

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

10/18/93

Dear Hal,

Hasty response to your 10/19. Shorter than it would be because I've just finished reading and correcting Chapter 30 and I'm very tired.

I'm glad to get that Carroll puff piece because I mislaid the retrieval system copy I was given and in rereading it saw something I missed that I can use.

You may have something with Belin. I'm going to put this in a Posner file because of it. The book is full of unattributed sources and some of it could be from Belin. What could have gone sour is Posner finding out that he was given crap.

There are other indications of pre-arrangements for him *Posner the prof.*

I had not heard of Lorenz and Vanity Fair but Lane could have ghosted it and "hunder's Mouth" Press made money from him. Maybe Stone can do something with that sick-headed woman. I'd not heard of that, either. I've also not seen the Atlantic and Russo. I did hear that a former KGB has a book. Whatever Scott's source, I do not believe that Oswald would have gone into any embassy with a weapon or that if he did it could or would have been kept quiet all these years.

At Failure Analysis write Dr. Angela Meyer. She replied to me and told me to tell my friend to write her, that she did not get the letter. I did not give your name and they are referring the letters to her to answer.

I know nothing about former SA O'Maley. I think Buck Revill went to Dallas only in recent years, from Washington. James Gale is the name of the assistant director who was the Inspector General. I do not recall ever hearing of a function "cover agent." I did know that Gemberling was back on a per diem fee to respond years ago and then left. I've not heard that he is back again. I have no reason to believe that the kind of file he says was opened on Oswald existed. He is referring to an informer on probation. What he told you is the Ruby actuality. I don't recall a cop named Kenneth but there was an FBI Dallas supervisor of that name, Howe. One of those disciplined. As of now I think he is stringing you along, why I do not know.

We are OK for us, thanks. Hope all goes well with you.

Thanks and best,

Hal

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

10/13/93

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21702

Dear Hal:

I'm enclosing a recent article in the S.F. Chronicle on Posner written by Jerry Carroll, a columnist who has a daily feature in the paper. It is quite apparent that Posner gave Carroll the "snow job" during the interview and from the article you can see that Carroll really has nothing but a superficial knowledge of the whole case. Carroll makes references to straw men that Posner was only too happy to provide. He knew what he was doing.

Since I don't know Carroll it is very possible that the interview was conducted on 9/29/93 at the Green Apple book store in S.F. I was present as were both Paul Hoch and Dr. Gary Aguilar and we heard him (Posner) discuss his book. Channel 4 TV and their top newscaster, Pete Wilson, showed up and must've interviewed him but I never got the chance to see what they put on the news that night.

During the question period all three of us got to ask Posner a question or two. Aguilar faulted Posner for misusing Dr. Hartogs "clinical" evaluation of Oswald when he was a truant and erring child. I then asked Posner about Oswald's possible government connections and why he so easily dismissed this in his book. I pointed to the Oswald "slip" when he was on WDSU in August, 1963 and I asked him why he ignored mention of the "crypto" revelation both discussed in your book, "Oswald in New Orleans". I then asked him how come that when he put his bibliography together after mentioning that you had written 6 books on the JFK case he only included 5 books and left out "Oswald in N.O." To the latter question he replied that he only put in his bibliography those books he actually used or referred to. I answered him that I was extremely puzzled by his response because I noted that he (Posner) had made negative comments ~~about~~ ^{about} Oswald's transposition of numbers as addresses when Oswald was in New Orleans and that you had discussed this in your book, "Oswald in N.O." I had caught him, in my opinion, off guard and he never really answered the question.

When I pressed Posner on Oswald's possible links to a gov't agency I asked him if he were familiar with some reports that Oswald could have ties with ONI or another agency (I did not specify CIA). He said he was familiar with this and ~~that~~ I asked why, then, hadn't he at least contacted the ONI to find out if there were any merit to these allegations. To establish a record is how I put it. His answer to this was that it would not do any good - that that agency most likely would not give him any answers and that, in any event, the record would most likely be "destroyed". To which I promptly retorted, that is

exactly what did happen. I mentioned in passing that any good reporter would have at least made contact with the ONI to make a record regardless of what that agency ~~was~~ denied or upheld. What was important was to establish a record and this he clearly did not do.

Aguilar tried to engage Posner on the question of the medical evidence and Posner put Aguilar in the very difficult position of saying that the photos and X-rays were altered or tampered with. Posner used ~~the~~ the lawyerly approach by saying that it made no difference what ~~various~~ various doctors, nurses and medical aides saw but what did ~~the~~ ^{the} photographic evidence, the "best evidence" as Posner frequently referred to it, show. In my view Posner held the upper hand in this part of the questioning because Posner claimed that ~~at~~ at the House Select Committee you had very responsible medical people and none of them could find any evidence of tampering or alteration of the photos so how can Aguilar's claim be justified? Throughout Posner's defense of his position his wife was laughing at Aguilar's counter-arguments.

Prior to Posner's discussion of his book, Paul Hoch introduced both myself and Aguilar to him. As I shook hands with Posner he ~~said~~ said, oh, yes, I know of you. Dave Perry has told me of you and also Weisberg has mentioned you. I was not certain if he meant that he had read letters I had written to you or if you had mentioned my name when he stayed with you.

After the book discussion was over I went up to him and asked him if he were going to be at the Dallas November, 1993 ^{symposium} as a panelist (since I had heard that he was to appear on a panel titled, "Case Closed", and that Dave Lifton was one of the panelists). He told me he wasn't really sure and then said that he wouldn't agree to appear on a panel where the panelists would "gang up" on him, something like 9-to-one against and I said that this was very unlikely to happen. Posner then asked me who I would suggest to appear on the panel with him to make the panel more even. I suggested Jim Moore and he said, no, he'd "made errors". (And I recall that he made use of Jim Moore in his book, no less!). When he rejected that suggestion I said why not have David Belin and his response was even quicker (and firmer) - no, absolutely not! This latter response conjured up in my mind that Posner may have had a ~~relationship~~ relationship with ^{Belin} ~~Belin~~ that he may not have wanted known and that something sour went on between them. Of course this is just a gut reaction on my part but, if true, may go a long way in explaining ~~the~~ the Posner scenario and motivation behind his book and other efforts.

One thing that makes me feel that Posner won't show at the Dallas Symposium was a comment that his wife had made to a woman as they were leaving the book store. When she was asked if they were coming to Dallas, she replied, "Well, we'll have to see about that!".

One final note that I thought that was intriguing about the event that night was when Aguilar had asked Posner how he was able to interview Humes when other researchers were unable to reach him for any comments at all. Posner said that there was no problem - that he just looked up Humes name in the phone book and called him. It was as simple as that! To which a very incredulous Aguilar replied, amazing, can you give me (Aguilar) his phone

number. I don't know if Aguilar did, in fact, get this number but the whole thing suggested that if Posner were able to speak with Humes it had to be pre-arranged. I, too, find it hard to accept that a mere phone call could accomplish what Posner claims to have done. I think he should be pressed on this point.

Before closing there are a few things I'll mention and I think you should know of them. First is that Vanity Fair magazine in its November, 1993 issue will have an article by Marita Lorenz. It may well be ghost-written. This could be an excerpt from her book. The report I hear is that Oliver Stone has paid \$200,000 for a movie he will make on her life. (Will this include all her fantasies, too?). I don't know if Stone paid Marita or the book publisher. My guess is that the publisher is Thunder Mountain Press, the same one that did Lane's book.

Gus Russo is supposed to have an article in an upcoming issue of Harper's which is a "reply" to an Epstein piece. That should be Atlantic Monthly", not Harper's when I checked my notes. Have you seen it?

The latest word on the "Frontline" TV show on Oswald is that it will be aired on Nov. 16. That show will come down real hard on Oswald and claim, like Posner, that he was a very disturbed, unbalanced, and unhinged person. The conclusion is that Oswald was part of the assassination which involved the mob or underworld that somehow worked with him. Peter Dale Scott says that Frontline will provide evidence that when Oswald came into the Soviet Embassy he did so ~~with~~ with a loaded gun and that Embassy had to forcibly remove his gun from him. I would assume that the gun here refers to a pistol but I am uncertain if the visit refers to Mexico City or Moscow.

Mary Ferrell told me on the phone that the Russian, Necheperenko, called up the Dallas Symposium and asked ~~to~~ to be a panelist on the Intelligence panel. The Symposium agreed ~~to~~ to have him appear. I believe he was ~~one~~ one who handled the Oswald case while Oswald was in the Soviet Union. A researcher told me that he is also coming out with a book but I know little else. Have you heard this?

I still have had no reply from Failure Analysis. You and I can't be the only ones to whom they've not replied. I will call them up and ask them to explain.

Finally, I want to tell you about the ex-FBI agent, Tom O'Maley, whom I called on 9/30/93. ~~He~~ If you'll recall his name is in the listing of agents you provided me (DL 89-43). He was present on the 12th floor, 1114 Commerce Street, Dallas on 11/22/63. Although the document indicates that he "saw the parade" he denied that this was so. He did say that he "heard" the shots. He said it "sounded like a firecracker". I asked him if he personally knew any of the agents in that list and kept in contact with them and he said yes he did. He readily stated he knew Shanklin, Hosty, Barrett, Gemberling, Will Griffin, Bookhout, Jack, "Buck" Revill and a name I added because Peter Dale Scott cites him in his new book, James Gale, whom O'Maley called "Jimmy".

I asked O'Maley if he knew whether or not that it was

A-

Barrett who called Shanklin at the time of Oswald's arrest and he said that was what he believed, too. In fact without my saying it O'Maley pointed out to me that Barrett was present at the arrest of Oswald. I then asked O'Maley if it were true that Barrett and Hosty were in the same subversive unit section (checking up and/or working with informants) and he said this could not be the case because Hosty was assigned with "security" whereas Barrett was described as being a "cover agent". At that point I didn't ask him to explain the difference between the two. Would you know?

Throughout the conversation O'Maley kept saying that I should contact Gemberling for more information. Apparently he knew that Gemberling is back in the case handling queries. He told me I could reach Gemberling through the "Ben Nix Associates" in Arlington, Texas.

I then asked O'Maley about the story a researcher told me which was told him by O'Maley. Was there any truth to the story that Oswald was an FBI informant? O'Maley explained it this way: a file was opened up on him (Oswald) but he supplied no information of any importance so the file was ~~not~~ closed. It was not clear to me, however, if O'Maley meant that Oswald had, indeed, given information to the FBI but it was considered useless or with ~~little~~ little value. I didn't press O'Maley further on this point since I didn't want to endanger my being able to talk with him in the future.

I then asked him if he knew about the phone conversation between Hoover and Shanklin and he said that Hoover was very upset with Shanklin for dragging its heels and not coming up with anything.

I then asked O'Maley about Ruby since he had drafted a report on how Ruby got into the Dallas police basement and shot Oswald. O'Maley said the report was by him and agent ~~Albert~~ Albert, whose first name he did not mention. I checked the listing you gave me and there is an Albert listed so this must be the one. I have not seen that report. Are you aware of it? In any event, O'Maley told me that the report includes an interview with a Dallas police officer whose first name was Kenneth. O'Maley could not recall his last name and I've gone through the volumes and cannot come up with an officer whose first name is Kenneth. Perhaps you may ~~have~~ have a file that includes such a name. This Kenneth claims he "let" Ruby in because he knew Ruby and the question never entered this cop's mind that he shouldn't let him in. As O'Maley pointed out to me security was very "lax" then and ~~was~~ such an event as this would never occur today.

I'm uncertain as to what all this really adds up to but that is all he told me. I hope to be in touch with him again and if you can think of any questions I can ask him, do let me know.

I do hope that you are feeling well and I'll be in touch with you in the near future.

Best,
Hal
Hal