8/1/70

Dear Jurkin,

There is a common denominator among all you nuts and those of you who are extremists who engage in the self-deception of calling yourselves conservatives, which is an honorable thing you are not. You all avoid fact and reality, you all twist, and expect rational people to accept your corruptions as the reality.

It is a futility to attempt to reason with a man whose dishonesty is as apparent as yours, whose every effort is the deforming of fact that thereby, in his bemused mind becomes fact.

I respond for a simple reason: to note that yours endless defamation that is, without your apparent awareness of it, a considerable self-defamation and self characterization, is not responsive to what I accurately told you.

The point about the hearings, plural, is that the Committe didn't dare print them, for they are quite contrary to the lies they released and could dare release only because the legislative process, no matter how abused, no matter how dishonestly mishandled, is immune, and there can be no suit filed by the victims of these men who disgrace their station and responsibilities. This means, if you have a fraction of the knowledge you should have to write and offer opinions on the subject, that they cannot be sued and those quoting them with any semblance of accuracy also cannot be sued.

Consistent with your inability to understand simple English in any form, you cannot comprehend it on the cover of a public documents. What you enclosed is not the "title and credit line page of another hearing" but of a report. That jazz about not being able to tell me where you got it is another typical stupidity, for there is nothing secret about it. That committee held no secret hearings, had no unpublished transcripts. As the editor I did all I could to get these public documents into every library and institution where they could be available to those who might want them. Every one who asked it got free copies.

HENRY P. DURKIN - Box 1537 - FDR Station- New York NY 10022

July 30, 1970

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route 7
Frederick, MD. 21701

Dear Harold:

Sorry to be so long in replying to your letter of July 17, but it didn't get to me as quickly as it should. You see, you got the box number wrong on the envelope, misspelled my first name, and goofed on the zip code. Why should people trust you with the facts about the assassination, when you can't even get an address right?

Anyway, your letter was hilarious. I laughed and laughed and laughed. You should get some kind of award for being a master as the art of incomprehensible sentences.

How clever of you to demand that I go back to the original source--the hearings in 1940. As you point out, the committee didn't print the transcript of the executive session and for that reason it is impossible to get the original documents. You don't even have them! Further, to disclose the contents of an executive session without the proper permission is a violation of federal law. Even if I had the transcript, I couldn't do anything with it--that would be illegal and you wouldn't want me to do anything illegal, would you? No, I can't say that--you probably would.

Anyway, not having the transcript, I relied upon the San Francisco papers for the information. If they are in error, why didn't you sue them at the time? Why didn't you sue the New York Times, too? They carried the stories on January 31, 1940 (page 10) and February 1, 1940 (pages 7 and 10). Go look it up--why should I send you the clippings? To quote your letter of July 6, 1970, paragraph 4: "You have the gall to ask me for what I worked so long and hard to get, at such great cost -and for free?"(emphasis in the original).

I am, however, out of the goodness of my heart, enclosing a copy of the title and credit line page of another hearing--this one from 1939. No, I can't tell you where I got it. Maybe it came from the CIA, maybe from the KGB, maybe from Mad Magazine.

No love, no kisses. Henry P. Durkin

76TH CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT No. 6
PART 3

VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR

REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

PURSUANT TO

S. Res. 266
(74th Congress)

A RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE VIOLATIONS OF THE RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH AND ASSEMBLY AND INTERFERENCE WITH THE RIGHT OF LABOR TO ORGANIZE AND BARGAIN COLLECTIVELY

INDUSTRIAL MUNITIONS

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1939

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah, *Chairman*

DAVID I. WALSH, Massachusetts
JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana
VIC DONAHEY, Ohio
RUSH D. HOLT, West Virginia
CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida
ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana
JOSH LEE, Oklahoma
LISTER HILL, Alabama
WILLIAM E. BORAH, Idaho
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., Wisconsin
JAMES J. DAVIS, Pennsylvania
ROBERT A. TAFT, Ohio

EARL B. WILCEY, *Clerk*
W. ALAN THODY, *Assistant Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SENATE RESOLUTION 266

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., Wisconsin, *Chairman*
ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah
LOUIS MURPHY, of Iowa, was a member of the subcommittee until his death on July 6, 1936

ROBERT WOHLFORTH, *Secretary*
DAVID D. LLOYD, *Counsel*
DANIEL F. MARGOLIES, *Counsel*
N. R. DANIELIAN, *Director of Research*
HAROLD WEISBERG, *Editor*
HEBER BLANKENHORN, *Special Consultant*

Special assistants in the preparation of this report: Luke W. Wilson, Isadore Salkind, Solomon C. Sherman, Virginia Withington, Margaret Lawsing, and Charles Flato

7/17/70

Dear Durkin,

More even than the irrationalities and fictions that for your are "waiting", your letters persuade me that any attempt to reason with you would be less meaningful than farting into a hurricane. There, knowing in advance that this letter has no possibility of making the blind see, I write it for a final record of your dishonesty.

You are of a new school that somehow persuades itself that, confronted with fact, fact is irrelevant if it conflicts with the political preconceptions without which you have no orientation. What is not as you want it to be you merely say it is, thereby satisfying yourself and those deceived when your words are spread, for the most part those anxious to be deceived so that their identical preconceptions can be smoothed and comforted.

Another characteristic is the pretense that any vilification is fine and proper if it is couched in words aired by those capable of considering them somehow other than vile because in self-concept they were not shouted. You lie and acuse me of a crime and that, to you, in the words of your own letter, is other than "vicious", not of the "gutter".

You deceive yourself, not me, in saying "I am just as much interested as you are in finding out the TRUTH behind the assassinations..." Your writing, especially the article in question, belies this. So does your record, You do naught byt parrot and rehash, neither being by even so twisted a standard as yours a search. Truth you would not recognize in any event because you culd not live with it.

You lie shamefully in pretending the language you quote from the San Francisco Examiner is that of your Combat article. But why the west-coast source, the one carefully planted by official propagandists beginning the end of 1966, when the same affair is reported in papers more accessible to you? And why, since you pretend the diligence to consult original sources, do you not quote the hearings rather than one where's misrepresentation and another' retailing? Coulnd't be because the hearings do not contain what you want to say? They don't, you know, and they were, for that reason, not printed by the Committee.

Now you wrote me in advance and knew the truth. I trusted your representation of yourself as a man of honor, yet in this effluence that for you and that toilet tissue Combat passes for writing you didn't even say I said what you intended saying all along is false, as the most dispreutable hack generally has the decency to do, if only so he can pretend to himself to have self-respect.

Were you in any sense a weiter, if you had any knowledge of the requirements as well as the problems and traditions of a once-honorable craft, you'd know that accurate quotation of Congressional libel is immune to suit for Congress is imune. The committee lied; the Examiner printed the lie on the way most appealing to you, and you embroidered on that. As I told you, Mayne was convicted on two counts and at the time he executed the forgery he was in the pay of the un*Americans. They got him out of serving time, all a matter of court record. Which gets us back to the beginning, this is no good for you when your wild desires and irrationalities that you want to be accepted as fact are in conflict with reality

You are endlessly shameless, never stop trying to make of yourself what you are not, cannot be and wouldn't be if you could. So you alleged your own opposition to official suppression. No doubt this accounts for your total public silence onthe score? Or your complete failure to in any way try and end it, in nay manner try and bring the suppressed to public attention? Talk is cheap, fink, especially yours.

So that you will not come back with more of that horseshit you talk yourself into believing, let me challenge you, you and that great, big, noble, dedicated, 100% American longing for the truth of the assassinations and that enormous detestation of official suppression to which you lay claim:

Go get it, baby (no figure of speeech, but recongition of your mental age and literary standing)! Did out the hidden dirt! And of course, send it to everyone unable to do it for himself.

Baby, would you knw where ~~to~~ to begin, or what to look for, of whom to make what request and in what manner?

Talk, Durkin, baby talk - aside from the most sincere evil and the rottenest dishonesty, this is all you are.

But in one area I do you an injustice in merely saying you have inordinate gall in demanding free what it cost me so much for so long to get for myself. That is hardly gall alone. It is the most profound detachment from the capatilist or "free enterprize" system. You have to be some kind of secret red or Marxist hiding in redical-right diapers to try and deny me my own literary and property rights, which is exactly what you do. You demand that I give you what is mine (if you have anything to give you do not offer it, and could you?). And if I do not give it to you, you continue to insist free, I am "oppressing". That I have written a book of more than a third of a million words, with an appendix in itself the length of an ordinary book is immaterial. If you cannot steal from me, then I am "suppressing".

Being as incompetent as you are is no crime. Lacking as you do in the most elemental understanding is something for which you cannot be held to account, for you neither sired nor birthed yourself and you can have only what the ungenerous God saw fit to let you have. But lying, manufacturing and that most un-American of un-Americanisms, not believing in or respecting property rights and trying to steal or bludgeon the property of others, for these there is no excuse.

This attitude toward private property tells me all I need know about you: you have to be some kind of subversives agent who has penetrated the right extreme for some kind of red outfit, for yours is the "communist" attitude, one of no property rights.

I will respond no further, having nothing to do that is not more significant than any intercourse with you. Besides, I find changing diapers unpleasant, no less so when the mouth serves as a second anal orifice, as with you it does.

Sincerely,

Probably a complete waste of time, but this sick fascist has a dressing-down coming and it would be just as good if he found a different kind of shit to get into the reactionary journals.

Harold Weisberg

Henry P. Durkin-----P. O. Box 1537-----FDR Station-----New York, N. Y. 10019

July 13, 1970

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route 7
Frederick, Md. 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I was very astonished to receive your letter of July 6th. I never expected you would reply in that tone!

I know that we could never agree on the aspects of the Kennedy assassination, but is that a reason for you to vituperative? Must you use such language?

I have always tried to be polite in writing to you and I will continue to be polite in this letter and in any subsequent ones which may come about.

I will never stoop into the gutter of vicious name calling. I had hoped that you would be of reasonable mind in replying to my letter of July 2nd. I am sorry that you disappointed me.

Whatever our political differences may be, I am just as much interested as you are in finding out the TRUTH behind the assassinations of JFK, MKL, and RFK. That's shy I thought you could help me get a set of the documents in the James Earl Ray case.

I'm just as much against governmental suppression of facts as you are. And if the government suppressed copies of the Ray documents, then that is to be deplored. If you were able to get hold of most of the copies that were distributed by the Justice Department, then you are suppressing the documents and that is also to be deplored!

As for my slandering and libeling you in Combat, where did I do that? I took my information from the San Francisco Examiner of February 23, 1940: "Harold Weisberg... admitted to the Dies committee that he had paid $105 to David D. Mayne for forged documents used in the abortive attempt by Representative Hook, Democrat of Michigan, to 'smear' the Dies Committee."

If that is libelous, then why did you not sue the Examiner and the New York Times, which carried a similar story?

Henry P. Durkin