XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
WA6-2034

20754

6/6/66

Dear Mr. Cook,

You haven't had time to read my book, or you'd know that on page 133, which I have cause to remember, I say what you said. On that basis, at least, there is no disagreement between us.

My note of May 9 to Carey McWilliams was answered by a non-responsive card dated May 12 in which he said of WHITEWASH,"...it goes without saying is of special interest to us." Not special enough to elicit a reply, even after the lapse of a week after page 1 treatment in the Wash. Post, eight columns accross the top with a jump to page three, a total use of almost 8 full columns of typeon the Epstein book and mine. What might I have expected had he had a special interest, had the NYTimes not devoted a full column to the subject of the books to follow and mine, had I not been getting a big radio play in Washington, and two pages in BOOKS?

He and the Nation have their own and well-deserved reputations. We can forgive him for wearing special glasses that see only in black and white, but before long, when he realizes that others, such as I, also have a great respect for Earl Warren, and that if we cannot protect him from his own error, we might try and keep him from bearing the additional responsibilities of others. It is the graveyard at midnight routine to pretend, as he and others apparently do, that Earl Warren hasn't erred. Even were the Report right he has. The have-and are abdicating both a responsibility and an opportunity. There is nothing further I will try and do with them, for there isn't enough time for the constructive things. They may have gotted you, but you still have blood left, so there is that much good.

I sent Ramparts a copy marked for review only. Lifkin ordered a personal copy. Today there was a check for two to be airmailed from the assistant to the editor, and Lifkin phoned while I was in DC. I'm expecting his call tonight. I can only wonder why, but the coincidence between two copies and two sides to a page is remarkable.

Welcome to the eye of the storm. I've been building a windtunnel you'll soon, I hope, know about. By the time the five interviews on prime new time on the MD's best and largest station I taped today have been aired, there may be some additional reaction, for they'll be used beginning tomorrow through next Monday, at least once a day. I have also developed new material, almost as shocking as the most terrible this far, in between other things. I've been at the Amer. Bookseller's Assn convention since Sat, have several distributors, a selling organization, 2145 copies in distribution (which may mean nothing), with editors and bookstores speaking to distributors. I expect two more tomorrow. My unorthodox books seems to be as well-known as anything there. I made a tape to be offered 500 stations today, and I expect more. Good luck with the Nation and your books, and I'm getting on the other letters so I will not get behind in that department, anyway. I do have NY and Boston distribution now. The books left by truck today. And thaks for the good wishes.

Sincerely,

722 Fernmere Avenue
Interlaken,N.J., 07712
June 3, 1966

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Wyattstown, Md.

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

This comes a little late, but I've been in a whirl trying to promote a new book that is out and trying to finish writing another. Anyway, thanks very much for sending me the brochure from Ramparts. It will be interesting to see what happens.

Especially so since I've solved my problem. After the collapse of the Ramparts business, I went back to The Nation and showed Carey McWilliams the finished script. There has been long delay and much arguing back and forth, but the upshot is that The Nation is going to run the article in two parts. The first appears in the coming week's issue.

The editing has removed all of my biting adjectives, and the piece is accompanied by a precede that re-expresses The Nation's abiding faith in the Warren Commission, but still the guts of the piece is all there and will see the light of day, which is a considerable satisfaction.

You and I will disagree, I think, or at least disagree seriously, on only one major point, the involvement of Oswald. I cannot myself believe that he was innocent, but am quite convinced on the contrary that he was in the thing, though I suspect in the role of a dupe or, as he said to Seth Kantor, "the patsy." I'm sure he didn't fire the first shot that wounded the President, and I'm not at all sure he fired the second and lethal shot.

Anyway, though we'll disagree on some points, I think and hope you'll find I've rather effectively dynamited the Warren Commission's rationalization of one gunman-three shots-three wounds, case closed. Now I'll wait with you in the eye of the storm and see what happens.

Thanks again for taking the trouble to send me the Ramparts brochure.

Yours truly,

Fred J. Cook