George Lardner, newsroom The Washington Post 1150 15 St., NW Washington, DC 20071

Dear George,

When we drove into town to pick up a microcassette franscriber I'd ordered, as usual, we went to Hana's for lunch. In talking briefly about my work Idl asked me if I'd heard from you. I told her I would not until next week, that you have the month of August off. She then said I'd misunderstood you, that you'd said you would return this past Monday. I'd thought you had to have your review in by then. All the way home I debated writing you again, believing that you misunderstood, resented my writing you or prehaps fear I will use that, this, too, against you of the Post. So, be assured that I will not. If I should later address the reaction to Posner's book, and if I do it would not be limited to the Post, I will make no reference to our conversation or these letters.

I am now about a little more than halfway through the book. My annotations of it, awkward when I have to hold the book in one hand and write with the other (and how awful my handwriting is,) are extensive and close to illegible. It is because my li mitations make the use of the standard dictating machine awkward and impossible or close to it some places I sit that I got this gadget and have started using a handwheldmicrocassette tape record I was given and never used. Because A friend will do the transcribing I started dictating and this is why I got the transcriber we went into town for.

Please believe me, what I wrote you is enormously understated. I won't go into any particulars save one so you will not think I'm trying to tell you what to write if you have not yet turned your review in. I've done my checking on the part that interested you and you discussed with me. I think you should compare what you told me with that girl's Commission testimony, and when yo'do, do not be a partisan. Be a critic. And you will not find it under the name Posner uses, Marilyn. She is Linda Kay's mother and it is Linda Kay's testimony your should pay close attraction to. Links he does not me.

With all the foolish media rhapsodies about this book, beginning with US News's and then with all the TV (which I did not stay up for but would appreciate transcripts if you got them), another media jackassery is of no real consequence to me. Except that it forwards the thrust of my work, which is that the media is one of the failing institutions. In this sense I am acting against interest in trying to be a friend to you and to the Post.

If it is too late, I'm sorry. As I fear in time you will be.

I'm sorry for Wise and Wicker, too, Wise in particular because of his excellent earlier writing. Any explanation will have to wait. If your review has been delayed, I am NOT trying to influence what you say. I've been trying to be that a friend should be, no more.

When I went to check the index for you, recalling you said the review copy has none, the Rosemary Willis entries (607) are 320, 321. Even that is wrong. Nothing on 329, 341. It is 321-2. His footnotes are 17,18, and 19. These are on page 553.

## He does not cite her Commission testimony!

With all the cracks he aims at others throughout the book for use of recollections of hears later, and these, if they are her recollections, are second-hand, he does not even tell the reader that she as a Commission witness and knowing she was, he does not use it and instead bases want he says on these sources the character of which I do not describe of 1979.

Wekl, I think I should tell you that Lui is a , or was then, a kidd a teenager.

I never heard of Marcia Smith-Durk. He does not say where, if anywhere, that interview appeared.

If you want to check Linda's testimony, so you won't have to search for it, it is in VII, almost all on page 498.

17/is Jim Moore, book Conspiracy of One. When he was in high school he wrote me that he intended skipping his senior year to be able to get out of college in an election year so he could run for President that year. More on request.