

25 May 1966

Dear Harold,

Although I find myself still hard-pressed for time, I do want to reply, even if briefly, to your letter of the 21st, which arrived this morning.

(1) I haven't found any technical errors other than those I sent you about a week or ten days ago. As you know, I was glad to scan your manuscript in February, and now your book, and to be helpful—if I could be—in insuring maximum accuracy in any published criticism of the WR. I am doing the same scanning of other material, for the same reason, since as a group we are particularly vulnerable to attack, whether for factual error or any other shortcomings.

(2) Thank you for arranging for Mr. Agel to send me a copy of Mark Lane's brochure. I am curious to see it. You are quite correct in inferring that Holt's advertising (and Lane's self-advertising) reflect panic about Epstein's book. Lane is trying to pirate and preempt what he believes to be the major evidence in Epstein's book. He is quite mistaken. Moreover, his strategy is quite transparent to those in the publishing world and the only effect which his desperation is having is to heighten interest in the book he wants to undercut. I am always amazed that the practitioners of the "fast one" and the "smart deal" fail to understand that their unethical tactics are invariably self-defeating—if not sooner, then, later.

(3) Arnoni is a friend of mine, and a person for whom I have profound respect. My acquaintance with him is recent and came about indirectly through Vincent Salandria, an old and close friend of Arnoni's and, as you know, a very treasured friend of mine. I am glad that you did not send me copies of your correspondence with Arnoni—I should not wish to be drawn into a controversy between any mutual friends. However, I suspect that one reason which may contribute to his reaction to your book lies in the "Post Script," which quotes the passage from the FBI Summary Report without acknowledgment that it was discovered by Vincent Salandria and published in the April 1966 issue of The Minority of One (which has always given a forum to criticism of the WR when other periodicals did not). Harold, I must be frank to say that I too regret that your epilogue does not credit Salandria with uncovering the document and may even give the impression that it was your own find.

I am troubled by a growing tendency within the small group of critics (we are perhaps only 25 or 30 in the whole country) to engage in attempts to beat-to-the-draw and to dispute credit for discoveries. If we achieve our objective, there will be more than enough credit to go around. But we may never achieve that objective if as a group we cannot summon up unity and cooperation, now that things are beginning to move. Personally, I intend to cooperate in the work, regardless of my distaste for Lane or Ramparts or anyone else. With apologies for the "sermon," and best wishes,

Sincerely,

Syavia Meagher