

Legend

4/30/76

Dear George,

While I do not know if you, Kaiser and the Post have a continuing interest in Epstein and his Legend I enclose a review by Prof. David Wrone of the Univ. Wisc., Stevens Point Branch. Wrone is the outstanding bibliographer in the field, a responsible man whose documented criticism of Lane at the Southern Historical Association convention caused Lane to chicken out and not appear to speak.

Of course the fact that he is more commonly in error does not mean that Epstein's work is always inaccurate. However, I believe that the growing number of reviews and articles showing very clearly that in the field of his expertise (supposed) he is usually in error does raise some question about anything Epstein says.

To put it another way, I would not assume he is right about anything without independent confirmation of it or substantial reason to believe him.

Like Angleton was a source. I believe that. And that Epstein understated Angleton's role in Epstein's work.

Epstein raises questions about himself with some of his lies. Like why did he write in Psychology Today that it was in 1976 that Readers Digest approached him? It appears to have been in 1975, what I'd thought to ~~begin with~~ begin with. The current Book of the Month Club News also says 1975. (And that Epstein's bachelor apartment in New York is decorated with Angleton's orchids.)

Why was the pub date delayed so much, past the profitable Xmas market, and the price of the book reduced in a time of increasing prices?

I am inclined ~~to~~ to think these indicate a major change in the book.

More and more it appears that he is part of the battle of the moles, the real moles inside the spookeries, those of the Angletonian view of the world.

As of yesterday's mail no date had been set for any status call in the transcripts suit. The Government filed a one-page Opposition to our motion for a "new" trial.

In this connection, if it is not secret, I'd like to know the source of the Nosenko photo the Post used. We put the entire article in the record in support of the Motion. I think you can see the relevance of a newspaper having a photo of Nosenko if you recall the language of the second Briggs affidavit.

While much depends on the judge's attitude, I think whatever form the proceeding takes it will be interesting. It is possible that Robinson will take the appeals Order as a putdown. On the other hand, it is also possible that Robinson was bucking the issues to the appeals court based on my record and in the expectation that what it would do would force him to hold a real hearing.

If we prevail we will have strengthened FOIA very much. This is not apparent to anyone not familiar with the case. Robinson held that he had to accept an affidavit - any old affidavit, regardless of its obviously dubious nature. If he does not foreclose us the affidavit and his position on having to accept any affidavit will be at issue. You may not be aware of it but false affidavits are not uncommon in political and sensitive FOIA cases. (So are false representations by government counsel.) Establishing a precedent about such affidavit will make the great effort and its costs worthwhile.

Sincerely,