Dear Cyrill, ( CC Si , ER )

## 8/30/72

well, your malpractise busines should flouriah now. But no other eood has come from your venture boyond your depth and isith thase who could but drac; you dow lower. The hams you have done is, I suspect, beyond your comprehonsion, as is what you plan or at least deinand beyond your comprehenaion.

If you have any seli-rospect you will forget this once and for all. I do not expect you to, but I ain going on recori, having bean cilent for a long time. By "this" I moun fort tho inarudibly imiemponesble public statements you have been melang (which mice Carrison the soule of probity by comparison); the further demands you can't becin to understahds having been too busy getting too rich to do any work that is ro ured for understending; and what + have presumed to be one of your objectives froat the first, an article in some profesotonel joumal whare; over and midar your nene, will be unoxicinal wort if not now and irrenodial disastor for all of us and for what you have clatned to serve vifth notining but unselfish prupose.

In thif turivilue $t$ ing you have done there are but two surprises for was the complete uxprofesaionnlinm of it (I had the hediost rogeri for your professional competenco); and the stupidity (I also had the ht cheet regur for your intelifgence). Fron that Gruhan rould have his exclusive and the ganture of Grahan's story were so obvious I lad them out in detail almost 9 ponths alyoftio shanam, with Howard hearing ny end of the converaation, I mas not in any vay opposad to limhan's botig in touch vith you about Lattimor. I recorin ended it and gave hism all your phones. And oven when your insatiable ego and zuldition for unearned reward drove you to winat I hope you oan in the cone to see is the uneonscionable, and I was atroncly opsosed to $1 t$, to thoge I had reason to bellove you would useux as colmsel I tiicut to be holintul to you, to prevant whet you have iopeo of course, I never expected you
 nade the recowundation if not the amungomente. If you acked Syivia, she could not have but told you, though it toak her years and later great pain to learno I howni of this ISfeton inaunity of yours only recently and then perkupe thixid hand, from Canada. It was insanity. For your sake, I hope you con't find out as you can. The rest of we have beon through it.

जlow that you have validated the Warren loport, what worlds remain for you to conquor in thile fiald? Boopt, of course, the work of others who have truated you end your pronise of confldentinlity.

Should you now write a respeatable artiole, you would but compound the evil. I an not going to talos the time to expladn, but again, I'm on record. But you don't know enough to write an article of ahoth any reaponatilie person would be anhamed. You soucht counsol only where it wae undependable. Freryone umened you of this. I know Zob Sprith vas woricing for you a year aco. Asdie Irom many notions he developed, one of which altiost cost me a thumb (he vas still loolding for exploaive bulluta for you this paat winter!), he ham't the fafnteat notion of the realition of the modical evidenco, as of ny last conversation wit th him on thds mand $t$ mastered what I did in eariy 1965, leave alone the substantial work like Sylvia's which followed. What I an tolling jou may be unvolcose, but I challeng you to aok Sylvia or Howard, far in the part as Sylvia's knowlodge is. There is but one uith less kooviedge of the authemticated, publishod evidonce than you, Jerry $\mathbf{Y}$ olicoff. Your derands are a conplete and imrendidal silf description. Ignoranco is hardiy an aiequate definition for a nan with your really eminont caedentials. There is this difference bevroen you anil Jorry he hasm't read. $Y_{\text {ou, }}$ the expert, have read and have not understood. So, before you go any further with the gervico to lloove, Hixon, Cleindionst and all the other responsible for thels tragedy in the wake of tho tragedy, be aware that this in the only posuible ond product. Or are you really trying to validinte the official fietion? I just can't reconcile the respoct I'va had for your abilifty and intolzigonce uith this inoredible performance. I don't int nd a nasty crack in the question. It ronlly malces more sonse than anytifng you suic, except to clain diveovery of the magic bullet and the aincle-bullet theory.

You don't have to ansuer this letter and I don't expect it. But is you are driven to, h.ve thu sildr ruapeot to be rosponsive. If you hnve, you'll not write. You did not call ne the thaes you wrote you did. I keep a diary and wy wife and I were both hom. And you could have oallod ajpin. Howari says you didn't phone hifin when Syivis asked it and not when ho said ho is a not-sealidy student. So don't pull any more of that domeanin linu, oithor. Dut you sure as heill did sit down with Sprague! On this, perconable as he is in other ways, only tha most ifnorant could not know he is a madman. So I leave you to tho Syracues and the liftons and tra other nuts. and, I sinceroly hope, a late-devolopine conociunce. Harold W isborg

