

1997

Dear Paul,

3/28/78

I had hardly written you to tell you what I plan doing with Epsteinker/Nosenko when events starting taking control and then Jim in effect laid down some law about what I must do and by when. So I'm not going to be able to dictate comments on either your excellent notes of various kinds or the book itself. I did annotate the book as I read it and I've read all but some of the appendix.

Your notes are so more than adequate as a general and specific criticism they serve most purposes. They are not angled, of course, for use in FOIA litigation or in the depositions Jim hopes to take. But I did make FOI notes as I read and when the time comes can pick these up by flipping the book's pages.

In your draft of questions for Epstein, which you can always send by mail and then report he refused to answer, I suggest that in any reformulation you might want to include more on the assistance and support he had, including finances and direction.

You might also want to seek to get his opinion on the professionalism of the so-called legends of Nosenko and Oswald. Was the KGB no more professional than he represents? Like it could not send a fake telegram? Nosenko could not remember what he knew he'd be asked, or have a good story prepared?

I'd also be specific on what he obtained under FOIA and from whom. He fudges on this in more ways than you indicate (you can't indicate everything, of course). And from what agency, in response to requests of what dates?

The conflicts in the various accounts is not limited to "the sequence of these key events," your G. It extends to so-called fact, as when LHO departed England.

(You'll have a great time with the "factual" appendix, which is not an appendix but it more text selected out for notes not called notes to dignify them.)

I had a long talk with George Lardner this morning. I did not intend it but it happened when I told him I'd forgotten to mail him a letter of caution I'd written and mislaid. In the course of it he referred to your notes and his appreciation of them. What I did not immediately realize is that you had not sent him notes like these. He asked for them. I told him I was willing to save him time by providing them but that you had an article you had written and I preferred that he phone and ask your okay.

If you have no conflict I think you would do well to continue to send them to him. He is being pushed to complete the review and the book is acceptable to the prejudiced and the non subject-expert. George is both, despite his recent and past reportings.

If on the other hand you do not want him and/or other reporters to know about any of the notes, as distinguished from the article or review, please let me know this. I have my own observations and can limit myself to them. But your citation of the diary check for example is something for which I did not take time. I just assume that Epstein lies, a sage assumption and true on everything I've checked.

You refer to and quote various promos, ads and other sources, besides the book, RD and NY mag. These Jim should have for the litigation and it would be better if I also do. I can copy for him but if you send to him please let me know. Because we want to have Howard in a position to help Jim him also. Either way, your preference, but please let me know.

Please also let me know if you want copies of the records I'm expecting to get re all of this under new FOIA requests. These would be for you, not to use I regard as irresponsibles. If they are voluminous I'll have to have the copying done in Washington, which is cheaper than using my own machine. And faster. I've been promised some compliance by the FBI!

Despite your datings of 3/21 and 23 not received until today. Original cancellation Oakland, extra one Baltimore, yesterday. Did you mail at Oakland? Envelope enclosed.

Hastily,

5