

# CLANDESTINE AMERICA



THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER OF THE

ASSASSINATION  
INFORMATION  
BUREAU

July-August 1977

© AIB, Inc.

Vol. 1, No. 1

*"This is the Age of Investigation, and every citizen must investigate." --Ed Sanders*

## **New Chief Counsel**

On June 20th, the House Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA) announced the appointment of G. Robert Blakey to be its new chief counsel. Blakey, who had been serving as the director of the Cornell Institute on Organized Crime, provided some initial insight into his attitude toward his new position when he quoted the words of Thomas Dewey from a 1935 radio address made after Dewey was appointed special prosecutor in NYC to investigate organized crime.

"In general, it is my belief that a talking prosecutor is not a working prosecutor."

"It is my sincere hope," Blakey continued, "that the work we are doing vanishes from the newspapers."

Towards that end, HSCA chairman Louis Stokes read a resolution passed by the HSCA that invoked a virtual gag order: "To protect the witnesses and the integrity of the process of the investigation, be it resolved that during the preliminary evidence-gathering phase, the policy of this Committee shall be to safeguard all information in a confidential manner. As to the substance of the investigation, it shall be the policy of this Committee and its staff not to comment until the investigatory phase is completed."

Acknowledging that he was uncomfortable in having to field reporters' questions, Blakey was purposely vague in response to many inquiries and declined to say when public hearings might be held. (The old timetable as proposed by former chief counsel Sprague suggested that there might be hearings this summer.)

Blakey is known as a hard-line expert on criminal law. He served as a special attorney in the organized crime and racketeering section of the Justice Dept. from '60 to '64. Later as chief counsel of the

This is Vol. 1, No. 1 of AIB's Washington newsletter. The purpose of this newsletter is to provide critical coverage of events surrounding the House investigation, as well as pertinent information related to the general theme of assassinations and 'clandestine america.' In Sept., we plan to offer this newsletter on a yearly subscription basis, the cost and frequency of which have yet to be determined. This is the first issue of what will be an evolving format. We would like input from our readers concerning the format and content of this newsletter. What kinds of articles and information would you like to see emphasized? In the future we hope to include letters and contributions from our readers. Send us any 'hot scoops', short articles, cartoons, poems, quotes, etc., that you'd like to share with us. Tell your friends about what we're doing in D.C.

Senate Judiciary Subcm. on Criminal Laws and Procedures, he played a role in drafting a section of the 1968 Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act that authorizes govt. wiretapping and bugging with judicial warrants.

Those who know the man and his work call Blakey "a man of extreme personal integrity" and a "brilliant legal tactician". He is said to be "politically very conservative" and extremely well versed in the ways of organized crime.

Naturally, there was some speculation that the HSCA's choice of a renown expert on the mob could be interpreted as a sign that the investigation was focusing on that area. Both Stokes and Blakey dismissed the notion, however, while declining to say what areas would be tar- (con't next page)



## 2 • Clandestine America

(BLAKEY con't) gets of their probe.

When asked if, as a private citizen, he held any opinions as to who was involved in the two slayings, Blakey responded that he had no opinion and that "to the best of my knowledge, I have never publicly stated any opinion."

Blakey actually began working with the HSCA fulltime on July 5th. On July 14th the HSCA met in closed session to discuss "personnel matters." It is rumored that Blakey will be bringing several law/graduate students down from his Cornell Institute to fill existing vacancies on the HSCA's research staff. So far there is no indication as to whether the research staff will be expanded, as many observers of the HSCA's work to date feel is necessary.

---

### Ray's Escape

On Friday, June 10th, James Earl Ray and six other inmates climbed up a pipe ladder on a wall in the northwest corner of Brushy Mt. State Prison and fled into the rugged woods and underbrush surrounding the facility. Until Ray's apprehension some 55 hrs later, there was considerable feeling that Ray might never be seen again. Almost instinctively, many people expressed concern that Ray had outside help, and that the ultimate purpose of the escape was to have him killed. As Ray's former attorney Robert Livingston said, "Dead men don't talk."

Thus, when Ray was finally discovered in the early hours of June 13th, his capture was greeted gleefully by that element of the news media which has been antagonistic to conspiracy theories from the beginning. Committee members who had earlier expressed their conviction that Ray was never to be heard from again were roundly chastised in the press for their premature utterances. The question of the Committee's competence was posed once again.

While our sympathies lie with the Committee, the entire episode well illustrates the considerable problems that plague this investigation. An evidentiary hearing was held by the Committee on the morning of Ray's capture to hear a report from the two investigators who had gone to the prison in Tennessee on the previous Saturday to probe the circumstances surrounding the escape. Very little was learned at this hearing. The investigators reported that they found

"no evidence of outside aid," but they did not completely reject the possibility. The investigators were unable to shed light on events surrounding the escape that have yet to be resolved. [Example: It was said that the phones were dead for an hour and a half after the escape in the area where the prison is located. The official explanation was that the lines were overloaded because everyone rushed to their phones after hearing the wail of the prison sirens.]

We do not fault the Committee for failing to find all the answers immediately. One would expect that it would take some time to thoroughly probe the unanswered questions. Rather, it is the manner in which the hearing was held that we call in question. Such a hearing at best seems to have been premature.

The Committee has suffered from poor public relations; in particular, the press has repeatedly charged that the Committee has yet to demonstrate that it is really getting somewhere. Having such a hearing, where nothing of any substance is revealed, can only detract from the Committee's already poor public image.

It is essential that the Committee fully explore Ray's story concerning the King assassination. There are strong indications that Ray has not been totally forthcoming in all that he has told to date. We noted with considerable interest, for example, in an interview with a reporter from the Nashville Tennessean conducted on May 29th, 1977, Ray said when his attorney Percy Foreman urged him to plead guilty by telling him that the chances were 99 percent sure that he would go to the electric chair, he was "in a bind" because he feared that his brother, Jerry Ray, might be prosecuted by the government if he did not go along with a guilty plea. [For more on Ray's couched disclosures and desire to protect his brother, see Jeff Cohen's "A Man Called Raoul", New Times, April 1, 1977.]

With the appointment of a new chief counsel, the Committee has the opportunity to re-examine its past performance and restructure its investigation. Along these lines, chief counsel Blakey's announced intention of shunning all publicity seems entirely appropriate. We hope the Committee will make profitable use of its time "underground", and that when it is called upon again to answer its critics, it will do so with a new sense of confidence.

---



### Secret War Of CBS

On Dec. 29, 1962, in the Orange Bowl in Miami, John F. Kennedy addressed the members of Brigade 2506, anti-Castro exiles who 20 months earlier had gone ashore at the Bay of Pigs and had recently been released from prison by Castro. JFK's speech, which promised continued U.S. backing for the exiles' goal of overthrowing Castro, drew long standing ovations from the brigade members and their families, and from the huge crowd. The brigade commanders presented the President with their flag. JFK told them he would return it "in a free Havana."

This statement not only re-inforced the confidence of the Cuban exile community in JFK's continued determination to "liberate" Cuba from Communism, but also reassured conservative politicians and businessmen about the direction of U.S. policy toward Castro. The Cuban missile crisis in Oct. '62 was resolved when Soviet Premier Khrushchev agreed to remove offensive missiles from Cuba, in return for a pledge by JFK not to use military force against Cuba in the future. Less than two months after the Orange Bowl speech, there were already those in Congress calling for a new invasion, claiming that the missiles had not been removed.

JFK intended to keep his pledge to Khrushchev. During the last year of his administration, he resisted the pressures of the "Cuba Lobby" for a new, tougher policy toward Castro. At the time of his death, JFK was conducting secret negotiations with officials of the Cuban govt. seeking better relations between the two countries. Soon after the missile crisis, JFK had begun to use federal intelligence and law enforcement agencies to arrest Cuban exile groups and their CIA advisors attempting to launch independent raids on Cuba. Officially sponsored raids ceased entirely for a period of 8 months after the missile crisis. By the spring of '63, the Miami-based Cuban community was seething with resentment toward the Kennedy administration; infiltrators in exile paramilitary groups reported to the Miami Police growing threats of violence against U.S. government agencies.

From just after the Bay of Pigs in April '61 to the missile crisis of Oct. '62, the Kennedy administration and the CIA operated a covert paramilitary force of Cuban exiles based in Miami in what has now come to be known as the "secret war" against Castro. But after the missile crisis, a year before JFK's death, the secret war was terminated.

With this 1st newsletter coming out of D.C., the AIB has completed the transfer of operations from Cambridge to the nation's capital. AIBers Bob Katz, H. Yazijian and D. Joyce remain in Cambridge, but our office there has been closed; thus we ask that all mail be sent to D.C.

We plan to continue providing the same services--supplying bibliographies, films and slides, books, background briefings, and a regular newsletter. Only our tape service has been suspended until we can work out the necessary arrangements to continue it in D.C.

At the moment, there are 4 of us working fulltime in D.C.--David Williams, Jim Kostman, Marty Lee and Jeff Goldberg. We feel we have made substantial progress in our attempts to establish a working relationship with the HSCA and the press. We are hopeful that our long struggle to gain tax-exempt status is about to reach a happy conclusion. Still, our financial situation is dire and all contributions would be greatly appreciated.

There are unanswered questions about this post-missile crisis shift in JFK's Cuban policy, but all of the above is a matter of public record. This record was ignored in the recent two-hour documentary on CBS, produced by George Crile and narrated by Bill Moyers, called "The CIA's Secret War." The program stated flatly that the secret war continued unabated until Nov. '63 and that JFK's support for the exiles' cause hadn't wavered at all. This view is contradicted by the facts. It is difficult to imagine any explanation for this bizarre falsification of evidence other than a desire on the part of Crile and Moyers to obscure important political aspects of the assassination of JFK.

It was CBS's treatment of the Orange Bowl speech itself which made the deceptiveness of the program apparent. The quotation about returning the brigade's flag "in a free Havana" was used by CBS to introduce the long section of their program on the 1961-62 secret war, despite the fact that it took place at the end of that period. Later in the program, Moyers presented two statements by JFK during the period of the secret war. The first was from a major foreign policy address at the U. of Wash. in Seattle in Nov. '61, where JFK said that "we cannot



## 4 • Clandestine America

as a free nation, compete with our adversaries in tactics of terror, assassination, false promises, counterfeit mobs and crises." Moyers correctly pointed out that it was about this time that JFK organized Operation Mongoose, a major escalation of the secret war. Next, in Aug. '62, JFK stated at a press conference that he was not in favor of a new invasion of Cuba. Why should JFK need to send in the Marines, Moyers asked, if he'd already given the job of overthrowing Castro to the CIA? But the special irony of the Orange Bowl speech escaped Moyers entirely. As JFK was telling the cheering exiles he would fight on with them, he was already putting into effect a new policy contrary to their interests. The FBI, and other agencies, on JFK's orders, had already begun to arrest Cubans and Americans trying to launch sabotage raids. Three weeks before the Orange Bowl speech, a group of Americans who had trained Cuban exiles on No Name Key were arrested and their boat confiscated. If the exiles in the Orange Bowl had known what was in store for them in the months ahead, they would have booed JFK out of the stadium.

The deception allows a theory of the JFK assassination to seem plausible—the theory according to which Castro found out about CIA attempts to assassinate him, blamed JFK personally for these plots, and took revenge in Dallas on 11/22/63. In fact, this "Castro-did-it" theory was the only matter discussed during the CBS program's brief section of the JFK killing. It is a theory whose public discrediting is long overdue and would not be difficult to accomplish in the proper forum. Yet to produce 'their' program, CBS chose George Crile—the one journalist who has done most, especially in a series of articles last year in the Wash. Post, to promote the "Castro-did-it" theory. To persuade us that the secret war really did go on after the missile crisis (Crile once wrote it entered its "second and most ominous phase" at that time), CBS depended on the word of two men interviewed by Crile: Grayston Lynch, who had disobeyed JFK's orders to American personnel and had gone ashore at the Bay of Pigs at the head of the Brigade; and Eugenio Martinez, who worked for Lynch during the secret war and ended up 10 years later as one of Nixon's Watergate burglars.

The program did point to a series of new sabotage raids initiated by JFK in the summer and fall of '63 as proof that the secret

war was continuing. But Crile and Moyers failed to put these raids in a political perspective. They were expressly intended, not as a new effort to bring down Castro's regime, but as a form of economic harassment of Castro, designed to increase dissent and defections and to force him away from his allegiance to Moscow. There were only a handful of these raids, which took place from Aug. thru Oct. '63. They were executed on a small scale, officially from bases outside the U.S., and were tightly controlled by the CIA. By this time, the JFK administration had abandoned the goal of overthrowing the Castro regime. A White House policy review conducted in the spring of '63 concluded that the defeat of Castro at that time would not bring about a situation in Cuba favorable to the U.S.

The chief folly of the "Castro-did-it" theory, as Castro himself stated to Moyers, is that it would have been utter insanity for Cuba to attempt to remove an American President by force. In addition, no explanation has ever been offered for why Castro would have chosen a self-proclaimed Castro sympathizer, Lee Harvey Oswald, to do the job. But, beyond that, Castro knew that he could not count on more favorable treatment from JFK's successor; he was well aware in '63 of the struggle over Cuba inside the US govt., pitting JFK against some of his own advisors—and the CIA. As it happened, under Johnson, the secret war did wind down. But this happened only after a new plan to invade Cuba and kill Castro developed almost to fruition. This later plan was not even mentioned by CBS, though its genesis was during the last months of the Kennedy administration, after JFK scaled down the secret war.

In the summer of '63, Manuel Arttime (handpicked by the CIA 2 years earlier to command the brigade at the Bay of Pigs) left for Nicaragua to organize training camps for the new invasion. He had the full backing of the Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua, and of Dr. Carlos Prío Socarras (the former Cuban president who killed himself in March '77), who visited Arttime and Somoza in the Nicaraguan capital in July '63. (None of this was referred to by CBS when they reported in the last part of the program that Somoza had attended a Sept. '76 meeting of brigade members and had promised new aid for Cuban terrorists.)

There is no doubt that some CIA support was given to Arttime's operation in '63, but



## Clandestine America . 5

it has never been clear where he got most of his money. On the other hand, many of the exiles who had joined him in Nicaragua had been trained in the U.S. Army after the return of the Bay of Pigs prisoners under an arrangement which appears to have been worked out by RFK. If there was any authorization from the Kennedy Administration for Artime's new invasion plan, however, it has never come to light.

Howard Hunt, the Watergate burglar, is reported to have played a key role in an assassination plot against Castro which was going to coincide with Artime's invasion in 1965. (Hunt and Artime have been extremely close ever since the Bay of Pigs.) This assassination plot, which was confirmed by the Church Committee, was going to make use of Rolando Cubela, a Cuban official whose CIA cryptonym was "AM/LASH". The '65 plot never came off; it was aborted at the last minute for reasons which are still unclear. But the Church Com. revealed that Cubela had been involved in a CIA-backed attempt to kill Castro as early as the fall of '63.

For Moyers and Crile, the only question raised by the 1963 Cubela plot was whether Castro's own knowledge of the plot caused him to retaliate by killing JFK, a theory which hasn't a shred of evidence to support it. The more serious questions were again ignored. If the CIA was engaged in such activities in '63, it was doing so without proper authority and against the wishes of Pres. Kennedy.

In case after case, Moyers and Crile presented superficial reviews of old evidence without seriously probing into the consequences of that evidence. For example, the only explanation offered by Moyers for the participation of Sam Giancana, John Rosselli and Santos Trafficante in the CIA's plots to kill Castro was the one given by the man who hired them for the CIA, Robert Maheu, namely that they undertook the assignment for "patriotic reasons." No mention was made of the tremendous loss in gambling, narcotics, and other revenues incurred by these mobsters as a result of Castro's revolution. And secondly, it is indicative that Moyers interviewed Sen. Robert Morgan (D-N. Car.), former member of the Church Com., who expressed his firm conviction, without citing any specific evidence, that the "Castro-did-it" theory is true. No other member of the Church Com. has expressed such beliefs; CBS failed to present views representative of the majority of Church Com. members.

There were some positive contributions made by the program; in particular, the treatment of the current wave of Cuban exile terrorism, and the exclusive interview with Richard Bissell, who supervised both the Bay of Pigs operation and the CIA-Mafia plots against Castro, and who virtually admitted that he had been ordered to arrange Castro's assassination. But in general, at least from our point of view, the good information emerged almost as an excuse for presenting the bad--as in Crile's earlier published articles. The key role played by CBS in maintaining the cover-up of the Kennedy assassination is continuing.

A Wash. group called the Military Audit Project is suing under the Freedom of Information Act for documents concerning the CIA's financing of the Glomar Explorer thru H. Hughes' Summa Corp. Federal Judge Gerhard Gesell in D.C. removed himself from the case this month, saying that he had been "compromised" by the CIA which had been "playing games" with him about national security aspects of the case. The Nat. Security Council has reportedly "re-evaluated" the govt.'s policy of absolute secrecy on the case. William Dobrovir, attorney for the Military Audit Project, will now file a motion to make previous court proceedings public. The ship is now drydock in S.F. The CIA has always maintained a policy of absolute secrecy about the project. In an unprecedented move last year, an opinion of Judge Gesell's was ordered sealed by the Judge himself.

### RECENT ARTICLES OF INTEREST--

- 1- "Execution for the Witnesses," Rolling Stone, 6/2/77, by Howard Kohn. (An examination of the March shootings/suicides of Nicoletti, Prio, and deMohrenschildt.)
- 2- "Three Witnesses," New Times, 6/24/77, by Dick Russell. (An examination of deMohrenschildt, Robert McKeown, and a mysterious anti-Castroite called "Carlos".)
- 3- "George deMohrenschildt, the Freelance Spy Who Said He Helped Kill Kennedy," Seven Days, 5/9/77, by Mike Shuster.
- 4- "Fidel On the Grassy Knoll?" Liberation, 5-6/77, by Jeff Cohen and Donald Freed. (A refutation of the "Castro-did-it" theory.)



## 6. Clandestine America

### Loran Hall

Loran Eugene Hall, (AKA, Skip Hall and Lorenzo Pascillo), a soldier of fortune involved in anti-Castro pursuits, was called to testify before the JFK Subcm. in a public session on June 7th. The meeting lasted only 7 minutes and its outcome, unfortunately, was apparent even before Subcm. Chairman Preyer gaveled it to order. Hall invoked the 5th Amendment on the 1st and only question he was asked: "Were you in Dallas, TX on Nov. 22, 1963?" He then added that he would refuse to answer any further questions relating to the JFK assassination. At that point the Subcm. promptly adjourned, after telling Hall that he would be recalled on Sept. 14th, 1977 (the HSCA's first meeting after the Congressional summer recess). Hall, who remained calm and confident throughout his brief appearance, promised he would return in September.

After the hearing, Hall was very coy with reporters, refusing to answer most questions. For example, when asked if he knew Santos Trafficante, Jr., Hall replied sarcastically, "Who's he?" But at one point he did say that everyone knows the Warren Report was a "whitewash" and he would have talked to the HSCA's investigators in L.A. if the meeting had gone as he requested.

The HSCA had been interested in Hall for several months, and in early May attempted to contact him in L.A. through an intermediary, KMPC radio reporter Art Kevin (Kevin has had a trusted relationship with Hall that dates back to Hall's testimony to Jim Garrison). The HSCA's chief investigator, Clifford A. Fenton, called Kevin at this time and told him they wanted to meet with Hall because, according to Fenton, "We've been talking to a lot of people all over the country who say he's (Hall) the assassin or one of the assassins."

A meeting was set up in L.A. on May 19th between Hall, Fenton, and Kenneth D. Klein (Ass't Deputy Chief Counsel). Art Kevin and Hall both understood that the major groundrule of the meeting was Kevin's presence in the room. But the HSCA staffers wanted to talk to Hall alone. When Kevin refused to leave, a 30 min. argument ensued. It ended with Hall refusing to talk. He was then given a subpoena to appear in D.C. (the subpoena had been dated a week earlier). Having been subpoenaed in this fashion, Hall became a hostile witness. He told Fenton and Klein, "You'll get me back to Wash.,

but you're going to get a polite string of Fifths." Explaining the subpoena action two days later, acting Committee staff Director Tom Lambeth told the Wash. Post that no misrepresentations had been made to Hall and that he was subpoenaed as protection against him leaving the country.

Exactly who is to blame for the misunderstanding is unclear. Kevin accused the Committee of using "thoroughly deceitful tactics." Hall told the press after the June 7 meeting, "I was willing to talk in L.A., but they lied to me and they lied to Art Kevin." Yet, Rep. Preyer told the press that the Committee investigators never said Kevin could sit in on the L.A. meeting, because Committee rules prohibit reporters from being present at such interviews.

In any event, Rep. Preyer and the Subcm. were clearly frustrated by the outcome of these events, and Preyer told reporters after the meeting that the Committee now has no plans to call public witnesses in the near future. And he added that they will evaluate closely whether they should give future witnesses immunity when they are called.

There are four primary areas of investigation which the Committee is pursuing related to Loran Hall:

- 1- Hall's deportation from Cuba on July 8, 1959 with Santos Trafficante;
- 2- The Sylvia Odio affair. Hall claimed to have visited Mrs. Odio along with Lawrence Howard and William Seymour (an Oswald look-alike) in late Sept. '63, but later denied the story;
- 3- Lester Logue and the \$50,000 offer to kill JFK;
- 4- Warren Commission document #1179, which relates how on 9/18/63, Hall redeemed a rifle he had previously pawned which looked identical to a rifle supposedly found in Dealy Plaza at the time of the killing. The FBI's handling of this matter is particularly suspect.

It is important to keep in mind that while Hall can shed valuable light on these matters, much of what he says could be part of elaborate cover stories which, even if unraveled, might lead to dead ends.

[NOTE: The AIB prepared a background briefing on Hall that was distributed to the Committee and the press. A copy of this briefing, 6 pp., can be obtained for \$1.00]



### Assassination Update

On June 30, 1977, RICHARD E. SPRAGUE, longtime assassination researcher (not Richard A. Sprague, former Chief Counsel), told AIB he had become the 1st outside paid consultant to the HSCA. Sprague had been doing consulting work with the HSCA since last fall; now he will be paid on a per diem basis for his work. The HSCA (i.e., Dep. Chief Counsel Tannenbaum) is relying on Sprague for help in examining the photographic evidence. Robert Groden is also expected to become a paid consultant in this area. We are pleased that the HSCA recognizes the importance of seeking assistance from independent citizen experts, and we hope that a fruitful working relationship with the critical community will develop. With this in mind, the AIB has submitted a list of responsible researchers and critics to the new Chief Counsel...

Rep. John B. Anderson (R-Ill.) resigned from the HSCA in April because of other committee assignments—he had just been named the ranking Republican on the ad hoc Select Committee on Energy. HAROLD S. SAWYER (R-5th Dist., Mich.—Gerald Ford's old Grand Rapids Dist.), age 57, was named to fill the Anderson vacancy. Sawyer is the only Freshman on the 12-member HSCA and will serve on the JFK Subcm. Sawyer is the former prosecutor from Kent County, Mich. In March, during the Sprague-Gonzalez controversy, Sawyer voted against the House bill to reconstitute the investigation. He told a reporter in April that he had "serious misgivings" about a Congressional probe. He is concerned that the investigation could turn into a "witchhunt" by "publicity seeking Congressmen", and that the national media attention could attract "kooks" with unfounded accusations...

The late comedian, FREDDIE PRINZE, played an instrumental role in locating a long-sought JFK witness. Prinze, a committed assassination follower, who showed the Zapruder Film to friends wherever he went, had been in regular communication with a well-known researcher for some time. In early '76 Prinze called from Miami and the researcher alerted him that if he was interested in lending a helping hand, he might try to locate a witness sought after for questioning by the Senate Intelligence Com. The witness, identified by Jack Anderson as "Mr. X" and more recently in New Times as

"Carlos", had proved elusive to Senate investigators. But Prinze, with the aid of a Miami phonebook, was able to find the man and passed the information on to the researcher...

WILLEM OLTIMANS, the Dutch journalist who had been very close with George deMohrenschildt, called a press conference in D.C. for June 21st, during which he was supposed to have announced his discovery of the "Deep Throat" of the JFK case, who could reveal the murderers of JFK. As it turned out, Oltmans never showed up, and has been missing and out of contact since that time. Sources close to Oltmans consider this kind of behavior atypical, and some expressed concern. (Oltmans had also disappeared for 10 days in March; this coincided exactly with the disappearance of deMohrenschildt just before his reappearance and suicide.) Other observers, however, believe that Oltmans' public antics around the JFK case significantly detracted from the HSCA's work by calling attention to sensational and unreliable allegations which, even if they originated from deMohrenschildt himself, cannot be taken seriously. Oltmans' latest ploy (the press conference which never happened) was, in effect, a slap at the HSCA, because he claimed his information was so profound that he could relate it only to Pres. Carter directly. The contradictions in the stories told by Oltmans to various researchers over the years raise serious questions about his own motivations...

The continuing saga of SIRHAN SIRHAN's search for his true identity inched forward during the past month. On June 2nd, attorney Godfrey Isaacs announced that Sirhan wants to go back to the pantry of the Ambassador Hotel where JFK was shot, to try and remember if he was a "manchurian candidate" programmed to commit the killing. Sirhan maintained during his trial that he went into a trance before the killing and did not "come to" until afterwards. Sirhan also told L.A. County officials interested in reopening the case that he has studied the second gun theory and he "hopes it is correct." Sirhan's memory gaps raise serious and frightening questions that have never been dealt with satisfactorily by previous official RFK probes. Perhaps the CIA's LSD experiments were just the tip of the mind control iceberg...

(con't next page)



## 8. Clandestine America

On June 20th, Federal Dist. Court Judge Joseph Sam Perry dismissed the \$47 million civil suit brought against seven policemen involved in the 1969 pre-dawn raid of the Black Panther Part Hdqts. in Chicago. The civil suit was initiated by survivors of the Dec. 4th raid, and relatives of BPP leaders FRED HAMPTON and MARK CLARK, who were both murdered in the attack. Substantial evidence indicates that the govt. conspired to kill Hampton. The case against the FBI was so strong, in fact, that at one point during the trial FBI agents tried to shirk responsibility for their actions by claiming that they were just following the orders of their superiors. Judge Perry's dismissal of the suit is another blatant example of a continued effort on the part of govt. officials to cover up the assassination of Hampton and Clark. Morton Halperin (a former Nat. Security Council staff member and co-director of an ACLU-sponsored investigation into the Panther killings) recently called for an investigation into the Panther case by the HSCA, which is authorized to investigate the murders of JFK, Dr. King, and "any others the Committee shall determine."

PLEASE SEND A SELF-ADDRESSED  
STAMPED ENVELOPE TO HELP US  
DISTRIBUTE THE NEXT ISSUE OF  
THIS NEWSLETTER.

HELP US INCREASE OUR CIRCULATION!

Please send all editorial correspon-  
dence and financial contributions  
to the—

ASSASSINATION INFORMATION BUREAU  
1322 18th St. NW #21  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 857-0017

## Looking Towards The Future

The AIB is considering plans for a second 'POLITICS OF CONSPIRACY' conference that would take place in D.C., perhaps during the coming fall. The first AIB conference held in Boston (Feb. '75), and attended by over 3,000 people, played an important role in politicizing the big murders of the '60s. As the prelude to a series of teach-ins around the country, the Boston conference was successful in mobilizing the kind of grassroots public support that eventually culminated in the formation of the HSCA. The second AIB conference will offer an opportunity for researchers, concerned citizens, and members of Congress to share information and reaffirm their commitment to a full ventilation of the facts.

The AIB would like to begin an INTERN PROGRAM in the near future (perhaps this coming fall if circumstances permit). There's plenty of work to be done here, especially in terms of research projects. Unfortunately, our financial plight makes it impossible for us to offer any monetary support for prospective interns. If you are interested in working with us, give us your feedback on what kind of work you might want to pursue, and any suggestions you might have concerning the possibility of an intern program. We expect to be able to offer academic credit for students when the program gets underway. (Letters should be addressed to AIB/ attn: Marty Lee.)

The AIB has joined the CAMPAIGN TO STOP GOVERNMENT SPYING, a coalition of over 50 civic, labor, educational, and religious groups which have joined together to call for strict controls on the operations of local, state, and national intelligence agencies. The basic principles of the Campaign focus on ending covert operations abroad, ending political spying at home, and ending secret budgets and charters of the intelligence agencies. The Campaign is not an individual member organization; rather, it concentrates on establishing a network of local coalitions. For information regarding literature, speakers, and organizing assistance we urge you to contact the Campaign directly at: CSGS/ 201 Mass. Ave. NE #112/ Wash., D.C. 20002/ (202) 547-4644.

