

18 November 1967

Dear Ed,

Your letter arrived this morning and I was very happy to hear from you and certainly overwhelmed by what you said about the book. My editor tells me that your review will appear in the Washington Post on 11/26/67, on page one of Book World. Page one! I almost fell down with surprise. Perhaps you have heard this by now, but in case you haven't, I wanted to tell you without delay.

About Garrison: don't worry, I can't tell Jones, he stopped calling me entirely, some months ago. Perhaps he was offended by my failure to join in the Garrison entourage of adoring critics; or he may have had a more personal reason. Jones does a lot of snooping around and sees things never intended for his eyes.

I rather took it for granted that you would see Garrison for what he was and I was quite surprised that a man like Popkin seems to have fallen victim to this transparent nonsense. For the Mark Lanes and Mort Sahl's to go into orbit around a buffoon like Garrison is entirely apt. For serious people like Salandria and others whom I had thought to be serious, such gullibility is beyond my comprehension. You will not be surprised to hear that I am completely alienated from Penn Jones, Maggie Field, and the others who have made a religion of Garrison.

However, I do like Tom Bethell and keep in touch with him from time to time. He is the one who told me you were reviewing Accessories.

Conor Cruise O'Brien has done a review too; it will be in The Minority of One, December.

Let me hear from you when you are in New York. I am glad we are in touch again, and very moved by what you have said about Accessories.

Sincerely,

P.S. This will amuse you: Mark Lane, with whose ethical strictness you are familiar, is accusing me (through Mort Sahl, on radio) of having tricked him into giving the quote that appears on the jacket, and is taking steps to have his quote excised. He says that the galleys had favorable remarks about Garrison but behind his back I substituted negative remarks in the book. This gives me the opportunity to say "I told you so" to Bobbs-Merrill, because the one disagreement we have had during the whole year of getting the book out was on their insistence on asking Lane for a quote, in the face of my frantic appeals against associating the book in any way with that sharp operator. He weakened my position by volunteering a quote, before anyone even asked him, and even wrote asking for the ms., in his impatience. He probably doesn't suspect that nothing could make me happier than the removal of his name from Accessories. What does puzzle me, though, is why a thorough opportunist like Lane has been so stupid as to risk his own reputation by going all-out for Garrison, who is such a transparent bag of echoes.