

Hal Verb
PO Box 421815
San Francisco, CA 94142

11/7/95

Dear Hal,

I appreciate that fat package in today's mail. We got it late and I'm deep in reading some retyping for which I want to keep tomorrow's early-morning hours free. So I may not in the morning get to reading and correcting my letter to Marwell I'll enclose, or this. But I did read your letter immediately, did get you testimony and did write Marwell ² ~~me~~ + think that may suit the purpose for which you asked my experiences.

I'll read the other enclosures when I can. I'm glad to get them all. Thanks!

I had forgotten that you sent me what you intended saying. But being able to quote the transcript is better. *and using the file cabinets is a problem.*

I do agree that the seeming suspect as that Marine probably wasn't.

The other three with that high clearance were the other three who handled that particular radar work and who went to Biloxi with Oswald and Schram. Probably identified in the testimony. I've forgotten.

You and others ought remember that the board has no mandate to investigate the assassination. Its mandate is ^{only} to bring existing records to light.

Don Gibson is a friend who has done and is doing fine work. His book *Battling Wall Street* (Sheridan Square) is a fine job.

I did not ^{begin} ~~begin~~ NEVER AGAIN! with Rostow's connection with creation of the Commission. I began with the decision not to investigate the crime itself. While I believe Rostow was involved in that, may even have thought it up, there is no ~~is~~ evidence of that so I did not say it. That part does not deal with the creation of the WC.

I do not remember the name Gene Case.

ARRB has no need to question Rowland or Hoffman. Their role is limited to existing records, getting them out.

So you learned that Baden is what I said he is in NEVER AGAIN! He knew what was wanted of him and he did it.

Glad you threw your cold. Hope you have gotten a flu shot. You should yearly.

Your telling me is the first I knew that Gary spoke about me, If I'd known I'd have thanked him.

Again thanks,

Jal

11/8/95 AT this juncture I think articles like Ian Griggs on ~~Captain~~ Captain Westbrook serve on purpose and have no real value except in suggesting the most improbable conspiracies and basis for further inquiry. On the other hand, there are worthwhile projects in basic areas, like yours, Doug's and Kathy Cunningham's.

However, I do love that Max Holland politicization from the fight to which he seems to have turned and I expect to add a chapter on that to Inside. I've not finished reading it but I'm highlighting it as I read. Including while I was on the physical therapist's table, on my left side, while he shot electronic shocks into my right hip. *I think Holland* He was here when he and Kai Bird began their planned joint book on McCloy that he seems to have abandoned and Bird did. *do* So he knows what I have and how conveniently some of it is arranged, including in the "subject" file. He knows also what I have published, the fact of it if not the content, if he writes in ignorance of it that is his reflection of his scholarship.

Do you know anyone at Rolling Stone or anyone with a connection to it or a publication like it? I think they could get interested in what I'll do. *with Holland*

And if you have what the cover advertised, their article on how the budgets and debt got where they are, I think I'd enjoy that very much!

H

-1-

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

11-4-95

HAROLD WEISBERG
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD
FREDRICK, MD. 21702

Dear Hal =

I had intended to write you just as soon as I returned from the "COPA" event but, unfortunately, I developed a cold which kept me from keeping up on things and from writing to you. I'm a lot better now but the cold did hamper my activities a bit.

I received your 3 letters & I'll respond to some of the questions you asked me in them & then I'll give you my evaluation of the "COPA" conference plus I'll enclose a number of items which, of course, are yours to keep and I'll add whatever comments I can to the enclosed items.

First, let me answer some of the questions you asked in your letters =

(1) Joe Baehes told you about my testimony to the ARRB last November 1994 & apparently told you that (to Tunheim I had discussed the caller to the 1966 KQIA show (of Dolan) where he discussed the "crypto" thing. This is partly true - I was asked not by Tunheim but by Marwell to see if I could provide the name of the caller. I told Marwell that this whole aspect was "confidential" but that I'd discuss it with you, Hal, before releasing the name. But, again, it was

Marwell & ~~not~~ Tanheim who asked me for the name. You may recall that last year I sent you a hand-written copy of what I would speak in (in Dallas in 1994). Perhaps you ~~had~~ had forgotten that, I sent this to you. In any event, I've enclosed the official transcript of my testimony so you can look it over more thoroughly. It differs slightly from my hand-written talk &, of course, included the questions asked me by Graf (he asked me "what is crypto" & he once did code work for the U.S. in World War II).

You'll recall our conversation when I visited you in Frederick on my trip. I gave you the name of the person I believed was the caller based on my looking into the matter. Well, I have news for you regarding the name. When I was on my trip to Washington, a woman friend of mine looked into the whole matter & based on her information I've now concluded that the name I thought it was & which I gave you (& my lady friend) cannot be the caller. Here's what happened - I had given the name to a woman friend of mine whom I trust absolutely with very confidential names or information. She is an avid reader of books, magazines, & newspapers. When I gave the name of this "caller" I told my lady friend that I had learned that the "caller" had died but if, by chance, she came across the name to let me know. She did come across the name! There was an article in a local newspaper mentioning that name & the article mentioned that the son of the alleged

"caller" was involved in some "cause". Using an alias, my lady friend called up pretending to be a friend of the "cause" in which the son was involved. My lady friend didn't speak to the son but to his wife. After some discussion of the "cause" my lady friend just point blank asked the wife if she knew of Oswald in any way. She said - no - she didn't. She (my lady friend) then asked if there was anyone in the family who knew Oswald & again the answer was - no. Finally she asked if her husband's father was in the Marine Corps & she, again, said - no - & that no member of the family was ever in the Marine Corps.

After all this I concluded that my choice for the caller was wrong (I based it on a list of people attendees a convention). Obviously my wrong choice doesn't mean the "caller" doesn't exist & he is still out there. Unless the wife is lying about the father being in the Marines (& I can see no reason for her doing this) it simply isn't the person I thought was the caller.

I know that when I gave you the name you said it sounded "familiar" but it appears I'm in error on the choice of the name - do you agree?

The only other thing I can think of is that since the caller maintained Oswald had "crypto" & there were only 5 such in the outfit, the caller could well be one of the 5. This would rule out, of course, both Oswald & Schrand but who are the other 3?? Is there a list or way of obtaining these 3 names & if I'm correct I can check on those names to see if any of the three lived in the Bay Area in 1966. Joe Lolan's program was not

a national radio show & was only heard in the Bay Area so the caller lived in this area. I could be wrong about the caller being one of the 5 but it occurred to me after I no longer concluded I had the right person's name & was in error. Do you think this a plausible way to proceed? Let me know.

(2) In one of your letters you cited a "USA today" story on John Newman or Carver Gayton. I don't recall the name though you said you did work on it in 1970. It could be in my files but I've no recollection of the name.

(3) In one of your letters you requested a copy of the letter I sent to "PUBLISHER'S OFFICE" on why they didn't review "NEVER AGAIN!". I received no reply from them & I'm enclosing a copy of the letter I sent to them.

(4) In your most recent letter you asked me if I had any information to the effect that Mailer gave as one of his reasons for not showing up at the recent "COFA" was his fear that you'd be there to receive your award.

I have no information to that at all & I don't recall anything like that being discussed either by Aguilar (who gave the speech honoring you) nor by Walt Brown who provided details on his conversation with Mailer on the "rules" Mailer laid down before he would attend "COFA". Of course, Mailer could've told Brown this on the phone (Mailer being unwilling to be there when you received the award) but, if so, only Brown could tell you. Brown told me at "COFA" that he became so exasperated at Mailer's "conditions" that he decided not to have Mailer come.

The previous (4) questions I've answered as best I can & now I'll discuss a few other points.

I note you said that Breo & Hosty are coming out with books on the JFK. I knew about Hosty but had no idea Breo was. Any idea on what he'll cover (undoubtedly the medical but anything else??).

And speaking of books there is Max Holland coming out with a book on the Warren Commission. Towards that end, I'm enclosing a copy of a November, 1995 "American Heritage" article by Holland. I'm already drafting a letter in reply to the article and want to complete it as quickly as possible.

Again, mentioning articles - I'm working on a long article to appear in the "Bay Guardian" newspaper. It is an "alternative" style paper, far from radical, but I know the editor (he ~~was~~ once offered me a job after seeing my Berkeley Barb articles) & he suggested I do something on the JFK case.

Here is my thinking on this. I'd like to do an article on the AARB - a short history - its hearings (to include my testimony) - the criticism the AARB has received not otherwise known of & not appearing in the assassination journals. I would appreciate it if you could send me a statement on your reaction to how the AARB has handled itself & particularly how it did (or didn't) react to what you ask they look into (I know, of course, from what you've written that they've done nothing). I will also mention in the Guardian article my frank analysis of what took place in "COPA" (Yes - there was a lot of ~~stuff~~

"Crazy" stuff being peddled by various speakers but there were moments which I thought were important (the best examples were Don Gibson (who, incidentally, agrees with your hypothesis of the Rostow connection to the Warner Commission set-up) & Gene Case who did a brilliant analysis of the Z-film confirming the first shot evidence & refers to your "blue analysis" approach. Case is a man you should know of (he may have already been in touch with you). You'll see the abstract republished in what I've enclosed. I've enclosed the whole abstract issue so you can look through it. To me the most important abstracts in these are (you should read these before you read the others) = Randy Robertson (various abstracts); The Snyders; GENE CASE; BRAD LAERKE (various abstracts); Gary Aguilar, Don Gibson & also look at my abstract on "Oswald as a U.S. Intelligence Agent - the Evidence".

These are, of course, the usual crazy abstracts. I would cite here the John Armstrong (theory that Oswald developed as an agent from age 11); Lenty (that the Z-film was altered); Vince Palamara (Secret Service "involvement") & a few others I could cite but you'll see for yourself.

Finally, to close out this long letter I'll just mention a few points about the enclosures = I've enclosed the press release copies which I picked up at the AFRB Hearing in Washington

on Monday October 23rd. I met the investigator ~~agent~~ handling the photographic evidence for the ABB. His name is David R. Montague. Keep that name in your file. He had a copy of the CCONTE Daley Plaza map which was given to him by a staff member of the ABB to whom I sent a copy some time back.

I sat down with Montague & discussed who he should seek out. Groden was there & so was Joe Bakes. Groden said Arnold ~~Bob~~ Rowland, Ed Hoffman & one other should be queried.

I suggested that the FBI agents in the Dallas field office at the time of the ass'n should be interviewed. I told Montague I'd send a list. I also told him that I had names of persons not on my listing who should be contacted. I also suggested the Paschall film be re-evaluated for anything on Barnett. I suggested that Ernie Brandt be contacted (he's the one I discovered in 1993) & can be seen in both the Z-film & Wilhoit. Brandt had a friend with him (Templin) who's never been interviewed & I suggested he be talked to.

Montague seemed eager & listened. I intend writing him very soon. If you have any ideas on this, let me know.

I'll close now but I want to mention one

f

last incident which occurred at COPA:

I had an opportunity to question Michael Baden (one of the panelists). Questions were in the form of ~~printed~~ ^{written} card queries. I asked him: "In your experience, or in the experience of anyone else you know, have you ever seen any evidence of damage done to a skull leaving 30 to 40 shivers pieces of bullet fragments from a military jacketed bullet?" His answer avoided the impact of why I asked that question & all he ~~said~~ said was - "We didn't have any experience with military jacketed bullets since we had no information on wounding ~~was~~ taking place in military combat!" (An ARRB staffer who was sitting ~~in front~~ front of me whom I know quite well, turned around to me & said "Hal - he didn't answer your question. There was a smile on the staffer's face as if to say & "we know why he couldn't answer because to answer would've shown that the HSCA version was a ridiculous position & they knew it).

Well, must get this in the mail!

Best,
Hal

Comm. To = H. WEINBERG

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ASSASSINATION RECORDS REVIEW BOARD

PUBLIC HEARING

Federal Building
1100 Commerce
Room 7A23
Dallas, Texas

Friday, November 18, 1994

The above-entitled proceedings commenced, pursuant to notice,
at 10:00 a.m., John R. Tunheim, chairman, presiding.

Are there questions for Dr. Aguilar?

[No response.]

CHAIRMAN TUNHEIM: Thank you. We appreciate your testimony today.

MR. AGUILAR: Thank you very much.

MR. MARWELL: Mr. Hal Verb.

CHAIRMAN TUNHEIM: Mr. Verb, we didn't have you on the list ahead of time. Could you spell your name for the record?

MR. VERB: Yes, my name is Hal, H-a-l, and the last name is Verb, that is like pronoun, subject, V-e-r-b.

CHAIRMAN TUNHEIM: Go ahead, sir. Thank you.

MR. VERB: I am from San Francisco. I am a private researcher. I have been conducting research for about 30 years, in fact, almost from the very first day of the assassination because it was a tremendous event in American history, still unresolved in my mind, and still unresolved in the minds of most of the American public. That is why I am here, and that is why you are here.

I am here as a private citizen who is deeply concerned to know the full truth about the assassination of President Kennedy. Today I wish to call attention to a serious question that has long lingered about the event, and that is precisely the accused assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, and his alleged association, connection or involvement with the U.S. Government as a possible agent for an agency or agencies that represented the U.S. Government.

Regardless of whether one believes or asserts that there was no conspiracy or there was a conspiracy, the unresolved question of Oswald's ties to the U.S. Government looms large and, indeed, hangs over us like the proverbial Damocles sword, and that is over all of us, including the U.S. Government, whether the U.S. Government is in any way connected or not.

Now I realize fully well that virtually no government reveals its agents or its methods of operations, but in the matter of the President Kennedy's death this question can no longer be ignored, and the longer it is avoided the greater the harm that will befall us all.

To focus the attention of the Review Board more closely in this regard, I specifically call your attention to a radio program that I appeared on in December 1966 which was several hours long and concerned the Kennedy murder. I was in the radio station studio, this was in Oakland, California, and the other half of the program was a telephone hook-up to a Maryland writer and researcher Harold Weisberg who had written and began a series of books called Whitewash, the Whitewash series.

At the end of the program, the program moderator received a call from an individual who did not wish to be heard on the radio, and who stated he wished to speak only to Mr. Weisberg confidentially. Now I was able to hear the contents of this discussion, the entire discussion between Mr. Weisberg and

the caller, and the phone call from the individual who insisted that he not be identified and who wanted to remain anonymous. In fact, Weisberg asked the individual if you desire to come forward, you always know how to reach me, but this individual never did step forward.

I am going to go into what the nature of this call was. The gist of the phone call was this. The caller had been a barracks roommate of Lee Harvey Oswald who was stationed at El Toro Marine Corps Base in California. The caller stated that about two weeks before Oswald received his so-called alleged hardship discharge, which is all over the record, can be established, he was constantly in the CID Headquarters being briefed for a mission overseas. The caller provided the information that Oswald also had a crypto secret clearance.

Now I raise this matter because if, indeed, the CID was involved in such an event -- I am not here to state flatly that they did engage in this, I don't know, I want the evidence to be presented -- it would necessarily follow that the ONI, which is the Office of Naval Intelligence, must certainly have been aware of this. It just boggles my mind.

I at one time served in an intelligence section during the Korean War, and it is impossible for me to believe that the CID could not have had in some way connection or approval by the ONI.

Now I mention ONI because there is a lot of speculation in the literature, some of which you may have read, you may not have, and none of this speculation has proven to be final, and this speculation is pointing to Oswald being connected in some capacity with the ONI. Other writers will suggest FBI, CIA, my concern here is with the ONI.

Recently Professor John Newman, who has appeared I believe at the last hearing, he has been looking into this matter, and has stated that a significant portion of the ONI files relative to JFK have been destroyed. There are still remaining, however, at least two boxes of ONI files that still have to be gone through. I have not, myself, seen these so I do not know what the nature of those files consist of. I believe it is incumbent upon this Board to reach a fairly definitive determination as why, when and how these ONI files were destroyed and whose responsibility it was for the destruction.

Since ONI files necessarily involve the Navy Department, it appears evident that those individuals from the Secretary of the Navy on downward, and those immediately below charged with their necessary responsibilities be asked precisely about the issues and points raised in my statement today.

If this is not done, history will not be served, and the American people will once again, as in prior investigations, be the ultimate losers. Respectfully, that is my -- I will be willing to send you this entire statement in a letter which I will forward to the Board, and I will answer any questions that you have about this.

CHAIRMAN TUNHEIM: Thank you, Mr. Verb.

Any questions?

DR. GRAFF: What do you mean, Mr. Verb, by crypto security clearance?

MR. VERB: Well, a crypto secret clearance has to do, as the caller explained -- I didn't get into it further. Actually crypto secret clearance is mentioned in the Warren Commission documents, in its actual Warren Commission volumes. I found that out after having looked into it. You can find them.

Crypto secret clearance is a very specialized high security clearance that very, very few people would obtain in any capacity, and it is interesting to note that at this time while Oswald was in the Marine Corps he was receiving "Communist literature," so you have a pro-Communist, Marxist having crypto secret clearance.

I talked to a General who was an aide to President Kennedy, who accompanied President Kennedy, I asked him about crypto secret clearance. He knew about it. He said, I have not confirmed this, that the only way that you could obtain crypto secret clearance is that you had first top secret clearance. Crypto secret clearance had to do with black box stuff, which is the information provided on atomic warhead missiles in case of atomic attack. I understand the Strategic Air Command has the capacity for this kind of information. I don't know precisely the nature of it, I haven't looked into it further.

But I have spoken to people who have had crypto secret clearance, many people, in fact, that I have spoken to who have pretty much asserted that what I have learned through this broadcast and other means turns out to be fairly accurate, and I only go by what I can document. I am not interested in speculation. I do not go by hearsay to the extent that I simply believe every single theory. I want documentation to prove what can be clearly set in the record and determined to be the truth.

DR. HALL: Have you made requests of the United States Government?

MR. VERB: No, I have not. I have not. In fact, I have never issued a single FOIA request in the years that I have been doing this, although I have relied on other FOIA requests from other -- not necessarily connected with this particular issue, but I have interviewed people who would have been in a position to know precisely what this kind of clearance was, and the nature of ONI and related matters.

DR. HALL: Well, the issue that you raise, of course, is one that goes to the availability or the destruction of materials held by the United States Government.

MR. VERB: Exactly.

DR. HALL: May I ask why you decided or have foregone the opportunity to use the Freedom of Information Act?

MR. VERB: To be quite honest, I am primarily involved in so many other areas. My area that I have been looking into is the photographic evidence, and that takes an enormous amount of time. I write letters and receive letters.

In fact, I should mention one important thing that may go to the heart of the matter. I recently received a call from a person who took Oswald's place in the Marine Corps in his very position after he left and went to Soviet Russia. I hope to be in communication with this person to find out precisely what the nature, if he knows anything at all, about crypto secret clearance.

So my answer would be, I simply have not had the time to do this. If you have been involved in this case, it is very time consuming. I have a full-time job during the day. I am not a member of any particular group or organization, nobody is sponsoring me. All the money I have put into this basically simply because I desire the truth, and I think justice will be served if the truth is known.

DR. HALL: I do think it is the case that part of what the Board is interested in is the efficacy and efficiency of the Freedom of Information Act as it relates to this matter, so my questions are directed to that issue and not directed necessarily to your personal capacity.

MR. VERB: I understand that. Right.

CHAIRMAN TUNHEIM: Other questions?

[No response.]

MR. VERB: Thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN TUNHEIM: Thank you, Mr. Verb. We appreciate your being here today.

MR. MARWELL: Mr. Thomas Meros.

MR. MEROS: Thank you very much.

MR. MARWELL: Could you please just state and spell your name for the record?

MR. MEROS: Yes, my last name is Meros, M-e-r-o-s. I live and work in Cleveland, Ohio, and over the years I have been coming to Dallas, Texas, and the first opportunity I had to bring my teenage children was May of '92.

In May of '92, I took my children into the Old Courthouse. We were walking around, and I was trying to find the courtroom where Jack Ruby was tried. Somebody told me that that room was locked, it was disassembled and it became a storage room. Well, the lady that told me that told me that she had been at the Ruby trial and she would be glad to talk to my children about that trial.

So we went into her office and she told my children a story that I videotaped. For a half-hour I listened to this story. She told me -- her name is Dee McCarell, M-c-C-a-r-e-l-l -- she is presently the administrative assistant for Judge Nicky Deshazo in the probate court here in Dallas.