

JAN 2 1967

Unasked Questions

-3-

[1] Why has the national press since 1964 carried an upsurge of hostile and derogatory news tending to shake our faith in the FBI, CIA, Secret Service, Supreme Court, Congress, the Chief Justice, certain Senators and Congressmen, and the President?

Could the answer be found in the following thoughts paraphrased from Allen Dulles' book, "The Craft of Intelligence", (Signet Edition, p. 232):

Exposing treason or presumed treason or even the hint of treason at high levels can produce disruption of governments more than almost anything else one can think of. The French government was in a shaky status for more than ten years because of the Dreyfus affair. If high officials could be tainted, either overtly or by innuendo, a disrupting paralysis of the body politic would occur and dismay would disorganize the populace.

In America today, the assassination investigation is growing, in the public eye, into an "Oswald Affair", because of the disclosures in the growing flood of books and articles, and TV shows. The Warren Commission is shown to have carried out a non-partisan politically-motivated and dubiously honest "investigation", which completely ignored any leads pointing to conspirators who might have arranged to have President Kennedy killed. Because the makeup of the Commission, and its method of operation, involved the people and agencies mentioned in the question [1] above, doubts about the Commission's activities can only have the effect of weakening our faith in the civilian government of the United States of America, as Allen Dulles pointed out.

[2] Why is big money being used to woo away all of President Johnson's long-time personally-trusted associates?

The Ford Foundation, the national associations of motion picture and automobile makers, large publishing firms, and other moneyed organizations, have lured away from the White House many of the people President Johnson likes or works well with. Replacements have gradually come over from the Pentagon and elsewhere. The implications are that, if this trend persists, the President may find himself in a situation in which he has no impartial close associates with whom to discuss the soundness of the advice which he gets from the Pentagon or other government agencies.

Incidentally, one might well ask why the Fund for the Republic (funded by the Ford Foundation) has been drafting a new and modern substitute for the Constitution of the United States! The Ford Foundation ran the recent "Citizens' Conference" to discuss the draft. The same Foundation wants to initiate a nationwide TV satellite system for broadcasting educational TV. (Could this be a step toward thought control, if it goes into effect?) The Ford Foundation is making huge gifts to Universities and school organizations. "He who pays the piper calls the tune!" Are the goals of the Ford Foundation trustees unquestionably beyond question?

[3] Is President Johnson now being (wrongly) "framed" as having played a part in the conspiracy which may have caused President Kennedy's assassination?

The following items seem to indicate that such a frame-up is taking place:

(a) The booklet "Stifle the Legend" which appeared early in 1964, written by an ex-C.I.A. officer, Lyle H. Munson (Box 101, N.Y. 16.) This spreads the legend (on pages 3--6) that "Lyndon did it." On pages 12--16 it indicates that the CIA had engaged in assassinations previously.

(b) The play "MacBird", published in 1966 by the Grassy Knoll Press. This recounts, in the style of "Hamlet" and "Macbeth", a story clearly implying that the Senate Leader who became Vice-President, with his wife, plotted the assassination of the President, in order to advance himself to the Presidency. The faces in the illustrations, and the first names of the characters, leave no doubt about who and what is intended to be understood from this play, which was given nationwide publicity in the New York Times Sunday book review section.

(c) The gradual release of evidence, and the gradual publication of books, clearly showing that the Warren Commission report was a white-wash, and indicating that the Commission had been politically directed to ignore all leads which showed that a conspiracy might have existed to have President Kennedy assassinated.

(d) In particular, the recent release by the Associated Press of the long suppressed (by the same Associated Press) right half of the Altgens telephoto photograph of the actual moment of the assassination. (See Harold Weisberg's book "Whitewash", pp.202-203.) This photograph purportedly shows that the Vice-President's Secret Service guards were more alert than the President's guards, since their left rear car door is already open after the first shot was fired and before the last shot, while the President's guards are still gazing in all directions and taking no action.*

(e) The apparent innuendo in the Manchester book "Death of a President", which has been accorded reams of first-page publicity lately.

* Don't jump to conclusions. The man sitting next to that left rear door was Secret Service agent Warren Taylor. He was not called upon by the Commission to testify. In fact, the Associated Press apparently never made this full photograph available to the Commission, since it is never mentioned, nor do prints showing the right-half appear in the Hearings. Furthermore, it was not mentioned during the testimony of Rufus Youngblood, the head of Mr. Johnson's Secret Service detail, even when he was being asked about the automobile positions at the moment of the assassination. The left half of this photograph was published on the day following the assassination; should the directors of the Associated Press be asked to explain this withholding of evidence until this time?

[4] Why would anyone want to "frame" President Johnson as being one of the conspirators, if he is (as I believe) perfectly innocent of such involvement?

The public is being conditioned to think of President Johnson as undergoing increasing strain in the White House, as is evident to the readers, watchers, and listeners, of the national news media. He is being depicted as doing "irrational" things, such as lifting hound-dogs by their ears, driving at 60 MPH through the fog, holding news conferences during seven-lap sprints around the White House, or inviting the newsmen's children to a press conference and providing circus-type entertainment at that press conference. He is being pictured as concerned by his daughter's change of religion and early marriage, by his other potential son-in-law's debatable draft-deferment status, by his own diminishing popularity, by the Viet-Nam situation, by the usual strains which every President must endure in pulling together the diverse interests of Wall St. and the general public in setting tax policies, budgets, government assistance programs, etc. He is pictured as unwilling to make up his mind until the last possible moment, as if trying to prove to himself that he retains "free will" and that other people are not planning his every move.

President Johnson's two poorly-timed surgical operations have added physical strain to his burden, while preventing him from engaging in necessary political activities. If the President is now unfairly, and wrongly, tarred by innuendo with the alleged responsibility for the death of President Kennedy, to the point where impeachment proceedings are even mentioned in official circles, the added burden may become too much too bear. The pressure of trying to fight this amorphous and false "frame-up" may well cause the President to exhibit the outward appearances of a nervous breakdown or similar disability, which would naturally be played up widely by the national news media as a matter of extreme world-wide public concern.

The stage would then be set for a "disability amendment" confrontation, as discussed in a later question. The stage might also be set for an "accidental" atomic strike against the Chinese nuclear plants, with the blame being placed on an "ill" President, who would be found to be suffering from a "Night of Camp David" malady. In such a situation, would "Sorry about that!" avert nuclear retaliation?

More to the point, after a few more books are published, there will be great doubt that Oswald could have been a lone assassin. At that time, if the public believes even half-seriously that "Lyndon did it", there won't be much pressure to continue to look further for the real conspirators. This may adequately explain why President Johnson is now being "framed" in this affair.

[5] Could the present divisive tendencies in America lead to a Second Civil War in the next few years? (Would you believe a Second American Revolution?)

The ordinary stresses and strains in America have been increasingly exacerbated since President Kennedy's assassination. The poor are being formally organized (it would be misleading to say "institutionalized"). There are civil riots over civil rights. Black power is opposed by white backlash. The Cosa Nostra remains active and unchecked. Drug usage grows, while many government agencies apparently remain helpless. An inflation which may reach the scale of the French, Italian, or Brazilian inflations seems to be descending upon us, as we convert to a purely printing-press currency step by step. Yet these ordinary stresses and strains would not be expected to bring on anything as drastic as a revolution or a civil war, not in this country, not in this century.

What might happen, however, if impeachment proceedings were to be brought against the President for any of several possible reasons? How difficult might it be for the average man of good will and reasonable turn of mind to decide whether to support or oppose the President's cause? To choose sides would be difficult, especially if an emotionally charged issue (such as the Kennedy assassination) were the ostensible reason for the impeachment proceedings.

→ (With the Minutemen, the Nazis, the K.K.K., and the other armed militant groups now abroad in our land, including militant civil rights groups having strength in numbers which compensates for their presumed lack of arms, the stage is set for a major fight. A rapid deterioration of civil order, as by a rash of riots in towns from 10,000 to 50,000 population (projecting the demographic trend of the last three years), would call for military power and martial law to maintain the public tranquility, on a scale far greater than in the last few years. Our major news media (or rather, those that control these media) can either fan or cool the inflammation of the public under these conditions.

In Brazil in 1964, in a so-called "constitutional" manner, an "inflamed public" forced the President to leave the country, and the reins of government were handed to a military junta by the Congress. Strongly committed foes of Communism, such as J. Edgar Hoover and Allen Dulles, might not bemoan the fate of democracy in Brazil. What would be their reaction to a similar situation in this country?

If neighbors find themselves forced to "choose up sides" on some oversimplified public presentation of a single unreal "issue", the outcome might resemble one of the many civil wars which we can read about in our history books. Whether democracy and free speech could survive, and free civilian government take over from the military afterwards, is a matter of debate. It would be better not to let things come to this pass.

- Q. [6] What specific course of action is provided, under the Presidential Disability Amendment to our Constitution (the 25th Amendment) if the incumbent President (say LBJ) disagrees with the decision of the Vice-President (say HHH) and the Cabinet, that he, the President, is acting irrationally and should be relieved of his duties until he recovers?

The text of this amendment has been printed, for example, in the 1966 World Almanac, p. 153. Read it, and try to answer the above question.

You will find that there is no special course of action prescribed for the above-described situation, in which the President has cause to disagree with the Vice-President's decision that he is unwell. This situation is unmentioned, let alone unresolved. Yet it seems to be the most likely circumstance to occur, in the case of a strong-minded President who gradually suffers the increasing strain leading to an incipient nervous breakdown. He will appear irrational to others long before he has reason, in his own mind, to think of his actions as being apparently irrational.

Especially in the case of the President of the United States, who must know and act upon secret information which may be kept secret from the Cabinet and even from the Vice-President, there is the strong possibility that some of his "irrational-seeming" actions may be perfectly logically justified by the information known only to the President and his military intelligence advisers.

In the event that the President is declared "disabled" by the Vice-President and Cabinet, he is supposed to relinquish his powers peacefully to the Vice-President at once. He may then appeal to the Congress to restore his powers, if he is really well. At least four days must pass (why???) and up to twenty-seven days may pass, before Congress is required to render its decision.

Does anyone imagine that a President with a strong temperament would wait even four days, allowing the Vice-President to take all sorts of actions with his new Presidential powers? Especially consider the case where the President knows full well in his own mind that he is definitely not suffering from any real disability or breakdown.

The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments itself could not imagine the President sitting idly by during this period. Its Chief Counsel states: "It was [this] situation...that concerned the Subcommittee the most and the circumstance they attempted to cover most meticulously....We [believe] that a President who has been removed would resort to an appeal by radio and television to the public. This might or might not be to his advantage. If it were a true case of usurpation by the Vice President and the Cabinet, it is obvious that his appearance on television would weigh very heavily in his favor. If he were mentally imbalanced, it is likely that a television appearance [by the President] would weigh heavily with the Vice President."

Evidently the subcommittee missed the point completely, of the case in which no usurpation was intended, but the President seemed to be acting irrationally while feeling he was perfectly rational.

Q. [6] continued.

What is more likely to happen in that case, as soon as the Vice-President declares the President disabled, is that the President might call upon elements of the White House guard force, the Secret Service, and the military guards from the Armed Forces, who might "remain loyal" to him, to guard him in the White House and prevent seizure of his powers or communications facilities by the "interloping" Vice-President. Meanwhile, since the Constitutional Amendment under discussion clearly provides that the Vice-President has received the full powers of the office of President (as Acting President) at the instant that he files the declaration of the President's disability with the Congress, trouble is evidently guaranteed. The Vice-President would be constitutionally empowered to issue orders (which would have full force and effect according to law) to any and all branches of the armed forces whose officers might choose to pay him heed.

The Civil War mentioned in Question 5 could then be started, with a poor chance of straightening the mess out quickly. It would depend on just how the incident was handled by the news media. Selection of which newsreel shots were edited into the news broadcasts on television, for example, would govern the beliefs of the majority of the people in whether the President or the Vice-President was in the right. And, as one may recall from the Kennedy-Nixon televised debates, such a collective judgement by the public would, in the last analysis, depend on the happenstances of the quality of the television make-up applied to the President, the type of "direction" given to the television camera crew while the President was on camera, the pacing of the TelePrompter script from which the President might be coaxed to read, and other such trivia which can "make" or "break" a television presentation.

It can be assumed that the responsible military leaders would tend to go along with the majority public sentiment, in deciding whom to give their support to during the critical first day of such a confrontation. Thus, the mass media (and those who control the mass media), would be able to manipulate this country into a Second Civil War or not, as they chose. Are we quite sure which way they would choose to go?

Q. [7] Can all of the facts listed below be only sheer coincidence, or might it be worth investigating, with sworn testimony, exactly who made the mistakes or gave the orders or made the decisions which caused each of these things to happen?

(a) The sentence

"LYMAN JOHNSON was President of the United States." appears on the first page of the Sept. 1963 printing of the Bantam Books edition of "Seven Days in May", by Knobel and Bailey. The text of the story correctly gives the name of the President as Jordan Lyman. How is it possible that this egregious error escaped the copy-readers, proof-readers, editors, executives, authors, and all others who should have had a chance to see and correct this, unless some private hanky-panky occurred at a key point in the chain? The significance of this error, to one who first read the book on Nov. 22, 1963, is overwhelming.

Q.[7] continued.

The book deals with a conspiracy to do away with the President of the United States, because of his signing of an atomic bomb treaty with Russia.

(b) The back page of the NEW YORK TIMES on the morning of Nov. 22, 1963, carried a full page advertisement for the movie version, scheduled for premiere in the Spring of 1964, of that same book "Seven Days in May" (see (a) above). What chain of decisions, by whom, led to the running of this ad, in that prominent position, on the morning of the day the President was actually shot? Was anyone interrogated under oath to explain the circumstances?

(c) The three-page gatefold illustration starting on p. 72 of LIFE magazine dated Nov. 22, 1963 is titled "A RIDERLESS HORSE.....LED A MARCH OF MONARCHS". It shows a riderless black horse with empty boots reversed in the stirrups, in the funeral procession of the head of state, attended by heads of state from all over the world. This was the current copy of LIFE in our homes during the days of President Kennedy's assassination and funeral, in which a similar horse was an importantly televised feature. To explore this coincidence, one should like to hear from, under oath, the artist who drew the picture, the layout man, the story editor, the publisher, etc., to learn the chain of decisions, and who made them, which led to this picture being prepared as it was and published a few days before the assassination.

(d) The lead story on pp.17-18 of the issue of TIME magazine dated Nov. 22, 1963 shows a large picture of Richard Nixon and discusses his possible future. (At that time he seemed headed for oblivion.) The persons responsible for the timing and placement of that story should be interrogated under oath. A few of these people might also be involved in the LIFE interrogation (see (c) above) since TIME and LIFE both are parts of Henry Luce's organization. They might also be asked why p. 19 of that same issue has a photograph of President Kennedy near the Tomb of the Unknowns at Arlington Cemetery, with the sub-caption "So the other photographers could shoot."

(e) The above-mentioned Richard M. Nixon (see (d) above) was himself in Dallas for business reasons on the morning of Nov. 22, 1963, leaving by plane just a few hours before President Kennedy arrived. The persons responsible for scheduling Mr. Nixon's appearance in Dallas at that time should be interrogated under oath to determine the decision-making chain of events leading to this "coincidence". Mr. Nixon's name was introduced into the Warren Commission hearings by the belated "recollection" of Marina Oswald, after she had been in the custody of U. S. agents for several months. This served as a reason for including newspaper clippings as evidence, documenting Mr. Nixon's presence in Dallas on the day of the assassination. (23H941-943) One of the headlines (23H943) reads "Nixon Predicts JFK may Drop Johnson." Coincidence(?)

(f) Why was a man whom President Kennedy had "fired" for a serious cause, Allen W. Dulles, proposed and accepted as a member of the Warren Commission to investigate any possible conspiracies behind the assassination? The investigation was supposed to, but did not, delve deeply into allegations that CIA-affiliated persons (including Oswald) were participants in the assassination conspiracy. Mr. Dulles had been the

Q. [7] continued.

Director of the CIA during the time of Oswald's defection to Russia and the start of Oswald's moves to return to America. Mr. Dulles should have been disqualified for membership on the Commission on that ground alone. By what reasoning were Messrs. Dulles and McCloy selected to "represent the Kennedy Administration" (the "New Frontiersmen") on the Commission? Sworn testimony should be sought from those who prepared the lists of possible Commission members and submitted them to President Johnson for approval in the days immediately following the assassination.

(g) Why did a freelance writer (identified on 26B496,13H363, Armstrong Exhibit 5302) think Jack Ruby was important or interesting enough to justify him spending a whole week at the Carousel Club ending a week before the assassination, taking photographs and preparing material for a national magazine story? Some of his pictures were purchased and published by LIFE magazine shortly after the assassination. His photographs inside the Carousel Club provide much of the leg-art in the published volumes of the Hearings. They raise a question as to the legitimacy of his skill as a photographer, since they have a very poor level of composition and background selection. Sworn testimony should be obtained to determine just who suggested that Jack Ruby and his insignificant club would be a worthy subject for a sellable magazine article. Why did the Warren Commission never ask this photographer to appear as a witness, for interrogation? (What are the odds, by normal "coincidence" experience, that a full illustrated article would have been roughed out, a few weeks in advance of their day of infamy, on any famous murderer of recent times, such as Speck, Whitman, Roy Nagle, etc.?)

(h) Exactly why was the President's Office in the White House empty of all furniture, and newly redecorated, at the moment when the President was killed in Dallas? A delay in receiving air-conditioning equipment was the cause of failure to complete the well-planned rapid redecoration job that had been postponed until President Kennedy left on his trip to Florida and Texas. Interrogation under oath might reveal possible traces of chicanery in "stalling off" the completion of the job until after the assassination.

(i) Why was Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara not asked to testify before the Warren Commission, or to give sworn testimony? He was the president of the Ford Motor Co. in 1960, when the special Lincoln Continental was designed and built in which President Kennedy was later assassinated. He could have been asked to name the people who suggested that this special automobile be built as a "gift" for the new President to use (who would be elected in 1960.) This car was built without running boards, although prior to that time Presidential automobiles had running boards on which Secret Service men could ride, to protect the President. President Kennedy would not have received his fatal head wound if he had been pushed over by an alert Secret Service man riding on a running-board, during the six seconds which elapsed between the time the first shot was fired and the last shot struck. The special 1961 Lincoln Continental was leased to the White House for a nominal \$300 per year, through the courtesy of the Ford Motor Company. Who decided that it would have no running boards?