

People and the PURSUIT of Truth

Vol. 2, No. 3

July, 1976

CONTENTS

<u>Title</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Pages</u>
The Takeover of America: The Power-Control Group and How It Began / by Richard E. Sprague		2 to 5, 7
"Go Ahead and Play Checkers — Just Don't Move This Checker" / by John Gardner		6, 7
One Kind of Justice for Whites, Another Kind of Justice for American Indians: The Story of Yvonne Wanrow / by Arthur Kinoy		8, 7
"There Is No Longer Any Reason to Have Faith in the Warren Report's Conclusion on the Assassination of John Kennedy" . . . Senator Richard Schweiker / by the Assassination Information Bureau		1, 7

"THERE IS NO LONGER ANY REASON TO HAVE FAITH IN THE WARREN REPORT'S CONCLUSION ON THE ASSASSINATION OF JOHN KENNEDY" . . . Senator Richard Schweiker

The Assassination Information Bureau
63 Inman St.
Cambridge, MA 02139

Note: Shortly after the Senate Subcommittee report* was released, the AIB held a press conference on Friday, June 25, 1976, at the Sheraton Commander Hotel in Cambridge. It was attended by 12 representatives of the media. The AIB's statements and analysis received coverage from the Boston *Herald American*, three TV channels, WGBH, WCUB, and WNAC, and at least four radio stations. The Boston *Globe* was silent — one more indication of the retreat of the Boston *Globe* from coverage of news obnoxious to the CIA and the FBI. The following is based on the report of the AIB at the press conference.

Courage

We are indebted to the Church subcommittee staff and, in particular, Senator Richard Schweiker, for having the

courage to do what no other government agency has ever done: openly and publicly acknowledge that (in Schweiker's words) "there is no longer any reason to have faith in the Warren Report's conclusion on the assassination of John Kennedy."

For the past several years, we have been urging a new investigation into this case, and we appreciate the steps taken by Senator Schweiker in that direction.

But The Same Old Excuses

Unfortunately, the subcommittee's work falls far short of a full investigation. In defending the narrow scope of its investigation, the committee offers the same excuses given by the Warren Commission for its inadequacies: poor resources, a limited staff, and not enough time to carry out its investigation.

Distortion

The AIB has always maintained that the basic arguments for conspiracy lie in the facts pertaining to the assassination of John Kennedy in Dallas: the ballistics, medical, and photographic evidence. The Senate subcommittee, with narrow limits on its investigation, did not go into this crucial area. Accordingly, we are annoyed by media
(please turn to page 7)

Editor: Edmund C. Berkeley, Berkeley Enterprises, Inc.
Associate Editors: Richard E. Sprague, Researcher
David Williams, Assassination Information Bureau,
63 Inman St., Cambridge, Ma. 02139

This magazine is devoted to:


- facts, information, truth, and unanswered questions that are important to people, widely suppressed, and not adequately covered in the usual American press; and also to
- solutions to great problems that are functioning well in some countries or places, yet are almost never talked about in the usual American press.

People and the PURSUIT of Truth is published monthly 12 issues a year by Berkeley Enterprises, Inc., 815 Washington St., Newtonville, Mass. 02160. Printed in U.S.A.

Subscription rates: U.S.A., \$9.50 for one year, \$18.00 for two years — except for students (send evidence): \$6.00 for one year, \$11.00 for two years. Canada, add \$1.00 per year; elsewhere add \$3.00 per year.

© Copyright 1976 by Berkeley Enterprises, Inc.

Change of address: If your address changes, please send us both your new address and your old address (as it appears on the magazine address imprint), and allow three weeks for the change to be made.



FIRST CLASS MAIL

From: Berkeley Enterprises, Inc.
815 Washington St.
Newtonville, Mass. 02160

The Takeover of America:

The Power-Control Group and How It Began

Richard E. Sprague
193 Pinewood Rd.
Hartsdale, NY 10530

"The question for 1976 is — can the power-control group continue the takeover during this year's elections? Based on a probability analysis, the answer . . . would have to be 'Yes.' "

"That's Not Possible Here"

The taking of America has been a simple and, at the same time, a very complex process. It has not been the result of a coup d'etat similar to those in South American countries, although some aspects of the process resemble a coup. It has not been a process similar to the dictatorship takeovers in Germany, Italy, and other fascist regimes. It has not been a process like the Communist takeovers in Russia, Hungary, and other eastern European countries.

The taking of America has been a process unique in the history of the world. The one feature that makes it unique is that what was once the greatest democracy in the world has been taken over by a power-control group without the knowledge of most of the American people or their congressional representatives or most of the rest of the world. Accomplishing this feat is rather remarkable. The group has taken America in this fashion because the American presidency had increased in power by the early 1960s to the point where control of the presidency and the presidential election procedure was good enough to control America. However, the use of two fiendishly clever stratagems was necessary in order to keep the fact that control had been seized from being obvious to the people. The first of these was control of the establishment media in the dissemination of both true (blocking) and false (flooding) information. The second was the use of clandestine weapons and techniques developed during World War II and perfected during the Korean and Viet Nam wars. These techniques are so new and unusual as to be unbelievable for most citizens. Thus, the incredibility of such weapons as hypnosis, brainwashing, and "programming" of patsies for assassins became a psychological tool in the bag of techniques of the power-control group. The average American has shrugged off the possibility of the takeover with the belief that "that's not possible here."

Hitler Did Not Even Come Close

The use of such weapons, when coupled with a tremendous campaign through the controlled media, as whitewashing any signs of conspiracies and disinformation being spread throughout the country has successfully blocked any serious or official attempts to get at the truth. Unofficial investigators, private researchers, and even congressional representatives have been ridiculed and completely blocked by both the power-control group and their unwitting or blindfolded allies in the media. The American people, by and large, know only what they read in the papers, as Will Rogers used to say. Except that

since World War II, it has been mostly only what they see on television.

To take over a real democracy without letting the people know it has been taken over is a fantastic achievement. Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and Machiavelli did not even come close to it. A list of the accomplishments of this group illustrates the point. Since 1963, here is what they have done.

1. Assassinated John F. Kennedy.
2. Controlled Lyndon B. Johnson as president.
3. Forced LBJ out of the presidency.
4. Assassinated Robert F. Kennedy, assuring Nixon's election in 1968.
5. Assassinated Dr. Martin Luther King.
6. Eliminated Edward M. Kennedy from the 1972 election by framing him at Chappaquiddick and threatening his children.
7. Eliminated George C. Wallace, assuring Nixon's election in 1972.
8. Knocked Edmund C. Muskie out of the 1972 election by using dirty tricks.
9. Covered up all of the above.
10. Controlled the 15 major news media organizations.
11. Made Gerald Ford vice president and then president.
12. Insured continuity of cover-ups by forcing Ford to pardon Nixon.
13. Murdered about 100 witnesses and participants in the above-mentioned assassinations and attempted assassination.
14. Blocked efforts by private citizens and organizations to reveal the takeover. Discredited, ruined, or infiltrated these individuals and groups. Assisted or killed the operating assassins in so doing.
15. Blocked efforts by congressmen in the Senate and House to initiate investigations of the assassinations. Used infiltration, influence in Congress, and threats to whitewash, ridicule, or eliminate these efforts. This influence and infiltration has been particularly effective in the Church committee and in the House Rules Committee.
16. Controlled the presidential election procedure in 1964, 1968, and 1972 by the expedient method of eliminating the candidates who might expose the truth and insuring the election or appointment of candidates already committed to covering up the truth about the takeover.

The Question for 1976

The question for 1976 is — can the power-control group continue the takeover during this year's elections? Will they be successful in blocking efforts by Congress to expose the takeover? Will they be able to fool the American public again and be able to control the media when they eliminate the candidate or candidates for president in 1976, who might threaten their secure position? Based on a probability analysis, the answer to these questions would have to be, "Yes."

The candidates on the scene during the primaries of 1976 fell into three categories from the point of view of the control group. Category 1 included candidates who would probably continue the cover-up of the takeover. Gerald Ford led this group. Ronald Reagan was not too far behind him. Henry Jackson was a probable ally because of his backing of the CIA, an important organization in the cover-ups and the takeover. Category 2 included those candidates who would probably try to expose the takeover and the power-control group if elected. Morris Udall, Fred Harris, and George Wallace fell into this category. Wallace would do it largely for personal reasons. Udall and Harris were publicly committed to reopening assassination inquiries. Category 3 included candidates whose intentions were not clear or completely unknown. Jimmy Carter, Frank Church, and Hubert Humphrey remained in this group, although Sargent Shriver and Birch Bayh were also in this category before they dropped out of the race during the early primaries.

Safe Candidates

Udall, Harris, and Wallace could be sure of efforts to eliminate them if any one of them were nominated at the Democratic convention. Jackson, Church, Carter, and Humphrey would certainly be put to some kind of loyalty test before being permitted to continue as the Democratic nominee. Reagan and Ford are no doubt already safe candidates for the control group because of the demonstrated cover-up performances. Ford has cooperated fully in at least four ways. He was on the Warren Commission and led the cover up. He published the cover-up book "Portrait of the Assassin." He pardoned Nixon and protected the Nixon tapes with their probable revelations about the JFK assassination cover up. And he formed the Rockefeller Commission, appointing David Belin as head of the staff to continue the cover-up of the JFK conspiracy.

Reagan has cooperated in at least three ways. He protected important witnesses from extradition from California in 1967-1969 for testimony before the grand jury in New Orleans and at the trial of Clay Shaw. He assisted Evelle Younger, then district attorney in Los Angeles and later California state attorney general, in covering up the assassination conspiracy in the Robert F. Kennedy case. And he has consistently supported the CIA, FBI, and other intelligence agencies in California and nationally in their foreign and domestic clandestine activities.

"Will the Truth Make Us Free?"

Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez from San Antonio, Texas, who introduced House Resolution 204 to reopen the two Kennedy assassination cases, the King case, and the Wallace shooting, has taken a public position on the possibility of the control of the 1976 election. Congressman Gonzalez says,

"If we find the answers — the truth — to the questions [about the assassinations of JFK, RFK, MLK, and Wallace attempt] I have raised, as well as those many others have raised, will the truth make us free? Yes, it will, for the truth will make us free to pursue democracy — our system of government — through the ballot box, and we will not be subject to government by bullets. The truth will enable us to prevent such a series of events from happening again. Some of the supporters of the investigation have written to me recently of their hope that the investigation will get underway right away [March 1976] because they are concerned that there is great danger in store for the Democratic nominee for president, whoever he turns out to be. I hope very much that these fears do not turn out to have a basis in fact."

The Cabal: More Questions Than Answers

Just who and what is the power-control group? Simplified explanations of a takeover group have been made in the past by assassination researchers and others. Some have said it's the military-industrial complex. Some prefer to put the blame on the Rockefellers and the Council on Foreign Relations. Others have talked about control shifting from the Yankees to the Cowboys and back again. The expression "the Cabal" was first used to describe a high-level conspiracy group that planned, financed, and carried out the assassination of John F. Kennedy, in an obscure paper by an unknown author in 1968 ("Nomenclature of an Assassination," Torbett). The word "cabal" has been used since then by some authors and researchers to apply to all of the major domestic assassinations.

The questions raised by the idea of a cabal are more numerous than the answers provided. What individuals are in the Cabal? Was the same cabal behind the planning and financing of all four or five (Chappaquiddick being the fifth) major eliminations? Or are there several interlocking cabals? What about the Warren and Rockefeller commissions? Were they part of the Cabal, or innocent dupes? Which cabal controls and infiltrates the media and organizes the disinformation pouring forth in 1975 and 1976? Is Ford a Cabal member? Was Nixon? How about Johnson and Kissinger? If there is only one cabal, have they commanded the executions of the 100 witnesses and lower level participants?

The Hierarchy of the Power-Control Group

The mistake made by researchers in postulating higher level groups is to try to simplify a very complex situation. First of all, to draw a distinct line between those involved in an overt conspiracy to assassinate a leader and those involved afterward in covering up the first group's actions is a mistake. The cover-ups are far more important in their implications than the original assassinations. Each assassination or attempted assassination or other form of elimination of a leader is only part of a greater whole. The sixteen accomplishments of the power-control group (listed in Chapter 1), plus those now taking place and those scheduled for the future, should be considered as a continuous spectrum, all interrelated and all sharing one prime objective: control of the presidency through control of the election process and the candidates.

In this continuous spectrum then, the control group membership may contain individuals in various

categories, some of whom planned, some of whom knew about, but did not plan, and some of whom did not know in advance about any given one of the assassinations or eliminations. Some may have been on the firing line but have had nothing to do with the cover ups. Some of them are victims of later eliminations. In the hierarchy of the power-control group somewhere is a subgroup, or perhaps several, who have been responsible for the murder types of eliminations of presidential candidates, of earlier assassins, of witnesses, and of earlier middle-to-higher level members of the power-control group. These subgroups might be thought of as intelligence-style task forces or mini cabals. There is little question that many of the individuals in these task forces are from organized crime and from the intelligence community, or both. They have had access to intelligence techniques and weapons that have been used frequently in the elimination process.

A Living Organism

A second mistake made by some researchers is to assume a static shape of the Cabal through time. Evidence shows that the power-control group has been a living organism that both shrinks and grows as a function of time, and with some turnover near the top. The shrinkages take place through eliminations and a few natural deaths. The growth takes place for several reasons. It is necessary to use new techniques and new people in the activities of the group as time passes in order to continue effective control of the media and to continue to fool the people and Congress. Other growth takes place because it is necessary to bring new higher level people into the group from time to time. New candidates for president acceptable to the group must be sworn in and must agree to continue the cover-ups. New media lackeys or new special committees or commissions are also needed. Once in a while, an individual blackmails his way in. Some come in on a de facto basis. Protectors of the Kennedys and their children fall into this category.

In addition to presidents (there have been three, Johnson, Nixon, and Ford), the very nature of the cover-up procedure has made it necessary to expose at least some of the truth to vice presidents and vice presidential candidates. Each vice president elected or appointed since 1963 has had to know the truth about the cover ups in the event he became president. These men include Humphrey under Johnson, Agnew under Nixon, and then Ford and Rockefeller. Ford was the most important of this group since he had to agree to pardon Nixon and to protect the tapes.

The heads of the FBI and CIA, plus selected, trusted second-level men as well as the deputy director of plans (DDP) in the CIA, have all had to know some of the truth. The members of the 40 group and their successors, who presumably know all of the intelligence secrets of the country, are no doubt brought into this inner circle of knowledgeable people. The Warren commissioners were split. Warren, Dulles, McCloy, and Ford all knew the truth. Cooper, Boggs, and Russell did not. The Rockefeller commission was also split. Rockefeller certainly knows and so does Ford's man on that commission, David Belin. Kissinger must know the truth, as well as some of the officers in the Department of Defense. Then there are the Cabal members planted in the various media organizations who know the truth.

Cover-Ups Easier to Prove

This view of the power control group as a living organism can best be constructed and proven by starting with the cover-up efforts and the control of the media, as opposed to examining the conspiracies to assassinate each leader. It is much easier to show how Gerald Ford, for example, led the cover-up in the JFK conspiracy than it is to determine who were the members of the power control group that planned and financed the assassination.

It is difficult to show evidence of higher level participation in the assassinations of Robert Kennedy, Dr. King, and in the attempt on George Wallace. It is not difficult at all to prove that many individuals at high levels conspired to cover up the conspiracies in each of the three cases and to prove that they helped frame at least one of the patsies selected (James Earl Ray).

How It All Began: The Late 1950s

To understand the origins of the taking of America and the power-control group, it is necessary to go back to the late 1950s, the last years of the Eisenhower administration, and examine what was going on in the cold war against Communism. Eisenhower had suffered several strokes and a heart attack and was partially immobilized. He entrusted a major share of the coordination of clandestine activities being conducted by the CIA against the worldwide "Red Menace" to Richard Nixon, his vice president. While Eisenhower was warning against the military-industrial complex at home and attempting moves toward detente with Russia through a summit meeting, he was being sabotaged by the plans section of the CIA and by Richard Nixon.

This clandestine section of the CIA arranged for a U2 with Gary Powers as pilot to go down over Russia, thus giving Khrushchev a chance to expose American spying and to cancel the summit meeting. This was one of the earliest moves of the nucleus of what later evolved into the power-control group.

The Bay of Pigs

In the spring of 1960, with Eisenhower nearly senile, Nixon got him to approve the plan for the invasion of Cuba and the assassination of Castro. Nixon was the chief White House action officer for what turned out later to be the Bay of Pigs. The power-control group was beginning to organize itself. Nixon was part of it, but surely not the leader. The cold warriors and strong anti-Communist "patriots" in the plans or operations section of the CIA formed the original nucleus.

The plan was, of course, for Nixon to become president in 1961 and to launch a successful takeover of Cuba. John F. Kennedy came along to upset the plan. Not only did he make the takeover impossible, but he soon discovered the evils lurking in the hearts and minds of the clandestine CIA operators and laid his own plans to destroy them. Kennedy's assassination became an essential act of survival for some of these individuals.

Many Americans Have Forgotten

With all that has happened between 1960 and 1976, it is sometimes difficult to recall just what the circumstances were back in those days. Many American citizens have forgotten that, in 1959 and 1960, Richard Nixon was vice president of the United States. As an old anti-Communist from Alger Hiss

and Khrushchev debate days, Nixon was in the forefront of pressure for the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba. What has not been remembered is that Nixon was largely responsible for the covert training of Cuban exiles by the CIA in preparation for the Bay of Pigs. He stated so in his book Six Crises: "The covert training of Cuban exiles by the CIA was due in substantial part, at least, to my efforts. This had been adopted as a policy as a result of my direct support." /1/

While the Bay of Pigs operation was under the overall CIA direction of Allen Dulles, Richard M. Bissell, Jr., was the CIA man in charge, according to Ross and Wise. /2/ Charles Cabell, /3/ the deputy director of the CIA, and a man with the code name Frank Bender were also near the top of the operational planning. /4/ Everette Howard Hunt, Jr., was in charge of the actual invasion, using the code name "Eduardo." Bernard L. Barker, using the code name "Macho," worked for Hunt in the CIA Bay of Pigs planning. James McCord was an organizer for the invasion and was one of the highest ranking officials in the CIA. Frank Sturgis, alias Frank Fiorini, was also involved in the Bay of Pigs operations. Virgilio Gonzales was a CIA agent active in the Bay of Pigs, and so was Eugenio Martinez. Charles Colson was a former CIA official who knew McCord and Hunt during the Bay of Pigs period. /5/

"President Eisenhower had ordered the CIA to arm and train the exiles in May of 1960. Nixon and his advisors wanted the CIA invasion to take place before the voters went to the polls on November 8, 1960." /6/.

Nixon's Lies October 1960

Mr. Nixon's truth-telling capacity during an election campaign is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than by the deliberate lies he told on national television on October 21, 1960. He said in his book that the lies were told for a patriotic reason, namely to protect the covert operations planned for the Bay of Pigs at all costs. The significance of this is that Mr. Nixon considered patriotism as covering the protection of plans or actions of individuals that he considered were working for the United States' best interests.

Kennedy Did Know About Bay of Pigs Plans

John Kennedy and Richard Nixon engaged in a series of national television debates during the 1960 campaign. At Eisenhower's request, Kennedy was briefed by Allen Dulles, head of the CIA, on secret CIA activities and international problems, on July 23, 1960. Nixon was not aware of the briefing contents and was not sure whether Dulles told Kennedy about the Bay of Pigs plans. As it turned out, Dulles had not mentioned the plans, but had kept his remarks about Cuba rather general.

On October 6, 1960, Kennedy gave his major speech on Cuba. He said that events might create an opportunity for the U.S. to bring influence on behalf of the cause of freedom in Cuba. He called for encouraging those liberty-loving Cubans who were leading the resistance to Castro.

Nixon became very disturbed about this because he felt Kennedy was trying to pre-empt a policy which he claimed as his own. Nixon ordered Fred Seaton, secretary of the interior, to call the White House and find out whether Dulles had briefed Kennedy on the Cuban invasion plans. Seaton talked to

General Andrew Goodpaster, Eisenhower's link to the CIA, who told Seaton that Kennedy did know about the Bay of Pigs plans.

Nixon's Attack on Kennedy

Nixon became incensed. He said, "There was only one thing I could do. The covert operation had to be protected at all costs. I must not even suggest by implication that the U.S. was rendering aid to rebel forces in and out of Cuba. In fact, I must go to the other extreme: I must attack the Kennedy proposal to provide such aid as wrong and irresponsible because it would violate our treaty commitments." /7/

So Richard M. Nixon, then our vice president, later our president, actually went on national television (ABC) on October 21, 1960, knowing we were going to invade Cuba and lied like a "patriotic trooper." During the fourth television debate, he said that Kennedy's proposal was dangerously irresponsible and that it would violate five treaties between the U.S. and Latin America as well as the United Nations' Charter. /8/

On October 22, at Muhlenberg College, Nixon really turned on the fabrication steam. He said, "Kennedy called for the U.S. Government to support a revolution in Cuba, and I say that this is the most shockingly reckless proposal ever made in our history by a presidential candidate during a campaign ..."

The Kennedy Strength

So the battle for truth boiled down again to Nixon vs. Kennedy. Apparently, the only power or strength in the U.S., since 1959, able to contest the power of Richard M. Nixon and his cohorts was the strength of the Kennedy family and name.

Thus the stage was set in 1961 for the group of powerful individuals who had planned the Bay of Pigs to gain revenge on John F. Kennedy for trying to change the overall direction of the U.S. battle against Communism. After Kennedy refused to approve the overall plan for overt U.S. backing of the Bay of Pigs invasion, various individuals in the clandestine CIA forces vowed their revenge.

Evidence has appeared indicating that, in the spring of 1961, Helms, Hunt, Sturgis, and Barker tried to have JFK assassinated in Paris. /9/ When the attempt failed, a number of other plots and subplots developed through the next two years. After Kennedy's blockade strategy against Castro during the missile crisis in 1962 was implemented, some of the high-level CIA and armed forces people wanted even more to get him out of the White House. They had favored a direct invasion or bombing of Cuba.

And, finally, when Kennedy found out about the CIA's plans for another invasion of Cuba in the spring and summer of 1963, and stopped them, they began in earnest a plan to kill him.

References

1. Six Crises, Richard M. Nixon. Doubleday, 1962.
2. The Invisible Government. Wise and Ross. Random House, 1964.
3. Brother of Earl Cabell, mayor of Dallas when Kennedy was assassinated.
4. Ibid.
5. New York Times articles on Watergate, June 18 to July 2, 1972.

(please turn to page 7)

"Go Ahead and Play Checkers — Just Don't Move This Checker"

John Gardner
Common Cause
2030 M St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Imagine you were playing a game of checkers — playing to win.

Someone leans over your shoulder, puts a thumb on one checker and says, "Go ahead and play — just don't move this checker." Then someone else leans over your other shoulder and puts a thumb on another checker. Then a third person immobilizes still another checker, then another, then another ... Soon all thumbs; no moves.

Could you ever expect to win a game like that? Of course not!

Yet, most Americans expect their senators and congressmen in Washington to solve the monumental problems of recession, inflation, devastating unemployment, and a dangerous energy crisis while working under the same insurmountable conditions.

In the struggle to find solutions to these grave problems, the restricting thumbs are the high-pressure demands of special-interest groups — they do not really want to paralyze the nation's problem-solving efforts. Each just wants to immobilize one checker. Each is simply looking after its own special interest — making sure that their financial gains are not affected, insuring that certain tax advantages are not disturbed, guaranteeing that subsidies are maintained, etc. Collectively, they prevent any solution.

And in real life you can't see whose thumbs are coming down on the checkerboard. You don't know what forces are making the game impossible to win. That's why we the citizens must step in and say, "THUMBS OFF!"

And when I say "we," that is exactly what I mean. Alone there is precious little you can do to change things. But firmly united with nearly 300,000 other concerned Americans in Common Cause, you will be amazed just how much you can accomplish.

Common Cause is a hard-hitting, relentless and successful national citizens' lobby. It was born of the dire need to return to all citizens their constitutionally guaranteed right to have their voices heard in their own government. We know that our country will never find equitable and meaningful answers to today's crippling problems until secret — and all too often corrupt — pressures of special interests are exposed to public view. And to cast off these pressure "thumbs," we need support.

Since our inception in the fall of 1970, nearly 300,000 Americans have banded together in Common Cause. Our membership is made up of concerned citizens — independents, Democrats and Republicans —

"... we the citizens must step in and say, 'THUMBS OFF!'"

from all walks of life. We have been praised by both the press and the public as the best organized, most professional movement of its kind in history. In the few short years of our existence, we have scored major victories such as:

- Making it a lot harder for big-money operators to corner political influence and buy politicians. In 1971, we sued both major parties for violating campaign financing laws, and our suit prodded Congress to pass a better law. In 1972, we successfully sued the Committee to Re-elect the President to force disclosure of secret campaign contributions. And among the gifts we forced out into the open were secret funds that had financed some of the most scandalous Watergate episodes.
- Our activity laid the basis for Congress's enactment of campaign finance legislation in 1974. Our members made the issue so hot, Congress had to deal with it and not duck it.
- Opening up our government to let citizens know what their elected representatives are doing. For example, in 1973, we played a key role in persuading the committees of the House of Representatives to reverse their long-standing habit of secrecy and to open up most of their bill-drafting sessions.
- Sparking the greatest wave of state legislative reform in the nation's history. In the past 2 1/2 years, 46 out of 50 states have passed one or more of the "accountable government" reforms recommended by Common Cause.
- Reforming Congress. We, for example, helped end the outmoded and tyrannical seniority system. We helped break the autocratic power of the House Ways and Means Committee, the committee which deals with your taxes. When three formerly entrenched committee chairmen were deposed, it made headlines. One, Representative Hebert, openly blamed Common Cause for his ouster.

Yes, we've come a long way ... but we have an even longer way to go.

Political corruption, backroom fixes, secret deals — aside from their moral repulsiveness — create a government that just does not work. And

(please turn to page 7)

accounts which distort the truth, claiming that no evidence of conspiracy was found when, in fact, no investigation was made in that direction.

Oswald's Involvement with Intelligence Agencies

Two specific flaws in the Schweiker-Hart report merit special criticism: (1) the omission of any consideration of Oswald's involvement with U.S. intelligence agencies — a matter directly within the purview of the committee's investigation; and (2) the assertion that Cuba was somehow involved in the assassination.

From 1956, when he entered the Marine Corps, until his death in 1963, Oswald had a record of encounters with the intelligence agencies that can scarcely escape the attention of a serious investigation. He enjoyed a high security clearance while stationed at an Air Force base in Atsugi, Japan. He accomplished his defection to Russia with funds in excess of his own limited savings. He returned to the U.S. two and a half years later on a loan from the U.S. State Department. Home in New Orleans, Oswald created a paper chapter of the pro-Castro Fair Play for Cuba Committee, where his actions had all the earmarks of an agent provocateur. As the report notes, he moved in both pro- and anti-Castro circles. Because of the committee's failure to investigate Oswald's background, it misses the likely motives for the CIA and FBI cover-ups.

Connection with Cuba

The committee's speculations about the involvement of Castro's Cuba are downright irresponsible. Stories pointing to Castro's involvement, cited as unpursued leads, are mere innuendo and hearsay.

The committee's primary reason for citing unpursued leads that suggest possible Castro retaliation is found in the story of AM/LASH. AM/LASH (a code name used by the CIA) was Rolando Cubela, an official of the Cuban government. He had secretly plotted with the CIA against Castro as early as 1961. In mid-1963, the CIA renewed its contact with Cubela, and by September, his case officer had promised CIA support for Cubela's plan to stage a coup against Castro. The plan to assassinate Castro was not considered, if at all, until late fall. Such a plan could not have provided Castro with the time needed to plot Kennedy's death in November 1963. The report implies that Castro suspected Cubela, was having him watched, and learned of the plot against him. But the report states there is no direct evidence that Castro was aware of AM/LASH's 1963 dealings with the CIA. We believe that the AM/LASH story is a deliberate distraction.

Finally, the notion that Castro was contemplating retaliation in late 1963 is contradicted by Kennedy administration officials, such as William Atwood. He was a former UN envoy, and was directly involved in negotiations toward better relations with Cuba. Frank Mankiewicz, in an interview with Castro, reported that Castro was encouraged by Kennedy's friendly overtures in the fall of 1963. In any case, Cuba could never have expected better treatment from Kennedy's successor, Lyndon Johnson.

One Step

A journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step. The Schweiker-Hart report is just

that — a single step. Moreover, this single step could not have been made without thirteen years of determined agitation by assassination researchers and political researchers who have struggled against the orthodoxy of the Warren Report

Recommendation

The Church Committee has recommended that the new Senate Intelligence Oversight Committee pursue the new investigative leads. Senator Inouye, the head of that committee, has said that the Kennedy assassination has a low priority and will not be scrutinized for at least six months. Considering the turtle-like pace of these investigations, it would be folly for us to relax in our own research. We have little reason at present to be optimistic about the prospects for a full congressional inquiry. □

* The Investigation of the Assassination of President Kennedy: Performance of the Intelligence Agencies, 106 pp., April 23, 1976, released June 23, 1976.

Kinoy — Continued from page 8

The Center for Constitutional Rights won a historic landmark decision when the United States Supreme Court ruled 8-0 that warrantless electronic surveillance was illegal. This was just two days after Watergate. If we had not brought that case, the practices of Watergate might still be unknown to us — and, what's worse, they still might be occurring.

Each time the Center enters court, it faces an opponent of unlimited finances: the government. The Center, on the other hand, is supported only by contributions from friends like you who are concerned with the protection of our civil liberties.

We ask for help so that the Center can continue its vitally important task of protecting our constitutional rights. Please help us.

Injustice anywhere in this country is injustice to everyone. None of us can afford to let the courts be used as instruments depriving people of freedom rather than guaranteeing people their freedom. □

Gardner — Continued from page 6

if we, as a nation, are to survive our current crises, we must have a government that does work, a government that is not paralyzed by surreptitious pressures and arrangements.

The problems we face would be terribly hard to solve in the best of circumstances. They become downright impossible to solve when underground pressures and deals paralyze the whole machinery. It is the "Thumbs on the Checkerboard" all over again. And because the citizens are the ones who ultimately foot the bill of all this graft and corruption, it must be the citizens who rise up and demand "THUMBS OFF!"

(Editorial note: For the rest of this article as originally written, please write to Common Cause.) □

Sprague — Continued from page 5

6. The Invisible Government. Wise and Ross. Random House, 1964.
7. Six Crises. Richard M. Nixon.
8. The Invisible Government.
9. "400,000 Dollars Pour Abattre Kennedy a Paris." Camille Gilles. Juillard Press, Paris, 1973. □

One Kind of Justice for Whites, Another Kind of Justice for American Indians: The Story of Yvonne Wanrow

Arthur Kinoy
Center for Constitutional Rights
853 Broadway
New York, NY 10003

In my 23 years of legal practice, I have handled many kinds of cases — murder, civil rights, conspiracy, antiwar actions — and, I thought I had seen everything.

I thought I was hardened and used to any injustice, but I have found out that I am not. Please let me tell you about Yvonne Wanrow.

Yvonne Wanrow, a Colville Indian, lived in Spokane, Washington. She is a mother of three young children as well as an artist, a writer, and a volunteer worker in a Colville Reservation alcoholism center. Would you believe a person like Yvonne Wanrow has been convicted of second-degree murder and sentenced to twenty-five years in a state prison?

Yvonne was convicted by an all-white jury of killing a white man who had attempted to sexually molest her 11-year-old son and who had raped her babysitter's 7-year-old daughter.

Yvonne was convicted for shooting the man after he had crashed through the front door at 5 a.m. in the morning and had charged her and her children, who were huddled in a corner screaming for help.

- The man was drunk when shot.
- The day before, the man had threatened Yvonne's son with a knife.
- The day before, Yvonne had begged the police for protection, but was told only to lock her doors.
- The man was identified as the prowler and peeping tom the police had received complaints about the week before he was killed.
- The man had previously been convicted of child molesting.

Have you heard enough? A child molester, a drunk, a prowler, and worse ... how, you might ask, could any jury find Yvonne guilty of murder for protecting herself and her children?

This is where racism and the law add up, simply, to injustice:

- The fact that the man had been previously convicted of child molesting was ruled inadmissible by the court.
- The racist slur that "Indians are prone to violence" was ruled admissible.



And, Yvonne's trial took place the week after the siege at Wounded Knee ended — a fact that biased the jury against her. Although the appeals court overturned her conviction on a legal technicality, the State of Washington is seeking a new trial.

There is one organization which has come to Yvonne's help. The Center for Constitutional Rights is defending Yvonne. We are fighting to see that she is not forced to undergo a new trial, and that she is able to stay with her family and continue her work. The Center for Constitutional Rights is Yvonne's main hope for justice and freedom, and that is why I want to ask you to help.

Yvonne's case is now before the Washington State Supreme Court. If we win, the state may be convinced of Yvonne's innocence — and drop forever their legal harassment. But, if we lose, it implies 25 years of prison for Yvonne and separation from her children.

The Center has been in the forefront of the fight against racism and injustice in cases like Yvonne's, as well as Wounded Knee, Attica, Vietnam Veterans Against the War, Gainesville 8, Chicago Conspiracy, and the Berrigans, among many others.

The Center has fought in court to protest the government's invasion of Cambodia, wiretapping, grand jury abuse, and forced sterilization ... to see that these injustices were stopped, and that they never occur again.

(please turn to page 7)