

12/24/71

Dear Jerry,

Your letter of the 22, to which you referred by phone last night, came today. I have read it. I have no doubt about your sincerity or your intentions, certainly none about your integrity, and I find it unpersuasive.

I have no doubt that you believe it. And I likewise have no doubt that when you talk about "an axiom of advertising" it is as correct as it can be - with other things, like doederants, worthless cereals, autos - but not on this subject.

From my own experience, and it has been as long as it has been painful, what you say is irrelevant.

It does me no good for "many people who have never read your books, have no first hand knowledge of the amazing things you've discovered", to find out about them outside my books and with the book from which they come unprinted.

It does no good, to me or to anyone, for there to be "mention of a provocative tid-bit like the displaced head wound" to "whet people's appetites for wanting to know more" UNLESS that more is then, immediately, available. And it does take the edge off.

(By the way, these are not "discoveries", or anything that casual. They are the end product of an enormous investment I have not yet come close to amortizing, an unimaginable amount of hard work. They are by no means anything as casual as a "discovery".)

Assume it to be what you say, "a devastating blow against Epstein", and I do not seek such things per se, for they are not, in themselves, constructive, tell me what good that does me, on a selfish basis, or us, collectively, in what we seek?

As a matter of corioaity, what do you mean by the work of Thompson, Kaiser and Sylvia, indeed, have done their own work. but be kind enough to show me one thing besides error that you can attribute to Tink.

Of course I want all the help I can get, and I appreciate both help and the intent to be helpful. Where we disagree is over your concept, that you would be helping me. I have no doubt this is your desire. What I doubt is the possibility it could be the end product.

Mark, Marks, Thompson, Flamonde, Turner, Garrison, Popkin and others have made extensive use of my work, but that it has done me any good in any way I have absolutely no reason to believe. Were it to be credited to me, that also would do me no good. In the minority of instances where Thompson did credit, there has been no single letter to me from anyone who read his book and wrote to ask anything, including how to get mine, of me. Not one! The references you mentioned to the head wound by others were by those who in at least one case knew it was my work and mine alone. I do not recall your telling me that it was then credited. So, tell me where the good is for me. I can tell you where the harm is.

But this is no way to waste time. You do what you think is right, as I told you. I can't and I won't impose my judgement on you and your work. Ask yourself, however, if you are not doing this with me?

Glad you are coming next week. If you want to pursue this further then, we can.

est,

12/22/71

Harold,

if I felt that using the material on the head wound with accreditation to you could do anything but help you I would never dream of using it!

1) a mention of a provocative tid-bit like the displaced head wound can only whet people's appetites for wanting to know more. Contrary to what you feel, it does not take the steam out of your discovery, but rather lets people know that you have discovered something of great importance.

2) Many people who have never read your books have no first hand knowledge of the amazing things you've uncovered. They see your name only when someone like Kaplan is calling you a chicken farmer. People who haven't read your work have no way of knowing what you've done unless they're told. This is an axiom of advertising.

I think you do me a disservice by suggesting that I am not sensitive about you and your work. If I felt that I was in any way exploiting either I would not even have considered using the head stuff. I honestly believe that I would be doing you

a favor, and that is not a rationalization or an attempt to ease my conscience. You better than anyone should know that I wouldn't be writing an article if a) I hadn't gotten ~~so~~ so pissed off at what the Times did to you; and b) if I hadn't been unsuccessful in getting pro-writers like Bentoff or McDougal interested enough to pursue the matter.

You should also know better than to say something like "there is nothing I can do to stop ~~me~~ you." I wouldn't leave it in over your objection no matter how essential I feel it is.

I hope you'll consider what I'm saying. If you want the hard stuff out it will come out. It is a devastating blow against Epstein, but it is not essential to documenting my case against the Times.

I'll talk to you further about it.

Paul,

Jerry

P.S. I'm not pretending to be making any revelations about ~~the~~ political assassinations. Everything on that subject is the work of others - ~~including yours~~ ^{yours} Thompson, Kaiser, ~~McDougal~~ Meagher etc. I'm simply showing that no revelation has been so great that the Times would not be ~~blinded~~ ~~by~~ deterred from its opinion by facts.