

Dear Wayne,

11/25/74

Without getting out the carbon of the letter to which you responded 11/21, I know that you have not yet understood the two major areas of my interest. Were there need for you to know now I'd tell you but because I like to keep things on the up-and-up and because Haile remains a dirty guy capable of dirty things perhaps it is best to let it wait. However, you missed them both.

I did follow up on both. Both were outside your papers assignments. And there were others with me on each inquiry, one of which is on signed, dated tape.

Perhaps you won't be able to come up with more specifics on the surveillance. If you can, fine because they may be of value in the future.

However, ask yourself if the paper really needed any surveillance on you after your first Computers article to make the allegations it did. I think the answer is negative. If this is the case then the primary target of surveillance was not you. It began, from what you reported, on both of us. So, if thereafter there was any on you it could have been a consequence of your having been seen with me, no?

Russell has more experience and less personal involvement so why not ask him if there was any issue before McKee on which you qualified as a witness. If as I believe the answer again is negative, perhaps this will lead you and/or Russell into a new line of thinking. You were subpoenaed, you were harassed, this was followed by the separation by the paper, but you, like Renfro Hays, were not called as a witness. While Haile was making all those noises in court about Hays and asking and getting a warrant he was also lunching with Hays, not even in secret. At Coopers' that I know of.

One of the reasons Haile was so hot to get me is that I charged, among other things, abuse of process to McKee and Henry's boss. Not even pro forma denial to date.

That Cambridge "workshop" is by and for nuts. I've rejected the invitation and I tell you as a friend that those characters are the most unprincipled commercializers of all. I presume you refer to the self-styled "Assassination Investigation Bureau." They are plagiarizers who are both incapable of and not interested in "investigation." Their interest is in \$\$\$ and they are rolling in via the abuse of trust and capitalizing on the genuine concerns of the fine generation of young.

Some have spoken to me in the past. I get clips on their hairy stuff. If they believe, if they are serious, they are rotten still. "ven McKee said I'm "forthright!"

The only way I can ever travel is if the expenses are paid. I'm tentatively but indefinitely scheduled to go to NYC for a TV show but I'll be surprised if it is not before the 28th of January. Unless something unexpected comes up I'll not be able to go.

Also, while in your experience there is no reason to believe it, there are other matters in my life besides the Ray case. All my literary interests are outside it and I have an almost completed book to finish and the current one to promote.

However, the widow did respond to my letter. We had a long talk. If you can, and if she has no objection, please tape your meeting. I'll return the tape to you or her. My recollection is that when she could find the time she'd come here or when I was in that city I'd let her know and we'd try to get together.

Yeah, the modernized postoffice is something else. In three weeks recently a review copy of the new book didn't reach the NYTimes reporter.

Good luck!

Nov. 21, 1974

Dear Harold,

I read your letter five times. Because of the fact there's evidence of mail ~~tampering~~ tampering, I guess you have purposely written a most ~~cryptic~~ cryptic letter. Your phraselogy is most ambiguous, but I suppose it was intentionally so worded because of the possibility of interception by outside parties.

For that reason, I have composed ~~my~~ letter to be ~~equally equivocal~~ equally equivocal.

First, I think I have an inkling as to the subject matter of the first matter you posed. I think you are referring to a disclosure you thought most significant--but one which I beseeched you to proceed very carefully because it involved a very important source, which has warned me that he would repudiate the information if I should ever divulge it. Based on the disclosure, I believed you were going to proceed ~~to~~ *to* a collateral source, one that might be in a position to have obtained the same information gained by my source. As I recall, you tried to pin me down on the reliability and credibility of this collateral source, but I could not help you--not that I ~~lacked~~ lacked the volition--but that I never intimately knew the party you referred to, except for his known activity in matters not related to the subject I knew you were interested in.

Second, I think I know what you are alluding to but I do not know what you could have done with it, except corroborate what you and I already both know. I believe I offered to assist in helping you, transportation etc, but we never did consummate the agreement, I never found out whether you contacted and talked to this source. However, what fears I expressed at the time--fears that my involvement would become known to parties this ~~source~~ source was associated with--~~may~~ may have been justified at the time I expressed them, but subsequent events have made them moot.

The "specifics" you requested may be hard to come by because what I know, I have deduced from the barest bones of a conversation with a superior who requested my resignation, but at the same time interceded to see that my salary would be paid through the first of the year, on ~~two~~ two conditions:

first, I would not file any grievance with the guild or any other agency concerning my departure from the paper; and

second, I would have some two months of free time--plus three weeks additional vacation pay which technically had not accrued--on the company payroll, without any assignments, duties, and which I could spend away from the office. In other words, the company is paying me for two months to stay away from the office and not fulfill any assignments for the paper during this time....

~~.....~~
(more)

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

I plan to be in Cambridge, Mass., from Jan. 31 to Feb. 2 for a workshop. My finances, like yours, will be somewhat tight but I believe it will be worth my while if I go via New York City and be in New York City on Jan. 28-29 to interview a very ~~important~~ important source which I had earlier identified to you and the relevance of the information and documents possessed by this source.

As much as I would like to go via Washington, D.C., and Md. it will be entirely out of the question. COULD YOU POSSIBLY MEET ME IN NEW YORK--time and place worked out later--AND BE PRESENT WHEN I INTERVIEW THIS WITNESS? YOU MIGHT HAVE SOME IMPORTANT QUESTIONS TO ASK. ALSO YOUR SKEPTICAL NATURE MIGHT COUNTER-BALANCE MY TENDENCY TO BELIEVE WHAT THIS PARTICULAR PARTY HAS TO RELATE.....

YOUR FRIEND AND ALLY,

Wayne Chastain Jr.
Wayne Chastain Jr.

P.S....I still feel that it better to more paranoid than trusting, but when it comes to the Post Office, it is a fact that ~~their~~ their inefficiency has become legend in the past year. I have had difficulties with letters and packages not pertaining to the subject that would warrant tampering. Computerized inefficiency has caused many letters to be returned to sender where the wrong apartment number is attached...etc, etc...of course, that would not account for long delays in delivery to your residence in Maryland, unless the zip code was left off, or was listed erroneously, etc