

5/30/68

Dear Sylvia,

The mountain of the Washington Post has labored and brought forth a mouse. A very long mouse, and a very retty one. Perhaps its size and fact will make up for some of its character. Right now, although I hope it turns out I change my mind, I regret all the time, effort and cost I put into it. It is not at all what I was lead to expect.

I have prepared a lengthy and detailed refutation, from the evidence only, of the misstatements of fact from the record that I presume originate with someone once with the Commission. In tracing FBI agents O'Neill and Sibert I used the index on Kellerman. Are the first two listings wrong or did I use the index wrong?

Dan Kurzman was to have done the story. He was impres ed and fascinated by my bo k, but he was also sent to the Dominican Republic, for he is the Post's Latin American expert and has written a book on the Dominican situation. As it happened, he had a minature of my experience with that book, which made him understand the situation. I know nothing about Harwood.

I have no way of knowing how well he reflects Epstein's book, but he gives no indication of mine, not really a single word about it.

This story is perhaps unique in that wherever it gets to "fact" from the Commission's apologists it invariably is wrong. I presume the answers come from the apologists, not Harwood. I do not even remember seeing a story so completely wrong.

Tomorrow, when I am in Washington, I shall deliver the latter ( which takes the form of the documentation of the abuse of the reporter's trust by those he trusted) to the chief of the national desk. I have also drafted a letter which I shall not mail until after tomorrow asking that since so much space was devoted to a book that was neither described nor in any way represented, possibly the paper might see fit to print an account of it.

Perhaps there are some who have read my book who will write the paper saying how unusual it is to have about a full page available without in any way giving its readers even the most rudimentary concept of the book it was discussing. A few might help, especially if they are printed. This does provide a way for keepin the question alive and calling it to the attention of the Washington press corps, Members of Congress, etc. And to say how equally unusual it is to go to such length for the single purpose of biased and inaccurate refutation, without even saying what is refuted.

But there is some interesting FBI stuff in it, just the same.

Sincerely,