

October 8, 1966

Mr. Richard Roberts, Sr. Editor
Dell Publishing Corp., Inc.
750 Third Ave.
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Roberts,

On my return I learned that Herkle Press had phoned to report it had been impossible to collect and mail out the requested negatives of WHITEWASH. I will be there first thing Monday morning and see to it that they leave them. With these negatives I presume you will not want the books and pages cut from the books of evidence that I gave Mr. Tobey. If this is true, I'd appreciate their immediate return, insured, for I need them daily for continuing work. With their markings, they are irreplaceable.

Here are the clippings you seemed to want most urgently. Those that are duplicates are so marked. Of some I have no copies, like the London Times story used in the flyer of which two extra copies are also enclosed. I shall also check through the files and locate additional things I think you can use, but because we have only a single outgoing mail a day may not be able to include it herewith.

As you said, I'd like the return of those not marked as duplicates. Enclosed are:

London Sunday Telegraph, 9/25/66

Frederick Post 5/23/66

Wall St. Journal, 8/30/66

Baltimore Sun, 9/1/66

New York Times Magazine, 9/11/66

New Zealand Monthly Review, 9/66

New York Times Book Review, 7/3/66

Wash. Daily News 6/1/66

London Observer 7/17/66

Wilmington (Del.) Morning News 5/20/66

Books, 6/66; August 66 ("Chalkie", I understand, means "action". The ad is a gift from the editor who heard me say this. Next to the last paragraph requires re-punctuation) I do not need the return of these.

Washington Post, 5/29/66 (This is how I inadvertently launched INQUEST 32 days ahead of schedule. I'll tell you the story if you are interested, but it is nonetheless a rare display of a book, greater than that of Schelsinger's or Lorenson's.

National Guardian, 7/2/66 (Paralleling this on the right is a story in the current and first issue of Triumph which I do not have. That magazine is edited by Bill Buckley's brother-in-law Brent Bozell. It says WHITEWASH is the best of the books.

Montgomery County Sentinel 6/9/66 (This is Maryland's largest weekly) This serves to remind me that none of the competitive books have any detail on either the number of shots or the doctors and the autopsy.

Writer's Digest, 9/66, had a favorable mention in its "New York Markey Letter", by Hayes B. Jacobs. I do not have it.

Washington Star, 8/21/66. They printed a challenge in reply, if you'd like it.

Baltimore Sun, 8/14/66

New York Review 7/28/66

Draw Pearson's Merry-Go-Round column, 9/17/66. The New York Times and other papers carried follow-up stories I do not have. The interesting thing here is that Jim Bishop has no intention of doing his book for another two years. This "leak" follows a night and a morning, 8 p.m. to 4 a.m., during which he sat next to me while we taped the coming Metromedia three-hour special and, I am confident, especially with what I learned from Mel Bailey yesterday, ~~that~~ I shook Jim's faith in the official account.

Private letter by Stephen Barber, Washington correspondent of The Daily Telegraph, dated April 19, 1966. Because this is private, and because of the connections of the addressee (something in British Intelligence), possibly Barber's advance permission should be requested. He has been very decent and will be helpful. I include it because of his repeated description of the book as "remarkable" and his opinion that it "reads like a detective story."

Permission would also be required, ^{by} I have correspondence from Leslie Frewin, the British publisher who declined the book only because of faulty intelligence about the publication date of the Lane book, in which he reports the opinions of his university dons that WHITEWASH is the infinitely superior work.

I have no decent pictures of myself, when that question arises. NET undoubtedly can supply some, for they have had me on camera for something over ten hours.

This should be confidential. I have been sort of working with Tom Wicker and more recently Harrison Salisbury. Salisbury, who is anxious for access to WHITEWASH II, told me August 29 that he and Wicker are working on the Times' reassessment of their position. Fred Graham, the Times' Supreme Court Reporter, has an attitude other than reflected in his reviews. We, too, have been in contact. I have reason to believe that at some time in the foreseeable future this attitude will be favorable to me. Wicker has been sort of a consultant to me. He read WHITEWASH and was considerably impressed by it more than a year ago, as did Salisbury. Fremont-Smith's position is that a private editor does not exist. This is also the Newsweek position. The Times editorial of several weeks ago, which I do not have, misquoted and I have so written them.

If I cannot get the index, both our working copy, which you can compare with your page proofs and the carbon, with this, it will go as soon as possible. There were a few minor changes in the carbon copy to make it fit the available space, to eliminate a "widow" at the top of an otherwise blank page.

I also have an incredible file of unsolicited letters. I'd say they number more than 500. If half the blessings bestowed upon me stick, I can face the hereafter with equanimity and assured of a royal reception. Should you want to examine these, you are welcome to do so.

If there is anything else you desire, please let me know.