

Hal Verb  
P.O. Box 421815  
San Francisco, CA 94141-1815

3/20/93

Dear Hal,

I look forward to read <sup>the</sup> enclosures with your letter of 3/16 because they are always interesting (thanks for them) but because I am so bogged down with work on the book and <sup>other</sup> ~~their~~ things I do not know how soon that will be. So before returning to work today I'll answer so of what I can off the top of the head.

Thompson was partly in error about the speed of the Zapruder camera. My mistake was not of my creation, as so many of his are. That was stated in the FBI's report and if Thompson intended honest criticism he would have said this because I reproduced the pertinent parts of that FBI report at that part of Whitewash II. Before going ~~farther~~ with this, if you anticipate and kind of disagreement or ~~debate~~ debate with him, I suggest you check the notes in his Six Seconds. My recollection is that he drew on WWII heavily and disguised it. His disguise was the note more or less like this: "According to a document recently disclose by <sup>or at</sup> the National Archives...." This is how he hid his cribbing ~~that~~ he was not honest enough to cite,

On the camera itself, and remember this was mid-1966, I could not locate one anywhere. Finally my camera shop got me one, several years later. The slow motion is ~~at~~ he says, 48 fps. The control is one that slips up and down. While I not and for years have had no interest in proving it, it would have been simple for <sup>his</sup> ~~his~~ finger to slip from excitement. Moreover, as I think my third book makes clear, it was not the Thompson who took a ~~hit~~ slight slap at the mythology and then coasted who forced the Zapruder camera into the Archives- I did that.

What <sup>a</sup> ~~Shneyfelt~~ testified to is how fast ~~the~~ unloaded camera ran at normal setting. He did not testify to checking any part of the film to see if the speed of exposure had changed at any point. I cannot say that it did, but it was possible.

I find it interesting that one who is himself a literary thief has to devote time to criticizing the victim of his thievery. I am confident that if you check the notes I refer to you will find that they all come from what I had published before his book was out.

His saying that there is no evidence of any hit before Z210 is like his saying in his SatEvePost article on his book what the book does not say, that there were three simultaneous <sup>independent</sup> conspiracies in Dealey Plaza ~~simultaneously~~. But because he was familiar with WWII, if I recall correctly, familiar enough to steal from it, he should have known one of the ~~many~~ <sup>or</sup> proofs, other than MSCA's, that the first shot was before Z202. He should have been able to perceive that ~~who~~ <sup>as</sup> I did, in the reprinting of the slides. I then confirmed it with the projected slides at the Archives. <sup>after taking my not picture</sup> ~~Williams~~ can be seen taking the camera down from his eye and walking into the street at Z202 <sup>10</sup> but in the unprojected film between the sprocket holes only. This should prepare you if he brings any of this up, as you suspect.



Hal Verb  
PO Box 421815  
SF, Ca 94142-1815

3/16/93

Dear Hal:

I'm enclosing a number of items which I've collected in the past few weeks and passing them on. There are a few that I'll comment on and then I have a few questions of my own.

The articles on "Little Hitlers" and Jessica Mitford I know you'll find of interest. The articles on J. Edgar Hoover should also be of interest. You'll note that the "Globe" article shows a photo of a woman with Tolson and the woman's face resembles Hoover. To me it looks like a paste-up job. Incidentally, the background appears to be the boardwalk of Atlantic City. If so, Tolson could have been there attending some convention. Note the pin he's wearing (Tolson, that is). The photo to the right of it purports to be that of Tolson & Hoover "holding hands" but it is obviously by Sherman Billingsley, the owner of the Stork Club, and not Tolson. And they aren't even "holding hands" as the caption states. Another plus for photo journalism for the "Globe"! Is it any wonder that they would publish photos that Groden would supply them of the autopsy proving whatever new claim Groden makes?

You'll note the enclosed copies of the Chicago Conference April 1 to April 4 and the speakers list. As you can see I'm scheduled to give a talk on the photo evidence and I'll be referring to your work in "Photographic Whitewash". I won't spend any time (perhaps none at all) on the Zapruder film but there is one question I'd like to ask you since it may come up at the Conference. I'll be targeting Josiah Thompson's claim in his book, "Six Seconds" that there was ~~no~~ no evidence of a hit on JFK before Z-210 and also Thompson's assertion that Willis #5 was taken between Z-210 and Z-225. These I can show are invalid but there is another claim by Thompson in his book on page 16 that might come up. There Thompson claims that you were in error when you stated that Zapruder's camera was set (or could be set) to 24 frames per second. Thompson lists a number of objections but the main argument he gives is that a Bell & Howell p.r. man said that Zapruder's camera had four settings: (1) "Single Frame", (2) "Stop", (3) "Run" - set at the factory at 18 frames per second- ~~and~~ and (4) "Slow Motion" - 48 frames per second. Thompson then adds that this p.r. man "checked" the speed of the camera and found it ran "within .1 second of the FBI-determined 18.3 frames per second." Thompson then asks the reader to look at *WARREN COMMISSION* volume 5 page 160 where Shaneyfelt testified how the speed of the Zapruder camera was clocked at 18.3 frames per second.

Is there anything to what Thompson claims? The reason I ask is that Thompson will be one of the speakers at the Chicago Conference and he might bring ~~it~~ this up.

You'll note the enclosed "Back Channels" articles and, in particular, an article by a former FBI agent Walter Brown writing on Dallas policeman McDonald's arrest of Oswald. Brown may be the FBI agent ~~you~~ you mentioned to me in a letter you wrote me last year (you didn't give his name) and you said he was writing a book on the Oswald case. His book, of course, is out - I don't have it but I glanced through it last year when I was in Dallas. You might also be interested in knowing that Brown is ~~also~~ scheduled to speak in Chicago.

Speaking of former FBI agents I thought you'd be interested in something my brother, Roy, recently wrote in a letter to me. I'll quote from it: "You might be interested in the fact that Joan has a girl ~~friend~~ friend whose parents were friends ~~with~~ with an ex-FBI agent who worked in Dallas at the time of the assassination. His name is Joe Sullivan and he lives somewhere in New York City. I ~~don't~~ don't know if in your research you came across ~~his~~ his name but this friend says she has inquired about the Warren ~~Report~~ Report on the assassination and told me that he is sworn to secrecy and is silent on the whole subject. I'm sure he is being well compensated to keep quiet and probably wants to keep his pension. You know the ways of Uncle Sam - you keep quiet or you're swept out of existence..."

I have no record of a Joe Sullivan in my files. Have you ever heard of him or know what he was doing when he was in Dallas?

Please note the enclosed critique of the NAS Ramsey panel on acoustics. It is by W. Anthony Marsh who I've been in touch with and I think he has raised some very serious questions that can't be easily dismissed. I ~~think~~ think you'll find his analysis very useful.


One last request: I'd like to send you money in ~~advance~~ advance for your book on the JAMA affair. I'd like to get two copies. Any idea when it will be out? I'm really looking forward to it.

Lundberg will be at the Chicago event. Lifton and others will be challenging him and his associates. I'll tell you all about it when I write you next.

Incidentally, Chicago turned down Tom Wilson as a speaker when he wouldn't submit reports documenting his research. And ~~this~~ this after having listed him as a speaker in their early brochures!! (I thought to myself how many other speakers could have been turned down if they had ~~any~~ offered documentation for their theories).

Well, must close now to get this in the mail.

Best,



Hal Verb