

## POSTSCRIPT

There is, I believe, a more than appropriate postscript I add to what Senator Russell told President Johnson when Johnson, having gotten word of the executive session Russell had forced on September 18, 1964, tracked him down and spoke to him. What Russell then said was not at all new for him. He told Johnson, and he was speaking of the Warren Report and some of the problems he had with it, "That staff business always scares me. I like to put my own view down."

As we saw, if that had been possible for him with the Report on the assassination, the Report as issued would have been impossible.

Before that, in the June 14, 1968 report on my books made by his staff assistant, Charles Campbell to Russell, Campbell referred to my criticism of the Commission because it "delegated too heavily to the staff."

That is a fair comment of the very first writing I did on this subject in which my writing exceeds a million words. In the Preface and in the Introduction to that first book, written under great pressure and in haste, I pointed out, from personal experience, that while most of the work necessarily is done by the staff, the ultimate responsibility is that of the Commission. It is responsible for its staff but its staff can do it in, can ruin its reputation, can corrupt its conclusions, and frustrate its work.

One of the means by which this can be done, fortunately not the most common of those means, is by perjury.

I have not used this word loosely and I do not now. Had I, the Department of Justice would have had me jailed many times going back more than two decades when with regularity I put myself under oath, making myself subject to the charge of that felony if I lied in charging FBI agents with perjury. We have seen that instead of clobbering me the FBI, through its lawyers, the Department, not only agreed, it argued in its defense, which it hardly is, that I could make charges "ad infinitum" because I knew more about the assassination than anyone working for the FBI. And, as we saw, the judges who did accept this, as John Pratt did, just ignored it.

In some of Hall's more glaring dishonesties in his article where he does what is intolerable in a scholar, particularly a professional scholar, he distorted what I said about one of the perjuries by the chief autopsy pathologist where I was speaking of the silence of the four federal agents present in the autopsy room, into an attack I did not make and was not justified, against the entire FBI and the entire Secret Service.

This question of perjury during the autopsy had to do with a phone call the chief pathologist, Humes, made to the cardiovascular surgeon at Parkland, Dr. Malcolm Perry, and what transpired on that call. Humes swore falsely that the one call he made was sometime during the next day. Perry had told his associate Dr. Kemp Clark that Humes had called him the night before and twice, not once, Perry asked Clark to handle the scheduled press conference for him

the next day, that Saturday, to avoid public contradiction of Humes. Clark, chief of neurosurgery, so testified, confirmed by Perry, as I reported in Whitewash on page 180, without a word of official contradiction in more than three decades. (see Exhibit 62).

As we saw in the Afterword of NEVER AGAIN! the kept-secret testimony of the navy hospital's radiologist more than confirmed Perry. Humes did perjure himself. That is what I wrote originally, leaving the FBI and the Secret Service no innocence because of their silence about this, that of those four agents.

That was only part of the problem the Commission staff faced in perpetrating the monstrous, the entirely unprecedented fraud about the assassination, about the coup d'etat from the assassination. In addition, some of the Commission Members also had to be conned. That was done without great skill but with consummate daring by the young lawyer who as of this writing has been a Republican Senator from Pennsylvania for several terms, Arlen Specter. When he came to the Commission he was as liberal as Democrats got, a member of Americans for Democratic Action. He had also been an assistant Philadelphia district attorney.

Perry had been quoted widely as saying the wound in the front of the President's neck was from the front. Specter had already sired his bastard of the single-bullet monstrosity, the only means of even trying to pretend that Oswald was a lone assassin--or that there had not been that coup d'etat. Perry's professional opinion meant its end if the Commission adopted it and it also meant that

the Commission would not be able to conclude that Oswald had been the lone assassin.

As Specter probably understood, there were some Members of the Commission who wanted that very much. They began with Warren. They included Ford, Dulles, and McCloy. So also, of course, did the Commission's general counsel and de facto leader, Rankin.

With the departure of the senior counsel on that part of the Commission's work, Francis Adams, Specter inherited it. Adams had been a prominent lawyer in New York City and he had also been its chief of police. He was experienced in the line of work he abandoned before the first hearing was held.

So, bright, young, ambitious, upwardly-mobile Specter had the problem, how could he handle it to make the untrue appear to be true and how could he tell the Commission, which was well armed with all the powers it needed to do and get whatever it wanted, that he can't give them a word of what Perry actually said?

That was Specter's need and he did meet it.

Hall having used Whitewash as a source and Whitewash having handled that adequately, here is what it reports on pages 169-170 about Specter and his genius of which, were he still alive, George Orwell would have been so proud--what Hall himself should have seen since he represents that he used that book as a source:

Special pressure was applied to Dr. Malcolm Perry. It was undignified and abusive. Putting him in the middle of nonsense about the unavailability of the tape recordings of his interviews, promising to send him copies of his statements and getting him to promise he would reply in a letter, not under oath, was neither fair nor responsible. None of this or any of the related proceedings is reflected in the Report.

When the runaround began to annoy even members of the Commission, Congressman Ford had asked if all the news media had not made tape recordings of their interviews with the doctors, as of course, radio and television had. In a largely incoherent manner, Doctor Perry replied, 'This was one of the things I was mad about, Mr. Ford . . . . I know there were recordings made, but who made them I don't know' (3H375). Later the subject was resumed with as much avoidance of the available clippings from the papers. The reason given for the unavailability of the tapes is that in four months, by the time of the doctor's appearance, the media had not catalogued them. However, Doctor Perry was not shown the newspaper accounts, either.

The delicacy of this question is illustrated by the circumspection with which it was handled. Dulles suggested to the lawyers, 'if you feel it is feasible, you send to the doctor the accounts of his press conference or conferences,' and to the doctor, 'if you are willing, sir, you could send us a letter . . . pointing out where you are inaccurately quoted . . . . Is that feasible?'

Here we have a picture of vigorous pursuit of fact, Commission-style. At issue were two important things: Whether the wound was one of entrance, which would destroy the Commission's entire case, and the honesty of its more important witnesses. The passengers on the bus with Oswald on his Mexican trip were searched out all over the world. Oswald's public hairs were even subjected to scientific analysis. But the Commission, which already had at least a considerable, if not a complete file of clippings, and had not been able to get the tape recordings, asked if as a voluntary matter the doctor would 'send us a letter'--not even under oath--commenting on the media account of this, one of the most important questions before the Commission.

Specter offered a further explanation, saying , ' . . . we have been trying diligently to get the tape recordings of the television interviews, and we were unsuccessful. I discussed this with Dr. Perry in Dallas last Wednesday, and he expressed an interest in seeing them, and I told him we would make them available to him prior to his appearance, before deposition or before the Commission, except our efforts at CBS and NBC, ABC and everywhere including New York, Dallas and other cities were to no avail . . . . The problem is they have not yet catalogued all the footage which they have, and I have been advised by the Secret Service, by Agent John Howlett, that they have an excess of 200 hours of transcripts among all the events and they just have not catalogued them and could not make them available.'

'These will be catalogued and the Secret Service is trying to expedite the news media to give us those, and it was our thought as to the film clips, which would be the most direct or the recordings which would be the most direct, to

make comparisons between the reports in the news media and what Dr. Perry said at that time, and the facts which we have from the doctors through our depositions and transcript today' (3H377ff).

It never happened. Whether or not the only too abundant quotations showing the doctors called the anterior neck wound one of entrance were ever collected and sent to Doctor Perry, and if they were, what or if he replied, it is not in the Report. Yet this was a most fundamental conflict about the most fundamental question before the Commission. If the wound had been one of entrance, then it could not have come from a bullet fired from the sixth-floor window.

This testimony was taken March 30, 1964. The Members present at the beginning of the session did not include Russell and Cooper. (3H357).

What Specter gave those Members of the Commission he knew very well would welcome it was a lesson in telling the literal truth to tell a big, a very big lie.

Perry was truthful in testifying that he knew recordings were made of his press conference when the President's death was announced. He was also truthful in testifying that he did not know who made these recordings.

Specter may also have been telling the literal truth when he told the Members, that "we have been trying very diligently to get the tape recordings of the television stations" and that "we have been unsuccessful."

He had to know he was lying in indicating that as what the TV stations had was catalogued, this would turn up.

The reason is that there was no TV coverage.

There was ample radio coverage.

There were many print-press reporters present and they all had notes.

And, as Specter should have known, there was an official transcript of the entire press conference readily available. There was no telling how many reporters had copies, but Specter did not tell the Commission that he had asked any radio reporter or any print-press reporter if he had a transcript or any notes.

He did not because he did not want them!

He knew very well what Perry had said and his need was to hide that from the Commission or all they were up to would fall apart.

That press conference was the first press conference of the LBJ White House and it was the White House that had the file and the extra copies of the tapes and transcripts and which gave copies to the media. It is headed, "NEWS CONFERENCE." It is identified as "#1." It then is headed, "At the White House with Wayne Hayes." It is dated November 22, 1963. It is timed at 3:16 P.M. CST, with "Friday" and "Dallas, Texas" following. The first words are:

"Mr. Hawks: Let me have your attention, please."

He then told the assembled reporters that they had asked to speak to the doctors Perry and Clark and he had them there to respond to reporters' questions.

The transcript is nine legal-sized pages long.

During the press conference Perry was asked three times, first "Where was the entrance wound" and he replied, "There was an entrance wound in the neck." The full transcript is appended. (see Exhibit 63).

This is what meant the end of the preconception with which the Commission began and Specter knew it only too well.

With Oswald allegedly in that sixth-floor window, where he was not in any event from all the official evidence--and none of which places him there--he could not possibly have fired a shot that hit the President in the front of the neck, particularly not when the limousine was so far past that window when the shot allegedly was fired.

Initially the doctors believed and said at that press conference that the bullet entered the front of the neck and exited, fatally, in the head. There is not a paper in the country that carried the story that did not include the belief of the doctors that the bullet entered the front of the President's neck.

There is, of course, much more like this but this is, I think, enough to make the point Russell made with Johnson when he said, "This staff business scares me. I like to put my own views down."

Whitewash, which Hall singled out to deprecate and to misrepresent as thoroughly and as grossly as he did, had the truth the Commission did not want and apparently Hall does not want, either. The official "solution" to the assassination of the President, which I emphasize means a coup d'etat, is based on known perjury that was protected officially. The proof of this is what Hall is so critical of!

And he is to see to it that all government assassination information is made publicly accessible?

He who has launched a campaign against any and all criticism of the official assassination investigation (other than with regard to the Holland-loved irrelevancies) so long before his board's job

is anywhere near completed!

When they've asked for an extension of time past what was legislated!

This when he has to know he is of the most professional ignorance of the facts of the crime and its investigation.

Ignorant of even the relevant history and he teaches history and the law!

Before Hall started his campaign I put his board in the position in which it could not easily avoid this and related perjuries. It was forced to depose Humes and Boswell. Not for any writing about it but on the possibility of being able to help the board I asked for access to those transcripts. I was refused on the claim that a law-enforcement purpose was pending.

What law was allegedly being enforced I was not told. None was apparent or seemed likely to me.

If there is to be any punishment for the felonies and all else that went wrong in that investigation, where can it stop, who can it exclude, what can it ignore, and if by any chance one is punished, is that fair to him when the others are not punished?

Meanwhile, how pathetic it is that a man with Hall's credentials can be as ignorant as he is so long after being appointed to this board and armed with that ignorance and whatever political motive drives him, starts a campaign in defense of whatever his board does and does not do with his campaign of criticism of those who found fault with the Warren Report.

With the Warren Commission, with Russell having those sincere

doubts he took to the grave with him, as did his associated Commissioner Cooper, Russell's point to Johnson, about preferring to put his own views on paper have legitimacy when we see, as with the above illustration we do see, what the staff can do and this illustration of what it did.

With this Assassination Records Review Board the situation may well be reversed.

With Hall as an example it certainly should be!

It does not seem possible that any other member of that board can be more ignorant of the fact of the assassination than Hall is.

It is, however, a part-time board, each member spending only a couple of days a month on the board and its work.

Each member of the board had a full-time job when appointed, when accepting appointment.

The requirement was that the staff begin without detailed knowledge of the crime. No author of any book was hired, for example, and given what some of those books are, that was not a bad idea.

But when they all had to start from scratch, with the enormous amount of information already disclosed and so very much more to be disclosed, the Halls of the board would be hardly more than figureheads or rubber stamps.

With all the members of the board beginning with those full-time jobs they did not have the time, if they had the desire and if they were in a position to discriminate between what was assassination information and what was assassination nuttiness in

the available books, they could hardly become well-informed on the subject with what on-the-job-training they could get.

How well-informed the staff became we do not know although it is certain that at least some began determined to do the best they could.

What is certain is that the staff should be ever so much better informed than the members of the board.

The board has been seeking the getting considerable attention for what it announces it is making public as assassination records. This seems to be a board campaign to make the public believe it is doing the job expected of it.

However, the records it compelled to be disclosed up to the time of this writing and of much I know, are not for the most part records relating to the assassination itself.

What some Communist thought of the assassination has not a thing to do with the facts of the crime and facts about the crime itself is what the people want and the Congress visualized being made available.

The board is diligently seeking existing records, collections it could get, and in fact had been available. Examples of this are the records of the Garrison fiasco in his failed prosecution of Clay Shaw and the records Shaw and his lawyers left.

While these are not records of the crime itself they are records of potential interest because of the claims that Garrison made. And did he ever make claims! Besides his charges against Shaw.

Only time will tell what the board decides are assassination records and gets disclosed.

The real problem that exists and is not recognized in that there is no reason to believe that the government had records relating to the crime itself that had been kept secret because, as noted above, citing the beginning of NEVER AGAIN!, the crime itself was never investigated officially and was never intended to be investigated officially. Without an official investigation of the crime itself there is no reason to believe that the government files hold records that are of the crime itself.

There is some belief, whether or not justified, that elements of the government were involved in the crime.

If this had been so, with the illustration above of that CIA disclosure to me of its report on the mafia plot to get Castro assassinated, there is no reason to believe that if the assassination had been a government job there would be government records of it.

An enormous amount of paper has been made public and an added enormous amount of paper will be made public.

What this really means, assuming that there is information in this paper that does relate to the crime itself, is that the probabilities of coming onto it with the great volume of paper in which it is immersed is not very high.

That is to say that if there is some of the actual assassination information in the records already disclosed and yet to be disclosed, unless it is somehow flagged, and with that the

responsibility of the agencies, there is not much of a probability of that, finding any of this real assassination information would be like finding a needle in the world's largest haystack.

However, whatever the end may be, the indications are that legitimate as was Russell position on the Commission about his desire to speak for himself rather than have the staff do it for him, the opposite will be the better situation with this board. There is a greater probability that the staff can recognize, if it comes on one, what is a real record of the assassination itself than a Hall would.

If an outsider can make a fair appraisal of the situation, the best that can be hoped for from the work of this board is that in the midst of the monumental accumulation of paper that is being made public there may be some that may be located and used that relate to the investigation of the assassination and may cast worthwhile light on it.

This happened with some of the records made and kept secret by the House assassins committee some of which have been disclosed. An excellent example of this is the use made of some of it in the Afterword of NEVER AGAIN! only some of which is referred to in the foregoing.

With the government's records on the assassination, futile as it may seem from the record, the best the people can hope for is that some assassination information of value to the people does come to light and can get to be known.

In this we have been considering honesty, or the lack of it, dishonesty, and the consequences of dishonesty when trust is imparted to 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 Sobeloff lecture in Maryland, what was prestigious in Maryland, and acceptance for publication of the Maryland Law Review of that lecture in article form were because Hall was trusted. Those responsible had no reason even to suspect that Hall was really the subject-matter ignoramus he is and that what he said and wrote were not from his own work, his own study of the official records. He is, after all, an important man in scholarly circles, but he is not innocent.

However, he should have been checked. Whether or not one would suspect that a dean who is also a professor of history and the law would 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 liked and took from Holland. Hall was too ignorant of the subject matter to be able to make an independent judgment without checking he would not and did not do and did not have done by any who capable of it.

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

All of this is Holland's fabrication. He knew better, whatever

his reason, and political reasons are the most common for these kinds of assassination fabrications. There is no innocence on 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 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 concluded these matters of Holland's fabrications were on the Commission's mind. Holland knew that was not so and he got that documentation from me.

Aside from what is indicated above there was one other possible source, the Commission's TOP SECRET executive sessions. Holland got those from me. They prove that what Holland attributed to the Commission was not a real factor in what it did and did not do 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 and that when he was here he had free and unsupervised access to all the records we have, by then more than a third of a million pages of once-withheld official assassination records I got by all those FOIA lawsuits. 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 I got by all

that FOIA litigation.

He discussed this with Holland. Holland wanted some of these records Bird had not gotten. We provided him with copies of them. What they are is disclosed in Holland's polite letter of thanks to me dated March 17, 1987. He wanted and he got them because my wife copied them one page at a time on our primitive copier, those Commission's executive transcripts, those 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 executive sessions because all its other transcripts were of testimony and were published in the first fifteen of those twenty-six volumes.

From those executive session transcripts Holland knew that the Commission had no real problems with what he refers to as "sources and methods" and as "national security" and that there were no such factors of any real significance 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 official records he had, and he twice contracted a book based on the identical fabrications. The first book contract was with Basic Books.

More, from his writing it is apparent that Holland has talked himself into believing what he actually has to have seen 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 that is really fictional.

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

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

Obviously, Hall did himself in with his cribbing of the Holland he trusted and, 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 lecture series and for the Maryland Law Review, did not know that they were presenting what was cribbed from a complete fabrication by Holland.

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

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

He was not.

He would not have been once he decided to write this article

and the book that is an enlargement of it.

He had neither a need for nor an interest in the vast account of official fact freely available to him for the kind of book he decided to write or for the article he did write.

What the official fact refutes.

Holland's is a "bogus revelation" that Hall went for and used as his own bogus revelation for which, alas, the national media's appetite does exist.

I repeat, we have been considering honesty.

Inevitably, the official need to convince the people that the government was letting it 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 which 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 newspaper of July 2, 1997 with this headline:

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

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

We eliminate the also inevitable anti-Kennedy falsifications with which this non-news ends. As we saw in Exhibit 11, disclosed to me by the CIA almost a decade earlier, that mafia plot against Castro was of the Eisenhower/Nixon administration. It was of August of the year before Kennedy became President. That was even before the election!

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 was 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 hit 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.'

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 decides to be honest and there is little prospect of that.

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 about that assassination. As the AP put it, referring to this bit of ancient history as "newly-

declassified," another four hundred and fifty pages are to be released soon. They relate to Cuba for the years 1961 and 1962 and that has 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 Judith Campbell Exner, as AP rehashes from the January Vanity Fair, the first Kennedy knowledge of this plotting of the CIA with the mafia was when the bumbling wireman the CIA honcho sent from Miami to 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 Balletti. Hoover wrote Robert Kennedy about it May 22, 1961. The copy of that letter I have did not qualify for classification. It was given the lowest classification. It was marked as "declassified" on March 9, 1961. (see Exhibit 63).

Hoover was delicate about it while being suggestive.

Instead of writing Kennedy a letter on the FBI's 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 later Supreme Court Justice Byron White and the man then head of the criminal division of the Department, Herbert J. Miller, Jr. In this memo Hoover omitted what triggered it all, that tidbit of sex, of 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 disclosing alleged assassination records that have nothing at all to do with the assassination makes the board look like it is doing its job when it is not and cannot in the course of it rewriting our history falsely.

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

It disgraces us all, as an individual and as a nation.

It is more "bogus revelation," but this bogus revelation and so much more like it is not from any "national appetite" for it.

The people want the truth to the degree that the truth is possible.

Instead, from officialdom and from sycophants of officialdom they continue to get this unending "bogus revelation" about the JFK assassination.

I eliminated above what the AP attributed to Judith Campbell Exner to treat it separately as with what this board is up to and is not doing it facilitates. It is one of her profitable lies that the AP without discrimination rehashes, that in Vanity Fair she "wrote that she carried messages between the president and the gangster (referring to her bedmate Sam Momo Giancana of the mafia), including details of the plot to assassinate Castro."

In a January 8, 1997 column Liz Smith headed "The Mob and JFK" she adds what Campbell had said on earlier occasions, that she also carried the assassination payoff money from JFK to Giancana. That

included alleged JFK's "personal 'kill Castro' messages to Giancana."

The Smith version of this hoary myth she used to promote the coming treatment of this myth on TV. She also wrote that "The Kennedys tapped the mob to assassinate Castro, promising to give the Mafia back its Cuban casinos . . . ."

All of this, every word of this literary whoring with our history, was completely impossible, from the official records we have just seen.

Those impossible lies are part of the profit-making JFK assassination industry.

None of this was possible because it was all over before any Kennedy or anyone other than those six high officials of the CIA even knew about it. We have seen J. Edgar Hoover's delicate informing of Robert Kennedy 36 years ago about it--after Balletti was caught--after it was all over. (see Exhibit 64).

This is the kind of rewriting of our painful history not only made possible by how this board is interpreting its mandate but also by what it is and is not doing.

Beginning, for all that fine talk about restoring the confidence of the people, by its assumption of Oswald's lone guilt, which most Americans by far do not believe and will not be persuaded to believe by all the assassination junk and irrelevancy this board is soiling our history with.