



BROWN

A. ALFRED TAUBMAN CENTER
FOR PUBLIC POLICY
AND AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

Dr. James Wood
Department of Psychology
University of Texas at El Paso
500 W. University Ave.
El Paso, TX 79902

July 30, 2015

Dear Professor Wood,

Your message of July 18 comes as somewhat of a surprise. You said that you and your co-authors, including Debbie Nathan, have come to the view that the first interview with J.C. on August 9, 1984 is "of key importance for understanding the Fuster case." I have a few clarifying questions about this remarkable statement. First, did Debbie Nathan authorize you to represent this as *her* position—that she reached her conclusions about the Fuster case without examining an interview "of key importance" to understanding it? Second, does your statement mean that you, and your co-authors, have come to the conclusion that Dr. Bruck's testimony on Fuster's behalf, also rendered without examining this key interview, was based on an insufficient understanding of the case? Finally, have you and Nathan told the NCRJ to suspend its endorsement of Fuster's case immediately because their position was taken without a sufficient understanding of the case? I await your clarification.

In the meantime, since it has been nine years since we last communicated back and forth, I want to make sure that you are aware of some relevant developments in the interim. As you know, I agreed to house the so-called *Satan's Silence* archives. I did so because the "archive" was never made available to the public in the way that was claimed in the book. This was the only way for me to find out what was actually in the "archive." (As it turns out, there was less than what is claimed in the book.) All of the years that I housed those documents, I made them readily available to others, and I consistently treated Ms. Nathan with courtesy, going beyond any obligation to her by photocopying things on request on multiple occasions and sending them for no charge. I have documentation of her replies, such as the one on February 7, 2006 that ends: "Thanks. As always, your help is greatly appreciated."

I eventually decided to stop housing the "archives." My book was done and I was contacted by someone from Retro Report who seemed to think that I was obliged to provide her with research and photocopying services in connection with these materials. Her request was for a story that had obviously been written in advance of this "research." I declined to provide that service and instead contacted Professor Bruck to convey my desire to send the materials back to her, if she still wanted them. She instructed me to send them to Debbie Nathan. And that is what I did.

This is some of what I have experienced in return. First, Ms. Nathan prompted her co-author, lawyer Michael Snedeker, to send a baseless complaint to administrators at Brown University that I was "withholding" materials, when, in fact, I had sent them and there was some kind of mix-up at Nathan's rural post office in Phillipsport, New York; the complaint was later retracted. More recently, Ms. Nathan apparently told Cathy Young that I failed to acknowledge the use of the "archive" in my book. My direct use of those materials is, in fact, acknowledged on page 414. But Young published the false claim, and it has not been corrected.

My most recent experience with you also left something to be desired. As you know, I requested an interview with you in October 2009. I have a number of questions about matters that remain relevant given that I will be writing a response to your commentary about my book. (Those include questions about the ethics complaints you filed against Drs. Laurie and Joseph Braga, and the ethics complaints you filed against Michael German and Rebecca McReynolds.) We corresponded without incident numerous times in the early and mid-2000s, before I requested an interview. Then, in the course of three weeks, I sent you four emails, a fax, and I left a voice mail message on your office phone on a day when someone in your departmental office confirmed that you were on campus holding office hours. You did not reply to *any* of those messages, including the fourth email, dated October 26, 2009, that specifically asked, in the subject line, for the courtesy of a response.

Now, writing from the same email address, you are requesting *my* assistance—without any acknowledgment of my unanswered messages, let alone a response.

Before responding any further to you, I am renewing my request to interview you on the record. As I said in 2009, my questions could be covered in less than half an hour and the interview would, of course, be scheduled at a time most convenient to you.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ross E. Cheit", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Ross E. Cheit
Professor and Director of Graduate Studies
Political Science and International and Public Affairs
Brown University

P.S. Please be advised that since publication of my book, I have significantly restricted my email correspondence. The only reliable way for you to reach me, and the only form in which I will reply, is by hard copy. My primary office is now in the Political Science Department, Campus Box 1844.