4/18/71

Dear Hessard,

Relet 14 and enclosures, thanks for the letter to the Times. They did list book, I've been told. If they so reply, why not ank then why a responsible book evaluating the publicly-used and the suppressed evidence of a case of such magnitude and consequences, the only such book, has not been reviewed?

Envelope: the descriptions spunds like an not very professional intrusion into the sanctity of the mail, but the latter may very well have been damaged here. I recall chearly that one copy was, and that may easily have been the one I sent you. Especially if I sent it sees time right after the date, for I also recall it standing atop a file cabinet for some time. However, reprehensible and anti-demonstratic as such policestate methods and practices are, and much as you should never equal to accept them, I do encourage you not to become too damply annuald motionally and too angry, for this can lead to a dimunition of your anotenass in work, sto. Or, don't lat it get yn.

I now have a copy of the "newelector" I wanted. The Bulleton people are noth wierd and understandable, the latter because you should understand that, no matter how poorly they put it, they want to and they have a moral obligation to protect and hide their source, in this case either a criminal or an associate of a criminal, for much as we might approve the purposes and consequences of the raid on the Media effice, under the law it was both a breaking and an entering and a theft of public property. Which makes their desire to exercise the traditional responsibilities of the press in such matters more commendable.

And I thank you for your fine and flattering contrast with others of 58. I could only sish that, especially today, after a 25-hour day yesterday, I did not feel such older. Until the body starts exercising its prerogatives, I suppose age is a matter of the sinf.

Now have not as yet said snything about needing a copy of FRAME-UP. I have had to establish a policy of not giving may, for how would I make distinctions, and can I possibly afford to give them to all when 4 have to buy them. However, I can seve you the bookstere's profit. They cost me about \$6.50.

There was a rather pleasant party at Bud's last night, apparently one of Mis contributions to a meeting of his (excuse the expression) committee. Some of its members or board were there, and others, including some very nice people. We were invited, and it was good to see some again. It gave me a chance to lean briefly but more pointedly and heavily than before of Sprague, and I hope he will henceforth exercise more restraint that that of which he has thus for been capable. The one I wanted most to gee, one Bud expected, and one he wanted to have me meet, Aubrey Mayhew, did not show.

Treables of a most serious (nonfoasance) nature with publishers have come up, but there is no need to trouble you with all of them. I may, occasionally, send copies. It boils down to they ned not have sold out, but the distinction is irrelevant. They do nothing, respond to nothing, and as yet I do not have my "odwance". I think that as I can I'll return to writing AGENT OSMALD and would appreciate your noting mything you consider might be relevant.

Thanks and best:

Dear Harold,

Tpday I received your recent bulky mailing. I've not the time now to respond, but there are two things which I must call to your attention, which I believe involve improper surveillance.

First, I really think your letter was opened before it got to me. Two reasons: 1) Unfortunately I opened the letter by tearing open the scaled flap. However, my tearing left most of the edge of the flap still glued down. There is, I believe an area where there was a light smudge made on the original scaling. Now, there is about 1/16 inch of clean paper separating the edge of the flap and the continuation of the smudge. Also, there are 2 areas below the current position of the edge of the flap were the paper is slightly disturbed as when the glued sheets are **EXEMPL** pried apart. When I said 1/16 inch before, I meant 1/16 wide. It's over an inch long. The letter is postmarked Apr. 12 PM and arrived this AM.

Inside, one letter was damaged. It was your 3/16/71 to Senator Long. First, it is folded as none of yours I've seen--into 4 spaces of equal size. It had not been folded prior to the making of these. It apparently has been roughly handled for there are numerous other incomplete folds. Two chunks of the paper have been ripped out, one on the top, and one on the left side at the middle crease, in a way which removed some paper and left irregular, rolled edges. I have no way of knowing if this occured while the letter was in your possession but please tell me. I cannot see how it could have.

I've been calling the various people you asked me to. Will detail later. Called the Bulletin for copies of PBI stolen docs. Waited 10 minutes while gal at switchboard connected me to the "Libmary." There I asked a girl if I could get copies for research. She said to a man near her, "He wants copies of the stolen PBI documents." The man laughed and said, "So does the PBI." At that a chronic buzz appeared in the connection so that I could barely hear what was said. The girl said she could only give me dates of news stories and I asked again for copy of just one doc. A man answered and I repeated my request. Suddenly the connection went dead, though the buzzing continued. I don't think the man hung up for I did not then get a Gial-tone. Finally I hung up.

Perhaps you were right that the Bulletin's phones were a good target for tapping.

On a note more negative than I desire, I wish you a (belated) happy birthday. I believe your letter indicated you were 58, but I find this incomprehensible for your idealism, dedication, and undying efforts seem more like those of one much younger. My 18th approaches, not brightened by upcoming Congressional action which may deny me MAX the chance to finish my college education on my schalarship and force me to actions I might otherwise never consider but to escape that which I refuse to do.

Best.