

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

WA6-204

20734

6/28/66

Dear Jerry,

Although the Times seems not to have mentioned it, today's Washington Post reports the Knebel piece under a three-column head on page 2, "Assassination Report Critic Accused of Dangerously Deceptive Writing". The headline is not unfair but its effects are, especially as they relate to others than Epstein. The last paragraph begins with Epstein's general admission of error:

"Epstein, now studying for a doctorate at Harvard, said yesterday Knebel had made some valid criticisms..." There is all the excuse LOOK needs to decline my ~~xxx~~ challenge, although, of course, they needed no excuse. The rest of the apology is: "...but the book ~~xxx~~ never was intended as a complete account of the assassination itself. He said Knebel and other reporters were in a better position than he to get fuller statements from the FBI and other sources."

Obviously, this in no way answers Knebel's criticism, even if it is not the most direct part of whatever answer Epstein may have given. Perhaps you see now why I suggested Friday it may not be too wise to try and protect this young man from himself. I heeded your advice Saturday morning to the extent of ignoring him, followed it a little further in the letter to LOOK, and have now reached the point where I will have nothing to do with the book. I'll stand on the issue of free press, I'll not retreat from calling it important, for it has importance in two areas, but that is all. The young man is a coward, hence dangerous. He has also refused a chance for four hours on the major station in Philadelphia. I accepted and picked the first open night, July 20. In return for promising WCAU that I'd make no earlier radio or TV appearance in Philadelphia, they promised to speak to their TV station to see if an arrangement can be made for my appearance on it the next day. And, as I was on Long John, I'm happy Epstein will not be there. I do not look forward with any feeling of comfort or assurance to his Today appearance Friday.

I hope the letter met your requirements. I had to do it fast and I made a special trip to town to mail it, hoping it would reach you in time. I was kind of pooped, for it had been a long day, night and day. Please send me a copy of anything you use as fast as you may have it. The Times, by the way, has a regular service of providing advance copies of their book review section. It was in a DC bookstore before they opened Monday a.m., and I suspect it reached there not later than Saturday.

I'm staying home tomorrow to try and get some more research and writing done and to save the cost of the trip to town and the parking. Ditto Friday. But the past two days have yielded more good material, all consistent with what I already had. Also, other indications of favorable attention. No word from NAL, from whom by this time I'd expect a negative letter. Any reaction to the Long John show that you've heard? As of now there are indications that when I get around to asking the right people the right questions, there may be a movie camera and a reporter with me. Good, if it happens, huh? The Phila show is McKinney's, 10 p.m. to 2 a.m., and I've told them I can handle the entire four hours without help, and that the format doesn't concern me. They use both interrogators and phone-ins. I didn't get through to Fay Henley or the McCanns when I was in NY, nor to ABC, but everything else you suggested I did. In about a week, I'll be up to another such offer, if available. Sincerely,