

Jim, I recall reading headlines and articles that he gave the impression that he was a man who was not to be trusted. He held to the right and gave the impression that he was a man who was not to be trusted. I paid close attention to what he said. It reminded me of my line of work, my own experience with it for which I was paid no fee, but, satisfactory as it was, I was not to be trusted in his. and then, just to be a reporter. I recall that I was not because he enjoys his presence too much 5/23/73.

Dear Herb,

Because I am aware of what time pressures, emotions and excitement can do to the most level-headed and most competent reporter, please understand that I am not making an accusation or anything like that. I don't for a minute think that any nastiness was the intent or deliberate.

At the end of today's dramatic Alch testimony, Carl Stern, after making some comment about Bud Fensterwald's interest in political assassinations, said something to the effect that it was because of this interest and nothing else that Bud had come to public attention in Washington and that only recently. These are not his exact words, but it is the sense I took from them.

It is not an accurate representation of a lawyer who, before going into private practice, was on the staffs of Tom Hennings and Estes Kefauver. Even less does it reflect the career of the counsel for the Senate committee from which the Freedom of Information Law issued. Maybe Carl is unaware of it, but Bud was counsel for the Senate investigation of wire-tapping. And there he was so little a party-lining Democrat that he questioned Bobby Kennedy when no member of the committee had the courage.

Is not Bud better known as James Earl Ray's counsel? Lest you assume that this is connected with his committee, I arranged that, and I am not a member of his committee, nor have I ever been. He has the Ray case without fee, as he is handling the FOI case for me of which you know. It is, with him, a matter of principle, and his interest in freedom of information precedes the organization of his committee, by more than two years to my knowledge. In the Ray case and with me, he is not getting his costs back and in my FOI case, he paid all the costs of appeal.

Or, without intending it, NBC slandered a man who puts his money where his mouth is (principles are).

In this case, you appear also to have been conned by Alch's testimony in more than the two cases I cite. He denied that of which McCord did not accuse him, for McCord did not say that he would fake McCord's CIA records. I think a proper question is why did Alch so grossly misstate the issue. I can understand how a competent reporter, who can't follow complexities like these, can fail to catch them, but I can't conceive innocence in the gross misrepresentation by Alch. Nor can I conceive of Bud's saying what Alch said he was quoting directly, that Bud would be out to get Nixon. I can easily understand that Bud would give as his opinion following a certain line in defense of McCord would, if it succeeded, have this effect. Examine what has happened since McCord wrote Sirica if you want validation of the opinion.

I write just before your evening net news, so I don't know if anyone will catch these things. As of this moment, being suckered by Alch has just done more to exculpate Nixon than any one thing to date, and it is not factual. It is, in effect, a successful propaganda ploy that was in no sense necessary to Alch's purposes, to say McCord did not fairly represent his relations with Alch. I wonder why?

Toward the end of March, in your absence I loaned one of your associates some material on E. Howard Hunt. He was to return it in a few days. I then wrote you about this, without answer. I was in Washington on the 15th. In your absence I left a message. It would take time and money I do not have to replace these things. I would appreciate getting them.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Jim, I guess modern luxuries are not for me. To save time I used some carbon sets I have and put them in backwards. Hold to the light and you can read. Poor Bud! What a dirty, rotten thing! I paid close attention to Alch and it reminded me of my limited, previous experience with him for which I can find no innocent, satisfactory explanation. Lil keeps saying he was disbarred in N.J. and there had to be a reason. I haven't send Bud a carbon because he enjoys his paranoia too much as it is.

Your best,

Because I am aware of what this pressure, distortion and excitement can do to the most level-headed and most competent reporter, please understand that I am not making any accusation or anything like that. I don't for a minute think that my narrative was the intent or deliberate.

At the end of today's dramatic and testimony, Carl Wain, after making some comment about Dan Fensterwald's interest in political assassinations, said something to the effect that it was because of this interest or nothing else that Bud had come to public attention in Washington and that only recently. There are not the exact words, but all is in the sense I took from them.

It is not an accurate representation of a lawyer who, before going into private practise, was on the staffs of Sen. Kennedy and later Malver. When Dan was to reflect the effect of the demand for the Senate committee from which the disclosure of information law issued. Maybe Carl is unaware of it; but Bud was counsel for the Senate investigation of wire-tapping. And there he was so little a party-loving Democrat that he questioned Bobby Kennedy when no member of the committee had the courage.

Is not Bud better known as James Earl Ray's counsel? Just you know that this is connected with his committee, I arranged that, but I am not a member of his committee, nor have I ever been. He has the Ray case without fee, as he is revealing the FBI case for as of which you know. It is, with him, a matter of principle, and his interest in freedom of information precedes the organization of his committee, by more than two years to my knowledge. In any case and with me, he is not getting his costs back and in my FBI case, he paid all the costs of appeal.

Or, without intending it, will slandered a man who pass his money where his mouth is (principles are).

In this case, you appear also to have been misled by Alch's testimony in more than the two cases I cite. He denied that of which McCord did not accuse him, for McCord did not say that he would fake McCord's old records. I think a proper question is why did Alch so grossly misstate the issue. I can understand how a competent reporter, who can't follow complexities like these, can fail to catch them, but I can't conceive success in the gross misrepresentation by Alch. Nor can I conceive of Alch's saying that Alch said he was getting directly, what she would be able to get Nixon. I can easily understand that Bud would give as his opinion following a certain line in reference of McCord would, if it succeeded, have this effect. Examine what has happened since McCord wrote Nixon if you want validation of the opinion.

I write just before your evening net news, so I don't know if anyone will catch these things. As of this moment, being worked by Alch was just sure more to excite Nixon than any one thing to date, and it is not factual. It is, in effect, a successful propaganda ploy that was in no sense necessary to Alch's purposes, to say McCord did not fairly represent his relations with Alch. I wonder why.

Toward the end of my stay, in your absence I loaned one of your associates some material on N. Howard Hunt. He was to return it in a few days. I then wrote you about this, without success. I was in Washington on the 10th. In your absence I lost a necklace, it will take time and money I do not have to replace these things. I would appreciate getting them.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg