

Mrs. Mary Ferrell
4406 Holland Ave.,
Dallas, TX 75219

4/11/93

Dear Mary,

We are so glad that Buck has ~~xxxx~~ snapped back some! May in continue!

But ~~it~~ was because I did not want to remind you in any way of other worries that I ~~set~~ - at least I think I sent- some things to Peggy to let her decide whether or not you might find them troubling because of your other concerns. ~~We~~ just spoke, she said that is no problem, and because she had not yet received what I mailed yesterday I'm sending some copies to you and a bit of the other information about which I wrote her.

Waybright's 4/5/93 and my 4/7 to him and a report by Livingstone's Dallas investigator, or one of them, that should enable you to identify that person.

On some things I need to mask my source. One is a letter Harry wrote in which he refers to his "phone man" down there. I do not know whether this means wiretapper or not.

He also ~~refers~~ ^{March} refers to access to your phone bills and cites what they show, including your call to Adams.

There is a Peter down there working for him and an Eilaen, referred to as having a "crew" and saying that they left some bugs behind, where not indicated.

If by any chance this phone and bug stuff can refer to you, although I do not know the law, on the chance that is illegal in Texas I think you should, if you have any search made, see to it that it can be used in any prosecution.

I was to have seen the assistant state's attorney Friday but just as I got there, Good Friday being an official holiday in Maryland, she was called in an emergency to go to the court on someone else's case. I'm to see here tomorrow afternoon. I'll have a stack of copies of Harryisms to give her. I regret that it does not yet include his appointing me the ~~Wingleader~~ leader of the conspiracy against ~~him~~ he invented. With me the complainant that can have significance along with his assortment of defamations and threats. ^{do} In which, fortunately, he lumps us all together ~~that~~ that the generalized slanders and threats apply to all.

There were unspecified reasons for my going into some of the things I did in my earlier letter to Waybright in response to his of 3/27 that I sent you both copies. One was to make it clear to him that what may on an incomplete or inaccurate investigation appear to be bad may not be at all. Such as my marrying Lil twice without any divorce. With one knowing of only the second marriage in a position to assume that I defrauded the Army with the allotment I sent her during World War II. (That, the allotment to my maternal grandmother and my insurance resulted in my month ^{ly} pay ^{1/2} totaling the munificent sum of \$10. Which for about 10 months I did not get in any event over an Army snafu. Good thing I was more experienced than those I played poker with!)

In other of Harry's letters I now have he insists that he has a deal with the FBI ~~is~~

down there, with Rookstool in particular, and that it is reciprocal, that it is giving him information. I do not say that I believe this. I report what he said. Rookstool denied it to me. He did not respond to the last example I sent him do with all the too much I'm now into I've not sent him copies of those. Which I do not know whether I can without obscuring my source.

It is pretty clear that one of his sources is Paul Rothermel and that Paul has given him at least a distorted story. I do not know what he got from Currington. I wonder if they'd like to know that Harry wrote someone that the assassination "was condoned by the Republican Party and it was perpetrated by the radical right Republicans."

Does this refer to their chums, if not also to them? Not only their enemies?

Last week Mark Crouch told me that last year Harry tried to get him to get a DuPont friend to have me investigated as the chief "psyops" working on him!

Is it not to wonder about sick Harry's interests when he also wanted Mark to ask that man to learn whether I'd worked for the DuPont Company, which I'd never said, or for its newspaper, which it did not own! I did work for the paper Pierre DuPont owned. As under Gannett ownership it reported last year.

Unless she faxes it to you, you should get this before Peggy can get it to you by mail. If you can identify any of the finks, I'm interested, of course!

I'll write you both after I see the state's attorney I hope tomorrow.

Best to you all,

Harry

cc Peggy