

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
12/11/74

Dear Henry, *Henk*

I owe you an apology and you owe me a letter. Well, half an apology and really more than one letter.

You said I underestimated ^{etc} you and I said I didn't. I still don't. But I must confess that I did underestimate the inner resources upon which you can draw in the cause of justice until I read your Memorandum to Judge McRae. Based on the imaginativeness and the integrity displayed in the Memorandum I have to confess that in 61 years I do not recall its equal.

Well, maybe I exaggerate a little. I do remember World War II fairly well. Perhaps I was a little carried away by our "budding friendship."

Yesterday I saw Jim Lear. As you know, you are keeping him pretty busy. He asked me if you had responded to my November 18 letter and I told him that a clever card from Windsor was not really a response. He thinks I should remind you. So, please consider yourself reminded. My letter of the 23rd should have been a reminder. So should that acknowledging the view of Windsor.

I found you did not really come to grips with the same subject in your Memorandum, either. So, I look forward to an unequivocal response, including this time what I think you and Warden Rose ignored entirely.

Since I wrote Warden Rose other information has reached me that I think in fairness to us both I should address directly with you and in this case speaking for myself only, at least for now.

When I was in Memphis I knew my room had been entered and searched. I saw to it in advance that I'd be able to know and have substantiation. I have since learned that I was also under physical surveillance. And distinguishing between certainty and reason to believe, there is reason to believe that my mail was interfered with.

Now there are not too many people who have these interests in me. You did not hide your interest in asking questions about me that had nothing to do with what we were both in Memphis for. Nor did Joe Haynes hide his interest in asking pointed and I think improper questions of those with whom I chose to associate. Your questions reflected what does not come from newstories. They are also, some of them, consistent with what used to be called "rough shadowing" when I was investigating investigators for the U.S. Senate. (It was intended to intimidate. As you may hear, I have had occasion to address chickens and necks.)

As I have informed you in the past, proofs of surveillance do come back to me. Sometimes they are only verbal, sometimes they are in writing. I do have carbons of some. And I do have proofs that this is also done privately for official principals.

So, in reminding ^{you} of the answers you have not made, I am adding other questions that really are not addressed in telling me how busy you are or with what you elect to "concern" yourself. I do want to know if you know if or are in any way connected with these surveillances of any nature and regardless of by whom they are conducted or for whom, whether by or for federal, State or local authorities or whether any is the beneficiary of any. If it is no more than hearsay, I am asking for an unequivocal answer.

I do hope you are in a position to and of a disposition to. In reminding you of what asked this question directed to you not unreasonable, I hope you will understand that I am not making a personal accusation. However, were I in your person and were I able to make an honest denial, I would want to make it as unequivocal as possible.

Henk

JL- With regard to the enclosed letter to Henry Baile, the way these things usually work is that the locals draw upon the FBI, which is reluctant only when it has special reasons. In this case there is both federal and FBI interest, so there is less reason to believe that Henry does not have all of its file on me that it was not unwilling to part with. I am familiar with part of it and have a fairly good idea of what else should be there. Henry slipped up in a question he asked about me and did disclose knowing what is not in news stories, his explanation to Paul Valentine. Besides, I don't really believe that Henry reads and files the NYTimes Sunday magazine going back for years. If he answers at all I'll be mildly surprised. I'll expect something like his 11/15 more than anything else. However, there is always the chance that he'll say what is probably a lie and that at some point we'll be able to prove it. As in discovery, I believe he is uncertain about what I know and what I have and he may worry a bit about lying when I might be able to prove it. We'll see in time. And we'll wait time's running. HW 12/11/74