XXXXXXXXXXXX
WA6-2034

30734

8/2/66

Dear Sylvia,

To all save Crehan, of whom until your letter of the 30th I hadn't heard, I'll be sending or have sent indexes.

I've hard from O'Connell, Fields, Lifton, Marcus, Castellano and Verb.

With regard to Popkin, I have neither the time nor disposition to go into it at length. If it is necessary to point out to you the dishonesty, then in this you are alone, for even Curtis Crawford, entirely without prior discussion or prompting, went out of his way to point it out.

I did write the New York Review, and I responded to their prompty but evasive response. But in my first letter I specified it was a private letter, hence I think I should not be making copies. Because I never intended it for public use - I have made my position clear on the folly of internecine warfare, although it would seem that to date I am its only victim -I do not think it proper to send a copy. In my first letter I said the prof hadn't done his homework and had used a pony. He also misrepresented the publication date, and in the light of what he did, this can hardly be regarded as accidental. So now the world knows he's a great guy, and all these things he pretends he alone dug out of the 26 volumes from which we all got our data are personally credited to him, despite the fact that to his knowledge but not to his acknowledgement this is not the case. There just is neither time nor point to going into the whole thing now.

May I correct you on the "first mention" of the FBI Report that you attribute to Vince? Not so. First direct and unleaked direct quotation. There are a dozen references to the FBI report in WHITEWASH.

One last comment on Popkin: There is no major incident in his story that did not appear to his knowledge a year earlier in WHITEWASH and he acknowledged none of it. Nor in the entire lengthy review is there the slightest description of the book or the contents of the book he pretended to review or, for that matter, its history. Now this is not a question of all of us finding the same thing, not in any sense. His article is presented as a review, at least in part. But this would be true whatever its clothes.

And need I tell you the cumulative effect of such things, whether or not ill intended, such as what Vince and Armoni did? Can you think of a single liberal or liberal-pretending publication that has reviewed WHITEWASH, or one that didn't get a copy? Or even mentioned it? I know of only the National Guardian, and they did not do that in response to the review copy I sent them, but much later, after people started asking them questions.

Hastily,

30 July 1966

Dear Harold,

Thanks for your letters of the 28th and the 29th and particularly for the index to Whitewash, which is a valuable addition to the book and which I am glad to have. I assume that you have retained records of mail orders for your book and would be able to send copies of the index to Maggie (Mrs. Joseph A.) Field in Beverly Hills; Lillian Castellano in Hollywood, Calif; David Lifton in Los Angeles; William Crehan at 7 West 96 Street, NYC; those are the friends and colleagues who come to my mind as having indicated that they had ordered or received your book and I am sure they will appreciate having the index no less than I do.

When you send the index to William Crehan, who incidentally is one of those who was most enthusiastic about your Alan Burke appearance, you might ask Bill about tapes of that and of the Long John. If anyone has them, I believe Bill is the person. It will be simpler for all concerned not to rely on me as middleman, since I have been too busy always to give prompt attention to such requests.

I am glad that things are going well for you and that you have sold serialization rights. I believe that Bantam is doing Ed's book in paperback 125,000 printing--I may be mistaken because I was half-asleep when he called one night and mentioned that. Which of my California friends did you hear from? I have about six contacts there, all splendid human beings so far as my contacts with them revexal.

My opinion of the Goodwin review is that it was cautious and calculated; the NY Times story was more exciting because it expanded his views on the basis of personal interview. I too have known about the Goodwin review for some months. As for the Popkin piece, I am amazed at the suggestion that any plagiarism was involved. What do you refer to? I am very careful always to take into consideration parallel discovery and reasoning, which is widespread among critics of the WR and almost inevitable. If you recall, I felt impelled the very moment I looked at your ms (on loan from Oscar---his second name was Collier, I believe) to send you a copy of my long chapter on the Odio affair, so that you would have no grounds ever to suspect that I had taken advantage of the opportunity to read your work. Those items in your manuscript which were new to me--the wet-tape dispenser, etc.--I wrote you indicating that they were new; and in my own ms, I incorporated the wet-tape dispenser, with specific credit to you. I am not saying this

in order to boast of how ethical I am; rather, I take it for granted, unless and until there is proof to the contrary, that every critic operates on that same basis. Of course, when I get a brochure from Holt Rinehart etc. in which Mark Lane has the unblushing gall to claim first publication of the 12/9/63 FBI Summary Report--which was first mentioned as you well know by Salandria in TMO--I consider that "proof to the contrary." Otherwise, I would hesitate to charge or to believe plagiarism. Popkin seems to have made an intensive study of the 26 volumes. For example, he is the first one to publish a reference to the alleged encounter of Tippit and LHO at Dobbs House restaurant---an incident on which I have done a chapter in my ms long, long ago---I know he didn't lift it from me because he did not see my ms; I don't believe that you have mentioned thatx incident in your book; so I assume that he found the document by himself and is an honest student of the H & E.

I should mention that I have heard rumors, and I am sure that they are inaccurate rumors, about a letter of complaint you sent to the NY Review of Books. Should you feel able to do so, I suggest that you send me a copy or a summary of your letter to them, so that I am in a position to refute any unfounded remarks about what you did or did not write. But that is up to you; just forget it, if you feel unable to circulate your letter to the NY R of B.

I hope I have covered all the points raised in your two letters. This is the first opportunity I've had in weeks to type a letter--a real luxury.

Best, as ever.

Sylvia