

It was just such a desire to avoid world war, in fact, that led to the creating of the Warren Commission (page 200).

Typical of his thorough scholarship Riebling has no source cited in this. (page 501) Again, it still is because there can be no such source.

While I go into this in great detail and with copies of the documents I obtained in those FOIA lawsuits against the government, the fact is that the creation of the Warren Commission also dates to the moment of Oswald's death. As soon as it was known that with his death there would be no trial, Nicholas Katzenbach, deputy attorney general and the man running the Justice Department in Bobby Kennedy's absence, got J. Edgar Hoover to agree to the proposal he made for "The appointment of a Presidential Commission of unimpeachable personnel" to do the job. I have this from Department of Justice file 129-11, with Katzenbach's handwritten draft of it that Sunday, when he had no typist, the Department's file copy after typing, I have that of the FBI from its main JFK assassination file, 62-109060, in which it is serial 1399 along with the memo of Assistant Director Courtney Evans, who was also the FBI's liaison with Justice, in which he confirms that Katzenbach prepared his memo "after his discussion with the Director." It is part of that same FBI 62-109060 serial

While much more can be said about this there here is no need to say more to show just how thorough Riebling's scholarship is and how much - of how little, very little - anything he says can be trusted. He has a clear record of making up what he can use to appear to give life to the long-dead corpse of that imagined Soviet or Cuban or Communist assassination involvement, the only thing his book can ever pretend to be adding to the existing dishonest literature on the subject.

Riebling then writes that "The next day," meaning the day after the last date he has given, which was November 24, "Johnson directed that `speculation about Oswald's motivation should be cut off" (page 200). For this he does have a source and his source is as politically dominated and as undependable as Riebling himself. His ambiguous source is Edward Epstein who, having written more than one book, is "Katzenbach to Moyers, 11/25/63, at Epstein, 1978, p. 253." (Why merely saying instead of all that other stuff is his source is a kind of a scholarship I'm not familiar with.)

Well that as we see above, did not originate with Epstein. So Riebling, the cat that was so well fed by the FBI with its documents, and by the Department, uses Epstein as his source. Epstein attributes it to Hoover and no less ambitions as a novelist than Riebling, he times it at "shortly after 11 ... , strains of music wafted toward the offices of the Director of the FBI in the Department of Justice Annex (where it wasn't - it was in the Justice Department main building. The Washington field office offices were nearby). J. Edgar Hoover had moved very quickly (which is hilarious) after Oswald's death to contain speculation... Within hours he had let President Johnson know through his chief aide, William D. Moyers, that both he and his immediate superior, Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, wanted to "have something issued so we can convince the public that Oswald was the real assassin." Epstein then says that Katzenbach's memo followed Johnson's conversation with Hoover.

On sourcing, Epstein is Riebling's equal if not his superior. He has no end notes or sources at all for any of this (pages 326-8).

The idea may in fact have originated with that notable Cold Warrior Walt Whitman Rostow who had a phone conversation with Katzenbach that day. But the first proposal was not

Use of  
Chapter  
one  
  
Use of  
Chapter  
one

Note for  
R.W

by Hoover. It was, as we have seen, to Hoover. And the first contact with Moyers also was by Katzenbach. It was not that "next day" but it was on Sunday the 24th that night, by phone.

I go into this with full documentation in *NEVER AGAIN!*, at its beginning.

I have the records. The "next day" is the date the typists put on the memo Katzenbach wrote out the 24th. But he went ahead by phone and I have those records, too.

The quoted words are not Johnson's. They are from Katzenbach's memo. Which is loaded with crazy stuff that Riebling could have used if he were not so leery of the kind of scholarship that resorts to available original sources.

What makes the writing of the Epsteins and Rieblings so ludicrous is that very very early that "next day" or Monday the 25th, Hoover opted against a commission and he had Cartha DeLoach, his chief ax-man and blackmailer who was also his lobbyist and his chief press contact and pressure man working to block a Washington Post editorial endorsing precisely that proposal for a commission. Again, I have the FBI's records on this and so far as Riebling is concerned, they were all public long before he started dredging evidentiary sewers for his fiction he wants believed is non-fiction. Those records, dated by the minute, such was Hoover's intensity, are from the same 62-109060 file.

Next, one scholar of the Riebling stripe quoting another, Riebling has a paraphrase within quotation marks on what he does not say it was, Johnson's twisting Warren's arm to get him to agree to chair the Commission after he had declined. Riebling attributes his quotation to a book by former FBI Director Clarence Kelley. Kelley, Riebling says, quotes a February 17 memo by "Eisenberg," who is not otherwise identified (page 501). The memo was by Commission Assistant Counsel Melvin Eisenberg. I printed it in facsimile in my 1974 book, *Whitewash IV* on page 24.

Riebling's quotation of Kelly, within quotation marks, is not of the Eisenberg memo. It is a lengthier paraphrase of it.

I use this as a special illustration of newly-defined scholarship and of thoroughness and to illustrate that before we get into Riebling's Mexico City miasma there is no basis for trusting Riebling's word, his sources or his quotation of alleged sources.

So, skipping ahead, again to Riebling's again making his case against the FBI in favor of the CIA whose crazy Mexico City confabulations he has as the very basis for his allegation that the nonexistent rupture of relations between the FBI and the CIA made the imagined assassination conspiracy succeed, he gets into that with these words:

"On November 26, 1963, perhaps out of anger over the CIA's failure to warn the FBI about Oswald's safety, President Johnson gave the FBI the lead responsibility for investigating JFK's death" (page 202).

[Note: It was dean Eugene Debs Rostow, not his brother, Walt Whitman Rostow.]

If Riebling had a source on this it would be on page 501. He has none.

If there is any sense in this complaint about Oswald being in danger, it would mean that Jack Ruby worked for the KGB! But nonsense is grist for Riebling's mill. The main point here is still again, as it is endlessly, Riebling's ignorance of well-known assassination fact, his apparent credentials for this book. It was not "on November 26" that LBJ put the FBI in charge, gave it that "lead responsibility." According to J. Edgar Hoover himself, in memos I have and in his Warren Commission testimony (5H98)



Here, atypically, in part Riebling is correct. If he had read and understood that Katzenbach memo with which Hoover agreed he would have known that what really "colored the Bureau's investigation" began no later than the moment Hoover agreed with Katzenbach on Sunday, November 24. But with his thorough scholar's disdain for original sources Riebling is unaware of the language of that memo he has already played games with. It is:

1. The Public must be satisfied that Oswald was the assassin; that he did not have confederates who are still at large; and that the evidence was such that he would have been convicted at trial.

The belief that the FBI was in the case even earlier, the evening of the day of the assassination, has a solid foundation in the previously cited memorandum on Hoover's conference with Manchester. Hoover's note-taker was Cartha DeLoach. He routed an eight-page single-spaced memo to Hoover the day of that conference, June 4, 1964. (The original is in an FBI's special Hoover file, 94-42768. A duplicate in the previously cited 62-109060 file.)

In it Hoover told Manchester he knew immediately, the day of the trial, that Oswald was a lone assassin, and in the FBI Hoover's word is law, its "official conclusion."

Hoover also told Manchester — to say he boasted of it is not to exaggerate from the language — that he had the FBI enter the case immediately despite the fact that it had no jurisdiction, it then not being a federal crime to assassinate a president.

Riebling then says that to cut off "speculation about a Communist role" in the assassination that "William Sullivan leaked, on what he later said were Hoover's orders, the news that `An exhaustive FBI report now nearly ready for the White House will indicate that Oswald was a lone and unaided assassin of President Kennedy.'"

It is interesting that Riebling does not cite the source of his quote of Sullivan (page 502) or his source for that Hoover note, about which Riebling has the words correctly, in his note relating to the story that appeared in the *Washington Post* December 3, 1963. But it was not when Hoover "was informed"

*Chatter*  
*per FW*

Here, atypically, in part Riebling is correct. If he had read and understood that Katzenbach memo with which Hoover agreed he would have known that what really "colored the Bureau's investigation" began no later than the moment Hoover agreed with Katzenbach on Sunday, November 24. But with his thorough scholar's disdain for original sources Riebling is unaware of the language of that memo he has already played games with. It is:

1. The Public must be satisfied that Oswald was the assassin; that he did not have confederates who are still at large; and that the evidence was such that he would have been convicted at trial.

The belief that the FBI was in the case even earlier, the evening of the day of the assassination, has a solid foundation in the previously cited memorandum on Hoover's conference with Manchester. Hoover's note-taker was Cartha DeLoach. He routed an eight-page single-spaced memo to Hoover the day of that conference, June 4, 1964. (The original is in an FBI's special Hoover file, 94-42768. A duplicate in the previously cited 62-109060 file.)

*Review*

In it Hoover told Manchester he knew immediately, the day of the trial, that Oswald was a lone assassin, and in the FBI Hoover's word is law, its "official conclusion."

*2*  
*CHATTER*

Hoover also told Manchester — to say he boasted of it is not to exaggerate from the language — that he had the FBI enter the case immediately despite the fact that it had no jurisdiction, it then not being a federal crime to assassinate a president.

Riebling then says that to cut off "speculation about a Communist role" in the assassination that "William Sullivan leaked, on what he later said were Hoover's orders, the news that 'An exhaustive FBI report now nearly ready for the White House will indicate that Oswald was a lone and unaided assassin of President Kennedy.'"

It is interesting that Riebling does not cite the source of his quote of Sullivan (page 502) or his source for that Hoover note, about which Riebling has the words correctly, in his note relating to the story that appeared in the *Washington Post* December 3, 1963. But it was not when Hoover "was informed"