

18 May 1966

Dear Maggie,

To my great surprise I received a few days ago a privately-printed copy of Harold Weisberg's book Whitewash (\$4.95, by request to Weisberg, Hyattstown, Md. 20734). Apparently he panicked at the news that books by Epstein, Lone, and Savage were due out by October. Harold has always been very grandiose about his book and now seems to be developing a real paranoia about his failure to see commercial publication. What he does not face, and what no one is eager to tell him, is that his manuscript (and now his book) was presented very badly - in purely visual terms - ie single-spaced on 2 sides of legal-size paper, no spacing between paragraphs, scanty margins, etc. - and that while some of his research is excellent (although only the expert can appreciate the originality of particular points) his "discoveries" are parallel with the findings or published findings of other critics, and not sensational or new (perhaps they were when he first completed the book February 1965).

However, his writing is often careless, and his style at best is merely adequate. Therefore, on balance, it seems certain that his book was rejected on merit, not as he implies because the subject was taboo. His sense of persecution is not really justified — I feel sorry for him — yet I get irritated by his constant pleading of poverty, his disparagement of other critics (if he even acknowledges their existence) and his sometimes — indecent self-praise.

What I resent most is that he has added an epilogue to his book which was a direct result of learning, from me, about Salandria's article in the April TMO — especially the quotation from the FBI report. True, Weisberg did go at once to the Archives and read the document for himself — but his epilogue suggests that he found the document, without a word of acknowledgment of Salandria's earlier published work — and that seems to me to be outright dishonesty.

Savage received a copy too and phoned me last night, expressing his "surprise" (euphemism) that Weisberg failed to mention Savage's

3.

work on, for example, the Dial Ryder affair and other facets of the case on which Sawage was "first."

Mark Lane too apparently is claiming credit for the FBI report quoted by Salandria - This I gather from a copy of a letter Wersberg wrote to Lane's publisher, which W. sent me for my information (probably expecting applause, too!) The hilarious part is one pirate accusing another pirate while the real "finder" Salandria, with his sometimes-doying self-abnegation, sturdily maintains an attitude of non-presentation and unconcern. (No wonder his intimates tease him with the appellation "St. Vincent," which I learned with amusement, and which he squirms to hear!).

I saw Vince Saturday - We were both invited to dine by the Arnoni's, in N.J. There were other guests too - a civil rights lawyer and his ex-Catholic wife - a socially-mixed marriage - Nice people but not Warrenologists at all, which meant less

4.

Conversation about the case than I would
have liked.

Had a phone call Sunday from Dallas, from
Welsh, and gave him a lot of detail
for follow-up on the Betty Morney Mac Donald
business and a few other items.

While at Arnoni's, saw the page proofs of
the June issue and my article on
Hartags. I wonder if there will be any
repercussions from my employers! I
half-hope they will fire me, so I can
spend all my time on the case — But
how would I pay the bills?

Maggie, I have been thinking about you
and waiting to hear from you when you
feel up to writing. I send you all
my love.

Alycia

Because the
handwriting — I
spoke this in
while at a
meeting.