Yesterday the library at the Lab got the September issue of <u>Computers</u> and <u>Automation</u>, and I picked it up to see what they had come up with this month. I confess that I was a bit surprised to see the entire revised <u>Doggs</u> memo, with no substantive changes or corrections.

when you sent this revised version to me in July, you noted that it was still subject to criticism, although it was improved over the original version. In my letter of August 17, I was agreed with you, and cautioned against further dissemination without careful consideration.

Some of the factual errors which I pointed out long ago were not corrected.

Actually, I am glad of that, since some of them involve rather sensitive work
in progress where there is no point in broadcasting what we know and how we

tentatively interpret it.

Recently, Rob Emith sent me a letter explaining quite well the origin of this memo, the intent. etc. I have no complaints to make in those areas; considering the nature of the original memo I can not object too much to the use of a memo of mine that was marked "confidential." (The reason for that restriction was not primarily to "protect" my own work, since it was based on published documents, but to assure that I would be able to throw my two cents worth in if anyone wanted to draw any conclusions from this material.) Bob indicated that he was not completely happy with the revised version either. He mentioned that Bud had circulated copies to one or two places, but did not indicate that publication was impending.

Since you and Bob and I seem to have fairly similar views on this memo, there is no reason for me to launch into a polemic. I am confident that HW will make his views known. But I would like to say that I see no point at all in having this kw kind of article published in that magazine. It is, and should properly have been, given its original purpose, largely a combination of old and well-known facts and sensitive work in progress. As far as I can tell, the audience of C&A consists of computer people whose reactions so far have been of two kinds: "See whit" and "why don't you stick to articles that have something to do with computers?" I'm sure it is also read with interest by whoever the FBI still has on the case, plus the man from the C&A (whom, I hear, Bud has talked with).

As I said, it seems pretty silly for me to be lecturing you about this, but I wanted to get it out of my system. You may wish to communicate my opinions to the appropriate people.

I'm still working furiously on the my thesis, and had better get right back

to it. Hope all is well with you.

Sincerely yours,

bee: Hy

Jim Lear Lesar & Carrollsburg Square, Apt. N700 300 M St., S.W. Washington, D.C. 20024