

Dear Miss Mitchell,

Your letter about FRAME-UP has just reached me. Many other things have occupied my mind since I wrote the book, but I'd be quite surprised if I handled the justifiable criticism of Ramsey Clark other than I handled the equally-justified criticism of those I call the Mitchellists. If you were familiar with my earlier work, you'd be without doubt that party political considerations do not figure in it. I doubt, for example, that there has been a more reasoned yet forceful criticism of LBJ than is in the forward of PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITTEWASH, written in the late Spring of 1967, and at that relatively early date dealing with Vietnam. Or of those made famous by and close to JFK than is in the Epilogue to WHITTEWASH II, dating to the fall of 1966.

On the other side, what can be taken as a defense of the Birchers, with whom I have no political sympathies, in the Introduction to WHITTEWASH.

In each case I deal with a specific issue. I believe the record leaves no doubt that the Commission abused the Birchers, for example.

I think it is good that readers examine serious works with a critical mind. But I'd like you to consider that the last part to which you object deals with a deliberate violation of law by the federal government, an incident unparalleled in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, and deliberate lying by the man now Attorney General (by the way, affirmed as falsehood in another suit and by his own assistant United States Attorney, in a suit I now have before the federal court of appeals in Washington). The case is unique. Analysis of it therefore is also different.

I have spot-checked the index. There are 29 page references to Clark. I did not ignore him. I doubt one page contains praise. There are but 16 pages referring to Kleindienst, and he was the adversary in that unique suit. There are 18 pages mentioning Mitchell.

Mr. Clark does regard me as an enemy.

I agree with your comment on our abuse of the Japanese-Americans, but I disagree with the evaluations. For example, it can't compare in bestiality, in my view, with what the Nixon administration is now doing in Southeast Asia, where the kindest treatment accorded innocent civilians is confining them in concentration camps that make ours of World War II like heaven.

You have no way of knowing of my private correspondence with newspapers each time they print spurious "analyses" by publicity-seeking psychiatrists that, in effect, solicit some nut to come forward and attempt another assassination. Bremer finally did it. However, the record is overwhelmingly the other way, particularly if one considers relatively minor figures. I have personal familiarity ^{with} assassinations of labor leaders going back to before the 1930s, when I was part of an investigation of them. There are the more recent ones, uncountable, really, of black and other minority militants. And you could have added Rockwell to Wallace. The law of averages required that ultimately there would have to be an exception, but as of today, no major leader of the right has been assassinated.

Thanks for taking the time. I enclose a list of the other books in case you would like to get them. One is out of print, and others I'd then expected to be able to bring out I have not. This is unrewarding work and my debt is at its upper limit.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

1 Sidney Place
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201
July 25, 1972

Mr. Harold Weisberg

Dear Sir:

I have read your book "Frame-up" and I think it is an excellent work. You have obviously done much research and worked extremely hard to get all the material necessary. I am so impressed with the book that I shall try to obtain your earlier work, "Whitewash." Let me say that I agree with most of your conclusions that the whole James Earl Ray case was a mockery of justice and indeed a frame-up.

However, I have one criticism to make, and I hope this will not turn you against my letter, and that you will continue to read it to its end. Remember, I do admire your book on the whole, very much.

First, let me say that we all have prejudices, even those of us who pride ourselves on being liberal and fair. In the last part of your book, you also have shown your bias. You hate Nixon-Agnew-Mitchell, and that is your right. But Martin Luther King was murdered in 1968 and this team was not in office then. Ramsey Clark was the Attorney General, and since he had access to all the files at all times, he certainly could have drawn the same conclusions you did, the conclusions that it was indeed a conspiracy, a frame-up, etc. The fact that Clark gave out false statements to the news media proves that he was a part of the hoax from the start. In spite of his liberal posture, in spite of his statements that he was against bugging King, if he wasn't part of the conspiracy, he protected those who were.

Mr. Weisberg, a few weeks ago I happened to be watching the Today Show, and Ramsey Clark's father was a guest. He defended the Supreme Court's decision to put all Japanese Americans into concentration camps during W.W.2 This action stripped over 100,000 people of their civil rights and their property was confiscated. They were aliens and non-alien. And what is anon-alien? it is an American Citizen! This Mr. Clark, senior said, was a decision required by the times and he defended it as right and proper. He did admit, however, that no Japanese was ever tried or convicted of any crime against the U.S.

Now all this happened during the Roosevelt administration, and history has it that this administration was liberal, fair and just. Roosevelt postured as a great humanitarian. Not that he ever did anything for civil rights, the poor or anyone else. He kept the depression going until 1939. In his 12 years in office he did nothing but get us into war.

2,

Surely the Nixon-Agnew-Mitchell team never did anything as monstrous as arresting over 100,000 blameless people!

Well, I don't want to stray from my subject, which is Ramsey Clark. If senior Clark can so glibly write off 100,000 innocent people, why can't junior Clark do the same with James Earl Ray, but one man and a petty criminal at that. Of course I don't approve any more than you do Mr. Weisberg. I think there is some secret behind all this that the public will never know, as each administration covers up for the previous ones. Mitchell doubtless had some agreement with the out-going Clark.

I know how frustrating it was for you to be refused access to the copies and papers you required, but had Clark still been in charge, you would never have gotten them at all.

Another point I wish to discuss is this: You lumped together these four names, John Kennedy, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy. You said all four were murdered because they stood for peace. I never heard that Malcolm X was for peace, and Robert Kennedy was definitely shot by a fanatic Arab because Robert Kennedy was sympathetic to Israel and for no other reason. If he was for peace, his slayer was not interested in that. So this conclusion of yours is wrong.

You further state that people like Goldwater, Nixon and Wallace do not get shot. As we know now, Wallace was shot. I hope you weren't implying this is what you wanted to happen. I'm not for Wallace but I'm not for having him or anyone else shot. As for Goldwater, I always felt that he is very honest. During his presidential campaign he admitted we were at war, and he told us of his plans to fight it and end it. It was Johnson who lied. Never once did he mention the war. It only existed in war-monger Goldwater's mind. Not one American Boy would be sent to Asia, peace-loving Johnson told us. I may not be a very smart person but I do have a good memory.

In closing, let me again praise your book. It was outstanding in every way except at the very end. Instead of being factual and unbiased it was factual but slightly biased.

Most sincerely yours,

Mary Mitchell

MISS
M
I
T
T
H
-
Miss Mary Mitchell
One Sidney Place
Brooklyn, New York 11201

8/4/72
Received open in lot Z
envelope postmarked
8/2/72