

4/8/75

Mr. Tom Spelman, Counsel
Administrative Practices Subcommittee
Senate Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Tom,

Your straight arrow seems to be have ~~be~~ tipped with a rubber suction cup rather than flint.

I'm sorry.

As we had discussed Jim did phone Mike Epstein. The call was unwelcome, as was the idea itself. Finally, as Jim told me, Epstein told Jim to have me write him whatever I want the committee to know. Jim told him I had published six books on the subject and had done an enormous amount of other work but did not know what the committee wants. I would suppose this is the purpose of conversation.

I told you that because we had been on different sides in the past it would make no difference to me ~~it~~ but that I thought it would with Epstein.

If his attitude changes I am ready to cooperate in any way I can. ~~xxxx~~ However, I have no interest in merely talking, just giving someone a chance to say he or his committee heard what I have to say. Today I am 62. Two nights ago I worked until 6 a.m. and then got a three-hour nap. I do not work this way to go through idle motions. Nor, quite obviously, for personal reward.

Had there not been someone here all weekend and had I not had to spend every free moment beginning to clean up after wind damage worse than I have ever had from a hurricane I'd probably have written you what follows. My reluctance to put it on the phone comes from a desire not to advertise - or run the risk - that anyone would know that I've told you.

Long before I first met James Earl Ray I suspected that the King assassination could have involved Partin. There was one ignored fact that suggested this. Ray was and remains reluctant to do anything that can identify those with whom he was in association prior to that assassination. It is impossible that Ray was part of it. He was framed and I have put together and tested in court a case that was neither cross-examined nor rebutted. It can't be. We have since gotten from Ray one lead we could trace. It leads to Partin. In addition, twice lawyers connected with that case have figured behind the scenes in it. All my written communications with Ray have been intercepted. Exposure of this illegal practise in federal court did not stop it and the judge said it was of no moment! So, I assume that pretty much of what was exchanged between Ray and his investigator is known to those who have no business knowing. Whether this or the fiction that I was in Garrison's pocket (actually we were at loggerheads in private and my efforts were to do what he did not and keep him within bounds) or his disagreement on the subject of assassinations accounts for his attitude I have no way of knowing. Sheridan's past could figure in it, what he did in Louisiana while I was there in particular.

Unless I hear otherwise soon there are a few things I want the committee to have that I will get to it by other means. If it thinks I can help it, I will. I think I can offer the only means it can escape what can be a very real and very embarrassing problem for it, assuming, as I do, that a majority are of serious intent. But because this can involve giving away a decade of unpaid and impoverishing work I'm not going to push myself. Or my view or my work.

Since we spoke I have heard from one with whom I have been in contact with a TV net. They have turned on - the insane interests them! I fear this may well mean more embarrassment for the Senator and his family. Of all the solid evidence available they

are going for the Oswald-Ruby relationship. My response was "What relationship?" This is more of the nut stuff popularized when I could not deter it but not invented by Garrison.

When all the so-called responsible doix nothing or do worse there is not much that I, unassisted except for Jim today, can do.

Beginning this evening there will be someone here for the rest of this week, working. After that if anyone has any serious interest I'll be available.

Please excuse the haste and errors. I feel you should know and I want to get this into the morning mail before I can be interrupted.

On spectre the government is up to something. They were to have responded in court by Friday. They did not and they did not ask for the time extension we would have agreed to and they have delivered nothing more.

On Colby's statement of yesterday there is a fairly effective answer in my G.A. 2052-73 if it ever interests anyone.

We are not going to ask for a summary judgement in the spectre suit. Jim favors instead taking depositions. If we can it can be quite significant. It can do much to clean up the mess and can be germane to the Church committee's work. It can even mean the end of acceptance of the so-called investigation in the JFK assassination.

Sincerely,

Herold Weisberg