

More Hiss Controversy

I AM WRITING in regard to the review by Mr. Merle Miller of *Perjury* by Allen Weinstein . . .

I find it a disturbing review on several levels. First of all, Mr. Miller spends very little time in his long article discussing the book—rather he repeats gossipy anecdotes and hearsay information to corroborate his own strong belief, since 1950, of Mr. Hiss's guilt. He says nothing of the sources of information upon which Mr. Weinstein's book is based, nor that many equally informed scholars have come to a completely opposite point of view as a result of their research.

In the April 8 issue of *The Nation*, Mr. Victor Navasky has written an article, "The Case Not Proved Against Alger Hiss," in which he points out a sufficient number of distortions, inaccuracies, misrepresentations of interviews and the use of questionable sources, to disturb anyone seeking an objective analysis of the Hiss-Chambers case, via Mr. Weinstein's book.

Certainly, Mr. Miller is entitled to write his review. However, in the interest of presenting the entire situation as accurately as possible, *The Washington Post* has a responsibility to its readers to present other points of view by other writers on the issue; i.e. Mr. Victor Navasky, Mr. Fred Cook, Mr. John Lowenthal, Mr. William Reuben, etc., etc.

This case and the political ramifications involved, is sufficiently important to make space in your paper for rebuttals from other writer-reviewers concerned with the issues involved.

Mrs. Pearl Volkov
College Park, Md.

Merle Miller Replies

WHEN I WROTE my review of *Perjury*, I had not read my friend Victor Navasky's piece in *The Nation*. He has since sent it to me, and I have read it, as I do all his work, with respect. It does not in any way change my opinion about Alger's guilt or about the soundness of Weinstein's book, though again, as always, I admire Victor's diligence in questioning Weinstein's diligence.

Since the appearance of his piece Vic has surely relearned (a journalist and editor as brilliant as he knew it all along) that people seeing what they said in print are likely to deny that they said it.

As for the other writers that Mrs. Volkov mentions, I have read them all, except for William Reuben, whose book on the Hiss matter has for two decades or more been largely unwritten and unpublished, and I suspect that it will remain that way. The works of "etc., etc." are also, I believe, unfinished. I look forward to them.