Law Offices

FENSTERWALD AND OHLHAUSEN

910 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 Telephone 202 228–1667

> Bernard Fonsterwald, Jr. William G. Ohlhausen Gorden F. Harrisen Of Counsel

January 7, 1976

Mr. Harold Weisberg Route 12 Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dear Harold:

I want you to know that I have read all your recent letters to me and to Bud, plus I read and re-read the articles in the <u>Post</u>, <u>Oui</u>, and <u>New York Times</u>. I also discussed the matter with Jim.

Last night, between the hours of 12:00 and 2:00 a.m., I drafted a ten-page response to your letters in the hope that I could be of some small help in ironing out the problem, despite the fact that I really don't want to be involved in this. It is not my case, and frankly I have too many other cases to worry about.

Today, when I got in the office, I received your letter of January 5 and promptly tore up my long, and what I like to think of as well-reasoned, response. You obviously would have viewed it as "city-slickerism", "smooth talk" and/or "greasy kid stuff."

I think things are now irretrievably polarized. If you feel you want to go public over this, go ahead. Just this week I talked Bud out of sending you a brief, nasty response to your letters in the hope that a confrontation could be avoided.

I resent your questioning my motivation, but that is your privilege. But you have gone beyond that privilege when you start making totally unfounded accusations about things like tax fraud on the Ray expenses. That, for your information, <u>is</u> defamatory.

The pettiness in all this absolutely astounds me. I have now read the Valentine article about four times and I fail to see where it is unfair to either you or Jim, nor do I see how anyone would see you as lumped together with the CTIA. And, as far as the <u>Oui</u> article is concerned, I think all of the subjects of the article were treated unfairly, including Bud. But that is not defamation.

FENSTERWALD AND OHLHAUSEN

Mr. H. Weisberg Page 2 Jan. 7, 1976

Harold, you <u>are</u> irascible, to use Bud's word. If that is defematory, so be it. I see no point in further correspondence with you on this.

Nor do I see any point in taking any more collect calls from you, which, you might like to know, I have had to pay 50% of, over these many years.

I realize that I will now be on your private shit list, but save yourself the time in writing further nasty letters to me or Bud. They will neither be read nor responded to, but will simply be placed in what is now a 3/4-inch thick file of other such letters from you.

Sincerely,

Bell

William G. Ohlhausen

WGO:crr