

Dear Mr. Emma,

3/31/89

To illustrate a point I use as a letterhead something I got in the mail recently from someone who, with good intentions, thought he was informing me. How dated that is! And how meaningless to me!

Just because two decades or more ago my mail was interfered with does not mean that it is now and for about two decades I've had no reason to even suspect that it was.

In a few days I'll be 76. My health has been impaired since 1975, I am not able to do much, and while I try to respond to meaningful mail and for the most part respond at least once to everyone who write me, more than 15,000 strangers by now, keeping up a chitchat correspondence is not possible and if it were it would be an enormous waste of time I could better spend on what might bring more to light.

This is the only reason I did not respond to your last letter.

Can't you see how burdensome, how impossible it would be for me to write each person and explain that such correspondence is now too taxing?

I took no offense and you gave no offense. I have to live with the realities of my accumulated years and I hope you can understand this.

While there is much that I have learned that I've not been able to publish, most people will find when they've read all I've published that what they have in mind has been answered to the degree possible for me.

And after all these years, I can assure you that there is virtually no factual error in my work, that the few errors are not of real significance and for the most part are the consequence of official dishonesties and will not interfere with reader understanding and comprehension of the actualities.

I do appreciate that you intended to be helpful. I hope you can understand that this kind of correspondence is now beyond my limited capabilities.

I have no current knowledge of those interested in carrying on this kind of correspondence. There are a few newsletters to which I do not subscribe but none I know of in your area. A college professor named Jerry Rose has one. If I remember correctly he is at State University College, Fredonia, N.Y. What he publishes is called "The Third Decade."

Thanks and best wishes,

Arnold Weisberg

Handwritten signature: H. C. ...

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

Several weeks ago I sent you a manilla envelope of material, and then a letter a few days later. Since you responded to my original letter inquiring about your books, and since you feel your mail has been tampered with before; I'm sending a letter in way to at least be sure that you receive what I have sent. If you don't care to correspond, I can understand. I would not be offended. If you did receive what I earlier sent, then you found one criticism. This was not meant to be a personal offense to you. I apologise if it was. I meant this as a constructive criticism, and I could very well be wrong. I believe in your writing that you are trying to reach people like me, and in my case, you have succeeded. If I may impose once more on your time, if you do not care to correspond with me, could you recommend someone who would? Although I have no special training, nor am I well to do; I would like to offer my help in whatever way might be useful. I can also explain in detail my criticism of the Altgens picture analysis that you made. You very probably already know much of what I wrote to you about, but on the outside chance you didn't, I wrote trying to help. Few may realize it, but you have done all Americans a great service by your writings. I personally wish to thank you.

Thank you for your time, J. Emma.

37173 n. Hampshire Lane

Lake Villa, Ill. 60046

*Emma
Hampshire*

CLAIM CHECK
NO.
802987

*- Ill.
60046*

of the return address

CERTIFIED

P 709 985 931

MAIL



HOLD

DATE

3-31-89

1ST NOTICE

2ND NOTICE

RETURN

*Mr Harold Wusheng
7627 Old Received Road
Frederick Md. 21701*

**RETURN RECEIPT
REQUESTED**

Detached from
PS Form 3849-A
Oct. 1980