

6/26/68

Mr. H. Verb
922A Multon St.,
San Francisco, Calif. 94117

Dear Mr. Verb,

Many thanks for your long letter of the 22nd., which I shall hurriedly address, at least in part, as much as to-be-interrupted time today permits. I drove home yesterday morning right from an all-night bash on the Long John Nebel Show on the NY NBC station, which covers a large part of the country. While there has been no time for mail, I've had several phone calls, from as far away as Miami, with only favorable comment. This was true also the many telegrams that reached the studio during the broadcast. All were favorable. The effect is yet to be measured. I hope it will be good, and I do expect this. What a stacked deck they gave me! Kevin O'Dougherty, an official of the right-of-Goldwater New York Conservative Party, allegedly a lawyer (of which there was no reflection during his part of my interrogation or in his lengthy, befuddled and I think almost insane commentary), and Victor Leski, a refugee from some part of the left, I presume.

The very irresponsibility of these people, their conspicuously bad manners and their congenital proclivity for confusing their wild prejudices with fact were a boon. As I believe the program went over the air, I established every point I wanted to make despite their effort to prevent it. It got to the point where I was openly needling them, and when they degenerated into unrelated redbaiting I just sat back in silence, afraid any more fact would only overwhelm the listener. The program just petered out on this note, leaving me with an abundance of fresh material for any similar ones that might and can be offered...Numerous complaints of their effort to silence me reached the studio while I was there, a fitting touch for this subject, and on the air I emphasized this at every opportunity, even though it was obvious in context.

There will be a very dishonest attack on the Epstein book (which is quite vulnerable) in the coming issue of Look. Nebel gave me a copy and I have written LOOK in Epstein's defence and challenging them to give me the opportunity for a full rebuttal, from the record alone. They'll probably reject it. There will be not unfavorable reviews in the NY Times of the 3rd, mostly an expression of sympathy with the Commission and of the rest most on Epstein, for they cannot address mine. The important thing right now this review has: my address, so people can write for copies, and the acknowledgment that WHITWASH is both painstaking and overwhelming. I have as yet no real way of measuring sales, but I know that there has been some distribution to NY bookstores.

I have no means of writing all the Calif. people working on this subject, so as you are in touch with them, you may convey this. Other reviews are pending. Epstein, who has (and should, for he'll be torn apart) has rejected all requests for public appearances save this coming Friday on the Today show, where Viking apparently insisted he go through with it.

Your reference to the "original" autopsy report makes me wonder what people, including

Epstein, are really talking about. I have no reason to doubt that the handwritten copy I used is the oldest existing copy. There is no reason of which I'm aware (and if there is, I'd like to know it) to believe that after 11/24/63 there was a different version of the autopsy drafted. This does contradict the Report. It is also public. How is Robert Kennedy supposedly collecting this kind of information, if you know or can find out, and through whom? Also why? I have no reason to doubt these rumors that I often hear, but no means of authenticating them. But they can be of vast significance.

Ferlinghetti is right in complaining the price of WHITEWASH is too high, but wrong if he thinks it can be any lower. If I sell this entire edition, aside from the very large number I have had to give to the press, I'll just about pay its cost alone, and he should be able to understand this from his own knowledge. Aside from this considerable cost, all as of this moment additional and considerable debt, I have the equivalent of at least \$50,000 invested in WHITEWASH. I'd like to be able to get some of it back, so I can pay the additional debts it required and to have a little to live on and finance my continuing work, which is entirely without any kind of subsidy or assistance from any source, save for the good people who are trying to help with the success of the book. Ferlinghetti can get and handle the book on what is called a "protected" basis, that is, he can return for full credit what he does not sell. Experience shows the cost is not prohibitive and that the book, despite its cost and format, does sell. There is now a west-coast distributor, Rayman, at Menlo Park, who have stocked 500 copies, in itself a commercial refutation of Ferlinghetti's fears. I hope he will at least handle the book. Where it has been merely offered it has sold, but where the offer has been accompanied by a window display, etc., it has sold very well indeed. One store in Washington, to which I had given 130 on consignment, last week offered to pay for all of them now so I can give the printer some money because they have no doubt now that they'll sell all of them. At a University, with the school out of session, the bookstore sold so many I have as a result been invited to address a faculty-student meeting. One of the more important bookstores, Seville, one of those from whose sales Book Week computes its list of best sellers, offered to ask Viking to distribute WHITEWASH as a companion to INQUEST, on kind offer I decline. Five major distributors now handle WHITEWASH. I hope Mr. Ferlinghetti will realize that if I sell all my copies at a loss I accomplish nothing. In any event, thanks for your efforts and those of others. Any bookstore that wants the book can get it from Rayman, under regular commercial terms, and they and Ferlinghetti know this can be profitable to them.

With this commercial distribution arranged for the west coast, and because what in the trade is called "protected" is virtually the same as "consignment", I do not feel it is honorable of me to ship direct to any bookstore in Rayman's territory, even though the return to me would be greater.

Your reference to errors is correct. Both were the result of haste when the first printer broke his contract, destroyed the plates and in other ways was less than helpful. I have found two or three others, none serious, that I'll correct if there is another edition. If you find any more errors, please let me know immediately.

The Epstein book is and has been out, since June 6, as a matter of fact, for the publicity I arranged had the effect of launching it in an effort to sublimate my book. I have written the LA Times about their story, which makes no reference to WHITEWASH (actually a 1965 book) and if anything appears I'd appreciate a copy.

I'm glad to get Jones' address. I'll get the book. I did know of the deaths and of other strange happenings, without details on most. Your point on the watchband is interesting, but as of this moment, despite the Commission's mishandling, I'm inclined to think that could have been Lovelady, although I have no doubt Oswald was not at that moment on the sixth floor. I doubt if he'd have gone up for a coke after he had seen the President assassinated....The exact frame of the Zapruder film that coincides

with the Altgens picture is 255. This is the opinion of Shaneyfelt, and my own earlier opinion was, as I recall only about two frames earlier. He should be right. The fact that the windshield in it appears to be intact merely strengthens the belief that a head fragment caused the damage to it. I rather doubt that a bullet (which this could not have been) smashing through the windshield could have injured either. I believe the front bullet would have had to have a higher trajectory, or one more to the side....I'm aware that Oswald may have been left-handed, but there is no evidence he shot that way, aside from testimony that the sight was mounted for a left-handed person, if that is evidence. But because of this testimony, it would have been to the Commission's interest to have him a left-handed shooter, for it would have been consistent rather than inconsistent with this testimony and would have crowded him less....The time of Oswald arrest, as I recall, was fairly accurately reported. The time of entrance was not....The editing of Oswald's "patay" remarks is true, I have no doubt. I've heard it before. I have not yet come across any public source quoting it, and would like to have it.

I'm continuing my work, as I can and when I can, and the material is, I believe, quite sensational. I think, however, until it is ready for publication I'd best say nothing about it. I've got close to 20,000 words done.

I'd be happy to go to California if my expenses were paid. Even if WHITWASH takes off and does well, our debts are such I'll be broke for quite a while. We have been without income for 1 1/2 years. There is one other thing I'd also want, and that is a recording of anything I say, especially if there are questions answered. I hope you can see this is necessary to prevent distortion or worse and to protect against it.

Thanks for your offer of assistance. At the moment, more than anything else I believe distributor of WHITWASH is important, for the other current writings have an inherently bad line and are inaccurate, ultimately playing into the hands of the right. Epstein and Lane point at Earl Warren as the goat, and Lane has confirmed this in writing to me. It is in Trevor-Roper's introduction, too. Sauvage is a person of high integrity, from my two phone contacts with him. His book will be much less complete, and from his writings in the New Leader will have nothing new.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

June 22, 1966

923A Fulton St.,
San Francisco, Cal.
94117

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I wish to thank you for your prompt reply to my letter. I had intended to answer yours earlier than this but first I wanted to go over your book more thoroughly and other material that I had come across so that my reply to you would be more constructive and, perhaps, somehow aid you in your further investigations.

I did not mention it in my last letter to you but I am a freelance writer and have had a very active interest in the assassination from the very start. I am enclosing a copy of the "Berkeley Barb" (June 10, 1966) which contains an article I helped work on concerning the assassination and the independent investigations being conducted by several people including yourself (see page 2). There was one error in that story and that is the reference to the rumors that both Bobby and Ted Kennedy were doing their own checking of the facts. Actually, I had only mentioned Bobby's investigation and I had no information that Ted Kennedy was involved although I am sure he would quite naturally be interested.

Incidentally, you asked me if I had any information about Bobby's investigation. All I can tell you is this: I learned about it from a Dave Lifton who was active in the Citizen's Committee of Inquiry initiated by Mark Lane to investigate aspects of the assassination. I was also active with the Citizen's Committee which until recently had been quite inactive but with the new information coming out it would appear that it is about to be revived. Lifton is doing a series for the "Ramparts" magazine on some rather sensational data he has obtained. According to him Bobby Kennedy has obtained the original autopsy report and the X-ray findings of President Kennedy. That is what I meant when I said in my first letter to you that Bobby had information contradicting the Warren Report and had not raised a stir about it. That is all that I can tell you about the matter. Perhaps, you can check this out in Washington, D.C. through sources there.

I did manage to contact Lawrence Ferlinghetti who owns a bookstore known as "City Lights" here in San Francisco. I tried to persuade him to become a distributor for your book but he explained to me that the cost of the book at \$4.95 was too prohibitive to charge his readers. He said, however, that he knew that readers would be interested in the book and would buy it. He pointed out that his bookstore is primarily a paperback one and that few paperbacks sold beyond the \$2 or \$3 price. He said that if you could work out some arrangement to bring the price down he would be willing to consider it and that it was his feeling he could sell a good quantity of them. He did ask me, however, to speak to his partner about the book and see if he could be persuaded but he doubted this would be the case. This weekend I will visit the bookstore and discuss it with him.

I also spoke to Max Scherr who is the editor and publisher of the "Berkeley Barb". Max has many contacts with bookstores in the Berkeley and Bay Area and he said that he would try to get the book distributed. He is as enthusiastic as I am about getting the book distributed. In the meantime, I am going to be contacting some bookstores here in S.F. and see what I can do. I did contact a bookstore in Berkeley known as Moe's Bookstore located at 2476 Telegraph Ave. and he said he would be interested in handling your book on a con-

signment basis. You can either write him or, if you want, allow me to make the arrangements for the book's distribution whatever you feel is best.

Incidentally, it would be helpful if you could send another copy of your book to me so that I can leave it at a bookstore for the owners to look over before they make up their minds. My copy is always winding up being borrowed somehow and it is difficult to get it when I need it at the moment.

Now I want to get down to discussing the contents of your book in order to make some suggestions and point out other information that you may not be aware of. To begin with: First, there are two minor errors. On page 16 you mention the garage where Oswald kept his property and then refer the reader to the Appendix for the photograph. Inadvertently, I suppose, you forget to include the photo in your Appendix. Also on page 207 you have an arrow pointing in the wrong direction next to a caption describing the window which the assassin allegedly stood inside of. It looks as if you switched captions and the one on top should belong on the bottom and vice-versa.

Many of the observations and conclusions you have made in your book are confirmed by Edward Jay Epstein in his new book "Inquest" published by the Viking Press. The book is due for publication on June 29 and I strongly urge that you get a copy so that you can examine the work that he has done. I have an advance copy and I am certain that you can obtain one also before the publication date.

Some of the examples that both you and Epstein agree on are, for example, the following:

On page 39 and 40 of your book you make exactly the same points about Howard Brennan that Epstein does in his book about this "accurate observor" (Epstein, pp.135-136).

Also see your discussion of the comparison of hairs test made on the blanket known to have been Oswald's property (p.119). Epstein, likewise, makes exactly the same points you do on page 140 of his book.

Epstein also confirms in his book (pp.76-80) the conclusions you drew concerning the stretcher bullet. (See pp. 161-162 in your book). He says the determination of this bullet by the Warren Commission as coming from Gov. Connally's stretcher was "superficial", and calls attention to witnesses never called to testify concerning this bullet. Epstein also points out that both the FBI and the Secret Service Reports show that the bullet did not come from the Connally stretcher. He says he bases this on the examination of material he found in the National Archives.

Also refer to your description of a meeting that took place in Sept., 1964 with Marina Oswald and some Senators from the Commission (see page 188). Epstein confirms your conclusion and states that after this meeting Marina "changed major aspects of her story and altered her previous testimony" (p. 27).

Now to bring out some other points. I suggest you get a hold of a new book on the assassination by Penn Jones, Jr. entitled "Forgive My Grief". (You can obtain it by sending \$2.95 to the Midlothian Mirror, Midlothian, Texas, 76065). He has some valuable information on peripheral matters that could be highly significant for your investigation. For example, did you know that at least 13 persons have met with strange and mysterious deaths since the assassination? All of the persons involved were in some way connected with Ruby or Oswald. Jones lists 8 of these in his book. Just to mention two of them - one was Mrs. Earlene Roberts, Oswald's roomlady and the other was William Whaley, the cab driver who drove Oswald to his home on that fateful day when Kennedy was gunned down.

Incidentally, referring to Whaley I believe this may be helpful and should be checked out. You will notice that Whaley in his testimony before the Commission mentions an "unusual watchband" that he had seen on Oswald (See your book, page 107). Now photographs of Oswald have appeared from time to time showing him to wear some kind of watchband on his left wrist soon after his capture. Also Altgens photo of the man standing in the doorway of the Depository Building (allegedly Lovelady) shows what appears to me to be a man wearing some kind of watchband on his left wrist but it is not too clear in the versions I have seen of the Altgens photo. What I am suggesting is that this Altgens photo be blown up and a comparison made of the watchbands. If, as I believe, they would compare then it would be strong proof that it was Oswald standing in that doorway and not Lovelady which would, of course, demolish the whole Warren Report. Is it possible that Whaley could have been silenced among other reasons that he knew something about this watchband and was in a position to identify it - particularly, since he was familiar with watchbands having worked with them in the past?

One other suggestion to offer here concerning that Altgens photo is this: Notice that the Altgens photo shows both Kennedy and Connally visibly reacting to the shot that hit Kennedy. (Connally is turned 90 degrees rightward). It can be determined at what precise frame number in the Zapruder film this position was. Observe that the front glass window of the Presidential car shows no apparent evidence of a bullet having passed through it. Now - is it possible to blow up this photo (the front glass window part, that is) so that one could observe more carefully whether such damage does in fact exist? This, of course, would have to be based on an intensive photographic analysis. Perhaps by this means one could develop proof that the bullet that smashed through the window did not take place during the time of the wounding of either Kennedy or Connally and this would mean that there would have to be at least four bullets which would disprove the Warren Report's contention of three bullets.

Refer also to your discussion of Connally's wounds (on page 157 & 176) particularly to the remark by Dr. Shaw that two or three bullets could have caused his wounds. Now in "Four Days" a book published in 1964 by the American Heritage Publishing Co. there is on page 23 a reproduction of the November 22, 1963 teletype report of UPI reporter Merriman Smith who was a witness to the assassination. The teletype report says: "It was impossible to tell where Kennedy was hit, but bullet wounds in Connally's chest were plainly visible, indicating the gunfire might ~~have~~ possibly have come from an automatic weapon". (The underlining is mine). I point this out because Dr. Shaw's remark suggests that he was more than just aware of this possibility of the wounds being caused by an "automatic weapon" which would help to explain Kellerman's and others reference to a "flurry of shots".

Incidentally, I note that you refer to Oswald in your book as being right-handed (for example, page 107). But Oswald's mother has stated that "my son was left-handed and has always been left-handed" (National Insider, Dec. 13, 1964). This may seem trivial but as Oswald's mother has pointed out in that article how could he have shot left-handed from the right of a window? I suggest that you contact Oswald's mother on this. I am not mistaken Marina has mistakenly testified that Oswald was right-handed. Did she do this deliberately? Could that have been one of the reasons she changed her testimony in that meeting she had in Sept., 1964 with members of the Commission? I think this bears looking into.

You will note also that in none of the interrogations of Oswald did any mention come up about the time Oswald was "captured" at the movie theater he was alleged to have been in. It would be interesting, if it is at all possible, to check those witnesses who have testified at just what point in the film the lights were turned on when the police entered the theater to "capture" Oswald. All movie houses have a time schedule for the running of their films and they do not vary greatly from day to day. If you could check this out you could establish a more precise time when he was in the movie house. I doubt though that this can be done now because I am sure that this has all been covered up by now.

One final point: in discussing the so-called "press interview" of Oswald on page 67 there is something about this interview that you may not be aware of. I note that you end this interview with Oswald saying: "...The first thing I heard about it was when the newspaper reporters in that hall asked me that question." The Warren Report also concludes the "interview" with Oswald's reply. But immediately after that there is a row of asterisks printed (see page 189 of the NY Times Bantam Edition of the Warren Report). Now in place of that row of asterisks there should have been the following exchange:

Reporter: You have been charged with it.

Oswald: Sir?

Reporter: You have been charged with it.

(Oswald looks frightened).

Oswald: I'm a patsy."

Jack Ruby was present at this conference and he certainly knew what Oswald meant by "patsy". I came across this information and the censored portion of this "interview" in a letter printed in the "Minority of One" magazine, March, 1965 by a Lillian Castellano, Hollywood, Calif. She claims that not only has the Warren Report censored Oswald's "patsy" remark but that the TV stations have edited out this "patsy" remark on their filmed versions of the interview. She recalls viewing a CBS report by Walter Cronkite on Sunday Sept. 27, 1964 when the Warren Report was released and it was cut from the show. Again on Nov. 22, 1964 on the anniversary of the President's death CBS also cut this "patsy" remark from its program entitled "Four Dark Days". Incidentally Mrs. Castellano said that when Oswald made this remark it was the first time she had seen him appear frightened.

This would appear to confirm your suspicion that Oswald was a "pigeon" which I also believe. And it shows the collusion between the government and the mass media to suppress the truth. I think that this should be pointed out and exposed as widely as possible.

There are other leads that I can suggest that may be of use to you but I want to get this in the mail as promptly as possible. As you can see I have done some research on this entire affair (not as extensive as yours to be sure) and I would hope that we can keep in touch with each other. I am most interested in learning about the new and sensational material you have dug up since your book came out.

Some of my friends have suggested that you be invited to appear here as a speaker on the work you have done. I thought this would be an excellent idea and would like to know if you would be interested. Of course, we would arrange to have all your expenses met including the fare back and forth to Maryland. It was suggested that perhaps the Fall would be the most appropriate time since college students are away now and when they return they would make for the best audiences. Also in the Fall new books (such as that by Mark Lane and Leo Sauvage) will appear.

Before I forget the Nation magazine for June 13 and 20 have articles on the assassination by Fred Cook. You should read them.

Well, I hope that this long letter will be of some help to you. Please keep in touch with me and if I can be of any further assistance let me know.

Sincerely,
Hal Verb
Hal Verb

Sarkulm Barb 6/20/66

Kennedy Killers

New Data Uncovered Vs Official "Truth"

New and sensational data refuting the official "truth" about the assassination of President Kennedy has been uncovered, BARB learned this week.

In a letter dated June 1, Harold Weisberg, author of *Whitewash: The Report on The Warren Report*, wrote to BARB's Hal Verb that since completion of his recently-published book he had come across the new data. The book is mentioned in a June 5 New York Times article.

In response to Barb's mention of rumors that Senators Bobby and Ted Kennedy are doing their own checking of facts, Weisberg wrote that he, too, had been aware of such rumors. The correspondence included suggestions from Verb concerning the continuing investigation.

The "lone killer" version, announced on the day after the assassination by the Dallas police and upheld ten months later by the Warren Commission, is being shot full of holes by at least a half-dozen independent investigators.

Weisberg concludes: "One thing is now beyond question: There was not a single assassin, Oswald or any other. There was at least one conspiracy - to kill the President."

The current Newsweek carries a major feature titled "Inquest: How Many Assassins?" based on a doctoral thesis by a graduate student at Cornell, to be published June 29 in book form. Edward J. Epstein, says, "If the FBI reports are accurate, as all the evidence indicates they are, then a central aspect of the autopsy was changed more than two months after the autopsy examination, and the autopsy report published in the Warren report is not the original one."

The New York Times of June 5 noted publication of three other books on the subject, including "Whitewash." The other two will appear in September: *Rush To Judgement* by Mark Lane

and *The Oswald Affair* by Lee Sauvage.

The Times story reprinted June 7 in the San Francisco Chronicle, mentions also the Unanswered Questions About President Kennedy's Assassination, by Sylvan Fox, published last October, and an article by Vincen J. Salandria in the April issue of *The Minority Of One*.

Salandria finds that the evidence points to a "minimum total of five bullets" figuring in the assassination. The Warren Commission stated that if more than three shots were fired there would have to be two or more assassins.

Another book on the same subject, published early this year, is *Forgive My Grief*, Vol. 1, by Penn Jones, Jr.

One reason for appearance of several books on the assassination at this time is their use of material from FBI reports which were "Classified" until January, 1966. They are now available to the public in the National Archives.

The story of Weisberg's futile attempts to have his book published, until he did it himself, is part of the history of suppression of facts not compatible with the "lone killer" theory. After being turned down by 103 publishers, 14 major newspapers, eight magazines and TV stations across the country, Weisberg decided to print the book on his own.

That the book is not without reader interest is indicated by the following in Weisberg's letter to Verb: "We have had more orders from California than from any other state, yet I have done no advertising and have done nothing to interest any Californians."

Weisberg is a newspaper and magazine writer, has served as a Senate investigator and as an intelligence and political analyst. The analysis in his book is based entirely on the Warren Report and the 26 volumes of Hearings and Exhibits released by the Warren Commission.

He shows that evidence in the case has been tampered with to the extent that white trees and road signs were removed from the assassination site. In its use of the movie film taken by a bystander, the Commission spliced one frame with no explanation as to why. Part of a tree is missing from the resulting picture. The four frames preceding this one are missing, again with no explanation.

Jerry Rubin

**of toChi
SDS**

Page 1

the country,
nal and ex-
he said.
-keley
ay,