

Hal Verb,

12/5/94

This was one of the four days I've been driven to Johns ^{yearly}Hopkins for regular check-ups. Today's was urological and good. But the trip alone tires us both and Lil has had to take a nap. The mail was heavy and I'll not get to all of it today but I did go over all the valuable info you sent to get an idea of what it is and I read your letter and your statement, and I'll read the rest when I can. But it already tells me that I'll have to find more space for AARRB info.

If I forgot to make copies and include the AARRB/Woolsey letters remind me. I can't think of standing today, my legs are in that shape. If I can get Lil to do it it will be enclosed.

One of the reasons I rush this is the off chance that you hear from AARRB about the Oswald security clearance. Your recollection is not the same as mine on some of it.

I do not recall that the KNEW caller-in said he was with LHO at El Toro. Could have said it but I do not recall that. Nor do I about that CIA assignment overseas.

I'm sure I have the Three ~~Lat~~ Doctors story but do not think I have the Three Latimers.

The KNEW show was mid-December, 1966, my first trip out there, and I was in the studio with Dolan. You were in the control room. When they took a break for a commercial you told me about the caller, I asked you to ask him to wait, and when the show was over I spoke to him from the control room.

He did not mention any clearance other than Crypto. We both learned later that Top Secret is a prerequisite. I did when I left there, in LA. The man did say black box stuff but that is not what the officer under whom Oswald worked said, as I quote him in O in NO.

In your letter you quote someone who overheard Graff say to Hall, in a low voice, not ~~me~~ to be heard, "Well, lets get this show on the road, other wise we'll be here all evening listening to this garbage."

I've not ^{yet} read the Marrs article you enclose but how many of them do there have to be to justify the description of a prejudiced man to begin with that they spout garbage? I regret it is probably true of much too much of what they've heard. Those people are an enormous handicap. They really are subject-matter ignoramuses. ~~Marrs~~ ^{even on} Marrs is of his supposed specialty, the so-called mysterious deaths. They are a curse we all bear, they are not unknown and to poison the minds they are always heard.

Before I tackle the rest of the mail, a word more about Hopkins. I had prostate surgery locally in 1986. Since then I've been a Hopkins patient on it, the local guy that bad. For several years I went there once a month. Then a new medication and new test came along, the test PSA and the medication Proscar. The latter is now being used in a massive test to see if it prevents prostate cancer. The PSA is a need of all men in the prostate problem age and the Proscar seems to be working very well. I do not go back for a year

PAGE (OF 4)

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

(SAT) 12-3-94

HAROLD WEISBERG
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD
FREDERICK, MD. 21702

Dear Hal:

I'm rushing this letter out so that I can beat the time the post office closes today. I may not be able to do this as I've enclosed a big amount of reworked items as part of this letter which will have to be done first. (I would've listed all the enclosures but that would take too long & it might make me miss my post office deadline.

This letter will relate solely to the AARB & the recent hearings in both Washington & Dallas both of which I attended. I tried to testify at the Washington hearings but speakers were cut off there as the hearings ran over time. I did, however, testify at the Dallas (11/18/94) hearings. (I'm enclosing a copy of that to which I testified to & I intend typing this & sending a copy of it to the AARB.

By the way, before I forget - can you send me a copy of the Woolsey letter & the Craff letters. It should tie in with what I testified.

To briefly tell you about my Dallas testimony (of 11/18/94) first - you'll note the news article in the hearing. They didn't mention my name (not that I expected them to) but I think what I had to say was far more important than the silly statements of Mann & others.

My testimony (as you'll see from the enclosed) related to my

(and your appearance) on the Lee Dolan Dec. 1996 radio show & the caller who phoned in to tell of Oswald's crypto plus his ~~etc~~ CIA visits for a presumed "mission" overseas.

After I testified Graff asked me, "Mr. Vent - what is crypto-secret clearance? And I told him (as part of my answer - which, of course, not in the stuff I'm sending) that I spoke with a (retired) U.S. Army General who was an aide to JFK. I asked him if he knew of "crypto" & he said - yes - that you couldn't get it unless you had "~~TOP SECRET~~" first. (What I didn't tell the ARRB was that the General I spoke to was at ATSDG/ & worked with the CIA but not when Oswald was there). I then told Graff that "crypto" had to do with "black box" stuff dealing with A-bombs & SAC in case of atomic attack & ended it there. But I added (after a while when the press fell asleep) that just before I came to Dallas I received a phone call from someone who alleged that he replaced Oswald at EL two. I told Graff that I intended to contact this person & go over more in detail about "crypto" etc. & I left it at that.

Little did I know that the one who called me was actually there in the audience & he testified shortly after I did. He told the board that - yes - he was the one who called & while not testifying about the crypto, etc. he discussed the Z-film & his theories on it (He's become a "buff" & most of his theories on it are half-baked). I had no idea he would be there but he told me he saved up enough money to attend "ASK" & see me. It would be too long to go into here but we did discuss the crypto stuff. Show on that in a later letter.

Not one board member asked this fellow a single question about the crypto, etc nor did the press prance upon him. I would've (I did, of course).

As this letter is about the ~~1988~~ you'll note the enclosure ~~is~~ relating to it.

On your phone call you said that it was G. G. G. & Marwell who attended the COA conference but I corrected this. They were Tankin & Marwell. It wasn't G. G. G. who corrected himself at COA (in Washington) about Posner, it was Marwell. When asked a question about why Marwell had stated publicly that he had found Posner's book compelling or convincing (or words to that effect) he replied, yes, he had made such a comment but now stated, "I've read up a lot more since on this case & I would not have now made such a statement." Marwell also said he had found faulty stuff in Posner's German research (I presume this was Hitler's Children book as you indicated in your phone call & not the Myra case).

Incidentally in the papers I'm enclosing there are a list of names of people who testified at both Washington & Dallas. But both lists are incomplete. There were additional sign ups at both hearings & no listing of these were printed. The Dallas article like nearly everything else in the article of 11/19/84 got the number of people wrong (they said 20 but it was 23 - I have the records on who & what was said). If the Dallas paper can't even get the number of speakers present while they are there why should we expect them to get the number of bullets in the Toll case right (single bullet, three shots)!! Especially when they weren't even there!!!

Now, on my appearance at the Dallas AERS Hearing (11/18/94) there is one more interesting thing that happened which was told to me in the strictest of confidence. The contents of what you about to tell you was told by my source OK to be revealed, but I was never to reveal the name.

After the testimony was all over & the Board was about to leave one of the persons who testified overheard Graff to say to Hall in a low voice not to be heard aloud = "Well, let's get this show on the road, otherwise, we'll be ~~here~~ here all evening listening to this garbage."

There's a lot more to say, but it could be that with all the zering I'll be doing this letter won't be mailed on 12/3 but on 12/5.

One final question = I have copies of these two articles & wondered if you have them. If you don't, sure them I'll send them to you in my next letter. These are =

(1) A report by three Latimers in "The Kennedy Connally Case Ballet Theory" — MEDICAL TIMES — NOVEMBER, 1974

(2) TEXAS STATE JOURNAL OF MEDICINE on "THREE PATIENTS" — JANUARY, 1964

Also, my next letter I'll send you my update on my file on Korth. Plenty of stuff here & worth noting!

Best,

Hal Ver-

Letter to WEINBERG

TO BE DELIVERED AT HEADQUARTERS (REVIEW BOARD)
10 AM - NOV. 18, 1994 - DALLAS

MEMBERS OF THE ASSASSINATION REVIEW BOARD

I will
send
copy
to the
press

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 THIS EVENT & THAT IS, PRECISELY, THE ACCUSED ASSASSIN, LEE HARVEY OSWALD, & 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, THIS UNRESOLVED QUESTION OF OSWALD'S TIES TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT LOOMS LARGE &, INDEED, HANGS LIKE THE PROVERBIAL DAMOCLES SWORD OVER ALL OF US, GOVERNMENT CONNECTED OR NOT.

I REALIZE FULLY WELL THAT VIRTUALLY NO GOVERNMENT REVEALS ITS AGENTS OR ITS OPERATIONS BUT IN THE MATTER OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S DEATH THIS QUESTION CAN NO LONGER BE IGNORED & THE LONGER IT IS AVOIDED THE GREATER THE HARM 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
I APPEARED ON IN DECEMBER, 1966 WHICH WAS
SEVERAL HOURS LONG & CONCERNED THE KENNEDY
MURDER. I WAS IN THE RADIO STATION STUDIO
(OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA) & THE OTHER HALF OF THE
PROGRAM WAS A TELEPHONE HOOKUP TO MARYLAND
WITH AUTHOR HAROLD WEISBERG.

AT THE END OF THE PROGRAM THE PROGRAM
MODERATOR RECEIVED A CALL FROM AN INDIVIDUAL
WHO DID NOT WANT TO BE HEARD ON THE RADIO &
WHO STATED HE WISHED TO SPEAK ONLY TO MR.
WEISBERG, CONFIDENTIALLY.

I WAS ABLE TO HEAR THE ENTIRE DISCUSSION
OF THE PHONE CALL FROM THE INDIVIDUAL WHO W-
SISTED ON REMAINING ANONYMOUS.

THE REST OF THE PHONE CALL WAS THIS- THE
CALLER HAD BEEN A SARAACKS ROOMMATE OF OSWALD
WHEN OSWALD WAS STATIONED AT EL TORO MARINE BASE,
CALIFORNIA. THE CALLER STATED THAT ABOUT 2 WEEKS
BEFORE OSWALD RECEIVED HIS ALLEGED "HARD SHIP" DISCHARGE,
HE WAS CONSTANTLY IN THE C.I.D. HEADQUARTERS
BEING BRIEFED FOR A MISSION OVERSEAS. THE CALLER
~~THE CALLER~~ ALSO PROVIDED THE INFORMATION THAT
OSWALD HAD HAD A CRYPTO-SECRET CLEARANCE.

I RAISE THIS MATTER BECAUSE IF, INDEED,
THE C.I.D. WAS INVOLVED IN SUCH AN EVENT, IT
WOULD NECESSARILY FOLLOW THAT THE O.N.I. MOST

CERTAINLY WAS AWARE OF THIS.

I MENTION O.N.I. BECAUSE SPECULATIONS IN THE LITERATURE (NEVER PROVEN) HAVE POINTED TO OSWALD BEING CONNECTED WITH IN SOME CAPACITY WITH O.N.I.

RECENTLY PROFESSOR JOHN NEWMAN WHO HAS BEEN LOOKING INTO THIS MATTER HAS STATED THAT A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF O.N.I. FILES (RELATIVE TO JFK) HAVE BEEN DESTROYED. THERE ARE STILL REMAINING, HOWEVER, AT LEAST, 2 BOXES OF O.N.I. FILES STILL TO BE GONE THROUGH.

I BELIEVE IT IS INCUMBENT UPON THE BOARD TO REACH A FAIRLY DEFINITIVE DETERMINATION AS TO WHY, WHEN & HOW THESE O.N.I. FILES WERE DESTROYED & WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY. SINCE O.N.I. FILES NECESSARILY INVOLVED THE NAVY DEPARTMENT IT APPEARS EVIDENT THAT THOSE INDIVIDUALS FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY & IMMEDIATELY BELOW BE ASKED ABOUT THE ISSUES & POINTS RAISED IN MY STATEMENT TODAY.

IF THIS IS NOT DONE HISTORY WILL NOT BE SERVED & THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL, ONCE AGAIN, AS IN PRIOR INVESTIGATIONS, BE THE ULTIMATE LOSERS.

RESPECTFULLY YOURS,

HAL VERB