

1/12/72

Dear Ed,

Thanks for the Saga, the clips and your letter of 1/10. Usually I am in accord with your analyses, and usuassly they range up to brilliant and most incisive. This time I disagree with all but minor aspects. For example, there is without doubt both misrepresentation and deception. There is only the most remote chance of a substitution, and nobody dare do that on a large scale. It might have been done with one picture of a wound in the back. On the basis of what L has said, I'd be unwilling to consider any more.

I don't have time to go into all the possible purposes served, but why not put your own excellent mind to work on this, beginning with the assumption that there was no need to do this, no clamor for it (only four applied, not counting me, and I did 11/66 for all and intermittently thereafter for specific parts). If only four applied, how much interest do you think there was? Did you see a single story, no matter how small, anywhere, asking on 10/29 now it can be done, it should be? Any ringing editorials? This should be the beginning of your thinking, as I see it.

On the Kaplan book, I declined collaboration but offered other help months ago. I will not change the decision. Your advice is right and proper for one who has not already ruined his life and his literary prospects, a younger man with more years ahead. The curse is as you put it. But also ask yourself another question: If I do not do what I am doing, who else will? And at the risk of sounding conceited, of those you know or know of, who else can? So, what you are asking is that I quit, in context. You don't mean this, and I won't do it.

What nobody has yet seen or if anyone has seen what nobody has yet told me and what I now say to anyone for the first time is that this Lattimer play is really an act of desperation. The tragedy is that those who could have made it possible for us to really do something about it wouldn't or worse, didn't have the brains to see it. We are in such bad shape with all our geniuses.

I don't really think I need a "fresh perspective". Your reference is unclear to me. If you mean on any other subject, I think you are wrong. If you mean on this one, until I have made a major error, and to date I think I have not, then I think the record speaks for itself. My interests are not limited to this subject. They can't be because nothing that has happened since can be divorced from it.

But I do appreciate the advice. Hope we can have time to chat when I'm there. It may have to be on a Sunday a.m. if not after the show, when there may be too many for any real communications.

Thanks.

ccJP

1/10/72

Dear Harold

The possibilities of the
rebased data:

- I W.R. correct
- II misinterpretation/deception
of analysis of actual data
- III a correct analysis
of notional or substituted
data.

A good logic obviates I. Two is only
partially correct. Thus, III, a substitute
or false data, a conclusion that
is based on differences between
various reports including Panel
Review etc. Unfortunately, such
a deception could only be proved
by previous medical data, data
unavailable. Of course, you could
reveal anomalies, gaps, contradictions
etc. But this approach will lead
nowhere!

" To borrow a phrase of N.C. -
We've been attacked!"

The Government possesses the
Cross-Reference data!

J.P. mentioned the possibility
of collaboration on a Kaplan
Book.

I advise H.W., my good friend,
not H.W., the writer, to accept
any New project for your own
good - fiscal, emotional, political -
and not to allow yourself to
be trapped in a maze of blame
wales.

Get a fresh perspective.
You can always return if
a break develops.

Sincerely,
