

Hoch

Saturday, 25 March 1978

Dear Paul,

This is just a brief line to tell you and Russ Stetler that I found your review of Epsteinker's book really excellent. It set forth, far better than I could have done, everything that I found evasive, flimsy, deceptive and intellectually deformed in the book. In addition, it raised a number of cogent and central points with which I had little or no acquaintance or appreciation, mainly in relation to J. Jesus Angleton. And I certainly did not know that Epsteinker has adopted Angleton's (and Nero Wolfe's) hobby of orchid cultivation. Where did you get that bit of esoterica?

I do understand that space limitations prevented you from dealing with Appendix A. I hope that that will still be done by someone, because Epstein's duplicity and/or abysmal lack of scholarship in dealing with specific evidenciary items (e.g., oak tree) must serve as an index to the reliability and objectivity of the work as a whole.

Incidentally, I was flabbergasted to see in the book an acknowledgment of the help he had derived from my Subject Index, and I even wondered if there was not an ulterior motive for this seeming generosity. As you know, I have not been on speaking terms with Epstein since his New Yorker piece on Garrison, on which he obtained my help under false pretences (that he would make his attack on Garrison an appeal, at the same time, for a responsible new investigation, with the tacit suggestion that he repudiated the Warren Report, which he then proceeded to endorse).

Please feel sure that I will not discuss or share your review with anyone.

About the NY Times microfiche of the FBI documents, I think my answer must be "no", at least for the time being, because my tax bite is so horrendous this year that I have to become more cautious financially than has been my habit.

Again, congratulations on your fine review of Legend and thanks also for your illuminating preliminary notes on the book.

As ever,

