

Dear Jim,      Delays mailed discovery material; leads    11/17/74

On this hunch that there might be more than coincidence in the long delay/in the package of discovery material you mailed me 10/12/74 reaching me I decided not to do what I'd planned for today and to read it. Whether or not the hunch is right, the decision is and what I've spotted could bear on motive in delaying this particular package. There is much in it you could have used in questioning Jimmy, to authenticate what he now recalls from what he wrote so long ago.

With all that lies immediately ahead of you I suggest you save it for rebuttal because it relates to several matters I'm sure Hiale intends going into. Example, the Eastland letter. Remember, these are one deposition exhibit, their election, so each and every word is relevant, right?

I have marked this set up. I have kept them as they were on receipt, which is out of any logical order. Even where there is a duplicate page I have not moved or removed it. I'll file them as they are, as a unit, with a copy of this.

I won't try to organize this because I still want to do the other work and at 1 haven't even looked at the paper.

There is in this confiras some of my sources of whom you know but have not met. This includes exactly where JER was (not the same time) that has not been reported and an excellent lead I'd picked up earlier and from three separate sources, here repeated.

Long before any public use, here Jimmy tells Hiale that the names he provides are being added to the witness list as he provides them. Initially he blames it on Hanes.

Consistent also with his firing of Hanes is his request of Hiale that Hiale make certain responses by November.

He identifies others in criminal activity, without expurgation by Hanes of Hiale and actually used by Hiale in court.

He reports FBI use of what he gave to Hanes only. Probably via Hiale to FBI, but confirmation of his years later testimony.

It is apparent to me from what he told me that he did, consciously, hold back from Hiale and Hanes. I suggest this means he had doubts.

Missing from this exhibit and needed for comprehension are the Hiale questions to which JER responded. Often where they are numbered they appear to be number keying to questions. This limits and can mislead about the meaning(s).

Hiale's interest is in the irrelevant, the tawdry, not the crime or anything directly related to it, almost entirely.

Hiale did annotate a few pages. Not significantly. Tinselly stuff.

There are the full and earlier explanations of what he had in mind in writing Eastland.

For the most part Ray did not date what he wrote and what seems stranger, Hiale did not date receipt. One page is largely and ineptly masked. I think we want full page and should make an in-court issue of it. The lines at the right edge where the masking was incomplete do show. He used ruled paper.

Some of this was to Foreman, not Hiale, and these pages do confirm exactly what JER always told me, that Foreman would not listen so he had to write out in advance. It is, however, more than interesting that what he wrote his lawyers is in the Hiale exhibit. This becomes clear by internal content.

There is a different and I believe the accurate version of a significant event, the renting of the room. This accounts for the inability or refusal of those who saw the man to identify Ray. This account says Ray did not do the renting. The rest of this account is identical with what he told me. I don't recall the renting part clearly enough now. But how he found the flophouse is not as Hiale wrote and is as Ray told me.

There are probably other items I don't recall. But I did mark as I read.

I think it would be helpful now if you could get someone, perhaps some student, to do some library work and get the schedule of the King poor-people's March. At least for the period well into May.

Hastily, RW Scery about types. Will correct when we need to go over.