

2. Blakey Being Blakey

Blakey had headed what we have just examined, ~~XXXXXXXX~~
 "Conclusion: Oswald Lone Assassin." what he follows that with is
 headed "Conspiracy Theories Rejected." But as we saw with the
~~actual~~ ~~and~~ unrefuted and irrefutable official evidence, the
 actual official proof is that Oswald, ^{in Blakey "Conclusion"} who is not proven to be the
 assassin and cannot be proven to be an assassin, was not "lone"
 when no one man could have done the shooting that the best shots
 in the country did not and could not do, not even under much
 better conditions.

Or, that there was a conspiracy was not a theory-it ~~was~~ ^{was and it is} ~~an~~
 irrefutable fact, from the official evidence only, that same unrefuted
 and irrefutable evidence. And. ~~whether~~ whether or not Blakey admits
 it, as the Warren Commission did not, there is more evidence that
 proves there was a conspiracy, by proof not by any so-called
 "theory." ~~For~~ ^{For} Blakey is a fraud, and a liar, a deliberate liar.

What controls all officialdom and has since before the
 assassinated President ~~was~~ buried is ~~the~~ ^{and} the national policy that ^{is}
 in that Katzenbach memorandum that the new President approved
 the Sunday night before the burial, as we have seen and as I go
 into a greater length in other writings, ^{in this series.}

Blakey can "reject" all the conspiracies he wants to reject
 but what he cannot "reject" is the fact, not the theory, that there
 was a conspiracy that assassinated Kennedy and made Johnson President.

Blakey says that the "Commission went to great length (131 pages)
 of its Report to dismiss the idea of a plot, and it said that no
 limitations (had) ...been placed on the Commission's inquiry. ...
 If there is any...evidence (of a plot) it has been beyond the reach
 of all the investigative agencies and resources of the United States

..."(page 30).

This is tricky language by the Commission and Blakey, no Sherlock Holmes, does not point out ^{that} the Commission did not have to search, did not have to plumb "all the investigative agencies and resurces of the United States" for what it had ⁱⁿ its own record. Only one of these many proofs, not theories in its record is what we have seen from the Commission's own hearings and testimony that is fact, not theory, that the ^{best} shots in the country could not, under much better conditions, duplicate the shooting at ^{attributes} to the "poor" shot, Oswald.

Who, as the Commission also knew and did not have to dig for, according to the paraffin tests made by the Dallas police, did not fire a rifle that day.

Blakey continues his argument saying that "The Commission's (no-conspiracy) conclusion was the produce of a systematic examination of the issue that, on its face, was thorough and foolproof" (page 31).

There were no "issues" to be examined to determine whether there had been a conspiracy, only ~~the~~ the fact, the irrefutable and unrefuted fact and all the other totally irrelevant matters that Blakey goes into here ^{can} have no relationship to the unquestionable fact that the Commission and he ignore and nothing he might dredge up can change the irrefutable and ~~the~~ officially ignored official fact that there was a conspiracy because ^(in its simplest form) the shooting was proven, beyond any question, to have been impossible for any one man, including the very best shots in the country/.

Blakey then rehashed some of the Commission's really non-existent "affiliations" ^{allegedly} Oswald had. They were, at best, slight and meaningless ^{at} contacts on Oswald's initiative and amount to nothing. The fact is

to prove it, Oswald had no real connection with any political group and, as the Commission and Blakey fail to report, Oswald could not have been "affiliated" with both the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party at the same time because they hated and fought each other, (page 33). *and then when had only a few con- facts that were without any meaning.*

There are more pages that rehash what was well known and have nothing to do with the absolutely irrefutable proof that the assassination was the end product of a conspiracy, the truth that was ruled outside official acknowledgement by the President's agreement with that Katzenbach memo the night before the assassinated President was buried.

After more rehash like this, including under the heading, "Oswald and Ruby Not Connected," Blakey has reached the end of his chapter titled "The Aftermath - Confusion, Grief and an Inquiry." The aftermath of the JFK assassination did include confusion most of all because there never was any real investigation of that assassination and, as we have seen, that was official policy even before the assassination President was buried.

There was widespread grief. It was not limited to the victim's family and, what Blakey refers to as "an inquiry" never was that and, tragically, never was intended to be a real "inquiry."

Blakey's next chapter, his third chapter, is titled "The Decline of Credibility, 1964-1976." In this Blakey suggests that the decline in credibility ended when his committee was created but the fact is that Blakey, personally, added to the deserved lack of credibility, that lack coming, despite the enormous media campaign to have the unacceptable Report accepted, coming from the lack of credibility in the Report, which was made up, *manufactured, fabricated* in its entirety, *made up,* as it soon was proven beyond question, *by*

my wife's typing substituting for type setting,

The fact is that even in its unusual form, as a private printing Whitewash was a best seller. It had no organized distribution. I had not a penny for advertising or promotion. But the book was so comprehensible that it sold itself and it sold well,

very well for a private printing. It went through at least four ~~and~~ I think five ^{N/} printings the least of which was for ^{five thousand} ~~5000~~ copies, before Dell, which had turned the book down three times, came to me for it. Dell spent not a penny on advertising or promotions, It did not even arrange for me to appear on a single talk show. But with an original ^{print} ~~print~~ of a quarter of million copies in December

1966, it was distributing its fourth reprinting in May of 1967. ^{at least}

^{had at least five Dell printings} The actual record of that book, without a penny spent on advertising or promotions, makes it clear, without any question at all, ~~that~~ that Blakey is a fraud and a liar who is bankrupt on the subject on which he presents himself as an expert.

It should be noted that he has not a word of criticism about a single word I wrote, and ^h that after he had wasted the largest appropriation ever made by the House of Representatives for any investigation.

And of what people th think of that book, which is not at all what Blakey says ~~he thinks~~, ^I was told in August of 2001 that on the internet a Dell ~~th~~ ninety-five cent reprint had been sold for just under a ^u hundred dollars.

It has long been used in a number of college classes.

~~contradiction~~ to the Commissions own evidence.

For all the world as though Gerald Ford was an impartial observier, Blakey quotes a line from his ghosted book, Portrait of the Assassin: "(The) monumental record of th^e President's Commission will stand like a Gibraltar of factual literature throughout the ages to come, " (page 40). *# It can't even stand on its own feet, it is a Gibraltar of Sand.*

Blakey begins ~~this~~ assault on the critics suggesting that Mark Lane's was the first book, as it was not. He then goes ~~after~~ ^{me,} ~~nazz~~ attacking Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report, the first book ~~and~~ ^{even} then, without ^a word made up against any of them, ~~fall~~ my bokks:

under single space

public ~~misperception~~ . . .]") Next to Lane in prominence ^{among the} first wave of critics was Harold Weisberg, a former U.S. Senate investigator whose series of privately published harangues (*Whitewash, Whitewash II, Photographic Whitewash*, etc.) were centered on the theme of government complicity and cover-up, but because his rhetoric was so obscure, his arguments so dependent on accusation rather than logic, the effect of Weisberg's work was to make complex issues confusing. *(page 41).*

inventions

Because Blakey cannot refute a single word in all of my books ^{- and my inventions -} ~~he inse~~ instead presents what may be his conclusions ^{as fact, which they are not.}

457A new

In all the many years since my first book was first published, in 1965, not a single one of the many of whom I was severely critical, including Members, like Ford, staff from Rankin down and a n innumerablely large number from the federal agencies, , not a aingle one has written or phoned to complain that i was unfair or inaccurate in anything I said ^a bout him. One of the Commission Members, the most conservive of them, ⁷ Senator Richard B. Russell, not only approved my writing but h^e encouraged me until his dying day ⁽¹⁾. So, when Blakey cannot say a single word in fact ual criticism he refer^s to all my works as "Harangues."

It is a lie that any of those books "centered on the th~~h~~eme of governmnet complicity." It is true that they dealt with govern-

in which they was - including Blakey's.)

ment cover-up.) I use that word in the subtitle of the second book and the titles of the first four being with "Whitewash," referring to the government, and after all these years ^{there} that is no reason to consider changing any of those words. *Especially not after Blakey!*

For all the word ^{argues, is} as though any of my books) is other than entirely factual, which not one is, all coming from the official evidence only, Blakey, unable to address ~~sa~~ a ~~single~~ ^{is full} truthful word of criticism against any one of them, then says "his rhetoric was so obscure, his arguments so dependent on accurate accusations rather than logic, the effect of Weisberg's work was to make complex issues confusing." *Without a single illustration example or even citation.*

There is no "obscurity" except in the minds of those who have to make up accusations when they cannot address those books on fact.

I do not "argue" in any of those books. Where there is what Blakey pretends ~~is~~ ^{is} his argument, it is the mobilization ^{of and} and the direct ^{verbatim} quotation of the official evidence itself, the official evidence that says other than the official misrepresentation of the evidence says.

I make no ^{accusations} in those books. Again, what Blakey refers to as my "accusations" are the only thing he ~~can~~ ^{can} make up when he does not quote a single one, as he could not ^{quote} quote a single illustration to support his earlier lies.

Which is what they are, deliberate lies, and there is no reason to sugar-coat them.

What ^{he} ~~he~~ can refer to, if he has anything in mind, is that the official evidence I mobilized because there is nothing else in those books.

The only way in which anything I wrote that could make any-

thing "confusing" was in confrontation with the official mythology which, being mythology, cannot survive comparison with fact.

Thus the dishonest Blakey skips around what he and his dishonest work cannot survive.

In what he here says, Blakey is contradicted by the many thousands of letters I have received. Quite a few were from high school students who had no difficulty understanding what I wrote, ^{some also of} as did some students even younger, ^{who also write me.}

Perhaps the most effective refutation of what Blakey says here when in his intellectual bankruptcy he can say nothing truthful is that when Dell reprinted Whitewash with a first print of a quarter of a million copies and with four additional reprints they edited nothing and ^{it} made no changes at all in anything in the first ^{both of} two books, ^{which it reprinted} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~Even~~ ^{White} ~~ash~~ ^{was} ~~a~~ ^{an} ~~unedited~~ ^{and} ~~rough~~ ^{and} ~~draft.~~

And it today remains the only basic book on the ~~assassination~~.

It alone, the very first book on the ^{and the Report} subject, not in agreement with it, a Ford's was, proved that as his record on the Commission shows, Ford did not know what he was talking about. Rather than being like the rock of Gibraltar or "~~factual literary literature~~" ^{was} ~~lasting~~ throughout the ages to come," the Report turned into sand by the first analysis of it.

Do, naturally, Blakey had to lie about it or he'd have had no book because the reports of his investigation have the same self-destruction built in and, like the Report of the Warren Commission, ^{and} can survive no real analysis. And, if ^{one} you look at Blakey's index (page 428) You will find no other references to any of my books or to me. Only this entirely dishonest one with which, intellectually yellow as he is, he attempts to wipe out the

As an illustration of his intended dishonesty in this part of his writing, before his committee ~~was~~ was created I had published seven books on the political assassination, including one the King assassination, which Blakey ignores in his book but was part of his committee's responsibilities, and had obtained ~~far~~ ^{and had obtained about a third} away most of the three quarters of a million pages from the FBI, much more than Blakey obtained although my getting them made them ~~partzzozzhe~~ public.

He did not even get what was public before his committee came into existence.

Which also says much about Blakey as an investigator ^{and about his intention}

What I did in the King case was also public and he made no use of it, either. I ~~conducted~~ ^{seeking the trial by new way} the successful investigation for the habeas petition, which Ray then won, and I conducted ^{day} the investigation for the fourteen ~~weeks~~ ^{days} of ^{federal} hearings in federal district court in Memphis, which could not be won there then, and not a ~~record~~ ^U of this in his official investigation or in his ~~cover-up~~ book.

all public

the built-in, the basic dishonesty of his own imitation Warren Report with all the mistakes in it and a few added ^{he} ~~by~~ Blakey.

48X This disgrace to the public service is so dishonest, so afraid of precipitating an fight with me ^{over} his phony book he apparently feared mention of even my works from which he and ^{his} ~~his~~ committee took what I (alone) brought to light ~~and~~ he cribbed from my ~~books~~, presenting ^{that} as his own work.

Interestingly enough, while he ~~mentions~~ the title of three of them, he even excludes them from his index, ^{listing of new, replacing them with}

Blakey being ~~B~~ Blakey.

But he does index the next book ^{book that followed my first.} he mentions, Epstein's Inquest, ^{(right times) for}

a small and superficial triviality that says the Warren Commission was right in spite of itself and its being wrong, (page 41⁵).

Blakey being ~~B~~ Blakey .

When Blakey argues in defense of the official assassination mythology he still cannot ~~be~~ ^{be} honest, as when he said that "FBI tests ^{that} indicated ~~that~~ it would have taken 2.3 seconds for a single gunman to have fire two well-aimed shots... (page 42). In

the kind of plain English Blakey and his ~~gross~~ grossly and intendedly dishonest book requires, every part of this is and to his knowledge ^{that} ~~this~~ a lie.

^{there any} It was not "FBI test" which could ^{even} "indicate" any such thing.

It was a single firing by a single agent, a single shot under, again, vastly improved conditions, in an inside firing range at a distance of 25 feet and on ~~at~~ the ~~same~~ level, with that agent in the best position for firing, the prone position, not from a height ~~and~~ at a steep angle and from an awkward position, through a window ^{and} yet when the bottom of that tall window was but a single foot from the floor. As we have seen, the best shots in the country,

and entirely impossible
~~could~~ not and did not duplicate Oswald's alleged, really imagined shooting.

Blakey also knew
That fictitious ^{also} 2.3 seconds was not for "two well-aimed shots," ^{as} it was the time between shots ² of two shot not aimed ^{at} a human ^{of}.

When Blakey gets to the "found" bullet, as he had to, ~~he~~ he again repeats the glaring lie without which there could have been no Warren Report and without which he could not, as he all along planned for his committee's conclusion. He is less than usually dishonest yet despite his efforts he is still dishonest. He says that "The nearly whole bullet" (Commission Exhibit 399) reportedly found on Connally's stretcher at Parkland and assumed to be the one that had wounded both men. ..."

That bullet was not found ^{on} Connally's stretcher and it was not ^{men} "reportedly found" on it. There was not the ~~slightest~~ question about ^{that} that at all. It was "found" by a single ^N person. It was observed by ^m ~~Dartell~~ ^{linson} Tomlinson alone when he ~~saw~~ ^{an unidentified and unidentified} came out from underneath the mattress on ~~the~~ stretcher and fall to ~~the~~ ^{was seen} floor. That ^{by} ~~also~~ Tomlinson alone. ^{specter} AND when ~~Stretcher~~ ^{pushed} Tomlinson hard to get him to testify to the lie that was so important in the Commission's preplanned conclusion, Tomlinson still refused to ^{do} ~~do~~ that. ^{he} He then added that ~~if~~ he did what Specter was pressuring him so hard to do he'd ~~not~~ be able to ~~sleep~~ sleep nights.

It was assumed to have hit both men but that was contrary to the best evidence the Commission had, that what was being made up for it ~~ew~~ was impossible. This also was proven ~~in~~ the Commission's ~~record~~ record.

Fidelity to established fact is not a Blakey ^{fault} failure.
Next (pages ⁴⁵⁻⁵¹ ~~4-7~~) Blakey gets into Garrison who was, as Blakey

says, a fraud.. However, Blakey being Blakey, he begins with an untruth, "In December, 1966 Garrison was telling newsmen 'for background' that he had a suspect in the Kennedy assassination and that an arrest was imminent" (page 47). I knew most of those "newsmen" one of the most prominent was a woman and the co-author of a book on Garrison. and not one even told me any such thing. There was universal complaint in February of the next year, however, when the story did break, but then that was on the initiative of the morning of the pair of daily papers of common ownership. *(He reported the return of the* checked the court records on search warrants obtained by Garrison.

There are other errors and quotations of partisans misrepresented as impartial but there is no point in wasting time on them when there are bigger fish to fry. *(page 52 ff).*

Next Blakey gets to "The Castro Assassination Plots." In Blakey's account it was unnecessary for him to omit what was well and publicly known, that they were Eisenhower plots, *not Kennedy's, and* that are among the policies Eisenhower preferred that he deliberately fixed on Kennedy by *creating* having the situations what Kennedy could not get away with not continuing. However, there is no evidence at all of any Kennedy plot with the Mafia to assassinate Castro. *They began before Kennedy was elected.*

in August 1960 of Blakey

~~Blakey states~~ states that "the idea originated with (J.C.) King and Colonel Sheffied Edwards" (page 53) when there is no doubt that the idea was Eisenhower's. As the Bay of Pigs also originated with ~~the~~ Eisenhower. *else also* and much ~~else~~ did.

Again. ~~Blakey~~ includes *much* less than was publicly reported and was well known.

Blakey's
 Whatever ~~his~~ intent, this is not honest writing, it ~~is~~ has the ~~effect~~ ^{whether or} ~~if~~ not the purpose, of protecting Eisenhower's reputation and it leads the uninformed reader to believe that, with the responsibility made to appear to be Kennedy's, there is a basis for Castro wanting retaliation against Kennedy. *which is false in all respects*

Blakey knows what he does not say, that these plots were Eisenhower plots (page 53).

Only when he gets to page 59 does Blakey end this misleading:

*indent
 single
 space*

the delivery of poison pills and weapons to the exiles. (Taylor swore to the Senate Committee on July 9, 1975, that he never heard of Harvey's passing pills to poison Castro.) It was also on May 7 that Attorney General Kennedy was briefed by Colonel Edwards and CIA General Counsel Houston, who informed him of the operations involving underworld figures, but they said they had been terminated, which was a lie. They said that Roselli and Giancana had been offered \$150,000; that senior CIA officials in the Eisenhower administration had approved the project orally; and that knowledge of the operation extended to only six persons within the agency. (The 1967 Inspector General's report indicated it was known to thirteen CIA officials, including ex-Director Dulles.) Edwards testified to the Senate Committee on May 30, 1975, that at the time of the Kennedy briefing he had not known the CIA was still dealing with the underworld, but the Senate Committee chose not to believe him, citing the 1967 I.G. Report and Harvey's testimony of July 25, 1975, in which he said Edwards knew full well that the operation was proceeding on track when he told him about briefing the Attorney General. Houston described the Attorney General's reaction at the briefing to the Senate Committee: "If you have seen Mr. Kennedy's eyes get steely and his jaw set and his voice get low and precise, you get a definite feeling of unhappiness." Kennedy met on May 9 with Hoover, who described the Attorney General's displeasure in a memo. ~~At~~ *(page 59)*

What Blakey does not ~~make~~ ^{clear} is that when the Kennedys first learned about what they have been blamed for by so many was in 1962 when the plots dated to August, 1960, or were

account
 Eisenhower's, Robert Kennedy, after that briefing, demanded a fuller ~~and~~ the memo was sent to him by CIA counsel Larry Houston. ~~I~~ I have the memo and the brief Houston memo which forwarded it. In the memo Edwards said that only six men, all high officials of the CIA, knew about the plots and there were no records of it on paper.

Even that turns out to have been a lie, with thirteen CIA officials *knowing about it.*

When Blakey states that at the time of the Kennedy briefing, ~~9~~
~~the~~ May, ⁹1962 the CIA was still dealing with the underworld, what
 he does not say is that without any authorization the CIA was
 dealing with some of the same characters in an effort ^{at} to get them
 to kill Castro.

Against ^{even} Blakey inadequacy, when he does not ~~sup~~press entirely,
 And what he does not spell out is that at the time the memos
 to Kennedy were prepared (Houston's was merely a very short
 covering memo) the CIA "stated falsely that the Roselli operation
 had been terminated," he fails to state that this ~~is~~ "operation" was
 to get ^{Castro} Kennedy assassinated by the mafia.

Blakey could have learned more about this Mafia ~~business~~ business
 and more about ~~delayed~~ ^a reports to injure Cuba in various ways if
 he had read disclosed government records.

Thus Blakey ends his third ~~chapter~~ chapter.

~~His next chapter, a mere eight pages, is on Blakey's committee,~~
~~as its title modestly does not suggest. The title is "Congressional~~
 Inquiry: 1976-1978. (pages 6229).

Still again, the permeating, the perpetual Blakey dishonesty.

Still again the Blakey who pretends he is Perry Mason reborn
 is actually a Pink Panther, junior ~~grade~~.