

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

WA6-2034

20734

1/13/66

Dear Sol.

Comparatively, things look better, by which I mean a) nothing is worse; b) nothing has happened; ~~c- nothing has worsened.~~ Thank you for your solicitude about my health. Insofar as I know, there is nothing serious. Abdominal X-ray examinations two weeks ago I presume were negative, having heard nothing further from them, but the difficulties continue, so I presume they are, as originally diagnosed, a by-product of our way of life with a little assist from an inflamed prostate, which was found and had been treated. The major development of the series of examinations was microscopic blood in the feces. That has now disappeared, but apparently it is symptomatic of some things that can be serious and cannot be ignored.

In response to a straightforward letter I had written Williams, we had a meeting with him yesterday, to be followed by another with him and the steffer handling the case upon the letter's return from west-coast litigation, and some thinking by us. He was disturbed by my letter, as he said, and has offered us the selection of several acceptable choices. The point of which I have yet to be satisfied is that they will pursue the case with diligence because of the heavy burden of work in the office and the load they place on the fine young man working on it. Thanks for the recommendation, and someday, in another context, I must make the acquaintance of your present Washington staff. There is also the possibility I may in small ways be able to help them. Paul Richman, my very good friend, was the last one I knew well, and I did do things for you through him. In this connection, I have referred our liberal Republican Congressman to you or Arnold Forster. It was to him I gave the book. He may want some help vs the Birchers. I told him I didn't know policies but did know the people, their competence and superb knowledge. The politicians have plans for this man, and he is worthy of one the public-relations firm told me several years ago, candidate for Governor. He is a very sincere and hard-working fellow of whom (and his family and especially his wife) we are quite fond.

Each and every one of the publishers who now has a copy of the book has expressed affirmative interest, in varying degrees, ranging from initial editorial approval by the largest to a flattering telephone call last night from the President of one of the smallest, in which he told me he found it interesting and exciting. It has had preliminary approval on a higher level at three places, two of which are small and one medium size. This is why I haven't been to New York. Saturday I got a letter from the senior editor of one of the major houses which had overridden his desire to publish it saying he had written their British subsidiary about it, which I think is very nice. Most of the editors have gone out of their way, a number in writing, to praise the book and disassociate themselves from their publishers' decisions. I am satisfied about the worth of the book, not only on content, but by normal editorial standards, which, as you point out, may not be the prevalent legal ones. But it is consistently made clear to me that the question of the book is a matter of imposed fear. But, after this strange history, I now face the possibility of multiple offers, which may be an embarrassment. Incidentally, I have had a note from Bob since seeing you in which he said what I did is "important" and "historic". He is instead printing a cheap lampoon of Marguerite Oswald by A.J. Liebling's widow.

NEW YORK

809
MILWAUKEE EXTENSION

YERVAH

I have no concern about the statute of limitations, but I do about the corporate continuance. Lil has been counting up. I spent over \$900.00 on tolls and gas alone during the trips to New York required of me by his violation of his agreement. I have also kept a record of the time I was gone, and can estimate the other time wasted and possibly there are ways of evaluating that, such as by Guild standards, etc. I have completed an animal book in between times, a beautiful story on which it did not do well and which will have to be extensively revised when I can put my mind to it (and there may be other and more serious problems with it, for I am not blessed with a light, deft touch and have, unlike the first book, never done that kind of writing before). I am deep in another serious book which the U.S. correspondent of Le Monde said would make me famous if the first, which he read and approved and praised, did not do so first. Like the first, it will ~~xxx~~ take and has taken much time. I believe it is important (and Tom Wicker shares this belief). These things are just between us, Sol. I tell you this so that you will know I am working on things that may be significant, hence ~~and~~ not frittering my time away, and should, with any kind of luck, give us some income. And I keep working on the evidence or rebuttal evidence of the suit, in the context of a book I have been working on for some time, "No Peace", in which I hope to do with noises what Rachel Carson did with chemicals. I just finished a chapter (really intended for the lawyers, so it is only a rough of a chapter, which will have to be revised for popular consumption). Despite this major limitation, I sent it to one of the editors of the Saturday Evening Post who, while saying he didn't know if they would be interested, other major magazines should be when it was revised, added a handwritten note asking me to let him see it first. Encouraging. Really, aside from the problems of the nature of our lives, my biggest trouble is that too much is cooking simultaneously on my single mental burner, and I cannot easily shift from one pot to the other. I wish I were five guys for one year.

To finish bringing you up to date, our property is in the hands of a large real-estate firm which has shown it to several prospects. There will be no trouble selling it, but he counsels we hold out for what he considers the right price and we, despite our anxiety to make a change, are following his advice.

Just so you will know, I haven't heard another word, directly or indirectly, from Ivan or any one connected with the firm, about the money due me, the return of my manuscript, or anything. While you would have presumed this, I thought I'd make it specific.

I'll come to New York now when there seems to be need, and only hope that will be soon. Hope we can get a chance to talk then. You may be interested in some of the things I have developed in my researches. Recently, I have been going and coming on the same long day, which, while tiring, has other advantages.

Delighted with the one report that had hitherto been lacking about your little jewel, that young men see in her what loving adults do and more, the more young men and not old ones should see. Wonderful! Remember us to everyone and thanks.

Sincerely,

SOL RABKIN

315 LEXINGTON AVENUE • SUITE 900

NEW YORK, N. Y. 10016

MURRAY HILL 9-7400

January 13, 1966

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Hyattstown,
Maryland 20734

Dear Harold:

This is in reponse to your letter of January 3.

Thanks for the information about your friends and relatives in Philadelphia. We spoke with Nancy last night. She tells us that she is very busy and will probably have practically no time to look up your friends and relatives.

She is teaching remedial arithmetic in a Philadelphia public school on a five-day-a-week basis. In addition, she's attending rehearsals of the U of P chorus and madrigal group in preparation for a series of concerts in some of which she will have solo roles. In addition, she is planning to register for at least one education course on methods of teaching remedial arithmetic. Finally, she hopes within the next couple of weeks to find a good voice teacher in New York City so that she can come in weekends and take one lesson a week. Finally, she is working on applications for fellowships and grants in connection with her plans to start taking a Masters next September, either at the University of Chicago or at Columbia University, or possibly even at Harvard University. This should keep her very busy. In addition, there are several boys who like her, who are taking her out frequently for dinner.

I do hope that your pending medical examinations result in a finding that whatever is wrong with you is something very trivial. Please let us know quickly what the news is.

I'm sorry to hear about the troubles you are having with your lawyer, John Bennett Williams. I do hope that you can work out the difficulties and really get them moving again. If you can't, then call David A. Brody, who is now director of our Washington office. His office is at the B'nai B'rith Building in Washington, D.C. It is my information that he does a considerable amount of

private law practice on the side. He's a very stubborn guy, a hard worker, and a bright guy. If you get him interested in your problem and willing to take the case, you can be sure that he'll push at it hard and consistently. Tell him that you asked me to recommend a lawyer and that I recommended him. But first make sure that your taking the case away from Williams and giving it to someone else is done on the basis of an understanding and agreement with Williams.

On the matter of Obolansky, all I can say is that before we have any basis for proving damages in a suit, we must have some evidence that the book is publishable. For that purpose, all the turn-downs you've been getting are of no help. Rather, and I hope this happens soon, the acceptance of the book for publication will be the proof. As I indicated to you, the statute of limitations is six years so we don't have to worry about the case disappearing simply because of passage of time. If there are any assets available to be levied against when we bring suit, then we'll bring suit. It may well be that there will be such assets since the publishing firm's income from books already published continues for a substantial period after the original publication of the book.

Sincerely,



SR:hy