

6/4/71

Dear Mr. Durkin,

Enclosed are two earlier letters to Leonard. I referred to only one because it was relevant, the second having a different purpose. I'd appreciate their return. And you used twice as much postage on this as necessary. If you do not have a scale, the lever type is available for pennies.

Generally, I meet all challenges, although it takes time, not only to preserve my own integrity but to make a record for history. You'll find that what I alleged against both the Post and Times are understated. The cited record is far from the complete one.

Baridman did not meet my challenge. Nor did Elmer Gertz, who should have disqualified himself but reviewed for the Chi-Sun-Times.

Appreciate the Times' address, but I have it. I am into so much more work than you can conceive that I just don't take time to go to the files unless urgent. With the Times, delivery is prompt. Leonard had my first letter at the latest 5/5, for he acknowledged this to an indignant young man who phoned him and then phoned me. He then said he'd have to do something to make this good, pleading personal ignorance, and asked this man to write him a letter he could publish. With mine, that and I understand quite a few others, Leonard used Wolff's defamations only. Asked about this, his excuse is the incredible confession of rigging, that they had Wolff's letter set in type.

Thanks for your approval. I think if you can ever remove the political blinders, you'll find that I've "got the goods" on most of the situations. The reason is not that perfection is a condition of man but because I make the necessary effort at honesty and accuracy without political preconceptions.

Don't trouble with the Stanley Ross thing, unless you want it for yourself. It means nothing to me now. And it was insane and irresponsible when Ross, also the captive of his beliefs, pulled it. He wasted a small fortune in time and money for the FBI.

Developments of the past month (not the Kaplan/Times/Wolff bit) have compelled me further to limit distribution of the two parts of POST MORTEM. Sorry. Perhaps it will be different in the future. It is not personal, not you, but a policy I've had to adopt for reasons that may become clear later. I'll be in court on one aspect in 10 days.

Including today's mail, I've not had a word from the Times. If I get a chance I'll write Leonard, because he is lying, saying he wrote me immediately. His envelopes have a printed return address, so short of destruction, had he written, I'd have his letter or it would have been returned to him.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Henry P. Durkin
Box 1537
FDR Station
New York NY 10022

June 3, 1971

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route 8
Frederick, Md. 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Thank you for your most recent letter and for letting me read your letter of May 30 to John Leonard of the New York Times. I'm returning this carbon of the letter to you, as you requested.

May I suggest that you use the following more complete address when writing to the Times again: 229 West 43 Street, New York NY 10036. Apropos of addresses, the New York City phone book gives the following for John Barkham: 27 East 65 Street, New York (11021 is the zip, I believe). Phone is 212-TR 9--9705.

By the way was your letter to Leonard of May 30th the one you referred to in your letter to me as "My first letter to Leonard"? If it isn't, then you did not send me a copy of it and I would very much like to read it. You've certainly "got the goods" on this situation.

I've not located the Stanley Ross item from National Enquirer yet, but I'll keep searching and will send it when I finally turn it up.

In your letter of May 6th you mentioned that the two Post Mortems were under restricted distribution and I can understand the need for this to protect copyright, etc. However, I really would very much like to read them and wonder if you could lend them to me for a short time. I assure you that I would not plagiarize anything from the manuscripts and would return them by insured mail within a week.

Sincerely,

