

24 January 1975

Dear Harold:

This replies to your mailings of Jan. 14 and 18, and is also to get the enclosed on its way to you; most is stuff from the NY Times (thanks for those slips advising what you already have) but I agree with you that little new seems to be emerging in spite of all the hullabaloo. We have, however, been as careful as possible to copy anything that looks like it might provide a name or connection which may be new.

Regarding the letter in the Post about an earlier article, I too sighted the letter but was unable to find the antecedent article when I dug up the earlier issue which was supposed to contain it. If Lesar finds it, it will mean that it got into an early edition which neither you or we get here. If he doesn't, that earlier edition possibility is still present, but it also could mean that the letter writer is somehow off the mark, or is deliberately so for some obscure reason. The author of the purported article did have one in the Post several days later, but it appears innocuous. (Several days after the letter appeared, that is).

The "Leigh" book was one I found in the library and read hastily, and I don't remember much about it now. I do agree that the fact there was a grandfather of that name certainly increases the possibility of its use by that particular author, who seems consistently conscious of and rather particular about names. With regard to him, we recently got in late on, and taped part of, an interview with some Southern California English prof on how this author's books reflect his own character. Haven't yet had time to dub it, but it does have a couple of specific points which should interest you and when I dub I'll make a copy for you.

No reaction here to the name John C. Elliott, not even a glimmer. I'd say it's entirely plausible, both as a real name and as a synthetic.

Thanks for your elucidations on the chicken. I've only one further thought to offer on him, namely that in a pale sort of way I've gone through the same stages you appear to have travelled in at first suspecting strongly his possible connections and then deciding, on balance, against them. However I do suggest that this doesn't eliminate all possibilities, which include their demonstrated expertise in using the sons of rich men. Thoresen and Kaplan are two examples which are obvious, but I think we both could come up with half a dozen if we put our minds to it. The wealth, for which the used individual did not work, is merely a stage-setting element. The critical element is the different kind of ego need which dominates the person who has not worked to acquire the means of his power, that is his wealth. There has been some very expert work done in exploiting such needs in several individuals. Probably a lot of inexpert work also, which never surfaced. But the point is that with the degree of subtlety and skill which has been demonstrated, it is entirely possible that a chicken could be used and not have the faintest idea that this is what is going on.

Hope to get this in the mail, so that's all for now.
Best to you both,

 jdw