst. Dir.:	
Adm. Serv.:	
Crim. Inv.:	
Ident.:	
Intell.:	
Laboratory:	
Legal Coun.:	
Plan. & Insp.:	
Rec. Mgmt.:	
Tech. Serv.:	
Training:	
Public Aff. Off.:	
Telephone Rm.:	
Director's Sec'y:	

22 JUN 78 00 02z

RECEIVED
FEDERAL BUREAU
OF INVESTIGATION
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

P 211246Z JUN 78

FM LONDON (88-228)

TO DIRECTOR FBI (62-117290) PRIORITY 630 620-21

BT

UNCLAS E F T O

MURKIN

ALEC
ALEX EIST, FORMERLY NEW SCOTLAND YARD - COMPLAINANT.

REFERENCE IS MADE TO COMMUNICATIONS IN BUFILE, HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS. (BUFILE 62-117290) (HSCA).

ON 6/20/78, ALEC EIST, OWNER GREEN MAN PUBLIC HOUSE, SIX MILE BOTTOM, CAMBRIDGESHIRE, ENGLAND, TELEPHONE 247, TELEPHONED AMERICAN EMBASSY, LONDON, ASKING FOR FBI. CLAIMED WORKED WITH LEGAT OFFICE WHEN WAS WITH FLYING SQUAD OF NEW SCOTLAND YARD (NSY). AS SUCH WAS IN ON APPREHENSION OF JAMES EARL RAY IN LONDON AND WAS WITH HIM THEREAFTER CONTINUALLY. KNOWS THERE IS CERTAIN CONTROVERSY IN THE CASE AND LOTS OF NEWSPAPER REPORTING CONCERNING RAY. HE IS ABOUT TO MAKE A MOVE IN THIS MATTER, "A FINANCIAL" MOVE BUT WANTS TO TALK TO SOMEONE FROM LEGAT OFFICE FIRST OUT OF LOYALTY. REFUSES TO COME TO LONDON.

EIST WELL KNOWN TO NSY, FORMERLY WITH FLYING SQUAD AND BELIEVED PARTICIPATED IN RAY ESCORT. SUSPENDED FROM NSY AND RECENTLY ACQUITTED OF CORRUPTION CHARGES. CONSIDERED CONTROVERSIAL AND

HAL HERTHOFF D116
Advised 6/22/78

res

ST-131 REC-79 44-38861-626 JUN 27 1978

70 JUL 10 1978

ADH 12/2/78
RCB

PAGE TWO

DISAFFECTED. NSY DOES NOT CONSIDER HE COULD HAVE INFO OF VALUE AS NOT PART OF INTERROGATIONS, NEVER ALONE WITH RAY AND ANYTHING OF INTEREST WOULD HAVE BEEN FORWARDED IN REPORTS FURNISHED AT THE TIME.

CONSIDERED HE HAS SOME SORT OF INFORMATION DEROGATORY TO NSY WHICH WILL TRY TO PEDDLE TO LEGAT OR PRESS.

NEVERTHELESS UACB WILL BE CONTACTED AND ADVISED TWO LEGAT PERSONNEL WILL MEET WITH HIM IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

NO INDICATION THIS RELATED TO PROPOSED HSCA VISIT TO LONDON. MATTER WILL BE COORDINATED WITH NSY.

CORRECTION - FIRST LINE OF MESSAGE - NAME IS ALEC NOT "ALEX"

BT

2

FILED
JUN 9 1977

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

V. BAILEY THOMAS, CLF
BY DEPUTY:

A. Wade
CR 76-11-109

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

PERCY FOREMAN

NO. CR 3-75-281

ORDER

ON THIS 6th day of June, 1977, came on to be heard the motion of the United States of America, authority having been secured from the Attorney General of the United States for the dismissal of the above styled cause as to PERCY FOREMAN.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the indictment in the above cause as to PERCY FOREMAN, be, and it is hereby, dismissed.

Entered this 6th day of June, 1977.

Richard D. Woodard
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

TRUE COPY I CERTIFY
ATTEST:

BAILEY THOMAS, Clerk

Released with exceptions
Wit: *[Signature]* Deputy Clerk

- | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| PA: | FOIA: | <input type="checkbox"/> (b) (1) | <input type="checkbox"/> (b) (4) | <input type="checkbox"/> (b) (7) (a) | <input type="checkbox"/> (b) (7) (d) | <input type="checkbox"/> Released with exceptions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (j) (2) | <input type="checkbox"/> (b) (2) | <input type="checkbox"/> (b) (5) | <input type="checkbox"/> (b) (7) (b) | <input type="checkbox"/> (b) (7) (c) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Released in full | <input type="checkbox"/> Wit: <i>[Signature]</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (k) (2) | <input type="checkbox"/> (b) (3) | <input type="checkbox"/> (b) (6) | <input type="checkbox"/> (b) (7) (c) | <input type="checkbox"/> (b) (7) (f) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (k) (5) | | | | | | |