

1972  
15  
1  
11B  
17 FEB 72  
RENTNES

Some time ago I started a plagiarism file, initially with the intent to do something about it. I found that while it was real and profitable to Epstein (hardback to paper, first print jumped from 65,000 to over 200,000 by it) whose addition of my material to the appendix of the Bantam version was innocent on his part (his only innocence, probably), with Lane it was deliberate, and he also stole from Epstein. I had thought for a while that I'd be able to do something with Flammonde, for Meredith also used an entire chapter of II without authority and to defame me and never paid for the contracted excerpt they did use of another chapter. Meredith agreed to do something, but my lawyer never did anything about it. Then I decide trying is in itself a futility, but that I have the obligation to keep a file for history. Thus my Six Second On Dallas is so marked. Every single ref in it to "according to a doc. recently discovered in the Arch." is to WWII. Now there is the Esquire thing t ree different people have told me they've sent. One reporter says the theft is clear, but the law is not as he may think. I do not have plans for doing anything about it unless, in the Hughes context, there is a dead giveaway. These happen. An authentic scholar once cribbed a typo in one of my footnotes! So, I'd like to keep a file on what is coming out in the Hughes flap. Thus I am sending the two stories from today's Post, both AP, to see if the wire carried more than the Post used. Pls return them and, if you have it, anything else, now or later... Some years ago I caught the House UnAmericans in the worst of which I know. They stole an entire

official Congressional report, not only word for word and comma for comma, but factual and typographical errors too, from an obscure west-coast newsletter I had by accident. As you know, they can and did survive anything, even though it was read, word for words, etc., on the floor of the House by a friend on mine. Today stealing is accepted scholarship. Phelan has acceptability and a market, not real talent as an investigative reporter. He never did ask Russo the direct question to which he testified. I have a friend who was then his photog and was there. More, he missed the really big one that with his suspicions he never should have: when did you first meet Moo Sciambra? It turns out Moo knew him before Baton Rouge! Just learned it on last trip to N.O., not from Moo but from Sal Panzeca, who was a gentleman and didn't use it in the trial. Would have ruined Moo beyond repair, even in N.O. Makes one wonder, doesn't it? HW Ted Kupferman, from whom I heard recently: once at lunch he told me his filed of law had been publishing before he went to Congress.