Hall story-Yates-Odio 6/12/69 Harold Weisberg

Rereading the Yates 6/28/67 letter to Garrison brings to mind several of the continuing problems: who is truthful and why do the people involved dissemble when there is no superficial reason for it?

On the face of it, and seemingly voluntarily, Yates wrote Garrison a long letter. Giving no specific reason for the timing of his writing, he several times refers to his reading of the Warren Report. The context is that his reading of the Report inspired the letter. Well, he waited almost three years, which is too long a time in itself to appear likely. Internal evidence is that his reading of WHITEWASH II is the immediate cause, and the internal content of the letter attributes to the Report what is not in it and what is exclusively in WW II. So, on motive, Yates lies. (Example: the FBI showed Odio only old pictures.)

Possibly in other respects Yates is both truthful and forthright, but I am inclined to believe he is holding back at best. Hall did not stay with Yates as long as he did, blabbermouth that Hall is, without saying much more.

There are sharp contradictions between what each says. Here I compare Yates' letter with my lengthy interviews with Hall, of which I presume copies have been read. There is no doubt that Hall is a liar. Some of the contradictions can be resolved against Hall because it was to his interest ti lie about them. (Example: number of times he was in N.O.) But I also feel that some of what Yates is holding back may be significant. Save for one thing, there is nothing in his letter that does not flow from WW II. That is his reference to the taking over of Haiti as a point for attack on Cuba. (And this is of current interest because of the involvement of some of the mercenaries of this group in the current Haitian adventure, as forecast to me by Hemming 10/31/68.) Also, I recall no other reference to the use of Big Pine Key.

In a letter that is as seemingly factual, Yates slips over a few things that would interest me. Example, his place of work and its nature. It is indicated as medical only. Hall said he was an oxygen technician and believed he had worked at Parkland. Another, the nature of his firearms-act conviction. Hall said he was an expert marksman whose garage was loaded with various explosives, who had every conceivable weapon, etc., and was radical-right in orientation.

Yates contradicts Howard also, on his presence in Dallas in September 1963, as I recall Howard's statements to me. He places a man who seems to be Howard there. Deliberately or otherwise, he goes far to confirm WW II, and the immediate question is does he go out of his way to do it, and for a purpose, or is it entirely factual. If Yates is right, there is heavy confirmation of Odio here. One thing that is surprising and pertinent is his emphasis on Hall writing Manolo Ray. This is consistent with the statements and representations made to Odio but inconsistent with Hall's own rightist orientation. His not mailing the letter is consistent with a puton. I find it very ijteresting, either way.

At this point I can do little with it, but I solicit thought and opinion. Does anyone have anything else pertinent?