

THE CASE AGAINST LYNDON B. JOHNSON

In the Assassination of President Kennedy

by JOACHIM JOESTEN

(Author of five published trade books about the Kennedy Murder Fraud)

A special, privately published supplement to the books

OSWALD : THE TRUTH

and

MARINA OSWALD

(Peter Dawnay Ltd., publishers, London, May 1967)

Volume I

The Case Against Vice-President Johnson

(His Role Before the Assassination)

(Vol. II "The Case Against President Johnson" - His Role After the
Assassination - will follow shortly)

Published Somewhere in Europe

World Copyright by Joachim Joesten

Count One

CUI BONO ?

"Since Roman jurisprudence, two thousand years ago, a basic maxim of criminal investigation has been CUI BONO? Who gains? Who stands to benefit from the crime?"

"That question has not been asked by the Dallas police.

"It has not been asked by District Attorney Wade.

"It has not been asked by the FBI.

"It is not being asked by the Warren Commission, for all one knows at this time."

Those were the opening lines of Chapter 13 ("Cui Bono?") of my first book on the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, OSWALD: Assassin or Fall Guy?, which was published three months before the Warren Commission wound up its work.

As a matter of fact, the Commission never bothered to ask that all-important question and this failure alone suffices to stamp its ostensibly painstaking investigation as a sham and a fraud. For, CUI BONO? is the touchstone of honest intent in any inquest. Find the person who stands to benefit most from any given crime, and you have found the most likely suspect

Needless to say, CUI BONO? is not enough, all by itself, to establish guilt. But it is the strongest indication to start out from in any honest inquiry into a capital crime. It should be used, and has thus been used, for thousands of years, in all civilized countries, as the most reliable guidepost leading a criminal investigation in the right direction.

CUI BONO? serves to establish a presumption which can be overcome by an alibi or by conclusive counter-evidence, but which also must be overcome by the most likely suspect. To simply ignore this basic element of lawful inquiry, as the Dallas Police, the District Attorney, the FBI, the Secret Service and the Warren Commission have done with remarkable unanimity is, of itself, convincing proof of a conspiracy, in high quarters, to suppress the truth.

The Warren Commission, unable by its own account, to establish any kind of plausible motive in the case of its "presumed" culprit, Lee Harvey Oswald, simply let it go at that. It chose to look no further. In spite of the fact that my book, which the Commission studied very carefully, pointedly raised the CUI BONO? question, the seven sages, most of them trained lawyers, conspicuously shunned any contact with that guidepost towards truth and reality. They were commanded to be blind by the so-called reason of state and therefore had no use for a motive. They shrank away from the mere thought of CUI BONO? as though it were the plague.

The press, which in all its history has never played a more paltry role than it did in the Oswald case, also shied away from raising the overriding question of motive. None of those great muckraking reporters, crusading editors, opinion-making columnists and fearless commentators America used to be so proud of bothered to ask that simple, indispensable question: CUI BONO? If there were Pulitzer prizes for the best job in non-reporting and non-investigation, one would be hard put to it to pick the most deserving candidate.

Being no longer a respectable member of the press, but an irresponsible rumor-monger, speculator, ghoul and kook, I alone raised the question of CUI BONO? and devoted a whole chapter of Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy? to it. Among other things, I wrote in that book:

"The hatred of Mr. Kennedy by the racists is well known; less well known is the hatred of certain Texas oil millionaires, such as H.L. Hunt, and the hatred of certain military leaders of whom General Walker was only the most notorious. They all feared that Mr. Kennedy, with his test-ban treaty, his neutralization of Laos, his dislike of Latin American militarists, and his quiet feelers towards Castro, intended to put an end to the Cold War, cut back the armaments budget and bring under control the Warfare State - that 'military-industrial complex' which President Eisenhower had excoriated, and warned the nation about, in his farewell address."

In the voluminous fan mail which I received after the publication of Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy? there also came a curious pamphlet entitled "LBJ - A Political Biography." Published by "Liberty Lobby," a notorious right-wing outfit, this pamphlet would not normally have retained my attention, except for the eye-catching unsigned note attached to it. This note read:

"If you wish to broaden your speculations on CUI BONO? -
Read this!"

So I read the pamphlet which turned out to be an extract from the book "A Texan looks at Lyndon," by J. Evetts Haley. I lost no time getting hold of a copy of the complete book which is sub-titled: A STUDY IN ILLEGITIMATE POWER. Although it was written by an arch-Conservative and, curiously enough, a pal of the ultra-Right leader, General Edwin A. Walker, I found this book, published in semi-clandestinity by the author himself (The Palo Duro Press, Canyon, Texas) utterly absorbing. Haley, a 66-year-old rancher, historian and politician (he unsuccessfully ran for Governor of Texas in 1956) knows a great deal about the antecedents, background and character of his fellow countryman from Texas, Lyndon B. Johnson, than ever transpired into public knowledge. His unflattering portrait of Johnson as a man whose whole public career and private fortune (about 14 million dollars) are based on the exercise of "illegitimate power" is the more impressive because the author conspicuously fails to indict LBJ for the ultimate in illegitimate power, usurpation of the presidency. In the eyes of J. Evetts Haley, Lee Harvey Oswald is Kennedy's assassin and he was of course inspired by the Communists. Even Haley, who has done the most ruthless job so far of stripping the emperor of his resplendent clothes, shuns the question of CUI BONO? and complacently accepts the official version of what happened in Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963. But then, after all, he is a Texan, too, and so is his friend, General Walker. Future historians may wonder, though, how any member of their craft could possibly write a "Study in Illegitimate Power" having as its subject Lyndon B. Johnson and publish it in 1964, mind you, without ever even inquiring into the mere possibility that the assassination of President Kennedy may have been the last step on a long road to illegitimate power.

Some of Haley's associates in "Liberty Lobby," however, appear to have indulged in second thoughts on the matter, for what else could have been the meaning of their challenge to me: "If you wish to broaden your speculations on CUI BONO? - Read this!"

Not that the idea of "broadening my speculations" in the direction of LBJ had escaped my mind altogether until then. As a matter of fact, the very first thing I wrote about the assassination of President Kennedy was full of suspicion that the then Vice-President had something to do with it. That was a four-page, 2,000-word memo ~~MEMO~~ I dispatched from New York, on November 23, 1963, to Henri Nannen, editor-in-chief of Der Stern, Germany's biggest illustrated weekly, in which I pointed out that the official version of the Dallas tragedy was an obvious fraud, designed to cover up for the real pattern of events. In the first paragraph of that memo, I wrote:

"Lyndon B. Johnson has entered the White House at a moment a scandal of incalculable potentialities, that has been brewing for weeks, threatened to put an abrupt and irreversible end to his political career. This is hard, historical fact. Although it appears certain that this embarrassing fact will be hushed up on all sides, the truth some day is bound to come out."

The reference, of course, was to the Bobby Baker scandal, which I have considered all along the hidden key to the assassination, as will be set forth in detail in a following chapter. In my memo to Der Stern I recalled the basic facts of that scandal in which Lyndon B. Johnson had found himself deeply implicated (both on the financial and the moral sides of it) and also quoted Richard Nixon's prediction, uncannily made at Dallas, on November 21, 1963, that President Kennedy would "dump Lyndon" at the 1964 elections.

"Johnson, then, was going to be fired - politically," I wrote in that memo, "and as a result Kennedy was fired upon by means of a high-powered rifle."

After showing up the absurdities of the official version, which were plainly discernible from the start, I went on to say:

"Nobody appears to consider the self-evident fact that an assassination of this type cannot have been the work of a single individual. What is even more important, the elementary maxim CUI BONO?, which was a keystone even in Roman jurisprudence, was disregarded completely. Who benefited from the Dallas murder? The Soviet Union? Castro? No - the Dixiecrats did. And now their man is in the saddle (and the Baker scandal most likely will be swept under the rug). The guns of Dallas hit their target dead center with an accuracy unsurpassed in history."

Herr Nannen was so impressed with this memo that he immediately asked me to fly to Dallas and to carry on there a private investigation of what really had happened. He also cabled the necessary funds for that purpose and later signed a contract with me which provided for the publication in Der Stern of a series of three articles detailing my findings in Dallas, which ran counter, in almost every respect, to the official version. And, although Herr Nannen later reneged on this contract, apparently under official pressure, he thus set in motion a line of inquiry which so far has resulted in five books I have published about the assassination (six, including the present volume) and which eventually, I feel certain, will greatly help to bring out the truth.

I also meant to air my original suspicions of Lyndon B. Johnson in the CUI BONO? chapter of Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?, but my publisher, Carl Marzani, vetoed that project. I don't blame him for it, for even today it is practically impossible to find a commercial publisher who would dare to print "The Case Against Lyndon B. Johnson," even though that case now is immeasurably stronger than it was in 1964. The reason is obvious: almost everywhere in the world, the heads of state are protected by the law against "libel," even though the charges levelled at them may be completely true. To be sure, in America the Chief Executive is not thus automatically protected but in practice he too, is inviolable because of unbreakable publishing taboos. There is a national consensus that the President can do no wrong (except for the trivial things that are used as ammunition in the political combat) - even though the wrong he is doing hit you right between the eyes.

Marzani was brave enough putting out a book that shocked officialdom speechless - and the press, too. I really can't hold it against him that he cut out the highly uncomplimentary remarks about LBJ which I had planned to include in the book.

Peter Dawnay, too, went the limit - especially for an Englishman - in publishing so explosive a book as Oswald: The Truth, and its companion volume, Marina Oswald, both of which squarely put the finger on the CIA and the FBI as the forces behind the assassination. But, of course, neither the CIA nor the FBI could have acted on their own in such a case. They had to have advance assurance of impunity and that assurance could come only from the man who was predestined to become Chief Executive the moment President Kennedy had died. And to put the finger on that man, publicly, was no more possible for Peter Dawnay than for Carl Marzani. Thus the ultimate conclusion of my inquiry had to be left for private publication.

If the afore-mentioned challenge from "Liberty Lobby" didn't exactly provide me with a fresh line of thought, it nevertheless helped to crystallize my conclusions. For even I, who never held authority in high esteem, had been somewhat reluctant until then, to think out what to this day remains unthinkable to all but a handful of people: that the only logical explanation of what happened at Dallas is predicated on the assumption that Lyndon B. Johnson masterminded the plot.

Here we come to a second important tenet of honest criminal investigation - a study of the character and antecedents of the prime suspect. If the pursuit of the CUI BONO? line of inquiry has led us towards a person with an obvious and strong motive for the crime, our next step must be to ask the question whether the suspect is capable of committing such a crime. What manner of man is he? Does his record show him to be inordinately ambitious, greedy and ruthless? Has the shadow of murder ever fallen across his path before? Could he be desperate enough to stake his whole career, his reputation, his fortune, perhaps even his life on the chance that the perfect crime he is planning proves really flawless?

And, in this particular case, the question must be asked: did the seizure and exercise of illegitimate power over the years so condition Lyndon B. Johnson that he would not hesitate to gamble his all on a final and decisive power grab? Does his record show Johnson to be capable of usurpation - even through murder? If I hadn't been satisfied on that point before, Haley's "A Texan Looks at Lyndon" convinced me.

CUI BONO?, as I have said before, does not constitute all by itself conclusive evidence, but, in a case of murder apparently committed without motive, such as the Kennedy assassination, it is apt to lead the right way. To make light of this tried and tested instrument of criminology, as Edward J. Epstein has done in the December 1966 issue of Esquire magazine ("Who's Afraid of the Warren Report?") is cheap and irresponsible.

Epstein, in that article, compiled a list of 35 allegedly current theories about the assassination, a large proportion of which are manifestly absurd. In between such conspicuous "oddball" theories as the "Manchurian Candidate Theory," the "Domestic Quarrel Theory," the "Horrible Accident Theory," the "Oedipal Theory," the "Killer-Instinct Theory," the "Crystal Ball Theory," and the "Evil-Forces Theory," the author managed to slip in as an equally questionable No. 28 the CUI-BONO? Theory and did so in this manner:

"28. CUI BONO THEORY

Proponents: Izvestia, Trud, Joachim Joesten, Barbara Garson, Don B. Reynolds, Jack Ruby and others.

Thesis: Although not one shred of hard evidence has been uncovered to prove them right, many people have taken the "Who benefited?" line of pursuit and point an accusing finger at Lyndon Johnson.

"The Soviet Government newspaper Izvestia, after condemning the Warren Report as slanderous to Russia, hinted by sly innuendo that President Johnson may have been implicated in the assassination. They cite the soon-to-be published works of Joachim Joesten (seven volumes to be sold by subscription for \$ 200) which argues that Johnson has been covering up. The next day, Trud, the trade-union paper, made the accusation more forcefully."

Let us stop here for a moment. The intelligent reader will have noticed immediately that the purpose of this peculiar presentation is to discredit the CUI BONO Theory as a mischievous Soviet invention. By placing two Moscow newspapers ahead of my name as "proponents" of this theory, the impression is conveyed that, in advancing a theory which is in fact a time-honored instrument of classical criminology, I drew on Communist inspiration. This is but one step short of the low in argumentation reached by the CIA when it included my book Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?, in an "inside report" presented to Congress in September 1965, among a list of books allegedly masterminded by a mystical Soviet "Department of Disinformation." And, to make it libel-proof, this bunk was inserted into the "Congressional Record" by a good friend of the CIA in the House of Representatives.

Where did Epstein get his information from, linking my name and my writings with something that seems to have been published in two Russian newspapers, but which I, for one, have never seen? Apparently his source was a dispatch from Moscow which appeared in The New York Times on September 1, 1966, that said in part:

"On August 17, the Soviet Government newspaper, Izvestia, printed a long article describing the theories of a writer described as a German-born American, whose name was given as Joachim Josten, in which President Johnson was accused of 'seizing power' and manoeuvring to cover up the 'ultra rightwing plot' to kill President Kennedy. On Aug. 25, the trade union paper Trud carried a further article on Josten and made the accusation more forceful..."

To this day, I don't know how my "soon-to-be published" works could have inspired comments in the Soviet press, and, frankly, I couldn't care less. What matters is that E.J. Epstein, by indiscriminately lumping together the fanciful and the rational, the absurd and the scholarly, and, on top of it all, by applying a coat of red paint to the Romans' CUI BONO?, has done a great disservice to the search for the truth which he pretended to serve when he wrote Inquest.

In the case of the Kennedy assassination, all normal rules of reasoning and inquiry have been thrown overboard. Those who argue that crimes are committed for a reason are derided as "kooks;" logic is thrown to the winds and the thousand-and-one improbabilities of the official version are simply charged off to coincidence, pure chance and the "erratic course" of history. Whoever dares to suggest that, through it all, a pattern shows that has occurred thousands of times in the annals of mankind is treated as a lunatic while the unquestioning believer in the official word gets top honors in the press.

Not long ago, there was that telling headline in Die Welt, one of Germany's most thoughtful newspapers: "Once again, the second man in the state has wrested power from the first." The reference was to the overthrow of President Ben Bella of Algeria by Colonel Boumedienne, in June 1965. Two years earlier, in commenting on the events of November 1963 in Dallas, Die Welt had not exhibited the same keen sense of history. But then, of course, America is not Africa.

Let the Russians chew to their heart's content on CUI BONO? Let a handful of rumor-mongers and troublemakers look for hidden forces behind the assassination. Right-thinking Americans will be satisfied to believe, with William Manchester, that Kennedy was the victim of a lone nut who went berserk and killed the President of the United States for no other reason than because his wife, the night before, had refused him her love.

Count Two

Johnson: Tool of the Oil Magnates

In a country and era governed by common sense, CUI BONO? would have been enough to establish a reasonable presumption that Vice-President Lyndon B. Johnson, whose desperate longing for the White House was no secret in political circles, had something to do with the violent removal of its lawful tenant. On the strength of that argument one would be justified in taking a long and hard look at Johnson's background and career, his backers and associates, his steady climb to power and, above all, the way he managed to become a multimillionaire during a lifetime of public service, so-called.

Three weeks after the assassination of President Kennedy, The New York Times, in an article entitled "Action on Oil," (The News of the Week in Review, Dec. 15, 1963) noted:

"Nowhere is oil a bigger political force than Texas, producer of 35 percent of the nation's oil and possessor of half of its obtainable oil reserves. As a Texan in Congress, Lyndon B. Johnson was a strong advocate of oil industry causes - low import quotas and the 27 1/2 per cent tax allowance for depletion of oil reserves..."

That was putting things rather mildly. Fact of the matter is that Lyndon B. Johnson, throughout his long political career, has been the

most unabashed servant of the oil interests in Congress, the staunchest defender of what Newsday on Feb. 8, 1964 called the "iniquitous depletion allowance on oil and gas wells."

As Senate Majority leader, Johnson was able powerfully to influence legislation in a sense beneficial to the oil industry and he never failed to do so. In the House of Representatives, meanwhile, his old crony and fellow-Texan Sam Rayburn held a similarly dominant position as Speaker of the House. Between them, this pair of oil-minded Texans did a remarkable job of beating down all attempts in Congress to curtail the oilmen's "iniquitous" tax privileges or to make the industry, as a whole, subservient to the national interest. In the words of J. Evetts Haley, himself a Texan and a conservative one at that, "With Rayburn's ready help he (Johnson) ingratiated himself with Texas oil men by defending the depletion allowance. Yet Johnson's support of depletion was not for free. It gained him the animosity of many party radicals, such as Senator Proxmire, but it paid off in Texas, where he and Rayburn shook down the subservient fat-cats 'for the good of the party,' or sometimes simply in gratification of personal vanity and pride in life-long tenure on the public payroll..."

At the start of the year 1963, America's oil interests, for the first time, were in for trouble. Two of the industry's most powerful props in Congress, Speaker Sam Rayburn and Senator Robert S. Kerr (Oklahoma) had died and the third, Lyndon B. Johnson, had been effectively neutralized by his move from the Senate into the Vice-Presidency. To make things worse for the oilmen, President Kennedy was about to submit to Congress a tax reform program designed to produce about \$ 185,000,000 in additional revenues by changes in the favorable tax treatment until then accorded the gas-oil industry.

On January 7, 1963, The Christian Science Monitor, in a dispatch from Dallas entitled "Oilmen Prepare for Tax Battle," summed up the situation as follows:

"The domestic oil industry of the United States begins 1963 with its hardest fight yet before it to stave off attacks on the 27.5 income-tax depletion allowance which has been under fire in the Congress...

"With the passing of Sen. Robert S. Kerr (D) of Oklahoma, the industry has lost its strongest defender in Congress. It lost its other staunch defender with the passing of Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn (D) of Texas.

"There is no one left on the scene in Washington to compare with these two legislators in staving off liberal attacks on the depletion allowance.

"Just when the newest assault will come is uncertain. No doubt the industry will not know until President Kennedy sends up his tax program. If the President asks for a cut in the allowance, the industry has little doubt that the Congress will take up the matter. A real fight will then be on.

"It is noted down here that about a third of the Senate generally has gone along with the interests who have termed the depletion allowance a special privilege and have tried to reduce it from 27.5 percent to 15 percent.

"These senators will be more apt than ever to vote for the reduction if the President requests it and takes a strong stand on the issue, especially with no strong opposition leadership, such as that formerly presented by Senator Kerr..."

Even more revealing is the following excerpt (already quoted by me in Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?) from Marquis W. Childs' nationally distributed column "Washington Calling," which was published on October 10, 1963, i.e. only 43 days before the assassination of President Kennedy:

"To a friend and long-time associate who called on him the other day President Kennedy expressed considerable bitterness on the subject of top-bracket taxpayers who use tax exemptions to spread propaganda of the extreme right.

"The President talked about two men, each of whom is often referred to as 'the richest man in the world.' One was J. Paul Getty, an oil man who spends most of his time in England. The second was the Dallas, Tex., oil man H.L. Hunt. Both are Billionaires. Both, according to the President, paid small amounts in federal income tax last year. These men, the President said, use various forms of tax exemption and special tax allowances to subsidize the ultra right on television, radio and in print.

"There is no doubt that the right-wing is heavily subsidized. On radio and television stations across the nation free taped programs are run daily, assailing the United Nations, attacking the graduated income tax, foreign aid, social security and the other favorite hates of the extreme right.

"One of the biggest tax benefits oil men enjoy is the 27 1/2 per cent depletion allowance. In his January tax message, the President proposed a sharp reduction in this benefit, which has been extended to cover a long list of minerals. The tax bill passed by the House made only a minor change, however. The right-wing is prepared to go all out to defeat Kennedy in 1964..." (italics added).

So the oil industry, for decades one of the most powerful forces in America, and President Kennedy were sharply at odds in 1963. In particular, oil magnate Haroldson Lafayette Hunt, who has an annual income of about \$ 30,000,000 yet practically pays no income tax thanks to the depletion allowance, had reasons to be sore at President Kennedy. For Hunt, who obviously can't spend thirty million dollars a year on himself or his family, is putting his unconscionable wealth to a good use, as he thinks. After having been for many years one of the most generous financial backers of Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin and other with-hunters of the '50s, Hunt invested untold millions in an ultra-rightwing propaganda outfit first called "Facts Forum" and later "Life Line Foundation." Even this change of name was dictated by tax considerations, for Life Line, as a "foundation", was also tax-exempt, at any rate until a year or so ago.

This situation rightly aroused the ire of liberal Democratic Senator Maurine Neuberger (Oregon) who also in 1963 took Hunt severely to task in a Senate speech. "You would think," she said, "that a man with \$ 3 billion at his disposal and an active spleen would be willing to finance his own propaganda warfare. But Hunt prefers to let the federal government assume a substantial portion of his political crusades. Hunt has simply packaged his propaganda network under the head of the Life Line Foundation, Inc., and then had his business corporations - the Hunt Oil Co. and its

food-processing and canning division, the HLH Parade Co. - commercially sponsor Life Line propaganda throughout the country."

At the request of Senator Neuberger, the Bureau of Internal Revenue launched an investigation of tax-exempt foundations that pretended to pursue charitable and "educational" purposes - as Life Line did - while actually engaging in political warfare against the Government and America's democratic institutions. By March 1963, the Bureau had arrived at the conclusion that "Life Line Foundation, Inc." was a prima facie case of such a partisan operation under false pretenses and recommended revocation of its tax-exempt status. The death of President Kennedy came just in time to prevent this ruling from being put into effect and, under the new Administration, it was quietly buried. These startling facts were brought to light in the course of hearings held in the late summer of 1964 by the House Small Business subcommittee under the chairmanship of Wright Patman who also demanded that Life Line's tax-exempt status be terminated.

In Dallas, H.L.Hunt was pompously indignant, insisting that his Life Line was an educational and patriotic undertaking. "An attack is being made," he exclaimed, "on the right of free speech and comment." But Patman was unmoved by such rhetorics. "If an old slouch like Hunt really wants to educate people," he replied, "he's got lots of money to do it, without putting \$ 27.5 million which is tax-exempt aside for the Life Line Foundation." (Newsweek, 9-14-64)

One day in the fall of 1961, Dr. Albert E. Burke, a well-known TV lecturer on the West Coast, was one of a group of people who had been invited to Hunt's sumptuous villa overlooking White Rock Lake in Dallas. After the assassination of President Kennedy, Dr. Burke described his experiences at Hunt's home - without naming names - as follows:

"... I have listened to communists and other groups that can only be called enemies, accuse us of the worst intentions, the most inhuman ways of doing things, as the most dangerous people on earth, to be stopped and destroyed at all costs... But nothing I have heard in or from those places around us compared with the experience I had in the Dallas home of an American, whose hate for this country's leaders, and the way our institutions worked, was the most vicious, venomous and dangerous I have known in my life. No communist I have ever heard, no enemy of this nation, has ever done a better job of degrading or belittling this country. That American was one of this nation's richest and most powerful men!

"It was a very special performance by a pillar of the American community, who influences things in his community. It was very special performance because in that living room during his performance - in which he said things had reached the point where there seemed to be 'no way left to get those traitors out of our government except by shooting them out' - during that performance, there were four teenagers in that room to be influenced. His views were shared on November 22, 1963.

"Interestingly, the man accused of that crime (Oswald - J.J.) claimed to be a Marxist, a communist. But my host assured me - when I objected to his remarks - that he believed as he did because he was anti-communist!

"What happened in that home in Dallas, of one of America's richest and most powerful men, smashed that goal of America as a united country, for the four teenagers in on that conversation that night.

"And Mr. Big American's actions - the actions of men like that one with whom I spent that evening in Dallas two years ago - his actions

include giving heavy donations to political campaigns of candidates he wants to see in public office running things. It is understood that in return for his help, they will favor his views in running things. He supports political candidates and semi-secret societies. And he supports television and radio programs which set up the environment in which things happen in this country... even the kind of things that can lead men to assassinate Presidents in communities such men influence..."

On April 29, 1964, Miss Lillian Castellano of Hollywood, California, sent a transcript of this remarkably informative TV lecture to the Warren Commission with this statement:

"The rich and powerful man referred to above is H.L.Hunt. His seditious, treasonable statement was made overtly, in the presence of witnesses, whose subversion he wished, and to whom he overtly advocated the overthrow of the American Government by the assassination of its duly elected leaders.

"Dr. Albert E. Burke was a witness to this treasonable act. Dr. Albert E. Burke can verify the identification of this man to the Commission. The Commission need only call Dr. Albert E. Burke to testify."

Needless to say, Miss Castellano received no reply and the Warren Commission took no notice of her information. It was much too busy with the motiveless "assassin" Lee H. Oswald to be able to pay any attention to an immensely rich Dallas civic leader who had openly advocated the violent overthrow of the Government through assassination, in the presence of at least five witnesses. The Commission did not call on Dr. Burke to testify and it exhibited no interest in identifying the four teenagers - who, two years later, would be young men of about Oswald's age - who had listened to H.L.Hunt calling for "traitors" to be "shot out of the government."

Dr. Burke is not the only witness to attest to Hunt's violent hatred of the Kennedy Administration. In The Nation of February 24, 1964, Robert G. Sherrill, a former Texas newspaperman, drew a striking picture of H.L.Hunt ("Portrait of a Super-Patriot") which included this extraordinarily revealing paragraph:

"In the weeks immediately preceding the assassination of President Kennedy, the commentators of Life Line were daily warning their listeners that his tyrannical Administration was by-passing the laws of Congress, following a line ordered by Moscow, suppressing the chief spokesmen for freedom in the land and forcing American taxpayers to subsidize communism around the world. It was a time, Life Line insisted, that cried out for 'extreme patriotism,' and by a ghoulisn coincidence, the ^{program} broadcast in the Dallas area on the morning of the assassination prophesied a day when American citizens would no longer be allowed to own firearms with which to gun down their rulers. Under communism, which is seen as imminent in this country; 'No firearms are permitted the people, because they would then have the weapons with which to rise up against their oppressors.' "

So to Robert G. Sherrill and The Nation it was just a "ghoulisn coincidence" that H.L.Hunt's propaganda network, on the very day of the assassination of President Kennedy, pleaded, in the very Dallas area, for firearms with which American citizens could gun down their rulers.

Just as for the Warren Commission, it was mere coincidence, and nothing to make a song about, that Nelson Bunker Hunt, the eldest son of H.L.Hunt, had put up the money along with two other wealthy Dallas businessmen for that notorious, black-bordered full-page ad in the Dallas Morning News which greeted President Kennedy on his arrival by accusing

him of every conceivable treachery under the sun; and as it was just another coincidence that Jack Ruby, on the very eve of the assassination, had driven, in the company of a young girl, to the office of Lamar Hunt, another son of H.L.Hunt. Says the Warren Report, innocently as ever, "Although Ruby stated that he would like to meet Hunt, seemingly to establish a business connection, he did not enter Hunt's office with her." That, too, one can almost call a ghoulisn coincidence.

"There is no evidence that the killer of Mr. Kennedy was incited by Life Line," Mr. Sherrill suggests after relating how the H.L.Hunt program, all over the country, had called for citizens to bear arms against their Government.

"There is no evidence..." That is the cheap catch-all phrase they have all been using, time and again, from the Warren Commission down through Epstein and Manchester to Sherrill and others, to avoid thinking the unthinkable and speaking out the unspeakable.

There is plenty of evidence, but to one who does not want to see it even the most solid evidence ceases to exist.

Perhaps the most interesting piece of information about Hunt's role in the assassination was provided by H.L. Hunt himself in a "candid conversation" with an interviewer from Playboy magazine, of all things. He textually told this reporter:

"By the way, you might be interested to know that the UPI quoted Senator Maurine Neuberger a few minutes after the assassination to the effect that if anyone is responsible for the assassination, it is H.L. Hunt of Dallas, Texas. Well, soon after that, my house began receiving a few friendly calls of warning and many threatening calls to the effect that I would be shot next, and also to tell Mrs. Hunt she would be shot. My office force would not consent to either of us going home even to get our clothing. We were sent out of town, and neither the police department nor the FBI would consent to us returning to Dallas until a few days before Christmas."

Now, that's very curious, isn't it? And it strikingly confirms what I had written in Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?: "According to The Realist, March 1964, the FBI 'within an hour of the shooting went to H.L.Hunt and advised him to get out of Dallas, fast. Under an assumed name, he took American Airlines flight 42 to New York..."

"Why should the FBI warn Hunt, and why should he take their advice and fly?" I went on to say in this book. "Are the local FBI agents his servants? Or accomplices?..."

Try to visualize the situation in Dallas at that crucial moment. From his seventh floor office in the towering Mercantile Bank Building, about ten blocks east of the Kennedy assassination site, H.L. Hunt has just observed the slaying of President Kennedy on Dealey Plaza. The time is about 1:30 p.m. and Kennedy has been dead for half an hour. The FBI is now under the control of the new Chief Executive, Lyndon B. Johnson, who is still "Acting President," for he has not yet been sworn in.

And what does the FBI do at that moment when all of its energies should have been concentrated on hunting down the assassins of the President? - It rushes to the office of the most influential man in Dallas and tells him to get out of town, fast. So fast, indeed, that he can't even be allowed to make a quick trip home to his villa, well guarded as it is by armed bodyguards, to change his clothes. Off with him, quick, under

a false name, to faraway New York:

Why was the FBI not only so anxious to get Hunt out of town, but insisted on such unseemingly haste? I'll tell you, why. Because, at that moment, the conspirators were in a panic. Something very important had gone wrong with their otherwise well-planned and perfectly executed scheme: Oswald, the predestined fall guy in the operation was at large! He had flown the coop after his famous chance encounter with Patrolman M.L. Baker, and he had not yet been recaptured. As long as there was no certainty that the pre-ordained scapegoat could be sacrificed according to plan, the plotters were in acute danger of exposure, especially after that tell-tale remark dropped by Senator Neuberger, a real expert on H.L.Hunt.

Most noteworthy is also Hunt's reaction to the following question put to him by the Playboy reporter:

"In Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy? the author, Joachim Joesten, claimed that President Kennedy intended to make you and other oil millionaires pay a greatly increased amount of income tax. 'With that kind of money at stake,' Joesten wrote, 'murder, even Presidential murder, is not out of the question.' That borders on a very serious charge against you. What do you have to say about this?"

Hunt's reply: "Before the 1960 elections, the Kennedys were in the oil business. Congress, rather than the President, formulates the law applicable to oil products. I was never apprehensive about President Kennedy's attitude. I had never heard of Oswald. After the assassination, I heard that the Justice Department had caused previous charges against Oswald to be dropped - which made it possible for him to be available to shoot anyone he might decide to shoot."

Was there ever a lamer rebuttal of the most serious charge in the world? And, doesn't that weak and evasive reply clearly bespeak Hunt's guilty conscience?

Count Three

The Texas Power Grab

Why is H.L.Hunt so important to my case against Johnson? Because of the close relationship which has existed, over a span of many years, between this hate-mongering oil tycoon and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Hunt was by far the fattest of the Texas "fat-cats," which Johnson, in the words of J. Evetts Haley, had been "shaking down" regularly while he was running the Senate and his old crony and mentor, Sam Rayburn, similarly held sway in the House. Hunt didn't mind being shaken down by this pair of influential Texas politicians because he, in his turn, profited handsomely by their backstage pull on the Administration; and the State Government of Texas also obeyed their instructions to do business with the Hunt Oil Company. Robert G. Sherrill has related in shocking detail, in The Nation (l.c.) how H.L.Hunt was able to wangle 100,000 acres of State-owned tidelands oil leases from the Texas land commissioner, Bascom Giles, on average bids of six dollars an acre, while the overall bid average was \$ 78. Giles later went to the penitentiary for cheating the state, while Hunt continues to rake in tremendous profits from his oil leases, tax-free.

The New York Times, in its issue of August 19, 1964 (International Edition) carried a long feature story by its Dallas correspondent, David R. Jones, about "H.L.Hunt: Magnate with a Mission" which contained some extremely significant and revealing passages such as these:

"Mr. Hunt has been friendly with President Johnson for several years... Booth Mooney, a Hunt public-relations man in Washington, was an executive assistant to Mr. Johnson from 1953 to 1958. He wrote Mr. Johnson's authorized biography, 'The Lyndon Johnson Story,' in 1956 and brought it up to date this year."

u Ponder this paragraph well. This is the period when the most vicious demagogue America has produced in our time, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin, was riding high through the land. McCarthy and Hunt, after their first meeting in April, 1952, had become close friends and political allies. "Facts Forum" whose chief moderator at the time was the former FBI agent and ultra rightwing agitator Dan Smoot, went all out for McCarthy and became one of the principal driving forces behind McCarthyism.

According to the New Republic of February 16, 1954, "In the fall of 1952, McCarthy and Hunt had another meeting, this time for dinner. They discussed the Senator's political situation and Facts Forum. Shortly afterward, Miss Jean Kerr, then McCarthy's research assistant and now his wife, and Robert E. Lee, a close personal and political friend of McCarthy, went to work for Facts Forum. Their job was to organize the television project.

"Hunt himself has admitted that McCarthy's recent bride (Miss Kerr) 'has done a great many things for Facts Forum,' but has denied she was on the Facts Forum payroll at the time. 'She and Robert E. Lee,' Hunt said, 'were instrumental in getting together the first Facts Forum programs, the television programs.'"

A nice setup. Here we have the wealthiest of the Texas oil tycoons, the man who has practically run nefarious Dallas for decades, forging close personal, political and business links with the very symbol of rightwing radicalism in America, Senator McCarthy.

And Lyndon B. Johnson, the Democratic Senator from Texas, who hypocritically used to proclaim himself a devoted follower of the Franklin D. Roosevelt tradition, picks that precise moment to select from this Hunt-McCarthy crowd an executive assistant and "authorized biographer." Indeed, nothing could illustrate more strikingly the close working relationship between Johnson and Hunt than the fact that Booth Mooney has been operating simultaneously as executive assistant to Senator Johnson and Washington lobbyist for oilman Hunt.

"Friends say Mr. Hunt finds it hard to break away publicly⁺ from Mr. Johnson because the President for years was such a staunch friend of the oil industry," the above-quoted article in The New York Times went on to report. "But Mr. Hunt says, Mr. Johnson has 'made terrible mistakes' as President, including the selection of Chief Justice Warren to head the inquiry into President Kennedy's assassination."

This almost naive statement fully bears out what, according to Robert G. Sherrill's piece in The Nation, "one Dallas editor, who has observed him for years" has been prompted to "say coldly" of H.L. Hunt: "If he had more flair and imagination, if he weren't basically such a damned hick, Hunt could be one of the most dangerous men in America."

His friend Lyndon B. Johnson certainly does not lack flair and imagination. Indeed, it was a real masterstroke when he picked Earl Warren, until then the bearer of one of the most respected names in America, to lend his high prestige to the most transparent as well as the most ignominious coverup operation in modern history. A hick like Hunt couldn't appreciate

⁺ This is a reference to then current reports that Hunt would back Sen. Goldwater for the presidency in November 1964.

the finesse of that move. Johnson had actually appointed Chief Justice Warren to head the commission investigating the assassination three days after the Communist Daily Worker, in a front-page statement, had suggested such an appointment. That Johnson didn't do so in order to accomodate the Communists, but for a truly Machiavellian purpose, was something bound to escape the limited intellect of an H.L.Hunt.

Hunt was scared to death, and for good reason, when Earl Warren, who immediately after the assassination had publicly expressed his conviction that this foul deed was the work of rightwing extremists, was appointed chairman of the presidential commission that was to investigate the case. His anxiety grew when investigators for the Commission found out that one of his boys, Nelson Bunker, had paid for that despicable ad in the Dallas Morning News, while another, Lamar, maintained a cozy business and social relationship with Jack Ruby. What the old man didn't realize is that the Commission, in this as in many other cases, simply sought to establish the facts in order to be better able to suppress them and to shield effectively those responsible for the assassination. How Lyndon B. Johnson ever managed to get a man like Earl Warren so abjectly to prostitute his once great name and prestige, remains the only real mystery of Dallas. But he did it. A masterstroke, indeed.

After the Warren Report had been released, H.L.Hunt heaved a deep sigh of relief. When reporters asked him how he felt about it, Hunt replied, "It's a very honest document." That, coming from H.L.Hunt, is the most damning thing that has ever been said about the Warren Report.

One more quote from the article about Hunt in The New York Times of August 19, 1964, is in order:

"Mr. Hunt lists among those Americans whom he admires as patriots Gen. Robert E. Wood, former chairman of Sears Roebuck & Co., a member of the Life Line advisory board, and a strong Goldwater supporter; Gen. A.C. Wedemeyer, former chief of staff to Chiang Kai-shek, once a member of the John Birch Society advisory committee, and a Life Line advisory board member; Robert H.W. Welch Jr., founder of the John Birch Society; Maj.Gen. Edwin A. Walker, the ultraconservative former officer; Gov. Wallace, Senator Goldwater and President Johnson."

A fine bunch of Fascist generals, Birchers, Ku-Kluxers and the like; charming company for Lyndon B. Johnson.

Actually, this list of H.L.Hunt's military friends is far from complete. He himself declared, in answer to a question from the Playboy reporter, "What do you think of Johnson's handling of the war in Vietnam?" :

"I think that it would be better to listen to the McArthur school of thought - General Courtney Whitney, General A.C. Wedemeyer, General van Fleet, General Bonner Fellers and younger men trained by them. Whatever this school of thought would advise, I think should be followed."

Mr. Hunt need not worry. His good friend LBJ is following, has been following all along, the advice of that "school of thought." And the American people is paying a steep price for it, in blood, money and scrap iron.

Still the list of H.L. Hunt's military friends is not complete. Conservatively speaking, it would also include at least the following: Admiral Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, a featured speaker for the "Christian Anti-Communist Crusade;" General George Stratemeyer, board member of "Liberty Lobby" and another prominent Christian Crusader; General C.A. Willoughby, also of the Christian Crusade; General W.Peyton Campbell, same affiliation; General Charles B. Stone (John Birch Society), etc.etc.

These retired top officers and active militants of the extreme Right and their likes, many of them still in the armed forces, form the backbone of that pernicious military-industrial establishment against which even a conservative military man like former President Eisenhower has found it necessary to warn the nation. Many of them have had, or even have today, close links with the "intelligence community" and, in particular, the CIA.

No wonder Hunt and his likes detest Eisenhower. According to Robert G. Sherrill, Hunt has said: "Eisenhower was no good. Eisenhower was the worst President, the most harmful President we have ever had..." Hunt takes great pride in having helped to push through (or so he claims) the Twenty-Second Amendment, which forbids a third presidential term. He makes one exception, though: "Johnson," he says, lighting up, "is the kind of President who can lead Congress around by its nose. I wouldn't mind seeing him in there for three terms." (The Nation, loc.cit.)

Yes, Lyndon B. Johnson is the ideal President for the Hunts of America. And they made him President.

"Since the late 1940s," Sherrill writes, "Hunt has fancied himself in the role of king maker and as a shaper of national policy." He tried his hand at the making of various "kings," in particular General Douglas Mac Arthur and then, in 1960, went all out for his fellow Texan Lyndon B. Johnson. In this endeavor, Hunt enlisted the help of one of those bigoted rabble-rousers of the cloth who abound in the Dallas area, the Reverend Dr. W.A. Criswell, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Dallas. Since about 1957, Hunt and Criswell have been working hand in hand, the former sponsoring the pastor's printed outpourings, the latter peddling "Life Line" pamphlets to his parishioners. Now, to quote again textually from Sherrill's illuminating piece in The Nation:

"Not long before the 1960 Democratic Presidential Convention Criswell mounted his pulpit and sounded an alarm against the threat of Romanism in politics that was heard round the country: 'The election of a Catholic as President would mean the end of religious liberty in America.' Kennedy had gone on record as favoring a review of the oil industry's tax benefits, including the depletion allowance. A 'review' could only mean a lessening of benefits. The Reverend Criswell's message sounded useful indeed to Hunt..."

"That's why Hunt promptly had 200,000 reprints of Criswell's

sermon printed and mailed out, after which he sat back to watch a wave of aroused Protestantism wash Kennedy out of the running. Instead, the wave was one of indignation from editorial writers and the general public at this artificial injection of hysteria into American politics.

"The Senate took an even sterner approach. The Criswell flier did not name its source and there is a federal law against distributing this kind of anonymous circular after a campaign is officially under way. In Dallas, the perpetrators panicked. Hunt ducked out entirely and could not be found. (Three years later, there was a repeat performance, as we have seen - J.J.) Criswell denied that Hunt had paid for the leaflets, but Ralph B. Raughley, a partner in a Great Neck, L.I. printing firm, told a Senate subcommittee that an employee of Hunt's had paid \$ 10,008 for the printing and mailing of the sermon to Protestant ministers.

"Fortunately for Hunt, Raughley also swore that the order had been placed before the Democratic convention closed in Los Angeles. Thus Hunt was legally, if not morally, in the clear..."

After their attempt to torpedo the Kennedy candidacy on religious grounds had failed, the Johnson clique, before and during the Los Angeles Convention, tried a dozen more low tricks from their well-filled bag. In particular, they berated the front-running Kennedy for the alleged Nazi affiliations of his father (that, coming from the McCarthyite Hunt & Co.); they hinted darkly that he was incurably sick (Addison's disease and other alleged disabilities); they spread false rumors about Kennedy's supposed earlier marriage; and they even peddled fancy tales of his alleged sexual escapades at Convention time. It was all to no avail.

Even the staid New York Times, in an article by Russell Baker published on November 23, 1963, wrote: "Although Mr. Johnson arrived at Los Angeles with the Kennedy nomination a virtual certainty, he nevertheless attacked with a ferocity that startled his admirers and seemed likely to create a permanent chasm between himself and Mr. Kennedy."

That ferocity turned into a boomerang, just as the preceding Hunt-Criswell production had done. Kennedy won the nomination hands down.

"The history of the Vice-Presidential nomination that followed is still garbled," Mr. Baker went on to say. "It came as a shock to Mr. Johnson's family, his advisers, his staff, his Senate colleagues, everyone who had assumed that he had alienated himself permanently from the Kennedys. It was also a shock to Mr. Kennedy's liberal convention supporters.

"When Mr. Kennedy first proposed it, the Johnson camp seemed to receive the offer as an insult. The late Sam Rayburn, then Speaker of the House, and Mr. Johnson's closest friend and confidant, advised against accepting. His family was opposed. Most of his staff and most political veterans on the scene assumed that the man who ran the Senate would scarcely surrender his position of power for the anonymity of the Vice-Presidency..."

Since then, a good deal of light has been thrown on the backstage maneuvering that went on at Los Angeles. Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Theodore White and other well-informed political writers have brought out that the Kennedy offer to Johnson was no more than a gesture in the interest of party unity, made in the belief that there was practically no chance Johnson would accept.

He did accept, though, after some hesitation. Why?

"There are many theories about his reasons for stepping into what most observers at Los Angeles considered oblivion," Russell Baker wrote, conspicuously overlooking the most obvious one.

H.L. Hunt has not been so reticent. "I personally intervened to get Lyndon to take the Vice-Presidency," he has stated (The Nation, l.c.).

What prompted Hunt, ostensibly against his own interests (for acceptance of the nomination for the second spot on the ticket was bound to deprive the oil interests of their most influential voice in Congress) to urge Johnson to take the Vice-Presidency?

And how could his lone assent prevail over the opposite counsel of so many other Johnson advisers, including Sam Rayburn?

History has given a clear-cut answer to that question. It is an answer as yet understood only by a few, but more eyes are opening every day.

Even J. Evetts Haley, who really seems to know more about what makes Lyndon Johnson tick than anybody else, has a blind spot here. After setting forth in ample and convincing detail how Johnson in 1948 obtained his Senate seat through a variety of fraudulent manoeuvres (including the massive vote for him of hundreds of dead Mexicans), Haley writes that this steal "established his illegitimate seat in the Senate, where his aptitude for compromise and chicanery put him into the crucial position from which a diabolical fate catapulted him into the presidency..."

No, my dear Haley, not diabolical fate. Diabolical kingmakers.

Besides H.L. Hunt, there was only one other Johnson intimate who advised the reluctant candidate to accept the second spot on the Democratic ticket. That was young Bobby Baker, LBJ's favorite protégé, about whom a great deal more will have to be said in a following chapter.

Bobby Baker, whose chief natural asset is a nimble mind and who is as totally devoid of scruples as is his mentor, immediately understood the possibilities H.L. Hunt had in mind even at that early moment. A great believer in cash philosophy, he also realized instantly why Hunt, after having done everything in his power to block the Kennedy nomination, now was ready to fork out 100,000 dollars to help the Kennedy-Johnson team win over the Republican competition.

It was one of ~~ex~~ Bobby Baker's closest friends and business associates, Don B. Reynolds, who three years later spilled the beans on that score. That's why Edward J. Epstein, in his afore-mentioned article in Esquire, included Don Reynolds among the proponents of the CUI BONO? theory, putting things this way:

"In January of 1964 the Warren Commission learned that Don B. Reynolds, insurance agent and close associate of Bobby Baker, had been heard to say that the FBI knew that Johnson was behind the assassination. When interviewed by the FBI, he denied this. (Poor guy, what else could he have done? - J.J.) But he did recount an incident during the swearing in of Kennedy in which Bobby Baker said words to the effect that the s.o.b. would never live out his term and that he would die a violent death."

Bobby Baker said that, mind you, in January 1961. Now, was that supernatural vision, would you think, or exact foreknowledge of what was going to happen at the opportune moment?

Count FourJohnson - Favorite Choice of the CIA

Early in April, 1967, District Attorney James Garrison of New Orleans received a British Broadcasting Team headed by Mr. Jo Menell, the producer of "PANORAMA." That was quite an exception, for Mr. Garrison, justly angered at the persistent way the American news media had been distorting everything he said about his investigation of the Kennedy murder, had by that time more or less broken off relations with the press and the radio-TV networks.

In the course of this conversation, the District Attorney indicated that there was a governmental agency which held in its files information that clarified the real facts and he added that people in the United States and throughout the world had a right to know that a U.S. Government agency was concealing these facts, and also what the real facts were. "No Government ever existed," Mr. Garrison told the English visitors, "in the history of the whole world which was worth concealing the truth for." It was getting this Government organization to release the facts, that was the problem. Mr. Menell then said that this organization sounded like America's own intelligence system, the CIA.

Garrison replied, "It almost sounds like that, doesn't it? No comment." (a smile)

Cautious as the approach of needs was, the New Orleans District Attorney here let the world catch a glimpse of the biggest and most terrible secret of our time: the fact that the assassination of President Kennedy was engineered by the CIA.

Even in my earliest book on the subject, Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy? I had expressed the belief that the CIA was involved in the Dallas plot. Since then, the new facts brought to light by the New Orleans investigation add up to a certainty, for anyone with an open mind and a minimum of civic courage, that the CIA was not only involved, but that it organized and executed the ambush in which Kennedy died on November 22, 1963.

Not, of course, the ^hole CIA, any more than all of the Dallas Police or all the staff of the local FBI bureau could have been implicated. In each case, certain key figures were involved, and worked closely together, while the great mass of their associates and subordinates undoubtedly were unaware of the treacherous game. That is the reason some Dallas policemen, sheriff's deputies and FBI-agents were so obviously working at cross-purposes in the earliest stage of the investigation.

On the other hand, it is a well-known, and almost generally acknowledged, fact that the CIA is linked through numerous personal and business ties to the American oil industry. Almost since it came into being, after the last war, the CIA, in its worldwide operations, has consistently served the oil interests, rather than the national interest.

Just as an outstanding example among many, take the man who was the Director of Central Intelligence at the time of the assassination, John McCone. A multi-millionaire California businessman with pronounced ultra-rightwing sympathies, McCone, in the words of Drew Pearson, had "made more money out of Uncle Sam during World War II than anyone else." Ralph E. Casey of the General Accounting Office testified in 1946 that McCone and his associates in the California Shipbuilding Company had made \$ 44,000,000 on an investment of \$ 100,000. ("The Invisible Government" by David Wise and Thomas B. Ross).

Most of that money accrued to McCone through the building and operation of tankers, which alone would account for a close relationship with the oil industry. In addition, however, McCone held more than a million dollars worth of stock of the Standard Oil Company of California which has wide interests in the Middle East, Indonesia and Latin America.

When McCone's nomination came up before the Senate Armed Services Committee, in January, 1962, several senators were deeply disturbed by this close and obvious relationship between the man who had been appointed head of the CIA and one of the biggest American oil companies.

"Every well-informed American knows," commented Sen. Joseph Clark (D) of Pennsylvania, "that the American oil companies are deep in the politics of the Middle East... (and) the CIA is deep in the politics of the Middle East." (The Invisible Government) Nevertheless, a majority of senators voted for confirmation.

Even more disturbing was, or should have been, another close relationship affecting the assassination. Deputy Director of the CIA had been for eight years an Air Force general by name of Charles P. Cabell who, after the Bay of Pigs fiasco, was forced to retire (on Jan. 31, 1962), a few months after his long-time chief, Allen W. Dulles, had quit the CIA for the same reason. Gen. Charles Cabell is a Texan from Dallas and his brother, Earle Cabell, was the mayor of that city when President Kennedy was slain there. This is too much of a coincidence to be blandly overlooked, as the Warren Commission of course chose to do. As mayor of Dallas, Earle Cabell was one of those chiefly responsible for the travel arrangements that led Kennedy straight into a death trap (cf. Count Seven) And his brother Charles, ousted from the CIA leadership by President Kennedy because of his blunders in the Bay of Pigs disaster, was fuming with rage at the Chief Executive, as were Allen Dulles and the other bungling CIA officials Kennedy had forced into retirement after the stupid Cuban invasion attempt. Would it be far-fetched, under the circumstances, to suggest that the Cabell Brothers jointly played a part in the Dallas murder plot?

"Cuba sticks in the craw of the CIA," I wrote in Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy? That was putting it rather mildly but I was not yet fully aware at the time of the murderous hate the CIA leadership had nourished for Kennedy ever since the Bay of Pigs debacle, which they blamed on him.

Relations between the Chief Executive and the sinister forces of the "Invisible Government" couldn't have been worse than they were in the summer and fall of 1963. Not only because of Cuba and Vietnam, but also on account of other deceptions the CIA had practiced on the President. One of the worst of these was the case of Prof. Frederick C. Bagrhcorn

of Yale University who had been arrested in Moscow, on Oct. 31, 1963, on espionage charges. Needled by Congress and a frenzied press, President Kennedy sought and obtained from the CIA a formal assurance that Barghoorn had not been on an intelligence assignment. On the strength of this guarantee, Kennedy, in a stiff note of protest to the Soviet Government, personally vouched for the integrity of Barghoorn (who thereupon was promptly released), only to learn a few days later, from an unimpeachable source, that the professor had been working for "intelligence" after all.

That was too much and Kennedy exploded. Talking to a confidant, he vowed to smash the CIA and scatter its bits to the winds. But the CIA, which has its eyes and ears everywhere, was quicker on the draw.

Not only did the CIA hate Kennedy, but it loved Lyndon B. Johnson. There was a man who had always stood up for "free enterprise," meaning the oil interests and big business in general. A man secretly pledged to escalating the war in Vietnam as soon as he got into the driver's seat and to make Latin America safe for military dictatorship. A man who could be relied upon to dispose of Sukarno and restore Indonesia to oil company control. A man who would let the Invisible Government run the country visibly.

For all the hush-hush atmosphere that surrounds this nefarious organization, the dominant role played by the CIA in the assassination of President Kennedy is self-evident. It is apparent at all levels of the drama.

Lee Harvey Oswald was, without a shadow of doubt, an operative of the CIA. His mother, Mrs. Marguerite Oswald, has formally stated not just her belief, but her knowledge that her son had been in the employ of the US Government as an undercover agent. More importantly still, every phase of Oswald's stay in the Soviet Union, every line of his correspondence with American authorities, every action of his after his repatriation (in particular, of course, the dazzling speed with which he obtained a new passport in New Orleans) clearly bespeak such a relationship. All this is described in abundant detail in my book Marina Oswald and need not be recapitulated here. The evidence is overwhelming that Oswald was recruited by the CIA while he was in the Marine Corps; that he tried hard to please his taskmasters, but bungled every assignment given to him; and that, for that reason, he was sacrificed in the end when a scapegoat was needed to take the blame for the assassination of President Kennedy.

Jack Ruby, too, worked for the CIA, even though to him this was only a sideline, for he was first and foremost an authentic mobster on the Mafia payroll. (How many of its low-level operatives the CIA recruits from the dregs of the underworld has also been strikingly demonstrated by the Garrison investigation in New Orleans).

Ruby's connection with the CIA, especially as paymaster for underground operations against Castro, has been exposed with dazzling clarity by the deposition of Nancy Perrin Rich before the Warren Commission - which promptly suppressed every word of it, at any rate as far as the Report is concerned. This matter has been fully dealt with by me in Oswald: The Truth and again, therefore, needs not to be recapitulated here. One point of interest, however, should be added.

In her testimony before the Commission, Mrs. Rich described in graphic detail a semi-clandestine meeting in Dallas, not long before the assassination, at which arrangements were discussed for smuggling guns and ammunition into Cuba and taking refugees out from that country. To this end,

Nancy's former husband, Robert Perrin, was to pilot a small boat between Miami and the Cuban coast and he was to receive \$ 10,000 for his services. There was some argument about the price (Nancy wanted \$ 25,000) and then all of a sudden, Ruby walked in with a big wallet bulging in his breast-pocket. Nancy knew Ruby well, for she had been working at one of his clubs as a bartender and "B-girl."

It was clear to the witness that the operation was planned and financed by a colonel whom she was able to describe but whose name she did not know. The witness also gathered ~~xx~~ from remarks made at the meeting that the military supplies that were to be run into Cuba were being secretly taken from Army stocks (this fits in neatly with similar information obtained later by Garrison's investigators). The whole thing, thus, smells CIA operation a mile away.

Now, one of the many correspondents personally unknown to me who wrote to me after the publication of Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy? to volunteer additional information has been able to identify this mysterious colonel. He is Col. Robert L. Castorr, formerly of Dallas, and a close friend of General Edwin A. Walker. In the period immediately preceding the assassination, Castorr and Walker held several meetings with Cuban refugee groups in the Dallas area at which inflammatory speeches against the Kennedy Administration were made. After the assassination, Col. Castorr moved to Washington where he is now employed by the "National Federation of Independent Businesses." His home is at 4511 33rd Street, North Arlington, Virginia. It is to be hoped that District Attorney Garrison will do something the Warren Commission should have done but, as usual, failed to do: subpoena Colonel Castorr and grill him relentlessly about his and General Walker's role in the events that led up to the assassination.

A final word about Nancy's first husband, Robert Perrin. Like Ruby, he was a living link between the Mafia and the CIA. Perrin, like Ruby, was a dope smuggler and white slaver for the Mafia (Jack Dragna, Mickey Cohen etc.) on one hand, and a gun-runner for the CIA on the other. Soon after the assassination of President Kennedy, Perrin died in New Orleans, of all places, of "arsenic voluntarily consumed," of all things. That, at any rate, was the coroner's report.

Speaking of New Orleans, just about everything Jim Garrison has dug up so far, or rather, has made public so far, points towards the CIA as the gukling hand behind the assassination. Clay Shaw, a retired Army major, was an intelligence officer during the war and later served with the CIA; so did David Ferric, a former Air Force captain. All of those Cuban refugees and other shadowy figures who were in one way or another involved at the New Orleans end of the conspiracy were on the CIA payroll or manipulated by that criminal outfit through interposed persons.

In conclusion, one point must be made firmly and unmistakably: Even the CIA, all-powerful as it is, would not have dared to organize a conspiracy aiming at the assassination of the Chief of State without adequate reinsurance. It may be taken for granted, therefore, that there was an understanding between the CIA leaders implicated in the plot and the man who automatically was to become Chief Executive after the deed, Lyndon B. Johnson. They made him "king" with a few well-placed shots and in return obtained a promise of total impunity and of an even bigger voice in the Government. And that is the only promise Johnson ever kept.

Count FiveThe Bobby Baker Scandal - Key to the Assassination

In all the history of the United States, there has never been anything to match the sordid partnership between the most powerful lawmaker of his time, Senate leader Lyndon B. Johnson, and Robert G. ("Bobby") Baker, the most crooked wheeler-dealer who ever moved about Capitol Hill.

Were it only for the fact that Bobby Baker for years acted as go-between and bagman for the inordinately greedy and grafting politician Lyndon Johnson, one could dismiss the matter as trivial. Such behavior is commonplace in the top strata of the Great Society that centers on Washington, D.C., USA. But there was more, much more to the cozy relationship between Bobby Baker and LBJ.

Young Baker was also a pimp and procurer who, almost openly, operated a string of high-class brothels for the benefit of his high and mighty friends - and the then Senate Majority leader, and later Vice-President of the United States was one of his most assiduous customers.

This aspect of the Bobby Baker scandal, generally referred to in hushed tones as the "moral side" of it, has been diligently suppressed all along by the powers-that-be, although every newspaperman worth his salt in Washington and New York has been keenly aware of it. The scandal was so great it even overwhelmed the muckrakers.

Not an inkling of it ever came out during the trial of Bobby Baker in January 1967, for an excellent reason. When the Government was forced at last, by the pressure of public opinion, to prosecute this unmitigated scoundrel, great care was taken to limit the proceedings strictly to the "financial side" of the long-brewing scandal. The same thing had happened before during the 1963-64 Senate "investigation" of the Baker affair under the chairmanship of Sen. B. Everett Jordan, a tried and tested Johnson toady.

Even so, the Bobby Baker trial threw enough light on the intimate relationship that had existed for twelve years between Johnson and the convicted crook Bobby Baker to warrant a call for the impeachment of the man who is now President of the United States on that count alone. And it is about the most insignificant count of all those outstanding against Lyndon B. Johnson.

Here are some tell-tale headlines from the Baker trial:

"Baker: LBJ Helped Me Borrow 300G - 'The Best Friend I Ever Had in Senate' Bobby Says" (New York Daily News, January 21, 1967) - "Baker Tells of LBJ's Help - Says the Then VP Got Him \$ 300,000 By Phoning Kerr (World Journal Tribune, 1-20-67) - "White House Silent on Baker" (New York Post, 1-21-67).

Three times in a row Bobby Baker, on the stand in his own defense on charges of grand larceny, fraud, interstate transportation of stolen funds and income tax evasion, had invoked - with unconcealed, almost gleeful emphasis - the name of the "then Vice-President" (Lyndon B. Johnson) as "the best friend I ever had in the Senate."

According to a UPI dispatch from Washington, Jan. 20, 1967, "Robert G. (Bobby) Baker testified today Lyndon B. Johnson sent him to see the late millionaire Sen. Robert S. Kerr, D-Okla., in 1962 when Baker found himself in desperate financial trouble... At that time, Johnson was President Kennedy's vice president.

"Baker told the Federal Court jury: 'I told him (Johnson) I had a very serious financial problem and asked his advice. He picked up the phone and called his friend and my friend, Sen. Kerr, and then advised me to go immediately to Sen. Kerr's office which I did.'"

The Senator Kerr in this story is of course the same multimillionaire oilman who, along with Johnson and Rayburn, used to be one of the strongest pillars of the oil lobby in Congress. The extremely warm personal relationship between the old Oklahoma tycoon and the personable young rogue Bobby Baker is reflected, among other things, in the following testimony by Fred Black, a long-time Baker associate during the Senate investigation of Baker's affairs: "Sen. Kerr told me... that outside of his sons, his wife, he never knew and loved a man so much as he did Bobby Baker... there wasn't anything in the world that Bobby Baker would ask him to do for him... that he would not do."

After having received that urgent phone call from his other great friend, Vice-President Johnson, Kerr promptly swung into action. To quote again from the above-cited UPI dispatch: "The defendant said that after listening to his story of financial woe, Kerr telephoned the president of the Fidelity Bank and Trust Co. in Oklahoma City and arranged for Baker to be given a loan credit of \$ 250,000. Kerr also assured Baker that he would personally lend him \$ 50,000, Baker testified."

The government's case against Bobby Baker, at this trial, revolved largely around the allegation that the one-time "golden boy" of Capitol Hill had put into his own pocket nearly \$ 100,000 which he had received, in cash, from three California savings and loan firms, for political contributions. The defense claimed that Baker actually had collected this money on behalf of Senator Kerr, as a payoff for Congressional services rendered to the financiers. Either way the deal stinks to high heaven. But it must be said that the defense story sounded less likely, if for no other reason because Kerr was rich enough, from his oil profits, not to be in need of a paltry \$ 100,000 bribe. The jury saw things that way, too, for Baker was found guilty, late in January, on seven counts and on April 7, 1967, he was sentenced to serve from one to three years in prison (he could have drawn a maximum penalty of 48 years).

I cannot here go into details of Baker's extraordinarily involved financial tangles with the law. The whole thing is a labyrinth leading into a morass, or vice-versa. What matters here is the extremely close personal relationship this convicted crook had maintained over the years, while he was secretary to the majority in the Senate, with Lyndon B. Johnson and how the latter became compromised on the "moral side" of the scandal to the point where desperate measures were required to get him out of this mess.

Lyndon Johnson has never denied - he never could deny - the extremely warm affection he had felt for Bobby Baker for more than a decade. On July 27, 1956, Johnson rose on the Senate floor to deliver a speech which included this gem: "I know I should refer to him (Bobby Baker) formally as Secretary to the Majority, but my tongue even as my heart says 'Bobby' instead... Always present, always alert, and more than anything else, always understanding and persuasive with his wise counsel. I say to all of you here tonight that here, indeed, is a young man of rare and real promise."

A year later, on August 23, 1958, Johnson again used the Senate floor for another touching eulogy on his protégé: "There have been few times in my life that I have ever seen a young man who combined so much wisdom and maturity with such youthful vigor and enthusiasm as Bobby Baker... He is a young man who has already gone very far and who is going much farther. I believe he will reach much greater heights."

Yes, they loved each other for, the age difference apart, they were alike as two peas in a pod: the man who was going to be the storm center of the greatest scandal in modern American history; and the man who was going to become President of the United States thanks to "diabolical fate." One made two million dollars on the side while serving on the public payroll; the other fourteen million. One now stands convicted for what he is and has always been; the other is awaiting the judgment of history.

Basically, Bobby Baker's modus operandi, that earned him a cool two million dollars in a few years, was very simple: he brought top executives of big business corporations and the leading political figures on Capitol Hill together for an exchange of views which invariably ended in an exchange of favors. And, since big business thrives on unrestrained pleasure, Baker organized a ring of high-class call girls (politely referred to by all concerned as "party girls") which he made available, in three (or possibly more) establishments he controlled in and near Washington to his patrons in both business and politics.

The most widely-known of these three snuggeries was the plush "Carousel Motel" which a group of businessmen formed and controlled by Bobby Baker built at Ocean City, Md., beginning in 1960. Baker himself once described this pleasure palace as the "Washington hideaway for the advise and consent set" (NY Herald Tribune, 4-1-64). He spent well over a million dollars on it.

Of the many exquisite young ladies who have graced Baker's three seraglios, two have acquired a sort of world fame: Nancy Carole Tyler, a sultry brunette in her early '20s, who also acted as his secretary, confidante and "girl Friday;" and Elly Rometsch, the dazzlingly beautiful wife of a German Luftwaffe staff sergeant stationed in Washington. He kept the former (along with another girl) in his luxuriously equipped "Town House," which was conveniently located near the Capitol, and used the latter (with several others) to entertain his patrons at the "Quorum Club" in Washington and at the Carousel Motel.

The role played by these classy sirens in the Baker scheme of things has been bluntly defined by Sen. Carl Curtis of Nebraska, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Rules Committee which was to investigate the Bobby Baker affair:

"Party girls and entertaining were part of the business promotion apparatus. The facts are available if we pursue it. Individuals were induced to enter into certain business arrangements as part of the promotion. Girls were solicited on Government telephone lines, taken to the place, entertained the prospective customer and it is part and parcel of the transaction."

The Senator's syntax may not be flawless, but his information was.

Leading American newspapers frequently, if coyly, alluded to the malodorous "moral side" of the Baker affair, which was strenuously suppressed in all investigations. The New York Times, for instance, on March 22, 1964, published a dispatch from Phoenix, Arizona, that began with this paragraph: " 'Call girls and Bobby Baker and motels' have become the symbols of Washington under President Johnson, Sen. Barry Goldwater charged today..."

Less than two weeks before Kennedy's death, The New York Herald Tribune, in an article on the "Secret Rules of Inquiry" governing the Baker investigation, reported on Nov. 10, 1963: "It is an open Washington secret that when the 'sex angle' was introduced into the Baker case by revelations that a beautiful German model had been sent home after reported (and denied) affairs with Washington politicians, it scared almost as many people in Washington as when the Russian missiles in Cuba pushed the U.S. to the brink of nuclear war."

This was a reference to Elly Rometsch who had been bundled out of the United States, on Aug. 21, 1963, by the FBI after she had been boasting a little too indiscreetly about her intimate relationship with top government officials. What had aroused the FBI into frantic action was not a concern about the morals of the nation's leaders but knowledge that Elly Rometsch hailed from East Germany, a Communist country. With the impact of Britain's Profumo scandal still fresh in everybody's mind, J. Edgar Hoover wasn't going to take any more chances...

The deep secrecy about the Rometsch ouster was maintained even for some weeks after the Baker scandal had broken early in September 1963. When her story at last was out in the open, an immediate hush was imposed by the White House. It was probably President Kennedy's most fateful mistake that he yielded to the pressure of the party regulars and used all of his personal influence and authority to persuade editors not to spell out the names of the "top government officials" involved. Yet everybody who is anybody in the Washington press corps knew who they were and that the list of unmentionable names was topped by that of the then Vice-President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

In their attempt to keep the public informed without contravening Kennedy's no-names-edict, some papers performed miracles of between-the-lines disclosures. Newsday, in particular, must be credited with a unique performance. In its issue of Oct. 29, 1963, this paper ran an almost full-page story entitled "Baker Scandal Quiz Open Today," which began with these words:

"Already liberally spiced with sex, scandal and intrigue, the tantalizing case of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker comes under official scrutiny today. And what everyone wants to know is: Who is going to get caught?..."

Who, indeed? Attentive readers of Newsday must have caught a glimpse of the truth. For, topping this article were five pictures of interested personalities with the following legends:

1. Rep. H. R. Gross - Demands Facts;
2. Sen. Everett Jordan - Pledges Open Inquiry;
3. Sen. John J. Williams - Led-Off Witness;
4. Robert G. Baker - On Senate Grill;
5. Vice-President Johnson - Feels No Taint.

In the text of the story, Newsday explained about Rep. Gross "demanding facts." The Congressman, the day before, had asked this question, in a brief speech in the House: "Among other things I want to know, Mr. Speaker, are the circumstances under which a young German woman was hastily deported from this country a few weeks ago following an FBI investigation. Members of the Congress and the public are entitled to know whether there was any element of security violation concerned in this speedy and hitherto unpublicized deportation?"

About the man in the second picture, Sen. Benjamin Everett Jordan, Democrat of North Carolina, who as chairman of the Senate Rules Committee was to conduct the inquiry into Bobby Baker's extracurricular activities, Newsday had this to say: "... reports are that some ranking Washington officials have their fingers crossed in hopes that their own names will not figure in the revelations. Because of these reports, an inordinately sensitive watch is being kept on the hearings the Senate Rules Committee is opening today. The witnesses will be heard behind closed doors before their testimony is opened to public scrutiny. The Senate traditionally is reluctant to embarrass any member and some observers fear that the closed testimony will offer suitable opportunity for a whitewash..."

Why Sen. Williams' picture was shown, is also explained adequately in the text: "It was Williams' personal investigation of Baker's activities that led to Baker's resignation from his Senate post earlier this month and the hearings beginning today. The committee itself is making no independent investigation until it hears from Williams..."

Bobby Baker's inclusion in this gallery of political portraits was a matter of course and requires no further explanation.

But, what about the picture No. 5? Lyndon B. Johnson was in no way involved either as an investigator, a witness or a committee member. Why did he figure at all on this list of personalities? And why the cryptic statement that he "feels no taint?"

The only mention of the Vice-President comes in this paragraph which is well worth pondering: "Baker, now 36, was a protégé of Vice President Johnson's, who got to know him when Johnson served as Senate majority leader. A report, from those who claim 'inside information,' is that the Justice Department started an investigation of Baker as a means of embarrassing Johnson and eliminating him from the Democratic ticket next year..."

In other words, Robert Kennedy - who had most strenuously opposed Johnson's selection as his brother's running-mate in 1960 - wanted Johnson off the ticket in 1964 and thought the Baker case would serve to eliminate him automatically. This was well understood by Johnson.

"Despite Jordan's promise," Newsday went on to say, "there are still questions as to precisely how 'searching' the committee investigation will be. The latest revelation in the case, and one which could turn into the juiciest the government has seen in years, is that a West German party girl, wife of a West German sergeant who was stationed at the embassy here, 'entertained' high-ranking members of the government at a motel partially owned by Baker in Ocean City, Md..."

In a follow-up story, published the next day, Newsday wrote: "While rumors about Baker and his relationship with a frisky frau, who was bounced from the United States allegedly for her hanky-panky with top government officials, buzzed from the Potomac to the Ruhr..."

How many "top government officials" are there? Exactly two, i.e. the President and the Vice-President.

A UPI dispatch from Washington, dated Oct. 28, 1963, started out with this paragraph: "A Senate investigator is expected to unfold at a closed hearing tomorrow a Profumo-like story of a German beauty's relations with prominent Washington figures..."

The New York Journal-American, too, smelled Profumistic odors. In its issue of Oct. 28, 1963, this paper reported: "A West German party girl was thrown out of Washington because of her Congressional capers, the Bonn Government confirmed today... The action came after the FBI notified Bonn of the girl's activities, which paralleled the Profumo-Keeler affair in London..."

In order to qualify as a "Profumo-type affair," or one that parallels the Profumo-Keeler affair, there had to be these prerequisites in the case: (a) A Cabinet member with access to top defense secrets; he had to have an intimate relationship with a siren who also happened to be a security risk; and (c) he had to be on personally friendly terms with the purveyor of the girl's charms. Of all the members of Kennedy's Cabinet only Johnson filled the bill on all three counts.

Despite terse official denials - which are routine in such cases - it is certain that by the end of October 1963 President Kennedy and his brother, the Attorney General, had made up their minds to "dump Lyndon," - as Nixon accurately stated at Dallas the day before the assassination. All they were waiting for were the facts still to be brought to light by the Senate investigation then in progress.

Thus, for Lyndon Johnson, it became a matter of political survival to halt that investigation at all costs, or at any rate to see to it that the "moral side" of the Baker scandal was eliminated from the hearings. As Vice President he was unable to do so, for his chief, President Kennedy, had clearly indicated that he expected a thorough house-cleaning in the Baker affair. As President, however, Johnson would be in a position to turn the investigation into a whitewash of himself, which is exactly what happened after Kennedy's death.

The Baker scandal, then, is truly the hidden key to the assassination or, to be more exact, to its timing. For the roots of the drama undoubtedly go back to the 1960 Convention, as I have already set forth, what the Baker affair did was to crystallize the more or less vague plans to eliminate Kennedy which had already been in existence. The murder of a president is hazardous business under the best of circumstances. It takes an element of urgency to put such a plan into effect. The threat of complete exposure which faced Johnson in the Baker scandal provided that final impulse. He now was forced by the instinct of self-preservation to give the go-ahead signal to the plotters who had long been waiting for the right opportunity.

It may have been an almost imperceptible signal, but the CIA, which is always on the alert for instructions to commit murder, caught it clearly and promptly swung into action.

Count SixMurder Unlimited - and Unpunished

Through all of the Lyndon Johnson Story, there runs like a red, a blood-red thread, a string of mysterious deaths, from implausible suicide through unlikely accident to overt, unpunished murder.

I am not suggesting that Johnson in all of these cases, or even in any of them, was directly responsible. But one finds that in each of some thirty cases of unnatural death which have occurred over the past six years, there was a link to some definite Johnson interest. The common denominator of these suspicious deaths, occurring in widely different spheres, is an obvious intent to cover up something, that would have been apt to embarrass Johnson, had it been revealed.

"Dead Men Tell No Tales" is not only the favorite slogan of the organized underworld, but also a guiding maxim in the political jungle that goes by the name of The Great Society. Facts liable to incriminate the boss are ruthlessly suppressed; evidence is fabricated or tampered with; witnesses to the truth are silenced, one way or the other.

Another common hallmark of the various occurrences which we shall briefly examine in the following is the fact that in all instances violent death went uninvestigated and unpunished. In some cases, there was a perfunctory sham inquest, usually followed by a vague or evasive coroner's report; then the matter was quietly buried. In most instances, however, a verdict of suicide or accident was pronounced without the slightest attempt even to examine a possible murder angle. All this denotes a powerful behind-the-scenes influence which, under the given circumstances, can have been exercised only by or on behalf of Lyndon B. Johnson. He is the grand master of the coverup technique which has been brought in America to a perfection unmatched anywhere in the world.

Of the approximately thirty people who have died under highly suspicious circumstances, two could have connected Johnson, or close associates of his, with the Billie Sol Estes scandal, and at least four with the Bobby Baker affair, while 20-odd were potentially embarrassing witnesses in the Dallas events of November 22 to 24, 1963.

Space does not permit an exhaustive discussion of the Billie Sol Estes case here. J. Evetts Haley has adequately covered the subject in his book "A Texan Looks at Lyndon," and the matter is, on the whole, of marginal interest only to the present inquiry into the morals and practices of Lyndon B. Johnson.

Briefly stated, Billie Sol Estes, a young Texan from Pecos, was the very prototype of the "wheeler-dealer," i.e. the inordinately avaricious, grafting, finagling businessman usually operating on the outer fringes of the law which is so characteristic of the Johnson era. A "wheeler-dealer" can best be recognized by his ability to make millions of dollars in a minimum of time in an area of business where political influence is of paramount importance. Billie Sol Estes, Bobby Baker and Lyndon B. Johnson are the three outstanding wheeler-dealers of our time.

The web of Estes' business interests and financial entanglements was even more complex than that of Bobby Baker and almost as impenetrable as the vast reaches of the Johnson business empire. More than two dozen different firms dealing in cotton, fertilizer and grain storage were lumped together in "Billie Sol Estes Enterprises, Inc."

The magic word behind Estes' spectacular, if short-lived, success was influence. At the height of his career, in 1961 and early 1962, Estes made a point of flying to Washington about once a month. Invariably, on the eve of his departure for the capital, he would make huge withdrawals from one or the other of his various bank accounts. On a single trip he is reported to have taken with him \$ 150,000 in cash, returning home nearly empty-handed.

Three big grain storage companies, all of which made huge profits from Government contracts, formed the mainstay of Estes' multimillion-dollar business empire. In the single year of 1961, United Elevators, one of these companies, was paid about four million dollars by the US Government for the storage of grain surplus. Subsequently, three top officials of the Department of Agriculture, which had handled these deals, were forced to resign as a result of the Estes scandal. Who was the power backstage that channelled millions of tax dollars into Estes' bank accounts?

The New York World Telegram & Sun, on Sept. 24, 1964, quoted Sen. Barry Goldwater as follows: "The Billie Sol Estes case is more than just a scandal. It is more than a sordid picture of favoritism and fraud. It is a study in the operations and attitudes of some of the top officials of government - many of whom are still with us."

After that opening shot, Sen. Goldwater, in the words of the NY World Telegram & Sun, "deposited Billie Sol, like an unwanted founding, on Mr. Johnson's own doorstep." Reminding that the Texas wheeler-dealer in illegal cotton acreage allotments withdrew \$ 40,000 in cash for a trip to Washington in 1962, he (Goldwater) said: 'The record shows that Estes spent about \$ 6,000 of this for tickets to a \$ 100-a-plate Democratic dinner and turned most of the tickets over to his friend, Cliff Carter, in the office of the then Vice President, Lyndon Baines Johnson. We have never learned what happened to the other \$ 34,000. Whose office, whose pocket got that? ...

"Sen. Goldwater said Mr. (Orville) Freeman (Agriculture Secretary) ignored months of warnings from the FBI about Estes, ... while at the same time Lyndon Johnson's office was busily contacting him on behalf of Estes.

"This isn't rumor; this isn't speculation,' Sen. Goldwater said, 'This is on the record, tying the office of the man who now lives in the White House with Billie Sol Estes.'

"The GOP presidential nominee said it is up to the President to expose wrongdoing in the government, 'but the interim President whose office dealt with Billie Sol Estes does not press for exposure. His power is used for far different ends, and the White House has been turned into whitewash house...' (italics added - J.J.) "

The Whitewash House. Not a bad term, even though it has been coined by a Barry Goldwater. That's exactly what it has been from the moment Lyndon B. Johnson moved in. And Coverup House. Covering up for the misdeeds of his friends, and his own, has been a full-time occupation for LBJ for as long as he has been President, and on half a different fronts. The Billie Sol Estes front. The Bobby Baker front. The Walter Jenkins front.

The LBJ Company front. The Kennedy assassination front. And, as he goes along, the dead bodies keep falling by the wayside.

In the Estes case, and to cut a long story short, the first to die was Henry Marshall, Supervisor of Federal cotton allotments in Texas at the Department of Agriculture in Washington. After having conducted a quiet investigation of Estes' cotton allotments, Marshall, in the late spring of 1961, sent in a report which revealed the whole scheme to have been fraudulent. In June of the same year, Marshall was found dead of gunshot wounds on his ranch in Texas. His death, at the time, was listed as a "suicide," and he was quietly buried - as was his report.

After Estes' arrest, however, investigators of the McClellan Committee in May, 1962, decided to exhume not only the long-forgotten Marshall report, but also the body of its author. And now they got the shock of their lives. For, Dr. Joseph Jachimczyk, the examining pathologist, declared flatly that suicide was out of the question because the victim had been riddled by five bullets from a bolt-action rifle and that one shot had struck in the back.

Nevertheless, the McClellan Committee preferred not to press its inquiry into this matter. The chairman, Sen. McClellan, closed the book on it with the sibylline remark: "His (Marshall's) death concealed more than establishment of an act of murder would reveal." And that was that.

Between Estes' arrest and the exhumation of Marshall's body, another corpse turned up. On April 4, 1962, the badly decomposed body of one of Estes' accountants, a man named George Krutilek, was found in an automobile in El Paso - the city where a Federal grand jury happened to be looking into Estes' affairs. Krutilek would have been a prime source of information to them concerning Estes' complicated business deals and secret partnerships. And now he was dead - of a heart attack, according to the official story!

Turning now to the rise and fall of Bobby Baker, the first dead body in the case was that of Alfred S. Novak, Baker's original partner in the Carousel Motel venture already discussed. One day in March, 1962, Novak, aged 43, was found unconscious by his wife, Gertrude, on the floor of their garage. His death was first listed as due to accidental carbon-monoxide poisoning, but later it was attributed to suicide.

What is particularly suspicious in the Novak case is that his "accidental" death followed closely in the wake of his discovery that he had been swindled out of his legitimate share in the Carousel by Baker in a complicated business deal that also involved two Dallas oil kings, Clint Jr. and John Murchison. Another curious aspect of the case is that Mrs. Novak, after the death of her husband, attributed simply to "cardio-respiratory failure," collected 45 000 dollars in life insurance through an insurance agency then headed by Don. B. Reynolds, one of Bobby Baker's closest friends and business associates at that time.

Perhaps the most telltale fact about the second death in the case is that the press paid no attention to its Bobby Baker angle, conspicuous as it was. When authentic and sensational news thus is stripped of its meaning by the news media, this is nearly always due to "hush-up" orders filtering down from high government levels. On Dec. 2, 1963, an AP dispatch from Miami reported: "Grant Stockdale, former Ambassador to Ireland,

plunged to his death today from his offices on the 13th floor of the duPont Building. The police said Mr. Stockdale, an intimate friend of President Kennedy, had committed suicide. No notes were found, however. Mr. Stockdale was 48 years old..."

Note that Stockdale, according to this dispatch, did not jump out of his window. He "plunged to his death," a conveniently ambiguous statement that is generally used when a person dies by a fall from a window and the police isn't sure whether it is a case of accident, suicide - or murder.

The New York Herald Tribune, in a dispatch published on Dec, 3, 1963, was less affirmative than the AP dispatch had been. "Police said it was an apparent suicide. Miami police investigators, however, were unable to find a suicide note or provide any motive."

No motive. That's always suspicious. Suppose somebody had pushed Stockdale out the window to shut him up forever? That's not a far-fetched supposition by any means. The Herald Tribune coyly hinted: "Mr. Stockdale's name also came up briefly as a part-time associate of Eugene Hancock, a vending machine operator, mentioned in the investigation of Bobby Baker.

The New York Times of Dec. 3, 1963, was a little more explicit: "Grant Stockdale once had close business connections with vending machine concerns that are under investigation in the Robert. G. Baker inquiry... In an interview published in The Miami Herald last October, shortly after the Senate authorized a study of Mr. Baker's dealings, Mr. Stockdale said: 'I hope I don't get cut up too bad. I haven't done anything wrong.'..."

Stockdale, the NY Times story went on to explain, had been sued for using "undue influence" to get government contracts for Automatic Vending Services, a Miami company in which he owned stock. President of that company was the same Eugene Hancock who later acted as a stooge for Bobby Baker in Serv-U-Corporation, another automatic vending concern. It was the exposure of official favoritism in the case of Serv-U that started the ball rolling in the Baker case. As to Automatic Vending Services, Inc. it "won contracts totaling \$ 500,000 a year at Patrick Air Force Base and the Air Force missile test center at Cape Kennedy," according to the New York Times story. Clearly, then, Stockdale's sudden and violent death was a direct consequence of the Bobby Baker scandal, even though there was no mention of that angle in the papers.

Mystery befitting a B-grade thriller surrounds the third body in the Baker case, one that belonged, in life, to a beautiful woman.

Like other housewives in the crime-ridden Washington area, Mrs. Sheila Brennan made it a practice to keep the doors of her home in suburban Maryland not only closed, but locked. Yet one day, early in 1964, when her children came home from school, they were surprised to find the front door not only unlocked, but wide open.

Their misgivings were horribly confirmed. On the floor of the bathroom, the children found the lifeless nude body of their 34-year-old mother. Nothing else had been touched and in the adjoining bedroom the police found the woman's clothing and rings neatly arranged on her bed. Apparently, she was about to take a bath when sudden death overtook her.

What had happened? The medical authorities were as puzzled as was the police. County Medical Examiner Dr. John Kehoe was unable to make a firm determination of the cause of death. He noted an internal neck injury but expressed the view that this could have been caused "by a fall or a mugging." He thought, therefore, that the woman's death could have been "either accidental or homicide."

And what has it all to do with the Baker case? Simply this: Sheila Drennan was the wife of Lorin H. Drennan Jr., a government accountant, who gave the Senate investigators a detailed picture of Bobby Baker's financial entanglements. And that Lorin Drennan's testimony was followed, in a matter of days, by the mysterious death of his wife. Circumstances strongly suggest that somebody tried to lay his hands on Mr. Drennan's records, and in the process stumbled upon the wife as she was heading for the bathroom. That he then silenced her, is routine in such cases.

Quite extraordinary is the case of Bobby Baker's beautiful secretary, confidante and top "party girl," Nancy Carole Tyler. She was privy to most, if not all of the explosive secrets in the Baker closet. What she knew, first-hand and through her intimate friendship with Elly Rometsch, about goings-on in high circles, in Washington, was enough to bring the government down, any time.

She never showed any disposition to betray any of her knowledge. When she on Feb. 26, 1964, succeeded her boss on the witness stand, before the Senate investigating committee, she swore to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth - and then clammed up as effectively as he had done. She was protected, of course, by the Fifth Amendment, the same as Bobby Baker himself. She wouldn't even give her present address which was no longer that of the famous Town House Baker had rented for her and her girl friends.

Despite such loyalty, Miss Tyler before long was to meet with an "accident" so cleverly engineered no one will ever be able to prove that she was murdered. Ostensibly, this is what happened: After moving out of the Town House, early in 1964, the girl took up residence at the Carousel Motel also owned by her boss. She kept out of the public eye as much as she could.

In the first week of May, 1965, a man named Robert H. Davis, a 43-year-old pilot for a West Virginia coal company, arrived at the motel where he stayed for several days. Davis, a resident of Huntington, W. Va., had flown to Ocean City, Md. in his own plane, a single-engine Waco biplane. No sooner had Davis met Miss Tyler at the motel, than he invited her for a sightseeing trip in his plane over Ocean City and surroundings. Carole accepted and on May 9th they took off together. The girl was riding in the front seat and Davis in the back of the dual control plane.

All of a sudden and for no visible reason - the flying weather couldn't have been finer - the plane plunged into the sea, about 1,000 feet offshore. Rescue boats reaching the scene shortly after the crash could find no signs of survivors. The Coast Guard eventually located the wreckage in murky water about 23 feet deep. Divers recovered the bodies of Tyler and Davis.

Officials of the Civil Aeronautics Board promptly arrived on the scene to direct the salvaging of the plane for inspection. They hired a commercial barge with a crane to bring the Waco to the surface, rather than to drag it ashore with a winch because, as a CAB official indicated, the plane might be damaged by a sand bar between the spot where it was found and the beach. This suggests the CAB thought it was a peculiar accident and wanted to make sure that its cause could be determined. However, nothing further was heard about this investigation. It, too, was quietly buried.

It is of course hard to say what had happened in the case. One possible explanation is that the plane had been sabotaged, unbeknown to Davis. On the other hand, Davis, an experienced flyer, may have been hired to dump the girl into the sea and make it look like an accident. This theory is strongly borne out by the fact that Davis, according to The New York World-Telegram & Sun of May 10, 1965, was stunt-flying when the plane fell into the sea. To engage in stunt-flying seems hardly normal for a professional pilot who takes a girl he has just met out on a sightseeing trip. If this assumption is correct, then evidently something went wrong. Perhaps there was a struggle between the killer and his victim with the result that the plane went irretrievably out of control. Who will ever know?

As ^{to} the ~~the~~ 20-odd Dallas witnesses who have perished to date, mostly in staged traffic accidents, from previously undetected fatal diseases or through established but never punished murder, there is no need for me to go into details of these cases here. Except for the latest additions to the list, the matter has been dealt with exhaustively in my previous books, in Mark Lane's "Rush to Judgment" and in other recent publications.

The Sunday Times (London), on Feb. 26, 1967, stated that it had "asked an actuary to compute the life expectancy of 15 of the dead. He concluded that, on the morning of November 22, 1963, there was one chance in about 10 to the 29th power that they would all be dead today. More crudely, the odds against all 15 dying were 100,000 trillion to one."

Unimpressed by its own scoop, the Sunday Times considered that this statistic "is no grounds for any sinister conclusion."

How many more Dallas witnesses must die before the blindfold press begins to see something sinister?

Count Seven

The Dealey Plaza Ambush

The core of the Kennedy Murder Fraud is exposed by the topography of the assassination site.

As early as November 23, 1963, The New York Times accurately described the Texas School Book Depository as an "Ambush Building Chosen with Care." What the paper did not care to tell its readers, though, was that Lee H. Oswald, the alleged assassin, did not of his own initiative choose the TSED as his place of work, but was planted there by a false friend (Ruth Paine); nor did The Times care to point out ^{that} the employment of Oswald at the TSED took place about six weeks before any member of the general public in Dallas could know, or even guess that the presidential motorcade would pass in the vicinity of the Book Depository. All of which logically rules out Oswald as the one who chose the ambush building with care.

There was not only an ambush building but also, and more importantly still, an ambush itinerary in the choice of which Oswald, again, could not have had any say. As early as June 1964 my book Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy? called attention to the "self-betraying" double detour which brought the parade within convenient shooting distance, at a conveniently slow pace, not only for the sniper at the window of the TSED but also for his accomplices firing from the front. The Warren Commission, instead of relentlessly pursuing the all-important question of who was responsible for

that risk-studded itinerary, chose to quibble about traffic technicalities. With plenty of charts and exhibits, the Warren Report makes the point that the chosen route was entirely natural and "appropriate."

"To reach the Trade Mart from Main Street the (Secret Service) agents decided to use the Stemmons Freeway (Route No. 77), the most direct route," the Commission says. "The only practical way for westbound traffic on Main Street to reach the northbound lanes of the Stemmons Freeway is via Elm Street, which Route No. 77 traffic is instructed to follow in this part of the city. (See Commission Exhibit No. 2113)

"Elm Street was to be reached from Main by turning right at Houston, going one block north and then turning left into Elm. On this last portion of the journey, only five minutes from the Trade Mart, the President's motorcade would pass the Texas School Book Depository Building on the northwest corner of Houston and Elm Streets. The building overlooks Dealey Plaza, an attractively landscaped triangle of 3 acres."

The Commission's explanations here are somewhat less than candid and wholly misleading. Fact of the matter is (and Exhibit 2113 shows that clearly) that normally traffic bound for Stemmons Freeway and the Dallas-Fort Worth Turnpike moves, in that part of the city, all the way along Route 77, i.e. along Elm, not Main Street. Had the motorcade followed that route, it would have passed the TSED at normal speed and, by the same token, "Oswald" would have found it all but impossible to hit his mark accurately.

But, the Report tells us, the planners had decided not to use Elm Street for the main portion of the downtown part of the motorcade, "because Main Street offered better vantage points for spectators."

This point can certainly be argued by anyone familiar with the aspect of both streets. However, that is not the real issue. What matters is that traffic moving west along Main Street, and headed for the Trade Mart or the Airport, normally would not take the access road to Stemmons Freeway at this point, but would proceed for a few blocks and then turn right into the broad Industrial Boulevard which runs roughly parallel to the Freeway and rejoins the latter at almost exactly the spot where the Trade Mart is located.

What the Commission chose to overlook, or at any rate failed to tell its audience, is that westward traffic normally is very heavy along both Elm and Main Streets, which run parallel. If it truly were a normal traffic rule for cars moving westward on Main in the direction of the Trade Mart, the Airport or the Turnpike, to turn right at Houston, going one block north and then turning left on Elm - as the presidential motorcade did - the inevitable result would be a permanent traffic jam of monster proportions. For then the heavy flow of cars coming down Main Street would have to merge with the equally heavy flow down Elm Street at the Book Depository corner. Actually, Elm Street traffic normally turns into Stemmons Freeway and Main Street traffic goes on to Industrial Boulevard, which allows for a fairly smooth operation all day long.

Moreover, with the President's safety at stake in a turbulent and clearly hostile city, priority should certainly have been given to elementary considerations of security, in charting the "appropriate" itinerary, rather than to the solicitude to provide "vantage points" for spectators.

The principal shortcoming of the Warren Commission, in the matter, is that it completely failed to look into the question whether the itinerary could have been charted by inside conspirators precisely in

such a manner as to provide the best opportunities for a deadly ambush yet at the same time leave room for specious arguments about traffic conditions. Isn't it natural, when you plan to assassinate the President, to make allowance for all kinds of pretexts and subterfuges that would seem to explain the treacherous arrangements made?

If the Commission really had wanted to find the truth, it would have tried to visualize, at least as a theoretical possibility, what undoubtedly has been the real sequence of events:

First, the decision was made to use the President's visit to Texas for setting up a trap in which he could be killed effectively by cross-fire (A year before, President Charles de Gaulle of France was to have been assassinated in the same manner, but escaped through sheer luck and the quick response of his bodyguards).

Next, persons thoroughly familiar with the topography of Dallas suggested that Dealey Plaza with its tall buildings overlooking a wide open space, its Triple Underpass, its colonnades and its parking areas hidden by trees, bushes and fences presented all the features for an ideal death trap.

Then, in the third place, an itinerary had to be found that would seem to justify leading the motorcade right into this trap.

That this is, indeed, the correct interpretation of events becomes readily apparent from a searching review of what the Warren Report, William Manchester's "The Death of a President" and authoritative press reports have had to say about the making of the fateful travel arrangements.

To begin with the Warren Report, it states: "An important purpose of the President's visit to Dallas was to speak at a luncheon given by business and civic leaders. The White House staff informed the Secret Service that the President would arrive and depart from Dallas' Love Field; that a motorcade through the downtown area of Dallas to the luncheon site should be arranged; and that following the luncheon the President would return to the airport by the most direct route. Accordingly, it was important to determine the luncheon site as quickly as possible, so that security could be established at the site and the motorcade route selected."

Two observations are in order. In the first place, this paragraph conveys the impression that the Secret Service was informed by the White House staff at one and the same ^{time} that the the President would (a) arrive and depart from Love Field; (b) that a motorcade to the luncheon site should be arranged; and (c) that the return to the airport would be by the most direct route. This is inexact and indeed misleading, for the decision to hold a motorcade was not made until Wednesday, November 20 (see below), six days after the luncheon site had been selected and five days after Winston Lawson, the representative of the White House detail of the Secret Service, had arrived in Dallas to check arrangements from the viewpoint of security. Instruction (b), then, cannot have been given to the Secret Service at the same time as (a) and (c).

And two, why was it important only to establish security at the luncheon site and not along all of the motorcade route?

The Warren Report then goes on to say: "On November 4, Gerald A. Behn, agent in charge of the White House detail, asked Sorrels* to exami

* Forrest V. Sorrels, special agent in charge of the Dallas office of the Secret Service

three potential sites for the luncheon. One building, Market Hall, was unavailable for November 22. The second, the Women's Building at the State Fair Grounds, was a one-story building with few entrances and easy to make secure, but it lacked necessary food-handling facilities and had certain unattractive features, including a low ceiling with exposed conduits and beams. The third possibility, the Trade Mart, a handsome new building with all the necessary facilities, presented security problems. It had numerous entrances, several tiers of balconies surrounding the central court where the luncheon would be held, and several catwalks crossing the court at each level. On November 4, Sorrels told Behn he believed security difficulties at the Trade Mart could be overcome by special precautions. Lawson also evaluated the security hazards at the Trade Mart on November 13. Kenneth O'Donnell (special assistant to the President who, according to the Warren Report "acted as coordinator for the trip"- J.J.) made the final decision to hold the luncheon at the Trade Mart; Behn so notified Lawson on November 14."

Note how quickly Sorrels made up his mind that security hazards at the Trade Mart could be overcome. The same day he is asked by the head of the White House detail "to examine three potential sites for the luncheon" Sorrels expresses the view that a large building with numerous features presenting security difficulties could be made safe "by special precautions." This is but one of several instances in which those locally responsible for making the arrangements, i.e. the Dallas officials and "civic leaders," expressed a preference for the Trade Mart above all other possibilities. The Warren Commission, as usual, saw nothing suspicious in this subtle insistence on the Trade Mart as the most convenient luncheon site. Yet only this choice could lead to the selection of a motorcade route that would pass in the vicinity of the Texas School Book Depository. In the case of the Women's Building, which is located in an entirely different part of the city, it would have been difficult, indeed, to justify a route leading past the Book Depository - even in the eyes of a Warren Commission.

William Manchester who, as everyone knows, was able to draw on an exclusive source of information, the Kennedys, paints a very different picture from that presented by the Commission. He blames the selection of the Trade Mart on petty considerations of prestige put forward by John Connally, the Governor of Texas, who allegedly was preoccupied with plans for humiliating a political rival, Senator Ralph Yarborough.

"Connally, meanwhile, had been busy spinning intricate webs," Manchester writes. "Jerry Bruno, advance man for the Democratic National Committee, learned of one Connally scheme to put Senator Yarborough in his place. The details are important because they involved the choice of the site where the President would speak in Dallas and, as a consequence, the motorcade route he would take.

"There were three major choices: the Women's Building, the Market Hall and the Trade Mart. Bruno preferred the Women's Building, but it was rather drab and its low-ceilinged structure made it unsuitable for one of Connally's schemes. In Dallas Connally wanted a two-tiered top table. The President, the Vice-President and the Governor would sit at the higher one. Lesser officials - such as the state's senior senator Yarborough - would be relegated to the lower.

"It was within Bruno's power to make a final decision on the spot. Had he insisted on the Women's Building, the Dallas motorcade would not have

passed beneath the Texas School Book Depository."

So far I have quoted from the serialization of the Manchester book which appeared in the London Sunday Times and which represents, according to an explicit editorial note, "the version... authorised by Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy."

In the French illustrated weekly Paris-Match, which used the original, uncut version, however, the above-quoted passage reads as follows: "It was within Bruno's power to make a final decision on the spot, and later he had to live with the thought ("et plus tard il devait vivre avec la pensée.") that if he had insisted on the Women's Building etc.etc."

The difference is important and significant. In the original version, then, Bruno was presented as a man still deeply disturbed by the realization that he could have saved the President's life, and changed the course of history, had he only insisted on his own preference, the Women's Building. Why was that reference deleted from the "authorized" version?

"Because he (Bruno) hesitated the matter remained unsettled," Manchester goes on to write without bothering to explain what happened. If Bruno had full power to make the final decision on the spot, why did he "hesitate?" and, if he could have insisted on his choice, the Women's Building, but failed to do so, is it not self-evident that he had encountered opposition - an opposition so strong that he could not overrule it? And, again, if Bruno, as the original version has it, now is consumed by remorse for having failed to insist, does that not suggest that there was a strong conflict about the issue?

"The Secret Service regarded all three sites as acceptable," Manchester says. The contradiction with the Warren Report is only on the surface, for we have already seen that Sorrells overcame the apparent security difficulties at the Trade Mart with remarkable speed. Now, to quote Manchester further:

"The issue was bucked up to the White House, where the policy was still to appease Connally. On November 14, Kenneth O'Donnell opted for the Trade Mart, though the two-tiered top table was rejected."

This paragraph, of course, makes no sense whatsoever. If Connally really preferred the Trade Mart to the Women's Building, then it was, according to Manchester himself, because the former was suitable and the latter unsuitable for the Governor's pet scheme of installing a two-tiered top table. And if the policy at the White House was to appease Connally, then it was essential to give him what he wanted: the two-tiered table. As long as this scheme was rejected, Connally no longer had any reason to insist on the Trade Mart. This version, then, is obviously nothing more than a subterfuge to cover up the fact that O'Donnell gave to the Dallas leaders what they wanted - for far less respectable reasons than Connally's considerations of prestige. They wanted the Trade Mart, because on it depended the selection of a motorcade route that would lead into the predestined death trap - Dealey Plaza.

In parentheses, Manchester adds to the foregoing: "The Warren Commission reported that the luncheon site was selected by the Secret Service with O'Donnell's approval. This is incorrect. The decision was a political decision, made by politicians. Bruno was among the witnesses whom the Commission did not summon."

What does Manchester mean to convey by the first of the last two sentences? Who are the "politicians" who made the decision? Kennedy? O'Connell? (Remember, he has stated before that the decision was "bucked up" to the White House). Or Connally, after all? "The Governor was content," Manchester writes. Content with what - the rejection of his little scheme? All that makes no sense and is manifestly designed to hide the identity of the people who really made the fateful decision.

More illuminating is Manchester's statement that "Bruno was among the witnesses whom the Commission did not summon." A glance at the official list of witnesses who testified before the Commission confirms this - and highlights one of the most scandalous sins of omission the seven sages have been guilty of. For, it is perfectly clear that Bruno played a key role in the arrangements that preceded the assassination. The way he wanted it would have been the safe way and the President would still be alive. But somebody overrode him - somebody influential enough to push aside a man who had full power to make the final decision on the spot! Who was that opponent of Bruno's, why was he so insistent on the Trade Mart, and how did he manage to make his views prevail over those of the plenipotentiary?

Had the Warren Commission really aimed at establishment of the truth, it could not have failed to ask those questions and to insist on satisfactory answers. Instead, it simply dodged this essential issue by not calling a witness of first-rate importance. Can there be any excuse for such behavior?

Let us turn now to a third important source of information on this issue, one to which I had already called attention in Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?, but which assumes increased significance in the light of the above information gleaned from the Warren Report and the Manchester book.

As early as November 29, 1963, The New York Herald Tribune came out with a remarkably informative dispatch from Washington entitled: Dallas Ride: Questions in New Facts which is worth quoting to some length:

"President Kennedy's triumphant motorcade through Fort Worth last Friday morning and his even more exhilarating but ultimately fatal motorcade through Dallas at noontime were events written into his schedule in the last days before his death, the Herald Tribune learned yesterday.

"They were events the Secret Service could not have counted on when it sent its advance man to the Dallas-Fort Worth area a week before the trip to make plans for the President's security."

Compare these two paragraphs to the already-cited passage from the Warren Report which begins with the words "An important purpose..." The contradiction is evident. The Warren Commission presented the matter in such a way that the impression was created as though plans for a motorcade had existed from the start or, at any rate, before the luncheon site had been determined. This determination, according to the Report, took place on November 14, a day after the advance agent, Lawson, had "evaluated the security hazards at the Trade Mart." According to the Herald Tribune, however, Lawson arrived in Dallas a week before the President's arrival, which would make it the 15th of November and he did not know then that plans for a motorcade existed. Since the Herald Tribune story was based on unimpeachable authority, as we shall see, and had been published before the Warren Commission was even set up, it is clear that the Commission deliberately twisted already established facts in order to conceal a crucial element pointing towards conspiracy at a high level.

"Raymond E. Buck, president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, told this newspaper the decision to hold the Fort Worth motorcade was made in the '24 to 36 hours' before the President's arrival in the city the night before his assassination," the Herald Tribune dispatch continued.

"Robert B. Cullum, president of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce and director of the Dallas Citizens Council, said the decision to hold the fatal motorcade was made 'two or three days' before the President arrived.

"Both men were active in making arrangements for the visit, dealing with the White House representatives and Secret Service men making the advance arrangements.

"Mr. Cullum said he dealt with a Winston Lawson of the Secret Service in making the arrangements... Mr. Cullum said Mr. Lawson... arrived in Dallas to make the security arrangements one week before the President arrived - that is, several days before the decision to hold the motorcade was made.

To recapitulate: November 14, 1963: The final decision to hold the luncheon at the Trade Mart is made in Washington and is communicated to the Dallas authorities and the Secret Service bureau in that city. (And, on the night of November 14, that conspiratorial, two-hour meeting between Jack Ruby, Police Officer J.D. Tippit and Bernard Weissman took place at the Carousel Club!)

November 15: Winston Lawson, advance agent of the Secret Service (White House detail) arrives in Dallas to supervise security arrangements there and in Fort Worth. He does not know yet that motorcades are planned in both cities.

Lawson, on arrival, contacts the presidents of the two Chambers of Commerce, Raymond E. Buck and Robert B. Cullum, both of whom are "active" in making arrangements for the presidential visit. The latter is also director of the all-powerful Dallas Citizens Council which - this is a matter of common knowledge - has ruled that city for decades after the manner of ancient oligarchies. The man behind the throne of the Citizens Council is oil-magnate H.L.Hunt, as has been explained before. Smell a rat?

To go back to the Herald Tribune: "Neither Mr. Buck nor Mr. Cullum could say definitely who made the decision to stage the motorcades. 'The motorcade development was just one of a consensus among all concerned,' Mr. Buck said. (Consensus. The favorite term of Lyndon B. Johnson, the one he has always used to justify his own decisions! - J.J.) * Prior to Wednesday we thought there would be no motorcade. On Thursday we were advised by the White House representatives that there would be. I would say that the President made the decision.' "

This last statement is undoubtedly correct in the sense that Kennedy must have agreed to the proposal to hold a motorcade, otherwise it could not have taken place. But who really proposed it? Who talked Kennedy into it? How was this done? The Herald Tribune gives a hint:

"Mr. Cullum said the Dallas parade resulted from a feeling that not enough citizens of the city would get to see the President. The Trade Mart luncheon, which was to be sponsored by the Dallas Citizens Council... the Dallas Assembly and the Southwest Research Institute. (Sentence left hanging in the air by the H-T. - J.J.)

"While the luncheon was for 2,600 people, it was an invitation affair,' Mr. Cullum said. "There was a feeling that the people of Dallas

- more than could be invited - should have the opportunity to see the President. The President, as we understood it, had a desire to see the people. When this desire on the part of the people and on the part of White House representatives was expressed, we did not feel it was our prerogative to say no.'

Note the suspiciously cautious wording of that statement. There is "a feeling" that more people wanted to see the President than could be invited to the luncheon. Who tested that feeling and how? It is also "understood" that the President "had a desire to see the people."

The Citizens Council, it would appear from Mr. Cullum's remarks, really had nothing to do with the motorcade project; it just felt it could not stand in the way of the combined desires of the people and the President. That would have been a misuse of prerogative, says Mr. Cullum.

As a matter of fact, the Herald Tribune goes on to belabor this point in a subsequent paragraph: "One irony in the situation was that the Citizens Council leaders, who represent the power structure in the city, favored a direct trip by the President from Love Field to the Trade Mart and back to the airport after the speech... 'But we're not taking any holier-than-thou attitude on the motorcade in hindsight,' Mr. Cullum said."

If that is true, then the question most urgently arises: Who, with an influence even stronger than that of the Citizens Council, prevailed upon the organizers of the Dallas trip, in the last two or three days before the President's arrival, to include in the arrangements the "irregular U-shape" (Herald Tribune) motorcade route from the airport into the downtown area and then back to the Trade Mart?

"He (Cullum) could not identify the Dallas individuals with whom Mr. Lawson and a White House representative on the scene spoke in planning the route," the Herald Tribune went on to say.

Why couldn't he? Doesn't the director of the Citizens Council "represent the power structure in the city?" And he doesn't know what goes on in such an important matter? That is an obvious evasion. Mr. Cullum doesn't want to identify the "Dallas individuals" who planned the route, for we are getting here to the heart of the conspiracy and those unnamed citizens were in the thick of it.

The final paragraph of the Herald Tribune story is perhaps the most revealing and most disturbing of all: "The motorcade arrangements came so late in the planning that Texas Gov. John B. Connally jr., who accompanied the President on the short plane trip from Fort Worth to Dallas, was not aware of it."

There you have it - and let it sink in well. Not even Connally knew where the motorcade, which set out immediately after the plane's arrival from Fort Worth, would be going. Yet Lee Harvey Oswald, a small man in a big office building on the outskirts of town, is supposed to have known! He is even supposed to have known the motorcade route the day before, since he went out to Irving to get his gun - according to the Warren Report - on Thursday afternoon!

I had already pointed out the absurdity of this official assumption in Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?, but the Warren Commission, forever anxious to close its eyes to the truth, chose to ignore it. Since then, the testimony of a ranking Dallas FBI official, James P. Hosty Jr., the agent entrusted by his bureau with the task of keeping an eye on the

movements of Lee H. Oswald, has strikingly confirmed the early, tell-tale revelation by the Herald-Tribune.

"Agent Hosty testified that he was fully aware of the pending Presidential visit to Dallas," the Warren Report states. "He recalled that the special agent in charge of the Dallas office of the FBI, J. Gordon Shanklin, had discussed the President's visit on several occasions, including the regular biweekly conference on the morning of November 22...

"Hosty testified that he did not know until the evening of Thursday, November 21, that there was to be a motorcade, however, and never realized that the motorcade would pass the Texas School Book Depository Building. He testified that he did not read the newspaper story describing the motorcade route in detail, since he was interested only in the fact that the motorcade was coming up Main Street, 'where maybe I could watch it if I had a chance.'"

Here the Warren Report is really stretching credibility to the breaking point. Imagine the situation. The President is coming to town and all the law enforcement agencies are on the alert. On the very morning of his arrival, a briefing is held at FBI headquarters and a top agent - Hosty was on the second echelon of the Dallas bureau - emerges of it ignorant of the motorcade arrangements, although his duty is precisely to keep suspects out of harm's way! He, the agent watching Oswald, does not know what the latter is fully conversant with, that is, that the President's car is going to pass beneath the Book Depository, within convenient shooting distance...

The whole thing is such a transparent web of lies, subterfuges, fabrications and distortions one really wonders how anybody in his right mind who ever studied the matter can have been taken in by it.

For the Warren Commission, it would have been easy to cut through this web of false pretenses. All it would have had to do was to stage a general confrontation of all the persons known to have had a hand in the making of the three crucial decisions that led to the Dealey Plaza ambush: (a) the decision to hold the luncheon at the Trade Mart, rather than at the Women's Building; (b) the decision that "came so late in the planning" to hold a motorcade through the downtown area; and (c) the decision to lead the motorcade past the Texas School Book Depository, unbeknown to the occupants of the presidential car.

As we have seen, the following persons were definitely active in making at least some of these arrangements:

1. Jerry Bruno - Of him, the above-cited Herald Tribune dispatch says, confirming in essence the information already quoted from the Manchester book: "Mr. Cullum reported that detailed plans for the Presidential trip were not made until two weeks before the visit when Jerry Bruno of the Democratic National Committee, representing P. Kenneth O'Donnell, the late President's appointments secretary and handler of political affairs, came to town."
2. Robert B. Cullum, director of the Dallas Citizens Council, whose prominent part in making arrangements has already been discussed.
3. Raymond E. Buck, president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, who was active in arranging the prior motorcade through that city.
4. Kenneth O'Donnell, one of Kennedy's most trusted aides, whose actions both before and after the Dallas tragedy are open to suspicion (among other things, he was responsible for the outrageous kidnaping of the dead President's body from the lawful jurisdiction of the Dallas County Medical Examiner, as is described in detail in my book Oswald: The Truth)

5. Secret Service agents Forrest V. Sorrels and Winston Lawson
6. FBI bureau chief J. Gordon Shanklin
7. Dallas Chief of Police Jesse E. Curry and his top aides.

In this connection, the following paragraph from the Warren Report is also worth quoting:

"After the selection of the Trade Mart as the luncheon site, Lawson and Sorrels met with Dallas Chief of Police Jesse E. Curry, Assistant Chief Charles Batchelor, Deputy Chief N.T. Fisher, and several other command officers to discuss details of the motorcade and possible routes. The route was further reviewed by Lawson and Sorrels with Assistant Chief Batchelor and members of the local host committee on November 15."

As we have seen, two members of the host committee for the Dallas-Fort Worth area, Messrs. Buck and Cullum, have specifically stated that the decision to hold motorcades in the twin cities was made "in the 24 to 36 hours" (Buck) or "two or three days" (Cullum) before the President's arrival. These unqualified statements glaringly expose the fallacy of the Commission's contention that the route was "reviewed" by Lawson, Sorrels, Batchelor and others as early as November 15. The Commission is obviously lying here and it does so for the manifest purpose of shielding the responsible police and Secret Service officials who together with members of the Dallas Citizens Council plotted the fateful route and put it into effect at so late an hour that no objections could be raised by honest officials who were not privy to the conspiracy. So late, indeed, that even the occupants of the presidential car did not know where they were going.

"The police officials agreed that the route recommended by Sorrels was the proper one and did not express a belief that any other route might be better. On November 18, Sorrels and Lawson drove over the selected route with Batchelor and other police officers, verifying that it could be traversed within 45 minutes. Representatives of the local host committee and the White House staff were advised by the Secret Service of the actual route on the afternoon of November 18."

Which actual route? As I have set forth and documented in Oswald Assassin or Fall Guy?, the only map of the motorcade route published before the assassination appeared in the Dallas Morning News on November 22 and it showed an itinerary that led straight from Main Street to the Underpass, without the double detour towards the Book Depository that was actually taken by the parade. All other references in the press, before the fateful day, were vague and confusing. Accordingly, nobody in the general public, least of all Oswald, who seldom read newspapers and displayed little interest in current affairs, could know for sure that the motorcade would pass by the TSBD. Only a very small circle of top-ranking Dallas police officials, Secret Service men and members of the Citizens Council knew the exact itinerary because they had planned it - as a trap.

Most significantly, the Warren Commission also failed to summon the two "civic leaders" that had been most active in making the arrangements, Messrs. Buck and Cullum. Evidently, the Commission did not want to hear from their lips, in sworn testimony, what these gentlemen~~x~~ already had told the New York Herald Tribune and which, as we have seen, is in flagrant contrast with the "findings" of the Commission.

Bruno, Buck, Cullum. Three prominent personalities in the know who could have guided the Warren Commission to the truth, had they been called to testify and subjected to a searching, relentless inquiry. Three personalities the Commission conspicuously ignored, although their statements were already in the record. Nothing could demonstrate more cogently that the Commission, far from aiming at the truth, as it hypocritically contended, was in reality determined to suppress it. The failure to summon these three key witnesses was no oversight, any more than the preposterous findings of the Commission concerning Oswald can have been due to innocent error.

These actions, on the contrary, are proof that the Warren Commission - for so-called reasons of state - deliberately shielded the real assassins of President Kennedy. Thus, individually and collectively, the members of the Commission made themselves accessories after the fact in the Crime of the Century.

District Attorney Jim Garrison in New Orleans has vowed that he will prosecute all accessories after the fact in the assassination of President Kennedy. If he keeps his word, he will have to arrest some day Earl Warren, Allen Dulles, John J. McCloy and all the other members and counsels of a Commission which condoned the murder of the President, covered the tracks of his assassins and connived in the worst travesty of justice in our time - the sacrifice of the innocent scapegoat Oswald.

Needless to say, neither the responsible Dallas officials, nor the disloyal Secret Service men, nor the time-serving FBI chiefs, or even the respected members of the Warren Commission, would have dared to become accomplices in the assassination, or accessories after the fact, except for one overriding consideration. They all counted on the support and protection of the key man in the conspiracy, the man who was predestined to become President, Lyndon B. Johnson. But his time is running out, too.

Count Eight

How Kennedy Was Lured into the Death Trap

Except for the reckless, death-defying bravado of fanatics who attack at close quarters with a bomb, a gun or a knife, the assassination of a President of the United States can succeed only in a propitious environment. It can succeed only as the result of a conspiracy which includes key members of all protective organs, the local police, the FBI and the Secret Service. Indeed, the most powerful, yet least considered argument in defense of Lee Harvey Oswald is simply that he was not in a position to neutralize the security apparatus which normally protects a president. Oswald had no control of the Texas School Book Depository, a huge building swarming with more than a hundred people and one that by its location, shape and other features was predestined to attract the attention of the Secret Service.

Even the Warren Commission has lamely conceded that the TSBD was an apparent danger site that could have been easily identified. "An attempt to cover only the most obvious points of possible ambush along the route," says the Warren Report, "... might well have included the... Depository Building." Normally, this would have happened, for it is basic to the functioning of the Secret Service to spot such danger sites and render them harmless. Anybody planning single-handedly to shoot

from such a building at the President would have been a stupid dare-devil doomed to certain failure.

For the plot to kill President Kennedy to have a maximum chance of success, it was necessary to draw him out of an environment where he ~~is~~ was ordinarily well-protected, such as Washington, and lead him to a place where the security apparatus could be effectively neutralized. Dallas was just such a place, for there the police force was in the hands of an organization (the Citizens Council) determined to get rid of the liberal, progressive, peace-minded Chief Executive. In all of the United States, there was no city where Kennedy had more active and powerful enemies. Not only the local police force, but also the regional bureaus of the FBI and the Secret Service were headed by persons hostile to him. In Dallas there was, to use the favorite LBJ term again, a "consensus" that Kennedy was a president the nation could do without and that Lyndon B. Johnson would make a fine successor. And out of that consensus developed the conspiracy.

But first you had to get the prospective victim into your grip - and Kennedy was reluctant to make the trip to Texas which he himself described to his wife, only a few hours before his death, as "nut country." There was only one man who could induce Kennedy to do what he didn't want to do, i.e. to take that trip down to darkest Texas. That man was Lyndon B. Johnson.

Just how loath Kennedy was to go to Texas, and how strong the pressure was which Johnson brought to bear on him has first become known through William Manchester's "The Death of a President." The published version, at that, is far less outspoken on this ticklish subject than the author's original manuscript had been. Long before Manchester's censorship problems were highlighted by his spectacular rift with the Kennedy family, his manuscript had been thoroughly revamped by the editors of Harper & Row and of Look magazine especially in this respect. Many passages that were deemed to be offensive to President Johnson had already been deleted and indeed the whole first chapter, and the introduction, had been purged. But even what is left after this blue-pencil rampage goes a long way to expose Johnson as the driving force behind the fateful journey.

The pretext Johnson used to lure his chief into the prepared death trap was a political one. He alleged that the interparty feud between Governor Connally and the conservative wing of the Democratic Party on one hand, and Senator Ralph Yarborough and the liberal faction on the other hand, had reached such proportions that a party split threatened which might result in the loss of Texas to the Republicans at the 1964 elections.

"So Kennedy was obliged to step in and patch things up," Manchester writes. "He had to make a real production of the trip, with Connally, Yarborough, Johnson and himself appearing together in public and in apparent harmony. The prospect was unappetising and vexing to Kennedy. It appeared to him that Johnson ought to be able to resolve this petty dispute himself; the trip seemed to be an imposition."

In the published version of the book, Manchester then goes on to "explain" in a very unconvincing manner why Johnson supposedly wasn't able to settle the political dispute in his own home state so that it was necessary to impose on the President to the point of forcing him into an "unappetising and vexing" journey:

"Actually, Johnson's problems were authentic. Politically, he had become a cipher..." So far, so good. But then Manchester goes on to illustrate his point by saying that "Mrs. Johnson had never seen the inside

of the famous Presidential plane," and that "if Johnson wanted to use a plane he had to apply to the President's Air Force Aide, and sometimes - mortifying to a man of his extreme sensitivity - the request was denied..

What has all that got to do with Texas and the Connally-Yarborough dispute? Johnson may have been a cipher in Washington, but his power and prestige in his home state of Texas was intact. To suggest otherwise, is to mislead the public about the real background of that fatal trip to Dallas.

This is apparently one of the passages in the Manchester book where the editorial pencil had been fast at work. Newsweek, in a preview of the contents of the book, on Sept. 5, 1966, reported: "A third fascinating historical sidelight concerns the last Washington talk between JFK and his Vice President. It was, according to the book, an argument. The President didn't want to make the trip (whose purpose was to patch a Democratic feud in LBJ's home state) and complained that the Vice President's political clout should be sufficient to settle the rift. Mr. Johnson is said to have replied that his influence had waned since taking over the Vice Presidency and that the trip was vital." This tell-tale urgency which Johnson put into his plea for the trip does not appear in the published book.

The New York Times, on August 29, 1966, similarly reported:

"... According to one who has read it, the Manchester manuscript reveals that in their last conversation President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson got into an argument. President Kennedy did not feel that his visit to Texas was necessary. Why couldn't Vice President Johnson, with all his reputed skill as a Texas politician, patch up the feud between the state's two Democratic factions, the Connally Democrats and the Yarborough Democrats, and let the President tend to pressing business in Washington? Reflecting that the Texas trip ended in the President's assassination in Dallas, a careless reading of the Kennedy-Johnson argument might result in anger over the Johnson role.

"But Mr. Manchester is said to have given at considerable length Mr. Johnson's reasons for urging the trip. Texas had been won in 1962 by a perilously slim margin and now the deepening Democratic split threatened loss of the state to the Republicans in 1964. Mr. Johnson is said to have argued that, since becoming Vice President, he had lost much of his political leverage in Texas, and that only a visit by the President would help..."

Little of all that is in the published version of the book. Above all, there is an unmistakable shift in emphasis. The original manuscript had Johnson driving and urging the President, even shoving the unwanted trip down his throat. If "only a visit by the President would help" the situation in Texas, in Lyndon Johnson's view, that was a challenge so strong as to be almost tantamount to blackmail. In effect, Johnson was saying to his chief: "If you don't make that trip to Texas, we'll lose the 1964 election, and the whole country will know why." To a full-blooded politician like Kennedy, the threat of such political calamities must have sounded so ominously, he couldn't but yield. To put it bluntly, perhaps even crudely, but nevertheless accurately, Johnson in the case pricked and goaded Kennedy towards the prepared death trap the way cattle is driven into the slaughterhouse.

What is more, Johnson was the only Democratic leader of consequence to advise, nay to urge, Kennedy to make that trip to Texas. Several others are on record as having strenuously opposed the idea. The most prominent of these was no other than Governor Connally who, in an interview with The Dallas Times Herald, published on Jan. 9, 1967, unmistakably stated that he had been against the project.

"I reminded him (Kennedy) he had not made a political appearance in Texas since the 1960 campaign," Connally said, "and that if he spoke at four fund-raising dinners, he would be accused of coming to Texas 'just to take back a lot of money.'"

It doesn't matter why Connally was opposed to the presidential visit to his state. The fact that he tried to prevent Kennedy from coming is enough to expose the hollowness of Johnson's pretext for luring the President into the Dallas ambush. Significantly, the AP dispatch from Dallas reporting the above statement began with these words, "Gov. John B. Connally has indicated he did not want President Kennedy to take the trip to Dallas in November, 1963,..." And the New York Herald Tribune (Paris edition) headlined the story, on January 10, 1967: CONNALLY SAYS HE WARNED KENNEDY NOT TO GO TO TEXAS.

As a matter of fact, Connally must have indicated these feelings even at the time of the tragedy while he was at the hospital. For, The Dallas Morning News, on November 23, 1963, stated that Connally had gone to Washington to persuade Kennedy to call off his planned two-day, five-city tour of Texas. The story said that the Governor's purpose was two-fold - the trip would expand rather than heal the split in the Texas Democratic Party, and "there was the possibility of some unpleasantness." (From the New York Sunday News, 11-24-63)

On both counts, Connally was right. The fallacy of the Johnson pretext for maneuvering Kennedy into a position where he could be conveniently eliminated was exposed the day the presidential visit to Dallas took place. Indeed, a front-page story in the Dallas Morning News of Nov. 22, 1963, proclaimed "STORM OF POLITICAL CONTROVERSY SWIRLS AROUND KENNEDY ON VISIT," while another was headlined - because Senator Yarborough, in Fort Worth, had refused to ride in the same car as Lyndon Johnson - YARBOROUGH SNUBS LBJ. And, according to Manchester, the first result of the trip was that the feud between the Connally and the Yarborough factions "had become the biggest political story in the nation."

As for the "unpleasantness" Connally was expecting, I believe this was a covert reference to the Governor's inside knowledge of the Jack Ruby plot against himself (which is described in detail in the first two chapters of my book Oswald: The Truth) which might conceivably also lead to harming the President. At all events, this remark shows that Connally had other, far more serious, seasons for warning Kennedy off than the rather petty ones he cited in his January 1967 interview with the Dallas Times Herald.

According to the above-cited AP dispatch from Dallas, Jan. 9, 1967, Connally "made the remarks in reaction to reported statements in William Manchester's book, 'The Death of a President.' Mr. Manchester reports in the book that five prominent Democrats strongly urged President Kennedy to keep Dallas off his Texas itinerary because of what they felt was a highly charged atmosphere of antagonism toward him in the city. Mr. Manchester does not mention Governor Connally... as one of those who advised the President to omit Dallas..."

Who were those other "five prominent Democrats" that had "strongly urged President Kennedy to keep Dallas off his Texas itinerary?" The readers of the "authorized" version of the Manchester book will never know.

For now we come to one of the most significant, and also most shocking, "revisions" that have been worked into the Manchester book ostensibly to spare Jackie Kennedy's feelings but in reality for a quite different purpose: in order to prevent the exposure of Lyndon B. Johnson as the man who singlehandedly pushed Kennedy into making that fateful Dallas trip over the opposition of six prominent Democrats, including his own close friend and political ally, Connally.

In the "authorized" version, as published in the London Sunday Times of January 22, 1967, one reads in the paragraph following that little incident about the selection of the Trade Mart and Connally's fruitless attempt at getting a two-tiered table arrangement: "The atmosphere in Dallas was becoming highly charged by inflammatory statements. No one dreamed that Kennedy would be killed there, though there were many who feared that he might be embarrassed."

What Manchester originally had written is apparent from the German-language and French-language versions which have been published, respectively, in Der Stern (Jan. 15, 1967) and in Paris-Match (same date): In retranslation, the German text reads as follows:

"Throughout that month (November, 1963) Byron Skelton, the Texan delegate to the National Committee of the Democratic Party, had been plagued by sinister forebodings. For, in the meantime, the atmosphere in Dallas had become so explosive that Skelton was genuinely worried. On November 4, he decided to do something about it. He wrote to Attorney General Robert Kennedy: 'To tell the truth, I would be greatly relieved if the President were to omit Dallas from his itinerary.' Two days later, he wrote a letter to Johnson's adviser, Walter Jenkins, in which he again expressed his concern and his distrust of Dallas."

At this point, I have to switch to the French-language version in Paris-Match which contains important additional details about the Skelton warning which Der Stern chose to omit: "And, to be sure that he would be able to get his point across, he (Skelton) the following week took an airplane to Washington and talked to John Bailey and Jerry Bruno at the National Committee. All these efforts by Skelton proved absolutely fruitless. On November 8, the Attorney-General, who knew him and took him seriously, forwarded Skelton's letter to O'Donnell who judged it to be an unfounded intuition."

At this juncture, the Stern and Paris-Match versions again rejoin the Sunday Times story, except for one more highly significant episode which, in the German and French texts follows after the Arthur Schlesinger incident and which again is missing in the "authorized" version as published in the Sunday Times. Again, therefore, I retranslate what must have been in the original manuscript of the Manchester book but what subsequently was eliminated by over-zealous censors:

"The most clear-cut warning, which had been addressed to the President himself, was sounded by the liberal Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas. Fulbright mistrusted Dallas because of its past record of political violence. He was afraid - physically afraid - and readily acknowledged it. On October 3, on the eve of the last meeting between Kennedy and Connally at which arrangements for the trip were discussed, Fulbright

entreated the President not to go to Dallas. He said to Kennedy: "Dallas is a very dangerous spot. I wouldn't want to go there myself. Don't you go there either."

How one can understand that Lyndon Johnson moved heaven and earth to have these revealing passages "edited" out of the Manchester book before it was published in English! For they show with dazzling clarity that he was alone in his insistence that Kennedy should go to Dallas. Everybody else who had a say in the matter - Connally, Fulbright, Stevenson, Schlesinger, Skelton, Bruno etc. was opposed, and for good reasons, for Dallas' record of violence was indeed bleak and well-established.

One more thing must be added here. Let me quote now from a UPI dispatch, datelined Dallas, Jan. 10, 1967:

"Sen. Ralph Yarborough, D., Texas, a main character in William Manchester's 'The Death of a President,' said yesterday he plans to write his own book on the Kennedy assassination but will wait until 1973 to publish it. Sen. Yarborough told the Dallas Times Herald he will wait until 1973 because 'there will be two presidential elections behind us then.'..."

That's clear enough. By 1973, if the worst comes to the worst, and barring of course a coup d'état, Lyndon B. Johnson will no longer be President of the United States.

I have no doubt that the Yarborough book will be sensational - provided the Senator lives to write it.

Count Nine

The Guilt of the Secret Service

President John F. Kennedy would not be dead, and Lyndon B. Johnson would not now be president, if the Secret Service, on November 22, 1963, had done its duty. Not even the Warren Commission would question that statement. It did administer a reprimand to the Secret Service - oh, an ever so mild one - but merely suggested that its failure to protect the President effectively was due to lack of liaison with the FBI and to inadequate surveillance of the buildings along the parade route.

"The Commission believes that both the FBI and the Secret Service have too narrowly construed their respective responsibilities," the Warren Report piously remarks, mindful only of Oswald, as always.

William Manchester has been more severe towards the Secret Service, but he, too, stops at the water's edge. "Book Scores Kennedy Security," The New York Times headlined an article published on Dec. 20, 1966 (International Edition) about the then forthcoming Manchester book.

"A man who has now the 1,300 page manuscript said today that the book gave names of allegedly negligent Dallas policemen, agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Secret Service men in appraising the assassination in Dallas Nov. 22, 1963," the article stated. "This book," said the man who asked to remain unidentified, "is full of the ineptitude of those who were supposed to protect the President."

There is only one word wrong in that sentence: ineptitude. Complicity would have been the right term.

All those misleading statements in the press about the "stupidity" of the Dallas police, the "ineptitude" of the Secret Service, the "negligence" of the FBI etc. have recently been shattered by the most tell-tale disclosure to precede the Garrison inquiry in New Orleans. I had just wound up my manuscript of Oswald: The Truth, when this truly sensational development occurred. However, it was still possible to add a final chapter ("Breakthrough to the Truth") to the book before going to press, in which the matter is discussed as fully as is possible at this time. There is no need for me, therefore, to go into all the details again in the present volume. However, the gist of the story must be recapitulated because it is also essential to a correct appraisal of how the Secret Service, or at any rate its Dallas section, helped to put Lyndon B. Johnson in the saddle.

On Feb. 2, 1967, the Miami News, in an exclusive story written by Bill Barry, revealed that the Miami police had in its files a tape recording of a conversation held on Nov. 9, 1963, between a police informer and a Ku-Klux-Klan-type terrorist in which the latter described just how President Kennedy could be assassinated, - two weeks before it happened.

Kennedy was due in Miami on November 18, 1963. Alerted by its informer, who had heard repeated talk about an assassination attempt, the Miami police instructed this man to lure his acquaintance, the terrorist, to Miami so his conversation could be recorded. It turned out to be a veritable blueprint of the actual assassination in Dallas, two weeks later. After the story had first appeared in the Miami News, the Miami police not only confirmed it but also played the tape for reporters. According to an AP dispatch from Miami, Feb. 3, 1967, this conversation was on the tape:

Informer: "I think Kennedy is coming here on the 18th, or something like that, to make some kind of speech... He will have a thousand bodyguards."

Man: "The more bodyguards he has, the easier it is to get him."

Informer: "Well, how in the hell do you figure would be the best way to get him?"

Man: "From an office building with a high-powered rifle."

Later the man said: "... take it (the rifle) up there unassembled and assemble it and..."

Afterward, the man said, the police "would leave no stone unturned" trying to find the killer. "They will pick up somebody within hours afterward... just to throw the public off."

There you have it in a nutshell, the whole Dallas story, although as the dispatch points out, Dallas was not mentioned in the conversation: the office building; the high-powered rifle that is taken into it, unassembled; the calm assurance of the prospective killer, or his confederate, that the Secret Service wouldn't interfere; even the prediction that the police, after the deed, would pick up somebody within hours "just to throw the public off."

But that is not the end of an amazing revelation. Even more important is the fact, acknowledged by the ~~Dallas~~ Miami police, that the contents on the tape had been turned over to the Secret Service before President Kennedy was killed.

In order to appreciate fully the enormity of what happened, compare these dates:

On, or shortly after Nov. 9, 1963, the Secret Service, the agency charged with the protection of the President, is informed officially, through police channels, of plans to assassinate the Chief Executive. Details of the plot are available: a high-powered rifle is to be taken, unassembled, into an office building to be reassembled there and then used for presidential murder.

Five days later, the Secret Service approves in principle (according to the Warren Report) an open-car parade through a city of known hostility like Dallas. No changes are made in this plan even after the Miami police, on the occasion of the President's visit to that city, on November 18, has explicitly barred the project of a motorcade through the downtown area because of the known danger (that, too, is in the above-cited AP dispatch).

And, finally, a motorcade route is selected which leads the presidential car, with its bubbletop down and no bodyguards on the running-boards (as a matter of fact, there were none on that type of limousine), at a slow pace beneath the open windows of an uninspected tall office building. And then the predictable, or rather the predicted, murder comes to pass.

What would you call that? Ineptitude? Carelessness? Stupidity?

I call it complicity.

The guilt of the Secret Service is not only highlighted by this story which would be incredible, indeed, if it did not come from a police source; it also cries out from every page of the Manchester book describing events immediately before and after the assassination. The most revealing passage is this one:

"Within the first minutes after the final shot was fired the split between loyalists and realists began to tear the Secret Service asunder. The first realist was Agent Emory Roberts, who made the switch in allegiance while Kennedy's heart was still beating... As the follow-up car picked up momentum Roberts said to Agent Bill McIntyre, who had been standing up in the car behind Clint Hill:

"They got him. You and Bennett take over Johnson as soon as we stop."

The guilt of the Secret Service is as clear as the day. But again it must be said that none of these fellows would have dared to ignore an official warning like that they had received from the Miami police; to disregard basic rules of their service about the surveillance of tall buildings along a parade route; to engage in revelry the night before duty (for details, see the Manchester book); or to switch their loyalty with such lightning speed from a moribund president to his constitutional successor, if they had not been sure of impunity.

They counted on Lyndon B. Johnson to protect them against all untoward consequences of their manifest disloyalty and in that they were right. President Johnson did shield them, and all the other murderers, accomplices and accessories after the fact, in the case, not only against reprisals but even against public exposure.

That is the matter we shall deal with in Volume II of "The Case Against Lyndon B. Johnson."