

Hal Verb
PO Box 421815
San Francisco, CA 94142-1815

1/23/95

Dear Hal,

I appreciate the trouble and expense you went to and the contents with your 1/21, here yesterday afternoon but there are none in the Washington area I know who do not already know about the 1/25 hearing. There in another aspect of hearings like that one to which I draw your attention. These hearings are to let the board know what records exist that have not been disclosed. When as has happened at several of those hearings of which I know the nuts who know nothing at all about actual records and care even less about them run off at the mouth with their nuttiness it turns the board off and give fuel to those who may not be all that anxious for there to be full disclosure. I am confident that the staff wants full disclosure and I presume this may be true of some members of the board but the more nonsense and worse they are given the more that interferes with disclosure and the willingness to go to the trouble some of them means. I have given them specifics of actual records withheld and copies of records that so indicate. When the Judges and Livingstones put on the performance they did at COPA and the Harris did at Dallas that does not help and it does hurt. The kind of crap from these and from others hurts. It does not help. And there is nothing the board can get from those who are ignorant of the actual records, have never had any interest in them, Then consider also the consequences of persuading the board of what it not true and having it make serious efforts to get - what does not exist. So, I think we do not want to regard the board as what it is not and that we do not want the nuts to appear, waste their time, and make it appear that those who say there are withheld records are not to be credited.

I agree with Mantik on the Dale Meyers stuff. I see no real usefulness in the Meyers approach.

I think Brandt is worth no time at all.

I do not know the answer on Mrs. Beck. I suppose it is possible.

I think time spent on Carr is wasted.

I agree with you on Pauline Bates.

I do not know the answer re those splotches perhaps from fingerprint powder but again, I do not see that this ^{now} can lead to anything of value. Do you know anything about W. Waldron? Martin Waldron who was a NY Times reporter was a friend.

On your double head-shot article, which I think is good, I also agree with you that it as wrong to go off the records as they did, with anything at all.

Wallace and Cyril did a good job on Lattimer who seems dedicated to destroying any credibility he ever had. Which I think was little to begin with.

I am concerned about the wasting of time for the board and its staff. There is simply an enormous volume of records in many government agency files and they'll not be able to get anything like all of them disclosed in any event. So any time wasted for them is hurtful. In addition, the more they check and find foolish the less they will feel determined to persevere. Then there are seeming solid cases that can be made, like that the back of JFK's head was blown out. Whether or not this indicates or can indicate any records being withheld, before a case is given to such a body there should be some checking of existing fact. Not just an argument to make the case for the theory. In this instance, what does the Zapruder film show? That the back of the head was not blown out. So, unless it can be shown that the film was doctored, and I believe that is impossible, giving anything like this to the board is counterproductive, hurtful and turns it off and diminishes all else they are given.

Gary Aguilar appears to be put out over my disagreement with something that is probably a theory. He did not respond when I asked him for the source of Finck saying that there were pictures taken at the autopsy he did not see when shown supposedly all those pictures and he did not respond when I made a suggestion to him about how he could carry forward with JAMA what he started and others did when they first protested the Humes defense. I have no personal feeling about this. I rather like Gary. But not telling me the source of that Finck statement was hurtful. Not in the least to me personally. I'll regret it very much if he and those he deals with find themselves in the end like those ^{blind} wise men of Hindustan who in the poem were taken to an elephant and each described what he felt, like a night tree, a snake, etc. I think that those who believe the autopsy film was toyed with should begin by being their own devil's advocates, as I suggested to both Gary and Kentik. The basic question for them to address is why would anyone run the risk of toying with the film only to wind up with what destroys the purpose of any such tricks, with film that destroys the official story? For one thing, and there are more than this ~~one~~, with those 40 dust-like fragments in a head X-ray. That is absolutely impossible with military ammo. Or showing fragments where ^{the} ~~the~~ autopsists said there were none. To illustrate what withholding that info from me can mean, I knew a board staff member before he was on the staff. I could give it to him and then he'd have a basis for seeking the missing film. And I have taken time for Gary whenever he phoned and wrote. One big blowback on any such projects and they'll see what I mean. And with that back of the head blown out thing, the Z film shows the head there intact at about frame 596, for several frames. And if it were possible to alter so tiny an original, hardly more than 1/4 in maximum dimension, so that on projection to a width of five feet, what I had when I saw those slides in early 1967 or late 1966, and not have it show, which I do not for a minute believe, what then about having access to all the copies so they, too, could be altered. And what if one was not gotten and altered?

Again thanks, and best wishes,

PAGE 1 OF 6

Hal Vero
P.O. Box 721815
S.F., CA. 94142-1815

1-21-95

HAROLD WEISBERG
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD
FREDERICK, MD. 21702

Dear Hal -

I'm writing this letter to you on a Saturday with a kind of rush to make sure I get it to the post office in time so that you can receive it rather promptly.

The reason for this rush is that there will be an Assassination Records Review Board hearing in Washington on Wednesday Jan. 25th & I wanted to make certain you receive the items enclosed plus give you time to alert people you know in the Washington area to go to the hearing. I have no idea who the Board will hear. Perhaps you could alert Jim Lesar & others to go down & attend.

In any event I'm enclosing the following items which, of course, you can keep. On certain items I'd appreciate your comments on (which I'll note in my listing):

ITEMS ENCLOSED =

- (1) THE S.F. CHRONICLE "SPED" Book Review
- (2) DR. WEGHT & MILAM reply to DR. LATTIMER'S THEORY ON CONNALLY FLAP AT ZAPRUDE FRAME Z-22K (My view is that the "flap" was caused by the wind). Your comments appreciated.
- (3) FBI agent SWAEYNGEN new book: I've met him & he told me personally of the score of "black bag"

jobs while at the Chicago FBI office. I asked Bill Turner to see if he could ask Swearingen if he knew GUY BANNISTER.

(4) The letter by E. Brandt to myself on his defense of the Warren Commission their view that 3 shots were fired & all from the 6th floor. Brandt was the witness I helped to discover (he showed up in Dallas on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of JFK's death). He pointed to a photo in Groden's book & said "That's me - I'm still wearing the same hat I wore then!" (You can see him on Willis #1 & the equivalent Z-frame). Note that Brandt agreed with me that the first shot struck JFK (that I got from him on 3 different occasions, once on TV in Dallas at the "NSA" Symposium. I've not yet replied to him (am working on a long reply to him). He doesn't realize that his own observations reinforce my conclusion rebutting "no conspiracy".

From a conversation I had (today in fact) I learned from Gary Shaw that Brandt has given an "ORAL HISTORY" tape to the "6th floor Exhibit" where Brandt is now working ~~for~~ for them as a "docent". In that "History" he says he heard 2 shots. Shaw said that Brandt immediately after the first shot ran back toward the knoll parking area. This is pretty much what Brandt told me in 1993 when I first discovered him & located him on the Willis #1 photo.

Brandt is also quoted in the latest "Dateline Dallas" magazine by a woman reporter from Florida who says Brandt heard 2 shots. Thus we have 2 sources for his statement.

I'd appreciate your comments on what Brandt wrote to me & anything you can add on this.

(5) Dr. Mantak's reply to the Myers article in the "VIDEO TASTER VEE" magazine in which MYERS "provides" computer "proof" of no conspiracy. (I'm in the process of writing a reply to Myers article & I understand Dr. Milam is too. Your comments on this are appreciated. I previously sent you a copy of Myers article).

(6) Gary Mack's great review of Beverly Oliver's book (he doesn't buy her being in dealey). Note that Gary mentions a possible clue to the "Bobushka lady" based on a KGB man's experience. Could this be Mrs. Beck??? Incidentally, Gary has now been appointed the Archivist for the 6th Floor exhibit. I am in touch with him. Gary replaced an archivist who says he was voted out probably because of his activism on the case.

(7) The letter from Waggoner Can to a Texas paper (he's still defending the Warren Commission) + the reply to him by a researcher. Note that Can has his ~~his~~ address listed so it is now easy to write to him. My friend, Tom Sanders, knew Can when Tom lived in Lubbock, Texas.

(8) The 4 pages of documents on Sergio Carlo (who appears in your book "Oswald in New Orleans"). I've pointed out to a researcher working on the CAESO

PAGE 4 of 6

angle that CARBO was also involved in the CIA plot to overthrow Brazilian President Goulart in the spring of 1964. From a researcher I'm in touch with he indicates to me that McCloy was instrumental in this plot through a mining company McCloy represented at the time (when McCloy was also working for the Warren Commission). What's interesting to note in this whole CARBO caper is that Carlo's son was in the Bay of Pigs invasion. If you'll recall Sergio Carlo had stated in a news article that there would be "in a short time" an "event" occurring that would "dramatically alter" the peaceful coexistence policy between the 2 super powers (USA & Russia). I always thought Carlo's comment (made on 11/19/63) referred to the JFK assassination but I now believe I was wrong & that CARBO probably was referring to a second invasion of Cuba. I could be wrong but something was in the wind. And, if, indeed, Carlo's son was in the Cuban Invasion of 1961 whose better ear could he have listened to than his own son!

Note also in those CARBO pages that there is a reference to "Oswald's manuscript" plus a belief held by a "stenographer" who thought Oswald was "an agent". It is my belief that

PAGE 5 of 6

this refers to Pauline Bates. Wasn't Bates the woman I recall reading many, many years back who tried to deny Oswald as having a "crypto" clearance. I know I read that somewhere in some book but I can't recall where or by whom but my memory says that it was a woman writer?

(9/ Enclosed is a 9 page FPCC pamphlet written by V. T. Lee on "Cuban Covert Revolutionaries in the U.S." It was one of the pamphlets Oswald ordered from the FPCC & included in the inventory of items found in Paine's garage. I had asked a researcher, Lamar Waldron, to see if he could get a copy of it at the Archives which he frequently visits but he said the Archives "stonewalled" him. When he finally got a erox copy what he got was what I'm enclosing. As Lamar explained it to me the dark splotches beginning to appear on page 4 (& thereafter) were due to the result of "fingerprint dusting" (obviously done by the FBI). Lamar pointed out to me that no such dark spots appeared on either the front or back cover. Only on the inside! Why? This is what Lamar told me (the explanation was provided for him by the NA archivist whom I presume is Steve Tilly). What is your evaluation of all this? When do you think the fingerprint testing was

PAGE 6 OF 6

done prior to Lamar's request or after Lamar's request to obtain a copy. My guess is that it was before & not after.

The interesting thing about this V.T. Lee pamphlet is that I was partly responsible for it being printed. When V.T. Lee first told me he had information about what the Xiles were doing & their plans for a second invasion I told him this had to be printed & circulated widely. The information had to get out to the general public. He agreed & I loaned him money to get it printed & distributed. Lee did pay me back later. When Oswald ordered that pamphlet my view is that Oswald had to find out as best he could what the Xile plans were even if he had an "ear" to what they were doing through an exile (or exile group).

(10) The Washington Spectator (1/17/98) article on the ARRB up-coming hearing. Note the Jan. 25th Wash. hearing plus other city hearings to be held in Boston, New Orleans, Miami & L.A. Have you any info on this? (I guess this article was written by Max Holland).

(11) The William Safire article on the JFK tapes.

(12) Lastly, my article in "Lateline Dallas" (Sept. 30, 1994). This is on the "Double Head Shot" theory I propose. I would truly appreciate your input on this.

Have to run now. I want to get this mailed out pronto!

Best,
Hal Verb