

THE CASE AGAINST LYNDON B. JOHNSON

In the Assassination of President Kennedy

A Public Indictment

Before the High Court of World Opinion

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., London, July 1967)

Vol. II

The Case Against President Johnson

(His Role After the assassination)

(Vol. I , "The Case Against Vice-President Johnson" - His Role Before
the Assassination, was published in May 1967)

Published somewhere in Europe, in July 1967

World Copyright by Joachim Joesten

Count Ten

Murder Without Manhunt

Even if it should not be possible to prove, to the complete satisfaction of a court of law, that Lyndon B. Johnson instigated the assassination of his predecessor, President John F. Kennedy, there cannot be the slightest doubt that he did condone it. His every action after the deed bespeaks complicity with the assassins.

The evidence that Johnson, at a minimum, became an accessory after the fact, which will be amply documented in the following pages, is overwhelming. I do not think that it could be dismissed by any independent tribunal when the day of reckoning comes.

With the President dead, the victim of foul murder, whose duty was it to take immediate and drastic action in order to ensure the capture and trial of all possible assassins and their accomplices?

It was the duty of Lyndon B. Johnson, the new Chief Executive.

What did he do? Did he launch the biggest manhunt in history? Did he use every means at his command to make sure that the Crime of the Century be fully investigated and every participant brought to book? Did he give strict orders to the FBI and the Secret Service, relentlessly to pursue every lead, to grill every suspect, to check minutely every conceivable angle, to close all loopholes, to bar all escapes?

He did nothing of the sort. As soon as one poor little fellow had been caught, Johnson decided that Oswald, the "Marxist," was good enough for him as the "lone assassin." He immediately called off the chase for the real murderers, although District Attorney Jim Garrison of New Orleans and others were hot on their trail even then.

At least nine suspects already in the net - several of them confronted with prima facie evidence of their guilt - were released. Every single clue not pointing to Oswald was systematically wiped out. Material evidence of utmost importance, which from the first day revealed a conspiracy, was suppressed. Witnesses who could have exposed the plot were shoved aside, intimidated, harassed, bullied and even murdered. A fraudulent autopsy was performed on the body of the President. A fake re-enactment of the crime was staged. An innocent scapegoat was sacrificed. And, on top of it all, the records of this sham investigation were withheld from public inspection through burial in the National Archives where access is limited and a large portion of the materials relating to the assassination has been "classified."

Who was responsible for this shameful travesty of justice?

Lyndon B. Johnson. Everything the FBI and the Secret Service did or did not do in the case, everything the CIA has been doing lately to block the Garrison inquiry, these federal agencies have been doing under orders from the White House. None of them could have acted as they did without such authority.

"The buck stops here," President Harry Truman used to say, referring to the Executive desk. It does indeed. Lyndon B. Johnson will have to take the full responsibility for the fact that all the law enforcement agencies under his control joined forces in suppressing the truth about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

The first step was to hunt down and sacrifice the pre-ordained fall guy, Lee Harvey Oswald, and to make the world believe that he was the assassin. The story of this vicious frame-up has been related in detail in my book OSWALD: THE TRUTH and need not be recapitulated here. After the book had gone to press, District Attorney Garrison has confirmed the correctness of my thesis in every respect. He has on at least three occasions publicly asserted that Oswald neither killed the President nor Patrolman Tippit - as I have always held, beginning with my first book on the subject.

In a television interview on May 21, 1967, Garrison declared textually: "No, Lee Harvey Oswald did not shoot President Kennedy. He did not fire a shot from the Book Depository Building... he did not touch a gun on that day. He was a decoy at first. And then he was a patsy, and then he was a victim."

Just let this statement sink in and ponder the enormity of its significance. The "lone assassin" certified by the Dallas Police, the FBI, the Secret Service and finally the Warren Commission, never fired a shot on November 22nd, 1963. He was just a decoy, a patsy, a victim. And this statement comes from a District Attorney, after an exhaustive inquiry. Can one imagine a bigger bombshell? Yet the American press, almost in its entirety, paid no attention to it. One need not search far for the reasons of this unusual reserve. Those editors who are now engaging in a conspiracy of silence about the sensational results of the Garrison inquiry, just as they had previously conspired to suppress the disclosures made in my first book on the subject, OSWALD: ASSASSIN OR FALL GUY?, published in June 1964, know what they are doing. They know that they must keep the Oswald Legend alive at all cost or face the inescapable conclusion that this monstrous hoax was aided and abetted by a President of the United States. And just as inescapable is the next question: WHY?

Nothing incriminates Lyndon B. Johnson more devastatingly than the fact, now established on the judicial level, that no genuine hunt for the murderers of President Kennedy ever took place, although there were plenty of clues available from the start. Before I go into the details of this scandalous omission, let me quote a significant remark by Senator Russell B. Long of Louisiana who, as is well known, prompted the Garrison inquiry. According to an UPI dispatch from Washington, Feb. 21, 1967, "Sen. Russell B. Long, D. La., said today the New Orleans district attorney 'has something' that the Warren Commission investigators failed to uncover about the assassination of President Kennedy... Sen. Long said that Mr. Garrison had arrested a person he thought to be involved in an assassination plot shortly after the assassination. 'But when the press media came out and said there was no one connected with Oswald, Garrison let the person go,' he said."

Senator Long, given his eminent position in the Senate, is evidently reluctant to express himself too clearly. After all, the reputations of two of his colleagues in the Senate, who were members of the Warren Commission, are at stake in the Garrison inquiry. His statement, therefore, is vague and in two respects inaccurate.

For, it shifts the blame to the press media which of course had no power to obtain the release of any person arrested as a suspect in the assassination. If the press "came out and said there was no one connected with Oswald," it was because reporters had been misled, from the start, by the official investigators. And, secondly, it is not correct to say that Garrison "let the person go." The fact of the matter, confirmed by Garrison himself, is that the suspect in question, David Ferrie, had been turned over to the FBI by the New Orleans district attorney and it was the FBI who turned him loose.

While information on this subject still is sporadic and therefore almost certainly incomplete, it is an established fact that arrests of suspects took place, after the assassination of President Kennedy, in at least four different places - Dallas, Fort Worth, Miami and New Orleans - and involved a total of at least nine persons.

To begin with Dallas, scene of the crime, the little known fact of the matter is that two, if not three, potential suspects were taken into custody there before Oswald was captured in the Texas Theatre. I had already called attention to this important matter in OSWALD: ASSASSIN OR FALL GUY? and the Warren Commission, therefore, has no excuse for having failed to look into these cases.

As stated in Chapter 7 of that book, the "Dallas Times Herald", in its first edition to hit the streets after the assassination at 2:30 PM - i.e. at a time Oswald was still unheard-of - reported: "Patrolman W.E. Barker saw workers in the Texas School Book Depository pecking on a window from the third floor and pointing to a man wearing horn-rimmed glasses, a plaid coat and rain coat. The officer immediately arrested the man for questioning and placed him in a room of witnesses in Sheriff Bill Decker's office across the street from the Depository.

"With the young man protesting, the crowd all along the way jeered at him as he was escorted across the street. One woman said to the man: 'I hope you die.' Another screamed hysterically, 'Is that him? Is that him?' An unidentified photographer shot a picture of the arrested man and then said bitterly, 'I hope you burn.' Officers on the case would not explain what connection the man might have with the shooting nor would they identify him."

Note the circumstantial account and the liveliness of the scene which rule out any possibility that it may have been made up by a reporter. The officer who made the arrest is identified by his name and initials; three persons are quoted as witnesses and a picture was taken; the suspect was placed in the custody of the Sheriff, at a given location, and there were officers on the case."

It does not matter in the least whether this young man actually had anything to do with the shooting. What matters is that once a person has been arrested - and in a case of such gravity at that! - his case must be disposed of one way or another. Either he is released, having been able to prove his innocence, or he is bound over and arraigned. But he cannot simply drop out of sight without a trace, as happened in this case.

It is a matter of record that the Warren Commission carefully studied my book OSWALD: ASSASSIN OR FALL GUY? With a minimum of honest intention to search for the truth, the Commission could not have failed to investigate this matter. All they had to do was to ask Patrolman W.E. Barker

on what grounds the suspect in question had been arrested and to inquire from the Sheriff's office, how his case had been disposed of. Yet, Patrolman Barker's name does not appear on the official list of witnesses and there is no record that the matter was discussed between the Commission and the Office of the Sheriff. None of the three persons who had shouted their spontaneous anger at the suspect was questioned and no attempt was made to identify the photographer or to get hold of the picture he had taken. The whole incident was simply treated as though it had never happened, and a person suspected of having shot at the President, or of having been an accomplice on the spot, simply vanished into thin air.

Why? Does not this off-hand treatment of an important lead, to say the least, bespeak a clear-cut intention not to look for the truth about the assassination?

Nor was this the only arrest made on the spot, as is shown by another report in the "Dallas Times Herald," on December 8, 1963, which I had also quoted in OSWALD: ASSASSIN OR FALL GUY and thus presented to the Warren Commission on a silver platter, for easy further investigation:

"It was also learned Saturday that an early suspect in the assassination of President Kennedy was still in jail - but no longer as a suspect in the killing. The man, a 31-year-old man who gave a Knight Street address was arrested minutes after the assassination when officers swarmed railroad yards near the assassination scene. A man was reported seen in that area carrying a rifle..."

The fact that this man was arrested in the area of the railroad yards indicates that he is not identical with the young man in a plaid coat and rain coat, for the latter was seized close to the Book Depository. The hair-raising thing about this second case is that the never-identified 31-year-old man with the Knight Street address was still in jail weeks after Lee Harvey Oswald had been buried, and the case against the Kennedy murderers with him. Wrote the Times Herald on this score:

"The suspect was unarmed when arrested but booked, along with others arrested in the hectic hours following the assassination, on charges of 'investigation of conspiracy to commit murder.' The investigative charges were dropped Monday morning but the man was held in jail on 'city charges.' "

This case is so outrageous it truly cries out for investigation, yet the Warren Commission paid no attention whatsoever to it. Here we have a suspect other than Oswald who actually was charged with conspiracy to murder the President. Better still, these charges were not dropped until early December, long after the whole matter had been officially buried, as far as the public is concerned! And finally, a man first charged by the State of Texas with being an accomplice in the assassination of the President of the United States winds up, without explanation, being still in jail on "city charges" - I suppose because he littered the railroad yards with his equipment.

It should also be noted that the above-quoted report speaks of "others" arrested in the hectic hours following the assassination, which suggests at least a third suspect in custody in Dallas that day, in addition to the young man with the horn-rimmed glasses and the man with the Knight Street address. What became of all of them?

Another, no less interesting case in point has come to light more recently. On September 29, 1964, the "New York Herald Tribune" published an UPI dispatch from Strawn, Texas, that ran as follows:

"Donald Wayne House laughed about it a little yesterday at his home here, but he failed to find a thing funny about it last Nov. 22 when he was mistaken for the accused assassin of President Kennedy. The fact that Mr. House was arrested as a suspect in the assassination, questioned three hours and held in jail an hour in Fort Worth has never been told before.

"Last Nov. 22 he visited Dallas, caught a glimpse of President Kennedy, then started back home. He did not know Mr. Kennedy was assassinated until he turned his car radio on well out of Dallas. When he stopped in Grand Prairie for gasoline, a woman asked him whether he had heard what the killer looked like. He gave her the description he had heard on the radio without realizing it also fitted him.

"The woman noted the similarity, however, and telephoned the police.

'What am I being arrested for?' Mr. House said he asked. 'You are being arrested for the assassination of President Kennedy,' a policeman said. After three hours of denying he was the assassin, he was put in a cell. Finally, a policeman came to the cell door and said: 'They've caught another boy. He is Lee Harvey Oswald. They are pretty sure he did it.'

Again, it is not a question of whether D.W. House had anything to do with the assassination. Rather, what matters is the way his case was disposed of. Ostensible grounds for his arrest is solely the fact that he looks somewhat like the (extremely vague) description broadcast by the police. According to the Warren Report, the radio alert sent to police cars at approximately 12:45 p.m. described the suspect as "white slender, weighing about 165 pounds, about 5'10" tall, and in his early thirties." As I have pointed out in my previous books, this description did not fit Oswald in several respects. I have no way of knowing whether it did fit Mr. House, but in any case there must have been thousands of young men in the Dallas area, at that moment, to whom this description would have applied just as well.

Therefore, it stands to reason that when the police picked up House and, despite his protestations of innocence, questioned him for three hours and then put him into a jail cell, they must have had more solid grounds for doing so than just the young man's apparent similarity to the description broadcast in the radio alert.

What grounds? It is easy enough to guess. Remember the time: it is just past 12:45 and Lee Harvey Oswald, having escaped from the Book Depository is still at large. The police are frantically searching for him, not because they really have anything on him, but because they need him as a scapegoat. They realize that he is most probably on his way to Fort Worth where his mother and brother live; and, indeed, the Texas Theatre, where Oswald was arrested, is close to the main highway that leads from Dallas to Fort Worth, only half an hour away by car. So it is obvious that all police cars in the area had been ordered to keep a sharp eye on that road and to hold any young man traveling in that direction who might conceivably be Oswald. Donald Wayne House seemed to fit the bill.

No less significant than his arrest is the way Mr. House was released. For three hours he had been arguing in vain that he was not the assassin. Did he have an airtight alibi? Apparently not, since he was sent to jail. Yet suddenly the door opens and the suspect is set free. Why?

For no better reason than that the police has "caught another boy" and that "they are pretty sure he did it."

How could the Dallas police at that early moment be "pretty sure" that Oswald was the assassin? Remember: Mr. House was arrested shortly after the radio alert had been sent out, i.e. around 1 p.m. He was questioned for three hours and held in jail an hour, for a total of four hours. His release, then, took place around 5 p.m., at a time when Oswald had not even been told yet that he was being suspected of presidential murder (as is well known, he was originally picked up and questioned on charges of killing Patrolman Tippit).

If the Dallas police were so sure of Oswald's guilt, even before they started to question him; so sure, indeed, that orders went out to release other suspects, without further ado, one can only conclude that it was all part of a dried-and-cut scheme to pin the blame on Oswald and nobody else.

Even if the police were "pretty sure" Oswald did it, within three hours after he had been caught, how could they be sure that he did not have any accomplices? How could the fact that one person is picked up on suspicion of murder - especially in the assassination of a president! - be considered an alibi for another? If Mr. House couldn't prove his innocence during three hours of grilling, how could it be proven by the mere fact that somebody else was arrested in a case that could very well involve several people?

~~xxxx~~ Viewed in conjunction with the other cases discussed above, the House affair clearly proves that the police were interested only in Oswald, not in any other possible suspect, unless a link to Oswald was indicated. This attitude again proves that there were no orders in effect to hunt down all possible suspects and to pursue all possible leads.

The same pattern shows in the arrests made outside of the Dallas area. Just as Donald W. House was released not because he could prove his innocence in the assassination but merely because it had been established that he was not Oswald, other suspects were promptly set free simply because no link to Oswald could be proved in their cases.

Records at the New Orleans Police Department show that three men were arrested in that city, two days after the assassination of President Kennedy, after District Attorney Garrison had received information that they were involved in the crime. They were David W. Ferrie, a former airlines pilot and jack-of-all-trades who at that time was working as a "private investigator" for the notorious mobster Carlos Marcello, top man in the New Orleans Mafia; Patrick Layton Martens, then 21 years old, and Alvin Roland Beauboef, who was 18 at the time.

No sooner had the arrests been made, than the FBI and the Secret Service stepped into the picture and demanded that the three suspects be turned over to federal authorities for further investigation. Garrison complied, with the result that all three were promptly "checked out" and released after having satisfied the FBI agents that they had no connection with Lee Harvey Oswald. At no time did the federal agents busy themselves with even the hypothetical question whether Ferrie and his friends might have had something to do with a conspiracy to kill the President, without Oswald being involved.

Clay Shaw, principal defendant in the present, early stage of the Garrison probe, had also been questioned by the FBI and then "checked out" in the days immediately following the assassination, after the lawyer Dean Adam Andrews had put the finger on him. That makes another total of at least four persons in the New Orleans area, all of whom have subsequently been re-implicated in the case as a result of the new inquiry launched by District Attorney Garrison. Independently of how their cases may be disposed of in court (with the exception of Ferrie, who died under highly mysterious circumstances just as Garrison was about to re-arrest him), the solid grounds for suspicion which have now been revealed make it plain that the FBI, in November 1963, failed its duty. These suspects were "checked out" not because their innocence had been established, but because Oswald was dead and no further complications were wanted. This is only one of many instances (many others are documented in my book OSWALD THE TRUTH) where the FBI has conspicuously demonstrated its aversion to finding the truth about the assassination.

The gravest case of them all is that of the still unidentified terrorist who, in a secretly tape-recorded talk with a Miami police informer, revealed not only the existence of a plot against President Kennedy but even important details of the manner in which the assassination could be accomplished - two weeks before it happened.

The matter has already been discussed in some detail in Vol. I (Count Nine: The Guilt of the Secret Service). What needs to be added here is this paragraph from the AP dispatch, datelined Miami Feb. 3, 1967:

"... the man who described a possible assassination on the tape was picked up by the FBI five days after President Kennedy was killed in Dallas, and questioned. The Secret Service and the FBI in Miami would not comment..."

Of course they would not. How could these federal agencies ever explain what they did? They actually had in their hands a man who had unwittingly betrayed to an informer the very blueprint of the assassination when it was still in the planning stage - and they let this self-confessed terrorist go - five days after the President had been killed just the way he had said it could be done.

In all these pseudo-investigations by the FBI as well as by the Dallas Police, the sole criterion of suspicion was some kind of link to Oswald. If the suspect had nothing to do with Oswald, he was automatically "checked out."

In order to correctly appraise this nonchalant attitude of the federal authorities, one has to envisage only the theoretical possibility - always present when a case goes to court - that the accused slayer, in this case Oswald, might have been able to prove his innocence and would therefore have had to be acquitted.

What then? With all alternative solutions of the crime eliminated beforehand by the FBI, there would have been no one left to prosecute nor any lead that could be followed. Under the circumstances, the murder of the President was bound to remain unavenged. What an unexpected stroke of luck Oswald was killed by Ruby, so the case could be closed!

There is no escaping the hard fact, unpleasant as it may be: Just as the Secret Service had closed both eyes when Kennedy was killed, the FBI closed them both when it was supposed to look for the assassins.

And, just as the delinquent Secret Service men escaped any kind of sanctions, the delinquent FBI in the case got away with murder - literally and figuratively speaking.

If Lyndon B. Johnson's conscience had been clear, he could not have tolerated such scandalous police procedures. He would have cracked down hard on the federal agencies under his control for being so remiss in their duties. The fact that he did not only condone such outrages but rewarded them - in the case of the FBI, its chief J. Edgar Hoover was continued in office after the normal age limit - speaks volumes.

The full responsibility for the fact that no real hunt for the murderers of President Kennedy was ever set in motion and that, as a result they are still at large, falls squarely on Lyndon B. Johnson. His failure to avenge his slain predecessor cannot be explained on any other premise than that he himself was involved in the crime.

Count Eleven

Johnson's Phony "Red Conspiracy"

In the political jungle, it is standard practice to blame one's own foul deeds on the ideological adversary. When the Nazis, early in 1933, set the Reichstag on fire as a means of seizing uncontrolled power in Germany, they promptly came up with an obscure little Communist whom they charged with the crime and then liquidated. When the Texas gang assassinated President John F. Kennedy, to seize a power denied to them by the American electorate, they had an obscure little Communist (and, in this case, not even a genuine one) ready to take the blame and then be sacrificed.

This is not the only existing parallel in the VanderLubbe and Oswald cases. Nor is it the only existing parallel between Hitler and Johnson, both advocates of the Big Lie as the all-purpose expedient in politics. And that's not the end of the similarity either.

If the American people were not so incredibly gullible, if they were not so pathologically steeped in anti-communism, the coarseness of the "Red Plot" tale spun by the Dallas conspirators as a cover-up for their own crime would have alerted them that something was terribly wrong.

The record shows that it was Lyndon B. Johnson himself who took the lead in spreading the notion that the murder of President Kennedy could only have resulted from a Communist plot and that there could be no other motivation. The first inkling of Johnson's active part in concocting this legend came in an UPI dispatch from Washington, December 24, 1963, which started with this paragraph:

"President Johnson ordered the news of President Kennedy's death withheld until he could leave the hospital on the chance the assassination was part of a plot to kill all the officials in line for the presidency, A White House spokesman said yesterday."

The story itself is well-known. Minutes after Kennedy had been pronounced dead at 1 p.m., Assistant White House Press Secretary Malcolm Kilduff, told Johnson: "I have to announce the death of President Kennedy. Is it all right with you?"

"And he reacted immediately," the UPI dispatch goes on. "He said, 'No, Mac, I think we had better wait for a few minutes.' He said, 'I think I had better get out of here and get back to the plane before you announce it.' He said, 'we don't know whether this is a world-wide conspiracy, whether they are after me as well as they were after President Kennedy, or whether

or whether they are after Speaker (John) McCormack, or Senator (Carl) Hayden. We just don't know."

The key word in this paragraph is "world-wide". It indicates without doubt that Johnson was thinking, or rather, pretended to think, in terms of a Communist conspiracy. For, if one thought it was, or could have been, a plot say by the Ku-Klux-Klan or the John Birch Society, it evidently would not be a "world-wide" conspiracy. There is no other conceivable political force today, than the Communists, that could engage in a "world-wide" conspiracy. The suggestion, clearly expressed by Johnson in the same context, that the plotters might be planning to kill all the officials in line for the presidency points in the same direction. For, evidently no person or group in America could have an interest in wiping out all organized government in Washington, while this could be, theoretically, the design of a cunning foreign enemy. Besides, Johnson, in later pronouncements (see below) has left no doubt that he was indeed referring to a Communist "plot."

Now, it is again important to keep the time element in mind. It is just a few minutes past 1 p.m., and Oswald is still at large. At that early moment, then, no one - neither the Dallas police, nor the FBI or the Secret Service, least of all the then Vice-President Johnson - possessed any information whatsoever on which to base any kind of judgment concerning the motivation of the assassination. Not ostensibly, anyway. Only somebody in the know would venture to emit such a judgment for the purpose of blurring the tracks. That is exactly what Johnson did. By jumping to the conclusion - publicly - that this could be nothing else but a Communist plot, he gave the show away. This was the false pretense the real conspirators had agreed upon in advance.

Note also how confused and absurd Johnson's remarks are - indicating a troubled conscience. Why should the news of Kennedy's death be withheld, until the man who now was Acting President had left the hospital? Why should he not be safe there? With all the forces of law and order now on the alert, were there not enough guns at hand to protect the new chief of government against a second assassination attempt? Does anyone in his right mind believe that the 1,500 men already mobilized for the parade by the Dallas police, plus the Sheriff's deputies, the Secret Service and the FBI did not represent a force strong enough to beat down any attempt at violent overthrow of the government - if, indeed, it was a Communist attempt?

This consideration leads to another one which shows even more strongly how preposterous the "Red Plot" theory, or rather pretense, fostered by Johnson and his friends, really was. Dallas has had for decades the reputation of being America's most conservative big city where every lever of power was in the hands of staunch anti-communists. Moreover, it is located in an area geographically far removed from any conceivable base of support for Communist agents. Is it plausible to allege that a Communist attempt at overthrowing the government of the United States had been made at Dallas of all places? Now, if the seat of action had been New York, or San Francisco, or even Miami, such an assertion might be barely believable. But in Dallas -

How liars expose themselves! The bigger the lie, the more certain is eventual exposure, even if it takes a long time. The "credibility gap," which by now has become a sort of trademark of the Johnson Administration, began at Dallas, on November 22, 1963, at 1 p.m. But for an incredibly abject and servile press, the American people would have known, or at least guessed, the truth long ago.

The phony nature of Johnson's Red Plot fears and of his every move that followed the assassination is also brought out clearly in William Manchester's account of the historic telephone call which Johnson put through from the Presidential plane to Robert Kennedy in Washington because he needed advice from the Attorney-General about how to take the oath and by "cruel mischance" (Manchester) that official happened to be the dead President's brother. After he had gotten Robert Kennedy on the line, Manchester writes, "Johnson began by expressing his condolences. But he had just become the busiest man in the world, and after a few compassionate sentences he plunged into business. The murder, he said, 'might be part of a world-wide plot.' In his statement to the Warren Commission seven and a half months later Johnson suggested that the Attorney-General had agreed with this interpretation and had 'discussed the practical problems at hand problems of special urgency because we did not at that time have any information as to the motivation of the assassination or its possible implications.'

"In fact, Robert Kennedy was unresponsive. He was not among those who suspected a grand conspiracy, and he didn't understand what Johnson was talking about," Manchester goes on to say. Given the well-known sources of his information, there is no reason to question the accuracy of his account on this point. Kennedy's rebuttal makes Johnson out the unabashed liar he is and has always been.

Elsewhere in his book, Manchester quotes Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren as explaining thus why he had accepted to serve as head of the Presidential Commission against his will: "The President told me how serious the situation was. He said there had been wild rumors and there was the international situation to think of. He said he had just talked to Dean Rusk, who was concerned... He said that if the public became aroused against Castro and Khrushchev there might be war..."

This is a humdinger, really. Johnson, the man who was first of all to get "wild rumors" started, pressuring the Chief Justice to take a very much unwanted assignment in order to stop those rumors. The brazen liar who had talked about a "world-wide conspiracy", the moment the martyred President's heart had stopped beating, being concerned about public feelings that might lead to war against the Communist powers! Was there ever a hypocrite in high office to match such a performance?

The most revealing item in the case, however, is a dispatch from Dallas by Dom Bonafede of the New York Herald Tribune, published in that paper on May 19, 1964, under the headline "U.S. Gagged The Oswald Plot Talk" which read in part as follows:

"Plans by Dallas police to link the Nov. 22 assassination of President Kennedy with an international conspiracy were headed off by Washington officials a few hours before the arraignment of Lee Harvey Oswald, the suspected assassin, the New York Herald Tribune has learned. The disclosure was made by a high-ranking law official here and confirmed by David Johnston, the Justice of the Peace before whom Oswald was arraigned

"Washington was anxious not to have the assassination tied in with an international plot because of the harm it would do to U.S. foreign relations," the official commented."

The anxiety of Washington is understandable only on the premise that there was no international plot, yet the impression that such a plot did exist was being created by interested parties. For, if such a plot really had existed, i.e. if a Communist power had actually been responsible for the assassination, then things had reached a point where U.S. relations with that power certainly could not be harmed any further.

"He (the official) said that after the arrest of Oswald, Dallas County District Attorney Henry Wade received an urgent telephone call from Washington requesting him to make certain that the charge was one of straight murder - avoiding the mention of possible foreign implications," the Herald Tribune dispatch went on to say.

"Mr. Johnston reported that Mr. Wade informed him prior to writing the complaint against Oswald that the call came from the State Department following consultation with the Justice Department."

This shows how the Oswald case was stage-managed throughout, without the slightest regards for due judicial process. The possibility that the man might be innocent apparently never entered anybody's mind, not even in Washington, although at that early moment no proof of any kind could be said to exist against him. The question being debated between officials was merely whether to pin a "straight" murder rap on him, or to present him as the tool of Communist conspirators. The Dallas police were all in favor of the latter course of action, as the following paragraph shows:

"Mr. Johnston nonetheless recalled, 'Enough evidence had been collected after his arrest to clearly show the man (Oswald) was a pink. The police got a little excited and talked about drawing up a complaint indicating the assassination was part of an international conspiracy. I talked with Wade about it, and he asked if there was any basis for an international conspiracy. At that particular point, I could see nothing to prove it. To say it is one thing, but to prove it in court is another.'"

What did the Dallas police get so "excited" about they jumped to the conclusion an international plot was afoot? The dispatch says on this score:

"Mr. Johnston said that immediately after Oswald's capture, he (Judge Johnston) and assistant District Attorney William Alexander and several police officers were sent to search Oswald's quarters in a Dallas rooming house. He said:

" 'The boy (Oswald) was like a pack rat; he never threw anything away. There was a pile of Communist material. Most of it was from the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and there were four or five letters from a Communist group in New York. Potentially, this was pretty strong stuff.'"

Judge Johnston here is engaging in gross double-talk. On one hand he affirms that the material allegedly found in Oswald's room was "pretty strong stuff;" on the other, he says that he could see nothing in this material to prove an international conspiracy.

Actually, what was discovered in Oswald's room was nothing more than some routine correspondence between Oswald and Arnold S. Johnson, director of the information and lecture bureau of the Communist Party in New York, concerning the "entirely fictitious" - as the Warren Report itself concedes - FPCC chapter which Oswald "purportedly" (again, this term is used by the Commission) formed in New Orleans. And Judge Johnston himself states that most of the "pile of Communist material" found in Oswald's room was from the FPCC - which, as the published correspondence shows, had no ties with Oswald's spurious, one-man "chapter" and disapproved of the way he handled it.

I have maintained all along, beginning with OSWALD: ASSASSIN OR FALL GUY?, that Oswald never was a genuine Communist or Marxist, but an undercover agent and stool-pigeon serving the CIA and the FBI. In my new trade book MARINA OSWALD, this thesis is fully documented. It has of late received powerful support, from Epstein, Lane and others as far as the FBI is concerned, and, more importantly, from District Attorney Garrison as

regards Oswald's relationship with the CIA. Garrison has made it perfectly clear that Oswald's ostentatious "pro-Castro" activities in New Orleans were nothing more than a "cover" for his role as an undercover agent working against Castro. In his television interview of May 21, 1967, Mr. Garrison stated explicitly that Oswald had been working for the CIA in New Orleans and castigated that agency for its "criminal activities" in trying to conceal this fact from the Warren Commission and even from the FBI.

If Oswald never threw away any of the phony Communist material he kept in his room, he did so on orders from his taskmasters in the CIA and the FBI. The fact that such material was found at all constitutes further proof that Oswald was no assassin, for a man who is about to commit a crime of such magnitude does not leave his room cluttered with stuff that is bound to incriminate him. All this is part and parcel of the official frameup of which Oswald has been a victim.

The fact that the Dallas police promptly sought to exploit this bogus propoganda stuff in drawing up a complaint that was to present the assassination as the handiwork of international (i.e. Communist) conspirators is powerful proof of their own involvement in the "Crime of the Century." Those gentlemen who went to search Oswald's room knew beforehand what they were going to find there, for they were working hand-in-glove with the local bureau of the FBI which knew all about Oswald's real face and the true nature of his political activities. The whole nefarious scheme is now being exposed, step by step, as a result of the New Orleans investigation and the picture that gradually emerges fits exactly the thesis first propounded by this writer about the real background of the assassination.

Precisely because I have been proved right in every other important aspect of the case, I feel completely confident that further developments will also prove right my contention that Lyndon B. Johnson was behind the whole scheme.

He was the one who started the "wild rumors" of a worldwide conspiracy, minutes after the guns of Dallas had propelled him into the presidency - the biggest sounding board in the world. Then the Dallas police picked up the cue and got all set to belabor this false issue. But Robert Kennedy in Washington immediately realized - if perhaps only instinctively - what really had happened and put on the brakes. In concert with the State Department, which could not but realize the damage to the national interest that was bound to result from this wild scheme, the Department of Justice then moved to quash it by phoning District Attorney Wade in Dallas. Then, "following a conference with the District Attorney's office, the Dallas police agreed to drop the reference to an ideological plot," to quote once more from the Herald Tribune story.

All of which represents another strong link in the already long chain of circumstantial evidence which proves that there was, indeed, a grand conspiracy to kill the President of the United States. But it was not an international, much less a world-wide one. It was an all-American plot in which Lyndon B. Johnson, acting in cahoots with the Dallas oligarchy and with the local branches of the CIA, the FBI and the Secret Service, played the leading part.

Count Twelve

What's Your Rush, Mr. Johnson?

The moment President Kennedy had expired, Vice President Johnson became Acting President. In this capacity, he was empowered to take all measures, especially all emergency measures, dictated by the needs of the hour.

This simple statement of incontrovertible fact takes the wind out of all the pious baloney with which the advocates of the Usurper have been trying to justify the unseemly haste of the swearing-in aboard "Air Force One."

When Arthur Krock in The New York Times of January 10, 1967, wrote that "the perils of these exigent times sustain Mr. Johnson's decision to reduce to the lowest possible minimum the period in which the Presidential office was vacant," the distinguished commentator either didn't know what he was talking about or else he was abetting the final touch of "The Crime of the Century."

The presidency is never vacant as long as any of the four officials constitutionally in line for succession is alive. Will Arthur Krock deny that Johnson, as Acting President, was in a position to meet the challenges of the atomic age which Krock belabors in his piece? What additional powers did he acquire by having the oath administered to him on the spot, instead of in Washington?

The American news media, which have with rare unanimity collaborated in putting over on the American public and world opinion the greatest fraud in modern history and which still exert every possible effort to prevent the truth from coming out, also have done their best to gloss over the sinister significance of Johnson's rush to get sworn in at the murder scene, in his pre-eminent domain.

William Manchester, in "The Death of a President," has given a graphic and disgusting account of this abominable ceremony, even though the published version represents only a much watered-down variety of the original manuscript. "Newsweek", in its issue of December 26, 1966, gave a preview of what was in the book before it underwent editorial surgery:

"Sources say Manchester has Mr. Johnson calling Attorney General Kennedy in Washington for a ruling on when he should take the oath of office. RFK was noncommittal - but LBJ was already convinced in his own mind that the oath-taking must be held before Air Force One could be airborne for Washington. The new President reportedly feared a Soviet attack, but the stunned Kennedys apparently interpreted his actions as an impatient desire to seize power."

This last sentence, of course, is phrased incorrectly. The seizure of power was already an accomplished fact and could hardly be undone in any conceivable way. Nevertheless, it is clear enough that the Acting President feared some kind of challenge, perhaps from the Kennedy camp.

That is why he displayed such indecent haste in getting sworn in. Johnson has always been a great believer in appearances, as distinct from reality. He wanted the trappings of presidential power as much as the power itself. And he calculated correctly that once he had been sworn in as President of the United States, no voice would be raised to challenge the legitimacy of his accession.

When Johnson, immediately after the President's death, put through his first call to Attorney General Kennedy in Washington, he said, according to Manchester: "A lot of people down here think I should be sworn in right away. Do you have any objections to that?"

"Kennedy was taken aback," Manchester writes (in the published version of his book.) "It was scarcely an hour and a quarter since he had first heard of the shooting, less than an hour since he had learned that the wound had been fatal. As Attorney-General he couldn't understand the need for a rush, and on a personal level he preferred that any investiture be deferred until his brother's body had been brought home."

If the Attorney-General didn't feel there was any need for a rush, there was no such need. He was the law officer most qualified to pass on this issue. Johnson's pretended fears of a "Soviet attack" were nothing but a subterfuge contrived ad hoc. In any case, as has been stated before, he could have coped with such an attack just as well in his capacity as Acting President.

What followed then - the long distance argument about who could administer the oath and what text should be used (it's prescribed by the Constitution) - borders on the grotesque. When Robert Kennedy and his deputy, Nicholas Katzenbach, had reached the conclusion that any Federal Judge could administer the oath, including a District Court Judge, Katzenbach displayed remarkable intuition. "I imagine, he'll want Sarah Hughes," he said, according to Manchester.

"Sarah Hughes was from Dallas, and he (Katzenbach) remembered Johnson's vigorous lobbying for her appointment," Manchester goes on to say, but he fails to mention several important things about this lady who had been a great friend of Lyndon B. Johnson's since 1943. Sarah Hughes' knowledge of the law has always been very limited. She is a graduate of one of those obscure diploma mills which flourish down south; this one went out of business long ago. Without Johnson's vigorous lobbying for her, she would never have gotten anywhere near a federal judgeship.

If Sarah has never been much of a jurist, she had, besides her friendship with the powerful Congressman Johnson, other useful connections. "Newsweek," in its issue of February 27, 1967, has disclosed quite casually that Sarah Hughes is a member of the board of trustees of the Hoblitzelle Foundation of Dallas, which has been identified as a CIA conduit, i.e. one of those innumerable make-believe foundations which channel CIA funds into political parties, cultural organizations, labor unions, religious groups, students' associations and so forth. Anybody who sits on the board of such an out-and-out CIA affiliate as the Hoblitzelle Foundation must be looked upon as being an undercover agent for the CIA.

It is certainly not by chance that Johnson called upon his CIA friend Sarah Hughes to swear him in, at the murder scene, in such haste, for District Attorney Jim Garrison, in his television interview of May 21, 1967, has openly accused the CIA as the agency which executed and covered the assassination. Garrison has identified five men as the killers of Dallas and he has stated that they all were former employees of the CIA. His use of the

adjective "former" does not mean anything under the circumstances, for naturally the CIA wouldn't keep on its payroll, not ostensibly anyway, five of its men who had assassinated the President of the United States.

In Vol. I of the present report, I had already pointed out that Johnson has always been a great friend of the CIA and that the latter wanted him to become President, partly as a measure of self-protection (for Kennedy had vowed to smash the CIA), partly for the purpose of intensifying the war in Vietnam. After the latest statements by District Attorney Garrison, there can no longer be any doubt that President Kennedy was killed by the CIA on behalf of Lyndon B. Johnson, with the Dallas police helping to set up the ambush, with the Secret Service looking the other way and with the FBI covering up. That is the hideous truth about the assassination.

That Robert Kennedy grasped this truth instinctively from the first hour appears also from the irony he put into his advice to Johnson: "Anybody can swear you in. Maybe you'd like to have one of the judges down there whom you appointed. Any one of them can do it."

As one of the most influential figures on Capitol Hill, Johnson had been packing the federal judiciary for years with his friends. He was no less active on the state and regional levels, as the incredible performance of the Dallas judges in the Oswald and Ruby cases has strikingly demonstrated.

Count Thirteen

Why All That Secrecy ?

Nothing could demonstrate more conclusively the utter falsehood of the official version of President Kennedy's assassination than the extraordinary precautions the Johnson regime has taken to conceal the evidence from public inspection and scrutiny.

In March 1967, the "New York Post" ran a series of articles on "The Warren Report and Its Critics," by Michael J. Berlin, which, in keeping with that paper's previous attitude, was generally favorable to the Report and sceptical about the criticism that had been levelled at it. In the sixth and last article, however, the author appears to have undergone a curious change of heart. What made him reconsider? A peep at the National Archives did. Let's listen to him:

"The Warren Commission papers are stored in the stacks of the National Archives, behind a door numbered 6 W 3. To enter, the archivist uses both a key and a combination. Inside, all the visitor sees is aisle after aisle of metal shelves, filled with cardboard file boxes, legal size, five inches thick."

Thus are guarded the treasures of a bank, the nation's gold stock in Fort Knox, the military secrets of the Pentagon. Is that the way to guard the records of a Commission entrusted with the task of establishing the truth about the assassination of a President of the United States? If the official truth is the truth, why should it be so jealously kept from public scrutiny? Is truth the sacred privilege of a handpicked few?

"Stacked on both sides of one long aisle, and in part of another, are 900 of these file boxes - 300 cubic feet - filled with the 1,555 Warren Commission documents," Mr. Berlin goes on to relate. "Some documents are just a page or two, some make the file box bulge. About a third are classified.

"According to the archivist, somewhere in that long aisle are the photographs and X-rays of the autopsy of John F. Kennedy. And somewhere in that 300 cubic feet there may be - there just may be - the information that can either ease the minds of the 59 per cent of the nation who today doubt the Commission, or cause enough new doubts to necessitate a new investigation of that day in Dallas."

Here some contrary observations are in order. If any information that could possibly strengthen the official thesis were to be found in that aisle, it would long since have been dug out and given maximum publicity by the zealous advocates of the Warren Report. A government that is faced with a 59 percentage of incredulity among its people - the latest Louis Harris Poll, made public on May 29, 1967, shows that 66 percent of all Americans now believe the assassination resulted from a plot - does not neglect a chance to improve its image, if it can. On the other hand, it must be said that there is no need for any "new doubts" to intensify the nationwide clamor for a new investigation. The case for a new inquiry can't be made much stronger than it is today. If this proposal so far has made no headway, the reason is that the Johnson regime is opposing it with all its might. It is safe to predict that there will be no new investigation as long as Johnson is President. Après lui, le déluge.

Not only is a large proportion of the material classified, i.e. it will not be made available to any researcher without official approval, but the documents that may be freely inspected are full of gaps and deletions. Mr. Berlin writes on this score:

"(Archivist Michael) Simmons produces a document at random: No. 7,809 pages, dated 12.10.63, at Dallas, Re: Lee Harvey Oswald, 'Report of FBI Special Agent Robert P. Gemberling. Some of the pages are missing. In one spot 150 pages are withheld, sequestered in another file box, and a pink slip in the gap says: 'Pages... through... being withheld by order of the FBI. The topic: 'Interviews' relating to 'other persons,' 'identified' and 'unidentified in the Dallas area.

"Standing in that room, the urge arises, barely controllable, to sweep Simmons aside, run down that aisle, and grope among the file boxes for The Whole Truth."

It is just as well Mr. Berlin controlled his urge to sweep the archivist aside and to make a dash for The Whole Truth. Such an action would certainly have brought official reinforcements to the spot quickly, for the kind of "truth" that has to be kept behind a combination lock is apt to be defended also manu militari against inquisitive probers. Johnson knows only too well what is at stake for him on those inviolable premises. The moment he loses control of the National Archives in Washington, he will be done for.

Further on in his article, Mr. Berlin relates how even Wesley Liebeler, a former staff member of the Warren Commission, has run into a stone wall when he tried to do a little sleuthing on the side.

Asked if he felt as frustrated by the inaccessibility of the files as are the critics of the Warren Report, Liebeler exploded:

"Frustrating? I think it's a goddam outrage. I can't even look at my own goddam memos any more, and neither can anybody else. When the Commission disbanded, it sent the files to the Archives and didn't go through them to determine which should be made public and which shouldn't. The question wasn't resolved until August, 1966, when the Justice Department ruled that the Archives had the obligation to go through these papers and decide which should be made available.

"I think that this kind of determination should not be made by the Archives. Seeing the way the government people think, it's obvious that there would almost be an instinctive desire to withhold. (At this point, Mr. Berlin inserted in parentheses: "Apparently, the Archives, in picking and choosing, has depended on the requests of such agencies as the FBI on which of their documents should be withheld." So now it's Johnson's all-purpose FBI that is in full charge of The Whole Truth. It has been handling this sacred trust about the way the Gestapo did under Hitler. - J.J.)

"I don't know what's to become of all this," (Liebeler continues), "but some people have become interested in it and are taking steps to try to do something about it...It's premature to discuss it... I don't know if we're going to get at (the classified documents) or not, but there's a good chance that we will..." So much for Liebeler, a maverick among the Commission counsels who is now embarked upon a private inquiry into the assassination evidence. Not that Liebeler has become a "critic," but his faith in the Report he had helped to fabricate appears to be somewhat shaken.

Columnist Henry J. Taylor, previously also a fervent believer in the official version of the assassination, appears to have been having some second thoughts, too. In the "World Journal Tribune" of January 30, 1967, Mr. Taylor published a column entitled "Mysteries Hide Truth About Kennedy Death," which contained these significant passages:

"But when you move outside the independent authority of Parkland Hospital into what happened at the Federal Government's Naval Medical School at Bethesda, Maryland, where President Kennedy's autopsy was performed, everything changes. Preciseness disappears, clarity and completeness vanish, official documents become burned or rewritten. These mysteries started with an affidavit by the chief autopsy surgeon, a Naval commander, buried in Vol. 17 of the Warren Report: 'I, James J. Humes, certify that I have destroyed by burning certain preliminary draft notes relating to Naval Medical School Autopsy A 63-272.' A naval officer taking any such action without orders would be court-martialed. Who ordered this, and why?"

Here, Mr. Taylor is being a bit naive. Who ordered this? Well, who is Commander Humes' Commander-in-Chief? President Johnson is. Even if the order was handed down through some admiral, as it presumably was, no naval officer, no matter how highly placed, would dare take such action on his own authority. In this case, too, the buck decidedly stops at the President's desk.

Why did Johnson order Commander Humes to destroy his original notes and then to write a completely fictitious and fraudulent autopsy report? (Cf. the Chapter "The Autopsy Fraud" in OSWALD: THE TRUTH) Because that was the only way to hide the indisputable fact that Kennedy was shot from the front. And once that point could be established beyond a shadow of doubt, there would be the devil to pay for all participants in the Oswald Hoax, including, and above all, Johnson.

For the same reason, nobody is permitted to examine the 22 color photographs, 18 black-and-white prints, 11 body X-rays and a roll of film made during the autopsy. They were immediately seized by the Secret Service, disappeared for three years and finally wound up in the classified section of the National Archives. Not even the Warren Commission ever saw them.

The whole argument about how many bullets hit Kennedy, and from which direction they were fired (for details, see OSWALD:THE TRUTH) could be promptly and easily resolved through public examination of these documents by a number of independent experts. Why doesn't the Johnson regime bow to the oft-made demand for such an examination? If the official story is true, the government has nothing to fear. The fact that it does fear, and has taken great care to prevent, public inspection of these photographs and X-rays, proves all by itself that the official version is untrue.

Also "classified" are, among many other items, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy's deposition before the Warren Commission (presumably because she blurted out something that was incompatible with the official version); a substantial portion of Marina Oswald's testimony relating to her life with Lee Harvey in the Soviet Union (because of telltale details that give away the true nature of Oswald's assignment to the USSR as a spy for CIA - for details see MARINA OSWALD); a major portion of the FBI report on David Ferrie, one of the principal suspects in the Garrison inquiry until he died under mysterious circumstances; and many other FBI reports that cut too close to the truth.

Out of bounds for the public is also Oswald's rifle. In this case the Johnson regime went to the extreme of whipping through Congress a bill awarding permanent custody of the "assassination rifle" to the federal government. This was done because a Denver oilman and gun fancier, John J. King, had sought to acquire this rifle which after Oswald's death belonged to Marina, under the normal rules of law. King had paid Marina outright \$ 10,000 for this rifle and promised an additional \$ 35,000 on delivery, but she was never able to regain possession of the weapon which had been seized by federal authorities after the Dallas shooting.

Why did Johnson and his obsequious Department of Justice go to such lengths to secure possession of this rifle, even though in the process private property rights had to be brutally discarded? Again, the answer is: in order to hide the truth. For the fact of the matter is that the rifle found in the Book Depository was not Oswald's Carcano, but a Mauser. And Oswald that day "never touched a gun," as District Attorney Garrison has confirmed on May 21, 1967. The story of how the Dallas Police switched rifles in order to incriminate Oswald against their better knowledge is fully told in OSWALD: THE TRUTH and need not be recapitulated here. The fact that the federal government used every means at its disposal to back up this fraud, and then spirited away the evidence, speaks for itself.

Total Secrecy is the best friend of Total Fraud.

Count Fourteen

Why Do the Kennedys Hate Lyndon Johnson so Much?

When one of her entourage suggested to the young widow that she should change her blood-stained clothes before the flight back to Washington with the Johnson party already installed on Air Force One, Jacqueline Kennedy fiercely resisted. No, she was not going to change, she replied, "so they can see what they've done."

Who, Oswald? Or any other nameless assassin? It stands to reason that Mrs. Kennedy's insistence on wearing her blood-caked clothes on the plane could not be meant to show to the actual snipers what they had done to her; none of them could possibly be on that plane. Who, then was "they?" Is there any other possible explanation than that she meant Lyndon Johnson and his party?

This terrible phrase "so they can see what they've done" constitutes positive proof that Mrs. Kennedy had instantly guessed what lay behind the tragedy; that she knew deep down in her heart that her husband had been killed at the instigation of Vice President Johnson.

Nor is that all. When Johnson later, in his incomparably hypocritical manner, tried to "comfort" the widow, she pushed him back. "I don't want that man to touch me," she cried out to her entourage. So does a sensitive woman shrink from a murderer.

Unwilling to admit the truth, yet at a loss how to explain the intensity of such feelings, officialdom and the press have blamed the highly emotional, even hysterical state Mrs. Kennedy was in at the time. Yet, when she poured out her heart to William Manchester, in April 1964, the shock of her terrible experience had worn off long ago. Since then, years have gone by and there are no signs that Jacqueline Kennedy's hatred of Lyndon Johnson has in any way abated.

Why does she hate him so much? The fact itself is conceded by all informed observers, yet few ponder its significance. Is it normal for the widow of a president to be consumed with burning hatred for his successor? Did Eleanor Roosevelt thus detest President Truman?

Manchester and others who, in spite of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary, persist in defending the official version of the assassination, as laid down in the Warren Report, seek to explain Mrs. Kennedy's intense bitterness towards Johnson with trivial reasons. They pretend to believe that these harsh feelings resulted from Johnson's uncouth behavior after he and his party had taken possession of Air Force One. But, could a state of mind lasting for years be induced by such trivia?

If it were just a question of dislike, the argument might be tenable. But the extraordinary depth and intensity of the hostile feelings which the Kennedy family, in particular Jacqueline and Robert, nourish toward Johnson cannot thus be explained away. This is not just the slightly superior

attitude of proper Bostonians toward a Texas hick; it is the classic enmity of a once ruling family toward the usurper who murdered the head of the clan. It is a blood feud that defies all attempts at reconciliation.

To be sure, the Kennedys have kept up appearances rather well. For reasons of their own which the outsider cannot fathom they seem to have put off the Day of Reckoning to a convenient but uncertain day in the future.

Robert Kennedy, in particular, has displayed a considerable talent for face-saving and make-believe harmony. He stayed with the new President as Attorney General for nine months, swallowing plenty of humiliations along with his suppressed anger. He chose a Polish city of all places to proclaim the guilt of Lee Harvey Oswald, knowing full well that the story wasn't true. He refused to read the Warren Report (as did all other members of the Kennedy clan), but nevertheless "accepted" it. He has announced and repeated ~~his intention to vote for a Johnson-Humphrey ticket in 1968~~ his intention to vote for a Johnson-Humphrey ticket in 1968, although he knows as well as his friend Pierre Salinger and other well-informed Democrats that there will be no such ticket, because by that time Johnson will be through.

In considering the seemingly strange case of Robert Kennedy, which Barbara Garson has perfectly parodied in *MACBIRD!*, one little-known fact has been taken into account. Robert Kennedy has always had a close connection with the CIA; he was his brother's personal liaison officer to that intelligence agency. As a matter of fact, Robert Kennedy was entertaining the CIA chief John McCone at his Virginia home when the President was killed in Dallas. In a strange way, Robert Kennedy, acting on behalf of the CIA, had unwittingly helped to make the assassination of his brother possible when he intervened with the Dallas Police, several months earlier, in order to prevent the arrest of Oswald and Ruby (for details, see *The National Enquirer* of May 17, 1964, as quoted briefly in *OSWALD: ASSASSIN OR FALL GUY?* and extensively in my German-language book "Die Wahrheit über den Kennedy-Mord")

It seems that Johnson has been holding this indirect and innocent involvement of Robert Kennedy in his brother's death as a club over Robert's head. Certainly, he has made good use of the fact that Robert Kennedy had belonged to the higher councils of the CIA to make sure that the truth about the CIA's role in the tragedy of Dallas should not come out. In this respect, then, Robert Kennedy is a prisoner of his own past.

Yet for all his self-restraint and his professions of loyalty, the bad blood runs deep between Robert Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. When the repressed feelings come to the surface, as happens every now and then, the results are spectacular as during that famous clash over the peace feelers Kennedy had brought back from Paris early in 1967. According ^{to} "Time" magazine (March 17, 1967) there was quite a scene:

"During a 45-minute meeting in his White House office on Feb. 6, Johnson castigated Kennedy for his stance on Vietnam. 'If you keep talking like this, you won't have a political future in this country within six months,' the President is said to have warned. 'In six months, all you doves will be destroyed.' At one point, Johnson used the phrase, 'The blood of American boys will be on your hands.' Finally, the President told Kennedy, 'I never want to hear your views on Vietnam again.' He also reportedly said to the Senator: 'I never want to see you again.'"

Under such extreme provocation - imagine Johnson, his own hands dripping with blood, berating Kennedy for wanton bloodshed! - Robert Kennedy's self-control cracked. Says "Time" of him:

"Bobby, for his part, is said to have called the President an s.o.b. and to have told him at one point: 'I don't have to sit here and take that --!'"

I wonder if it has ever happened before in the history of the United States that a President has been called a son-of-a-bitch by a Senator in the presence of witnesses. Only a sudden and uncontrollable upsurge of long-repressed rage can have prompted the normally cool Robert Kennedy to go so far.

On substantive issues, there have been more virulent clashes between Johnson and other Senators like Fulbright and Morse, but there is nothing to match the intensity of bad feelings, on a distinctly personal level, that has existed for years between LBJ and Robert Kennedy. Is there any other plausible explanation for this mutual hate than that Robert knows Johnson is the murderer of his brother, and that Johnson knows the younger Kennedy has vowed to destroy him?

On the whole, the American press, despite its usual fondness for political battle, has chosen to soft-pedal this deadly animosity between Johnson and Robert Kennedy, apparently on the theory that too many people might draw their own conclusions and guess the truth about the assassination.

It was left for a German reporter, therefore, to give the most graphic account of this blood feud I have seen anywhere to date. In a dispatch entitled "The Festival Became a Battleground," the correspondent of "Die Welt", Heinz Barth, described, in the issue of May 29, 1967, of his paper, the launching of the carrier "John F. Kennedy" in these terms:

"If the prevailing mood at the baptism of the new aircraft carrier "John F. Kennedy" at Newport News last weekend can be taken as an omen, this youngest, 61,400-ton giant will sail under threatening skies and on stormy seas. It was a beautiful day and Jacqueline Kennedy wore an extremely elegant white spring dress of tolerable length. On the baptismal pulpit, however, the temperature between Lyndon Johnson and the complete Kennedy clan was well below the freezing point, in spite of the summer-like day. If this intense mutual aversion, which is steadily growing in depth, could be measured in nautical terms, it would displace a tonnage far in excess of that of the world's most modern carrier.

"The ceremony, normally the occasion for exalted feelings and national pathos, was marked by an unmatched sobriety. Only if the most rudimentary rules of good behavior left no other choice, did the President pay the slightest attention to the family of his predecessor... Here at Newport News, America's TV-spectators, for the first time since the embarrassing disclosures of the Manchester book, were able to view the antagonists together on the screen.

"Under the glaring sun of Virginia, millions of Americans were able to witness the spectacle of an enmity of shocking proportions which no longer affords any hope of reconciliation. Even more hopeless than with the rest of the family is Johnson's relationship with Jacqueline - which is understandable in the light of the judgment she had passed on his manners.

"The whole nation could see how he ignored her with studied indifference, while she in her turn cut him icily. He did not even abide by the rule of protocol and failed to accompany the widow of the last President and her children to the baptismal pulpit, across the crowd estimated at 25,000...

"The master of the White House couldn't have been more sparing in his personal tribute to John F. Kennedy. There was no trace of the usual Texan joviality in the President's speech. Normally, Johnson puts his heart

into everything he talks about. He can speak feelingly even about waste disposal. Hence the monotonous indifference with which he reeled off his text was bound to attract attention. One could see how he loathed this command performance which he had arranged in such a way as to reduce the glorification of his predecessor to the barest minimum... His speech was brutally short... lasting only four minutes instead of the 20 minutes in the program..."

At the end of the ceremony, Herr Barth remarked, "there was no hope left that the conflict between the Johnsons and the Kennedys, which burns with the fire of irreconcilable enmity, could ever be settled."

"Die Welt," where these lines appeared, is a conservative newspaper, consistently friendly to Johnson. The editors, therefore, made no attempt to interpret for their presumably startled readers the meaning of this extraordinary feud. To most people, in Europe as in America, the bitter enmity between the Kennedys ^{and} the Johnsons is just one of those things that defy logic and reasoning. They are too blindfold, or too thoroughly brainwashed, to see the very simple, plausible and, indeed, cogent explanation of it all. It is to be found in the sober definition the Oxford Dictionary gives of the term "blood feud:" - "between families one of which has spilt the other's blood."

Count Fifteen

Sabotaging the Garrison Inquiry

Even at this late hour, Lyndon B. Johnson could effectively wash his hands of the Kennedy murder. All he would have to do is to let the new inquiry into the assassination that has been launched by District Attorney Jim Garrison of New Orleans, take its normal course. Would it not be the duty of the President to assist a law officer investigating the assassination of a President of the United States?

Instead, Johnson has used, and is still using, every means at his disposal in order to discredit Garrison and to block his investigation. In this endeavor, he has even resorted to every shabby device in the Book of Dirty Tricks which is the Bible of his favorite agency, the CIA. Witnesses are bribed, intimidated or murdered. Material evidence, again, is withheld, faked or suppressed. Torrents of abuse and slander are poured on Garrison's head every day by Johnson's servile press and TV networks.

To begin with, the insinuation was spread, through Washington channels, that Garrison's inquiry was "politically motivated," that it was a hoax devised by an over-ambitious and publicity-seeking go-getter intent on feathering his own nest. This charge is really too stupid to warrant rebuttal. Since when is it conducive to the political career of a public prosecutor to make up a case out of whole cloth and then present it to a judge and jury at the certain risk of acquittal?

This is, indeed, the touchstone of Garrison's honesty and integrity: so far, he has been upheld, at every step, not only by one, but by three independent judges as well as by a Grand Jury. If he didn't have a case, as his detractors assert, how is it conceivable that the courts would go along with him?

At this point, Johnson's advocates switch to the no less silly argument that Louisiana is "anti-federal." There had never been previously

any indication of such feelings, except perhaps on the civil rights issue, as everywhere in the South. But that issue is not at stake here.

The latest quirk in this insidious smear campaign is to blame the Napoleonic Code, on which Louisiana's legal system is partly based, and to pretend that this Code does not afford the innocent (meaning Clay Shaw and company) the same protection as the Anglo-Saxon concept of justice. Those who are now bemoaning the harsh fate of a Clay Shaw, who at least can afford a battery of good lawyers, never shed any tears when Lee Harvey Oswald, poor and helpless in the hands of a ruthless police, was even denied, through trickery, assistance by legal counsel. If the way the Oswald affair was handled by the Dallas Police and District Attorney Wade is any tribute to the Anglo-Saxon concept of justice, I go for the Napoleonic Code.

At the start of his investigation, Garrison seemed to be anxious to placate the powers-that-be in Washington. But he remembered only too well that the FBI, in November 1963, had "checked out" the suspects his office had already picked up on no better grounds than that they couldn't be linked to Oswald. Under the circumstances, it is hardly surprising that Garrison rejected the demand by Congressman Gerald Ford (a former member of the Warren Commission!) that he turn over any new evidence in his possession to the U.S. Attorney General for forwarding to the President.

"I am running this investigation, not the President, not the Attorney General," Garrison declared. "Now if they want to help me, I'll welcome their assistance. But I'm not reporting to anyone."

Garrison knew only too well what would happen to the evidence he had painstakingly gathered if he were to turn it over to the Attorney General "for forwarding to the President." It would have been suppressed, or doctored, like all the evidence in the Oswald case. The FBI and the CIA have developed extraordinary skill in the art of making evidence fit their preconceived notions and they have demonstrated, time and again, a total lack of scruples in interfering with the due process of law. (If this statement is doubted by any reader, I am referring him to the numerous examples of such lawlessness given in OSWALD: THE TRUTH and MARINA OSWALD)

It is probably not by chance that Johnson picked the precise moment the news of the Garrison investigation was breaking, to place at the head of the Department of Justice a fellow-Texan and native of Dallas ("the murder capital of the world," as Melvin Belli once said), 39-year-old Ramsey Clark, son of Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark. The young man lost no time deploring the New Orleans inquiry in tones of chagrined surprise and indignation. "I find it curious and I find it disturbing and I find it saddening," he proclaimed and added pathetically, "I believe in the Warren Report. I believe Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone killer of President Kennedy. I believe... I believe... I believe..."

Mr. Clark's act of faith is touching, but as Attorney-General of the United States it is incumbent upon him to investigate, not to believe, especially in a matter of such gravity. Instead, he has done everything in his power to stop Garrison. He has even instructed several FBI agents Garrison had subpoenaed for questioning to disregard the orders of the New Orleans court. An Attorney-General of the United States who aids and abets contempt of court is something of a novelty, but in this case nothing can come as a surprise any more.

Mr. Garrison's description of the way the Warren Commission worked, as given by him in a talk with Mr. James Phelan of "The Saturday Evening Post" (May 6, 1967) is both appropriate and amusing:

"What they did on the Warren Commission was send a hundred squirrels out to pick up leaves, acorns and sticks. Each squirrel brought something in and dumped it in a box. Then the head squirrels looked at this collection of junk and tried to reconstruct the terrain where it had been picked up. What it took to solve this puzzle was imagination and evaluation. It was like a chess game - and I once played an expert eight hours to a draw."

In the same interview, Garrison said that his interest in the Kennedy assassination had originated the previous fall when he flew from New Orleans to New York with Sen. Russell Long of Louisiana. "Up to that time I had assumed that the FBI had done a competent job," he told Mr. Phelan, "but I found that Long had some doubts about the solution to the Kennedy killing. He is a knowledgeable Washington figure, so I began to have some second thoughts."

Back in New Orleans, Garrison, in his own words, "read a number of excellent articles and books" about the assassination and the Warren Report and then "realized that something was wrong." As chief prosecutor of a city where Oswald had spent considerable time, prior to the Dallas events, Garrison was entitled to take an official look at what had happened within his jurisdiction and so he quietly opened his investigation. After a few months of undisturbed research, his activities were revealed, in mid-February 1967 through a "leak" in a newspaper (the New Orleans States-Item) and a big hullabaloo followed.

From the start, and consistently ever since, America's leading news media, after having played an incredibly one-sided, biased and shabby role in reporting the assassination, took the side of the Johnson regime against the courageously non-conformist New Orleans District Attorney. The New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune (Paris), the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, the newsweeklies and the radio and television networks all outdid themselves in either not reporting the news from New Orleans or trying to discredit Mr. Garrison. I doubt that there has ever been, in the history of the American press, an organized, nation-wide smear campaign of such scope and ruthlessness - and it was manifestly, almost blatantly, directed from Washington.

In an article on the "U.S. Establishment" (unrelated to the Kennedy murder) in the New York Herald Tribune (Paris) of March 22, 1965, John Crosby gave this apt description of current relations between the government and the press: "... Official guidance is, I should say, the greatest threat to press freedom in America... The Washington press corps cannot be bought but they can be conned and they are conned all the time by official guidance which is not much less strict than official guidance in Russia..."

Indeed, all the vicious outpourings in the American press against Garrison and his inquiry can be clearly traced to the Washington correspondents who are being "conned all the time by official guidance." Contrary to Mr. Crosby's opinion, I believe that quite a few of these gentlemen can also be bought, if not for cash then through official favors. There is no other way to explain the unbelievably shameful role of the American press in the Oswald drama and its New Orleans sequel.

When Garrison boldly attacked the officially sponsored Oswald Myth, as he did early in his public statements and with increasing emphasis, he became practically an outlaw as far as Washington is concerned. No wonder, for the apparent legitimacy of the Johnson regime is closely tied to the perpetuation of that fraud. Anyone able to prove that Oswald was framed saps the foundations of the regime and will in due course bring it down, that's for sure.

After Garrison, at his first press conference of February 23, 1967, had stated flatly, "I have no reason to believe that Lee Harvey Oswald killed anybody in Dallas on November 22, 1963," the die was cast. He might have been forgiven by the Establishment, had he merely sought to prove a conspiracy involving other persons beside Oswald. But to say, as Garrison did even more pointedly in the course of another conference on March 8, 1967, that Oswald was innocent of both the murder charges brought against him by the Dallas police is tantamount to saying that the police themselves were involved in the assassination of the President. On no other premise can their zeal in prosecuting and then sacrificing a scapegoat be adequately explained.

At the height of the Dreyfus scandal in France, at the turn of the century, a prominent French politician - who firmly believed in Dreyfus' guilt, -exclaimed, "If Dreyfus is innocent, our generals are guilty." Analogically, it is certain that Oswald's innocence documents the guilt of the Dallas Police. But then one thing leads to another. If the Dallas Police had a hand in the assassination, or the CIA for that matter, or both, FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover, who masterminded the coverup, is an accessory after the fact not only morally, but in a legal sense.

Garrison has publicly vowed to prosecute all accessories after the fact in the assassination of President Kennedy, all those who had "substantial knowledge" of the true facts and failed to disclose them. He has already specifically accused Richard Helms, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, of being at least an accessory after the fact and he can hardly fail to consider J. Edgar Hoover in the same light. Both men, however, are only heads of federal agencies under the direct control of the White House. Indict Helms or Hoover in the assassination of President Kennedy and you are indicting Johnson. The buck stops at his desk.

So far, Garrison has carefully avoided to implicate Johnson directly. That is understandable. But he has given to understand on numerous occasions that he is conscious of Johnson's responsibility.

how

"You know, you can pluck at a thread and wind up unraveling a whole coat," Garrison asked James Phelan in the course of the above-cited interview. "The thread that unraveled this whole case was the trip that Ferrie made to Houston the day after Kennedy was killed. While everybody in the country was glued to their television sets, Ferrie takes off with two guys and drives through a thunderstorm to Houston. He told the FBI that he had this sudden desire to go skating, and he knew there was a skating rink in Houston. The FBI checked him out and found that he showed up at the skating rink, all right, and they dropped him. But you know what? They never even asked if Ferrie put on his skates! We checked and found that he just stood alongside a wall there that afternoon and told everybody who would listen, 'I'm Dave Ferrie.' We checked the rink and found that there was a phone on that wall. So it seemed plain that this was the message center."

What was the message Ferrie was waiting for at the Houston skating rink? Garrison has not revealed it yet, but then he is still a long way from "unraveling the whole coat." Ferrie himself told reporters, shortly before

he was found dead, he understood that he had been "pegged as the getaway pilot" by Garrison. Getaway pilot for whom? Certainly not for Oswald who at the time Ferrie drove to Houston was already in custody.

After a particularly scurrilous attack made on him by the National Broadcasting Company, in a one-hour televised special report, on June 19, 1967, Garrison also took off the gloves. He issued a statement saying, "All the screaming and hollering now being heard is evidence that we have caught a very large fish. It is obvious that there are elements in Washington, D.C. which are desperate because we are in the process of uncovering their hoax."

The name of that "very large fish?" Garrison refrained from putting the label on, but the implication is perfectly clear. There are many big fishes in Washington, but the only one that looms very large in the picture is Lyndon B. Johnson.

Count Sixteen

The Inexorable Logic of Events

Viewed as individual plotters, David Ferrie, Clay Shaw or any other of those who have been named, or will be named, as conspirators in the Garrison investigation, could not have masterminded the Dallas ambush any more than Lee Harvey Oswald. As I have pointed out in Vol. I, the timing and tracing of the parade route are the decisive elements in the conspiracy, and no outsider had any control over them.

Suppose Ferrie and Shaw had conspired with the man who called himself "Leon Oswald" (but who was not Leo Harvey) and a couple of anti-Castro Cubans to shoot President Kennedy, as Garrison says they did, how could they have had any hopes of success without being in collusion with the Dallas authorities?

None of these people could exercise the slightest influence either in the selection of a motorcade route that led into the Dealey Plaza trap, or in the late timing of this decision, another key element of the plot, as I have explained in detail in Counts Seven and Eight (Vol. I). None of them, assuredly, would have been in a position to neutralize the normal vigilance of the Secret Service and the 1,500-man Dallas Police force.

This is the crux of the whole matter and a point that cannot be overemphasized. While it might have been perfectly possible for some daredevil individuals to plot an assassination regardless of circumstances, and at the risk of their own lives, the coldly calculated nature of the Dealey Plaza ambush, and the perfect success of the operation, in which not a shot was fired either by the police or by the Secret Service, betrays official connivance.

Perhaps the most telltale element in this situation is the fact, admitted even in the Warren Report, that three cars and several people did enter the forbidden area between the railroad yards and the Book Depository, shortly before the assassination, in spite of the ostensible police ban on traffic in that area during the parade. Lee E. Bowers Jr., an employee of Union Terminal Co., was at work in a railroad tower about 14 feet above the tracks to the north of the railroad bridge and northwest of the corner of

Elm and Houston, approximately 50 yards from the back of the Depository, the Warren Report states, and goes on to say:

"From the tower he could view people moving in the railroad yards and at the rear of the Depository. According to Bowers, 'Since approximately 10 o'clock in the morning traffic had been cut off into the area so that anyone moving around could actually be observed.' During the 20 minutes prior to the arrival of the motorcade, Bowers noticed three automobiles which entered his immediate area; two left without discharging any passengers and the third was apparently on its way out when last observed by Bowers. Bowers observed only three or four people in the general area..."

The situation is perfectly clear, then. Here we have a strategic area, ideally suited for sniper activities, with a private parking lot, a fence concealed by trees and bushes, a stonewall and, in the foreground, the famous "grassy knoll." Because of the obvious danger such an area presented, the Dallas police, after consultation with the Secret Service, had banned all unauthorized movements in that area. Yet Bowers did observe three automobiles and three or four people where none should have been. How did they get in, if not by passing freely through the police cordon surrounding the area? If they were authorized persons, say Secret Service men or detectives on the lookout for possible troublemakers, the Warren Commission should have insisted on their identification.

Precisely because no attempt was made to identify these mysterious intruders, the suspicion is warranted that they were the assassins and that they had entered the area with the knowledge and connivance of the police. This has always been suspected by the critics of the Warren Report, the more so because Lee Bowers saw two men standing at the fence and observed a flash of light, at that spot, at the fatal hour of 12:30, when Kennedy was killed. Poor Bowers, he perished, in August 1966, in one of those conveniently arranged "traffic accidents" which have played havoc among assassination witnesses.

Nor is that all. The records of the Warren Commission hearings disclose what the Report conspicuously fails to do: roughly 60 of the 90 assassination witnesses who were asked by the Commission where they thought the shots came from pointed at this general area, not at the Depository. Significantly, the "consensus" that the shots had been fired from the Texas School Book Depository, was a consensus of police officers only.

All that has been known and discussed for years. What is entirely new, and puts things into a glaring light, is the official confirmation recently provided by District Attorney Garrison to the effect that the shots that killed Kennedy had been fired from the grassy knoll area.

An AP dispatch from New Orleans, dated May 22, 1967 - which all of the "responsible newspapers" in America and throughout the world managed to ignore - gave the following truly sensational details:

"District Attorney Jim Garrison said Sunday night Lee Harvey Oswald did not kill President John F. Kennedy and charged that the 'Central Intelligence Agency' is through devious ways and through intermediaries is actually paying lawyers to block the completion of his investigation of the Presidential assassination. Garrison... said of the CIA, 'what it's doing is a criminal act.'

"I And if the Director of the CIA and the top officials of the CIA were in the jurisdiction of Louisiana, I would charge them without hesitation," Garrison said in an interview with newsman Bob Jones on WWL-TV of New Orleans. The station presented an hour long documentary on Garrison's investigation Sunday night. The flamboyant Garrison, this city's unorthodox prosecutor for six years, told Jones he could include CIA director Richard Helms 'because he has to know what he is doing.'

" 'The Central Intelligence Agency began its criminal activities in my judgment' Garrison said, 'immediately after the assassination when they failed to reveal to the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its entirety what its activities were in New Orleans when Lee Oswald was working for it and it's compounded them since by essentially criminal activities by making every possible effort to block our investigation.'

"Asked if Oswald fired the fatal shots in Dallas, Garrison replied:

" 'No, Lee Harvey Oswald did not, did not even shoot President Kennedy. He did not fire a shot from the Book Depository Building... he did not touch a gun on that day. He was a decoy first, and then he was a patsy, and then he was a victim.'

"This is how Garrison answered the question about who did kill the President:

"Oh, I can who did without any question, except, and we know the group and we know some of the names of the group. But we don't know which one was standing where and we can't find out with the CIA keeping its vaults locked. They were former employees of the CIA. We managed to get the names of some of them in a way I can't describe here, but we cannot find out through any government agency where they are located now... and we have a stonewall there as far as the identification of the other individuals is concerned. But I can say the rest of them are Cubans who were training in New Orleans.

"Garrison said his investigation was now 'moving at a snail's pace,' but quickly added, 'It isn't that fatal a problem for us because the essential elements we have clarified a long time ago. I don't believe they can stop us. They can just delay us.'"

"A spokesman for the CIA said in Washington the organisation would have no comment to make on Garrison's remarks.

(Later dispatch): "Garrison said that Lee Harvey Oswald did not kill President John F. Kennedy and the CIA 'knows the name of every man involved and the names of the individuals who pulled the triggers from the grassy knoll and the stonewall area.'"

"Garrison went on: 'We have learned what happened. We have located photographs in which we have found the men behind the grassy knoll and stonewall before they dropped completely out of sight. There were five of them, three behind the stonewall and two behind the grassy knoll.'"

There is no "mystery of Dallas" left after these declarations. The facts are on the line, clear for all with eyes to see. Five CIA agents killed President Kennedy by firing from the grassy knoll and stonewall area. That's why all the doctors at Parkland Hospital had stated correctly that

the President had been shot from the front, not the rear. By the same token the "autopsy" at the Bethesda Naval Hospital has now been completely unmasked as the barefaced fraud I had already branded it in all my books on the subject.

Those five CIA-men were operating from grounds that had been closed to the public by the Dallas police. They could neither have entered the area nor vanished from it after the shooting without the active complicity of topranking Dallas police officers.

As a matter of fact, several policemen who were evidently not in the plot immediately ran to the parking lot behind the fence wherefrom shots had been fired. But they were promptly called off this chase by their superior officers and directed towards the Book Depository, as Seymour Weitzman, for one, has stated in his affidavit (see OSWALD: THE TRUTH).

The guilt of the Dallas police in helping to set up the Dealey Plaza ambush is as clear as the day. The guilt of the Secret Service - at any rate of some key members in the parade - is just as plain, for they had disregarded all warnings, had gone on a binge the night before, they saw none of the many violations of Service regulations staring in their faces, and they never riposted to the attack with a single shot.

The guilt of the CIA, which critics of the Warren Report could only surmise but not prove, has now been exposed in all its shame by District Attorney Garrison. And the guilt of the FBI in staging the most unscrupulous coverup in all police history cries out from every action and omission of theirs in the sham investigation they conducted after the assassination.

Three federal agencies, all under the direct control of Lyndon B. Johnson, are directly implicated in the "Crime of the Century," as instigators, accomplices and accessories after the fact. So is the Dallas police, tool of an oil-rich oligarchy with which Johnson has always had close and cordial ties.

His own guilt is the most conspicuous of them all. He had an overriding motive to get rid of the man who was blocking his accession to the presidency. Or rather, he had half a dozen strong motives, as set forth in Vol. I of the present report. His background shows him to have been, throughout his life, a tricky, treacherous, greedy individual, utterly devoid of scruples, whose way through life is accompanied, moreover, by more than a score of unaccountable deaths and unavenged murders, as has also been set forth in detail in Vol. I.

He failed conspicuously to take any action whatsoever to bring the murderers of President Kennedy to book. He ranted about a worldwide Communist conspiracy he could not substantiate and then betrayed his own fallacy when he failed to take any kind of counteraction. He propagated the threadbare Oswald Hoax with every means at his disposal and even went to the incredible length of forcing the Chief Justice of the United States to underwrite the greatest fraud and injustice ever committed on American soil.

Lyndon B. Johnson has been getting away with murder, in the most literal sense, far too long. But the day of reckoning is near. What millions of Americans already know or suspect is beginning to penetrate even the ranks of Congress, normally the most obdurate body in the United States. Pierre Salinger's five-thousand-dollar bet that Johnson won't run again in

1968, Senator Vance Hartke's "intuitive" prediction that LBJ will prefer to sit the next one out are only a few of many telltale straws-in-the-wind.

Johnson knows he is trapped. His predicament is of classic dimensions. If he chooses to be a candidate again, he risks exposure, if not by the Kennedy clan then by a determined Republican opponent, for, by the time he must make his choice, Garrison's inquiry will be far advanced. But if he does not make a desperate bid for five more years of power - for a "lame duck" President's last year in office does not count for much - he invites open disaster even before his present term runs out.

He may be impeached by Congress when eyes begin to open at last, but I doubt it. Johnson has too many Congressmen, and especially Senators, on a string, in both parties, to have to fear such a contingency. It is much more likely that his successor, whether he be another President Kennedy or an honest Republican like, say, Nelson Rockefeller, will reopen the Kennedy murder case and let justice take its course.

Garrison has stated, early in his inquiry, that in due course "every individual involved," including all accessories after the fact, would be arrested and brought to trial.

"The only way they can escape is to kill themselves," he added significantly. He wasn't just thinking of Dave Ferrie.

If Lyndon B. Johnson has any brains, he'll blow them out before the law gets around to him. That way he could at least escape the pinnacle of infamy and save his country from foundering in an abyss of national shame.

Author's permanent address: 87-70, 173rd Street, Jamaica 11432, New York City

Address of Peter Dawnay Ltd., publishers of OSWALD: THE TRUTH and MARINA
OSWALD: 13 Westmoreland Place, London S.W. 1, England