

extra space

In this we have been considering honesty, or the lack of it, dishonesty, and the consequences of dishonesty when trust is imparted ~~in it~~.

In taking what Holland published and using it as his own "ideas and thoughts," Hall was not honest. But his invitation to deliver the Scheloff lecture in Maryland, what is prestigious in Maryland, and ~~and the~~ acceptance for publication by the Maryland Law Review of that lecture in article form, were because Hall was trusted. Those responsible had no reason ~~to~~ even to ~~suspect~~ that Hall was really the subject-matter ignorant he is and that what he said and wrote were not ~~truly~~ his own work, his own study of the ~~evidence~~ <sup>official records</sup> available. He is, after all, an important man in

scholarly circles, *but he is not innocent, these earlier words of mine he misused.*

~~He~~ However, he should have been checked. Whether or not one ~~suspect~~ <sup>would</sup> suspect that a dean who is also a professor of ~~history~~ <sup>would</sup> and the law ~~will~~ take the "ideas and thoughts" of another and use them as his own, plagiarism in varying degrees is not all that uncommon. Known plagiarists include even Nobel laureates.

Hall did no checking at all before taking those ideas and thoughts he ~~got~~ <sup>took and took</sup> from Holland, ~~and~~ Hall was too ignorant of the subject matter to be able to make an independent judgement ~~without~~ <sup>could not and</sup> the checking he ~~did~~ not do and did not have done ~~for himself~~ <sup>by any who were capable of it.</sup>.

As Hall was trusted in Maryland, so was Holland trusted by ~~the~~ Hall.

All of this is Holland's fabrication. He knew better, whatever his reason, and political reasons are the most common for ~~these~~ <sup>these</sup> kinds of assassination fabrications, <sup>there</sup> ~~there~~ is no ~~innocence~~ <sup>innocence</sup> on ~~the~~ Holland's part, ~~either~~.

As indicated earlier, it is not possible to review what the Commission published and what was in its files and believe that ~~there was any significance~~ what Holland says and Hall cribbed from him, that the Commission and what it did

and did not do, what it believed and what it concluded, was in any significant degree influenced by "sources and methods" or considerations of "national Security."

Yet there remained the possibility that without reflecting it in what it

did and did not do or in what it <sup>concluded</sup> ~~concluded~~ these matters of Holland's

fabrication were on the Commission's mind. Holland knew that was not so <sup>documentation from me</sup> and he got that <sup>to aside from what is indicated above there was</sup> because ~~the~~ <sup>one other possible source</sup>, the Commission's TOP SECRET

executive sessions, <sup>Holland got</sup> he ~~got from me~~ <sup>and</sup> those transcripts <sup>from me, they</sup> prove that what

Holland attributed to the Commission was not a real factor in what it did

and did not do <sup>or</sup> ~~that~~ had any real connection with the assassination.

Earlier I reported that when Holland and his then friend and associate Kai Bird were working on their book on Commission member John J. McCloy Bird was here <sup>that</sup> and when he was here <sup>he</sup> had free and unsupervised access to all the records we have, by then more than a third of a million pages of once-withheld <sup>official</sup> assassination records <sup>I got by all those FOIA lawsuits.</sup> Bird got what he wanted. He saw the extent of what we have and make freely available to all writing in the field, more than what <sup>we</sup> got by all that FOIA litigation.

He discussed this with Holland. Holland wanted some of those records Bird had not gotten. We provided him with copies of them. What they are is disclosed in Holland's polite <sup>to me</sup> letter of thanks <sup>dated</sup> March 17, 1987. He wanted and he got <sup>because</sup> ~~by~~ my wife copying <sup>ed</sup> them one ~~page~~ <sup>transcript</sup> page at a time on our primitive copies, the Commission's executive sessions, <sup>those</sup> I had not published in facsimile, again as referred to above.

Holland's letter concludes:

Again, we are indebted to you for taking the trouble to point these transcripts out to us. And we thank Mrs. Weisberg for going to the trouble of copying all 397 pages. We will be back in touch at some point.

The Commission had "these transcripts" of only those <sup>e</sup> executive sessions because all its other transcripts were of testimony and were published in the first fifteen of <sup>e</sup> ~~the~~ twenty-six volumes.

in dist  
Dwyer  
APAC

From those executive session transcripts Holland knew that the Commission had no real problem with what he refers to as "sources and methods" and as "national security" and that there were no such factors <sup>of any real significance</sup> involved in the assassination investigation itself.

Yet knowing this Holland wrote his American Heritage article, which is based on what was proven not to be true by the <sup>official</sup> records <sup>he</sup> Holland had, and he <sup>twice</sup> contracted a book based on the identical fabrications. <sup>Basic Books,</sup> The first book contract was with

Here, from his writing it is apparent that Holland has talked himself into believing what he actually <sup>has seen</sup> ~~has to know~~ is not true. It is not possible to read his American Heritage article without, if one lacks subject-matter knowledge, believing that Holland is genuine in his belief in what he wrote, <sup>that is really fictional.</sup>

American Heritage took him on faith, at face value, obviously ~~without~~ any competent peer review, <sup>what</sup> ~~which~~ once was the respected tradition in non-fiction book ~~and~~ ~~an~~ article publishing.

From the information available at this writing is it apparent that Houghton Mifflin is the second book publisher to take Holland at face value, not to question what he ~~said~~ said he would deliver.

Obviously, Hall did himself in with his cribbing of the Holland he trusted and in ~~his~~, to refer to this as it is referred to above, his giving a bad name to source notes.

And, trusting Hall, those responsible for the Sobeloff <sup>presenting</sup> lecture series and for The Maryland Law Review, did not know that they were ~~reproducing~~ what was cribbed from a complete ~~manufacture~~ fabrication by Holland, <sup>who seems to have political</sup> <sup>motives for it.</sup>

This is, in miniature, the history of the acceptance of the Warren Report. Questions that should have been asked were not asked. Those who <sup>should</sup> have asked <sup>with a face value</sup> ~~the~~ questions, particularly the media, merely trusted the Warren Report and ~~of~~ refused to consider that it might not be fully accurate or truthful, as it wasn't.

Holland did write me, "We will be back in touch at some point."

He was not.

He ~~would~~ not have been once he decided to write this article and the book that is an enlarge<sup>my</sup>ment of it.

He had neither a need for <sup>or</sup> an interest in the vast amount of official fact freely available to him <sup>in</sup> the kind of book he ~~dec~~ decided to write or for the article he did write.

What the official fact refutes.

<sup>Holland's</sup> ~~his~~ is a "bogus revelation" that <sup>Hall</sup> ~~Holland~~ went for and used as his own bogus revelation for which, alas, the national ~~apete~~ <sup>media</sup> appetite does exist!

extra space

I repeat, we have been considering honesty.

*the government*

inevitably, the official need to convince the people that it was letting <sup>it</sup> all hang out when in fact there was no disclosure of actual assassination information led to an official lie that was more ridiculous than most <sup>which</sup> that have characterized the official record from the time of the assassination. Having only recently written about it, as Exhibit 11 in the foregoing reflects, and having used it in much earlier writing, I was surprised to read the Associated Press story in our local morning paper of July 2, 1997 with this headline:

" Mafia offered to kill Castro for CIA . . . free of charge. "

This was a banner headline across the entire top of that page of the main news section.

~~Eliminating the Kennedy falsifications at the end of this story~~  
~~is how it begins~~ <sup>also inevitable</sup> eliminate the anti-Kennedy falsifications with which this non-news ends. <sup>As we saw in</sup> Remembering Exhibit 11, ~~as~~ disclosed to me by the CIA almost a decade earlier, that mafia plot against Castro was of the Eisenhower/Nixon administration. It <sup>was of</sup> dated to August of the year before Kennedy became President. That was even before the election!

Here is how that non-sensation begins:

WASHINGTON (AP) - The CIA offered \$150,000 to assassinate Fidel Castro in the early 1960s, but the mob insisted on taking the job for free, according to a newly declassified document. "We were at (ideological) war," says Robert Maheu, who as a Las Vegas private investigator on the CIA payroll in 1960 hired Chicago crime boss Sam Giancana for the hit. "Would it be folly to go after Saddam Hussein during the Gulf War or to go after Hitler during World War II?" The underworld murder-for-hire contract was detailed in a summary of a May 1962 CIA briefing for then-Attorney General Robert

Kennedy. By then, the Kennedy White House had launched its unsuccessful Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba and several assassination attempts against Mr. Castro had failed. The memo is among 450 documents, nearly all newly declassified, that are included in a soon-to-be released State Department volume, "Cuba, 1961-62." Only two copies of the three-page memo were made, one each for the attorney general and CIA headquarters. In the memo, then-CIA director of security Sheffield Edwards writes that senior agency officials approved plots to kill Mr. Castro between August 1960 and May 1961. The White House isn't mentioned. "Knowledge of

this project ... was kept to a total of six persons," Mr. Edwards wrote. At least two assassination attempts were made with CIA-supplied lethal pills and organized crime-made muscle in early 1961, according to the memo and congressional hearings in 1975. Lawmakers counted a total of eight CIA tries to kill Mr. Castro in the early 1960s; Mr. Castro bragged the number was two dozen. The memo said Mr. Maheu contacted John Rosselli, a top Giancana lieutenant, to arrange the hits on Mr. Castro. "A figure of \$150,000 was set by the agency as a payment to be made on completion of the operation," the memo said. Mr. Rosselli and Mr. Giancana "emphatically stated that they wished no part of any payment."

This fabricated news was used to make it appear that the government is telling all about the assassination when ~~it~~ is telling the people not a thing <sup>that</sup> about the assassination. As the AP put it, referring to this bit of ancient history as "Newly-declassified," another four hundred and fifty <sup>to eyes</sup> are to be released soon. They relate ~~to Cuba~~ <sup>to Cuba</sup> which had no connection with the assassination. *Except in mythologies, official and ~~unofficial~~?*

*Contrary to the multitudinous anti-Kennedy fabrications not the least of which were by Judy Emor Campbell, (the first Kennedy knowledge of this plotting of the CIA with the mafia was when the bumbling wireman ~~the~~ CIA's honcho sent ~~from Miami to~~ <sup>got caught trying</sup> Vegas to get the proof for Sam Giancana that Phyllis McGuire was sleeping with Dan Rowan.*

The FBI's long and detailed records, and I have two fat files of them I got more than a decade ago, are under the name of that bumbler, Arthur James ~~Ba~~ <sup>Ba</sup> Palletti. Hoover wrote Robert Kennedy about it May 22, 1961. The copy of that letter I have ~~was never classified~~ <sup>did not qualify for classification. It was given the lowest classification.</sup> but it was marked as "declassified" on

*March 9, 1981. <sup>origin and a half years before this "disclosure" of what had nothing to do with the assassination</sup>*

Hoover was delicate about it while being suggestive.

Instead of writing Kennedy a letter on the FBI'd letterhead he wrote Kennedy on an FBI Memorandum form. That made it an LHM and that meant it was intended for unspecified distribution. The distribution indicated on it was to the man then deputy attorney general and the man then head of the criminal division of the Department, <sup>of</sup> *Carl Albert Supreme Court Justice Byron White* *Herbert S. Miller Jr.* In this memo Hoover omitted <sup>what</sup> that triggered it all, that tidbit of sex, <sup>of</sup> the CIA doing the spooking for the mafia don to learn for him if his girlfriend was two-timing him.

Which in the unreal realities of the phony pretense of ~~disclos~~ <sup>disclosing</sup> ~~disclosing~~ alleged assassination records that have nothing at all to do with the assassination makes this <sup>as</sup> <sup>board</sup> look like it is doing its job when it is not and cannot and in the course of it rewrites our history <sup>al</sup> <sup>sely</sup>.

*The established truth*

It is, in addition, entirely irrefutable.

It is the official evidence that the Commission could not avoid and did not dare try to destroy, ~~although, as we said, some were stolen~~ *this central witness* Instead it hid most of it and it was good fortune that I was able to get and reproduce much of it.

As the Post reported, as drafted and given to the Members for their approval, the Report stated of ~~this~~ <sup>it</sup> quintessential mythology "without which no such Report could have been dared," "The initial draft of the report stated, 'A bullet had entered his [Kennedy's] back at a point slightly below his shoulder to the right of the spine.' Ford wanted this to read, 'A bullet had entered the back of his neck slightly to the right of the spine.' The final report said, 'A bullet had entered the base of the back of his neck slightly to the right of his spine.'" *In any of these versions this was a known lie.*

In addition to all the "verification" of the actualities included above, particularly of the official certificate of death and the official and verified autopsy body chart and so much else included above, I do have what I have never used and do not use now because I do not believe they should be subject to any <sup>e</sup> *sensational uses or any* misuse, copies of the black-and-white autopsy pictures. This set I have was made from a copy made from the original negatives, it is that close to the original. There is no possibility of any question, that bullethole was down <sup>of</sup> in the back, from the official autopsy photograph <sup>it was</sup> (exactly where the certificate of death and the official <sup>and "verified"</sup> autopsy body chart place it. *pages 108-9*)

At the very least, as I brought to light in my Whitewash II that Hall misuses, that being the nature of this scholarship, Arlen Specter was shown that particular autopsy photograph by Secret Service Inspector <sup>also</sup> Tom Kelley. This was published in U.S. News and World Report. All the members, whether or not they saw the autopsy film they did have, had access to the records used as exhibits above and to use those words Hall saw <sup>ed</sup> fit to misuse, they had "no innocence" in these deliberate lies recorded in the records ~~that~~ it was so wrong for "ankin to steal from the Commission's record and treat and his own private property rather than the

esse the part of our history, essential also to the supposed official investigation- what his thevery kept authentic scholars and those who were really seeking to truth from being able to see, to study and to report to the people on.

The board stages a series of public-relations field days in its campaign to get the mishmash of records in Jim Garrison files, records that were for the most part not factual but were imagined. When it got them that, too, was a public-relations honanza for the board. *another to deceive the people with.*

But it made no known effort to obtain what Landin had stolen. That was the *deleted* voluntary gift of his son. *The board* It made no known *effort* ~~effort~~ to get what Commission Members *Dalles* and McCloy had and deposited.

The archive left by Kentucky's Senator John Sherman Cooper that my good friend, Louisville lawyer Bill Weichter is seeking to enhance, is sadly lacking in Commission records. The board has made no known effort to locate whatever papers Cooper had that were not deposited with his state university. Yet those would have been official records of the official investigation.

No headlines, no possible scandals in that. As there could be in the Garrison files that were not of the official investigation and in fact were not of the assassination itself.

For *that* which there was a ready market of those who support the official assassination mythology and seek what they can use and misuse to abuse and defame those who stick to the actual, official evidence of the assassination as the sycophants have not and cannot.



7  
This was five years after that 1992 Act. And for all that time this does not represent ignorance or lies: it is both ignorance and lies.

disgraces us all,  
It ~~disgraces us~~, as individuals and as a nation.  
It is ~~more~~ "bogus revelation," but this and so much more like it ~~that that~~ bogus revelation is not

from any national appetite" for it.

The people want the truth to the degree that the truth is possible, not the "bogus,"

Instead they continue to get all this unending "bogus revelation"

~~and~~ about the JFK assassination. that is bogus but is not revelation.

from officialdom and from sycophants of officialdom.

It is as we learned as children, Oh what a tangled web we weave when first  
we start to deceive.

It will never end until the government decided to be honest and there  
is little prospect of that.

It was, in fact, resumed that very day as the ARRB continued with its  
public relation campaign to persuade the country that it had been and was  
doing its job when it was not and could not.

On July 2 it had the archives disclose what was described as some forty  
thousand pages provided by J. Lee Rankin's son.

As the Washington Post handled that story Rankin had kept an original  
suggestion for a change in the Report by Gerald Ford. The Post did not tell its  
readers that the language of the Report and of the change Ford proposed and was  
almost entirely accepted were proven to be false by the Commission's own  
evidence. In that there was no evidence to justify the supposition that is  
included in the Report to describe the myth of the single, magical bullet.

The change Ford suggested was designed to make the impossible single-  
bullet theory seem more possible. As the actual evidence scattered throughout  
all my published book leaves beyond question, it was and the Commission knew  
it was entirely impossible.

A few illustrations of this total and complete impossibility, not including  
all the official evidence that Oswald could not have fired any of those shots from  
that rifle and from that alleged "sniper's nest" ~~are the possibility of~~  
~~that shooting in the official testings of the Commission, cited above, are~~  
are in the foregoing. They are not all by any means. They are merely a selection  
of the readily-available official evidence for the purposes of proving how  
completely bogus this adventure by Hermit Hall is.

None of the above-cited evidence is conjectural and all of it is official,  
is the Commission's own evidence,