JLO
HR

3/2/72

Mr. Fred Graham
The New York Times
1920 L St., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Fred,

As I told you I would, after my 9:30 medical appointment yesterday morning I walked the four blocks to you office. You were not in. You did not answer at home. Nobody, including "Ike" on the desk had heard from you and there was no message for me. I made a few phone calls, sat and read the paper, and waited until after 11:15, when I had to leave.

And I did have a tape recorder with me and had to carry it the entire day. But I was ready to keep my word.

I shall not press you on this. My sole purpose was to be as fair as possible to you and I was not only willing to go to some trouble to do this but I did. By this I mean more than luggung the tape recorder around and killing that time waiting. As I told you, I waited I think a more than fair amount of time to hear from you and others to whom I addressed questions in this matter. I could delay the writing no longer and, because I knew it was possible yesterday's examination could lead to surgery, I had the draft of what I plan completed. I would have incorporated anything you might have said that would be relevant, as I still will should you have anything to say - up until the time it is retyped.

I have not exploited the questions you did not answer, as I think you understand would not have been at all unfair. I have restricted myself to what you did answer when you phoned me. Because it was relevant, I had included the leaking of the contract to you in the body of the book. I was quite happy to get your explanation of how that came to pass and I have incorporated it in full. I also believe it. It merely confirms, with detail, what I had assumed. If you recall, I did tell you this, in effect, when we first started talking, prior to your story on Lattimer.

When I did this draft, I reread your story. I then noted something of which I believe I may not have asked you. You reported that the clothing had been shown to others than government people prior to being shown to Lattimer. I can understand that you may have made an unintended error in reporting this, but because it is possible that you were so informed, I ask if you were and if so, by whom and what you can tell me about it. I am not trying to slip up on your blind side on this. I want you to know it was a violation of both the contract and Archives regulations. Also, as I told you, it is a subject about which Hoads perjured himself when I sued for pictures of the damage to the clothing only so that I could study it and have it examined by my own criminalist.

If it is your right to let the record stay the way it is and I have not exercised my right to use that as fully as I was tempted to, I do regret it.

There will be more such stories. If and when there are, I hope your reporting of them will be more traditional, and that you and the Times will treat them as other subjects are and should be treated.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg