4/27/69 I have not kept you closely posted on my correspndence with Sylvia over PM III, based on which she wanted to do a magazine piece.
I suggested instead that she do a piece making such references to it as would not jeopardize its chances and cite it as an example of theproblems of publication ~~xxx~~ in the field, intending the New York Review as a market. Her response, in effect, is that there are and have been no such problems.
Her letter to the Times is an excellent one. It is my opinion that in referring to those things she had to know she did not learn of from Wecht's testimony , she was not intending help for me. They are not essential to the point she effectively made.
I do not believe this is proof for your point. I do believe it can be so interpreted. Therefore, I let you know about it.
My opinion remains unchanged.
It is only technically true that her ms was not completed until July 1966, for I know she had what she regarded as a completed book long before then. I suspect that she was adding things she learned, as from reading mine, which she did (not) in limited edition.
I have a letter from her, one of the first if not the very first, in which she praised it so she said if there was a choice between publication of it and hers, she much prefered publicatio of WHITEWASH.
In writing the Times as she has, she is making a public record she has to know is false, giving Wecht credit for discovering this vital information she knows everyone, including herself, failed to She is, I think, subconsciously trying to dent me. Wecht has used this same knowledge in public appearances, as in New York, without ever indicating it was not his own diligent investigation by which he obtained this knowledge. This, alas, is but one of the prices we pay, and we have to get used to it, This is the way people are made.

H