George Lardner, newsroom
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

5/31/92

Dear Goerge,

As my enclosed letter to the American Historical Review indicates, I am well started in commenting on that disgraceful "forum" in its April issue. I've not enclosed a copy because the copying alone if getting to be a problem for us. It is 21 pages. If you want it I'll send it. With what Jim Lesar was not able tto get to the committees on Gates' flimflam I decided it would be better for us to have it done commercially. (Jim has not been well. Spoke to him last evening. He said he'll get copies to the committee soon.) The 21 pages does not include the attachments, pages unnumbered.

I've also been delayed by the interminable but unfortunately necessary doctor and hospital visits, fomm to Johns Hopkins in the two weeks ended this past Wednesday. I have three this coming week there that I'm hoping to be able to consolidate into one trip.

Otherwsse you and Downie would have heard from me on the Post's AMA coverage. You, plural, did not do yourselves proud and you did arm the Stoners if they want to be armed, as I think they now do not, he having picked his chips up. Without him they'll get little or no attention.

As soon as I heard AMA say that Humes and Boswell are right because they say they are right and the JAMA endorsed this I decied to submit what I know it won't publish to it. But I'll send you a copy as soon as a finish the draf if I do not then decided to take time to attach exhibits. I do have this in mind now but not all that firmly. Time again.

The embargo seems to me to have been rather firm. A friend who has access to Database could not get a copy of the article or the press conference transcript as of day before yesterday, no the 28th. If as I asked you, you have a press kit or such a transcript I'd appreciate a copy because I want to address this in detail. I'll start with the articles and then insert if I get more where relevant. But the clippings alone tells me they set themselves up if the media does not continue with what amounts to sycophancy and suppression. But if it dontines this way they have set themselves up for the histprical record, whether or not anyone uses it later. But is this unusual, and if you think it is, any idea why? I find it hard to believe that the pathologist/editor did not have some serious questions. It is not easy to exaggerate how very bad, how entirely unproffesional the who thing is! And that is to say nothing of the many outright lies that the slightest checking would have established are lies.

More later,

Harold