

12/20/71

Dear Ed,

Thanks for your attractive Xmas card, the "truth" letter, the Salandria piece (he's hopelessly paranoid), both of which I'll read in between other things, and the Lane clipping and the page from the Navasky book, which I'm particularly glad to have. I go into that in much this way in PM, one of the seed's of Ned's discontent. N. has details I didn't, but I have other things I feel more significant, as you'll eventually see. I'll probably use this as a note. I plan some for the end, as in F-U.

Until I've read Salandria's view first-hand, I'm prejudiced by Garrison's representation, that the CIA is now the good guys. I can't but it.

Salandria will work with nobody. He has, as a matter of fact, done incredible things that have been hurtful, but there is no point in going into them now. He was the major obstacle in the Halleck hearing, an incredible story. And, as I put that article aside, beside my comfortable chair, to read in free moment, a few phrases caught my eye and I read enough to know that he is quite wrong when he says no critics have given thought to why the President was killed. He is a latercomer to that and he also knows better. Believe me, he really is sick.

I fear your estimate about publishability is accurate. I've made no serious effort to do anything with PM for I believe the least likely is the only possible way to success with it, do as I did with WW, and that is beyond my financial capacity now.

That he took and/or won the airman's case does not influence my opinion of Lane's character. He is a late-comer to the peace movement, joining it, as he has others, when the ice had been broken. As he failed to mention the Guardian in R to J, he also failed to join the first Writers and Editors Protest against the war (I'm the only "critic" signatory). It is perhaps fortunate the air police made a wrong identification. I'd like to be able to feel otherwise about Mark, but I've had too much experience with him not to have a jaundiced view. He is amoral, not just in some areas without them.

When I finish PM and the heavy legal obligations I now have, I hope to evolve a book that can be commercially acceptable in AGENT OSWALD, which I've started.

Best,

11/14/71

Dear Howard,

Gratified to hear that your trip was productive.

The New York Book Week of the Newspaper Magazine albeit this enclosure does clarify the F.B.I./R.F.K. relationship in regard to the Warren Commission.

Sadly, at the commercial level, I can see no publisher interest in an assassination book, per se, and Howard's only chance would be his age! Such is the market for truth.

Tiger does have market potential but it's a matter of your priorities.

Salamalikia's view of the Pentagon Papers is one I share. I respect his honesty and determination. Perhaps,

you two causal works
together.

I hope that Justice
in whose cause you're
long received smiles on
you in the coming year.

Best Wishes,
E

P.S.

What do your "Younger
Critics" know of Reality
as divorced from Abstract
mouthing!