

RECEIVED  
JUL 16 1996  
FBI

Dear Hal,

7/15/96

This morning a screw fell out of the Hermes. Could not find it but took it for repair. This is a fine Olympia Pill Milk/got-for-me that I wish I could use more easily. I'm used to hitting things that are not the same, don't do the same thing. But it is a blessing!

We do look forward to your coming, when you are at COPA. Which is run by a nut but nice people go there.

Thanks for the enclosures. I've skimmed them and will read them when I can.

I'm sure the ARRB's "well-known researcher" is Lane. But they defined assassination record not to include such records. I had a tussle with them over that. They should disclose the records of what the agencies did to and about critics even though it does not address the crime, for the 1992 Act requires that!

No telling whether COPA will collapse, as you ask! I wonder what keeps it afloat.

Sorry, I have no recollection of the pamphlet you got Lee to do.

I agree with your hunch on why the FBI printed the FPCC leaflet but do not think Banister's prints would have been on any of it. Or that the FBI expected to find his there. The basis the FBI could have had for withholding whose prints they lifted ended with the 1992 Act, privacy. They should be required to disclose that now.

The Chronicle reviews the crappy books still but not any solid works.

So Morley is still hooked on the LaFontaines and their nonsense. So much for reporters being more critical and thinking more clearly!

The Hermes lost that screw when I was on the last page of the last chapter of the book-length manuscript Honorable Man, a work on the Commission lawyers. Wish I could get the retyping done better. The former student who did virtually nothing on the long Mailer manuscript has graduated and is getting a little work done on it. In more than a year she's not done half yet. But I can do no better. I've quite a few such manuscripts done to the degree possible for me now. They'll be a record for the future only, alas. But in time they will exist and to a degree will be available on diskettes. With which I can do nothing. But others can, some others. Best I can now do in any event.

When you are here remind me and I'll show you the extent of that work. Probably greater in volume than I've published.

This is too tiring now. Thanks and best,

-1-

Hal Veeb  
P.O. Box 421815  
S.F., Ca. 94142-1815

July 13, 1996

HAROLD WEISBERG  
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD  
FREDERICK, MD. 21702

Dear Hal:

I do hope everything out your way is O.K.  
It appears that with respect to any news about the JFK case things are really almost at a standstill. About the only thing that comes in fairly regularly is the stuff I get from the Assassination Records Review Board and I find what they do practically worthless. The most recent one says that the ARRB recently obtained documents about a "well known researcher" (in 1964). Although their newsletter doesn't mention the name of this "researcher" it is quite obvious it is Mark Lane. If it is (and even if it isn't) what does this have to do with the assassination event itself??! Lane wasn't present at the time and although he appeared before the Warren Commission what does this have to do with what happened on Nov. 22, 1963? With time fast approaching to 1997 when their mandate runs out even the Warren Commission did better! What a waste of time.

I note that the COPA conference which will

be held in Washington, D.C. in October, 1996 will discuss the ARRB and how it's handled the case so far. Will COPA collapse and touch them with kid gloves?

Despite all this I'm still intending to go to the COPA event. I'm considering doing a paper and a talk which may relate to Oswald and a particular pamphlet he received from the FPCC which was on guerilla training camps in the U.S. (by anti-Castro forces). It was I who persuaded V.T. Lee to publish this particular pamphlet after he provided the information to me. I felt it was necessary to have the information published. I have a copy of this precise pamphlet in its entirety somewhere in my files but haven't been able to locate it. If you'll recall I sent you a xeroxed copy of that pamphlet some time ago. The xerox copy was made from a copy I received from a researcher who had initial difficulty in getting it from the Archives. He finally did get it but a number of pages had blacked out areas. The researcher explained to me that this was due to FBI fingerprint "dusting". Why the Archives at first couldn't locate it I cannot say but I believe the "dusting" occurred prior to the researcher's request for it. The main reason I believe this is that when you go through the WC volumes you'll see evidence of this "dusting" in the FPCC items Oswald owned. It is my belief that the reason the FBI dusted this FPCC material was not to prove that Oswald owned it. They didn't need to know that - it was almost a given. I think the real reason is

that the FBI wanted to know who else besides Oswald handled it. Obviously, since there were no FPCC members in New Orleans it had to be non-members + the obvious candidates would be <sup>Cuban</sup> anti-Castro types. Of course, the possibility exists there could be others besides Cubans. Suppose, for example, a fingerprint identification on any of the FPCC documents turned out to be Guy Banister. Of course, here I'm only speculating, but what if this were the case!

On this "dusting" I would doubt that anyone has filed a Freedom of Information suit to acquire the results of all this fingerprint dusting. On what basis could the FBI results be prevented from being obtained. What could there be in an "official" denial they could cite? Your thoughts on this would be appreciated. I do have my own thoughts on what this entire episode means and it will be, of course, speculative but any input would be welcomed.

Now to get into the clippings and articles you'll find enclosed. Of these I want to call your attention to the book reviews on the Hosty + the La Fontaine's books. Two on the Hosty book appeared in the "Fourth Decade" which are really unimpressive & miss the boat completely. Both got sucked into the Hosty whirlpool he himself created. I also want to call your attention to the "Texas Monthly" letter by Jefferson Morley who is an editor of the Washington Post's "Outlook". You may even know of him. I thought there was a real howler he expressed in his

-4-

letter when he states that the La Fontaine book was "the most persuasive & professional book on the Kennedy assassination since 'Case Closed'".

By the way I wrote a review of both the Hostly + the La Fontaine's books which will appear in a new British journal on the assassination. Unfortunately it won't appear until about October or November, 1986 (in their second issue). I agreed to write an article for their first issue (due any day now) and this was on an interview I did of Roger Craig back in the late 1960's. It deals primarily with Craig's presence when Oswald was being interviewed by Curry. ~~But~~ Oswald allegedly stated that "everyone will know who I am now". Posner in his "Case Closed" tried to show the interview never occurred. Among other things I discuss showing Posner had no basis to assert this as what the Oswald remark meant. When the article appears I'll send you a copy - ditto on the book reviews scheduled for the second issue. For the third issue I've promised an article, "Oswald & the ONI" which I said would be exclusively theirs. That article will be an expansion of a talk I ~~gave~~ gave last year at COPA in Washington. There was much I had to omit from my talk (and paper) couldn't mention because of both time + space limitations.

And finally I want to call your attention to the enclosed review of Oliver Stone's "JFK" film which appeared in a new book, "Past Imperfect." This book goes over the many different films done on historical events or figures by Hollywood.

- 5 -

And, finally, I am definitely planning to attend the COFA conference in Washington this coming October and will be in Washington from Wednesday, October 16<sup>th</sup> through Monday, October 21<sup>st</sup>. The COFA event will run from Oct. 18 to Oct. 20. Perhaps I can come & visit you either Sunday, October 20<sup>th</sup> or Monday, Oct. 21<sup>st</sup> (I'll leave for S.F. on Monday, (evening), Oct. 21<sup>st</sup> so do keep those dates in mind. The hotel I'll be staying at is the Shoreham Hotel (the same one I stayed at in 1994).

Well, that's about all the news for now.  
Do stay in touch!

Best,  
Hal Verb

Copy to H. WEISBERG

that was published in Four Dark Days in History [1963] which shows the shadows, there is a Jack Beers photo taken at about 3:20 published in "Four Days" [1964] that shows the shadows, there is a photo by Robert MacNeil in The Way We Were [1988] that also shows the shadows.) Since we know that the sun was in fact casting the shadows as shown in the photo on page 553, we can know that the Warren Commission Exhibit #715 which is shown on page 525 of P.O.P. is a fake, because there are no shadows on the vertical beam.

CE 715 was presented to the Warren Commission by the FBI as an accurate representation of how the "sniper's nest" looked at about 1:15 PM while the spent rifle shells were still on the floor and before anything was disturbed at the scene. (Lt. Day testified before the Warren Commission that CE 715 was taken before anything was disturbed at the scene.) We can easily discern that CE 715 is a fake and that the FBI and Lt. Day were lying because there are no shadows on the beam. The photo was obviously taken at night, with the daytime street scene on the street below added to give the appearance that it was taken at 1:15 PM. Since CE 715 is a fake photo with some rifle shells lying on the floor, it is obvious that the DPD staged the scene because the shells were picked up and placed in an evidence envelope at 1:23 PM and removed to Police headquarters where they were turned over to the FBI at mid-night. It becomes readily obvious that the DPD was framing Lee Oswald, and the sixth floor "sniper's nest" was nothing more than a stage prop to bolster their lie.

There are many more examples of fakery and deceit that Trask could have seen, if he had simply examined his material with an open mind. Since I feel that Trask is a sincere and honest person, I am sure he would not have offered the opinion that the shots had originated from the SE corner of the sixth floor of the TSBD if he had fairly evaluated the evidence he had gathered.

Though I have criticized Trask because of his inability to perceive the fakery and deception, and for presenting false information as a fact, I am still grateful that he published his book and provided us

with so much new information.

-Walt Cakebread, P.O. Box 514  
Denair, CA 95316

To the editor: I was pleased to read Hal Verb's article regarding his rebuttal to Alex Cockburn in San Francisco (TFD, Sept. '95). I myself confronted the very same "leftist" Cockburn at a similar appearance in Los Angeles on July 12, as part of the same book tour. Hal and I discussed our experiences vs. Cockburn at the October '95 COPA conference at the Washington, D.C. Shoreham Hotel.

My discussion resulted from Cockburn's avoidance of a pointed question from researcher and CTKA's PROBE co-editor Lisa Pease regarding the ubiquitous "magic bullet." Cockburn declined my invitation to demonstrate how a shot fired from above and to the right rear of the President could enter the back (as is clearly evidenced by the autopsy photos, shirt and coat), and then exit Kennedy's throat, which would require reversal of the obviously downward trajectory from the Depository window. Cockburn labeled my proposed demonstration as "foolish."

Similar to Hal's experience, some others in the audience felt I had been too harsh on poor Alex. I pointed out to them my copy of Warner's JFK, The Book of the Film, which printed numerous critiques of Oliver Stone's film, including several articles by Cockburn, among them the Liebelier interview mentioned by Hal and another in which Alex called Stone a fascist.

Our brief confrontation reminded me of another, in 1993. As President of my Rotary Club, I took the opportunity to invite critics Jim DiEugenio and Dennis Effle to speak at two of our weekly meetings. To be fair, I also hosted Warren Commission staffer Richard Mosk, who like Liebelier, is a west-side (of LA) lawyer and Book of the Film critic of Stone. (His father, Stanley Mosk, still sits on the California Supreme Court.) After Mosk's speech, I invited questions from the floor. To maintain neutrality appropriate for my role at host, I waited until all had had their shots. Though most questions were critical, Mr. Mosk answered patiently, if a bit eruditely.

Finally, I had my chance, and I asked a pointed query as to why he felt DA Jim Garrison, and therefore Stone, were lunatics to think Oswald had a connection to the intelligence community through Clay Shaw when so much documentation later revealed Shaw's ties thereto, including the Permindex CMC records and Richard Helms' admission that Shaw had worked for CIA's Domestic Contacts Division. Mosk briefly stammered something about this all being a "figment of Garrison's imagination." When I pressed my point that, even if Garrison had a vivid imagination, he could not manufacture corporate records or put words in the former CIA director's mouth, Mr. Mosk, brilliant west-side law partner and son of a state high court justice, who had earlier bragged of attending Rose Bowl games in the 60's with Earl Warren, nervously glanced at his watch and announced he had to leave. He promptly did just that, leaving a benumbed audience of Rotarians and guests, all now thoroughly convinced that something serious was being hidden from them by this august guest and the Warren Commission he had attempted to defend.

The point is, my friends, supporters of the lone-nut theory will more often than not retreat swiftly or refuse a challenge to demonstrate their purported beliefs if we take the time to intelligently confront them. As dedicated researchers and searchers for truth, it is our duty to prepare ourselves to do so, and to take advantage of every opportunity we have to do just that. Kudos to Hal Verb.

—Arthur Pineda, 1609 Cedar Ave.  
Long Beach, CA 90813

## CORRECTING A COMMONLY HELD MYTH

by  
Arthur A. Swanson

I wish to put to rest the erroneous belief that Sgt. Gerald Hill made the radio call which identified the shell casings found at the site of the Tippit killing as coming from an automatic pistol, not from a revolver.

Many respected researchers and authors are still working with that mistaken belief. It is important to correct the record because Sgt. Hill has appeared on at least one nationally known TV program and said that he was "in error" when he made the call at 1:40 p.m.

He did NOT make the call, so how can impeach that evidence?

There are two versions of a "transcript" of the calls in the WC volumes. Both are very suspect and at least one has been shown to have been altered before publication in the volumes. Therefore it is very dicey to use either for the solution of this matter.

One should refer to Sgt. Hill's own testimony given to the Commission. This appears in Vol. 7, pp. 43-66.

Go to page 57:

*Mr. Belin: And the first one you made after you got in the car was 1:52 p.m.?*

*Mr. Hill: Yes, sir.*

*Mr. Belin: Now also turning to Sawyer Deposition Exhibit A, I note that there is another call on car 550-2. Was that you at the time, or not, at 1:40 p.m.? Would that have been somebody else?*

*Mr. Hill: That probably is R.D. Stringer.*

*Mr. Belin: That is not you, then, even though it has a number 550-2?*

*Mr. Hill: Yes, because Stringer quite probably would have been using the same call number,*

Arthur A. Swanson  
412 Midway Island  
Clearwater, FL 34630