

Implications of the John F. Kennedy Assassination
for our Society

I extend warm thanks to the Women's International League for inviting me to speak to you today. The peace movement for almost eight years has failed to address itself to the crucial issue of why President John F. Kennedy was killed. Much valuable time has been lost, and it is becoming increasingly clear that our delay has cost mankind dearly. Now, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom is demonstrating its courage by exploring this vital question. Again, I thank you for this opportunity. I urge that you do not drop the question, for to do so is to abandon the serious quest for peace internationally and our search for domestic tranquility.

Since November 22, 1963, there has been almost endless research into the micro-analytic aspects of the assassination of President Kennedy. I have been among the earliest and guiltiest of the researchers in my protracted analyses of the shots, trajectories and wounds of the assassination. I suggest that the process of fact picking the assassination is not a source of pride for me but rather of guilt. While we have involved ourselves in the consuming preoccupation with the micro-analytic searching for facts of how the assassination was accomplished, there has been almost no systematic thinking on why President Kennedy was killed. We have neglected this essential work of constructing a model of explanation which fits the data of the assassination and explains the why of it.

One who takes the trouble to study the micro-analytic material provided by the federal government must immediately conclude that there was a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy. How foolish it was of us to dwell so long on these governmentally

SPEECH BY VINCENT SALANDRIA
TO WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE & FREEDOM
OCTOBER 23, 1971 CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

9

supplied pacifiers, rather than to put them aside and undertake the serious work of constructing a model of explanation. In this connection it is important to take note that the very agency which made that mass of detailed microanalytic evidence available to us--the federal government--contended from the first that there was no conspiracy. But, if the federal government's intelligence agencies must have known that the material which the government issued would indicate a conspiracy existed, then why did we get the evidence? This proposition presents a serious theoretical problem. Why would the federal government on the one hand wish to provide us with data which prove a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy while simultaneously contending on the other that there was no conspiracy?

So overwhelming and voluminous is the evidence of conspiracy provided for us by the government that we are compelled to conclude that if not the, at least a number of possible plots, were meant by the conspirators to be quasi visible. The federal government has deluged us with evidence that cries out conspiracy. Another theoretical problem confronts us. If the killers were positioned in the highest echelons of the federal governmental apparatus, and by the assassination they had finally usurped the pinnacle of governmental power, then why did they not conceal the conspiracy? For, if they had accomplished a coup, they could have exercised their control by concealing evidence of conspiracy. But this coup was covert. The people would not have tolerated an overt coup against such a beloved man as President John F. Kennedy. Because of the covertness of the coup, I submit that the new governmental rulers were eager to reveal their work at differing levels of certainty to diverse people and at different times. Thus, they could avert a concerted counter thrust to their illegitimate seizure of power. Democratic forces could

not unite against the new illegitimate governmental apparatus. The insights of what had occurred dawned in the minds of the decent citizenry at different times and with different degrees of clarity. The transparent aspects of the conspiracy were permitted to flash signals to various elements of our population much in the fashion of spot ads slanted at different times for selected audiences. The new rulers carefully and selectively orchestrated revelations of their bloody work so as to gain therefrom the deference to which they felt they were entitled by their ascendancy to absolute power. I have long felt that the killers actually preempted the assassination criticism by supplying the information they wanted revealed and also by supplying the critics whom they wanted to disclose the data. Does it not make sense that if they could perpetrate a coup and could control the press they would have endeavored to dominate likewise the assassination criticism? But the full explanation of this thesis must await another occasion. Invite me back and I will develop this idea and name names.

Let us examine this thesis of a transparent conspiracy which was in large part inspired by and formulated with the invaluable assistance of my good friend, Professor Thomas Katen of Philadelphia. You who have seen the Zapruder film know that it provides powerful evidence for the support of a hit on the President by an assassin positioned in front of Kennedy and not behind him where Oswald was at the time of the shooting. You would also learn, if you studied this film more carefully, that the strike on Governor Connolly was accomplished by a separate bullet from any which impacted on the President. Even more careful analysis of the Zapruder film would reveal four separate and horrible bullet strikes on Kennedy. Now, the federal government was in possession of that film on the day of the assassination and was in a better position than you or I to know

(4)

what the film revealed. Yet, despite this evidence and other most impressive data indicating a conspiracy, the government seized upon Oswald as the lone assassin. At the official public level the government in its adherence to the single assassin cover story strained logic and refused to take seriously Newtonian laws of physics. But, at a more sophisticated level, the same government knew that anyone who accepted the Newtonian laws of motion would eventually have to conclude that President Kennedy was killed by a multi-assassin ambush.

Where evidence of a conspiracy with respect to the Kennedy assassination surfaced--and much did--thanks in the main to the government's disclosures, that same government from the very first and continuously to date has publicly refused to act on those data. Wherever any suggestion of evidence, no matter how thoroughly ludicrous and incredible--and much of the lone assassin evidence did violence to common sense--the federal government publicly and most solemnly declared those data veracious. The unvarying governmental pattern of consistently publicly supporting the lone assassin myth and equally uniformly rejecting the irrefutable conspiracy evidence was too studied to be the function of mere bureaucratic stupidity or accident. I suggest that this uniform governmental pattern did not speak to official innocence or ignorance but rather to the guilt of the government at the very highest eschelons.

I query further whether this systematic behavioral pattern when persisted in by the government in a wreckless and apparently unskeptical manner was not meant to communicate to the citizenry what really happened to its President and what was in store for any quixotic citizens who saw fit to oppose the new rulers of our land? Those who saw the Zapruder film know that the government could not have been innocent of knowledge of a conspiracy. If you are tempted to want to believe that

our leaders are just ignorant and capable of unremitting blundering, I urge that you abandon any such illusion. The peace movement learned the hard way that it is naive to imagine that our government is capable of unrelieved error. Some of us in the peace movement thought that the course in Vietnam could be altered by pointing out to our rulers the mistake of becoming increasingly involved militarily in that unhappy land. But our rulers would not alter their course because their intentions were fixed and not responsive to the public will. To picture our government as always well-intentioned but consistently misinformed does not comport with reality.

Those of us who had taken care to study the assassination knew too well and immediately that Tonkin Gulf never happened except in the vivid imaginations of our governmental incident arrangers. So, too, it would be naive for the assassination researchers to think that we caught the government again and again with its guard down, and that we had outsmarted the Commission and all of the investigating agencies of the government which aided it. It should have occurred earlier to the assassination researchers that the government never wanted its guard up. It had a need to exercise a certain amount of exhibitionism in order for the coup to be recognized in the proper quarters. In my judgment, the assassination critics came up by and large with that assassination conspiracy evidence which our new rulers wanted us to discover. We should have broken early and cleanly from the microanalytic or nit-picking approach in the assassination inquiry. We should have immediately undertaken the vital work of developing an adequate model of explanation in order to pursue the reasons for the assassination. We are here and now belatedly beginning this vital work.

I have heard it argued that the silence of the Kennedy family supports the single-assassin myth. But the Kennedy family knows how overwhelming and transparently clear the conspiracy evidence is. Can there be an explanation for this silence other than that the assassination was the act of the very highest pinnacle of American governmental power? The taciturnity of the Kennedy family does not and cannot speak to the lack of conspiracy evidence. Rather that evidence stands on its own merits--massively and indestructably. If we were to posit arguendo a low level conspiracy, then the Kennedy family silence would indeed be inexplicable. But, is that silence of the Kennedys--when juxtaposed against the irrefutable conspiracy evidence--not their mute acknowledgement that the assassination was perpetrated by our new rulers who possess awesome power which dwarfs that of the Kennedy family? So the silence of the Kennedy family rather than refuting a conspiracy tends to reinforce the feeling that all Americans entertain at some level of consciousness--what we sense and what the rest of the world knows--that the killing of Kennedy represented a coup d'état.

Once we are compelled to the conclusion that the American government destroyed its own chief of state, we are directed to the specific question of which segment of the federal government was involved? To answer this question we perforce raise still other questions. Which agency would have thought to touch every ideological base in order to intimidate all ideologists in America thereby dissuading them from delving too deeply into the meaning of the assassination? Which agency would think of structuring into the assassination cover story ideological elements which would tend to have the society divide against itself? Which police agency would derive benefit from making the Dallas police, and by extension all local police forces, look bad? Which agency would get pleasure out of having the

Secret Service criticized? Which agency would benefit from having the FBI placed in the silly position of turning in reports to the Warren Commission which contradicted the findings of the Warren Report/^{while} at the same time illogically conceding that those same findings were correct? Which agency was itself non-ideological enough, and yet so ideologically sophisticated, as to interweave into the Oswald assassination fabric all possible features of the American political left and right? Which agency could have arranged for Oswald to establish membership or contact with the Communist Party and the FBI--the anti-Communist Socialist Labor Party and the Soviet Union--the ACLU and the ultra right in Dallas--Fair Play for Cuba Committee and General Edwin Walker--the Socialist Workers Party and the American oil interests--the Cuban Government and the United States Marines--and finally the American Friends and the Soviet secret police?

Shall we enumerate the agencies who are candidates for having accomplished this brilliant charade? How about J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI? It is not plausible that the Federal Bureau of Investigation--if it had been involved in the assassination planning--would have chosen as a patsy a person who the attorney general of Texas would indicate immediately after the killing was a paid FBI informer. And if J. Edgar Hoover had effectuated the coup, then how could we explain that immediately after the assassination, and persisting through today, there has been a yelping in the land for Mr. Hoover's scalp? If J. Edgar Hoover were the new ruling tyrant, there would be far more reluctance on the part of our cowardly government officials and the media to take him on. No, I think that we can say with surety that the FBI did not kill President Kennedy.

Could the left have killed our President? Is it possible to believe our militarist^s, our anti-communist politicians and our communications media would have concealed evidence of a

conspiracy to kill Kennedy had such a conspiracy been or had the slightest chance of having been communist inspired?

✓
Could the right have killed John Kennedy? Would Earl Warren have covered for and surrendered his credentials for the political non-governmental right and/or oil interests? There were liberals on the Commission and its staff. Liberals have been known to play the game in covering for state crimes, but for them to cover for the extra-governmental right in matters of assassination is for them to sign their own death warrants. It would also make no sense for the right to kill Kennedy in an ultra right city such as Dallas. To do so would be to impute blame to the right.

Were President Johnson and his friends the killers? Again, it would be impossible to conceive of President Johnson and his Texas cronies arranging to have the President killed in their own baliwick where the world's suspicions would be directed against them. No, there is absolutely no evidence that President Johnson was involved in this assassination.

Was the American military on its own capable of this degree of sophistication? It does seem rather beyond the intelligence of the American military to have accomplished this crime alone. But it is not irresponsible to conceive of the American military as having been involved in a plot to eliminate Kennedy to ensure the continuation of the Cold War. Kennedy himself did not regard a military take-over as implausible. We have an excellent articulation of his feeling on this matter in a discussion with Paul B. Fay, Jr.¹ This colloquy occurred one summer weekend in 1962 on the Honey Fitz, the Kennedy yacht.

¹
Fay, Paul B. Jr., The Pleasure of His Company (New York, Harper & Row, 1966), p. 190.

The President was asked what he thought of the possibility of a military take-over in the United States. The discussion grew out of the book Seven Days in May by Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey.

President Kennedy said: "It's possible. It could happen in this country, but the conditions would have to be just right."

The conditions outlined by the President were as follows:

1. The country would have to be led by a young President.
2. There would be a Bay of Pigs.
3. Military criticism of the President would follow.
4. Then, if there were another Bay of Pigs, the military would consider overthrowing the elected establishment, and finally,
5. "...if there were a third Bay of Pigs, it could happen."

Mr. Fay concluded this episode by describing how the President "pausing long enough for all of us to assess the significance of his comment, ...concluded with an old Navy phrase, 'But it won't happen on my watch.'"

These conditions were approximated during the Kennedy administration. President Kennedy was in fact a young President. There was a Bay of Pigs. The missile crisis which followed resulted not in the bombing of Cuba--as the military advisors had urged upon the President--but rather in a detente with Russia. This was followed by a nuclear test ban treaty which "...the Joint Chiefs of Staff declared themselves opposed to under almost any terms."

Hearing Notes of the Warren Commission, Vol. II, p. 371

The American University speech following his reexamination of the Vietnamese policy completely fulfilled the conditions set forth by President Kennedy for a take-over to happen on his watch.

There is much evidence to indicate military involvement in the assassination. There was the startling and incriminating action of the then Commander James J. Humes, the head of the Navy Bethesda autopsy team, who took and burned the original autopsy notes. The autopsy was under the control of an army general who was not trained in medicine. The autopsy was never completed. The findings of the autopsy were contrary to the findings of the non-military physicians at Parkland Hospital. The pathologists were directed not to look at the Kennedy neck wound. The x-rays were never turned over to the Commission by the military.

The burning of the notes by Commander Humes did not deter the military from promoting him to Captain.

Although at the time of the assassination the interests of the CIA and the military coincided, now evidence of a CIA-military rift abounds. The Boston Globe of July 20, 1971 stated that the Pentagon Papers revealed that "one agency...comes out... with a record for calling its shots. correctly." So Ellsberg did not do badly by his "ex" employer. The Boston Globe of July 3 offered an item which indicates the "ex" Pentagon people are hitting back at the "ex" CIA Ellsberg. "A former Pentagon liaison officer with the Central

1 Hearing Notes of the Warren Commission, Vol. XVII, p. 48.

2 State of Louisiana v. Clay L. Shaw, Testimony of Pierre A. Finck, February 24, 1967, pp. 48-9.

3 Ibid.

4

Intelligence Agency said in London that President Kennedy engendered the hate of the CIA by trying to curb the agency's power. He also said he did not think Lee Harvey Oswald "by himself killed President Kennedy."

"L. Fletcher Prouty, a retired Air Force colonel and the director of special operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1962 and 1963, said Kennedy issued two directives in 1961 to limit the CIA's power but the documents never surfaced and were not implemented."

Jack Anderson on April 21, 1971 said:

"International espionage is seldom as efficient as the inter-departmental spying that goes on in Washington.

"...the Central Intelligence Agency never makes a move without the Defense Intelligence Agency keeping close surveillance.

"...Government agencies, in the best cloak-and-dagger tradition, snoop upon one another."¹

I view the American military's motive for involving itself in the killing of Kennedy as pervertedly patriotic in nature. But at that period of time, there was, as we will demonstrate, a congruence of interests between the American military and the CIA. Kennedy was the enemy of both power groups at the time he was killed. Of late, with the issuance of the Pentagon Papers by a long-standing CIA agent, Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, this alliance between the CIA and the military seems to have become strained. Dr. Ellsberg was one of the exclusive Society of Fellows at Harvard with McGeorge Bundy and his brother William.² When Ellsberg leaked the documents, he was employed at MIT's Center for International Studies and numbered among his colleagues Mr. William Bundy. In my assassination research, I learned

¹
The Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, April 21, 1971,

(12)

that ex-CIA people who undertook work to assist the research on the Kennedy assassination invariably turned out to be present CIA people. I would urge that the public remain skeptical about Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, the ex-marine, ex-CIA, ex-hawk, ex-Kissinger aide and present fellow researcher of Mr. William Bundy at MIT.¹ I would urge that you hold open the hypothesis that the Pentagon papers are designed as a thrust against the military by the CIA. I suggest that there has been a falling out between both of these anti-democratic power blocs. The military is still determined to defeat Communism abroad, and the CIA is now primarily concerned with maintaining its power domestically. How can we accept the Pentagon Papers as an honest and complete peering into the inner workings of our government? These papers predate and postdate November 22, 1963. Yet, these papers make no reference to the assassination and the enormous power and policy shift which occurred on that historical day when the republic expired. Can the purpose of the disclosures of the Pentagon papers really be to aid the CIA non-ideological elements in our government against the right wing, military, virulently anti-communist elements? Does not the evidence offered to support the existence of a present rift between the CIA and the military not support the concept that the Pentagon Papers were the offerings of the CIA to enlist assistance in its intra-governmental struggle against the military? And should decent, freedom-loving constitutionalists join either power bloc or rather use this fortuitious rift to benefit freedom in this society and in the rest of the world by denouncing both cliques as the enemies of humankind?

Well, then, we are reduced by the process of elimination to the question of whether the CIA was the prime mover in the killing of Kennedy. Was the CIA sophisticated enough to have

(TE)

run Oswald across the whole gamut of political ideology in America in order to place all ideologists on the defensive as possible suspects and in order to insure that the nation would be divided ideologically so that there could be no coalescence of forces which would seek retribution for the killing? We will now examine the question of whether the CIA was the specific federal agency which was the prime mover in the killing of President Kennedy.

After the assassination of President Kennedy, the government which had refused to act on conspiracy evidence resorted to amazingly fast action in an area where one might have anticipated a slow feeling of the way. The fact is that after the assassination, key foreign policy changes were put into effect immediately. Before the assassination, thanks to President Kennedy, we were on a course which could have ended the Cold War. That course was described by D.F. Flemming as follows:

"Fortunately, we had in President Kennedy at a new turning point in history a leader with both vision and courage. He had made certain that there were no missile gaps against us. He had won the acclaim of the West by the way he successfully played showdown nuclear politics in the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. He had faced the last of man's ultimate decisions on earth.

"Then, in the summer of 1963, Kennedy turned his face resolutely toward life and unmistakably signaled the end of the Cold War. Behind the patriotic facades of nuclear militarism, he saw the death of his own children and of all children. In a series of magnificent addresses, he urged us to reconsider our attitudes toward peace, the Soviet Union, and the Cold War. He won a treaty ending atomic testing above ground and then paused to wait a little for the more embattled of his cold-war compatriots to catch up with the times.

"At that moment, he was struck down..."¹

Drew Pearson, in his Washington Merry-Go-Round column of January 23, 1963, outlined the crossroad at which President Kennedy and humanity had arrived at that critical time:

¹ Flemming, D.F., "The Costs and Consequences of the Cold War," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, 1966, p. 137.

14

"President Kennedy today faces his greatest opportunity to negotiate a permanent peace, but because of division inside his own Administration he may miss the boat.

"That is the consensus of friendly diplomats long trained in watching the ebb and flow of world events..."

Here are the reasons why Mr. Kennedy is now sitting on top of the diplomatic world.

President Kennedy knew that his efforts to end the Cold War were dangerous to his life. In this regard I quote Arthur Schlesinger:

"...when he saw Nixon after the Bay of Pigs he said, 'If I do the right kind of a job I don't know whether I am going to be here four years from now.... If someone is going to kill me,' he would say, 'they are going to kill me.'"¹

President Kennedy saw the danger to his efforts to end the Cold War which lay in the power of the CIA. So the New York Times quoted him as saying, that he wished "to splinter the CIA into 1,000 pieces and scatter it to the winds..."²

But that purpose was never accomplished by President Kennedy. The CIA is a policy making body still. Eugene McCarthy is of this opinion. I quote him as follows:

"The general evidence is that in addition to gathering and interpreting information, the CIA does play an important part in influencing foreign policy, and certainly has become an important operating arm of the executive branch in this area of government responsibility."³

Andrew Tully states the position of the Kennedy administration with respect to the CIA after the Bay of Pigs:

¹ Schlesinger, Arthur M., Op. Cit., pp. 738-9.

² The New York Times (April 25, 1966), p. 20, col. 3.

³ McCarthy, Eugene J., The Limits of Power (New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), p. 91.

(13)

"The official concern, then, was not so much that the CIA had bungled in the past, but that it either had been entrusted with or had seized the broad responsibility for making policy which belonged to the State Department."

"...during most of Eisenhower's tenure, his Secretary of State was John Foster Dulles, and John Foster relied much more heavily on brother Allen's estimates than he did on the reports from his ambassadors. In effect, Brother John Foster made of Brother Allen's CIA a kind of super Foreign Service and apparently found nothing incongruous in the fact that in some embassies CIA personnel outnumbered Foreign Service employes. It was small wonder that the average citizen was confused, after Cuba, as to who was making foreign policy for the United States. Some top drawer members of the Washington diplomatic community were just as confused..."¹

After the Bay of Pigs, President Kennedy accepted the resignation of the head of the CIA, Allen Dulles. He had called in Dulles, Cabell and Bissell and told them that the three would have to be replaced. "Under the British system," he said, "I would have to go. But under our system I'm afraid it's got to be you."² But Allen Dulles was to return to government service immediately after the killing of President Kennedy. He appeared as one of the Warren Commissioners. Let us see whether the father of the CIA served the people and the search for truth concerning the death of the departed President, or whether he served the interests of the intelligence communities not only in the United States but in the Soviet Union as well.

On January 21, 1964, in a secret executive session, the Warren Commission had to deal with the problem of Marina Oswald giving evidence that Oswald was a Soviet agent.³ Senator Richard

¹
Tully, Andrew, CIA--The Inside Story (Greenwich, Conn., A Fawcett Crest Book, 1962), pp. 208-9.

²
Alsop, Stewart, The Center (New York, Harper & Row, 1968), p. 229.

³
Document Addendum to the Warren Report (El Segundo.

Russell said: "That will blow the lid if she testifies to that."¹
And so it would have. How did the Commission deal with that problem?
Well, we learn from the transcript of the secret executive session
that Isaac Don Levine was helping Marina Oswald write a story for
Life Magazine which never got published. Allen Dulles, the origi-
nal director of the Central Intelligence Agency who was fired from
his position by President Kennedy, decided to see Levine. Dulles
said simply: "I can get him in and have a friendly talk. I have
known him."² Does that not sound like Allen Dulles was contemplat-
ing subornation of perjury?

Perhaps you will remember Isaac Don Levine from his
central role in the Hiss case. I quote Whitaker Chambers as he
described in his book, Witness, how Levine nursed him through his
uncertainty about launching into his allegations against Mr.
Alger Hiss. I quote:

"The meeting was arranged by Isaac Don Levine...
For years, he has carried on against Communism a
kind of private war which is also a public service.
He is a skillful professional journalist and a
notable 'ghost.' It was Levine who led Jan Valtin
out of the editorial night and he was working with
General Kritsky on I Was in Stalin's Secret Service
when, sometime in 1938, I met both men.

"From the first, Levine had urged me to take my
story to the proper authorities. I had said no.
...When he proposed that he arrange a meeting at
which I might tell my story directly to President
Roosevelt, I was reassured."³

¹
Document Addendum to the Warren Report, Op. Cit., p. 200.

²
Loc. Cit.

³
Chambers, Whitaker, Witness (New York, Random House,
1952), p. 457.

And why was a Cold War warrior like Isaac Don Levine not interested in raising the specter of a political assassination by the left? Why was the idea of a leftist conspiracy unthinkable in the Cold War America where for twenty-five years a virtual paranoia concerning communist plotting had prevailed? Yet there was--as we have seen--some evidence of a leftist conspiracy, and it was not acted upon. Why not? What caused our government at the public level to be so immediately and permanently wedded to the lone assassin myth?

And so we are introduced through the transcript of this secret executive session to a new ghostly role for the literary ghost, Isaac Don Levine. Levine, through the intervention of his friend, Allen Dulles, apparently was successful in erasing from the prospective sworn testimony of Marina Oswald any references to Soviet intelligence connections with Oswald. The intelligence communities across iron curtain lines apparently cooperate to keep the truth from their peoples.

Do you think it irrational to suggest that the Soviet and American intelligences cooperated in the American governmental game of killing the President? Could an intelligence assassination have been perpetrated against the head of the American state unless the Soviet intelligence services could have been counted on to remain silent?

How did the Soviet government respond to the assassination of President Kennedy? Khrushchev, with whom Kennedy was working to effectuate the end of the Cold War, was duly deposed. I submit that if the Cold War had been genuinely adversary in nature there could not have been an intelligence assassination of Kennedy by either the American or the Soviet intelligence agencies. I don't see the Cold War as authentic. Rather I view it as a cooperative effort to foist on both the American and Russian

... .. on enormous military-intelligence budget

Senator Richard Russell was correct in being disturbed by Marina Oswald's prospective revelations about possible Soviet intelligence connections with Oswald. And therefore Allen Dulles quieted the matter with a discussion with Isaac Don Levine, a writer on intelligence and a Cold/^{War}warrior par excellence. Levine was the author of The Mind of An Assassin, a book that described the killing of Leon Trotsky by Stalin's intelligence. It is interesting that Levine's name, which has been so much associated with the study of political assassinations, was never mentioned by the American press as having been associated with Marina Oswald. It is also interesting that this expert on political assassinations never, to my knowledge, wrote for publication a single article on the Kennedy assassination. Was his function something other than that of a literary ghost? Was Levine assigned to Marina by the government to provide whatever testimony suited the political exigencies? Allen Dulles did not tell how ^{he} ~~it~~ had come to know Levine. Was it through intelligence work?

Now, let us shift our attention from Mr. Intelligence, Allen Dulles, brother of John Foster, to Mr. Intelligent, McGeorge Bundy, and his intelligence brother, William Bundy. For McGeorge Bundy's roles in the governmental apparatus before and after the assassination are worthy of study, and William Bundy's services in and out of the CIA are also of interest to us.

With the Kennedy Administration, McGeorge Bundy was in foreign policy a hard-liner who had little use for Adlai Stevenson's idealistic approach to foreign relations. ¹ McGeorge Bundy was one of the planners of the Bay of Pigs invasion. ² Allen Dulles was in

¹ Walton, Richard J., The Remnants of Power (New York, Coward-McCann, Inc., 1968), p. 19.

² Alsop, Stewart, Op. Cit., pp. 222-3.

Puerto Rico, so Richard Mervin Bissell, Jr. was the CIA's man in charge of the planning.¹ As happenstance would have it, McGeorge Bundy, the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs, had been a student of Bissell's at Yale. He also had worked for Bissell on the Marshall Plan in 1948.² Also in on that planning, as coincidence would have it, was General Charles P. Cabell, the CIA's deputy director, who is brother of Mayor Earle Cabell, the Mayor of Dallas at the time of the assassination. McGeorge Bundy was--in the Kennedy and early Johnson Administration--the presidential representative and key man on the Special Group which makes the key intelligence decisions for the country. It has operated as the hidden power center of the government.³

As one of the planners for the Bay of Pigs, McGeorge Bundy must take some blame for not serving President Kennedy well and participating in the betrayal of the President in the Bay of Pigs planning operation. Schlesinger discusses that betrayal as follows:

"Moreover, if worst came to worst and the invaders were beaten on the beaches, then, Dulles and Bissell said, they could easily 'melt away' into the mountains. ...But the CIA exposition was less than candid both in implying that the Brigade had undergone guerrilla training...and in suggesting the existence of an easy escape hatch. ...the Escambray Mountains lay eighty miles from the Bay of Pigs, across a hopeless tangle of swamps and jungles... the CIA agents in Guatemala were saying nothing to the Cubans about this last resort of flight to the hills..."⁴

But, despite Bundy's complicity with the CIA, which resulted in misleading the President in the Bay of Pigs, Kennedy

¹ Wise, David and Ross, Thomas R., The Invisible Government (New York, Random House, 1964), p. 21.

² Loc. Cit.

³ Wise, David and Ross, Thomas R., Op. Cit., pp. 260-1.

⁴

turned over the direction of Vietnam policy largely to Bundy, along with Rusk, McNamara and Rostow. The best we can say for McGeorge Bundy's handling of Vietnam for President Kennedy was that he botched. Here is what Schlesinger said about Kennedy's feeling concerning the Vietnamese policy:

"He was somber and shaken. I had not seen him so depressed since the Bay of Pigs. No doubt he realized Viet Nam was his great failure in foreign policy, and that he had never really given it his full attention."¹

The announced intention of Kennedy as stated on October 2, 1963 by McNamara and Taylor was to withdraw most U.S. forces from South Vietnam by the end of 1965.² But that was not McGeorge Bundy's policy--and President Kennedy was soon to die--and McGeorge Bundy would be carrying on his hawkish concepts in playing a key role in shaping the aggressive foreign policy of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

What was McGeorge Bundy doing on the day President Kennedy was dispatched? Theodore H. White in his book, The Making of the President, 1964, tells us that the Presidential party on its flight back to Washington on that fateful day "learned that there was no conspiracy, learned of the identify of Oswald and his arrest..."³ This was the very first announcement of Oswald as the lone assassin. Oswald was not even charged with assassinating the President until 1:30 A. M. the next morning. The plane landed at 5:59 P. M. on the 22nd. At that time the District Attorney of Dallas, Henry Wade, was informing us that "preliminary

¹ The New York Times, November 25, 1965.

² Schlesinger, Arthur M., "A Middle Way Out of Vietnam," New York Times Magazine, Sept. 18, 1966, p. 114.

³ White, Theodore, The Making of the President, 1964 (New York, Atheneum, 1965), p. 48.

reports indicated more than one person was involved in the shooting...the electric chair is too good for the killers." ¹ Can there be any doubt that for any government taken by surprise by the assassination--and legitimately seeking the truth concerning it--prior to six o'clock on the day of the assassination was too soon to know there was no conspiracy? This announcement was the first which designated Oswald as the lone assassin. Who was responsible for that announcement? That announcement came from the White House Situation Room. Under whose direct control was the White House Situation Room? The Situation Room was under personal and direct control of McGeorge Bundy. I do readily concede that Mr. McGeorge Bundy is a most intelligent man. Joseph Kraft, a well known American political writer, said of Mr. Bundy in 1965 in Harper's:

"His capacity to read the riddle of multiple confusions, to consider a wide variety of possibilities, to develop lines of action, to articulate and execute public purposes, to impart quickened energies to men of the highest ability seems almost alone among contemporaries..."²

John F. Kennedy shared this view of Bundy's intelligence ³ for in speaking of him he said, "You just can't beat brains." McGeorge Bundy himself is not known for his modesty on the question of his intelligence. He was reported to have been "mildly miffed" when a Kennedy aide quoted the President as remarking that Bundy was the smartest man he knew next to Ormsley Gore, a British diplomat..⁴

¹ Dallas Morning News, November 23, 1963.

² Halberstam, David, "The Very Expensive Education of McGeorge Bundy," Harper's, July, 1969, p. 22.

³ Loc. cit.

⁴ Tully, Andrew, White Tie and Dagger (New York, William

So, then, Mr. Bundy--this man of brains--this coordinator of intelligence for President Kennedy--had reason to know that his Situation Room's announcement of Oswald as the lone assassin on the afternoon of November 22, 1963, before there was any evidence against Oswald, was premature. Make no mistake about it. Bundy, who had been in the Pentagon¹ when the announcement of the assassination was issued, spent that fateful afternoon in the Situation Room. Jim Bishop tells how President Johnson was--while on Air Force One flying back to Washington-- "...phoning McGeorge Bundy in the White House Situation Room every few minutes."²

I urge upon you the idea that McGeorge Bundy, when that announcement was issued from his Situation Room, had reason to know that the true meaning of such a message when conveyed to the Presidential party on Air Force One was not the ostensible message which was being communicated. Rather, I submit that Bundy, with "his capacity to read the riddle of multiple confusions, to consider a wide variety of possibilities" was really conveying to the Presidential party the thought that Oswald was being designated the lone assassin before any evidence against him was ascertainable. As a central coordinator of intelligence services, Bundy in transmitting such a message through the Situation Room was really telling the Presidential party that an unholy marriage had taken place between the U.S. Governmental intelligence services and the lone assassin theory. Was he not telling the Presidential party peremptorily, "Now, here this! Oswald is the assassin, the sole assassin. Evidence is not available yet.

¹ Henderson, Bruce and Summerlin, Sam, 1:33 In Memoriam: John F. Kennedy (New York, Cowles, 1968), p. 95.

² Bishop, Jim, The Day Kennedy Was Shot (New York, Funk & Wagnalls 1968) p. 257

Evidence will be obtained or in lieu thereof evidence will be damned. This is a crucial matter of state that cannot await evidence. Intelligence has spoken, You, there, mere President, and therefore dispatchable stuff, and you the underlings of a deposed President, heed the message well. The President and Presidency are dead." Was not Bundy's Situation Room serving an Orwellian double-think function?

And, so, it came to pass that Bundy's Situation Room knew well whereof it spoke. For the federal government remained wedded to the lone assassin myth in spite of the absence of evidence to support the proposition, and in the face of irrefutable proof which would demolish it as a rational idea.

The Presidential party which also numbered among it men of brains apparently got the message. None, to my knowledge, has undertaken to express a single public doubt as to the veracity of the lone assassin theory, yet seeds of doubt grew to mountainous dimensions among the less intimidated elements of the population who did not seek to retain trappings of power. Don't interpret the lack of expressed skepticism among the Presidential party as evidence of their stupidity. On the contrary, their silence speaks more of their strong instincts of self-preservation and their penchant for governmental careers rather than lack of intelligence.

Please keep in mind that some among that Presidential party had no need to see the Zapruder film. They had on that fateful day witnessed first hand the bloody horror of the multi-assassin ambush. Doubts as to the veracity of the single assassin story were more likely to give way to certainty of conspiracy in their minds. The message of Bundy's Situation Room was necessary to dispel other doubts. Perhaps some of the Presidential party were given to misread the situation and were

laboring under the belief that some sharp shooting nuts had gotten lucky in Dealey Plaza and that punishment was in order. Bundy's Situation Room was putting them straight. Through that announcement it became clear to all in that Presidential party who could think that the assassins, if madmen they were, were highly placed in the pinnacle of power of the intelligence community of the United States government and that punishment was out of the question.

So, McGeorge Bundy was quite busy on November 22, 1963. After having spent a good deal of time on the telephone with President Johnson as Johnson was flying to Washington, he managed to be at the new President's side when Air Force One landed.¹ He was seen with Lyndon B. Johnson when the President emerged from the South Lawn of the White House.² History records that Bundy remained with President Johnson to be designated by him as one of the three leading hawks of the Johnson Administration.³

What was the future to hold for the United States following the assassination of President Kennedy? What changed? The most important and immediate change following the assassination of President Kennedy occurred precisely in the area of foreign policy. The Cold War warriors of the Bundy brothers' stripe gained a stranglehold on the foreign policy of the nation much in the same fashion that Allen and John Foster^{Dulles} had in an earlier administration. Of course, to note such a change is not to prove it was a deliberate consequence of the assassination. Yet, a careful examination of foreign policy following the killing of Kennedy is required to see whether the change might have been related to the killing of the President.

¹ Bishop, Jim, Op. Cit., p. 413.

² Ibid., p. 428.

³ Evans, Rowland and Novak, Robert, Lyndon B. Johnson:

The book The Politics of Escalation in Vietnam has the following to say about the change:

"Three weeks after the assassination, on December 19 and 20, 1963, McNamara and CIA Chief John A. McCone visited Saigon to evaluate the war efforts of the new Saigon government. McNamara told the junta leaders that the United States was prepared to help... as long as aid was needed."¹

"...the United States had made the crucial decision to reverse the policy, announced during the last day of President Kennedy's administration, of gradually withdrawing U.S. troops from South Vietnam. Was it all a coincidence that a change in leadership in Washington was followed by a change in policy, and a change in policy by a corresponding change in Saigon's government?"²

That there should have been a change in Vietnamese policy so immediately after the murder of Kennedy when the external situation in Vietnam did not evoke it raises serious questions about what caused it in our internal situation. What is at stake here is the issue not of how the assassination was accomplished, but the fundamental question concerning why it was done and which elements are behind it. At issue are questions of war and peace that involve the whole of humanity. For the peace movement not to raise these questions is and has been irresponsible.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the definite and deliberate policy of militarization of this country was quickly put into action immediately after the death of President Kennedy. There was no evidence of governmental traumatization, but rather a most efficient and abrupt movement to military policies.

McGeorge Bundy and his brother, William, continued to help shape the foreign policy of the Johnson Administration.

¹
The New York Times, January 2, 1964, p. 7.

²
Schurmann, Franz; Scott, Peter Dale; and Zelnik, [unclear]
The Politics of Escalation in Vietnam (Greenwich, Conn

McGeorge Bundy became part of Johnson's Tuesday lunch arrangement which was in fact the National Security Council, Johnson style.¹

Bundy did most of the foreign policy coordinating for Johnson in the early part of his administration.² It was McGeorge Bundy who by happenstance was in South Vietnam when Pleiku was shelled.

After an inspection of the Pleiku base, he recommended to President Johnson instant retaliation. He urged upon the President a steady program of bombing the North, which recommendation was followed with horrendous consequences to peace.³

In the Gulf of Tonkin farce, Bundy was full of admiration for Johnson's decisiveness. Bundy said to friends that he had "...never seen a man who knew so clearly what he wanted to do or so exactly how to go about it."⁴

Ultimately, the Bundy brothers gave up their titular positions in government. McGeorge Bundy became President of the Ford Foundation. William Bundy joined the Center for International Studies at MIT.

Let us not imagine that these two architects of the Vietnamese War by taking on these new positions abandoned their penchant for power. Nor were the Bundy brothers retreating far from government in assuming these positions. David Horowitz said the following about the interlocking aspects of the CIA and the private foundations:

¹ Alsop, Stewart, Op. Cit., p. 279.

² Weintal, Edward and Bartlett, Charles, Facing the Brink (New York, Scribner's Sons, 1967), p. 155.

³ Kraslow, David and Loory, Stuart H., The Secret Search for Peace in Vietnam (New York, Random House, 1968), p. 114.

⁴ Bell, Jack, The Johnson Treatment (New York, Harper & Row, 1965), p. 195.

"It should be noted in passing that the congeniality of foundation-dominated scholarship to the CIA reflects the harmony of interest between the upper-class captains of the CIA and the upper-class trustees of the great foundations. The interconnections are too extensive to be recounted here, but the Bundy brothers (William, CIA; McGeorge, Ford) and Chadbourne Gilpatric, OSS and CIA from 1943 to 1949, Rockefeller Foundation from 1949 on, can be taken as illustrative. Richard Bissell, the genius of the Bay of Pigs (and brother-in-law of Philip Mosely of Columbia's Russian Institute), reversed the usual sequence, going from Ford to the CIA."¹

As for William Bundy's respite from the CIA and his State Department career, David Horowitz feels that the MIT Center is not in the least removed from the grip of the CIA:

"MIT's Advisory Board on Soviet Bloc Studies, for example, was composed of these four academic luminaries: Charles Bohlen of the State Department, Allen Dulles of the CIA, Philip E. Mosely of Columbia's Russian Institute and Leslie G. Stevens, a retired vice admiral of the U.S. Navy.

"If the MIT Center seemed to carry to their logical conclusion the on-campus extension programs of the State Department and the CIA, that was perhaps because it was set up directly with CIA funds under the guiding hand of Professor W. W. Rostow, former OSS officer and later director of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff under Kennedy and Johnson. The Center's first director, Max Millikan, was appointed in 1952 after a stint as assistant director of the CIA. Carnegie and Rockefeller joined in the funding, which by now, as in so many other cases, has passed on to Ford."²

So, we have examined how the CIA and the military had committed American power to ruinous military adventures through staged international incidents--reminiscent of the Oswald charade--but on an international level. These adventures, following close upon the assassination, spilled the blood and sapped the moral fiber of our youth. Our cities were turned into tense and neglected seas of metastasizing blight. Our economy, buffeted by

¹ Horowitz, David, "Senews of Empire," Ramparts, San Francisco, October, 1969, p. 39.

push-and-pull war induced inflation, became unbalanced. Our international trade position deteriorated, so that now we find ourselves with not only an unfavorable balance of payments, but also an unfavorable balance of trade. Our urban public schools are relegated to bare custodial functions. The standard of living of our workers and the middle class has dipped along with the quality of their lives. All of us have paid for the ineptness of our new rulers who, by the killing of John F. Kennedy, had overthrown the Republic.

If our model of explanation of the assassination of John F. Kennedy accurately interprets the data of the assassination, then it should also be useful in ferreting out current operations in which the Central Intelligence Agency would have had to involve itself domestically as a natural and necessary followup to the Dallas assassination. For, as the CIA's clumsy cousin, the American military, persisted in its Vietnamese adventure, the costs became prohibitive. Given this disastrous Vietnamese failure, the CIA found it increasingly necessary to separate itself from the military's commitment in Vietnam. As it parted interests with the military abroad, it sought domestic work. This work was designed to keep the American public divided against itself so that the CIA could manipulate and control our citizenry.

Of course, secret elitist police organizations such as the CIA do not thrive on peace, democracy, and a contented and informed people. The power of intelligence agencies increases in direct proportion to the degree of sickness of a nation. A healthy and united people can localize the cancer of a power-usurping intelligence agency and eventually extirpate its malignant cells from the nation's political life. Therefore, the intelligence apparatus which killed Kennedy had a need to

keep our society in turmoil. It had--in order to maintain its power--to generate a high degree of chaos. Chaos is required to make a people willing to accept such strong medicine as is administered by the secret police in order to restore order and to stabilize a disintegrating society. It takes an acutely sick society to be able to accept as palatable the terrible cure--totalitarianism.

One must look to our model of the assassination for an explanation of what has happened to our domestic society since the killing of President Kennedy. Now that the Vietnamese War has been rejected by our people, we must keep our eyes and ears open for an inevitable split between the CIA and military. For, although the military still looks to winning on foreign fronts the war against Communism, the super-slick non-ideological CIA sees the need to bring the war home. We must be alert to CIA agents who would promote the polarization of our society. We must examine the evidence which indicates that fake revolutionaries, who are inciting insurrection in our cities, have had their pockets and minds stuffed by the CIA. Is there any evidentiary support for such a design of social engineering having been foisted on us by the CIA and its foundation conduits?

One of the most polarizing events in our recent history was the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Decentralization-Community Control dispute which led to the New York teachers' strike of 1968. Martin Mayer said of this strike:

"The New York teachers' strike of 1968 seems to me the worst disaster my native city has experienced in my lifetime--comparable in its economic impact to an earthquake that would destroy Manhattan below Chambers Street, much worse in its social effect than a major race riot. Worst of all, the strike will very probably reduce to the condition of a Boston or an Alabama, or some mixture of the two, a school system that was wretchedly ill--organized and weakly led but relatively alert intellectually and by no means so completely ineffective as it has become fashionable to say--and that was almost the only

real hope the city could offer for the future of tens of thousands of Negro and Puerto Rican children."¹

Naomi Levine described how the Ford Foundation under McGeorge Bundy used Ocean Hill-Brownsville to provoke deliberately a confrontation:

"Why did the Ocean Hill governing board order the 'termination of employment' of the nineteen teachers and administrators in Ocean Hill in such a peremptory manner and at a time when the State Legislature was considering various proposals that would have enacted into law many of the Bundy report recommendations? Why did the union react so strongly?

"The answers to these questions go to the heart of the controversy. For it is clear that if Rhody McCoy had merely wanted to move some unwanted teachers out of his district he could have done so without provoking the U.F.T. and angering vast segments of the general public. He could, for example, have quietly requested the Board of Education to transfer the teachers a few at a time rather than attracting public attention by sending telegrams to nineteen teachers and administrators without warning or other prior notice. There is, moreover, strong reason to believe that Superintendent Donovan had told Mr. McCoy that if he sent him, in confidence, the names of the teachers he wanted transferred, the Board of Personnel would have handled the matter without further incident. Apparently, Mr. McCoy declined this offer. The conclusion is inescapable that the Ocean Hill governing board wanted a confrontation with the Board of Education in order to fix its powers and responsibilities once and for all, and that it created the situation to provoke such confrontation.

"The New York Civil Liberties Union pamphlet, highly sympathetic to Ocean Hill, supported this conclusion, albeit unwittingly. It indicated that the \$44,000 of Ford Foundation planning money had run out in the fall of 1967 and that Ocean Hill was not going to receive a previously promised additional grant of \$250,000 from Ford until the local board's powers and authority had been defined and agreed upon by the Board of Education...

"Howard I. Kalodner, professor of law at New York University and legal counsel to the Bundy committee and to the Ocean Hill governing board, has confirmed the confrontation theory. 'If they had asked me, I would have probably tried to dissuade them

or at least picked and chose more among those nineteen names,' he has stated. 'But they were looking for a confrontation. They had to make a display with the community and with the central Board.'¹

McGeorge Bundy's Ford Foundation's experiment caused New York City to shut down its educational system. That city became polarized--new-black militant radicals against old-left radicals, black trade unionists against anti-union black-power advocates, black against Jew, black against white, striker against non-striker, and ACLU civil libertarians against seekers of due process.

Martin Mayer puts the following question regarding Ocean-Hill Brownsville and the Ford Foundation's social experimentation in that district:

"Not the least of the political questions left dangling at the end of the tragedy of the teachers' strikes is the best way to make tax-exempt foundations responsible for the consequences of their actions."²

Martin Mayer says the following concerning the Bundy Report which precipitated the Ocean Hill-Brownsville confrontation:

"The Bundy Report on decentralization contains one inexcusable folly--inexcusable because...Bundy... recognized it as folly...that communities can 'unite' around the issue of education. In fact, communities inevitably divide about the issue of education."³

Edith Kermit Roosevelt said about McGeorge Bundy's provocateurism as head of the Ford Foundation:

"A new political alliance is being forged in this country between the super-rich and the super-poor--especially the alienated and activist members of minority groups.

"The Ford Foundation, under the aggressive leadership of McGeorge Bundy, is providing the major thrust for this power bloc... This is a dangerous

1

Levine, Naomi, Ocean Hill-Brownsville--A Case History of Schools in Crisis (New York, Popular Library, 1969), p. 56.

2

game but it doesn't seem to worry those members of the 'Eastern Establishment' who are involved. They're sure that no matter what happens they'll still be on top.

"The Ford Foundation's support of provocateurs and revolutionaries throughout the nation is raising numerous eyebrows. Many believe Bundy, former coordinator of intelligence for President Kennedy, is fostering a new political alliance.

"Its effect, at the moment, appears to be the destruction of the American constitutional system. The Foundation seems to be bypassing the legally constituted federal bureaucracy, Congress and state and local governments in order to build a movement of revolutionary proletarians."¹

The Ford Foundation funded the autobiography by Huey

P. Newton. Ford Foundation's Pacifica educational radio has featured regular news commentaries by identified Communists and Black Panthers, tapes made by Radio Hanoi, Red Chinese propaganda and advocacy of blowing up police stations and fire houses. Over a Pacifica station on December 26, 1968 and January 23, 1969, Tyrone Woods said, in part:

"What Hitler did to six million Jews is nothing in terms of what has been done to black folks over hundreds of years. ...As far as I am concerned, more power to Hitler. Hitler didn't make enough lampshades out of them."³

Congressman Henry Gonzalez of Texas complained that the Ford Foundation had promoted racism among his people, Mexican-Americans. He related how the Ford Foundation made a grant of \$630,000 to the Southwest Council for LaRaza. He said:

"The Ford Foundation wanted to create new leadership, and in fact the new leaders it has created daily proclaim that existing leadership is no good...

"...the president of MAYO, ...who likes to threaten to 'kill' what he terms 'gringos' if all else fails..."

¹ "News and Views," The Sunday Bulletin, Philadelphia, May 11, 1969, p. 5.

² Human Events, Dec. 5, 1970.

³

3

"...I must come to the sad conclusion that, rather than fostering brotherhood, the foundation has supported the spewings of hate, and rather than creating a new political unit, it has destroyed what little there was..."¹

Coleman McCarthy has very wisely shown the evil and cynicism behind the approach used by McGeorge Bundy. He points out the only legitimate function that the intellectual should play in dealing with ethnics and racism is to:

"...explain that the blacks and white working class are actually in the same urban fix together. Instead of letting them fight each other for useless inner-city leftovers, the intellectuals could act as a referee, creating a black-white coalition based on hard, mutual needs, not any sentimental notions of integration."²

I feel that McGeorge Bundy's social engineering experiments with ethnics are designed to cause this country to unravel under a systematic program of polarization. Where the foundations leave off, the government agencies directly involve themselves in provocateur attempts to splinter this nation. Senator Edward Kennedy has expressed his fear of the government's efforts at crisis creation. He complained:

"Now I fear that we are entering another era of crisis, an era of inaction and retrogression and repression..."

"Growing use of domestic spies--in schools, in political groups, at public meetings, of informants who sometimes help to foment the very acts they are supposed to be investigating."³

Congressman William Scherle of Iowa in answer to the question of how serious the problem of radicals and revolutionaries on government payroll has become said:

1. Congressional Record--House, April 16, 1969.

2. Colman McCarthy, Washington Post, July 14, 1970.

3. Congressional Record, May 13, 1970, S7112.

"The situation is unbelievable. It runs rampant throughout the country. It almost appears that the poverty agencies are seeking out the worst sort of militants!"¹

Karl Meyer, chairman of the Chicago Peace Council, said on the question of American political intelligence infiltration of his group:

"At our meetings they (police agents) invariably took the most militant positions, trying to provoke the movement from its nonviolent force to the wildest kind of ventures. They were about our most active members."²

Frank Donner says of intelligence provocation:

"There are powerful reasons for viewing provocation as the handmaiden of infiltration, even when it is no part of a planned intelligence strategy. A merely passive, 'cool' infiltrator-observer cannot hope to play more than a lowly 'Jimmy Higgins' role in the target group, if he gains entry at all. In order to enhance his usefulness, he must penetrate planning circles by becoming highly active. Moreover, the pressure to produce results in the form of concrete evidence of illegal activity often drives the infiltrator into provocative acts..."³

Now, I am not suggesting that every radical and violent act in our society is the direct consequence of foundation or governmental funding. There are many disillusioned youths who are easily induced to follow the provocateurs. Former Nixon White House aide, Daniel P. Moynihan, explained this well:

"One of the defining qualities of the period of current history that began, roughly, with the assassination of President Kennedy has been the emergence of widespread, radical protest on the part of American youth. The generation was already marked 'by the belief that its government is capable of performing abhorrent deeds.'"

¹
Congressional Record, Extensions of Remarks, March 31, 1971, E2547.

²
Congressional Record, Extensions of Remarks, May 6, 1971, E4098.

³
Ibid., E4097.

"The matter may be put simply. For a long period the distrustful responses of youth, and of others of course, to national events and the seeming course of national policy was essentially rational. Much begins, more than we yet know, with the assassination of President Kennedy. A whole generation was marked--and in ways deformed--by the crashing recognition that the world was not a safe or pleasant place at all, that the world was blind, destructive, unheeding.

"Then came the war. The same generation learned that things need not be what they seem if they are coming out of Washington. And so outrage and distrust mounted."¹

But let us not be so outraged as to lose our bearings. Yes, admittedly I have difficulty at times in maintaining my poise. This is especially true when I hear that McGeorge Bundy, the great nephew of A. Lawrence Lowell, one of the murderers of my Italian brothers, Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, through Ford Foundation grants will provide aid aimed at increasing minority opportunities in higher education.² How ironic that the Ford Foundation which has polluted the urban school systems with its provocateur activities and thereby foreclosed educational opportunities for so many ethnic children, seeks to parade as the ethnics' friend by buying off scholars of ethnic backgrounds.

Edith Kermit Roosevelt describes this process:

"The operations in New York City of the Ford Foundation typically illustrates the ruthless tactics used by the foundation's self-described 'elite' in their drive for political power. One of the Ford Foundation's goals has been to fundamentally change the direction and control of New York City's public-school system. City educational institutions provide the Ford Foundation with a vehicle in their drive to control minority and ethnic groups in urban areas through dollars distributed to key personnel who will be beholden to them."³

¹
Congressional Record, Extensions of Remarks, June 26,
1970, E5999.

But we must retain our calm in the face of provocation. We must be tranquil even when confronting the irony that the Ford Foundation, which has bought up so many fake revolutionaries, has as its head, McGeorge Bundy, who said recently:

"We must hope that the angry extremes will be rejected. But if it really does come to a test, the violent left and right are the enemies of all the rest of us."¹

So David Halberstam was correct to quote one of McGeorge Bundy's colleagues as stating that Bundy "...is a very special type, an elitist, part of a certain breed of men whose continuity is to themselves, a line to each other and not the country."²

Somehow, this elitist McGeorge Bundy feels that money can buy off anyone and everything. Was McGeorge Bundy buying the silence of the Robert Kennedy aides when the Ford Foundation gave \$131,069 to eight members of the staff of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy on November 8, 1968?³

Now, let us conclude. I^{again} urge that the peace movement has been silent too long on the critical issue of the Kennedy assassination. If we are to understand and bring under control the forces which are shaping today's America and are endeavoring to shape its future into a monstrous 1984, we cannot rest with the official version of the killing of President Kennedy. The model of explanation offered here explains the available data. We can and must employ this tool of analysis to learn more about our current-day society. Should you seek to bypass the task of understanding the Kennedy assassination in order to take up a cause which is for you more challenging and more immediately

¹ Newsweek, May 25, 1970, p. 31.

² Halberstam, David, Op. Cit., p. 28.

³ Congressional Record, Extensions of Remarks, April 14,

relevant to our society, I do not hesitate to suggest that you most probably err in your chosen course of social action.

What is your cherished fight? Civil Rights? Civil Liberties? If John F. Kennedy, a most gifted, rich and popular President, did not have the right or liberty to hide successfully from governmental guns in the United States, then are not civil liberties and civil rights long departed in our country not only for ethnics but all other citizens as well?

Would you, before you study the implications of the Kennedy assassination, seek first to destroy the capitalist system? But was not the capitalist system on November 22, 1963 overthrown by a new class in the United States? Was not Wall Street successfully stormed by way of Dealey Plaza? Did not the intelligence community force upon the financial interests an uncontrolled war machine which eroded American economic power and well being?

Would you first seek to improve our public schools? But the military has usurped for itself the funds required to educate our children. And the intelligence community has deposited provocateurs in our schools so that the conditions necessary for learning have been, through the ensuing turmoil, destroyed.

Would you first drop out of school, job, and society in order to change the system? There is no place to hide from the power which can gun down a President. Dropping off the face of the earth is your only refuge if you are unwilling to drop into the struggle to rest our government from the grip of murderers.

Would you seek to join the Communist world? But the Communist world has revealed that it too can accept a frameup in the killing of Kennedy just as easily as it can frame in the assassination of Kirov.

38

No, let us not turn away from the horror of the killing of John F. Kennedy. Let us join together, black and white, rich and poor, jew, gentile, conservative and radical, to tell the truth about the killing of Kennedy. Through this refusal to live a great lie we will come together to understand and love ourselves and our society better. Let us not delay in this union of truth. If we do not join together in the search for truth, then guns backed by cover-story lies will pick us off one by one and ultimately join us together--in death.

This is the lesson to be learned from the killing of President John F. Kennedy and the overthrow of the Republic by the CIA.

18 Boston Sunday Globe October 24, 1971

At Cambridge meeting Speaker sees CIA behind JFK killing

By Ann-Mary Currier
Globe Staff

Skeptics over the government's explanation of the assassination of President Kennedy were restated some new theories yesterday at a meeting of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom in Cambridge.

Three speakers reiterated the many criticisms of the findings of the Warren Commission, which concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald alone killed the President.

Atty. Vincent Salandria of Philadelphia explained to some 100 women and a few men at St. Peter's Episcopal Church his theory that the Central Intelligence Agency was largely responsible for the killing and that McGeorge Bundy, Ford Foundation President and former intelligence officer, was at least aware of its efforts.

Manchester architect Robert B. Cutler and Richard Sprague, secretary of the Committee to Investigate Assassinations, also spoke.

Salandria charged that both the CIA and the military were involved in the assassination, which, he said, was intended to eliminate a thorn in the Cold War.

"It is not irresponsible to conceive of the American military as having been involved in a plot to eliminate Kennedy to assure continuations of the Cold War," he told the audience.

However, he did not blame the military entirely. He said: "I view it (the Cold War) as a cooperative effort (by American and Russian intelligence agencies) to foil on both the American and Russian civilian populations an enormous military-intelligence budget."

"The intelligence apparatus which killed Kennedy had a need to keep our society in turmoil," Salandria said. "It had to order to maintain its power to generate a high state of chaos," Salandria said.

At first, the attorney said, the government was under the guidance of Bundy, involvement in the war in Indochina and now, that "The Vietnamese war has been rejected by our people like the superfluous role of the CIA sees the need to bring the war home."

Salandria charged that the CIA and former government intelligence officers like Bundy are promoting "The polarization of our society" and that "fake revolutionaries... are inciting insurrection in our cities."

He cited Ford Foundation's request for a definition of powers before it would grant funds to the Hill-Brownsville Ocean Centralization project as an event which led to the New York teachers' strike of 1968; the foundation's funding of the autobiography of Huey Newton; and grants which have piled against some minority leaders.

Salandria also warned that the Pentagon papers may be "designed as a thrust against the military by the CIA," charging that Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, who claimed to have leaked the papers to the press, is a former CIA agent, he said. "In my assassination research, I learned that ex-CIA people who undertook work to assist the Kennedy assassination invariably took on the Kennedy assassination to be present.

The league devoted three of its five sessions to the assassination. The others were a report on China by Mrs. Ruth Gage-Colby, representative to the United Nations, who recently visited China, and a discussion of the media's responsibility in a democracy.

Founded in 1915 to prevent future conflicts like World War I, the league has sent representatives to disarmament conferences and to trials of minority persons or dissenters and boycotted war producers.

FOR