

## 10 The Plot

For all the world as though this disgraceful, ignorant & dumb collection, <sup>o</sup> mostly of baseless conjectures, is anything else, Blakey titles his <sup>a</sup> 1st chapter not "conclusions" but "The Plot of Kill the President" (pages 167-198). *audits not that - or anything like it.* It ~~is~~

is intended to support Blakey's earlier conjectures he wants accepted as what they are not, as facts. There is nothing reasonable, as we have seen, about his mafia plot and, obviously, there is not a thing that can be called proof of it, Only Blakey can say why he was stupid enough to repeat his earlier stupidities, errors, fabrications and outright lies and obviously, he will not add that to his foolishnesses.

He begins this certainty of making a fool of himself ~~boasting~~ with the subchapter "The Meaning of the Assassination" (pages 367-371).

He <sup>o</sup> begins that by boasting of all the records his committee obtained, beginning with the FBI, Secret Service and CIA and, as we have seen ~~despite~~ ~~his stupid boasting,~~ ~~but~~ he got only about a half of

the relevant records the FBI had and had already made public-*largely*

*me in Ford litigation -* and when all Blakey had to do was ask for them, he ~~did~~ not even do that. As we also saw <sup>ead</sup> ~~instead,~~ he ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~at~~ <sup>at</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>at</sup> ~~time,~~ <sup>at</sup> time

he should have spent on Kennedy assassination records, pawing over totally irrelevant mafia records, ~~totally irrelevant despite~~ Blakey's beginning hangup, that this was a mafia plot.

As common sense alone would have told him it could not be ~~if~~ -if he'd had any common sense. This book is proof that he ~~does not~~ *has none.*

He then says (still page 367) that "We also assessed the assassination literature (our bibliography alone consisted of 1,021 titles)."

He then says that "When the time ~~came~~ ~~to integrate this great~~



Blakey refers to his fabrications as fact ~~and~~ and then uses that word in what he quotes, for <sup>a</sup>ll the world as though what he made up ~~his facts~~. Then, for all the world as though he is using this dishonest means of defending his fabrication that there is what is more important than fact, a brazen lie: "but we also knew that there was ~~more~~ to seeking the truth than ~~that~~ fidelity to facts." <sup>Of</sup> Only the use of facts ~~can~~ <sup>can</sup> this be true and then it is still what is most basic, "fidelity" to facts.

With this as his justification he says that "we believed, <sup>therefore,</sup> ~~that~~ the ~~broader~~ broader meaning of the assassination ~~had~~ had to be ~~ex~~ examined before we proceeded to an assessment of the soundness of our judgement that organized crime had a hand in the President's death."

Or, ~~he~~ he confesses the preconception arrived at without any basic fact and he claims that it is right and proper for the preconception to come first. The ~~real~~ "meaning of the assassination" comes from fact, not some ~~some~~ <sup>my</sup> cocakamnie belief that is only a preconception not based on fact. *So he gives nothing that can be considered "broader meaning of the assassination".*

And however he dresses it up, that is not true. It also is not the correct approach.

The plain and simple truth is that they did not investigate "what hapened in Dallas" ~~before~~ before they decided that the mafia did it.

*incident  
single  
space*

The quest for the meaning of life and death, of course, transcends the search for the meaning of the assassination of the President. Nonetheless, the basic dichotomy that applies to the approach to life itself — purpose versus chance — was reflected, we found, in the way people reacted to the assassination of the President. The word most often used to describe Dallas on November 22, 1963, was tragedy, and it was how people tended to view the tragic in life that most often shaped their view of the assassination. It happens that the two fundamental and diametrically opposite perspectives of tragedy are presented in literature. They, in fact, represent the basic difference between classic Greek drama and the realism of modern theater. It is instructive, therefore, to see how the different interpretations of the nature of life and death have been articulated in literature. (p. 90-91)

In the first quotation of what Blakey says about meaning, he there said that "the broader meaning has to be examined before we proceeded to an assessment...." In this quotation he also plays the most important thing down, saying that "The quest for the meaning of life and death, of course, transcends the search for the meaning of the assassination of the President." Not under the law in a murder <sup>case</sup>. The "quest for the meaning of life and death" does not mean search for the murdered <sup>and that</sup> is the first requirement of the law. Particularly when the victim is the President. That involves what Blakey never gets to, that whatever ~~is~~ the intent of the assassin or assassins, the assassination of any president is a de facto coup d'etat.

Greek drama has nothing to do with the basic question, why was it done. That answers the meaning of any assassination. And the way to get that answer <sup>is</sup> by fact, not presumption. <sup>It</sup> is to investigate the crime itself. That ~~was~~ never done, not under the Katzenbach memorandum, which <sup>was</sup> ~~became~~ national policy, <sup>officially,</sup> and ~~not~~ by the "house assassins and their Blakey, who abided by the Katzenbach memorandum. Of which he did know and from which he quoted all but this provision in his dishonest quotations from it.

Next, without realizing that it reflects a dishonest approach and his baseless preconception, Blakey says "Our next step was to examine the President's assassination in the light of the modus operandi of organized-crime murders...." (page 372).

Wrong!

Their first step should have been to examine the murder, with nothing imposed on a free and full investigation, with no real or imagined modus operandi imposed.

This in itself admits more than preconception. It says that what is necessary is to impose <sup>his</sup> ~~the~~ preconception on the <sup>non-</sup> investigation of the crime.

This is no way to <sup>A</sup>investigate and above all it is not the free and honest way to investigate the assassination of a President.

The next subsection is titled, "The Vulnerability of John F. Kennedy" (Pages 376-383). Not "vulnerabilities"? Which <sup>every</sup> ~~by~~ president has, in the plural.

First and most important to Blakey ~~and not in space~~ is organized crime. <sup>Q Which was not a special JFK vulnerability.</sup>

Then he goes to the theft of the Illinois election. In this Blakey is dishonest in omitting that the effort made by Mayor Daley in Chicago were duplicated downstate by the Republicans.

Then passing reference to his womanizing.

The next subsection is "The Assassination According to John Roselli" (pages 383-89). With Roselli the top mafia man of those the CIA recruited through Robert Maheu to get the President assassinated - and they failed - <sup>is</sup> he is hardly a dependable authority on the assassination, <sup>G</sup> likewise <sup>"</sup>the Death of Sam Gianacana" (pages ~~389~~ 389, 392) either dependable or in any way related to the JFK assassination. These nutty Blakey inclusion <sup>A</sup> <sup>A</sup> as related to the assassination of the President represents Blakey's hangup and his total undependability when he talks about the President's assassination,

~~The~~ "The ~~Angi~~ Anguish of Robert Kennedy" (pages 391-394 is more of Blakey's effort to make it a mafia crime.

Of which there then ~~and~~ since then <sup>o</sup> was no real evidence.

"Los Angeles: June 4, 1968" is the next subsection (pages 394-395). That was when Robert Kennedy was killed and it has no real relationship to the assassination of his brother <sup>five</sup> three years

earlier.

Except as more hinting that the assassination of his brother was a mafia job.

"A Witness to ~~Two~~ <sup>396-</sup>Tragedies" (pages ~~397~~ 397) More unrelated mafia rubbish.

"Murder Will Out" (pages 397-~~398~~) is the end. The short text says the opposite of the subheading and it says <sup>v</sup> that <sup>u</sup> as more of Blakey's mafia baloney.

Here is that text, *in full:*

*incident  
single  
page*

On September 28, 1978, as our public hearings were drawing to a close, the final witness before the Committee was Burt W. Griffin, who in 1964 was one of two Warren Commission attorneys responsible for the Ruby aspect of the assassination investigation. The Committee asked Judge Griffin to reflect on the successes and failures of the Commission and the FBI in light of his experience as a staff counsel, as well as a former prosecutor and current member of the judiciary with criminal jurisdiction. He showed extraordinary insight and candor in his comments, especially when he put his finger on a crucial fact, one often overlooked in analyses of the President's death: the great problem of obtaining "proof of conspiracy" in a free society. He directed the Committee's attention to the "reality that under the American system of civil liberties and the requirement [for a criminal conviction] of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, . . . it is virtually impossible to prosecute or uncover a well-conceived and well-executed conspiracy." Almost prophetically, Judge Griffin said: "The few successful . . . [prosecutions of a sophisticated conspiracy] . . . almost always result from accidental

discover[ies]." That explained, he suggested, why our society had "almost totally failed in its efforts . . . to prosecute the organized commission of crime."

It was difficult to disagree with Judge Griffin's perceptive comments. That freedom carries with it a certain price — and one that is well worth paying — ought to be obvious to experienced observers of American history. Proof of conspiracy in a free society only comes when there has been the right mixture of diligence and luck. Successful prosecution of conspiracy is in fact rare. Yet there is another point that must be made. History, if not prosecution, is well served, for truth has a way of taking care of itself. Chaucer said it well, as our investigation showed. Murder will out.

Having begun with the baseless belief that ~~the~~<sup>the</sup> mafia assassinated the President, ~~from books~~, probably in part this notion coming from his experiences in the organized crime section of the Department of Justice, Blakey then turned the full power of ~~his~~ committee, which had ~~the~~ the largest appropriation the House of Representatives ever gave an investigation and with all of that power and authority having failed all over again, unable to recognize that he was and ~~insisted~~<sup>on</sup> ~~in~~ being a fool, a stubborn fool, ~~in~~ his book Blakey tries to shyster a case that might fool people into believing that h<sup>e</sup> was not a fool, into believing th<sup>at</sup> despite a ~~ll~~ the real evidence there was no case ~~at~~<sup>at</sup> of the mafia as ~~an~~<sup>Presidential</sup> assassin.

Which is what his book tries to convince people is not so, tries to convince those silly enough to buy his book that in spite of his ~~own~~ committee's total failure to make any kind ~~of~~<sup>of a</sup> real case against the mafia, by far its greatest effort, the mafia was guilty anyway. And ~~to~~ seem to prove that Blakey shyster'd fake pretended evidence.

With all that power. with all that staff an<sup>d</sup> all that money and all those FBI pages relating to the maf<sup>ia</sup>, ~~partic~~<sup>ic</sup>ularly transcripts of telephone taps, Bankrupt Blakey hokes up a very poor and entirely dishonest book in which he pretends that in spite ~~of~~ of all, he was right and ~~the~~ mafia did do the job.

But ~~even~~<sup>le</sup> then, ~~so~~ dishonest as so much of Blakey's book is, the dishonesty largely in ~~the~~ the creation of phony evidence, he still ~~falls~~ falls flat on his face in this ~~is~~ disgrace of a book by a ~~lawyer~~ lawyer and a Congressional chief investigator.

Who closes his ~~is~~<sup>d</sup> disgrace of a nook with quotations from the testimony before his committee of a former counsel for the earlier failure, Bert ~~Griffith~~ Griffith who worked on ~~The~~ The Runy part of the Warren Commission, which was really ~~the~~ the Warren failure. With his own

record to apologise for Griffin, who had been a prosecutor and then was a local judge, used words that Blakey could use and misuse in his own defense.

And actually, literally, that is what the snassassination shyster really does.

Blakey ~~also~~ says that Griffin put his finger on a crucial fact, ~~one~~ one often overlooked in analyses of the President's death: the great problems of obtaining 'proof of conspiracy' in a free xs society...."

What proof of conspiracy Griffin and Blakey were talking ~~about~~ Griffin, as quoted, did not say, and Blakey, to give meaning th at it does not ~~need~~ need to have to what Griffin said, ~~is~~ is shysters.

There is proof of conspiracy to ~~establish~~ <sup>that does establish</sup> that there had been a conspiracy. ~~If it does not identify any conspirator by name.~~

~~And there is proof of conspiracy to identify~~  
~~in general,~~  
~~Getting proof of conspiracy~~ to establish that there had been a conspiracy need not be ~~a big deal~~, a difficult matter. In the assassination of President Kennedy there is an extensive oversupply of that evidence <sup>entirely</sup> ignored by both the commission and Blakey's committee.

Lying in the face of an overabundance of solid evidence and true to national assassination policy articulated in the Katzenbach memo, the Commission reached its charged conclusion, ~~regardless~~ regardless of fact, regardless of the national interest, regardless of the nation's honor and ~~sieg heiled~~ the national policy of that Katzenach memorandum.

Blakey was doing exactly that until, as we saw earlier, what he had conceived as the ~~putdown~~ <sup>of</sup> putdowns, the ~~poor~~ Dallas police tape that he had not even asked for and was given to

him, proved there had been a conspiracy. ~~They~~ he had no choice, and then his committee's record was blank on all the other proof of conspiracy in both <sup>m</sup>crimes he was <sup>have</sup> to investigate.

One reason neither case went to trial is because in both assassinations <sup>t</sup>there had been a conspiracy and both of the accused would have been acquitted <sup>of this,</sup> at trial. And the proof in each case is in the existing official records. Blakey had no investigation to make. All he had to do was use the ~~abundant~~ official evidence which existed before his committee was formed.

But, shyster as he was on this case, he avoided that throughout, pretended it ~~did~~ not exist, and only when the *Dallas police tape* tape backfired on him did he suddenly, having no choice, talk about a conspiracy, with that alone as his indication of a conspiracy, and even then this shyster lied about the shot that proved the President had been call killed by a conspiracy.

Evidence, reason to believe that he was hit by that <sup>(to Blakey,</sup> fourth shot, from the Grassy Knoll but Blakey, as did the Commission, ignored that amply supported evidence and he proclaimed that this shot from the Grassy Knoll, is the <sup>shot that missed,</sup> ~~on the miss,~~ an impossibility. He just made it up to continue the official fiction of Oswald as the lone assassin. Ordained in that Katzenbach memo Blakey could never quote in full and give this <sup>direct meaning,</sup> high controlled his committee, say to the people, <sup>that this</sup> the history ~~of~~ prove ~~that~~ there had been a conspiracy.

With, despite Blakey and what <sup>that</sup> he says ~~the~~ Griffin said, was a <sup>factually</sup> ~~sure~~ <sup>certainty</sup> in both cases.