

Dear Hal,

8/9/97

Thanks for your 8/2 and the enclosures. Some were particularly interesting.

I'm sure that if it has reached him Bill has not had time to have a copy of Bogus made yet. I've sent copies to the dean of the law school whose Review Hall used and to ARRB, each with a letter and each with a copy of the exhibits, about 65 of them. I have had no response and will be surprised if I get one of any meaning. If any at all.

Holland and his review are particularly interesting. He confirms the impression I'd formed of him, of a man who believes his is such a big brain it has no need for fact except if he can corrupt it to fit his preconceptions.

He says that the disclosure of relatively few USSR documents on the 1962 missile crisis is important but he gives none of the content for his reader to know and understand. He says that while Castro did not begin as a Communist a couple around him did. In fact the Communists opposed Castro, the Cuban Communists. Holland also does not mention the unprecedented measures taken by the Eisenhower administration to control Kennedy policy. Like breaking relations with Cuba only a few days before the new administration took over. Or that American petroleum interests, having charged Cuba extortionate prices, refused to process raw petroleum Castro bought at a much lower price. That forced him to nationalize, first petroleum interest, and then others. We were determined to continue to rob Cuba, to extort what we could extort, and was going to teach it if it dared object or try to save itself.

That Kennedy had a back channel with Dobrynin is something I wondered about when Bobby went to see him during the crisis but I had no knowledge of it. What Holland does not say is what the political climate created by the previous administrations was, a word about the Cold War, or about what would happen if it got to be known that the Kennedy administration had anything but bombs for the USSR, leave alone a desire for peace, for reducing the bankrupting cost of the Cold War and for ending it. He did get detente started and did not survive that.

I am not now certain but I think the Polshakov Bobby met with is the man to whom Khrushchev turned to get his first missile proposal to the Kennedy administration.

Holland has come to regard himself as a Big Brain and this writing also illustrates that. He is defensive of the official posture and roles and in effect argues the administrations' positions. As he did with the Warren Commission in American Heritage.

Part of the Lyons article in the July Fourth Decade is quite interesting and is what I'd believed at the outset, that Oswald did buy a movie ticket and would not have done anything as stupid and as certain to attract attention to himself as going in without a ticket. Particularly when he had to expect to be seen by the ticket taker as soon as he was inside the door. Nothing else made any sense and I wondered if it was even possible for Brewer to see the door from his shoe store. I did not believe him in any event. However, Marrs is not really a dependable source.

Glad you found what I wrote about the Newman book interesting. I have an epilogue to it I've not been able to get retyped.

It is unfortunate that so much of what comes from COFA cannot be trusted. But they know no better.

I'll get the Hall article to you.

Many tanks,

Hal

-1-

HAL VERB
P.O. Box 421815
S.F., CA. 94142-1815

AUG-2, 1997

HAROLD WEISBERG
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD
FREDERICK, MD. 21702

Dear Hal:

I received your latest letter & your mention of the "Bogus Revelation" manuscript you've done & I do appreciate you telling Bill to make a copy for me. I've not yet received it but I'm sure he'll get to it.

Bill did send me the manuscript you did on the Newman CIA & Oswald book and I also appreciate receiving that. On both manuscripts I'll not let anyone else handle it nor borrow it as you requested.

I did finish the Newman stuff & I agree wholeheartedly with your observations - Newman was a puzzle to me almost from the start. When I had dinner with him years ago he was insisting to me that Naom Chomsky's writings were ghosted by Alexander Cockburn! I do believe he thought this to be so. It bothered me that he couldn't see that the two writers have totally different styles & their politics although somewhat the same are of different natures.

Another thing about Newman was his failure to reprint the Oswald August 1963 broadcast where Oswald slips & says he was "under the protection of the U.S. government." It was in your book, "Oswald in New Orleans" (1967) but when I asked Newman why he printed the Warren Commission version (in the Volume) he replied that he was unaware of this at the time. I really felt this was extremely disturbing to me as it either showed a lack of interest or scholarship. There was no excuse for it and it placed Oswald in a context the book wanted to prove while avoiding what Oswald was really doing. Finally it became clear to me that ~~Oswald~~ Newman had no clear understanding of what the Fair Play for Cuba was all ~~about~~ about. Combine this with his not understanding the nature of the different political movements which Oswald minimally utilized and you have a serious problem of political awareness.

I thought you might be interested that a book dealer I know says Newman's "Oswald & Co" book is now on the remainder list (I believe it is selling for \$5.00).

I'm enclosing several articles with this letter & wanted to call special attention to these =

(1) The S.F. Chronicle editorial on "Why Americans Love Conspiracies" (with a reply by a reader). Perhaps you could fit this in with your new "Bogus Revelation" manuscript.

- (2) The Tom Lyons article on the Tippit murder
and the arrest of Oswald at the Texas Theater
- (3) Max Holland's "Nation" review of 2 new books
on CUBA + CASTRO.

(4) The "Washington Spectator" referring to Holland's
attendance at the recent "COPA" conference in
Washington in June, 1997

(5) Dr. Wecht's 8 page article in the "COPA" Bulletin
(of the June 1997
conference)

(6) Two articles taken from COPA which discuss
the first shot timing + placement of the shot
both of which I disagree with & I'm sure you
will too. If I recall one of them claims a
first shot deliberately missed + was a diversion
(to get the real job done). Of ~~the~~ such stuff are
sci-fi movies made! With the barest amount
of time allotted to them in the firing sequence it
is unbelievable that the assassins would fire a
shot deliberately missing. Someone forgot to
put on their thinking cap when it came to looking
at reality. In any event these are for your
records so you can see what is happening out
there in "research land".

Nothing else new here except that in
September I've been asked to speak on the JFK
case & utilize slides I have of the photographs
taken. It's been suggested that Aguilar be con-

-4-

tacted to see if he'll appear with me. I'll be calling him this week-end. I've not been much in contact with him the last few months & not since he got back from the recent "CSA" event.

I will be going to the Lancer event in Dallas (Nov. 20 to 23, 1991) but haven't decided if I want to speak. A lot of the stuff they put out borders on outright silliness and I do my best to try to put them straight but they do have their own agenda.

By the way if you have the spare time can you send me a xerox copy of the Maryland Law Review article by Kermit Hall. I'd much appreciate it & I can refer to it in my talk on JFK here in S.F. in September.

I will also send you a xerox copy of what Hall wrote about Earl Warren in a book by Hall on the Supreme Court (Oxford edition). Hall said that Warren never should've taken the job as head of the Warren Commission but went no further in explaining Hall's reasoning. If Hall uses the argument that Warren shouldn't have headed the WC because Ruby's case could appear before Warren as Chief Justice this cannot be the answer as to why Warren begged off not wanting to head the Commission. Hall's using that argument just won't wash in case he does use it.

Well, will close now. Hope you're doing well.

Best,
Hal Verb