

I Led One Life

Hal Verb

"The first principle is that you must not fool yourself - and you are the easiest person to fool."

Richard Feynman, Physicist

"The internet can. . . be a brave new world of miscommunication."

"Features Page" Columnist, Leah Garchik, in the San Francisco Chronicle (7/L/99), quoting a Hollywood movie Writer/Producer on how the Internet discussed his new film based on an actual historical event.

"The more ridiculous a belief system, the higher the probability of its success."

Wayne R. Bartz, "Human Behavior" (1975).

Let me state at the outset of this article that I do not own a computer nor am I on the Internet or have a web-site listing. But in the very recent period of 1999, JFK assassination researcher friends of mine have been kind enough to supply me with internet printouts and FBI documents on which the many pages of internet responses have alluded to.

In a nutshell, allegations have been made against me that I am an "FBI informant" and that the FBI documents clearly "prove" these allegations.

As I will demonstrate in this article, not only are the charges against me entirely false, ridiculous in the extreme (and hilariously so), but the entire episode contains valuable lessons from which all serious-minded researchers can learn. Whether or not my accusers or detractors can learn something, too, does not rank very high on my probability scale but time will tell and history will so record their reactions.

Before long I shall present a nine point listing of the various allegations and alleged "facts" about my participation in research on the Kennedy assassination. (I started on "day one," November 22, 1963). This listing includes both allegations by accusers and "facts" about me by my well-meaning friends defending me, and both sides got it wrong.

Lest one feel that this article is simply to be construed either as a tirade or diatribe against my accusers and detractors or a put-down of my researcher friends (who, incidentally, are many and I am proud to say I have the utmost respect for their work and their unsolicited response in coming to my defense)—no, absolutely not! My main concern is to show (hopefully) *how* a document should be read; *how* it should *not* be read; what a document actually reveals; what a document conceals (and *why*) and what valid and reliable scholarship *demand*s of us all in pursuing whatever avenues of research we take up.

To add to my intent I will attempt to analyze how a rumor originates: how it gets passed along the rumor mill and the various transmission belts pushing that rumor to its conclusion. Finally, but by no means minimizing their importance and significance, I will attempt to give hard evidence on how the FBI and even the CIA (*not* mentioned in the documents) actually perform. This latter point undoubtedly will raise eyebrows even among those of us privy to reading the FBI documents but a further reading of this

article will make this particular point clearer. Since I am the one mentioned prominently in these documents, what I am about to reveal about FBI methods and what is hidden by the FBI will make the accusers' charges against me look even more absurd and ridiculous than they could ever imagine! Read on.

Before continuing I cannot resist telling a tale I like to repeat. It has to do with something I read about a great American orator and atheist, Robert Ingersoll. He was on his way to possibly becoming a candidate for the U.S. Presidency more than a century ago but his detractors got to him and saw to it that he would not run. America, I think, would have been a better place had he run and won.

Here is that Ingersoll story:

The claim was made during Ingersoll's lifetime that the great orator's only son had spent years reading indecent literature, that this practice caused the young man's mental collapse, that he spent years in an insane asylum, where he finally died.

A clergyman wrote to Ingersoll asking whether or not the story was true, to which Ingersoll replied that it was false that his son had read obscenities, that he had never gone insane, that he hadn't died, and finally, that he had no son!!

Now, let us return to the nine points mentioned above. By way of introduction, the following are based on recently released and once classified secret FBI documents obtained by the Assassination Records Review Board. Included in the nine points are comments made on the Internet by my accusers and researcher friends defending me.

Here is the list:

- (1) That recently released and formerly secret FBI documents obtained from the ARRB "reveal" the names of four "FBI informants" with one of these "informants" being yours truly, Hal Verb. The FBI documents cover a two-year period before Kennedy's assassination.
- (2) That these same FBI documents "reveal" the "I.D. Numbers" (identification numbers—plural emphasis, mine) of each of these "informants".
- (3) That Hal Verb is a "provocateur" who "pretends" to be a "victim" thus "avoiding" being "exposed."
- (4) That Hal Verb is a "wolf in sheep's clothing."
- (5) That "we have an FBI informant in our midst." (This is an exact quote from the Internet offering the view that I am continuing to be an "informant" despite the fact that the documents refer only to persons and events before the JFK assassination).
- (6) That Hal Verb was in (or worked for) the FBI.
- (7) That Hal Verb was in the O.N.I. (Office of Naval Intelligence).
- (8) That Hal Verb has been saying this "for years"(about being in both the FBI and ONI).
- (9) That Hal Verb "reported" an alleged theft of FPCC (Fair Play for Cuba Committee) funds turned over to the S.W.P. (Socialist Workers Party).

All of the above nine charges or statements (all of which were aired on the Internet) are absolutely, unequivocally and ridiculously **false!** In the instance of the first five accusations against me these originated from my *accusers*. In the instance of the latter four points (6 to 9) these statements were made by researcher friends of mine but these alleged “facts” about me are *equally false!*

On the latter four statements, I recall reading somewhere what a great writer (I believe it was Voltaire) once uttered in a sage observation about his friends: “I can defend myself against my enemies but who will protect me from my friends?”

Let us now begin with the nine points mentioned above in the order I’ve presented:

(1) Recently-released FBI documents (once classified “secret”) clearly “reveal” the names of four “FBI informants” with one of these “informants” “being myself where my full name is listed as Harold Verb.

Answer: the seven pages of documents do not state that at all. The relevant page which my accusers and detractors are using is the second page of these documents which has at the bottom a notation titled:

-B-

(See Document No. 1 on page 30)

The wording in the middle of this page has the heading: Informants. This heading is what led the accusers to misread this page and, thereby, not fully comprehend it. As supposedly long-time researchers and readers of thousands of pages of books, articles and documents there is no excuse for their abysmal lack of attention to detail and historical scholarship. None!

Note for example that there are three headings with the first (on the left) shown as: identity of source and in the middle there is the heading: characterization and, finally, on the right side there is the heading: location.

Under the heading of “identity of source” are included six symbol numbers of which two are partly redacted and two have their symbol numbers in full with their complete names and affiliations listed. Both of these names have typed below their names: (conceal by request). One name is a State Department official and the other described as a “San Francisco Police Department informant.” Of the two the latter died many years ago and I have no further information on the State Department Official whom I never heard of prior to receipt of these documents. It could be, as my very good friend, Tom Sanders, (incidentally, listed as one of the four alleged “informants” right above my name) pointed out to me that this State Department official could very well be deceased also and that is why his name was not redacted.

It should be clear from all this that “identity of source” provides the names (whether in symbol form or not) as to who is providing the information. Information on what? This leads us to the middle section with the heading “characterization”. When I first saw this heading I thought of it as a poor choice of a word. Frankly, a better word would have been: “subject” or “subject

matter.” What is meant here by “characterization” is that I, Hal Verb, and three others are being reported on or about and what their activities are and their political organizations. That is what the six real informants (listed in the “identity of source” column) are revealing in these documents. No other realistic conclusion could possibly be drawn otherwise.

Another way to look at this is the following: if these many document pages were to provide the names of “FBI informants,” what would be the purpose of providing details of the activities and political associations? Wouldn’t the FBI already know who their informants were, anyway? And then you’d have the silly and rather hilarious situation of informants spying on and reporting on other informants!!! A wholly ludicrous scenario that must be making members of the FBI who could very well be reading the magazine this article is printed in engage in howls of laughter at how certain researchers conduct their work. (I recall the ancient saying here that “Against stupidity even the gods strive in vain.”).

If there are any doubts about what is meant by “characterization,” a further reading of other document pages clarifies this also. For example, on the very last page of the seven pages there is a name in the “identity of source” section (fully given) and in the middle is typed (under the heading “file # where located”) “used to characterize. . .” The names of these two individuals are unknown to me.

As for the third column (titled “location”) on the “Cover Page B” three sets of numbers are typed in with alphabetical notations added (c and d). Of the three sets, two are partly redacted. It is very clear (or should have been clear) that “location” refers to the precise site (or FBI field office) where these pages of documents can be found. These numbers are not I.D. numbers as erroneously reported, but more on this when I answer this in point number two.

But let me add here what a former FBI agent, Bill Turner, who has written on the JFK assassination, has written me recently describing the charges against me as “absurd.” Here are his reasons: “In the first place your name would not appear in the details (or body) of the report if you were an informant; it would be disguised by a T-symbol. The T-symbol is used to protect the identity of, say, a wiretap, a bank official who is known as a confidential source, or a potential or approved informant furnishing information on a continuing basis. The identity of sources protected by T-symbols is normally set forth on an administrative page that is not disseminated to other agencies.

“With reference to cover page B, Sf T-3, who informed on you, is a Live Approved Security Informant. What has been redacted are the four digits of his informant number. You are named with three other individuals in the column ‘characterization’ in order to identify who or what Sf T-3 informed on. If Sf T-3 had informed on the FPCC as an organization, a characterization or thumbnail sketch of the FPCC would have appeared. Characterizations of major organizations, as for example the Communist Party USA, are prepared so that an agent does not have to compose one every time he writes a report.” Enough said on point

number (1) for now.

(2) These afore-mentioned FBI documents “reveal” the “I.D. numbers” of the four “informants.”

Answer: Absolutely false again. As Turner’s letter indicates and the documents show no such I.D. numbers exist. What my accusers have wrongly read as I.D. numbers are location sites (not I.D. Numbers). If, indeed, there were I.D. numbers posted on this page what would possibly be my I.D. number? If the I.D. number is meant the numbers listed with the alphabetical notation of both C and D, then you have the ludicrous situation of the alleged four “FBI informants” having the *same* identical I.D. number. Ladies and gentlemen, put on your thinking caps or take a course in logic 101.

Before going into point (3) allow me to call your attention to an earlier comment I had made which was that this article would reveal information about “FBI methods” and what is “hidden” in the documents.

On the third page of the FBI documents I received (which is typed as page 7) there is a mention of a FPCC party which was held at my apartment in Berkeley where I was then living. (*See Document No. 3 on page 31*) The occasion for the party was to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the Cuban Revolution. Apparently the facts are correct in so far as what transpired but in commenting on the party I held, the FBI report goes out of its way to make a rather snide comment on the event. They reported “. . . only about eighteen persons were in attendance, despite the fact that the notification was mailed to all persons on the BAFPCC mailing list.”

In attempting to provide a tally of how many attended my party, the FBI was attempting to downgrade the influence of the FPCC in the Bay area. “Only about eighteen” doesn’t reflect the realities. My opinion then (and now) was that we had a very successful party event. Of course one could have hoped for more but it should be noted that our mailing list was very widely distributed all over the Bay Area and not just Berkeley and San Francisco. Because of FPCC’s popularity it was one of the reasons that the FBI, under Hoover, was determined to smash and crush the FPCC however he could. It should also be noted that our mailing list included many students who, at the time the letters were mailed out (late July, 1963), were on vacation. Furthermore when transportation from outlying regions was not as developed as it is today, it was difficult to travel, especially if one did not own a car.

And how did the FBI learn that “only about eighteen” were present, anyway? It means that the FBI had one of its informants at the party. Who that person (or persons) is or were I have no idea but all of us in the FPCC knew that there had to be informants within our ranks. We were never able to identify them although we had our own individual suspicions.

Moreover, in this document, note the FBI agent making the comment that “notification was mailed to all persons on the BAFPCC mailing list.” Now, how would he know that unless the FBI had a mail surveillance intercept program which was then (and still is) illegal? All of us in the FPCC knew the FBI was intercepting the mail—we took that as a given in those days. That it is still being done, (mail intercept) and by whom which should not be stunning news, I can personally confirm because my current mail has obvious slits made on the flaps of the envelopes. Does this

surprise the reader? It shouldn’t, of course, knowing the whole history of this case of which I am thoroughly and intimately familiar with. Even my mail from the ARRB has been opened up and a researcher friend of mine told me of this same thing happening to him with respect to mail from the ARRB.

Imagine that the U.S. Government spying on its own governmental creation which essentially accomplished very little except to promote and propagandize what a terrific job it did uncovering assassination-related documents which were not that to begin with!

There is more to the wrecking job the FBI attempted against the FPCC. I ought to know because of another incident reported in one of the pages of this document. This is a true story that I am reporting for the first time in these pages of this particular magazine and its lessons for all of us should be learned.

Here I refer to page 44 of the document pages which was actually the fifth of the seven forwarded to me. Around the middle of the page there are the following two sentences quoted herein with the redaction (*See Document No. 5 on page 32*):

[Redacted in black] advised on 6/17/62 that a public FPCC meeting was held on 6/16/62 at 108 Clinton Ave., Newark. Informant further advised that Richard Gibson, acting Secretary of the FPCC, was the speaker at this meeting.

Note the two very short and rather clipped sentences here as contrasted with the Berkeley Party I held in 1963 (in 1962 I was living in New Jersey but later in the year moved to Berkeley). There are no snide comments by the FBI about how many attended, and there are good reasons as to why the FBI would not dare to engage in their unsolicited comments.

What happened during that time is this: I contacted Richard Gibson, then head of the FPCC. He agreed to speak before our Newark, New Jersey FPCC Chapter. The meeting was very well attended and all of us in the FPCC were buoyed by the experience. The story doesn’t end there. For in arranging to have that meeting at the Clinton Street address I had to really pull some rabbits out of the hat, so to speak, to have a meeting at all. Almost within 24 hours of the meeting time after I and others had arranged for a meeting site (not the Clinton address noted above but another location entirely) I received a phone call from the person who agreed to have a meeting at his storefront (another street address) telling me he couldn’t hold the meeting. I asked why and he told me that the FBI had come to see him at the premises and threatened him, saying they were going to throw all kinds of housing code violations at him if he held the meeting. I tried very hard to persuade him otherwise (and he was a supporter of the Cuban revolution at a time when the U.S. and the media were engaged in a hostile propaganda campaign to defeat the Cuban revolution). He would not change his mind, citing the economic difficulties this would place him under if he did allow the meeting to occur.

I had to think fast because we obviously did not want to cancel that meeting at such a late date. So I contacted an organization known as “The Henry George School of Economics” in Newark which had a good track record of allowing controversial speakers to appear at their forums (some of which I attended). They immediately agreed to hold the meeting there without a moment’s hesitation. The day was saved and we held our excellent meeting.

This does not quite end the story because prior to the meeting there would have to be a way of notifying people coming to the

meeting about a change in the meeting's location. There was obviously no time to mail anything out (which is why I believe the FBI waited until the last day to visit the original location. They knew we'd have a tough time reaching everyone on our mailing list which was rather extensive).

I took it upon myself to stay in front of the original location and advise persons coming to the meeting where the new site was. It worked. As I was standing in front of the original location I noticed a very tall gentleman; he must have been with the FBI. He was standing about twenty feet away but blocking part of the entrance as if to indicate he was there to prevent you from entering. Undoubtedly, to attempt to learn where our new meeting place was. As I was telling people coming to the original meeting site I warned them not to go near the obvious FBI man. Somehow there must have been an informant who learned where the new meeting place was as evidenced by the blacked out informant symbol number in the documents reporting on the meeting.

I could not help but recall that when the FBI turned over its account of the JFK shooting to the Warren Commission its report was only two short and very clipped sentences and didn't even tell the cause of death. Shouldn't this be taken notice of by researchers that when one sees an FBI report with a minimal amount of reporting in laconically stated sentences there's something amiss here?! And, as Marina Oswald once noted, "That is the FBI for you!"

(3) This charge is that I was a "provocateur" and as such I'm supposedly "pretending" to be "victim" so that my "informant" role won't be "exposed."

Answer: If there is no role as being an "FBI informant" existing then the conclusion of being a "provocateur" collapses completely. And since no instances of what constitutes "provocative" actions are offered in the Internet pages at all it is hard to know what is in the minds of my accusers and what they mean. The burden is upon them to show very specific pieces of evidence. If they cite some of my photographic or medical evidence upon which I differ in certain cases they are on the thinnest of grounds because one can find researchers who agree with me as well as those who don't. Are my accusers going to make the bold accusation that anyone who agrees with me is also an agent? This would border on sheer lunacy and approaches the level of the height of absurdity.

What is truly ironic about this charge (about being a "provocateur") is my actual past history in this case. When submitting this article for publication I enclosed a biography of myself that lists certain items of my work. One of these was the uncovering of a document at the national archives dealing with Jack Ruby who was visited by the FBI nine times in 1959 which was well before the JFK assassination. I turned the document over to Harold Weisberg, who I consider the number one researcher in the world, and we both recognized the significance of what the document meant (that Ruby *was* an informant).

Adding to the irony of tarnishing me with the brush of being a "provocateur" is the discovery I made of Oswald's famous slip

when he appeared in New Orleans in August, 1963 on a radio program to discuss his role as a FPCC "leader" (which he was not). The slip referred to his having blurted out that he was "under the protection of the U.S. Government" and quickly retracting that. The Warren Commission volume prints only his retraction. It was my opinion then (and now) that Oswald was working under O.N.I. protection (more on this later).

As one more note to this brew and mixture of heavy irony my biography very briefly notes that I helped participate in breaking up an alleged CIA/Mafia plot to murder Jim Garrison while he was secretly in San Francisco investigating the murder of Kennedy (late in 1967). Part of the work I did was to provide security arrangements for the person told about the plot and who was the informant revealing the nature of the plot. Garrison wanted the informant to come down to New Orleans and reveal all he knew.

This required very elaborate arrangements on my part and others to accomplish. And who were the others? None other than my very good friend, Tom Sanders (mentioned previously as one of the alleged four informants) and Bill Turner whose letter I have previously quoted from. Can this be the job of "FBI informants" and "pro-

vocateurs" uncovering other informants? I await in eager anticipation how my accusers and detractors handle this hot potato.

(4) The charge has been made that I am "a wolf in sheep's clothing".

Answer: Of all the charges and statements about myself this is the easiest to answer. When I last checked my ancestry there is no record of any wolfish linkage and what records I do find overwhelmingly show that I am descended from a long line of species known as hominids. If my accusers can provide contrary evidence I certainly will be willing to listen. I will gladly match my DNA evidence and fingerprint identification with their DNA and (paw?) print evidence. As far as my wearing "sheep's clothing"; sorry, but I would find this utterly uncomfortable as I'd be constantly itchy.

(5) The charge is made that "we have an FBI informant in our midst".

Answer: If the first three of the above charges are proven to be entirely false then how can point (5) be true? -point five must rest entirely on points (1) to (3) being established as fact. They are clearly not facts so what else can this charge rest on? Something made up out of one's over active-imagination and nothing more.

(6) The charge is made that Hal Verb was in (or worked for) the FBI.

Answer: This is the first of the remaining points and the statement was made by one of my researcher friends attempting to defend me. The statement is *absolutely* false and while I can track down how other rumors about me originated I am baffled as to how this rumor got started. Unequivocally and herewith I absolutely deny having any association whatsoever with the FBI.

Note that all that I've written about my activities contained within this article makes it ludicrous to say I had any FBI connec-

tion. Fellow researchers, please double-check your sources and information before you put things in writing. This bears repeating over and over, again, for what I have seen on the internet only demonstrates my point and that doesn't cover at all what I hear at JFK conferences or read in articles and books.

(7) The statement is made on the Internet that I “was in the O.N.I. (Office Of Naval Intelligence).”

Answer: Again, this was put on the Internet by one of my researcher friends and is, also, entirely false. I never ever worked for the ONI and I couldn't have, as the following information will show. My biography lists me as having served in the U.S. Army in Panama in the 1952-1953 period. I served in an “Intelligence section” where I did daily cryptographic work using an ancient World War II device that by now is probably obsolete what with all the highly sophisticated computer equipment now available. Incidentally, one researcher friend of mine who gave one of my strongest defenses on the Internet, got my intelligence record wrong when it was reported that I was in the USAI (United States Army Intelligence). No - I was not in that division which is devoted solely to intelligence gathering and reporting. My particular job was in a “section” of an outfit. Think of it as an office where there are several departments (or “sections”) such as sales, marketing, accounting, etc.

As I noted earlier one of my intents in this article was to trace how a rumor got started and this particular ONI rumor can most probably be tracked down. This is how I believe the rumor got started: many years ago in Washington, D.C. I gave a talk before a JFK assassination conference in which I developed what I considered was compelling evidence that Oswald was a U.S. Government agent and I stated that I thought he was under the helm of the ONI. I may be mistaken but I believe that at least one of my accusers was in that audience and heard me say what my proof was for Oswald being ONI-connected and also heard me say that while in the U.S. army I was in an Intelligence section. The conference printed my talk in its journal and there is a video of my talk so whatever I say here documented entirely. Nowhere in my talk did I state that I had been in the ONI (nor did I say I was in the FBI).

One good reason that I could not have worked for ONI is that I was in the U.S. Army. According to a former Marine friend of mine who was (possibly) being considered to work for ONI he assured me that there was no way one could be in both the U.S. Army and the Navy at the same time. (ONI is under the Navy Department). While I cannot say I know this to be true it does seem entirely unlikely. Of course all my denials may mean nothing to my accusers mistakenly using wrong information from my researcher friends but perhaps these accusers should take up some form of eastern mysticism, meditate a little more and contemplate their naval.

As previously noted I indicated to my readers that I would provide information on how the CIA operates even though the CIA is not directly named in the seven pages of documents referenced previously. As I was going over the seven pages of documents I noted the huge number of agencies and cities all over the world

these documents were circulated among. Absent from these pages were any copies being forwarded to the CIA. Why is that, I asked, as the CIA was heavily involved in the anti-Castro movement almost from the time Castro took power. I say “almost” because it is a fact that when Castro arrived in Havana just after New Years day in 1959 part of the welcoming crowd greeting him were CIA agents! Witnesses to the event said they stood out there like a sore thumb! Why of all agencies isn't the CIA in these seven pages? If my analysis is correct (and of this I do not claim infallibility but I throw it out to the research community for all to ponder on) the agencies to which copies of this document were forwarded about my FPCC and SWP activities are among the following: Army G-2, DIO, INS, OSI, and, of course, various FBI offices. But not CIA. The possible reasons that CIA was not included could be: (a) by the National Security Act of 1947 the CIA was barred from engaging in domestic surveillance (we now know, of course, that the CIA did such domestic surveillance a point to which I shall return shortly); and (b) it was not the practice of the FBI under Hoover to

provide the CIA with information to the CIA that Hoover considered his “turf” and was jealous of the CIA stepping into his “plantation” so to speak. If any reader has another way of looking at this I'd be glad to hear what he or she has to say.

As I was developing my proofs (on Oswald as agent) at this Washington conference I discussed at length a pamphlet that Oswald had ordered from the FPCC and which became useful for his purposes of infiltrating various anti-Castro organizations. He certainly didn't use it to infiltrate pro-Castro groups as there were none with the exception of himself and he was the leader of a non-existing group.

But what is interesting about this pamphlet is that it dealt with counter-revolutionary groups and their training camps all over the U.S. and their preparations for a second invasion of Cuba. I ought to know because it was I who gave V.T. Lee the money to pay for that pamphlet (I still have a copy of the check receipt). V.T. Lee had written the pamphlet and I saw the urgent need of getting it widely circulated. Lee was then head of the FPCC and succeeded Richard Gibson who I also knew (as mentioned previously).

What was my motivation in seeing to it that this particular pamphlet got circulated? I was trying to do whatever I could to head off the mad dash to a possible World War III if, indeed, Cuba was to be invaded. One very interesting aspect about this particular pamphlet is that when a researcher friend of mine finally obtained a copy from the archives (after an extremely prolonged time) he sent me a copy and all of the inside pages (but not the outside cover nor the back cover) were partly blackened - not redacted - just blackened. As this researcher noted it appeared to be FBI inking material to recover any fingerprints to be found. Obviously since Oswald had ordered it and owned it his fingerprints would be expected to be found all over the pamphlet but why would only the inside pages be dusted for finger-prints? Could it be that Oswald showed it to anti-Castro people and unknown right-wing individuals of whom we have no knowledge? I do not know nor do I know what the results of that FBI fingerprint dusting led to for I never followed up on this and I know of no one who has. This should be a worthwhile project for a reader to follow up on by

“What is Verb's real interest in this case? . . . To find out what really happened on November 22, 1963 and who was involved.”

initiating a Freedom of Information Action.

I should add here that Gus Russo in his book, *Live By The Sword*, which claims to offer “proof” that Fidel Castro “may” have been behind the JFK assassination which I consider as totally preposterous, labels the pamphlet mentioned above as a “diatribe” against the anti-Castro movement.

A “diatribe?” Providing evidence that preparations for another Cuban invasion is in the making and attempting to alert American citizens of the dangers involved is a “diatribe?” And this is the stuff that a “Book of the Month” selection is based on? There is another dimension to what I’ve reported above about what the CIA does and doesn’t do and that is this: Years ago Anthony Summers was doing an article for *Esquire Magazine* on the JFK case. He contacted me and said, “Guess what, Hal. I came across this CIA document dated in 1962 and your name is in it! I asked him what the document was all about and he said it was an entire listing of all FPCC members with my name listed in the Newark, New Jersey section. Naturally, I was not surprised at this (even though by law the CIA was not supposed to be engaged in domestic surveillance) and Summers sent me a zerox of that 1962 report subsequently. But I asked Summers about the more important period of time which would have been 1963. Summers did have a copy of that CIA report. The inevitable question from me followed, “Was Oswald’s name included?” The reply from Summers was: “No, he is not!” I asked Summers didn’t he find that odd? Oswald, while in New Orleans, had been on radio, photographed, in the press and surveilled at least once by the ONI and the CIA doesn’t have his name! “What is going on here?” I asked. Although I have mentioned this point in another magazine no one to date has looked into this and I, again, throw it out to the research community to see what it can find.

(8) the statement has been made on the internet that Hal Verb has been saying this “for years”(by “this” is meant that I have been in both the FBI and ONI).

Answer: again, this is absolutely false that I have been “saying this for years.” And this statement was not made by my accusers but researcher friends who in an honest attempt to defend me put out erroneous information about my past. I have never stated this “for years” or even a millisecond.

(9) the statement is made (again by one of my defenders) that Hal Verb “reported” an alleged theft of FPCC (Fair Play For Cuba Committee) funds which were turned over to the SWP (Socialist Workers Party).

Answer: absolutely false! I never reported anything about a theft to the FBI.

This statement again refers to my point about how one reads the document. It is true that one of the seven pages does refer to the theft but a very careful reading of that particular page does not state that it was I who reported that theft. In fact what the document *does* state is that the information was “furnished” by an unnamed individual and identified by the symbol number of “NY 2440-s*.” It is obvious (or should have been) that the source of information is from someone in New York (and not Berkeley or San Francisco). Moreover, even if that New York source hadn’t been provided on this document page the information is given that the allegation of theft was reported by V.T. Lee who told an indi-

vidual in Denver. See, now, what I mean about applying oneself diligently in reading documents? Perhaps what is needed is a refresher course.

That concludes my nine point rebuttal of the various accusations and statements about me which are all false. In conclusion I wish to add some observations and thoughts about this whole sorry and sad episode which I hope the research community will take to heart and seriously consider. There are things that can be learned from my experience.

For the moment let me explore one thought. Not mentioned in the above nine points but put out on the Internet by one individual (who shall be nameless as all the others in this article and that includes both my accusers and defenders) who asked pointedly, “What (is) Verb’s real interest in this case?”

If that particular individual has managed to read this article up to this point he or she could not fail to know what my “real interest” is in this case. My interest? To find out what really happened on November 22, 1963 and who was involved. Repeatedly at many forums I have stated my belief that there was a conspiracy and it is also my belief that Oswald was framed and never fired any shots that day (including rifle or revolver). Has this doubter of my “real interest” read anything I’ve written or heard me speak?! From his or her statement it does not appear very likely or if this person has, he (or she) just “doesn’t get it.” Or, as one writer has put it so succinctly, “For those who understand, no explanation is necessary. For those who don’t understand, no explanation is possible”.

Summing up: in the course of this whole bizarre episode about myself I have learned several valuable insights and I hope, sincerely, that all of us as researchers can learn something which I have shared in this article.

It may well be that my accusers and detractors will in spite of all I’ve said believe the nonsense they cling to. When the famous heretic, Giordano Bruno, was burned at the stake in Rome in the year 1600 he is reported to have said “History will demonstrate that his death will be remembered not so much for what was done to him but far more for the shame and disgrace his executioners have brought upon themselves.”

And bringing things more up to date there is the comment made by Fidel Castro as he was being sentenced by dictator Batista’s court, “Condemn me. I don’t care! History will absolve me!” I think as controversial a figure as he is, history has and will absolve him.

But can history absolve those who continue to perpetuate false rumors, innuendoes and facts that are not facts? I think the answer is no. I chose the title of this article because I have led and continue to lead *one* life and that is the pursuit of truth and let the chips fall where they may.

As George Orwell once said, “...there was the truth. And even if you were a minority of one there was still the truth.” Let me repeat the words of some one who never got the chance to tell his side of the story - Oswald: “Everyone will know who I am now.”

THE BEGINNER’S GUIDE TO THE JFK ASSASSINATION

By educator and 1998 *JFK Lancer Teacher Scholarship Award* Winner Mark Taylor. For the advanced classroom or group study. Oversized, spiral bound. Illustrated, 81 pages.

#214 for \$20.00

SF 97-247
ULL/rev

This report is being classified confidential in order to protect the identity of the informants of continuing value used therein and whose identity, if made known, could be prejudicial to the national defense interests.

The deposit of \$417.81 on 11/5/63, was reviewed by SA LITTLE and it was noted that the deposit was made up of numerous personal checks in small amounts - apparently in response to the appeal in the 10/21/63, SAFFCC newsletter for funds to aid the hurricane victims in Cuba.

The details of this report do not contain the information furnished 5/9/63, by NY 240-S* concerning the allegation made by VINCENT THEODORE LEE to TOM LEONARD in Denver that ASHER HARER skimmed five thousand dollars from the SAFFCC film project and gave it to the SMP. This information is not being reported due to the complete coverage that was given to the SAFFCC film project, which was appropriately reported and indicated no malfeasance on the part of HARER, or anyone else, in the handling of these funds.

INFORMANTS

Identity of Source	Characterization	Location
SF T-1 [redacted] S		134 [redacted] 250 D C
SF T-2 KENNETH ORSELL U.S. State Department, Office of Security, San Francisco (conceal by request)		97-247-1284
SF T-3 [redacted] S	TOM SANDERS RAL VEB PAUL MONTAUK MARION SYRICK	C
SF T-4 ROBERT KAPFKE San Francisco Police Department Informant (conceal by request)		134 [redacted] 48 thru 10 D

COVER PAGE
-2-



FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
~~SECRET~~

OFFICE OF ORIGIN SAN FRANCISCO	DATE 12/11/63	CLASSIFICATION 7/11/63 - 12/16/63
FILE OF CASE FPCC - SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	REPORTING OFFICER SA WARREN L. LITTLE	TYPED BY PEW
CHARACTER OF CASE IS - C, CUSA, SMP, RA - CURA		

REFERENCE: Report of SA WARREN L. LITTLE dated 7/11/63.

- P* -

LEAD:

SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE

AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA:

Will continue to follow and report the activities of the FPCC in the San Francisco Division.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA:

Copies of this report are being disseminated to Los Angeles, San Diego, local intelligence agencies and IMS because of their interest in this matter.

CLASSIFIED BY [redacted]
DECLASSIFY ON: [redacted]

APPROVED	SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACES BELOW
1 - Bureau (97-1188-47) (RM)	97-1992-307	
1 - SAC, Sixth Army, San Francisco (RM)		
1 - OSI, Travis AFB, San Francisco (RM)		
1 - DIO, 12th HD, San Francisco (By Hand)		
1 - INS, San Francisco (97-1353) (RM)		
1 - New York (97-2384) (Info) (RM)		
1 - Los Angeles (105-8734) (Info) (RM)		
1 - San Diego (105-3858) (Info) (RM)		
1 - San Francisco (97-147)		

~~SECRET~~

SF 97-347
WLL/rev

1963, there would be a BAFPC social at 3030 Regent Street, Berkeley, to honor the 10th anniversary of the 18th of July. News items from Cuba were set out and a brief article decried the violation of law encouraged by CIA in allowing private expeditionary forces to organize and train on U.S. soil. The newsletter also set out parts of the June 4, 1963, speech made by FIDEL CASTRO regarding the normalizing of relations between the U.S. and Cuba.

On July 27, 1963, a BAFPC social was held at HAL VERS's apartment, 3030 Regent Street, Berkeley, and only about eighteen persons were in attendance, despite the fact that the notification was mailed to all persons on the BAFPC mailing list. The social started at 9:00 P.M. and shortly before 10:00 P.M. a picket line of about twenty members of the Cuban American Liberation Alliance (CALA) started parading in front of the apartment house. They carried a coffin and picket signs declaring "Cuba - tomb of Communism", "Castro brought to Cuba hunger and death", and "Cuba Yes, Castro No." The disruption caused by the picketing disturbed the social and the party broke up at about 11:00 P.M., after the CALA pickets dispersed. When the pickets first appeared TOM SANDERS or HAL VERS telephonically notified PAUL MONTAUK, who has led the monitors at various pro-CASTRO rallies held in the San Francisco area, and MONTAUK came over to the social to observe the picketing.

SF T-1 - 8/16/63

HAROLD VERS and PAUL MONTAUK
are current members of the OBSWP.

SF T-3 - 11/13/63

SF T-9 on October 22, 1963, SF T-11 on October 21, 1963, and SF T-10 on November 26, 1963, furnished the October 21, 1963, newsletter of the BAFPC. The newsletter contained an editorial by TOM SANDERS which reflected that money sent to the BAFPC would be sent to New York to help relieve the suffering caused by the recent hurricane in Cuba. News items from Cuban radio were set out as well as several articles written by students who had visited in Cuba during the summer of 1963. The newsletter contained an announcement of the October 26, 1963, BAFPC meeting which would be chaired by Professor PAUL BABAN and would feature several students who would give eyewitness reports from Cuba.

-7-

SF 97-347

1

COMMITTEE TO UPHOLD THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL

A source advised on August 1, 1963, and October 4, 1963, that at a meeting sponsored by Progressive Labor and held on July 31, 1963, at Stiles Hall, Berkeley, California, it was decided that a committee be formed in behalf of the San Francisco Bay Area students who had traveled to Cuba in June, 1963, in defiance of the ban by the United States Department of State on travel to Cuba. The name decided upon was the Committee to Uphold the Right to Travel (CUST).

The same source and a second source advised that CUST, a non-membership organization, has as its principal aim and main purpose the directing of publicity toward the thought of freedom to travel. In the event of the prosecution of the students who traveled to Cuba, CUST will become a committee to aid in their defense.

The first source advised that of the twelve officers elected, five are currently members of the Socialist Workers Party and one was a member of the Socialist Workers Party until July, 1963. The current members are:

SUE MATTINGLY, Recording Secretary
BRIAN SHANNON, Steering Committee
HAROLD VERS, Educational Director
TOM SANDERS, Steering Committee
RICHARD AOKI, Steering Committee

The former member of the Socialist Workers Party is JAMES PERIAS of the Student Committee.

APPENDIX PAGE

-15-

SECRET

This reference in the file captioned "Andre John Martinsons, IS-Cuba" set out the association between Martinsons, who was employed in the office of the FCC, 769 Broadway, NYC, and Richard Gibson, Acting National Executive Secretary of the FCC, from 2/7/61 to 5/29/62. During this period they held and attended numerous meetings and affairs concerning the FCC and kept in close contact with each other in connection with the operations of the FCC in NY.

NY rpt. 10/1/62 (NY 100-138737)
Re: Andre John Martinsons, aka.
IS-Cuba
107-42238-19 P. 1, B, F, 5, 7-9, 11-13,
(18/28) 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 27

NY [redacted] advised on 6/17/62 that a public WFCC meeting was held on 6/16/62 at 103 Clinton Ave., Newark. Informant further advised that Richard Gibson, Acting Executive Secretary of the FCC, was the speaker at this meeting.

Acc. info.

NY rpt. 11/29/62
Re: Harold Verb, aka.
IS-Cuba
NY-308
103-102029-16 P. 4, 5
(24)

This reference in the file captioned "Cuban American 24-41 Rights Committee (CACRC)" set out lengthy information concerning the activities of Richard Gibson in connection with the CACRC. The CACRC was formed through the alleged efforts of several pro-Castro and communist organizations in the NY area to serve as an ad hoc committee to call attention to the alleged violation of the civil rights of Cuban Americans in NY, NJ and Fla.

Gibson attended meetings of the CACRC held at the FCC HQ's. In NY, discussed the organization at various times, was named as a member of the publicity and press committees of the CACRC and collected \$150.00 for the CACRC.

NY rpt. 7/9/62 (NY 105-56134)
Re: Cuban American Civil Rights
Committee
IS-Cuba
105-711370-8 P. 2, 5-7, 14
(25/28)

SECRET