

6 Jan 71

Harold (cc. Howard & Sylvia)

I am in great haste, have been very busy lately with "must do" things-- this explains failure to reply to all your letters. I owe a lot of mail, and can't get to it all at once. Patience, please

Your 3 Jan letter asking opinion re your letter to Paul inspires this note. The note does not concern your letter-- I'll comment on that later, but does concern Paul and things that may cause you more consternation than you now feel. I am getting to know him better and better, and more and more he appears to me to be pure f-i-n-k(or is it F-i-n-c-k).

I just found and re-read his 17 Nov. letter to me-- I mean just found, so that I am still burning as I write this. The letter is a revelation, not about my statements concerning the fragments, but about Paul. Without sanctioning it, I can understand his blindness over his melon-cholia, for I have been similarly blinded myself over stupid things. What just turned up concerns not his blindness, but his honesty, his integrity. I think it stinks.

For reasons which I'll explain later (perhaps in a letter to Paul), Paul's 17 Nov letter to me indicated that after he learned what I thought about the fragments Paul did a lot of good homework. The book that he used for his homework was Wound Ballistics. If you knew how thoroughly that book treats matters that bear with utmost directness on the fragments, and how authoritative its discussions are, you would know why I am furious. Knowing (from Paul's letter) what parts of that book he read, I know that he found nothing but support for my arguments about the fragments-- and in language that he understands better than I. Nevertheless, in the letter he elected to cite the one thing that he thought (incorrectly) weakened my argument. I welcome that, for I need Devil's advocates (though I wonder the part of what Devil Paul is ~~advocating~~ advocating). What rankles me is that he did not refer me to that book. He knew how valuable it was to me-- he cannot have failed to know that. I have already instituted important changes in my monograph, (notably the deletion of quotations by NRA's Harrison and Braverman, and substitution of a more comprehensive discussion of penetration, because I read Wound Ballistics after I had gone to the god-damned trouble to locate even those inadequate references. Paul had that book at his fingertips when he wrote to me. Why didn't he tell me about it? Did he think that I would not wish to know that there existed most thorough and authoritative discussions of the very principles upon which my argument depends? Did he think that the mathematical presentations would bore me, that I would not understand them, even though they are summarized in words?

I read the book a long time ~~ago~~ ago, and had all but forgotten about it until recently when I found it by accident while looking for something else.

I can understand such behavior in an F-i-n-c-k. Am I to think differently when I see it in an H-o-c-h? This morning I sent him a copy of my second draft of the monograph. Christ, what a mistake!

Still,

Dick

Bernabei

Sylvia — no need to reply; this

is merely for your information, although I think that on this topic you do not need to be informed. Dick