

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

WA6-2034

20734

9/8/66

Dear Mr. Lewis,

Yours, like so many other wonderful letters like it, make me feel very good. I interrupt work that I'm rushing on WHITEWASH II, almost completed, subtitle WHO DID IT, to answer in haste. I made no mention of ^{the} Wash's article because I restricted myself to the record. I had my book written before I saw it. I could have added it and didn't, feeling it was unnecessary, and weakened. The Prime car was a Chevy, according to the FBI, not a Rambler.

You'll be surprised when you see what relates to the false Oswald in WHITEWASH II. No staff of investigators was at all necessary, I think you'll agree. I'd prefer no publicity on this book until it is all set. The govt knew the whole story, had pictures, etc.

I left the Craig bit out because 110,000 words already exceeded the contract under which I originally wrote the book. It is less important, as I saw and see it, than what I used. There is also other indication Ruby was there, none of it solid. I'll use Craig in another way in II. That part is done, as is almost all the book.

You are correct in presuming most Americans believe a book not commercially acceptable has something wrong with it. However, WHITEWASH opened the subject against all the handicaps and is selling at a record-breaking pace for a private printing and for the time it has been on sale. We will get back our cash costs, anyway, but even with a stroke of greater good fortune can get no cash reward for the unending 20-hour days. We have sold 10,000 copies. It is not in most stores in most parts of the country. We have paid back the down payment we borrowed for the printer, have paid him for the entire first printing, have made a small payment on the second printing, and he has gone ahead with the third printing (each of 5,000 copies) knowing we'll be able to pay him eventually. Some of the money is slow coming in. Until about three weeks ago we borrowed even the money for postage. Now we are taking that cost alone from the money as it comes in. To further answer how it is selling, we have sold serializations to a German magazine and a Spanish paper. It is attracting attention in Europe, where the English papers at least parrot those in the U.S. and where the publishers have the same reluctance. They are now looking to the Popkins and the Johns to make the subject acceptable. I am convinced we will make a breakthrough on this subject.

After my appearance on the Alan Burkeshow in NY, there was a tremendous reaction. I was unexpectedly confronted by four or five lawyers, one of whom I understand has a relationship with a competitor "publisher". It grew into a sensational 2-hour special that in turn has led to another soon to be aired. Following that I received offers of help from a lawyer, who is researching some of the legal points. One thing I'd like soon is outside the field of math: the minimum legal requirements of an autopsy, if not in Texas, Maryland or under Federal regulations, as prescribed in standard texts, and especially the orientation of wounds in violent deaths. Excuse the haste, many, many, thanks. I'm finishing up one of the last chapters, one I know will interest you especially from your letter. Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

September 4, 1966

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

I finished your book "Whitewash". It is first-rate. The question now is: How can one check up on Mr Seymour and his friends, to determine, for instance, whether or not they were in Dallas on November 22, 1963. If the theory of the False Oswald is sound, one would expect that the US govt, ~~wh~~having put it's whole prestige and authority behind the Warren Report, could not afford to have the real killers on the loose. Thus the persons in question are most likely unavailable for comment. However if one could rigorously document their disappearance, this would be an achievement in itself. For such an investigation one would need trained investigators, a whole staff. How is it that no one has formed an independent commission to investigate the Dallas murders? Incidentally, why didn't you mention the testimony (eg of officer Craig) to the effect that a man resembling Oswald was seen leaving the depository about ten minutes after the shooting? Also, there was an article in the New Leader by two researchers from Columbia University which turned up two witnesses to the Tippitt slaying who were never called by the Commission, and whose version was incompatible with the official theory. How is your book selling? Most Americans ~~xxxxxx~~ would figure that if the book were any good at all a major publisher would have grabbed it. ~~ifxxxxxx~~ I've told some of my friends about it, and will send some free copies to appropriate lawyers of my acquaintance. Please rush me five copies. I am a math instructor at Berkeley, and teach during the week, but have weekends free. If there^e is any research or information I could get for you (I take it for granted you are still working on the case), let me know. I'd be delighted. However I can't do interviewing because I ~~lack tact~~ lack tact. Good luck.

Yours truly, Gene Lewis

P.S. Officer Craig said the "Oswald" he saw got into a blue Rambler station wagon, with a luggage rack. He mentioned that the Paine's also had a station wagon with a luggage rack. Mrs Paine [vol II p 506] said hers was a green 1955 Chevrolet. Such a car couldn't be confused with a Rambler, could it? [a check is enclosed]