

#20

See page 20 on bills
developed
system

Chapter D, Max Holland: Commission Defender and "Historian"

If Max Holland's article in the November, 1995 in American Heritage magazine has a title it must be what takes up most of the cover:

The Kennedy Assassination
WHY THE WARREN REPORT WAS WRONG — AND RIGHT

The table of contents (page 5) describes the article but does not give it a title: "THE KEY TO THE WARREN REPORT."

The first page of the article (page 50) begins with the first words of Holland's text in headline-size type. That page also has no title.

Yet this makes more sense than any of the article itself. It is only slightly confusing. The article itself is feigned intellectualizing to give an amateurish pretense of scholarship that boils down to the Commission was right because it ways it was right and nothing else, particularly not the Commission's own evidence, makes any difference at all. Instead of the actual evidence, which Holland shuns like the plague, he gives his opinion. It being his opinion, who can doubt it? is the thrust. Senselessly, he has not a thing to back his opinion up. This is not mere negligence on his part. It is the only way any such article can be written — without regard for the facts, by which I mean the official facts, or as may be true in Holland's case, with complete and deliberate ignorance of those readily-available official facts.

in comparison
see also to
ON the
history

The first words in Holland's article are:

Seen in its proper historical context — amid the height of the Cold War — the investigation into Kennedy's assassination looks much more impressive and its shortcomings much more understandable[.] (the period is omitted)

And that in itself sets the tone for what Holland is so lost in he hasn't the slightest conception

of how he disgraces himself in this flat-world writing American Heritage regarded as worth fifteen pages. That he says nothing is as important as the Cold War apparently was enough for it to disregard everything else — or it thinks that way itself. *End of page 1. We in history to the Cold War*

At his beginning Holland pontificates, “In the case of the Kennedy assassination, unprecedented belief in all kinds of nonsense...has waxed in good times and bad and flourishes among a remarkable number of otherwise sober-minded people.”

Assuming as I do that Holland is sober-minded this is apt self-description.

Albeit unintended.

What is omitted as quoted above is “coupled with extraordinary disrespect for the Warren Commission.”

After more than thirty years what is without question is that “extraordinary disrespect for the Warren Commission” is at the very least justified and as reflected in countless polls is the shared by most Americans. *See Hall article for Polls + Research.*

If anyone has made a study of its own evidence, as I have in many books, and compared its own evidence with its “extraordinary” misrepresentation of that evidence.

Which, scholar that he pretends to be, Holland does not do at any point in all fifteen pages or in any of his other writing of which I am aware.

Typical of this “scholarship” is the beginning on the cover, then in the table of contents and continuing throughout there was only one Kennedy assassination.

There were two.

Like all those agreeing with and supporting the conclusion of that Report, Holland begins with the assumption that Oswald was the lone assassin. This is the way the Commission began and it is

the way, beginning with the FBI almost the minute of the assassination, all the agencies of government began.

In FBI records I have J. Edgar Hoover himself boasted that in effect he had an instant vision the afternoon of the assassination and thus he ordained Oswald the lone-nut assassin.

In its TOP SECRET executive sessions I have published in facsimile and were available to Holland — if he read anything that did not also disregard the actual evidence as he does — the Commission itself agonized that it had no choice but to “fold its tent and go home” because the FBI had concluded as it dare not disagree with, Oswald alone did it.

Beginning of page 3. In those same sessions, all of which were classified illegally and from which all members of the staff were excluded, before the Commission did any work at all, the members agreed that it would be “terrible” if there had been a conspiracy because they’d not be able to disprove it.

So, like Holland and all the like-minded, it just did not look for any evidence of any conspiracy and when it could not avoid what meant that without question, there had been a conspiracy, it merely ignored that evidence and concluded with its beginning assumption, regardless of the evidence it had, that there had not been any conspiracy.

This is not one of those many “shortcomings” Holland regards as “understandable.”

He is too ignorant to have known about it. After all, the proof was only published. But not in his kind of book. He therefore makes no mention of it or any of the multitude of other “shortcomings” that resulted in conclusions proven false beyond any question at all by the evidence the Commission ignored or misrepresented. Its own evidence, mind you.

We come to what Holland regards as the Commission’s shortcomings. But right up front he

J
 The quote
 Cocop
 J

does get to the evidence, briefly. He finds the most abysmal ignorance of that evidence neither a handicap nor any kind of liability -- all in the context of the Cold War -- without his showing other than by his opinion any Cold War involvement. Of which there was none at all. Holland says it? Who can question or doubt him when, based only on his opinion or on what he wants believed, it is his way -- his only way -- of giving the Commission the "understanding" he says is lacking:

The Warren Commission's inquiry occurred at what we now know was the height of the Cold War, and it must be judged in that context. Perhaps with its history understood, the Warren Commission, instead of being an object of derision, can emerge in a different light, battered somewhat but with the essential integrity of its criminal investigation unscathed. The terrible events that began in Dallas are not an overwhelming, unfathomable crossroads; they are another chapter in the history of the Cold War.

Beginning of page 4. What is it that justifies Holland's reference to what he says is the "integrity" of what he refers to as the Commission's "criminal investigation," what he says after thirty years of criticism of it and leaves it "unscathed?"

Not a word -- not a single word if all fifteen printed pages.

Holland says it therefore it is so and no evidence is needed.

Instead of justifying these words, which are basic in his article, pontification always being at hand for him, he says that "Those terrible events that began in Dallas are not an overwhelming, unfathomable crossroads."

What "terrible events were there after Dallas -- other than the Commission's Report?

Again, Holland says it, citing no evidence, not even a claimed belief, and because he says it, it is automatically so.

How "they are another chapter in the history of the Cold War," Holland being Holland, he need not even suggest. As he cannot because this also is not so.

“At the height of the Cold War” is when he says the Commission began its work.

And even that is not true. It serves his argument that is only argument, never at any point tainted by any evidence, and argument is all he has for his article and for the book to follow it on the Commission’s history.

The well-known truth, known to all but scholars like Holland, is that the height of the Cold War was October, 1962. The Cold War started easing off after the settlement Kennedy and Khrushchev reached to end that Cuba missile crisis. There then was the beginning of detente and the agreement to begin ending the testing of nuclear bombs. That was the well-known limited test ban agreement. And as they groped toward peace Kennedy and Khrushchev exchanged about forty private communications. What remains secret of them is secret not because the other side insisted on that but because we did and do.

~~Beginning of page 4a.~~ Holland has to rewrite that history, too, for two reasons. One is because his interpretation of the Cold War and what it meant is his justification of what he says was wrong with the Commission. The other is the anti-Kennedy bias visible in his writing. It keeps him from admitting those two great Kennedy accomplishments, his peacefully ending that crisis that could have incinerated the world and his beginning of detente.

With this corruption of our history Holland is able to ignore the possibility that there was hawkish motive in the assassination because in the year before his assassination Kennedy took repeated steps to end the Cold War and looking toward peach in the world.

Making not the slightest effort to prove any of this argument in any meaningful way he next jumps ahead to the Commission’s giving the President “their 888-page report.” In fact that Report has 912 pages. Holland’s care in what he ~~Beginning of page 5.~~ writes led him to ignore the twenty-

four pages with roman numbers. The last Arabic page number is eight hundred and eighty eight. He looked at that and cast those roman-numbered pages into the memory hole.

Still pumping up his Cold War myth that he needs to pretend to justify that negligible Commission “shortcomings” he is going to explain away, pontificating as usual and offering no support for it as usual, he says,

But for officials whose instincts were honed by national-security considerations, the Soviet-American rivalry loomed over what had happened and dictated what immediately needed to be done. The overwhelming instant reaction among these officials was to suspect a grab for power, a foreign, Communist-directed conspiracy aimed at overthrowing the U.S. government.

What “officials”? Not one is named. What was the or any “national-security consideration[s]”? The reader must supply his own for Holland doesn’t.

As he meanders along in unreality he does name three countries:

...Attention fixed on the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba as the only governments that could possibly undertake and benefit from such a heinous plot.

Whose “attention” was “fixed”?

It has to suffice, once again, that Holland said this because he says nothing else to indicate what officials or what if any other than an imagined connection -- those unnamed officials had with the assassination of its investigation.

True, in a conspiracy to assassinate an American president the assassins must see some “benefit” to them from it. Assuming it seems reasonable is all Holland needs to say it because he suggests no such “benefit” for the Soviet Union, for China or for Cuba.

The one thing that is certain beyond question, save to the eminences of scholarship and political wisdom like Holland, is that not the Soviet Union, not China and not Cuba preferred the

hawk Lyndon Johnson to the dove Kennedy.

Not only had Kennedy and Khrushchev begun on the path to working their *Beginning of page* 6. disagreements out, begun with their end to the Cuba missile crisis; not only had they gotten into their extensive secret correspondence as they felt their way; not only had they entered into that first nuclear test-ban agreement; Kennedy had already begun to de-emphasize the military and to reduce appropriations to it. What such eminences of scholarship need not remember is that he had risked a serious breach with the British by canceling our agreement to make and let them have the "Blue Steak" missile for them to deliver their warheads. That did create a considerable stir in Great Britain and the most vociferous protests. But Kennedy preferred less military equipment to make the situation less difficult to face and normalize and thus he incurred the wrath of our most important ally.

This would tempt Khrushchev to have him knocked off and replaced by that longtime friend and beneficiary of those who produce for war?

With Castro Holland has a real doozer for him s' behind the assassination.

The solution to the Cuba missile crisis Kennedy proposed and Khrushchev accepted immediately is that we would protect Cuba against any invasion. Not just a promise that we would not invade Cuba but a guarantee the Soviets could not begin to offer -- we would protect Cuba against any invader.

When Khrushchev could make no such guarantee and when his efforts to protect Cuba against a United States invasion came close to getting Cuba wiped out, this, in Hollandaise scholarship and political wisdom is all the reason Castro needed to get him to knock off his only real protector in the entire world.

There was no special interest China had to serve in getting Kennedy killed but as with all else,

Holland needs none. All he has to do is say something and it is instant fact, instant political reality. He is so wise he actually says China had such an urgent reason for getting rid of Kennedy, for preferring the hawk Johnson instead of him, that it, like Khrushchev and Castro, was willing to get wiped out by our nuclear arsenal in retaliation.

Holland did begin referring to "all kinds of nonsense" written about the *beginning of page 7.* assassination and I did say this is self-descriptive. Q.E.D. demonstrated. But this is only the beginning of this demonstration.

Switching into the role of a novelist as well as a mind reader and somehow believing that for him to justify the Warren Report he needs to describe in detail how Lyndon Johnson left Dallas, he has him at *Cove* Field about to emplane:

Despite special security precautions, it seemed possible to those on the tarmac that the presidential jet could be raked by machine-gun fire at any moment. When the plane was finally airborne, it flew unusually high on a zigzag course back to Washington, with fighter pilots poised to intercept hostile aircraft.

This involves a special kind of machine gun, invisible ones, those not detected during those "security precautions." Why not a bomb? Planting one near the plane would not be all that difficult for a subverted airport worker. Or any of the other small but powerful hand-held weapons such as long existed for destroying tanks. That requires more explosive power than *penetrating* the thin-aluminum sheeting of an airplane to penetrate and explode inside.

But with Holland making it all up, perhaps he believed there is more razzmatazz in "machine gun".

Little excitement as he has been able to contrive and seeing a chance for some Holland even has the Presidential plane in danger from foreign enemies deep inside the United States, thus its

“zigzag course” from the depths of the country to Washington, which is still well inside its borders. This is more of that “all kinds of nonsense.” No plane could get near any border without an automatic alert being sounded. A flock of geese in the Arctic almost started a nuclear war, those detecting devices are that sensitive.

But, what the hell, give it a bit of zip, so the Presidential plane flew at its maximum elevation (not that Holland says why unless he believed that those dastardly Soviets had anti-plane missiles secreted inside the United States), on his made-up zigzag course and then protected “with fighters poised to intercept hostile aircraft.”

Not that our fighters were not so “poised” around the clock without any Presidential assassination.

Two paragraphs later Holland gets into his criticism of liberals simultaneously *Beginning of*

Page 8 demonstrating his carelessness, his ignorance of both:

Within hours the Dallas police arrested a twenty-four-year-old Communist sympathizer named Lee Oswald, a bundle of possibilities and seeming contradictions. Now many liberals showed a reluctance to shift the blame from right-wingers to a self-styled Marxist; a liberal President being assassinated by a Marxist seemed to make no sense.

It was not within “hours.”

It was within minutes of a single hour.

“Communist sympathizer,” was he?

The Commission had five hundred and fifty-two people it referred to as “witnesses.” Two were newspaper clippings, but no matter. No matter, either, that most by far of the witnesses were never seen by even a single Commission member. It did have hundreds of live witnesses and not one, not even Revilo P. Oliver of the John Birch Society was more anti-Communist than Oswald.

As Holland would have known if he had paid any attention to the Commission's evidence about which he spouts phony scholarship with such profundity.

As he would have known for another reason we soon get to.

It can be wondered, especially with this intellectual crud appearing in the right-wing American Heritage magazine, if Holland is no longer The Nation liberal he began by being.

Whatever the truth may be about his politics the fact is that he just made this up, too. A very considerable number of the critics of more or less the left have always suspected a conspiracy from the left, especially involving Castro. The fact also is that this is true of the right as it is also true of some of the right that their interest in their country outweighed their political interests.

Every liberal book publisher in this country I could reach rejected my first book, which was the first book on the assassination. In all I had more than a hundred international rejections. These included a number abroad. Without, I add, a single adverse editorial comment.

Beginning of page 9 Of the successful book publishers of the left, those whose publishing was mostly personalized, Barnet Rosset of Grove Press and Lyle Stuart, who published under his name, would not even talk to me about the very first book on the assassination of President Kennedy.

Although it engages in no theorizing and pretends no solution, my Whitewash: the Report on the Warren Report, is within Holland's definition of "liberal." conservatives made its publication possible, only conservative.

When I saw no possibility remaining for commercial publication of it after more than a year of trying a friend referred me to a very conservative public-relations man for a conservative union. That man, Sid Zagri, referred me to the most conservative newspaper publisher in the country, the late Bill Loeb, of the Manchester, New Hampshire Union Leader. Bill and his wife, Nackey Scripps

Loeb, both read it and both liked it. Bill asked his secretary to send it to the most conservative book publisher in the country, Henry Regnery, then in Chicago. She forgot to do that, as I learned only a month after I published it myself, from Regnery's son-in-law. He told me they would have published it if they'd gotten it.

Neither Bill nor I knew of this slip-up. I then arranged to publish the book myself. When the presses were ready to roll that printer chickened out. He feared losing business if he published it. He told me that ninety percent of his work came from the government. So stunned and dismayed I could not think straight I phoned my conservative friend, the late Steve Barber, then Washington correspondent for the Conservative London Telegraph. I phoned him from the printer's, telling him I really could not think.

"Come on in. I'll see if I can think of something by the time you get here," he said. I drove to his National Press Building office in Washington. When I walked in he handed me two telephone numbers, both Bill Loeb's. One was at his newspaper office, the other at his Pride's Crossing, Massachusetts home.

The personally politically conservative Steve Barber had been interested in and had read the manuscript of Whitewash. He had tried to be helpful. He knew that *Beginning of page 40* the Loeb's, without asking me but telling me later, had gotten two different libel lawyers to give the manuscript a libel reading for which they both paid both lawyers.

When I told Loeb what had just happened he thought for just a minute and then he asked me if I knew where the Merkle Printing Company was located. I did. When I learned the very conservative Edgar Merkle had been one of my customers.

"Okay," Bill said, "go there and see Tommy Crowell. Tell him I sent you."

Crowell was a Merkle executive. He listened when I told him I was broke and in debt but would give him a mortgage on the farm, which we owned clear of any mortgage.

Merkle did not accept the mortgage. They printed the book and never once dunned me to pay them. Not only that, they gave me free storage on most of the first printing of 5,000 copies, as they did on three subsequent printings all that size or larger. I picked them up when I needed them. And if that was not enough, because they printed major magazines, of which TIME was only one, they ran trucks to New York City almost daily. They trucked and delivered the orders I had as I made a success of the book to New York wholesalers. Without asking or charging me a single penny for that exceptional service. Before I was able to pay them a penny.

It is the subject-matter ignoramuses overwhelmed with their own opinions of their perception, wisdom and insight they believe is denied mere mortals, like Holland, who think, speak and write of attitudes toward the assassination of a President only in terms of their own political beliefs.

Beginning of page 10a. Americans of all political beliefs care about their country and what happens to it. There has never been a left-right division on the assassination except by those who, like Holland, impose their political views on their beliefs about it. Some of the most conservative people I've ever known have encouraged my work and have come to see me. I remember the head of one of the most conservative business organization in the country, those who said they were Republican politicians, even retired Secret Service and FBI agents. Some of these caring people have remained friends. Some of have been of material help to me. H.L. Hunt, who was as conservative as they come, even offered me a job. Conservative reporters have been helpful to me, too. As I have been to some of the most conservative law firms in the country when asked for the help I provided.

On this phony issue he contrived arrogance of mind applied to the Holland is a compliment

to him.

Here I've omitted a portion of a sentence: and whose work he makes all these and other
while history he says he is writing
 age, Going back to that "Communist sympathizer" Holland says Oswald was, the Commission) did

publish much on that, in the context of what Holland says about the "integrity" of its "criminal investigation, first let us note what Holland does not note. So undeviating in its "integrity" was the Commission he said needs to be understood that in that fine criminal investigation he says it conducted, with all those witnesses it did take testimony from, it did not take testimony from the President's personal *Beginning of page 11* physician, Admiral George B. Burkley. Burkley was the only physician in both the Parkland Hospital emergency room in Dallas, to which the President was rushed, who also physically present during the autopsy at the Bethesda Navy Hospital. That entire naval medical installation was in charge of Admiral C.B. Galloway. Galloway thus was in charge of the autopsy performed by three military pathologists of whom two served in his command, under him. Galloway also was not a Warren Commission witness. This imparts an "understanding," to use Holland's word, other than he intends. And there is much more like it.

Moreover, it was Galloway who issued ordered on what should not be done during the autopsy — directed that what was required to be done not be done. If Holland did not ignore my 1975 Post Mortem and my 1995 NEVER AGAIN! he knew this and in the most intimate detail.

And yes, he knew of Post Mortem. He saw it when he was here.

In any "criminal investigation," not only the most important one of the assassination of a President, which means of a coup d'etat, nothing is more important in what lawyers call the "corpus delicti" ~~the~~ or the body of the crime than the autopsy examination.

Was it that special "integrity" of the Commission that impelled it not to take testimony from

the two highest government medical officers present at that autopsy? The highest-ranking of Navy physicians?

Was it what Holland extols as the Commission's "integrity" that kept it from asking Galloway why he ordered, for one thing, that the track through the body of the bullet of the single-bullet theory that is the very basis of the Report, not be established?

Holland defends that single-bullet theory.

This theory, and it is dignified by referring to it as much as a theory, has that supermagical bullet entering the back of the President's neck, going through it without striking bone, exiting through his shirt collar and the knot of his tie, and then executing the most remarkable gyrations to enter Texas Governor John B. Connally's chest under his right armpit, going on to smash four inches of his fifth rib *Beginning of page 42* whence it found its way at supersonic speed into Connally's right wrist to demolish it and then, its career still not ended, to sneak into his left thigh to lurk there until it decided its time to enter our history had come when it was in Parkland Hospital in the Governor, its host.

This gets us to where it was that fabulous "integrity" of the Commission's that kept it from taking testimony from Admiral Burkley.

The official death certificate was executed by Burkley. With that special "integrity" of the Commission it did not find space to include it when it had only about ten million words in its only twenty-six volumes of evidence. That particular variant of "integrity" had the Commission file — I almost slipped and said "hide" — the original and all six copies of that death certificate the one place nobody would ever look for it, the Commission not having published it, with what was sent to the Government Printing Office for printing. It is from where it belonged less than in any other

Commission file that I had copies made of it. I published one in Post Mortem on page 309.

It does not state that the bullet of unprecedented agility and other magic entered the President at the back of his neck. It states that where the bullet entered was at the “level of the third thoracic vertebra.” That means the third knob on the back down from the biggest knob at the neck. Not in the neck, well below it.

Was it that special “integrity” that kept Admiral Galloway from being asked to explain why he made changes ⁱⁿ the handwritten autopsy report, like eliminating the word “penetrating” to describe that and other wounds, and this also I published in 1975, in Post Mortem. This is equaled in the Commission “integrity” when it did not ask Admiral Burkley to explain why he added his acceptance and approval to several certifications by the pathologist in charge, then Commander James J. Humes.

These, not printed — again I almost said “suppressed” by the Commission — I also got copies of from the same file of what went to the printing office — to which none of this went.

Beginning of page 12a. No, the Commission did not suppress Humes’ certifications. I published them in facsimile in my first book. It used copies that Burkley had not himself certified. With that it did what was the cause for a long series of explanation by those Navy pathologists and others who support the official assassination mythology. That was possible only because the Burkley certifications of them were not known. Thus Humes’ assistant, Dr. J. Thornton Boswell, also a commander, “explained” that if he had known the required Navy autopsy body chart was to be taken seriously he would not have located that back wound on it incorrectly. That, as it happens, is precisely where Burkley’s official death certificate place it, well below the neck.

Humes certified that “I have destroyed by burning certain preliminary draft notes” of the

autopsy. That being strictly prohibited in any autopsy examination, *Beginning of page 13.* Admiral Burkley added in his own distinctive and rather crabbed handwriting,

J/

add space

“Accepted and approved this date, George G. Burkley read Adm MCUSN.”
 (“This date,” which he did not add, is the date it was delivered to him, Sunday,
 November 24, 1963.)

(not part of quote)

double space

Humes also certified that his “autopsy notes and the holograph draft of the final report were handed in to” his commanding officer at five o’clock that same afternoon. As I go into with the sworn testimony in both Post Mortem and NEVER AGAIN! those autopsy notes are not in either the Commission files or its exhibits, both identified by then assistant counsel, now Republican Senator from Pennsylvania Arlen Specter, as in each and was in his hand when he conducted the questioning.

delete extra space

Admiral Burkley added the same “Accepted and approved” certification to this document, too.

I published both originals, also in facsimile, on facing pages in Post Mortem, pages 524-525. With Burkley’s signed “accepted and approved.”

Also addressing that unimpeachable “integrity” of that wonderful Commission “criminal investigation” and that magic bullet of the theory Holland supports and claims is real, the Commission was not only content to accept FBI photographs of that shirt collar and the tie that are close to incomprehensible except as propaganda from the FBI, it even published them. The picture of the tie in the Commission’s evidence and that it published required all the not inconsiderable skills of the FBI to obliterate the clear pattern of the tie. With no less skill the FBI made the pinstripe of the shirt that consisted of three parallel sets of pin stripes separate by a space about equal to that taken up by all three pinstripes to make the three appear as a single stripe, not “pin” by any means. However, when

the FBI for its own purposes, to make it appear as though the magic bullet had gone slap dab through the center of the knot on that tie and it took the knot ~~✓~~ which is the real evidence the tie bore → S

apart to stage a picture making it appear that there was a hole in that center, the pattern is clear, as is the lining of the tie, which would not be there if a bullet had gone through it. (This was deliberate FBI deception, there was no hole in the knot - or anything on the tie. etc.)

Having the FBI staged photograph in an FBI report identified in the Commission's Beginning of page 14, as Commission Document 1, the Commission of that Hollandized "integrity" knew that the FBI had clear pictures of the tie. That "integrity" impelled the Commission not to ask the FBI for the clear pictures of the knot of that tie it had.

That same staged FBI picture staged for its propaganda purposes include a view of the front of the President's shirt collar. The FBI Lab added arrows pointing to what it said are bullet holes in it (Post Mortem, page 597). Beginning of page 14a. I inserted it prior to the paragraph "Not burdened.." That unexceeded Commission "integrity" motivated it not to ask the FBI for that clear picture of the shirt collar and thus not a single one of the pictures of it the Commission showed witnesses and published shows that rather than a single stripe pattern is of triple stripes in parallel. This gives an idea of how the Commission's "integrity" controlled it and the physical evidence in its exhibits that were used as the basis for testimony.

Not burdened by Commission "integrity" it did what it ~~dit~~ not do, I got a print of that picture of that shirt collar under FOIA. I printed it actual size on the next page, 598. Thus the true magic of that bullet can be seen by all, even the Hollands if they have any interest.

Rather than bullet holes there are two slits. They do not coincide, and that in particular requires a special kind of magic. The one on the President's left as worn is about twice the length of that on the right. The one on his right is entirely below the collar band. The one on his left is both

above and below that collar band. This with his shirt collar buttoned.

In fact, as the Commission's evidence states in sworn testimony and as I learned in even greater detail and include in the text of Post Mortem, those slits were not caused by any bullet not matter how unprecedented its magic. They were caused by a scalpel in the hands of the nurse as, the normal emergency practice, she cut the tie off at the knot.

The only damage to the tie was not from any bullet. It was a tiny scalpel nick made as the scalpel grazed past it in cutting the tie at the knot, one cut from the top, the other from the bottom.

It was in doing this that those two slits were cut in the shirt, those slits the Commission's "integrity," *as the* *can't refer to it,* required it to describe as bullet holes, as the FBI had.

With this less than full, really far, far less than full establishing of what that expert of experts on the Commission, the man who is writing its history means, by its "integrity" and its "unscathed" work he refers to as its "criminal investigation," *is it not obvious that a real criminal investigation* *is required?* with this understanding of the rare talents and skills that Holland brings to this task of his, let *Beginning of page-15* us return to why I said he knew of all the books on the assassination I published, not only of the first, Whitewash or the most definitive on the medical evidence, Post Mortem.

Holland and Kai Bird were close buddies who also shared a column in The Nation. Victor ~~Las~~ Navasky, then its editor, asked me if they could come here and if I would help them on a book they were writing together on John J. McCloy, Commission member. I invited them both. While I kept no notes on the visit, and never do because all writing in the field have always had access to all my records, the rotodex phone number I was given and I added after the visit in under Max Holland, not Kai Bird. I believe it was holland but if it was Bird they shared their information on their joint book.

Holland spent his time, most of it, working in our basement where he could not avoid seeing the large number of file cabinets of records there. More file cabinets than are required to hold the third of a million pages of once-withheld government records I got by all those FOIA lawsuits. Much of my own work and all the work on all those FOIA lawsuits are also there. Each and every file drawer is labeled with its contents. Holland selected the records of which he wanted copies and copied them on our copier.

When we talked before he went to go over the files in the basement we sat in the living room. Not only did he know about my work from Navasky at the least, because of my physical limitations we keep a supply of all my books where Holland could not avoid seeing them in the living room. He also saw them cartoned in the basement. We keep some in the living room because I then could use the stairs only infrequently and others brought those books up for me so I could fill orders. I make the packages in the living room, having no other space in which I can do that.

I go into this to leave it without question that Holland knew of my work and of all those lawsuits and of all the records, some of which he examined and some of which he copied, that he knew are freely available to all writing in the field. *as they were to him.*

Yet knowing of this he has never since his McCloy visit expressed any interest in seeing them, asked me no question about them, and presumes to write about the Commission for all the world as though he knows what he is writing about while keeping himself ignorant about all that free information.

5/ *Beginning of page 16* That represents a studied, a determined effort to remain ignorant, to be able to write from that profound ignorance, to be able to write whatever he wants to write, undisturbed by factual knowledge that would make writing from ignorance, from prejudice, from

what he wants to be rather than what is, untroubled as fact and evidence would, inevitably, trouble it.

That Oswald as a “Communist sympathizer” is illustrative.

As a preface I quote what Holland once said in literary criticism. It is not unique with him that he applied this to another, not to himself.

That other was his former sidekick and close pal, Kai Bird.

Despite their long friendship and professional association they broke up with seeming hard feelings. Instead of a joint book on McCloy each did his own. Writing in The Washington Post's weekly Book World of July 26, 1992, David Streitfeld said “they are enemies now” (his emphasis).

Bird's The Chairman: John J. McCloy, the Making of the American Establishment, was published by Simon & Schuster in the spring of 1992.

In that same issue of Book World there is a Holland letter critical of Bird's McCloy book. What I referred to earlier is his criticism of Bird for his alleged lack of “thorough research” for The Chairman.

Holland throws stones from a glass house. His referring to Oswald as a “Communist sympathizer” could entice a barrage.

When Holland was here if he'd looked at the subjects on those file cabinets he would have seen a drawer holding copies of the FBI's copies of Oswald's writings.

I made a separate file in a separate file drawer of all the Oswald writings I obtained from the FBI.

If he wanted to avoid having his lack of “thorough research” thrown at him he would have asked for what I have on Oswald and on his political views. But he did not even have to go to that

trouble to learn what Oswald's actual political views were. The index to Whitewash lists twelve pages on which I go into that from the official evidence only.

Beginning of page 17 If Holland had done the "thorough research" he chides Bird for not doing he would have known all of that from what the Warren Commission published. Supposedly he is writing its history from the same published Commission evidence he would have found what is in my Oswald in New Orleans, too, if he had deigned to demean himself and his writing by consulting anything other than what he wills into seeming to exist, that Oswald's favorite book was George Orwell's The Animal Farm. That is an anti-Communist classic.

In reading the following excerpt from page 122 one of those many references to Oswald's actual politics in the first of the Whitewash series, the book that remains the basic book on the subject, it should be noted that it gives the source in the Commission's published record for each quotation of Oswald's actual and private words:

Oswald's hatred of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union exude from 150 consecutive pages of his notes in the same volume, as well as from other exhibits (16H283-434). For example, in Exhibit 97 (pp.422-3) he raged, "The Communist Party of the United States has betrayed itself!" It has turned itself into the traditional lever of a foreign power to overthrow the government of the United States, not in the name of freedom or high ideals, but in servile conformity to the wishes of the Soviet Union.. (the leaders) have shown themselves to be willing, gullible messengers of the Kremlin's Internationalist propaganda...The Soviets have ...mass extermination...individual suppression and regimentation...deportations...the murder of history, the prostitution of art and culture. The communist movement in the U.S.; personalized by the Communist Party, U.S.A., has turned itself into a 'valuable gold coin' of the Kremlin. It has failed to denounce any actions of the Soviet Government when similar actions of the U.S. Government bring pious protest." (Spelling improved.)

The Report quotes some of this as well as "...I hate the U.S.S.R. and Socialist system..." (R399).

He also described himself as one with "many personal reasons to know and

Handwritten notes: "5" and "O/W" with a vertical line.

Handwritten note: "Aoto" with a horizontal line.

Handwritten mark: "JP" with a diagonal slash.

Handwritten notes: "to" and "M/V" with a horizontal line.

therefore hate and mistrust Communism..." (16H442).

Can it be that Holland became the expert he says he is on the Warren Commission, the writer who is writing its history, and he did not read all of the Oswald writings the Commission has in its volume 16? Well, perhaps that reflects his concept of scholarship, his words "adequate research," not reading what he writes about — at book length. But can he possibly extend that personal concept of scholarship to where he did not read the Commission's Report about which he writes so much and necessarily will write more.

If he had read the Report alone how could he then declare Oswald a "Communist sympathizer" when the Report itself includes Oswald's intense hatred of the USSR?

Beginning of page 17a. All of this and ever so much more like it raises the most substantial questions about Holland, about his pretended scholarship, about the honesty of this research and writing and about his objectives and their intellectual legitimacy. It raises the most basic of questions, too. For example, has he really read and understood what the Commission published? Could he undertake his project, even if he had read all the Commission published, with total disregard for the more than 200 cubic feet of its records at The National Archives and meet the minimum requirements of honest scholarship? If he had made an authentic scholar's examination of those records, can he write a history of the Commission without consulting the great volume of other relevant records that were available before he began his McCloy project and have been added to since then? If it is believed that volume is too great and requires too much time, could he write honestly without reading at the least the disclosed FBI Warren Commission files, of headquarters and of field offices which he could have examined here? Knowing how open I am with them?

I am, obviously, raising question of personal and professional integrity.

I am saying that he began with a preconception and in the obviously limited amount of preparation for writing limited himself to what he believed he could use as a propagandist rather than as a scholar. And he made some of that up, as we see!

Beginning of page 17b. There is a possible explanation of this. It is not a justification of it for that is not possible.

What outside my writing never received any attention of which I am aware Johnson's appointees on his commission are unique in our history. All parties in power always appoint a majority from its ranks to all bodies. Johnson did not. He selected his Commissioners with care. He made the minority Republicans a five-to-two majority on the Commission. That assured the Republicans would not be able to criticize whatever it concluded. And as Johnson knew, J. Edgar Hoover would be able to and would influence if not control those conclusions. Nobody in political life tangled with Hoover and survived politically. Of the two Democrats on the Commission Johnson was careful to appoint ^{-Ch. 10.10} that who not only were not pro-Kennedy — they were from electorates that were anti-Kennedy (as we see, Holland is not honest on this, too).

In getting the chief justice to head the commission when he and the chief justice both knew that was wrong, that he should not have been on the Commission at all, Johnson did much more than trade on a chief justice's reputation. Earl Warren was the darling of the eastern intellectual establishment. He knew that it would not disagree with its darling and he could reasonably expect that it would avoid all criticism of him, of his Commission and of its conclusions.

This in fact is what happened.

And is happening still with Holland.

So, it seems that Max Holland really does know what a "lack" of "thorough research" is from

his personal practice of it.

Page 18. That makes him publishable on the Warren Commission and on those who do not agree with it. It also got him a contract from Basic Books for his history of the Warren Commission, slated for 1996 publication.

His defense of the Commission follows. It takes up most of his article.