ML

12/24/66

Dear Mr. Doores,

Your letter arrived as I was preparing to leave for a trip that included California. Hope you caught some of my radio and TV appearances;

I must be brief for I've no time and too much work.

The Ramparts thing was a spoof. I am Le Boeuf, as Keating admitted on the public platform in San Fransisco 12/16. It is a very clever spoof, but in remarkably poor taste. It is also the Ramparts way, when with their facilities and long effort they could add nothing material to what was already public knowledge, of pretending to their readers (who cannot get anything but the return of their letters by writing Levittown instead of Hyattstown) that they alone did the real work, they alone have h the knowledge, etc.

Enclosed are some of our new order blanks, including the announcement of the third book and its description, should any of your classmates be interested.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Weisberg

Box 7689
Stanford University
Stanford, California
Nov. 28, 1966

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Hyattstown, Maryland 20734

Dear Mr. Weisberg;

As you must have noticed, LIFE has come out this week with a frame by frame account of the assassination. I was very glad to see it since an article in LIFE will soon be followed by many more on the same subject. I also noted a very crucial mistake that you made in your book. You stated that the oak tree had to be in the way at the time of the first shot. From the film that was shown in LIFE one can easily see that Kennedy's reaction (described by Zapruder) came after the road sign and thus after frame 210! I do not think that this detracts much from the excellent argument that you have put together. I have written Time two letters about the Warren Report in the last three weeks. One was a list of about ten things that Whitewash pointed out, and a recomendation. The other which I have just sent is a reply to TIME's assertion that there is no valid reason for a new investigation.

I was interested in some of the comments made in the LIFE article. They mention, unfortunately only in passing, the discrepancies in the autopsy reports. I find your explanation very plausible. LIFE's criticism of Whitewash is also interesting. It would have been more accurate had the said many nuggets of criticism rather than "a few". Their point about irrelevancies is well taken, but I wouldn't count that as a serious problem at all. (In fact, I enjoyed most of the "irrelevancies" that I am sure LIFE is refering to.)

I was glad to hear from you in a very nice letter after my last letter. I am looking forward eagerly to your next book on the subject. Whitewash activated my curiosity. Have you heard any solid facts concerning the plane ride back to Washington? I have heard many disturbing rumors which I would tend to ignore. Do you give any weight to the "mysterious" deaths that surround the assassination?? I have gotten everybody on my floor (I'm in a dorm) excited about the Warren Report. My copy of LIFE has been read until it's falling apart. I recommend Whitewash to everybody. Most of the upper-classmen here base alot of their complaint on the articles in Ramparts. There is an amazing review of a book called Time of Assassins in the November issue. Do you give much weight to the far reaching arguments presented (or so the Ramparts review says) in that book??? After the organized crime program on NBC last year I could almost believe it, I really wonder if his conclusions are backed by the facts. Do you think they are? I wish you every success

with your new book, and I hope you have better luck with publishers this time.

Sincerely yours,

Larry Doores

Box 7689

Stanford University

Stanford, California

October 15, 1966

Mr. Harold Weisberg

Hyattstown, MD. 20734

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Due to the popular and critical success that Mark Lane's book, Rush to Judgment has received I felt it necessary to write immediately to you about your tremendous book on the same subject. I assume that one of the publishers you failed with was Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Since this same company has now published Lane's book, I cannot help but think that you broke the ice. If your book had accomplished nothing more than this by its private publication, I think it would still have been worth the price.

As I have already indicated, however, I think your book was tremendous. I have not read Mr. Lane's book, and I don't plan to. Whitewash presented the case so logically, and explicitly that I cannot envisage any book that could present the case more convincingly. By their own evidence alone you have torn apart the flimsy fabric of the commissions illogical conclusions. I could not agree with you more when on page 7 you state: " Never in history have such crimes been 'solved' by such a consistent disregard for truth, honesty and credibility, . . . " Aside from the obvious fact that the commissions own results were analized and their conclusions found to be false; I can think of no fact which would support your statements more than the fact that you have not been charged with slander. Surely, if what you said was false; the members of the commission would have levied this charge.

Having read this great work, I can but conclude that you were being extremely charitable when you conceeded that the commission might have found the right man. There are certain facts which by laws of nature make it physically impossible for the assassination to have occured in the way the commission said. You have pointed these out: 1) It is impossible to even see the president's car from the sixth floor at the time of the first shot! 2) Governor Connally heard the president get hit with the first shot and had turned to look before he was hit. How could the same bullet have hit him unless his reactions are super-humanly fast?

3) Oswald was and could not have been a marksman of the caliber needed to fire the three shots! (Not to mention the fact that the empty shells found often do not jive with the gun) 4) Oswald could not get to Tippit in time to kill him. These facts alone should be enough to disprove the theory. Yet these extremely important facts do not make up half of your tremendous argument.

I don't know haw many people there are like myself in the United States, but every person who buys your book cannot help but be impressed. We know who should really get the credit for the criticism of the Warren Commission that is bound to come with Lane's book! It is not Mark Lane!! I think you have done a great service for your country by the publication of this book. I am literally shocked that men of the caliber on the commission could allow such a fiasco to be issued in their names.

Sincerely yours,

Larry Doores

Larry Doores

10/ 18/66

Dear Mr. Doores,

Please excuse the haste, lessthan your thoughtful and encouraging letter of 10/15 deserves. I hope you will understand that as an unintended publisher who wants to and does continue his writing, I have little time. Were I to be fair, I could not, from my own experience, say a nice thing about Holt other than that they can see a chance to make a buck and are more than competent to do it, regardless of what is required. Yet I must honestly tell you they are not one of those who rejected WHITEWASH. The advice I got was that they would be among the last to consider the subject. I did try and make an approach through a former member of JFK's cabinet, who would have nothing to do with it.

You did not correctly understand me. I did not say the Commission might have found the right man, although, because of the rather eliptical approach I used and because I restricted myself to the official evidence, with all the limitations and handicaps that imposed, your conclusion is understandable. Please look at the top of p. 138. What I say and believe is that the Commission's best evidence is that he killed no one, that the Report failed in its case against him, but that he was in some way involved. I am unable to say this was knowingly or unknowingly.

When I have completed the sequel, tentatively entitled "HITEWASH II: WHO DID IT? you may better understand how "men of the caliber of the Commission could allow such a fiasco to be issued in their names". This book will tell how the whitewashing was accomplished and who did it. It will name names, give dates, etc.

It does mean much to me, still, to get such letters as yours. Many wonderful people have taken the time to encourage me, and it is helpful, for we are not yet out of the red, even though WHITEWASH has been a unique success. We have sold more than 15,000 copies and with the books now in the bindery or in commercial channels the "in print" figure is 22,500 copies.

I think is is kind and probably fair to say as you do that WHITEWASH and possibly some of my public appearances did lay the foundation of credibility for some of the books that followed. It is my perhaps immodest belief, as you state, that I told the entire story, insofar as it has been told, and that the later books add nothing material. But I think they serve a purpose, even though I violently disagree with their doctrine, which I regard as both backward-looking and hazardous. The importance of the Epstein books is that a commercial publisher did it. The importance of the Lane book, despite those many things about him and his book with which I cannot agree, is that his publisher is both willing and able to do and spend what is necessary to make it the success it has been, for that attracts considerable attention to the subject. In the last analysis, it is, or at least should be, on the basis of knowledge that our society functions. Lane's book and the expert flackery accompanying it do take the knowledge that the Report is false to more people than I can now reach. I am still plagued by the curse that is on a private printing.

My real thanks for your letter.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg