

Sept. 7, 1981

Dear Bruce

Some of this I have started and never finished.
First thank you for the nomination for the
instrumentation recognition. Unfortunately there are
generally two classes of people in development -
those that talk about it and those that do it and
most of the time the latter.

Let me briefly review what professional recognition is based
on: 1) associations both institutional and professional (people)
most of my professional associations such as NASA
have been negative simply because I have not 'gone along'.
For this reason I had tried to establish a base at TMB
and was painfully doing so until you smashed it beyond
all recall for the sake of "sales" - they consider me
and to good reason an agent of Del Mpr and I have
been treated accordingly.

2) publications - in spite of what anyone tells you
only ^{publication in} the recognized professional journals - about two
dozen - amount to a hill of beans - books in
established fields which become recognized are of
value - only established figures can afford the
negative publicity which generally accrues from commercial
house publications - for an unknown publication
is something like your Ambulatory Electrocardiography is at
best neutral and ~~was~~ a sales sheet such as
I did for the poster generally has negative effect
eg I have not received one comment or inquiry from that -
This is not the way things should be but it is the

way they are - John^H knows it, I know^{it} and this, coupled with the fact that John^H is a member of the establishment and is satisfied with his reputation (unlike Hal who is walking a tight rope in a hurry) is why ~~that~~ he has been reluctant to publish on a new & of necessity controversial subject - and is why it was such a boon to get him to agree to write a monograph on the use of ABP for you to publish - and why it destroyed my credibility when you slammed the door. In keeping with this the editorial which has been submitted ^{by one group}, disappointing to me as it is for its conservatism, is worth more than your entire ad. budget could buy.

3) Equipment and procedures that are ^{become} ~~not~~ established are a potent tool for ~~reg~~ recognition e.g. the Walter recorder - but my name has never been on anything, which I do not resent but I bitterly resent the many good systems ~~that~~ offered years ahead of their time which either through faulty design/production never had a chance or were fiddled with until outmoded. I equally resent the fruitless hours, days & in some cases weeks that have been spent tracking & solving serious problems and then having them completely ignored or ridiculed while Mac tries to make them go away with ill conceived changes & white wash.

4) Good ^{work} is usually recognized and in spite of everything it is the ITMA mark as I could have

personally salvaged something if I could have gotten
some way of producing presentable data - yet you gave
Kennedy the results of two years of hard work, the 1966.
yrs, you built it but you paid me only for a fraction of
the effort I put in that. Try, if you can, to put the
shoe on the other foot and imagine me taking
the pneumometer elsewhere and starting production. It
is equivalent, for ^{in contrast to your money} my reward would have been the pleasure
of at least sharing in the use of something I worked hard
on - and now that chance has gone.

This is not said in anger but is an attempt to
tell it straight and I am convinced that you would
like to see me receive credit & benefit for my work
but the irony is that you have often acted in a way
that precluded it. As you often point out, & correctly, your
actions have profound effects on hundreds or even
thousands of people now eg. your refusal to
lease the equipment for the drug study cost me & the
family dearly not in money but in more important
ways. Certainly hope your scanning svc. benefitted!
So much for the record.

appreciate this
use, money
not the
estimate &
only
decision
element -

Just as the ~~more~~ ^{conservative} ~~water~~ predicted in the editorial,
there is danger of misuse, primarily through misunderstanding,
of the A.B.P. Mac's recent article is only one
example and for everyone's benefit I must take
public issue & it for Mac would not listen before.
It is not personal.

To your issues: S.T. patent - While it is
I + I felt the most accurate way &

still do, to detect ST level was on a ~~ms~~ beat by beat basis it certainly was not limited to that in my implementation for I had averaging $\frac{1}{2}$ ckt. which could perform the equivalent of an average base line. This I know & recall $\bar{c}$ certainly but whether it was in the patent I don't know. I certainly covered in concept all the points raised. Was just looking at my notebooks & guess what was in a letter to Cliff almost 20 yrs (23) ago - a plea for an EEG amp on a Walter. Glad to hear Ray has finally done it. I totally agree that collidin electrodes must be supplanted & there are profitable potential work arounds i.e. better electrodes & hardware for restraint. I have use some of these.

above a threshold I don't agree $\bar{c}$ Kennedy's number & percent of readings concept. It's fine for him that there are more fundamental things needed which I would like to review face to face (c Squire) if possible otherwise I can try to send a list. Hope the threshold concept didn't cost much to implement for it is a theoretically wrong concept.

I have many reservations about the Smith/Craige work. Generally, if you are going to get into that field it should be a considered approach & not limited to displacement. There is certainly nothing new or novel about this ^{accelerometer} ~~general~~ approach for I used the same technique in a NASA ^{mission} simulation (SMD-111) 5 yrs. ago & NASA ~~is~~ ^{has} ^{been} working long hard & successfully on this. The only unique feature is tying the accel. to the electrode & that

complete review. It ~~was~~ is too extensive to attempt
 by ~~me~~^{letter} but if you're serious about this I'll dig
 through all my ^{documents & + review current work.} records. I have reservations
 about the entire concept and am appalled at
 \$167 K from NIH for Benie has been fiddling
 at this 5 success since 1960 when he had to
 withdraw a paper after I pointed out the inadequate
 freq. response of a system which grossly distorted
 his records, & conclusions. Conversely I feel there
 is room for improvements in this field but you
 should look at all possibilities - By the way,
 Jack H. is a flaming revolutionary compared to
 Benie C. who is a pillar of the establishment itself.
 A thick, dense pillar, but a very fine physician.
 I have enclosed MAC's CR per request & my
 comments -

Sincerely
 Bill