7/15/70

Dear Harold,

Perhaps it is because I studied them so during two very pleasurable stays at your home. Or perhaps it is just because they were such an unselfish gift from you. Whatever the reason, the copies of PM and PMIII which you sent will always have great meaning for me, and will remind me of your goodness.

I believe these books were a gift. However, I would not feel right if I did not replace them, for copies are important to you. Therefore, I enclose a check to cover the costs for new copies for yourself. I hope you won't be offended by this, for on my part it does not dampen the spirit of receiving or the spirit in which the books were given.

I hope what I have to say now does not affect your feelings on having made these available to me. However, with the close paralleling of our work, there are cases where I will overlap with what is contained in the PM's. Wherever this is, it is unintentional, and I am trying now, as I write, to make note of anything I wish to include in my book which comes in any form from either PM.

Currently, I know of two instances. One is with the lung bruise thing and the difference in the Specter memo and Humes' testimony as to what the initial opinion of these was. You detail this at pp. 95-96 of PM. I would want to use this in my Specter chapter in connection with a discrepancy I noted in the memo on Humes' interpretation of the "ragged" trachea wound. I would use it to show that Specter had to have doubts about Humes' testimony. I would also credit this to you--both as having noted the difference and discovered the memo and, if you want, to PM.

The second concerns something from PMIII where you explain how Humes' statement about X-rays showing no bullet "or major portion" of a bullet means there are minor portions, etc. Here is why I want to use this. I have a chapter which compares each observation of the two panel reports and shows how they are exactly opppsite, except rarely where they are corroborative. One case is on the neck X-rays about fragments. Thing is, the Humes panel report makes it seem that there were no fragments. If I compared the two and said they contradicted each other here, it would be false and, with the semantics not too difficult to understand, I would be open to severe criticism. I can't ignore this crucial point either. Here again I would cite you as having first noted the language and, if you want, also PMIII.

I want to know--when you get a chance--your feelings on such usage and accredation. Both points are important to my work, perhaps in a different sense than you used them. It is my understanding that I need your permission to use these and would credit you with them. I won't "steal" these, believe me, so don't get uptight about that. I think you know I have your interests in mind, and therefore will do nothing without word from you.

I can't thank you enough for the books.

Best,

Howard