Harold Weisberg Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701 12/2/74

Mr. John A. Limpert, Editor The Washingtonian 1218 Connecticut Ave., NW Wawhington, D.C. 10036

Dear Mr. Limpert,

Would you please forward the enclosed letter to Joe Goulden?

Thanks.

I also enclose a carbon of something I wrote some time ago on the personal relationship I had with the late Senator Richard Russell. It was written for a different purpose but perhaps it may interest you.

I do not mean to suggest a close personal relationship.

But I think it is unusual that as a former member of the Warren Commission he did trust the author of the first book critical of its work.

After the evidence I put in his hands he did break that long friendship with LBJ and did give up his "oversight" responsibilities over the CIA.

One of the two areas of Russall's sujor disagreements and doubts about the Kommission's conclusions involved a story Joe Goulden wrote. No objection to your reading that letter. It was about a rusor that Lee Harvey Oswald had been an FBI or CIA informant. It is for a book I'd started on this that I sued for and in the most bizarre of all Freedom of Information suits finally did obtain the transcript reprinted in the new book and referred to in the letter to Goulden.

The section of this new book dealing with the corruption of the Freedom of Information law by the government and with the details of this suit is, I think, suitable for reprinting in condensation.

One of my four such suits, by the way, was cited by the Senate as requiring amending of the law. You may recall that Ford's veto of these amendments was recently overridden.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701 11/30/74

Mr. Lewis Laphan, Managing Editor Harper's Magazine 2 Park Ave., New York, N.Y. 10016

Dear Hr. Laphan,

When I phoned you on the 4th, the first working day after I returned from a very intensive month on the May case in which I'm the investigator, it was because I'd heard of and obtained your special Watergate edition. I hadn't read it because my working days ran to an average of about 2 a.m. but it told me you have courage and imagination. This is why I phoned you alone.

By the time Taylor Branch came on the 11th I had read this issue. If it is journalistically less than I'd hoped for, the fact remains that mobody else had the courage or imagination it reflects.

I'm not sorry, therefore, that I phoned you. Nor at Taylor's initial encouragement, after your promising reaction.

However, he seems to be a very busy young man. I've not been able to reach him and he has not responded to messages. The last I heard he was hoping to return this past weekend and there was some kind of belief communicated to him by someone (I think he said Jones) that there was danger of being beaten on some of the content of the new book. Without plagiarism I don't see this because the wire copy, while good, didn't and could add value from the attention it got. We were to have discussed this and other possibilities I believe are real and not in the book. Guite topical, too.

Of course I have been inhibited in this because I have not been able to make other efforts. As an example of what was possible, ten days after I spoke to you someone from Rolling Stone was here on other business. I made no pitch to him. If this kind of bind is always a problem, in our case it is more serious because Jim Lesar borrowed the money to pay the printer and between printer's gremling and the work we had to do on the May case the note's time expired before we had a copy to sell.

I know Taylor is also writing a book. In confidence I gave him some of my unpublished knowledge, from my Watergate book, in the hope it could help him. This book means he has to be even busier. And I know what having too much work to do means. For me it meant starting at 3:30 this morning. (And I'm 61.)

But I also know that without communication people can't work out problems or even determine if they exist.

Then there was what I took to be interest in other of my work.

And Taylor had what appeared to me to be a good idea, your distribution of the book I think he said by mail. It could pay both of us. We do this all the time and might be able to do all the work on it for you, too.

I would like to hear something from somebody soon. I do believe we have common interests and that pursuing them holds great promise for both of us.

I know I'll be away much if not all this coming Wednesday. I may have to be away parts of ther days this coming week. But I'll be home every night if you or Taylor, phone. I hope one of you will.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

6 (Bronch Lesen