

1/28/73

Dear Paul,

I am into so much too much and am attempting to cope with so many not usual problems my memory is no longer always clear. So, I don't remember the questions in the letter to which you respond 1/15. However, the enclosures you do not exaggerate! Depending on your interest or interests, perhaps I can be helpful to you, as I'll explain.

First two things I don't want to forget. You ask "Can you find anything out about the Hirschkop-Hunt relationship?" If I can learn more tomorrow when I see a lawyer who knows Hirschkop it will be enclosed. If I do not enclose anything else, I would not expect to learn anything more but if I do I'll send it. So, I won't mail this until after this meeting. And then I remember you had an interests in George deMohrenschildt. I gave you years ago all the declassified FBI material on him in the Warren Commission files. A few more pages have been declassified and I have them if you want copies. I have been intending to write you about this so a carbon of my last letter may be with those pages.

It is my understanding that Hirschkop represented the Hunt brothers in the federal case against them, the case where my New York Times clipping on it suffered a mysterious disappearance in the mail when I sent it to a friend. Here is how I know about him and them:

I went to see him twice to see if he would handle an unusual case for me where I thought it would interest him because of the kinds of cases he handled for the ACLU. I first wrote him about this 2/23/73. He responded 3/1/73, when my letter took five days to travel 50 miles to his office, that he was leaving for Japan the following morning and asked that I recontact him after 3/14/73. I write him the 15th. In his reply of the 26th. he said, among other things, that he was "about to depart for Texas on a rather serious felony case which may take some time." He also asked for some papers in one of Freedom of Information Law suits. I sent them with my letter of 3/30. On April 13, whether or not including this Texas case, he said "I am presently overcommitted in the number of matters I am handling" so he could not take the case I asked him to take although "it would appear that you have a meritorious claim." On the 25th he referred me to the ACLU in New York on this case. Thereafter he repeated that he was too busy, "I am swamped with work."

As of now I do not know if he told me this Texas felony case was that of the Hunts or another lawyer or lawyers did, but I knew before the enclosed Nicholas van Hoffman column from the Washington Post. I'm sorry I forgot to date it. Relatively recent, though. I also have the impression for which I do not recall the basis that he took this case for the money, because all the pro bono work he had - and it was considerable and extremely time-consuming - required that he make some money. However the Hunts reached him, they picked the right guy because he is able and fearless. A number of efforts have been made to get him because of the vigor of his defenses of unpopular clients. And he has had experience on the other side of the issues in that case, so he knows something about law and practise. He was on the same side as usual with his client, defending against the government. (If the government was not anxious to win the case - I don't know the outcome - they might have had him recommended to the Hunts. Unless the undated clipping you send on the government's Lubbock appeal is the last word, on which case I assume it is not yet over.)

The clipping on Ray Vaughn's suit against Executive Action interests me. There is no love between Lane and me. I'm surprised to see Penn Jones included as "co-author" because he wasn't and two others were: a wisdo named Freed, who co-authored the book and a script that could not be used; and one of the ablest writers in generations, Dalton Trumbo, who did the final script. A number of other parts of this story mystify me. For example, who are the producers not included. National General did not make the film. Anyway, if you have any interest in this, I think I can be of considerable help, perhaps be the difference between winning and losing. But while Penn and I don't get along now because he believes me some kind of federal agent (and I think on this subject he has flipped), I would not do anything to hurt him. There is to this movie what practically nobody in the world except me knows. Even Trumbo and National General can't. If you have a personal interest, you will

have reason to remember some of it.

The complaint against Foreman, Hudson, Bunker and Shank is something I know I wanted. Thanks. Here I presume you have an interest. I also see signs of a first-rate investigation!

One of my interests in Foreman has been because of another case in which he did the exact same thing, sold a client out. And by precisely the means specified in the complaint. It could not be a closer duplication! I also have enough and can get more on still another case and I have leads on several others.

I did a fairly extensive investigation of part of that. My resources were very limited. However, I do have not fewer than four witnesses on tape on what Foreman did and how he did it. More, let me count them. At least five. No clandestine tapes, either. And an abundance of substantiating records. One is of Foreman under oath saying he charges \$250.00 an hour. He took a fee of \$1,000 only in this kind of case? At \$250 an hour?

I've got this much on the old windbag who is a disgrace to the law: he flew to New York City for some free TV publicity and fled the studio when he learned, while his make-up was being on, that he would confront me. There was an empty chair for him and I have the tape of the show from the station plus other things, including the highlight of the confrontation in the 'New York Times' TV listings. You know old Percy does not believe I am the better debater! You can get a glimmer from Frame-Up. If you don't have it let me know and I'll send you a copy. I now have all the remaining copies. It is unlikely that any Dallas store still has any. And where I quote the papers, I also have all the court records plus others the papers did not use. I wrote before I got the records and I had reasons for not changing the citations. What that old bastard told the judge it is impossible to believe any lawyer would risk, the lies were that big.

If there are any other papers in this case, I'd appreciate copies.

In one of the Foreman cases he put an innocent man, his own client, away in a heroin case, thus exculpating the guilty. When later counsel solved the crime, the DJ was so without interest it failed to answer successor ~~with~~ counsel's letters which I have. Justice insisted on forcing the innocent man to trial all over again when there was a reversal. He was <sup>ruined</sup> but he walked, and that ended it so far a Mitchell, Klein-dienst and your old Texas boy Will Wilson were concerned. No prosecution of the Mafia boys. So, you know whose money I think Percy took. Besides his client's.

In a Chicago case he put his mob client's wife on the stand, something the prosecution could not do, and that guy also got salted away.

Recently Foreman has been in the news again over some many papers James Earl Ray filed pro se. If your friends or you have any clippings or tapes of what he then said, I think I can show how they can be used in Hudson's suit. It is apparent from those few that I have that he double-crossed his client and gave the info to the prosecution, which gave him the results of its investigation.

So, let me know if I can help.

Best regards,