

25 January 1974

Dear Harold:

Some odds and ends:

Before I forget it, in your two-page letter to PH dated 1/13/74, in the 4th graf on page 2 you mention that you have lent out your one remaining copy of "Curry" and then go into a discussion of how it would be easier for PH to handle the matter of photocopying it. If you're referring to Jesse Curry's opus, the "JFK Assassination File," published in Nov. 1969, by American Poster and Printing Co., Inc., of Dallas, we have a copy. By now the problem may have been resolved, but if PH needs to borrow out to copy he's welcome if he'll undertake without reservations to get the original back to us. Leaving this to you to work out with him. Even if we had a current address~~x~~ for him, I would not want to get in touch with him under present circumstances, which would suggest clearly you have sent us a copy of your letter to him. Nothing wrong with~~x~~ that, except that he doesn't know it, presumably.

On another matter, we have looked in a couple of bookstores for "The Coven," and both said they could not order because their wholesaler doesn't handle Fawcett. One book store operator/said this line appears most often on bookracks in supermarkets and dime stores, where we'll begin looking on shopping trips. So unless you've already obtained a second copy, we might as well see if we can find it here. So much for The Coven until we hear further from you. If we find it, I'll advise you, then read it and try to provide some impressions.

On still another matter, I simply can't reply to some of your recent memos and discussions (assuming I have any worthwhile reply to make, which isn't justified) because I can't be sure of what you mean. Necessarily you have gone into elliptical terms which I cannot be sure about. In other words, if I don't reply to something, it doesn't mean I'm not interested or in violent disagreement. It just means I don't dig some of your terminology.

Then too there is also the matter of your typos, few of which you correct, which sometimes occur in strategic places where they leave one in doubt regarding ~~an~~ key element ~~and~~ essential to your meaning. One can guess, but one also can guess wrong.

Usually if I wait long enough the meaning becomes clear in later notes, but sometimes rather late in the game. A minor and unimportant example: You made several references to a piece you were doing for a London agent on Russell. Since there was absolutely no clue as to which Russell you were talking about, I tentatively assumed you were talking about Lou Russell, the old investigator who died early in the Watergate story after putting ~~him~~ ^{McCord} on to Fensterwald. (A death I still think may have been suspicious). Now I find you were talking about the late Senator. As I say, this was not important in the least, but suggest that if you want ~~want~~ your meaning to get through it would be well to read what you write and fix the more mystifying typos, and in sending carbons of notes to other people, perhaps check these against what you~~x~~ know that we know and don't know of the topic under discussion. This isn't a complaint. Just a small flag that might avoid possible hangups or even mistakes later on. Best ~~idw~~