

Hal Verb
PO Box 421015
San Francisco, CA 94142-1015

9/29/93

Dear Hal, and by a copy Paul,

Thanks to you both for what was in today's mail. And so I won't forget, I ask you both not to say anything about the books or the interests they reflect. The main reason is that I want no calls or letters about them because I do not want to waste time with such things now. On NEVER AGAIN! I do not know the pub date and have not asked for it. Last I heard it was in the hands of the copy editor. No proofs to read yet, for example. I believe that because it was too late to be catalogued they are not rushing it. From what I know of the book business I would not expect it before April. I also have another one, on Posner and his book, HOAX, that is being rushed for April. I have not finished the rough draft but I hope to soon. It has tired me quite a bit, more because I'm feeble, and we both have medical problems. As I was putting the paper in the machine we learned that I'll has gallstones and diverticulitis. We see the doctor on that next week.

Learning from you that Failure Associates also did not respond to you I wrote the letter I enclose. I'll appreciate all the clippings you can send me, please and as soon as you can. With luck I can have the draft finished in less than two weeks. It needs editing but it is powerful, I think unprecedented, which is what Wrono says. By clippings, mostly of the ABA's Trial of LHO and anything about the FA stuff in it and the jury decision. What I did not tell McCarthy because it could be misconstrued as a threat it means I'll have to take their case apart and that will necessitate my saying that it is based on ignorance of the available basic fact. It is. Or it misrepresents. And neither is likely to get them clients and not encourage questioning them when they are in court.

I've just skimmed Bowles' version of the Douglas Jackson. At the key part I think it is different. I'll enclose a copy of the copy I have. I should explain that but please keep my source secret. He did not ask for this but I also do not want him getting letters to answer. When I learned that the FBI had refused to accept Jackson's memoir I asked Henry Wade to ask him to lend it to me. Henry got it and had his secretary retype it, making no changes or corrections. If you find any differences please let me know pronto because Bowles was a source for Posner, who praises him and his impartiality.

On Posner's appearance there, if there is anything interesting I'd like to know that as soon as you put it down in the event I find something to use. He's gotten a little flak by now and how he reacts could be interesting.

Seth Kantor did die, I heard.

Your next week's meeting sounds interesting! Hope it goes well!

I do not recall ever hearing from Trask.

I erred in my letter to Paul. I should have said the proposed letter to the USSR. Those questions were drafted by the CIA and worried over by State. Not urgent but I'd

to include that given Posner's lovefest with the CIA.

I can fill you in on the "finding" of the Bronson film. I got those astounding pages in CA 78-0522, for the Dallas FBI files. As soon as I saw that I sent a copy to Dallas. I do not ~~now~~ recall but in order of likelihood to Golz, Mack or Ferrell. I was surprised not to hear anything and forgot about it. Then Ranftel found it in the FBI reading room.

Posner in fact described an entirely different book to me. Would ~~have~~ have made no difference, he'd still ~~have~~ have had full access. I'll have to reread what he said about you. After rereading it I can only wonder what pitfalls you helped him around! When they were here they were nice and we got to like them. Small things, he ~~was~~ promised an early copy of the book and promotional materials, etc. Not a page yet and I expect none. They've been sending the rather expensive house organ around, but not to me. I asked him the sources of some of his ^{inspired} snide ~~stuff~~ stuff. No response, no sources in much about me in book, and it ranges from deliberate nastiness to lies.

I like that Callahan line and would like to quote it if you have it in something I can cite.

Lil came in and I read the Jackson original to her and aside for slight changes, to make it grammatical and not to refer to Mrs. JBS as "him," that part is identical. No copy ^{is} this enclosed.

I've not read the enclosures but will now. Wanted to get this written before I poop out and go to bed. Many thanks to both,

Herb

1525 Acton St.
Berkeley, CA 94702
(510) 525-1980
September 26, 1993

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Harold,

Or should that be Dr. Weisberg? Thanks for sending me the material on your honorary degree, and Lil's. It's nice to see both of you getting some of the recognition you deserve.

One reason I feel bad about being so far behind in my correspondence, both with the old guard and with the newer buffs, is that I remember how helpful you were to me and others way back in the mid sixties. I would like to play that kind of role with some of the people who are just getting into the case and appreciate help from us old-timers. (I can say that now, I suppose, since I've been around almost as long as you've been married).

Here are copies of CIA ???-76 and 265-??? (or ???-265; I forget how the numbers on these early releases correspond to the later scheme.)

As I mentioned in my letter of December 10, the reference to Golitsin on p. 2 of CIA ???-76 suggests to me that he was not the source. My notes suggested that the source was indeed Peter Deriabin, who on November 26 made vaguely similar comments to the FBI. (CD 49, pp. 41-43)

WSSR
Your letter of August 28 also asked for "the CIA's proposed questions to be asked of the CIA." If you meant "KGB," I couldn't find anything. If you meant "State," I couldn't find any State Department response.

My files are not very well set up for finding things like this. I hear that the Archives now has some sort of computerized document register which can be accessed on a terminal there, and that Jim and the others at AARC are trying to arrange for broader access.

As requested in your letter of March 17, here's the memorial brochure on Robert Ranftel which I put together. (No charge to you, of course.)

I had forgotten the details of the discovery of the Bronson film, and your role in it. Robert was always amused to be thought of as the discoverer of that film, since he never saw anything of value in it.

You are right about the dangers of medication. Robert was a very well informed and careful consumer - certainly a good idea if one is getting mostly clinic care - but I think the drugs started having side effects and I suspected that when he switched medications there were some unpredictable interactions which made something worse. He tried the controversial Prozac only once, noted some bad effects, and immediately got off it.

I see that Posner said even more nice things about you than about me. When I talked with him, he did not seem to have a pre-determined agenda, and he did not take that annoying lawyerly tone of certitude. But, as Bob Callahan put it, I guess "Hung Jury" doesn't have the kind of appeal as a book title that "Case Closed" does.

All the best,

Paul

PLH