12/29/71

Dear Gary,

In the always-haste of responding yesterday(and I didn't leave home, so I couldn't mail it), I forgot at least two things. The came to mind while I was taking my morning walk.

Mary: there are certain realities with which we have to live, and the conditions of her life are one. She is working full time and in an exceptionally responsible position for a secretary. She could undoubtedly make at least twice as much by moving to, say NYC. She has a rare keenness of mind. But she prefers Dallas, and that is where Buck is now working. I suspect that in time he could work anywere. But Mary is aware of his problems, and the thing that does and I suggest must dominate her life is holding the family together. She keeps them going and kept liquid (bad word in context) and did during Buck's problems and illness. She worries about her kids, as what mother doesn't and shouldn't. So, what she can do is limited, and the problems take their toll on what she can do outside her working hours. I was aware of this when I arranged for her to plumb the two archives I opened. But I had no choice. I am aware she may never do it. I can only hope she can.

Medical recommendations: you have oversimplified and misunderstood. When we belong to a medical coop, there is no single doctor, like a family doctor, who can be called as a witness, and were there, he could testify only to what his professional competence permits. That to which a general practitioner can testify or, if he is in reality competent to testify to more, what a court will accept as genuine expert testimony, is limited. What I seek is not witnesses from your staff but recommendations for witnesses. The effects of noise measured by decibles is now well established. That is not the problem, not in reality, not in court. The effect emptionally is less well known, especially when the amount of noise is not the key factor. What I seek is leads to those who may have done work in this field. It seemed to me that some of your faculty might have heard of such. Your recommendation on Nader is a good one. I didn t know he had turned in that direction. I did try several others, including the Sierra Club, without accomplishing anything. They all have bureaucracies today. Your own porblem with the shrinks might further inhibit this capability of helping locate the experts I seek. And you bespeak my attitude toward them as a group, from my limited experience and more extensive reading. I did have good wintesses lined up, but they have disappeared, I suspect in the more important case died.

Your own situation and choices: perfection is not a state of man, nor is it the condition of his judgement. I think the most important thing is to do what you think is the right thing, in terms of your future and your life in your profession, not what at any one time seems most likely to be agreeable or profitable or immediately rewarding in any way. If it means continuing to do what is not agreeable for a while but permits the most expeditious possible completion of the not-yet-begun disertation, I'm inclined to think that in the long run it would be the right thing. I've been after you on the disertation for years, as you know. Do it and get it over with. I think it should be your first professional priority. There would seem to be no conflict between this and becoming part of your own office. That could conflict with your other professional work, but it need not with the thesis.

Hope I didn't forget anything else. Oh, yes, I did. How about bringing that second WDSU print with you? I have someone here who can do expert work on it now. I want to establish things other than we have looked for, like splices, which may not be easy for most technicians. I have carried this much, much further, as you'll know if you remind me when you are here. There is much of which I haven t informed you because you should have been working on your thesis and I didn't want to entice you away. But I can tell you all these things I can remember.

Best,

Here are the Jaffe corrections. I have switched troubled by the weakness to undertain about, as you suggested, made thereference to the rumors about the FBI more general by making that read "there had been rumors inside the Department to the effect tha the FBI", etc., and have made no change in the reference to Wecht because it seems not to be necessary and is one of the things that might pinpoint Jaffe. Your suggestion about "the din of battle" is too vague, as is the idea. If you do not like the more specific formulation, "troubled by the weakness of the medical evidence", and you seem not to, having asked its removal, I think it best not to make this any more vague. I can't understand why you wanted change from "troubled by the weakness of the medical evidence", which I think tells it like it was, but I have made it read as you suggested, even though it doesn't seem to make much sense.

HW