

Mailed to HR only

1/10/72

Dear Jerry,

The displeasure you detected last night was not entirely attributable to the excess of tranquilization and double-dose of painkiller prescribed from my injury. It was close to the loss of a thumb, so holding the phone, as you should have understood, without my finally having to tell you, could not but be disagreeable. I was tired, as you also detected, and had gone to bed in the hope of sleeping longer. But these are not the real reason. They merely reduced my disposition not to be pointed. Here I will be. If you understand, as you should, that there is much work I have awaiting me, and that typing is not pleasant, perhaps you can understand that I do this in what I regard as your interest. I propose to address that of which you are unaware or don't give a damn about. If these or any other reasons account for it, whatever they are, I think you should undertake some self-analysis. You may not agree with me and I'm going to give you less than all the examples available. Thereafter I will not discuss it simply because I have too many other things to do and can't find time for them.

I ought not have to protest the affection I (we) have for you. Or that we are glad to hear from you, or enjoy your visits.

You have a way of persisting in whatever whim possesses you at any given minute, regardless of anyone else's feelings, beliefs, attitudes or declarations. The Graham phone calls ought to be enough example, but you should think of other exact duplicates. You know I do not keep secrets from you. You go through my files at will, unsupervised, take whatever you want, sometimes mess it up and often don't even replace it or ask where it goes if you have forgotten. So, my reluctance with any subject, clearly and to your advance knowledge, had, to NOW, had nothing to do with keeping it from you. Therefore, you should assume that if at any time I am reluctant to discuss anything on the phone, I have a reason for it. You may or may not know or guess the reason, but I suggest that you owe me the respect for my desires to honor my wishes. There has at no time been any crisis in any of these incidents, least of all on the Graham thing. My reluctance to discuss any aspect of this had to be obvious. Despite it you persisted, including the making of what you should have known were juvenile suggestions, the sole end product of which could have been to get me to say what you knew I didn't want to say. Nothing in this is intended to suggest that you have less than the fine intelligence I attribute to you. I am talking about your gaddamned unthinking bullheadedness, not your intelligence and common sense, which are beyond question and except for self-indulgences, or an unusually high cover (which make the offense more grievous). What in the hell do you think, that I need you to tell me to make tapes? When I wouldn't talk, and you knew I wouldn't talk, and then I said I wouldn't talk, what do you do? You phone Howard, who was here, knew everything, for I told you that, and you pump him. Now Howard had no way of knowing that I didn't want anything said of this on the phone, so, having no reason not to, he told you. They, Jesus Christ, you tell me about it by phone.

Even if you feel I am wrong, I find this intolerable, and the next time it happens will be the last. I have too many real problems to cope with constantly to be even slightly annoyed with the unnecessary and more, the inexcusable. I am not going into the reasons for my reluctance to talk about this for three reasons: time, I've already told you in general, and it is utterly immaterial. I am entitled to lead my life the way I want, do what I want with my work, and if you haven't understood it before, please understand it now. I insist upon it. You know I rejected \$10,000 to compromise on this. Do you need more?

This is not the only related instance. You persisted after I told you I didn't want to on getting my new material on this. Ordinarily I would have sent you copies. Now I will not. I had planned to take the tape with me when I come to NY. Now I will not. One obvious reason, as you know well from the past, is that I want to use what I do my way, where, when and as I want. When you did think of which I did not approve on the

Times-Wolff thing I said what I had to say and dropped it. When you had a juvenile objections to the letter I wrote Wolff and didn't want to send it, despite my belief this was unbecoming chickshit, I drop ed it. I did not write Wolff separately, either. That was your wish, I felt bound to respect it, and I did. And to this I add that the record you made is unduly kind to him and therefore a record that is not congenial to me, my interests or, in reality, the totality of truth. But you want to cajole, even with compromise, as you did it your way, and I let it go. In short, I am not asking of you what I do not extend and practise.

Now one of the things you had best face early is that you are not going to set the world on fire with an article critical of the Times, even if you are lucky enough, as I do hope, to get major attention for it. Therefore, everyone else doesn't have to abandon his needs and interest because you are bestowing this intended great boon on the world. Get it in perspective. It can be an important record. I think in the form you have described it already is. But that is not the end of everything. As you should recall, what you pressed me for over my objections is an integral part of my own book. I will be adding a chapter on it. I have done much work on it already, despite the pain and handicap. All the work I did yesterday I did with one hand, holding the other erect. Now I have started to use the second, and I'll learn soon enough it is premature and will, in the end, delay recovery or fuller use. Before you were up this morning I did about 2,000 more words on this. Thus far all you are doing is talking and that in an objectional way (meaning to me, personally). Among the things I did this morning is write Lattimer a long letter. If you now write him one you will reduce the prospects of his answering mine. More so if you call him. Aside from the fact that you are hardly prepared to cope with him or analyze what he is saying, in Graham's or any other formulation, you do not know enough to know where he is reasonable or unreasonable, factual or in error. So, I hope you will let that alone. I have sent him almost four pages of single-spaced questions. I don't think you will think of any important ones I forgot, but if you do, after I get him or record will be time enough. To put this a different way, which of us do you think has the better chance of making a record with him?

Bad as Graham's article is, it is less so because of me. He has said he will come back to me. I will not be surprised if he does not. I will give him plenty of time and then I will write him, telling him that I am asking questions for use in a book of which he knows and that if he fails to answer them I will use his silence. For Christ's sake don't let your ego turn him off. I know he was fed a leak. This is not the first time. I warned him in advance of error, and he made the error. I got more than you know from him. Now I can't stop you from doing these things. I do not allege I enjoy a monopoly. But I think you should be more responsible and less egocentric about this, recognize your limitations, and do whatever is necessary to avoid fucking up. If you do, I will not forgive you. I have put much too much work into this entire matter and Graham and the Times to be willing to consider accepting such a thing. Same for Roberts. I stayed away from him while you were in touch. Now he has come into the area of my work and I have written him. By this time I am writing this he should have that letter. I also phoned him. He has not returned the call. Maybe he won't. But I'll wait and either way I have made enough of a record for my book.

Among the other things I did yesterday and before is write the Archivist, the appeals office for the agency (each twice), Marshall, a Senator who spoke to Marshall, Kennedy's office, Ned, Cyril, NBC (twice), plus doing things by phone where I could reverse the changes. (Note that the Post has, to date, ignored this story.) I'm not doing nothing and if perfection is not a state of man, I have done the best I could. On this aspect I think I am prepared to do more than any other, whether or not my performance is as good as it should and could be. I think others should leave this aspect alone. Nobody else has done any work in it. For purposes of your article, you have no need for any more than Graham's story, if you know your business.

By the way, before I forget, Lil's quitting schedule is about to change, perhaps this week, perhaps next. She told me this a.m. I think the new one will be 5 Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays. Where you can, please try and adjust to our plans in phoning. We do try to look at the NBC and CBS net news 6:30-7:30. It is also a relaxing time for us.

There are other ways in which you persist in having your own way, come hell or high water. You don't rant and rave. You just do as you damned well please, giving others no option. You are too old for this course of conduct to be acceptable. I will not further discuss this with you. I anticipate you will disagree. All I ask you to do is be aware that it is the observation of another and think it out for yourself, ask yourself if in this little way of that you do not do as I say. You just ignored both the expressed and anticipatable desires of others and do your think, whether or not it is of significance, only because that is either what you want to do or your way. Others also have rights.

I repeat what I think I told you last night. Unless you restrict yourself to what Graham has done in your piece, you are premature in doing anything now. You can't, for example, know what may yet come, what the other major media, like newsmagazines, LIFE, etc., will or will not do. You have no way of knowing whether it will in any way backfire. When you have a space problem already, you should be asking yourself why you need any more for your purposes than the piece and the fact of it. You don't by any ordinary measure.

You should know that I told you in advance that something was coming, for I did. You tried to pump me. Ask yourself if there is a better way to persuade me not to tell you of these things in the future. You never once gave thought to the fact that I have a large book, not just an article, and it is on precisely this subject. Or did you ask yourself if my work has lead to the need to pull this dirty one? It surely is not your nibbling at the Times.

By the way, I have already asked CBS for fairness-doctrine time, too. If you can think of any important thing I did not do despite the handicaps, I would welcome being told. I have, in fact, already raised questions with a lawyer to see if there is possible redress...I have just had a call from Paretz' secretary. The show is set back a week. I'd appreciate it if you would phone Manny Pawsner TEC-6162, and ask him if we can make the date for the 22 instead of the 15th; Walter, ditto for the 21, and John Friedman, 866-2761 (who may be available only nights), after an okay from Manny. John was to have met me there. Also Ed, when you talk to him. This will save me much letter writing. It is now going on 12 and no word from Graham, which is consistent with what I suggested. There is more I'd like to go into, but there simply isn't time. We it not do for the affection I bear you and the appreciate of your many favors, I would not have taken this time. I do hope that instead of being resentful, you will give these things some thought.

Best,