

11/13/66

Dear Sylvie,

When you have read it, please return the copy of my letter to UPI.

The effect of the WNEW show in the quiet of the home is that of an entirely different show than we saw in the preview. It is much better than I had thought. My specific criticisms still obtain. It was loaded for Lane, as was the taping. When it took a few pieces out of him, that is edited out. Much of what I did to Cohen remains, enough so that all but one of the six who have thus far phoned commented on what I did to him (none know the subject- just ordinary people). Part of what was edited out is much better than some of what remains.

There was not enough of Penn and ~~Sam~~ Sauvage but that is largely their own fault for not participating more. With Penn is it not fault. I think, unselfish soul that he is, he relinquished that time to Lane and me thinking we could do more with it (we must do more to get his book out. I've tried to interest him in having my ~~agent~~ agent place it in England and Italy. In Italy there were two unsuccessful bidders for my book, so I think the chances are good there. Penn has not responded, I suppose because he is busy and away).

A letter from Hal Verb reports good work he and Paul Hoch have done on radio there, getting Liebler, Ball and that pushover Jenner recorder with acknowledgement of Commission error.

Each day adds more to the too much I have to do. Excuse the haste.

9 November 1966

Dear Harold,

Your letter to Murphy at UCLA constitutes a clear and irrefutable case against university support of the Liebeler "investigation." I do hope that the university takes account of the very cogent points you have made.

I have re-read my letter to the Saturday Review, as you suggested; but I remain completely mystified by your reproach. I don't even know whether I have committed a sin of omission or commission. Whatever it is that provoked you to feel that I have in some way done you an injustice, please believe me when I say that if I did, it was absolutely unintentional and unpremeditated. Is it perhaps my phrase near the bottom of page 1 --"a fact not mentioned in any of the books reviewed by Judge Fein"—? I know that you rightly criticize the "painful and expensive reconstructions" (page 185 of your book) but I don't find a specific reference to photo no. 3 in the Bantam edition of the WR. If it is mentioned in your book, then of course I apologize very sincerely for my carelessness, but, I repeat, it was inadvertent, believe me.

Your comments on the Metromedia show are disappointing; Sauvage, too, regards it in a very negative light, although not for the same reasons you mentioned.

As ever,

