

10/26/71

Dear Russ,

I'm busier, more tired and more beset with insoluble problems than usual hence I didn't respond after I asked Larry Pinley to phone or write you. I read your letter to him over the phone before he received it.

I don't think he is the kind of guy you think, I don't think he has the intentions you anticipate, and the whole idea was mine, not his. He knew nothing about it. He was here for a different purpose.

What you said and repeat in different form in your 10/21, which came today, is all very reasonable, but you are looking at one side only. Go back to your reporting days and, without the personal knowledge you have, ask yourself how you would have reacted on learning this strange coincidence in locations? Can a good reporter not check it further? He didn't rush into print with it - he asked and said he would check. Is that wrong?

I have not given him anything. I have shown him some.

Perhaps it is just as good that my copy of that issue of "On Target" has not been returned. I asked for it about two months ago. But I think if you were to do a personal investigation on that stuff you would endanger yourself needlessly.

And with what might be suspected of you there, it is even a more dubious idea. You are not a stranger now, remember? The last thing you want to do is get into a situation ~~where~~ where you'd be under some kind of suspicion. Asking questions alone is enough to accomplish this.

In haste,

10-21-71

Dear Harold,

Last night I sent you a copy of the letter I sent to your man in Chicago. The letter was a little strong, but so was my reaction to it. When I read the letter he sent to you I was immediately reminded of something a friend of mine had said a couple years ago: there was an article in Newsweek magazine about a musician that we both knew and we looked at the article together and pointed out dozens of lies, ~~and~~ discrepancies and mis-use of innuendo in the article -- and my friend said, "Man, if they can be so wrong about something, and we only know it because we happened to be there and know the person, how wrong must they ~~also~~ be about other things?" Well that's how I felt about that business of the location -- it just happened that I had ~~been~~ been there shortly after they moved and had specifically discussed the location and know all the reasons why that location was picked. Had I not known that I might have been duped by the clever use of innuendo and said, "Hmm, maybe they did move there to be near the spy operation."

Did you ever get back the copy of "On-Target" that had the story about the townhouse bombing? You were going to send me a copy of it. Now that I'm here in New York I would be able to talk to some people who had contact with the townhouse who would find that issue worth looking at and who might be able to verify whether what they claim was possible. I would like very much to get a copy of it if you've gotten it back, but as you know I'll only be here three more weeks, so I'd have to get it pretty soon.

I guess I'll close for now. I hope I didn't turn your friend in Chicago off, but believe me I toned down my reaction before I wrote the letter so that I wouldn't be too offensive.



Russ