

November 2, 1977

Penn Jones, Jr  
Editor  
The Continuing Inquiry  
P.O. Box 1140  
Middlethian, Texas 76065

---

Dear Junior,

Once upon a time a president of the United States, preparing for a reelection campaign, was assassinated in the Texas city of Dallas. Everyone was affected. Some rejoiced. More mourned. In New York City, a man working at a desk, recognized a political murder. Thereafter, in radio, television, and newspaper accounts, he observed an orchestrated effort to attribute the assassination to a conspiratorial source; noted the man accused of the murder, a worker, asserted his innocence, avowed Marxist belief, asked for legal assistance; and understood, on the basis of historical experience, a frame up was in process. In behalf of powerful reactionary interests.

Two days after the assassination, he learned from the press the successor government had undertaken immediate measures to denude the assassination of political motivation and significance in the interest of national political stability, and noted proof of conspiracy in the murder of the president and of frame up of the accused when the latter was killed in police headquarters. He recognized creation of an ad hoc executive-department investigative commission as an extension of government policy of denuding the assassination of political meaning and, hence, unable to define a motive for the assassination and identify the conspirator-sponsors of the assassins, becoming thereby a collective accessory after the fact to murder of the head of state.

In the following years, he urged these views, in vain, on "critics" preoccupied essentially with personal ambitions and the question: "Who killed Kennedy?"; and incognizant of the decisive importance of motivation. In 1977 he tried to explain, by letter, to the editor of

a small publication devoted to continuing, undirected, uncoordinated, fragmentary research into the assassination of only the president, the need for realizing the significance of isolated bits and pieces of physical and testimonial evidence by relating them to original and changing governmental assassination policy. Without consultation or notice, in imitation of government practice, the editor, in an article in his publication, under his signature, took data from the letter, relating to the formulation of government assassination policy immediately following the president's demise, and put it in circumscribed context of the editor's interest in exposure of immorality in government and dishonest investigative procedure. Thereby he abetted government assassination policy of demanding the assassination of political meaning.

By describing the letter writer mistakenly as an assassination researcher and complimenting him for diligence, the editor implied the data sent him by the letter writer was a recent discovery, hoping thereby, very likely, to minimize anticipated criticism of his 14-year ignorance of significant, available, public, assassination data, which he excused as a result of not subscribing to the well known newspaper source cited by the letter writer.

Apparently, too, the editor is unaware of other sources documenting government assassination policy. In 1976 the government published the 106-page Volume V of the report of the Senate Select Committee To Study Governmental Operations <sup>Subcommittee</sup> With Respect To Intelligence Activities, the Schweiker-Hart report dealing with the assassination of president Kennedy, which includes, on page 23, the text of a memorandum, dated November 25, 1963, by Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach who informed Presidential Assistant Moyers of the need, one day after Oswald was assassinated, to fix him in public consciousness as the sole assassin of Kennedy, "cut off" speculation about his motive, and dispose of

"thought" of a communist or "right wing" conspiracy.

Other material in this report, titled The Investigation of the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy: Performance of the Intelligence Agencies, includes: "On December 9, 1963, Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach wrote each member of the Warren Commission recommending that the Commission immediately issue a press release stating that the FBI report clearly showed there was no international conspiracy, and that Oswald was a loner" (ibid). Nevertheless, the Committee which noted the Warren Commission did not issue the suggested press release, did not, it said, review the findings and conclusions of the Warren Commission, did not reexamine physical evidence, did not review "one" principal question: whether Oswald was the assassin of president Kennedy (page 1).

Thus, ironically, the government published decisive self-indicting evidence of governmental felony which "critics" and "assassination researchers" ignore in pursuit of evidentiary trivia to convict the government of procedural misdemeanors; and lack courage to say Oswald was the innocent victim of a frame up before and after he was murdered, and the governmental investigative commission became collective accessory after the fact to murder of the head of state, one of whom, subsequently, became vice-president and then president presiding over a government of assassins, including himself, his vice president, the butcher of Attica, and the head of the CIA who took responsibility for more than 20,000 assassinations in Viet Nam.

Amiably,

