

People and the PURSUIT of Truth

Vol. 1, No. 4

August, 1975

CONTENTS

<i>Title</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Pages</i>
The JFK Assassination: Recent Developments	— David Williams, Associate Editor	1
The Coverup of the Coverups: The Protectors of the Assassins	— Richard E. Sprague	2 to 6
Substantial Evidence of Conspiracy Ignored by the Warren Commission — Part 3 (Conclusion)	— Mark Allen and others	7, 8
"CONSPIRACY IN AMERICA": Conference May 16 to 18 in Los Angeles — Part 2 (Conclusion)	— Jeff Cohen	8

The JFK Assassination: Recent Developments

David Williams, Associate Editor

As we said in the June issue, much of the solid medical evidence, the autopsy materials, in the death of President John F. Kennedy has been withheld from investigators. Dr. Cyril Wecht, coroner of Allegheny County, Pa., and a renowned forensic pathologist, and Researcher Harold Weisberg have filed many, many suits through the Freedom of Information Act in an attempt to get at this information. Their persistency has begun to yield some results. In recent weeks some of the autopsy test results have been turned over to Weisberg, Dr. Wecht, and others. They have so far withheld comment on what the tests reveal until a complete disclosure has been made by the FBI and government officials and until the validity and thoroughness of the analysis can be evaluated.

At a recent press conference in Washington, D.C., Dr. Wecht and Dr. Robert Jolling, president of the American

Academy of Forensic Sciences, and Dr. Herbert MacDonnell, professor of criminalistics at Elmira College, urged the formation of an independent panel to "just do, from the standpoint of a scientific investigation in the JFK case, what any good homicide squad, crime laboratory, etc., is doing hundreds of times each day in the United States."

The FBI have also apparently renewed their interest in the JFK case. The "Dallas Times-Herald" of May 22, 1975 reported that federal agents have questioned several Dallas police officers and a former strip-tease dancer from Jack Ruby's Carousel Club, who is believed to be the last person to talk with Ruby before his death. Miss Shari Angel said that Ruby told her just three days before his death that he believed he was being injected with doses of deadly poison. She quoted him as saying, "They're giving me shots of something to kill me." Miss Angel said she had gone into hiding for several months after the shootings of Kennedy and Oswald. She is still fearful of reprisals. **F.B.I. DENIED THIS.**

This issue is Vol. 6, No. 4 of the series of reports "The Information Engineer and the Pursuit of Truth".

The first 60 issues were published in "Computers and Automation" and "Computers and People" in every issue from May 1970 to April 1975.

Editor: Edmund C. Berkeley
Associate Editors: Richard E. Sprague, Researcher
David Williams, Assassination Information Bureau, Cambridge, Mass.
Rusty Rhodes, Los Angeles, Calif.
Editorial Offices: Berkeley Enterprises, Inc.
815 Washington St.
Newtonville, Mass. 02160

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

We are applying to the U.S. Postal Service for second class mailing privileges.

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.

Please address all mail to: Berkeley Enterprises, Inc., 815 Washington St., Newtonville, Mass. 02160.

© Copyright 1975 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.

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

The Coverup of the Coverups:

The Protectors of the Assassins

Richard E. Sprague
130 Pinewood Rd.
Hartsdale, N.Y. 10530

"Any investigating committee going into this battle with its eyes closed . . . and with an attitude that says, 'We don't know whether the clandestine parts of the CIA or FBI or other agencies were involved in the assassinations; so let's find out,' is probably doomed to failure from the start. Therein lies the intelligence community's and the coverup group's greatest strength. They are relying on obfuscating and frustrating by any clandestine means, with great financial and organizational resources available, the efforts to re-open the four cases."

1975 Developments

The year 1975 is an important period for both assassination researchers and Congressional committees investigating domestic assassination conspiracies and coverups. By paying particular attention to those individuals and organizations who continue to defend the Warren Commission and to ridicule the researchers, the power structure responsible for covering up the assassination conspiracies can be detected. The odds are becoming very large that any such defender at this stage knows perfectly well what happened to the two Kennedys, Dr. King, and George Wallace. He (or they) is very probably being paid, coerced, or encouraged to continue the coverup of the coverups, in the same way that the second echelon (St. Clair, Haig, and Co.) continued the coverup on behalf of Richard Nixon in the Watergate affair.

As public pressure to reopen the four cases mounts, as the various non-committed media organizations publish more and more, and as Congressional support for the various resolutions to reopen increases, those who have covered up the truth can be expected to step up their all-out counterattack. Since these people include the power centers in control of the clandestine parts of American intelligence organizations, the fight will be fierce indeed. The senators, representatives, Congressional staffs, researchers, and media people can expect harassment, executive blockage, noise in the information loop, discrediting, and yes — more murders. It is very important for those responsible people and organizations now entering the fray for the first time to understand and to appreciate what they will be up against.

Counter Actions

One way to know who the "enemies" are is to keep a close watch on these counter actions and to determine who and what are behind them. Of extreme importance is the recognition, right away, that intelligence resources are devious enough to plant false evidence, fake witnesses, and misleading data; and even to place their own people on the staffs of the Congressional or media investigating teams. They have been doing this in a very successful manner ever since November 22, 1963.

Any investigating committee going into this battle with its eyes closed to this problem, and with an attitude that says, "We don't know whether the clandestine parts of the CIA or FBI or other agencies were involved in the assassinations, so let's find

out," is probably doomed to failure from the start. Therein lies the intelligence community's and the coverup group's greatest strength. They are relying on obfuscating and frustrating by any clandestine means, with great financial and organizational resources available, the efforts to reopen the four cases. If they are reopened, the clandestine methods (including murder) will still be used, to make sure the investigations lead nowhere or at worst, lead to a conclusion they can buy. One of these possibilities now seems to be surfacing. It is the "Castro did it in revenge" concept.

The Stakes

The new investigators must come to appreciate what is at stake in this forthcoming battle. It is, in effect, a fight for control of power in the United States. The victory, if won by "our" side, will have a tremendous impact on everyone and everything in our country. Power structures that have existed and controlled us all since World War II will crumble. The people will finally assume a decent measure of control through those among their representatives who survive the battle. This is not a mere fight to determine who the gunmen were in Dallas, Memphis, Los Angeles, and Laurel Park, or who backed and sponsored them. As the old schoolboy expression goes, now we are playing for all of the marbles. The main struggle, as in Watergate and the impeachment, is over the coverups, and the coverups of the coverups.

Presumed Guilty

The only safe approach for investigators is to reverse the standard American legal procedure, and assume that everyone is guilty of covering up until proven innocent. Jim Garrison said, after the trial of Clay Shaw ended, "You can't try an intelligence case in a normal American court." The opposition, with their clandestine resources, backed by presidential power and authority, has the capability of influencing judge, jury, witnesses, and evidence. This will certainly be true in any Congressional investigation or hearings.

An article titled "Nixon, Ford, and Political Assassinations in the United States" was published in the January 1975 issue of "Computers and People"./1/ In the article, what was called a "reasonable hypothesis" was used to explain Ford's pardon of Nixon, gaps and alterations in the Nixon tapes, and Jaworski's resignation. The hypothesis stated that Ford, Nixon, and an "inner circle" of high-level people in both administrations and in the intelligence community, have been going to extreme lengths to cover up

the truth about all of our domestic assassinations and especially the JFK assassination. The hypothesis stated that the Nixon tapes will forever be withheld from us because they contain discussions by Nixon, Haldeman, Mitchell, Kissinger, and possibly Ford about the conspiracies in the four assassination cases, and particularly discussions about the cover-ups. Since January, no evidence has turned up to disprove the hypothesis. In fact, a number of events have taken place which would tend to reinforce it. If a Congressional committee accepts the hypothesis as a possibility at the beginning of their deliberations and investigations, the entire set of ground rules under which they would operate would be changed. For example, Mr. Ford, Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Kissinger, most of the present administration, the CIA, the FBI, the Justice Dept., certain Senate and House committees, the military, and many others would be placed on the "Presumed guilty of coverup until proven innocent" list. The range of investigative resources in this situation is obviously quite curtailed. The committee could not rely on any information developed for it by the FBI, the CIA, the Justice Dept., the Rockefeller Commission or any other Executive Branch agency.

A screening process would have to be created to detect planted agents, planted witnesses, and planted evidence. This would be difficult. How does one check whether a proposed staff member is a CIA or FBI agent without the investigative resources of either agency? An external, trustworthy, investigative body would have to be created by such a committee, each member of it being carefully screened.

How to Detect the "Bad Guys"

There are three ground rule questions that would help separate the coverup side from the truthseeking side in this battle.

First, is the person or group willing to support the reopening by Congress, of at least the JFK assassination, if not all four major cases, and their links to Watergate?

Second, is the person or group willing to state publicly that there was possible involvement in at least the JFK assassination conspiracy and coverup of the intelligence community, including the CIA and the FBI, but not excluding others?

Third, if the person or organization has access to potential evidence or information, either in files, or in witness form, will they make the information openly and publicly available, whether it be classified or not?

The third ground rule should really separate the innocent from the guilty. It does so because it strikes at the real root of America's problems. There should be no information, short of actual war-time military secrets that has any bearing on domestic assassinations or clandestine domestic intelligence operations, that cannot be made public.

Let's take a close look at some of the recent counter actions by some of the coverup strategists to see what can be learned about who is on what side.

The Rockefeller Commission

When President Ford announced that a special commission would be formed to investigate the intelligence agencies, a number of researchers predicted who would be appointed as chief of staff. It follows

from "a reasonable hypothesis", that Ford's main Achilles heel which could be exposed by such an investigation, is his own involvement and that of Richard Nixon in the JFK assassination coverup. The prime prerequisite for a chief of staff of the Rockefeller Commission (the staff generally controls what the commission sees) was therefore a willingness to continue the JFK conspiracy coverup. What man could be better qualified for the position than David Belin? Belin was not only willing, he was a nut about continuing the coverup. He had published a new book in 1973, "Nov. 22, 1963, You Are the Jury", /2/ as part of his coverup crusade. He was one of the few Warren Commission lawyers who would still appear on TV or radio to debate researchers and to defend the Commission.

Of course, during the Commission's existence, he was one of only two lawyers assigned the task of determining that Lee Harvey Oswald was the assassin of both John Kennedy and Dallas policeman J. D. Tippit. He went out of his way to overlook testimony, witnesses, and evidence, and even to suborn perjury in the case of witness Charles Givens, according to Sylvia Meagher in her excellent analysis of Belin's interrogation of Givens, published in "The Texas Observer". /3/ Belin is still overlooking evidence. In December of 1973, this author debated Belin on a TV show called "AM-New York" with Robert Vaughn as host. Following the broadcast I showed Vaughn and Belin the beginning of my JFK assassination slide presentation of the photographic evidence. I did not get past the frames from the Zapruder film, 313 to 321, that show the back-and-to-the-left motion of the President's head following the fatal shot.

Belin's Contribution to the Coverup

Belin grew very nervous and upset when he saw those slides and marched out of the room, announcing that he had to go somewhere. I pressed him as to whether he had seen the Zapruder film in motion or looked at the slide series before, and if so, how he explains the back-to-the-left motion. He refused to answer or to discuss the subject. The JFK assassination section of the Rockefeller Commission Report demonstrates Belin's mental state on the subject /3A/. It was obviously written by Belin with little or no contribution by anyone else. The report on this subject is a blatant, almost laughable attempt to cover up the truth once again. It might have been titled, "That old gang of mine is here again." In addition to Belin, who did all of the interviewing of researchers, the "old gang" included:

- Lyndal Shaneyfelt, the FBI agent who testified as ballistics and photographic expert before the Warren Commission
- The testimony of the autopsy doctors, Finck, Boswell, and Humes, was again cited as Rockefeller Commission evidence.
- The Ramsey Clark panel of doctors which looked at the autopsy photographs and X-rays in 1968. Their report was cited as evidence.
- The Warren Report's summary of evidence against Oswald was included in the report.

Belin actually talked only to four or five researchers in conducting his so-called re-investigation of conspiracy and allegations that the CIA was involved in the assassination. These witnesses included Robert Groden who showed him the Zapruder, Nix, and Muchmore films in motion and stop-action, Dick Gregory and Ralph Schoenman, who made certain

suggestions about the CIA and some tramps or winos arrested after the assassination, Dr. Forrest Chapman from Michigan, a known supporter of the Warren Commission's findings that no shots came from the grassy knoll, and also a close friend of Bud Fensterwald, and Cyril Wecht, Allegheny County, Pa., Coroner and long-time critic of the Warren Commission. Belin did not interview any of the researchers who have been collecting the evidence of CIA involvement for more than seven years.

Ignoring of Dr. Wecht's Testimony

Dr. Wecht had been conducting honest medical research for more than eight years. The version of the Rockefeller Report appearing in the "New York Post" not only ignored Wecht's testimony completely, but even included the following statement, "The Commission staff also interviewed by telephone Dr. E. Forrest Chapman of Michigan, the only other physician who is known to have studied the autopsy photographs and X-rays." The phrase "only other" in this paragraph refers to the autopsy doctors, and the Ramsey Clark panel of doctors. The Commission, in other words, did not re-examine the autopsy photographs and X-rays, but relied on the Clark panel and Dr. Chapman for their contentions about the direction of the fatal shot.

In stating that Chapman was the only other doctor who studied the autopsy materials, Belin totally ignored both Dr. Cyril Wecht and, surprisingly, Dr. John Lattimer, who supported the Warren Commission. Belin discredited Schoenman and Gregory's testimony by focusing attention on the three winos arrested that day. He ignored the other testimony given by the two witnesses and also misquoted their statements about the winos. Gregory did not state they were Hunt and Sturgis. He said they bear some resemblance and we should find out who they really were. Belin did not want to find out who they were. He only wanted to prove they were not Hunt and Sturgis. As for Groden and the films, Belin's comments are replete with provable and even laughable errors too numerous to go into in this article. No explanation is given in the "N.Y. Post" version of the Rockefeller Report for the violent back-to-the-left motion of President Kennedy's head. Rumors were rampant before the report came out that Belin was planning to have a new panel of doctors explain away the motion by contending it was caused by a neuromuscular reaction following the fatal shot. He was shown the Zapruder film in Washington, D.C. by Robert Groden. At the fatal shot point, he became very nervous and with eye twitching, he began to shout, "Neurospasm, neurospasm!" /4/

Suppression of Annoying Facts

The truth of the matter is that Belin and the rest of the Warren Commission staff along with the Commissioners never did look at the Zapruder film in 1964 in slow motion to analyze that back-to-the-left acceleration of John Kennedy's head. They may have noticed it in passing, but it was like Givens' original testimony about where Oswald was and where Givens was during the period just before the shots were fired. /3/ It didn't fit the lone assassin solution. It was annoying and it got in the way. So they ignored it and suppressed it. The Warren Report and the 26 volumes of hearings and exhibits contain not one word about the back-to-the-left motion. Belin in later years when confronted with the film, has been extremely agitated and totally defensive about it.

So, when the researchers' forecast that Belin would be named head of staff for the Rockefeller

Commission came true, they were not at all surprised. And Belin lived nicely up to his reputation, fulfilling his primary duty for Ford and Rockefeller. In April 1975, Mr. Ford was asked by a reporter during a press conference held in San Diego, whether the Rockefeller Commission would be looking into new evidence of conspiracy in the JFK assassination and accusations that the CIA was involved. /5/ Ford, perhaps without thinking, said the Commission would be investigating possible CIA involvement. At that time, Belin and Rockefeller had maintained a total silence on areas being investigated and any conclusions reached. The next day, David Belin broke that silence, stating he was making an important exception to their rules in discussing Mr. Ford's remarks. He said the Commission had already conducted an investigation of the new charges of CIA involvement and conspiracy in the JFK assassination, and had concluded the Warren Commission was right and that Oswald acted alone. That would end the matter there and then. /5/ The report confirmed Belin's statement. A possible disclaimer on Rockefeller's part is a statement that the "staff" was responsible for these conclusions. Things that can be learned from this development, along the lines postulated at the beginning of this article, are that Gerald Ford, Nelson Rockefeller, the other members of the Rockefeller Commission, and David Belin have decided to cover up the coverup. Therefore they must be presumed guilty by any Congressional committee investigating assassinations and not trusted at all. Unless the Rockefeller Commission Report reverses the Belin statement, its contents can be presumed to be fraudulent. Congress can expect that any evidence the Commission may have turned up pointing toward CIA involvement in the JFK conspiracy or in the coverup conspiracy will be suppressed and not made available. It is already known that the report as released to the public did not include information about CIA involvement in assassinations of foreign heads of state.

Frank Church, on the day following the issuance of the report, came very close to calling it a coverup. He said it exposed only the tip of the iceberg.

Gerald Ford's Book

President Ford, in a continuing effort to cover up the truth about the JFK assassination, published his own book "Lee Harvey Oswald - Portrait of the Assassin" in 1965. /6/ "A Reasonable Hypothesis" contends that Richard Nixon talked Ford into publishing that book to quiet the doubts in America about the Warren Commission's findings. Several new books by researchers had already appeared by then, demonstrating how wrong the Warren Report was. Public polls then showed an increasing percentage of the population believing there was a conspiracy. The title of the book was a giveaway. The words "the assassin", as opposed to "an assassin", were in themselves significant. Ford used classified information in the book that had been completely unknown to researchers and the public. Recent declassification through Harold Weisberg's efforts of that information shows how the Commission fought with itself over whether Oswald was a paid informer for the FBI. /7/

The new event is this. MGM, in conjunction with CBS, announced in May 1975 plans to produce a TV documentary series based on Ford's book. /8/ It will be released later this year. What can be learned from this event? Congressional committees should find out how the plan for that TV documentary series happened. Following the reasoning of guilty till proven innocent, Congress should assume that

either Ford or someone acting for him and the rest of the coverup group contacted someone at both CBS and MGM to arrange production of the documentary series. Knowing there might be a great hue and cry being raised toward the end of the summer or in the fall of 1975 about the CIA, FBI, and domestic assassinations, the use again of Ford's book and his reputation as a Warren Commissioner was deemed desirable to combat these pressures. Perhaps someone at CBS and someone at MGM were made part of the "inner circle", and are aware of the coverup of the coverup. At CBS, the chances are good that the people who produced the four-part TV series on the JFK assassination in 1967 are very knowledgeable about the coverup. Those same people may again be helping out Mr. Ford. An article titled "The American News Media and the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy: Accessories after the Fact"/9/ demonstrates that CBS News top management made a major decision two weeks before the 1967 TV series was broadcast. They changed the conclusions reached by their own research team from conspiracy to supporting the Warren Commission. The decision was made at a level somewhere between William Paley, chairman of the board, and Leslie Midgely, executive producer. The possibility exists that external influence was brought to bear on whoever made the decision. Similar performances are cited in the article for NBC, "The New York Times", "Washington Post", "Newsweek", Associated Press, United Press, "Saturday Evening Post", "Los Angeles Times", "Chicago Tribune", all Dallas TV stations and newspapers, New Orleans TV-radio station WDSU, Capital City Broadcasting, and the North American Newspaper Alliance./9/

"Los Angeles Times" Article by Warren Commission Lawyers

On May 11, 1975, an article by David Slawson and Richard Mosk appeared in the Opinion Section of the "Los Angeles Times". The title was "Oswald Alone!"/10/ Mr. Slawson was one of the attorneys on the Warren Commission staff and Mr. Mosk was one of the non-legal-staff members. The article, as in the case of David Belin's book, was an all-out attempt to reinforce the Commission's findings and to attack the assassination researchers. Three researchers in Los Angeles, Fred Newcomb, Perry Adams, and Steve Smith, have written a rebuttal manuscript to the Slawson-Mosk article in which they point out the Warren Commission's own evidence in the National Archives that clearly demonstrates the total inaccuracy of the article./11/

A Congressional committee should regard this event as another set of clues to who the "good and bad guys" are, and use it to observe the coverup relationships between the "inner circle" and the news media. Who at the Los Angeles Times made the decision to print that article at this time? Was any external influence placed upon the "Times" to publish it? Did Slawson and Mosk develop mutual anger over the turn of recent events and the new attention of some American news media toward the Zapruder film and other evidence of conspiracy? Or did someone in the Ford administration, or at the CIA, contact them and "encourage" them to get together to write the article "for the good of America", having first arranged it with that key man at the "Los Angeles Times"?

To be on the safe side, the committee would be better off assuming the latter rather than the former. Certainly, the performance of the "Los Angeles Times" through the years on both the John and Robert Kennedy assassination conspiracies has been less than admirable. For one short period in 1972, reporter David Smith of the "Times" somehow managed

to sneak through the editors and management a fairly accurate story about conspiracy evidence in the RFK case. This encouraged Al Lowenstein to the point where he told this author in the summer of 1973 that he believed "Times" top management would back a re-opening of the case. He reckoned without knowledge of Evelle Younger's important role in the coverup and Younger's very close ties to Norman Chandler, owner of the "Times", under indictment for fraud. David Smith was taken off the case and not one other truthful article about RFK's murder has appeared in the "Los Angeles Times" to date.

Who pressured Younger and Chandler to cover up the truth about both assassinations? Was the CIA agent named Manny Pena who worked for the Los Angeles Police Department a point of contact for higher-level CIA people in the local efforts to cover up? There is little question that Pena was a key man in the extensive coverup efforts by Special Unit Senator, the task force of FBI, LAPD, District Attorney, and other official groups investigating the RFK assassination. Pena headed the subgroup responsible for determining whether there had been a conspiracy. His coverup handiwork shines through quite clearly in the book, "Special Unit Senator" by Robert Houghton./12/ Naturally, Pena's conclusion was there was no conspiracy and Sirhan Sirhan was the lone, mad-man assassin.

"Washington Post"—"Newsweek" Editorial Stand

"Newsweek" and the "Washington Post", despite their valiant efforts in the Watergate and Impeachment situations, have contributed heavily through the years in the JFK conspiracy coverup. "Newsweek" in the April 28, 1975 issue printed several pages on the new developments in the JFK assassination case. Anyone reading the article could see the anti-conspiracy, pro-Warren Commission editorial bias shining through the tongue-in-cheek, subtle and not-so-subtle attacks on the assassination researchers. Optimists said, well at least they published something. No one knew at the time that Wesley Liebelser had served as consulting writer for "Newsweek" on the story.

Now, a Congressional committee should look into just how that came about. Liebelser was a Warren Commission lawyer. Who employed him? Who encouraged "Newsweek" to use his talents? Did Benjamin Bradlee at the "Washington Post" have anything to do with it? How about Mrs. Graham, owner of the "Post" and "Newsweek"? Did the CIA or President Ford or Vice President Rockefeller or David Belin suggest to someone at the "Post" that an article indirectly supporting the Warren Commission would probably be a good idea at about that time?

Who at "Newsweek" was involved in that magazine's intense efforts not only to cover up the JFK assassination conspiracy in 1967-68, but also to support author Hugh Aynesworth's actions as an accessory after the fact, influencing jurors' testimony in the trial of Clay Shaw?/9/ Did they receive money, threats, or coercion from Richard Helms and others at the CIA in 1967 through 1969, to discredit the Garrison investigation? It is now known that Helms ordered assistance for Shaw in order to protect the CIA agent before his trial began./14/ A Congressional committee can learn a lot about who the coverup criminals are at "Newsweek" and the "Washington Post" by exploring those connections from the period of the Garrison investigation.

Murders

And finally, we come to murders. Murders by the dozens. Witnesses, participants in the assassinations, and others have died under unexplained circumstances ever since 1963. They are still dying. Clay Shaw was the last important person to die, in 1974. His death was indeed very strange, with no autopsy, quick embalming, and the New Orleans Parish Coroner left completely unsatisfied concerning the cause of death./14/

This author is not about to claim that Gerald Ford, Henry Kissinger, Richard Nixon, and all the other members of the "inner circle" still participating in the coverup of the coverups ordered the deaths of dozens of witnesses and participants. However, a Congressional committee should investigate how several of the important ones actually died and whether they were indeed murdered by lower-level members of the various assassination teams and/or by the clandestine part of the CIA, the FBI, or the Mafia.

There would appear to be a very high probability that the clandestine CIA forces hired the Mafia to murder Castro. E. Howard Hunt has admitted under oath that he headed an assassination team to murder the president of Panama. It seems that murders of people like David Ferrie, Clay Shaw, Hank Killam, Lee Bowers, and many others/15/ connected with the JFK assassination would have been considered a rather minor, routine affair by men like these. The book "Accessories after the Fact" lists more than fifteen deaths of this type, several of them resembling Mafia kinds of murders./15/

There is a very good reason for a Congressional committee investigating the JFK assassination to look into these other murders. It is best for their health. The single most asked question at presentations and discussions by JFK assassination researchers is, "Aren't you afraid for your own safety?" The new answer being given by most researchers now is this: The only people who are in danger of being murdered by the groups in the JFK case are those falling into one of three categories: witnesses who could harm the assassination teams, participants in the assassination, and those with the power to reopen the case. In the latter category are Congressional committee members and their staffs, the New Orleans D.A. and Henry Wade, district attorney in Dallas. Wade and the New Orleans D.A. have legal jurisdiction over the crime because it was a local, and not a Federal, murder. The Congressional committees have the power base to reopen the case and are therefore in danger of being killed or harassed. Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez, who introduced House Resolution 204 to reopen all four cases (JFK, RFK, MLK, and Wallace), has already been shot at along a lonely stretch of highway leading to San Antonio, Texas. A high-powered rifle bullet struck his auto while he and his wife were driving home./16/

Other Means of "Discouraging" New Investigations

In addition to murder, there are other ways that senators and representatives may be "discouraged" from reopening the investigations. Jim Garrison's experience provides a good example. Garrison was harassed, threatened, and framed for a crime he did not commit./17/ His wife and children were threatened. He spent the better part of a year in a hospital, lost his job (D.A. of New Orleans), and nearly lost his life. He was strong enough to fight back and beat the frameup by convincing a New Orleans jury he was innocent./17/ His investigation was halted, however, and now he has withdrawn from JFK assassination research. No one can blame him.

The staff and senators on the Church committee in the Senate, the staff and representatives proposing the formation of a special House committee to reopen the JFK case through resolutions by Representatives Downing and Gonzalez, and any other Congressmen who take actions to reopen, are the ones who are in danger. They must be aware of this danger and make special efforts to ferret out the connections between the clandestine forces of the CIA or FBI and the murders, threats, or harassment of witnesses, participants and district attorneys of the past few years. Thanks to Victor Marchetti we now know there is an excellent chance that the CIA is responsible for the harassment of Garrison, the murders of David Ferrie and Clay Shaw, and other murders.

These are not idle warnings or speculation. The researchers working on investigations for ten or more years are well aware of the implications of the activities now observable. Congressional committees must also be aware of the immense significance of the conspiracies involved and the rat's nest at the top of our executive branch that needs cleaning out.

References

1. Sprague, Richard E., "Nixon, Ford, and the Political Assassinations in the United States", "Computers and People", Jan., 1975, pp. 27....
2. Belin, David, "November 22, 1963, You Are the Jury", New York: Quadrangle Books, 1973.
3. Meagher, Sylvia, "The Curious Testimony of Mr. Givens", "The Texas Observer", August 12, 1971.
- 3A. "The Rockefeller Panel's Report on the JFK Murder", "N.Y. Post", June 11, 1975.
4. Interview of Robert Groden by author, June 7, 1975.
5. "Probers Discover No CIA Role in Assassination of Kennedy", "International Herald Tribune", April 7, 1975.
6. Ford, Gerald, and John Stiles, "Lee Harvey Oswald — Portrait of the Assassin", New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965.
7. Weisberg, Harold, "Whitewash IV", Hyattstown, Md.: self-published, 1975.
8. "Variety" magazine news item, May, 1975.
9. Sprague, Richard E., "The American News Media and the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy: Accessories after the Fact — Conclusion", "Computers and People", July 1973, pp. 31..
10. Slawson, David, and Richard Mosk, "Oswald Alone", "Los Angeles Times", May 11, 1975.
11. Unpublished manuscript by Fred Newcomb, Perry Adams, and Steve Smith, Los Angeles, Calif., May, 1975.
12. Houghton, Robert, "Special Unit Senator", New York: Random House, 1970.
13. "Dallas: New Questions and Answers", "Newsweek", April 28, 1975.
14. Boyle, Richard, "The Strange Death of Clay Shaw", "True" magazine, April, 1975.
15. Meagher, Sylvia, "Accessories after the Fact", Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill, 1967.
16. "Did Congressional Call to Reopen JFK Probe Bring Assassins Back?", "National Tattler", June 8, 1975.
17. Sprague, Richard E., "The Attempted Framing of Jim Garrison", "Computers and Automation", Dec., 1973. pp. 24.... □

Substantial Evidence of Conspiracy Ignored by the Warren Commission

- Part 3 (Conclusion)

Mark Allen, Sally Boucher, Kevin Farrell,
Mike Holm, and Andy Purdy
Students at the University of Virginia, April, 1975
Charlottesville, Va. 29904

V. The Warren Commission Inadequately Investigated the Movements and Actions of Jack Ruby (continued)

Even more troubling is the Commission's inability to determine exactly Jack Ruby's means of entrance to the Dallas Police basement the day he murdered Oswald. The Commission was only able to state that Ruby "probably" entered by the Main Street Ramp, while the police guard, Officer Robert Vaughn was distracted by a departing vehicle. But five witnesses cast considerable doubt on the Commission's Main Street ramp hypothesis. The three officers who were in the car which allegedly distracted Vaughn, were departing by the same ramp that Ruby was supposed to have entered ... yet none of the officers saw Ruby entering. Two of them, C. T. Pierce, the driver of the car and Sgt. Putnam stated they were positive no one came in while their car was leaving./2/

The guard at the ramp, Officer Vaughn, also firmly denied that Jack Ruby slipped by him. Not taking his word, the Dallas police administered a lie detector test which the Officer passed.

The Commission also did not fully investigate the allegation that Jack Ruby was involved in Anti-Castro activities. Nancy Perrin Rich, a former waitress and bartender at Mr. Ruby's Carousel Club testified that several men approached her husband, a former gunrunner during the Spanish Civil War, about shipping some arms into Cuba. One of these men, Mrs. Rich testified, was Jack Ruby, from whose employment she had quit several months earlier. The Commission did not even mention her testimony in the 888 page report.

As a footnote to the Commission's incomplete treatment of Jack Ruby, it is noteworthy to mention the meeting of five men at Jack Ruby's apartment the night of Oswald's murder. Though all of these men were thought to be in good health, within 18 months, three of those men were dead, two by violent means. On April 23, 1964, reporter Bill Hunter was shot to death in a Long Beach Police station. Then on Sept. 21, 1964, Jim Koethe, another reporter present that night, was murdered, dying of a karate chop to the neck. Finally, on March 27, 1965, one of Jack Ruby's lawyers, Tom Howard died of what was diagnosed as a heart attack. The death of Hunter was termed accidental while the murder of Koethe remains unsolved to date./3/

See Set F of Footnotes.

Summary of Argument

We contend that there is a reasonable doubt that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. We further contend that the magnitude and quality of responsible criticism of the essential findings of the Warren Commission justify a formal governmental inquiry into the assassination.

At a minimum, we contend that a Congressional committee should hold hearings to gather all evidence which calls into question the findings of the Warren Commission so that a representative body can indepen-

dently determine if there is sufficient doubt that Oswald acted alone to justify reopening the investigation.

Conclusion

There is a reasonable doubt that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. A governmental body should reopen the investigation of the assassination. □

Footnotes

Set A of Footnotes

1. "The Official Warren Commission Report on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy" (Doubleday & Company, Inc., Garden City, N.Y.: 1964), at 19.
2. Ibid., at 18.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., at 19. See also 86-90.
5. Ibid., at 19. See also 92-93.
6. Ibid., at 18. See also 143-149.
7. Ibid., at 18.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid., at 18. See also 87-96.
10. Ibid., at 19.
11. Ibid., at 19. See also 110.
12. Ibid., at 19. See also 111.
13. Ibid., at 19. See also 87-96 and 111-117.
14. Ibid., at 19. See also 131-134.
15. Ibid., at 19. See also 63.
16. Ibid., at 19. See also 189.
17. Ibid., at 20. See also 183-184.
18. Ibid., at 20. See also 166-167.
19. Ibid., at 20.
20. Ibid., at 21.

Set B of Footnotes

1. (Critics of Commission).
2. "Warren Report" at 19.
3. Interview with Josiah Thompson with "Life" Zapruder prints, Haverford, Pennsylvania, April 1, 1975.
4. (5 H 153-154); (3 H 407) (Frazier).
5. "Warren", at 114.
6. See Zapruder frame 230. See also Thompson, "Six Seconds in Dallas" (Bernard Geiss Associates, New York: 1967), at 68.
7. (4 H 114).
8. Thompson, "Life" interview with Governor and Mrs. Connally, October 30, 1966.
9. Thompson, "Six Seconds in Dallas", at 75.
10. Interview with Thompson on April 1, 1975 re: his November 2, 1966 interview with Dr. Gregory.
11. Thompson, "Six Seconds in Dallas", at 77.
12. (4 H 104).
13. Archives CD 87, dated November 28, 1963.
14. Archives CD 1.
15. (5 H 160; 18 H 89-90).

(please turn to page 8)

**"CONSPIRACY IN AMERICA": Conference May 16
to 18 in Los Angeles — Part 2 (Conclusion)**

Jeff Cohen
Campaign for Democratic Freedoms
P.O. Box 9662
Marina Del Rey, Calif. 90291

would now welcome a free trip home, since peace has been achieved.

On Sunday, panels discussed repression against the black, brown, and gay communities.

On the labor panel, Bill Barry from the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America (UE) described how Westinghouse Corporation conspired with the FBI by hiring an agent provocateur to disrupt the union's recent organizing drive in Tampa, Florida. After UE organizers rejected the "help" of the FBI's ultra-"leftist" informant, he was assigned by the Bureau to wreck AFSCME's attempt to unionize Tampa's sanitation workers.

The UE's open letter of support to the conference was read by Donald Freed in his opening remarks:

As a militant, rank and file union, the UE has always been a target for undercover agents, conspirators, and outright company spies. It does not matter whether these agents work directly for the corporations, or whether they are paid by the CIA or the FBI, acting as a subcontractor for the capitalists. In every case, their efforts are directed against the working people of the world.

Conference participants addressed themselves to one of Los Angeles's most pressing problems — terror, Nazi-style. Since February of this year, 13 bomb and arson attacks have taken place on public meetings, bookstores, election campaign headquarters, a newspaper office, and a TV station, and have victimized progressive groups in L.A. Local Nazis and anti-Castro Cuban commandos have taken credit for several of the bombings. But there have been no arrests. The L.A.P.D. and its allies have used hundreds of agents and thousands of tax dollars to harass minority, anti-war, and socialist groups. But they seem unable or unwilling to stop the right-wing terror.

Louis Tackwood, ex-agent-provocateur of the L.A.P.D. and source of "The Glass House Tapes", revealed more of the world behind the Watergate crimes. Tackwood alleged that Donald Segretti (also known as Sims) had met with right-wing FBI agent Howard Godfrey, the commander of San Diego's Secret Army Organization. The SAO was a terrorist group responsible for several bombings and murder attempts against anti-war activists. Tackwood also alleged that Watergaters Hunt and McCord met L.A. police intelligence officers during the week of the break-in at the office of Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

Philip Agee, CIA agent-turned-revolutionary and author of "Inside the Company: A CIA Diary", mailed a taped message to the conference. The tape crept through the mails for two weeks from London, and arrived in L.A. the day after the conference ended. Agee's message expressed his wish to come back to the U.S. and participate in the struggle against the CIA and clandestineism. The message was broadcast to thousands on listener-sponsored KPFK radio.

The "Conspiracy" conference marks just the beginning of the Campaign for Democratic Freedoms. Eight

followup meetings in localities throughout greater L.A. were announced at the conference. Three research projects have also begun: assassinations; the L.A.P.D.'s "New Centurions"; and 'kangaroo' grand juries. A second L.A. conference has been set for August, a third one in October. A San Francisco conference also is planned for October.

The Campaign's slogans include "Smash the Police State" and "Overthrow Big Brother".

Joe Busch, L.A. County District Attorney, has called for less restriction on police wiretapping. He declared on June 9th: "Sometimes you have to have confidence in Big Brother."

There's a long struggle ahead. □

Allen and others — Continued from page 7

16. "Warren", photo #12 after page 426.
17. Cyril H. Wecht and Robert P. Smith, "The Medical Evidence in the Assassination of President John Kennedy", "Forensic Science" 3(1974), at 124.
18. Thompson, "Six Seconds in Dallas", at 54-55.
19. Ibid., at 146-154.
20. Wecht and Smith, at 124.
21. (5 H 59-60).
22. Thompson, "Six Seconds in Dallas", at 223.
23. (17 H 29).
24. See "Six Seconds"; Thompson interview with Wecht, May 26, 1967.
25. (5 H 77-78).
26. See Commission Exhibit 850.
27. Interview with Thompson, April 1, 1975.

Set C of Footnotes

1. Thompson, "Six Seconds in Dallas", at 86-95.
2. Ibid., at 98-101.
3. Ibid., at 102-111.

Set D of Footnotes

1. "Warren Report", (8 H 304).
2. Meagher, Sylvia, "Accessories after the Fact" (New York: The Bobbs Merrill Company, 1967), at 131.
3. "Warren Report" at 194.
4. Meagher at 131.
5. Ibid., at 108.
6. Warren Report at 193-4.
7. Meagher at 108.
8. Ibid.
9. "Lee Harvey Oswald was Innocent", by George O'Toole, "Penthouse Magazine", April 1975, p. 46.
10. Ibid., p. 124.
11. Ibid., pp. 45-46 and pp. 124-132.
12. Ibid., p. 132.
13. Ibid., p. 125 (See letter).

Set E of Footnotes

1. Wecht, pp. 12-113. See also Appendix D in Thompson's "Six Seconds in Dallas", pp. 278-284.

Set F of Footnotes

1. (15 H 88).
2. See CE 5073; (15 H 189); CE 2002, p. 180, CE 2050 and 2063.
3. Meagher, at 299.

(Editor's Note: Although we corrected some garbles in the printing in the "Congressional Record", perhaps some more garbles remain.) □