

6/2/92

I've enough time before lunch that thank you for your 5/30 and its enclosures. I'll look at them twixt and tween because I'm into too much and can't keep up with it. I can't in fact finish anything before something else of importance surfaces. Most recently the JAMAhorie. Incredible that the AMA would intrude and ever more incredible that it was done so dishonestly and unprofessionally, except for the propagandists. I'm particularly interested in this now.

I read Livingstone's book when it first came out, have no clear recollection of Ch. 26 and do not want to take time to read it again. It is even more of a mishmash in which he often disagrees with himself and has those he quotes doing the same thing plus also with others. If he had not concentrated it developing his own angle and had just kept the medical people he interviewed talking that could have been of value. Hearing those who have any credibility has not convinced me he developed any hankypanky with the films.

Does the Realist have any credibility? Can you tell when he reports and when he speaks?

Good that you were on cable. When you have an audience that disagrees go back to where I began with Stone: he announced that he would record their history for the people and would tell them who killed their President, why and how. Non-fiction, and he produced many and unproven theories. And told those lies to more people than anything since the WR.

If he had not steadfastly insisted that he was presenting facts, history, he would, it could well be argued, have a right to say anything he wanted to say.

Nothing really new here. I've written a lengthy beginning to a rebuttal of what The American Historical Review published, pro-Stone, and I'll add specifics to it after I finish what I've started on AMA.

If I haven't told you, it is almost certain that Wrenshaw got no such call. I hear he is now complaining that his two coauthors exaggerated and made changes after he read what they'd written. Or, he wants no responsibility. Only the money and fame.

In September there will be a book by a former FBI agent saying that Oswald was innocent. I introduced him and it to the publisher, sight unseen on both. The copublisher says it is a good job.

Meagher's book has been reprinted. I've not seen it or any promotions or ads. Lane's RTO also reprinted.

None of the records of the Dallas Police of which I know is really exciting or important. But I've not gotten any copies for a while.

We are about as we were. Hope your medical problem has been wiped out,

Thanks and best,

PO Box 421815  
S.F., Ca. 94142-1815

May 30, 1992

Harold Weisberg  
7627 Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, Md. 21702

Dear Hal:

There is little in the way of news about the JFK case for the past few weeks but I've gathered together what items & articles I have and enclosing them with this letter.

I wasn't sure if you had read Livingstone's "High Treason 2" so I zeroxed chapter 26 with the accompanying footnote references. Your name is mentioned in other parts of the book but this chapter is the one where you are most frequently featured. I'd appreciate your reaction to it.

Also enclosed is a copy of the most recent stuff on Bush's alleged JFK "involvement" which appeared in the latest Realist. It would appear that a good part of it came from Kangas (the Austin account).

The talk I gave back in February before the Socialist Action group is on Cable TV today at 5pm and I intend to watch it to see how well I presented my case and learn from any mistakes I make (here I'm talking about delivery and not content). There will also be a second tv showing which will be the second half of my talk in exactly two weeks from today. If you will recall I mentioned to you that I really gave Stone a highly critical analysis and deplored his role in using film to make "history". I was, however, quite surprised at the audience reaction in supporting his film. Their claim was that he had every right to use "literary license" and even very close friends of mine would not agree with me. But I stayed my course and realized that they weren't in the position of knowing the facts behind the evolution of the film and your role and criticism of it.

This letter is shorter than most because I wanted to make sure you receive this as soon as possible. I do hope everything else is ok with you and your wife. Let me know what's happening in your area and if I can be of any help.

Best,

*Hal Varb*  
Hal Varb