

This file has been compiled very hastily because of reported House Committee interest in Hall. It is by no means complete.

(1) Article by Hall, National Enquirer, Sept. 1968 (date uncertain)
[Hall says he turned down a \$50,000 offer to kill JFK five weeks before the assassination. The alleged offer was made by "right-wing radicals." Hall describes the allegedly peculiar circumstances of his arrest in Dallas at around that time. (See CD 1546, p. 211 for details on the arrest, 10/17/63.) Hall discussed the Odio matter, speculates on various points, and reports on attempts to kill him. Garrison's statement of 5/16/68, "clearing" Hall and indicating that he was set up as a second patsy, is reprinted.]

(2) Hall interview with the L.A. Free Press (Jan. 12-19, 1968, pp. 1, 3, 10, and 12.)

[Headline: "Cuban raider 'Skip' Hall denies conspiracy charges". Hall discusses his arrest in Cuba in 1959; his contacts with Lawrence Howard; his activities in the fall of 1963, etc.]

(3) L.A. Free Press, May 24-30, 1968, pp. 14-16: "Hall deposes to Garrison in N.O., is exonerated."

[Hall discusses his meeting with Garrison; praises him; talks (speculatively) about CIA involvement in the assassination.]

(4) National Tattler, July 13, 1975: "Ex-CIA agent says: These men [Hall, Brading, Shaw, Ferrie, Oswald] murdered President John Kennedy."

[Incredible allegations from W. R. Morris.]

(5) National Tattler Investigative Special (September 1975): "Kennedy Murder Solved!"

[More of the same, with a long article on Hall's movements after the previous Tattler article. Considerable details about his recent movements - apparently the Tattler had someone investigating him closely.]

(6) Washington Post, May 21, 1977: "Reporter (Art Kevin) says JFK panel tricked him." (By George Lardner)

[Hall has reportedly said he will take the Fifth. Additional allegations about his interaction with the House Committee have been reported by Zodiac News Service.]

(7) CD 1179, pp. 295-8 (The Watley Report)

[Very strange. Report that Hall had a rifle similar to the one which killed JFK. Apparently on 11/23/63 some of Hall's anti-Castro colleagues were telling the FBI of their suspicions of his involvement. Hall and Gerry Patrick Hemming are said to have pawned the rifle in September. The FBI's response to, and reporting of, this incident is most peculiar. This report is buried in a large CD full of miscellaneous allegations.]

(8) CD 1546, pp. 211-213.

[FBI report to the Warren Commission, revealing pre-assassination FBI knowledge of Hall's 10/17/63 arrest. This is in response to the Commission's request to find the Odio visitors. (Liebeler has indicated that he didn't really expect the FBI to locate the visitors, and was really just passing the buck to them.)]

(9) CD 1553, parts B thru D.

[FBI interviews of Hall, Howard, and Seymour regarding their possible visit to Sylvia Odio.]

(10) CIA Item 1228-513. (Name traces on Garrison probe figures)

[Notes that Lorenzo Pascillio "is probably iden[tical] with [deletion, presumably Hall]."]

(11) CIA Item 1351-1059B. (Memo of 10 June 1975 re Hunt and Sturgis)

[Memo claims that Sturgis was not CIA but was apparently backed by an "unknown group." Discusses Diaz Lanz; the relationship between Sturgis' group and that of

Gerry Patrick Hemming (Interpen). Hall is described as "the individual in Interpen of most interest to Garrison." (There may be other references to Hall in the CIA documents, but I can't recall any offhand.)]

(12) CTIA file extract, p. 3 (Miami Police report, 11/1/63)

[Reports an allegation by Patrick (Hemming) that Hall had just stolen two rifles from him. Cf. Item 7.]

(13) CTIA file extract, pp. 394-396 (Memo of 9/18/67 from Bethell to Garrison)
[Reports on comments by Hemming on Hall and others; Logue is mentioned.]

(14) CTIA file extract, p. 634 (Hall arrest record - mostly illegible)

(15) CTIA file extract, pp. 829-836 (Letter of June 28, 1967 from Wiley G. Yates to Garrison)

[Allegations re Hall's activities in Dallas in 1963.]

(16) "Accessories After the Fact" (Meagher)

[Basic analysis of the Odio matter; several references to Hall. See index.]

(17) "Oswald in New Orleans" (Weisberg)

[Many references to Hall - pages 156, 161, 261-5, 267-8, 270, 272-9, 291, 526-30, 532-3, 551, 556-71. (Page numbers greater than 404 refer to the documentary appendix.)]

(18) "Coup d'état in America" (Canfield & Weberman)

[Chapter 8 is entitled "Loran Hall and the Free Cuba Committees. It's hard to tell, but there may be some reliable and useful information in here.]

Note: Because of the haste with which this memo has been prepared, it is essential to refer to the actual documents before basing any conclusions on my comments.

COMMENTARY:

Hall's name has popped up in connection with the assassination inquiry repeatedly since November 23, 1963. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that something funny has been going on, but I know of no persuasive evidence that Hall actually knows anything about the assassination or about Oswald. Some of the allegations against him have been quite incredible; others suggest that the hypothesis that he was being set up should be given serious consideration. (It may simply turn out that he had enemies among the anti-Castro groups who, for their own reasons (unrelated to the assassination) wanted to get Hall in trouble.)

At best, Hall is an unreliable witness. It would certainly be good to have his knowledge on the public record. However, if he chooses not to talk, I think very little can be concluded on the basis of the present record. (Hall has talked in the past; I understand that he knows Harold Weisberg, Art Kevin, and Dick Russell. Weisberg had a long interview with him at the time of the Garrison probe.) A public session at which it is known in advance that Hall will take the Fifth would, in my opinion, be unproductive and unjustified. A careful analysis of the currently available evidence would be a good thing.

If he chooses to, Hall might illuminate certain areas which have been the subject of analysis and speculation for years. That would be interesting, even though much of his information might be of very little relevance to the House Committee's investigation. On the other hand, his testimony might confuse an already confused situation.