Js, HR. There is a bit more than meets the eye in my today's response to Bob's Smith's rather arrogant letter. If either of you wants a copy, I'll make it when my new supply of 3M Paper gets here. Because of the usual haste I can't evaluate how close I've come to my purposes. There is nothing not genuine in my response. Some is understated to the point where you might not get it. One of the suits to which Irefrred, for example, is Bob's. It appears to be based on something not generally known, an effort to exploit what I go for in my spectro suit, and something I am sure he heard from Jim, who got it from me. Bob is trying to pre-empt me. He suffers the common malady, ambition to do something. In all the time he has put inon this to date, he has accomplished nothing and come up with nothing new....He also appears to be learning a bit about those with whom he has been associating, particularly Bud, as Jim did earlier.... Personally, Bob is a kind of Alvarez of our side. A physicist and arrogant. He has a good intelligence, but not for this kind of work....I found his warning to me against "wild charges" when I have been silent and all his pals have been sounding off and with incredible irresponsibility a bit much. There is more in his letter I didn't address, like how much work and time others than Jim and I put inon the spectro case. If he had said money, that would be different. But I drafted the Complaint, Bud edited it down, not very well, and Jim did the appeals brief. All the preliminary work and research was mine. Jim did a very good job on the appeals brief. But he did it with no help from anyone but me....Reference to the Jevons affidavit is to a government exhibit in the first Nichols suit. Jevons is an FBI agent....The tragedy is that there seems to be nobody in the CTIA other than Jim who is not a nut. They vary only in degree...I can't really figure if Bob is sincere in his points that are designed to be discouraging, meaning consciously sincere, or, below the level of consciousness has some other motive. However, I am sincere in wanting to know all the possibilities, no matter how remote. I am not exactly suggesting a sour-grapes thing, and I am not saying there can be none of this. I don t know, haven t and won't take the time to consider because it doesn't make that much difference....One of my purposes is to try to get him to think independently of emotion and to examine his own analysis. The CTIA's suits - and he is "research director"- have both been abortions. In one they got nothing and sued for the wrong thing and in the other they seek only to duplicate Kaiser...To this point I have had ajudication in four suits against the government, that in the spectro not yet final but very good. I have won all four, although in one it would appear that I dod not. I got what I wanted, and that, to me, is voctory. In each case there was a yield. I think this galls other, especially the CTIA nuts...Coinciding with this seems to be some rethinking on his CTIA abortion by Bud. He has not, of course, shared this with me. The best reason I can think of is because he seems in this thinking to be almost up to what I suggested to him going on five years ago and he then rejected in favor of the CTIA, which has done nothing for him and has cost him much money. And I did use Bob's letter as a means of sublimating the unpleasantness with the litigation it may require. hm 3./5/73