

CHAPTER TWO

THE PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AND LAW NEEDS LESSONS ON BOTH

We see a trifle of what Hall can draw on to criticize me for stating that there was no consideration of any assassin other than Oswald (and there are FBI records on this, too) from his reflection of his role as historian and his concept as a professor of law of the way the law works. This when it is simply beyond any question at all that from the moment of the crime nobody other than Oswald was considered officially and as soon as Oswald was killed there was this de facto conspiracy to freeze this conspired-on concept in our history. And this regardless of the truth and the inherent intent to exculpate the actual assassins.

Hall also assumes Oswald's guilt. He does not even pretend to prove it.

As a historian and a lawyer, given Hall's reflected concept of the proper function of historians and lawyers in a society like ours, it is not necessary for him to make even the most perfunctory showing that there is something wrong in my having written in the first book on the JFK assassination that the expected job had not been done. Nor did proper scholarship require Hall to go a few

lines further and quote what I have there said, that the job remaining to be done should be done by Congress. Hall criticizes me for what I wrote with partial, incomplete and unfaithful quotation yet he does not note that a decade and a half later the Congress came to agree with what I write as many years earlier and in its conclusions it disagreed with the Commission by holding that there was a conspiracy. (In this conclusion I also stated the Congressional investigation should be entirely in public. That one was not. Witness the suppression of the Ebersole testimony above-- and that is far from all that was suppressed and could be suppressed because some, if not most sessions, were in secret, with none of the public or the media present.

In passing (and perhaps this should be above) I note that Hall also begins as did the government on whose board he serves, by assuming that Oswald was the lone assassin. He states, "Many factors were undoubtedly involved in Oswald's motivations for the assassination." Scholar of eminence that he is, lawyer sufficiently steeped in and schooled in the law and the American concepts of the law that he is to be able teach it, having said this found no need to illustrate this. That is fortunate because other than as fiction it cannot be proven or even illustrated.

In this it seems that Hall confesses that in the remote possibility there are records that suggest another assassin or assassins they will not be disclosed so far as he is concerned because they are not relevant.

Before returning to what Hall stated that is of more

substance and has to do with the concept, not original with him, that one thing not needed for the job he accepted is knowledge or the fact of the assassination, there is another of his unwarranted lumpings of me amidst some of the most outrageously false and dishonest writings about the assassination. There he does include Gerald Posner and his mistitled book, Case Closed, But oddly Hall does not include my refutation of it, Case Open. So much for his concept of scholarship, and the thoroughness of his research and citations--if not still again of his honesty. But at the end of that catalogue of his alleged conspiracy theorizing, he writes:

Harold Weisberg, Frame-Up; Martin Luther King/James Earl Ray Case (1971) (drawing a parallel between the JFK conspiracy and "framing" of James Earl Ray in the King murder)."

For this, eminence of history and law and of education that he ^{is,} Hall needs no authority, no quotation of a single word.

There is no "parallel" of conspiracies in my JFK and King assassination books. Although it cannot be apparent to those who get their information and understanding from Hall. Frame-Up was based entirely on the public domain. It was written to inform people, not to allege any conspiracy of any kind, and to make a record for our history. Despite the Halls of history that remains the basic and quite correct book on the subject. In fact it provided the basis for a Ray effort to get the trial he never had. Yes, in these United States, it is possible, particularly in a crime of this magnitude, for a man to be put away for the rest of his life without a trial. That happened to Ray.

After the book Frame-Up appeared I became Ray's investigator.

I even got him free counsel to replace the right-wing racists he had. I conducted the investigation for the two weeks of the evidentiary hearings in federal district court in Memphis. I produced most of the witnesses and helped the lawyers in various ways.

In the end what I did was take the case alleged against Ray and refuted it. His lawyer had been the country's most famous criminal lawyer, the late Percy Foreman. What had to be proven to get Ray the trial Foreman foreclosed by intimidating Ray into a guilty plea, was that Foreman had not rendered effective assistance as Ray's counsel and that he had coerced Ray into the guilty plea.

Foreman's opinion of Frame-Up was not that of scholar Hall.

Foreman had agreed to appear on New York TV in those days before lawyers could advertise. I had agreed to confront him on that TV show. The station sent Foreman a copy of the book without telling him he would confront me, along with the lawyer he replaced, Arthur Hanes. When Foreman learned from the makeup man that he would confront me, he roared like a speared lion and without taking the makeup off he ran shouting threats of a new kind of libel, the unspoken libel, out of the station.

He had no answer for what Frame-Up says about him.

To prove Ray had not the effective assistance of counsel I decided, and the decision was left to me, that the only way, given Foreman's reputation, was to produce the available exculpatory evidence Foreman had ignored, had not even tried to get.

As happens, the judge decided politically, contrary to

evidence. In his decision he could not entirely ignore the record before him. So he held against Ray and to do that stated that guilt or innocence was not material to what was before him. He held contrary to the evidence that Foreman rendered effective assistance as Ray's counsel when Foreman had prepared no case, no defense and made no investigation.

It is apparent in this example, too, that Hall and his associated scholars and researchers regard evidence as what they do not want in anything they write.

There are not all that many books that provide a viable defense for anyone accused of so serious a crime but Frame-Up Hall leaves without recognition in what he says that is not about it or what it did do.

The record is in federal district court in Memphis in the form of two weeks of transcripts of testimony, mornings and afternoons, subject to cross-examination and refutation by the state, and in many relevant exhibits. But Hall needs no knowledge of the fact of the JFK assassination in order to decide what government records are relevant and should be disclosed. He also needs not know a thing about the facts of the King case or a word about the actual content of Frame-Up in order to express his criticism of it.

And it surely does make for an impressive collection of impressive footnotes which is how scholarship is measured today--not by contents, by their volume. Regardless of how irrelevant and worse, how dishonest they are, as we see in this Hall diatribe presented as scholarship.

It is not easy for one of the many whose reputations Hall undertook to damage, secure in his ignorance and supported by his prejudices and preconceptions, but in the effort I state that he does not tell the truth in saying: "This article addresses the Kennedy murder, generally, with the work of the Assassinations Records Review Board."

Hall does not in any way "address the Kennedy murder" in the "article." Nor, from anything it has disclosed of which I know, has his board. We return to both of these matters later.

Cribbing directly from his fellow subject-matter ignoramus Max Holland, who is cited among Hall's sources, he has the fiction that the Cold War required secrecy regarding sources and methods so the Commission "could not argue its case fully." This fabrication is cited to Holland's article here given as "The Key to the Warren Report," American Heritage, November 1995, at 50, 52."

(In the lengthy article Holland has not a single fact about the assassination. He argues with seeming scholarship but actually childishly that the Commission was right because it was wrong in what it withheld. He also then announced an enlargement of this pseudo-scholarship in a book to have been published that winter by Basic Books. It did not. The latest report is that his approach to the assassination, which is devoid of fact of the assassination, the only way he can argue his myth, is due from Houghton-Mifflin (August of 1998).

There is little more worthy of the greatest contempt and condemnation than making the most serious of accusations and

attributing them to the dead who cannot respond. This Hall does in stating that ". . . Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy failed to reveal information that would have helped identify a motive for a conspiracy."

In this Hall moderated what he spelled out and is here spelled out if anyone checks his sources, which are among the most dubious in any assassination literature.

Perhaps because Maryland is a largely Democratic state, perhaps because Robert Kennedy's daughter is the popular lieutenant governor, Hall here moderates the charge he laid against Robert Kennedy. It is a variation of this dishonesty of his he liked so much in an article in the February, 1997 issue of the Newsletter of the Organization of American Historians. His formulation there is that John and Robert Kennedy devised "a covert scheme . . . to assassinate Fidel Castro with the help of organized crime." For the historians, of whom he is one, in that article he required and gave no source notes. That he would flaunt his ignorance about major events in history he had lived through is little short of astounding for a dean and all the other things Hall is.

He titled it in accord with the Holland mythology that appealed so much to him, such being his ignorance of the established fact of the JFK assassination, and he gave the historians his Mencken line on "the virulence of the national appetite for bogus revelation." (That this incredible pap by Hall could get both published and honored does seem to establish that there is an "appetite for [the] bogus revelation," which Hall delivered).

There, too, dean of history and law that Hall is, he attributed this alleged Kennedy-mafia plot to Operation Mongoose. For the historians, many of whose stomachs should have rebelled, Hall added:

When these plans reached the public several years later, critics had a field day. The Commission's conclusion that a foreign government lacked a sufficient motive to murder the president now crumbled. Indeed, the Commission looked silly and, even worse, culpable, since its critics could plausibly assert that its distinguished members should have guessed at such a possibility.

Operation Mongoose came years after the mafia plot. It was not a plan for assassination. It was a plan for an invasion of Cuba. As Defense Secretary Robert McNamara told a gathering of those who had been involved on both sides of the Cuban missile crisis, Mongoose was not an assassination plan. The Church Committee report also states this.

What a booboo for an eminent historian who in addition to all his responsibilities as an educator also writes books to inform people!

And he not only does not know anything at all about this, he makes up what was impossible for the historians and for the Maryland Law Review!

Some of Hall's staff has been here. It knows in general what I have and it knows I make all of it available to all working in the field. I showed them a special file of documents I keep on my desk to show those who have an interest in the publicly unreported underlying official fact of the JFK assassination. Were this not true, Hall has his responsibilities as a dean, as a historian who

teaches history and as a lawyer, and as a member of the board, to have at least a glimmer of knowledge of what he talks and writes about.

The truth was disclosed to me by the CIA and I have always made it available to everyone. (see Exhibit 11). The CIA would have withheld it, as it refused to replace an earlier related memo that was stolen from me despite my making our copier freely available to all, but it had no choice this time because it was being processed for disclosure to me by the Department of Justice. The CIA was not about to try to pull on Justice the dirty tricks it has contrived to refuse to abide by the law with me.

The records disclosed to me state that the CIA's mafia plot to kill Castro was in place even before JFK was elected!!!!

In this memo the CIA dates it to August 1960. The election was the November that followed. And Kennedy did not become President and his brother the Attorney General until the end of the coming January, six months later!

The nature of this memo was such that the CIA did not dare lie. It might stretch things a bit but there was no possibility of an overt lie in what would in the name of the director, be sent by the general counsel to reach the attorney general.

The memo was written by the CIA's honcho on the silliness, the director of its Office of Security, Sheffield Edwards. Here I quote what goes even further than the secret plot preceding the Kennedy administration and having not a thing in the world to do with any Kennedy. The emphasis I add:

Knowledge of this project [sic] during its life was kept to a total of six persons and never became a part of the project current at the time for the invasion of Cuba.

There should be no misunderstanding of this language. That invasion plot "current at the time" was the Bay of Pigs. It also was of the Eisenhower administration, as was this misbegotten mafia plot. It without question was an Eisenhower/Nixon plot that not only no Kennedy had anything to do with--not one of them knew of it or could know of it "during its life," the reason emphasis is added above.

The Kennedys' learned about it, as did others, with its exposure. But that is different and in some ways a bizarre and titillating story. Those interested in researching it in my files will find those FBI records in folders labelled with the name of a bungling wire-tapper who got caught, James Balletti.

(One of the mafiosa who was supposedly working for the CIA on the deal, Sam "Momo" Giancana, was having an affair with Phyllis, one of the famous Maguire singing sisters. Giancana believed that she was two-timing him with Dan Martin, of the then also famous Rowan and Martin comedy team. The CIA's honcho on the "project," Robert Maheu, asked for help by Giancana, engaged the private detectives who sent Balletti to Vegas to tape the proof and he got caught).

Later in the memo Edwards states that the six to whom any knowledge at all could be attributed were all high officials of the CIA.

After Hall's article appeared in the OAH newsletter I wrote

Hall correcting him, on February 28, 1997. It was not the first time I wrote him. As on previous occasions, he did not respond. (see Exhibit 12).

The law that created the board on which Hall serves requires that the board make all its records available to the public when it ends its work. This means that what I wrote should be included. However, I do not believe that Hall would want what I wrote him to be a permanent record of his board forever accessible to people. So, to assure that it is not memory-holed--or to assure this to the degree possible for me, I sent a copy to the board's director. In the event he also elects not to permit that to remain in the files the board will leave, I have deposited copies with a number of educators one of whom may perhaps see to it that any official suppression of this letter, this indictment, can be called to public attention.

Now on the "motive for a conspiracy" Hall imagines, and his imagination of this is plagiarized, that also is a world-class indictment of any professional historian, more one who is an educator, and more still one who is, I believe given his record this cannot be repeated too often, "Dean, College of Humanities; Executive Dean, College of Arts and Science; and Profesor of History and Law, the Ohio State University."

He is actually saying that Castro had the motive to get Kennedy killed, that being the "conspiracy" he visualized, with the source Warren Hinckle and William Turner literary junk in the form of a book.

(Hinckle was the former editor of the defunct Ramparts magazine. He became a San Francisco columnist. Turner was one of the very few FBI agents fired by Hoover. He considered that having to fire an agent reflected on the Bureau so he usually banished them to a post not considered the best. In those days he preferred Butte, Montana. Turner had been a "black bag job" expert. Those black bag jobs were robberies.)

Can Hall have the remotest knowledge of history when he can say something like this?

Can he recall what he lived through, the 1962 Cuba missile crisis?

Can he have gotten his education in history without having learned all about that crisis that could have ended with the world engulfed in the hottest flames?

And can he meet his responsibilities in Ohio and to its state university with this remarkable display of the grossest ignorance in the field of his specialty?

There was nobody in the entire world who had less motive for getting Kennedy killed, more motive for wanting him to continue to live, than Fidel Castro.

This is, of course, all the propaganda of those who are dominated by their political beliefs but their propaganda is just that and has no connection with fact and reality.

Regardless of what Hall may believe and does say, Castro could not have wanted any foreign leader, not excluding Khrushchev, to be any safer than Kennedy.

The Cuba missile crisis is something one ought to be able to assume historians have studied and do understand. It was what could have ended the world as we knew it. There were times during this period when that seemed probable. For his share in steering the world around that disaster John F. Kennedy will be long remembered and honored in history, regardless of the stalwart and continuous efforts of those who are dignified by being called "revisionists."

For those who did not live through that trying time and for those too young to have studied it on the college level, it came to pass when Soviet missiles were discovered based in Cuba. It was the Soviet position that those missiles were there in defense of Cuba only, as we claimed that our missiles on the Soviet border in Turkey, and those in Italy and England, were in those places only for defense. Robert Kennedy took the lead in achieving the peaceable solution to the crisis. It was that in return for the removal of those Soviet missiles and certain aircraft and troops the United States would guarantee Cuba against any invasion.

This is a guarantee Khrushchev could not have given Castro.

But Kennedy did.

And the world knew that his right-hand on this solution was his brother the attorney general.

It requires of Hall, that he have the most militant kind of ignorance in the field of his supposed expertise, for him to say that the CIA's mafia plot was of the Kennedys and that it gave Castro all the motive he needed to get JFK killed.

All this in the context of that Hollandaise about tight

secrecy around sources and methods and "national security."

The actuality is that after this missile crisis JFK initiated secret talks with Castro looking to the resolution of their disagreements. It is well and amply reported, with even whole books devoted to it, that JFK initiated talks on two levels. Officially he had his ambassador to th UN, William Atwood, talk to Castro's ambassador, Carlos Lechuga. They were brought together at Kennedy's request by ABC News' Lisa Howard, who had interviewed Castro. On the unofficial level Kennedy asked the French cor^respondent Jean Daniel, who was on his way to interview Castro, to feel Castro out on the hoped-for rapproachment and return and inform Kennedy.

Lechuga wrote a book about this, In the Eye of the Storm. It was published by Australia's Ocean Press.

As soon as he could after the assassination, Daniel wrote a series of articles. In the United States they were published by the New Republic.

Daniel was with Castro when Castro learned of the assassination. The Daniel description of Castro's appearance when he got the news is of a man who was both shocked and surprised, of a man who could not have had anything to do with it and who was terribly sorry for it.

However, the truth is that there was no connection with the JFK assassination and no rational basis even for suspecting that there had been.

Quite separate from all of this and totally ignored by subject-matter ignoramuses, including historians, is whether the

existing official evidence of the assassination of which those like the Hollands and the Halls have preserved a resolute ignorance, permits attributing it to Castro or those who liked him. Or for that matter, to Khrushchev, who also did not want Kennedy killed. As even J. Edgar Hoover pointed out in an interview with William Manchester quoted elsewhere herein, Khrushchev and Kennedy were getting along well. The fact is that Kennedy's beginnings of the reduction of military expenditures appealed to the Soviets who were being bankrupted by the cost of keeping up with our own military expenditures.

Moreover, both Castro and Khrushchev, whether or not Hall and Holland did, knew very well that Kennedy had become a dove and Johnson remained and continued to remain the hawkishest of hawks.

Neither preferred the hawk Johnson to the dove Kennedy.

Neither had the motive to get Kennedy killed and neither wanted it, despite the nuts of assassination writing, those with political concepts to support and advance, and the pseudo-scholars like Holland and their myths of required secrecy.

With Holland available for all he imagined that appealed to this professional historian, Hall has Holland as authority for the stupid statement that "in appointing the [Warren] Commission, President Johnson had one goal: to check rumors that the assassination was a Communist plot."

Repeating it is both stupid and ignorant of Hall.

We have seen what was stated by those who are responsible for the selection of a Presidential Commission approach to looking into

the assassination. While they did want all rumors wiped out--they even wanted all "speculation ended"--that was not anybody's primary reason.

It is Holland's because he needs that to be believed to have the book he announced.

The most important of the reasons was to satisfy the people that the crime was being investigated and that it would be reported to them. There were many other reasons, many needs to be met. One of these needs, as Johnson saw it and talked about it, as also did the FBI, was to see to it that the Congress did not launch investigations of its own. There were a number of committees in each house that could have held hearings, whose responsibilities could have been interpreted as requiring them to investigate. By appointing a Presidential commission Lyndon Johnson foreclosed all of that.

And kept control.

While Johnson did have what Hall and Holland state as a "goal," it was one of many and it was anything but the major one. Except that the Hollands and the Halls, staying as far away from the established official fact as they do, have licensed themselves to make any political statement they want and to palm it off as real when it is not real at all.

As a matter of fact, in those first days after the assassination there was as much if not in fact more concern that the assassination was by anti-Castros who had come to be strongly opposed to Kennedy and his policies and blamed him for continuing Castro in power.

As even the Halls and Hollands should have known.

But in Holland's revision, this is what comes out at the point Hall cites, "Attention fixed on the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba as the only governments that could possibly undertake and benefit from such a heinous plot."

"Attention fixed" by whom Holland does not say. Just as well he does not, it not being real on the government level. China is a Holland improvement on the older fiction.

How in the world any government could see "benefit" from killing JFK and suffering the consequences requires a Holland mind because the normal mind cannot grasp that. It simply was not true.

To a mind dominated by unreal political preconceptions this might appear to be true when it was not even reasonable and then the Hollands do not include the consequences of nuclear retaliation such plotter had to have in mind. Whatever the Hollands and the Halls may imagine any country could see as a "benefit" to it could not possibly justify the risk of being wiped out in a nuclear conflagration in retaliation.

Simply it was not true whatever Holland and Hall after him may imagine, and they do not say what any government could regard as "benefit" from the assassination. To get a hawk to repalce a dove?

At what Hall cites Holland also has other fictions that can perhaps help place books and excite those he would like to excite politically to sell books but is not in any sense real:

The assassination might be the first in a concerted series of attacks on U.S. leaders or the prelude to an all-out attack.

Naturally, Holland has no source for this.

It might have been believed to be possible at the time of the assassination and perhaps for a few hours after it, but the rest of this simply was not possible long before Johnson appointed the Warren Commission.

This is Holland seeking to create hysteria to give his silliness about "security" some basis where there was none relating to the actual official assassination information and to excite those who might be seduced by it into buying his book which cannot be about the assassination because he diligently preserved his ignorance of that fact which does not exist in what he has written and Hall cites.

As Hall continues to ramble along writing about what he knows nothing at all about he says:

[As] the science of forensic analysis has progressed over the past decades, questions have inevitably arisen about the Warren Commission's conclusions involving the President's body, n57 the alleged murder weapon, n58 and the condition of the so-called "magic bullet," which passed through the President and Governor John Connally with a minimum of damage, n 60. We know that the autopsy performed on the President was problematic, both in technique and organization, n 61. Yet, the Commission relied on it. on other matters, new forms of analysis have been generally supportive of the Commission's findings although it now appears that the sequence of shots fired in Daley Plaza was somewhat different from that described by the Commission. n62 Ironically, even when the latest techniques corroborate the Commission's findings, the result has not been greater confidence in those findings, but rather, a belief that the Commission got it wrong instead of almost getting it right. n63

It is not any "progress" in "forensic science," real or imagined, and Hall has no source for this alleged "progress" in his

citation, which is to the Report beginning on page 15, that is responsible for any "questions" that "have inevitably arisen" about what the Commission said about damage to the President's body.

All those things were known almost immediately and all that were necessary were known as soon as the Report could be read. Also not attributable to any such "progress" is the utter destruction of the autopsy by the Department of Justice panel appointed to validate the autopsy. Which, in the course of demolishing it, that panel did say that it did validate the autopsy.

The panel's report was kept secret by the Department until January, 1969, when it was disclosed, it happens to me, in a lawsuit filed by Jim Garrison the Department was contesting. I was the subject-matter expert in that litigation.

I published that report in facsimile in Post Mortem. That was in 1975. That was not after three decades, as Hall has it. And whether or not he has Post Mortem, his board staff does and has read it.

With regard to the fatal shot to the head, which the autopsy prosecutors stated was at the base of the occiput, this panel of the most outstanding experts the government could get states it was a hundred millimeters higher (page 591 of Post Mortem). (see Exhibit 13). That is four inches higher than the prosecutors said and four inches is a major dimension on any head. Placing the point of entry four inches higher than the autopsists did is in itself the end of the autopsy and the Warren Report that it is based on it.

What the bullet did and where it went inside the head cannot be the same if it entered the head four inches higher than the autopsy states. It invalidates all testimony based on entry four inches lower. This includes the testimony, if what the Commission depended on can be called testimony rather than conjecture or imagination, on the point of origin of that bullet. Surely the professor of law, which Hall is, knows that if the Commission decided that the dispersal of fragments of bullet depicted by the autopsy X-rays is correct with the bullet entry so low on the back of the head it was almost in the neck, that dispersal of fragments cannot possibly be the same if the point of entry was at the top of the head.

The autopsy report also states that what came to be known as the magic bullet struck no bones in the President's body. (We have more on this later). But this same panel report, under "Neck Region", which in the autopsy that bullet is said to have entered, states straightforwardly that "several metallic fragments are present." This means that the magic of the magic bullet has to be increased enormously first not to show the loss of these fragments and then not to have that loss reflected in its weight. (Post Mortem, p. 592). (see Exhibit 14).

In addition to the facsimile reproduction of that part of the panel report, Post Mortem there cites Humes' testimony at 2H361 that the same X-rays showed no metal fragments. Moreover, regardless of what Hall and others imagine, that bullet, which I held in my hand and examined with care and of which I have pictures, lost no fragments. We have more on this later, too. 67

Later the prosecutors were taken to the Archives to examine the autopsy film and they wrote their own report on it. It was disclosed along with the panel's report but neither attracted much attention. They did get attention from the assassination nuts, whose imaginings were refuted by this science that was, I repeat, three decades earlier than the time of the Hall article, not his imagined more recent "progress."

The language of the prosecutors is tricky and has to be read with care. The note at the bottom of that page of Post Mortem, page 578, should be read with care. (see Exhibit 15). These prosecutors state that there is "no evidence of a bullet or a major portion of a bullet in the body of the President" This language virtually states that there were minor portions of a bullet or bullets visible in the neck region. But the autopsy report prepared, filed and sworn to, and on which the Report is based states specifically that no bone was struck in that region or anywhere other than in the head.

The President was not born with metallic fragments in his neck region. Nor did he get any during World War II.

This tricky language to hide the fact that the language of the autopsy report is not true and yet the entire official investigation was and had to be based on it.

So also is all Hall stated in his Sobeloff speech and in this law review article.

At this very point in his article almost all those notes of his use the Report as his authority, and if the Report is wrong, as

it is, he cannot be right, as he isn't. In addition, he in effect argues in those notes that the Report is right because it says it is right and nothing else makes any difference.

I have these documents, obviously, but I use them as I published them in Post Mortem for a reason, for the same reason I use selections from other of my books. The reason is that with all the junk and all the citation to the obscure and little-known that Hall and his expert assistants and researches used they did not use basic books that have content not duplicated in any other work and that has stood time's testing and are accurate.

Those writers who campaigned to dig up Edgar Allen Poe and General Zachary Taylor are not typical. But Hall uses and depends on them. He depends, too, on an utterly irrational source whose rationality is in question.

Not only should those working in the field, as those on whom Hall draws have done, but Hall himself should have known of those books of which he makes no mention if he considers himself qualified to write such an article.

This, too, gets to the honesty of his entire project, of his speech under prestigious auspices in Maryland and in his article for the Maryland Law Review which, obviously, trusted him, accepted him on his credentials, and did no checking and had no checking done.

Even if all these people, Hall included, were fresh to the field and began with no knowledge of the available literature, in ordinary, everyday research it is not possible to avoid the

existence of the books that Hall omits with all the trash on which he draws. They are all listed in the standard sources, aside from also being cited in the trash and trivia on which he and his do draw.

Books in Print is a standard source for anyone looking for books on any subject. My books have been listed in it for three decades as stated above. All of them are listed under my name. For example, on page 7718 of the current issue.

In addition, we have and for years have had a display of an eighth of an page in it.

Years ago Law Books in Print decided that my books should be listed and they are and have been ever since. (see Exhibit 16).

Why Hall et al did not check these standard sources and do not list or mention Post Mortem is obvious from the illustrations 68 above and there are innumerable other illustrations of it. A few more will follow.

They prove that Hall's speech and article are untruthful.

It did not take those "three decades" of Hall's or the "science of forensic analysis" to "progress" to where the few questions he acknowledges could be seen. They have all existed from the very first.

Hall quotes Whitewash, the first book on the subject, prejudicially. What he does not do, what is not honest for him to hide, is the fact that the basic forensic criticism of the autopsy and of the assassination investigation are included in it.

This is shockingly true of what Hall next says, nothing

omitted in quoting, "the alleged murder weapon, the number and sequence of the shots fired at the President and the condition of the so-called 'magic bullet,' which passed through the President and John Governor Connally with a minimum amount of damage."

With regard to the latter, as was brought to light in Whitewash, all the doctors, including the three autopsy prosectors, did not agree with this.

To get around that, as again the first book on the subject brought to light, the Commission assistant counsel who did that questioning substituted an imaginary bullet, "not this bullet, any bullet, doctor," and then he asked them hypothetically questions about that hypothetical bullet that in the Report are stated as relating to that "magic bullet" and which is the exact opposite of the doctors' testimony. (See the chapters "The Doctors and the Autopsy" and "The Number of Shots," pages 155ff and 167ff).

On the number of shots nothing is more basic than the Commission's testing on this. For that testing, at the Army's Proving Grounds at Edgewood Arsenal about thirty miles north of Baltimore, Maryland, the Army got the best shots in the country through the National Rifle Association. All were rated as "Masters" by it. Before they used that rifle it was overhauled. It needed overhauling. After it was overhauled, for the telescopic sight--and the rifle was not made for the use of a telescopic sight--had to be shimmed to be used. Those "master" riflemen, the best in the country if not the world, were not firing from behind a window the bottom of which was only a foot from the floor. They were on a

sturdy platform. They did not fire from as high up as the sixth floor window. Their platform was half that height. Thus the angle of their shooting was half as steep. They did not fire through a densely-leafed tree and in great haste. They took all the time they wanted for the first shot. They did not fire at a moving target not going in a straight line. They fired at fixed targets, with all the time they wanted to adjust to them.

In leading into this Whitewash uses the best authority in the world for the shooting of which Oswald was capable, the United States Marines. Even though it had been years since he fired a rifle and firing is a mechanical skill requiring constant practice. (As it also stated elsewhere in Whitewash, with a former Navy expert as the authority.) The Marines evaluated Oswald as "a rather poor 'shot'" in the words given the Commission "by direction of the Commandant of the Marine Corps." (see Exhibit 17).

That letter is published in facsimile in Whitewash on page 30. Whitewash is one of Hall's sources, at least for deprecating it and me and misrepresenting the entire subject as he does. If he used Whitewash as a source, as he states he did, instead of taking the undependable word of a less than honest assistant, he had to know that Oswald was indeed a lousy shot at his best and that was years earlier.

Hall also should have known the results of the Edgewood Arsenal testing because it is also reported in Whitewash, on page 26, with, as with all that book, the Commission's published evidence cited.

It cannot be repeated too often, that book is one of his sources! (see Exhibit 18).

And what was the result of the testing of the overhauled rifle with those vastly improved conditions and by the best possible professional shooters, all rated as "masters."?

Not one could duplicate the shooting attributed to the duffer Oswald!

Not a single one of the country's best shots under vastly improved conditions!

Now that was before the Warren Report was out, months before. So, obviously, Hall simply is not truthful, to put it modestly, in saying that "three decades" of "advances" in "forensic analysis" was required to answer questions about the "alleged murder weapon, the number and sequencing of the shots. . . the condition of the so-called 'magic bullet' which passed through the President and Governor John Connally with a minimum of damage."

While literally Hall here says that the alleged "minimum amount of damage" was to Connally, he means to the bullet--and the actual evidence, the actual official evidence is that no damage was done to it and that it could not have been fired during the assassination. There is no proof at all that any metal^{is} missing from that bullet other than taken by the FBI.

This may not seem credible to those familiar with all that has been said in support of the Report and who are not familiar with the official evidence rather than the official and most unofficial representations of it but it is that fact that is in many different

ways scattered throughout my books, with the official evidence as the source. We see some later.

Hall and those on whom he heaps such fulsome praises and use Whitewash as a source cannot have used it as honest scholars use sources and not seen what I quoted above and so very much more like it.

They omit it because it refutes what they began intending to say and then said to desecrate the Sobeloff lecture and the Maryland Law Review.

And not a word, not a single word of this is new. It all dates to what the Commission published at the end of 1964 and what Whitewash reported of what the Commission published in early 1965!

It is simply not possible, from the official evidence cited above, for that so-called "magic bullet," which had a magic unequaled in science of mythology, to have done what Hall states, as the Commission made up and stated it did.

We have seen from the Edgewood testing that it was not possible for that rifle to have fired those bullets, magic or otherwise, within the time permitted, so on that basis alone, as the scholar and lawyer Hall should have known, what he says and writes was and is totally impossible.

This is far from all and what follows will also be far from all, but the most deliberate dishonesty (if not by Hall by those on whom he heaps such fulsome praise and without whom he could not have dreamed of this lecture or his article) is apparent in this alone.

It will be even more apparent.

He follows this with another untruth, "We now know that the autopsy performed on the President was problematical, both in technique and organization."

And only "in technique and organization"?

In plain English, and it is past time for bluntness, this is a lie and it is a lie that cannot be accidental.

We have just seen that the Department of Justice panel of the finest experts in the country, using the autopsy X-rays and pictures, say other than the autopsy doctors say about the same autopsy evidence. We have also seen that the autopsy doctors all but confess that contrary to their protocol and sworn testimony there was metal in the President's chest when they swore there was none and that after studying the very same X-rays based on which the panel and they said the opposite.

"Technique" is a way of saying that the prosecutors were ordered not to perform a complete autopsy.

Only "Now"?

For shame!

It could not have been more clearly established than in Whitewash for an early book, and that was more than 30 years ago, not only "now."

It was carried much further in the Louisiana v. Clay Shaw case of Jim Garrison's.

Until I learned the basis of that case I had agreed to be Garrison's "Dealey Plaza" expert. When I learned the nature of his

case I withdrew. But before then I had been preparing his lawyers for this area of questioning, on the medical evidence in particular.

There was a strange and little known and never or almost never reported development in that case. The United States government sent an autopsy doctor, Colonel Pierre Finck, down there to be a defense witness. Finck testified that the government did that. He also testified under the brilliant cross-examination of Alvin Osner, later a judge, that the prosecutors had been ordered by a general not to do a complete autopsy.

I reported this and more in Post Mortem from the transcripts of his testimony there, which I have. (Post Mortem pages 234-7 attached). (see Exhibit 19).

In that secret House assassins committee hearing by its medical panel from which we quote the radiologist's proof that Humes lied and the FBI and Secret Service knew it, I also quoted Finck's also suppressed testimony. There he corrected what he swore to in New Orleans to identify the one who ordered them not to do a complete autopsy as Admiral C. B. Galloway, who was in charge of that entire naval medical installation. (Pages 480-3 attached). (see Exhibit 20).

He persisted in the falsehood that orders were given Galloway. Galloway not only told the House assassins committee that he never left the autopsy room but he and the rest had unlimited authority for a completely unlimited autopsy signed before the autopsy by Robert Kennedy acting for the widow. (Post Mortem, page 507,

attached). (see Exhibit 21).

So the autopsy was incomplete, not what the law required and not what the Navy's own regulations required.

But what the hell!

After all it was only the President of the United States!

After all, when a President is assassinated we have a coup d'etat!

So why do what would be done for an unknown, a bum found with a fatal bullet wound?

The official explanation for this is additionally indecent because it blames this unpardonable departure from all requirements including those of the Navy, on the grieving family. The word was put out and repeated that word came down from the hospital's seventeenth floor where the family was, not to cut the body up as a real autopsy required.

This was not true. In the Afterword of NEVER AGAIN! the House assassins interview with Admiral Galloway is published. he stated that he never left the autopsy room and never got any such instructions. Direct quotation of what he told that committee follows the above quotation of Finck in NEVER AGAIN!

But even if this were not true, and this I made public by printing in facsimile in Post Mortem, which appeared in 1975, prior to the autopsy Robert Kennedy, acting for the widow, signed a form giving the Navy the right to do anything it considered proper and necessary in that autopsy.

There was and there could have been no restriction on what

could be done in that autopsy and the Navy's own regulation, which controlled, required what was not done. There is no support for the added indecency of blaming the family for what was not done on military orders not to do it.

But again for emphasis, there is nothing new, not a thing new that required those mythical three decades of Hall's and the non-existing "progress."

Hall makes it up of nothing but need.

It does not exist.

He presents no indication of the existence of any relevant "progress."