

7/24/75

Mr. David Kairys
1427 Walnut St.
Phila., Pa. 19102

Dear Mr. Kairys,

After reading this morning's Washington Post story on the Christiansen case I phoned Eric Olson, who gave me your address after I explained the purposes of my call. Eric said he would be speaking to you about my call.

Most of my work for the past more than 11 years has been an investigation of the FBI, CIA and other federal agencies as they were involved in the investigation of the JFK assassination for the Warren Commission. It has also included a similar investigation in the assassination of Dr. King. I am Ray's unpaid investigator.

To a degree this work is published and more will be soon. This work is also embodied in a series of suits under the Freedom of Information Act. One, C.A. 2301-70, is the first of four cited in Congressional debates as requiring amending of the law. It is dealt with somewhat extensively in the conference report.

My lawyer in the most recent of these suits and in some that did not have to go to court is Jim Lenar, 1231 4 St., SW, Washington, D.C. 20024, 202/484-6023. He will understand if you phone him by a carbon of this letter. He is currently quite busy with the appeal in my C.A. 225-45 and in that on the Ray case, both of which have close deadlines. Jim also represents me in a suit I will be filing against the CIA over its intrusions into my life and rights.

My purpose is to inform you, if you have not had the experience, of the nature of federal affidavits, of the value of the CIA's word from our personal experiences, and of the equation of perjury with the ultimate in patriotism.

It requires some skill and experience, especially of honorable lawyers who are used to dealing with honorable lawyers, to begin to understand the semantics that in our extensive experience typifies the federal word, sworn and unsworn. While evasiveness not always easily detected is also characteristic, perjury is commonplace. I have charged it repeatedly and proved it, and wait for the first time even a mere formal official denial. The closest the Department of Justice and the FBI have come to this is to certify to a federal court that I know more about the field in which I work than anyone in the FBI. Obviously, this is no answer to perjury.

We have also had personal experience with CIA General Counsel John Warner. We met with him seven months ago after the CIA had ignored my requests filed under 5 U.S.C. 552. We then told him truthfully that I have some copies of these CIA improprieties. He is supposed to have investigated before this meeting and after it. After the meeting he lied and said there are no records of any kind on me other than my personnel file from my days in O.S.S. Even after I told him to his face that what he represented as all the files disclosed, on his desk, was less than those of which I had copies.

I believe a reading of the late Allen Dulles' exposition of loyalty and perjury and duty as I obtained it in a formerly top-secret Warren Commission executive-session transcript under C.A. 2052-73 may help you understand what, unless you have had this kind of experience, may not be easy to understand.

The late Senator Richard Russell, also a Commission member, made a few comments on this in those sessions and to me personally. For years he was oversight chairman. He said you can't believe a word they say and they twist everything.

I recall how difficult it was for me to begin to appreciate the extent to which mendacity has become the official way even after long experience as an investigative reporter (which began with the old Philadelphia Ledger syndicate and had other Philadelphia connections), Senate investigator and in legal and quasi-legal investigating.

It is not my intention to intrude. Rather do I write on the chance I can be of some help in cleaning up these frightful affairs and in the hope that at some point the system of justice will begin to be permitted to work with regard to them.

It seems to me not to be impossible that at some point my experience in these matters and those of my lawyer/associate/friend Jim Lesar might be of use to you, particularly if you attempt to exercise any form of discovery or if you want to have an independent means of determining whether you have been fully informed.

In any event, good luck to you in both cases. You serve more than your clients.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg