BF

Dear Bud and Jim, 6/15/78

In today's mail I have a copy of the House assassins committee's subpoena served on Jim (at an incorrect address, by mail).

Jim had mentioned receiving the subpoena and indicated that Bud also had received one. Bud had not mentioned this to me.

I interpret this subpoena other than as Jim indicated when we discussed it by phone yesterday. This is why I write both of you. I am assuming that the subpoena on Bud was identical or similar.

It is a sweeping sunpoena, as I interprete it, beginning with "all records regarding your legal representation of James Earl Ray..."

I regard this as improper under any conditions and circumstances and outside the rights or powers of the Congress.

I also regard it as a fishing expedition by those whose fishing to now has yielded nothing and who seek what they can misuse to justify the waste and worse of the largest committee appropriation in Congressional history.

If either or both of you honors this subpoena it can be interpreted as including records of or about or from me. I do not want either of you to provide any such records on, about or from me to this committee or to anyone else without my authorization.

With regard to this committee I have more than sufficient reason to have the most serious questions and doubts about its intentions from personal experience. This personal experience begins with conferences prior to the creation of the committee (and over a resolution that did not provide a legitimate legislative purpose I sought to get included) to being expelled from one of the committee's star chamber sessions when Jim wanted me there to help him as a subject expert and his clients both wanted me also to be present.

That the committee's present purposes are not serious and legitimate is also my belief, again based on personal experience. This personal experience has been with both of the committee's chief counsel and with its staff with regard to the King assassination. (Mr. Blakey referred only to the James Earl Ray case.)

I did offer Richard Sprague cooperation and access to records. He did sent a member of his legal staff here and I did provide copies of records. (I did not receive all my originals back despite the conditions of access agreed to by the committee.)

This year Mr. Blakey phoned me and asked if I would agree to speak to him and Mr. Eberhardt. I did agree, subject to preserving the obligations I consider I bear to James Earl Ray. Mr. Blakey said that he not only agreed, but as a lawyer he respected this position, which he added would be his own position under the circumstances. After the lapse of some time Mr. Blakey wrote and said he decided not to speak to me. His letter limited his expression of interest to James Earl Ray. It specifically made no reference to the assassination of Dr. King or to any investigation of it. Considering the work I have done that is known to the committee I regard this as a continuing expression of preconceptions rather than an intent to conduct a full, honest and open investigation. These preconceptions became apparent to me in 1976 and are actually expressed from the first by the committee and by its Members on the floor of the House and elsewhere.

I have followed the career and the activities of the committee. It is apparent that pursuant to its preconceptions it has intended and still intends to claim to have left no stone unturned, that it has explored all reports no matter how farout (and it appears to have had interest in nothing else) and that in essence it supports the prior and dubious official accounts of the assassinations it is supposed to investigate and hasn't. I do not regard this as a proper legislative purpose. I also see no proper legislative purpose in which any records from, by or about me are appropriate. Sincerely, Harold Weisberg