

7/29/66

Dear Sylvia,

Because of the opinions you have already expressed you would not welcome my opinion of the Goodwin review. There is, for example, from my point of view, an obvious defect you have not commented on. The same is true of both the daily and Sunday Times reviews, or had that not occurred to you? I have knowy of the Goodwin review since the end of ~~Jan~~ May.

I haven't had time to read the Times story you refer to. A copy was given me. It took me more than a week to finish the NYReview piece, about which even Curtis Crawford, without inspiration or hint, on the air, politely suggested plagiarism.

Here is a copy of the index, done in great haste, and the four pages of additional exhibits it made possible. I'd appreciate it if you said nothing about its existence until the stores have a chance to clear the first printing. Meanwhile, if you have any friends for whom you would like copies, please let me know the number and I'll either put them aside or mail them to you for future distribution.

Sincerely,

7/25/66

Dear Harold —

over

So glad to hear your comments on  
Voice. Spent most of Saturday and  
Sunday with the Solandrias and  
heard about that crushing bore and  
moral coward Curtis Crawford's  
performance. You are doing fine  
as I wrote you already earlier  
today, keep up the splendid  
presentation of the defects in the  
so-called evidence. No, I have no  
hope of the Lang Tola — If I ever  
get one will keep in mind  
copy for you. Congratulations on your  
second printing. All the best, Harold,  
and I wish I had more time to write  
properly and more fully. Sylvia

P.D. What do you think  
about the R. Goodwin  
piece? The NY Times  
story yesterday was  
far more positive than the  
review itself.