

9. Humpty Dumpty Reconsidered

Blakey's next two chapters are supposedly "reconsiderations" first of Jack Ruby's "Role," then ~~of~~ "Lee Harvey and his ~~role~~."

"Role" suggests players, as in a game, and perhaps Blakey has something like that in mind, as to a degree, at least, with his formulae in this book, that is necessary.

The real question this raises is did either play any kind of role, according to the actual evidence, not ~~the~~ according to what flows from inadequately prepared minds. As, despite the fact that he headed the House assassins committee, ~~we~~ have already seen that Blakey's mind does not hold the basic facts of his supposed investigation and it certainly does not with his book which one could expect, would provide some of the knowledge it is reasonable to believe he acquired in his role.

If Blakey believes he has proof that either filled any kind of a role, he has yet to produce it. From what he has in

his book to this point he will not have any fact that casts either in any role and ~~except for~~ the indications of what he has made up, he has presented nothing at all that is factual about either being in some kind of role.

Before getting into whatever Blakey has to say that he regards as either a reconsideration or any kind of role, the available, if factual information, disclosed official information, can give the impression that Ruby may have had other connections that might be relevant depending on other evidence which decides whether or no that information is really relevant. However, the official information on Oswald, especially what was hidden, not used, what was suppressed from the Report, is clear in stating. without

without using that word, that Oswald had no connections, no role to be reconsidered. *Or reconsidered,*

As we have seen, Blakey provides no factual information, ~~none~~ *nothing that* of the real evidence, ~~no~~ *any* which can reasonably be used to place him in ~~some~~ *any* kind of role ~~and~~ *or* in any real connection that can do or does do that.

What the actual evidence on Oswald, as distinguished *from* what fertile minds invent for him, is that he was a real loner.

Ruby was gregarious, a pusher, and what may appear to be real friendships may not be that and most of the "connections" of ~~with~~ *which* he ~~had~~ had many by phone are, for the most part, ~~on~~ *on* his initiative .

Blakey says of his investigation that "we recognized the implications of the murder of Oswald was crucial to an understanding of the ~~as~~ assassination of the President" (page 279).

In this Blakey seems to be assuming that there was a connection rather than just ~~a~~ *y* wondering whether there was an ~~connection~~ *connection*, the ~~letter~~ *a*, to begin with, ~~was~~ *in* an obvious consideration but ~~in~~ *in* any kind of real investigations in a real investigation, ~~that was~~ *it is* a wonder that should ~~no~~ have lingered long.

Blakey does report a reasonable ~~an~~ immediate concern, ~~had~~ *had* other conspirators ~~conspirators~~ *ed* who wanted Oswald kill ~~it~~ *to*. But again, as Blakey does not indicate, in any real investigation that ~~wonder~~ *would* ~~did~~ not hang around for long.

Blakey does state, referring to his investigation rather than his book, that if "Ruby ~~were~~ *was* associated ~~with~~ *w* parties who had the motive to kill the ~~President~~ *President*, especially if they were parties associated with Oswald, we would have a strong ~~indication~~ *N* of the assassination conspir~~acy~~ *acy*" (page 280).

Here again it is necessary to recall what for other reasons Blakey referred to Humpty Dumpty and the meaning of words, for it again applies to Blakey. He quoted Dumpty as saying that words as he used them had whatever meaning he intended to give them.

In what we have quoted from Blakey, "parties associated with Oswald" refers to parties that have no existence because he had ~~no~~ nothing that can be believed to have been a ~~deaf~~ real "association"

with any "parties" save for the Paines. Ruth Paine gave Marina a home as the time of her delivery of their second child drew close.

Blakey does not begin by stating what he believes Ruby's role was or could have been, but he does begin with the assumption that Ruby did have a role.

He goes into all sorts of really not relevant fact as he seeks to substitute arguments for fact.

As under "The Cultural Matrix" (pages 280-282).

Pretty much the same under Jack Ruby: <sup>1941-</sup> ~~192-19; 9; 9; 4-1967~~ (pages 252-285). In "The Move to Dallas" (pages 285-288) all sorts of impossible rumors become acceptable to Blakey.

"The Strip Club Operator" (pages 288-292) opens with "Prostitution is a sordid aspect of American history." Unique to American history? not true of other countries? Going back to biblical days?

There is nothing new and nothing unique in Ruby ~~managing~~ operating a strip joint, of which there must have been thousands in the country

~~XX~~

"Ruby in Havana" (pages 292-302) reports nothing not well known from the time the Warren Report was issued. Blakey's investigation added nothing

"Ruby's telephone contacts" (pages 302-305) is briefer than it could have been, Ruby used his phone that much. Blakey begins ~~the~~

this section criticizing the Warren Commission for not making a more ~~an~~ exhaustive investigation of Ruby's phone calls and then reflects nothing of any real meaning in what checking his committee did.

Probably Blakey is disappointed because he could not extend any of those <sup>many</sup> calls into ~~any~~ <sup>would like to</sup> ~~meaning~~ ~~he could~~ give them.

"At Odds with AGVA" (The American Guild of Variety Artists, pages 305-7.) <sup>holds</sup> ~~There is~~ <sup>that</sup> ~~nothing in this section that~~ relates in ~~any~~ way to the assassination or to any <sup>Ruby</sup> connections ~~to~~ Ruby to which any meaning ~~it~~ can be given.

"Ruby's Financial Plight" (pages 307-310) does not exaggerate the permanent <sup>financial</sup> ~~mess~~ he kept himself and his affairs in. He did all the business he could in cash. Blakey draws on philosophy for what he regards as an appropriate quote without realization of how much more it applies to him in his book than it does to Ruby:

We came to realize, however, that the significance of Ruby's conduct in the summer and fall of 1963, with respect to the assassination, lay elsewhere and rested on surer footing. There was in medieval philosophy a dictum called Occam's Razor: "*pluralites non est ponende sine necessitate*" (multiplicity ought not to be posited without necessity), which suggested that a simple explanation should always be preferred to a complicated one. We knew that while a number of inferences could be made from Ruby's activities, none was individually compelling. Consequently, we decided it was sufficient to point out what Ruby's conduct over the summer and fall of 1963 did establish beyond serious question and how his conduct might have fit into a conspiratorial scheme. Ruby's business was in deep financial difficulty, complicated by the dispute with AGVA over "amateur" strippers and serious tax problems. 309).

*indent single space*

William (if I remember correctly) of Occam, also spelled Ockham, was a ~~Briti~~ medieval British philosopher. A novel based on his thinking is titled Occam's Razor. It is of relatively recent years. A more appropriate interpretation of what it's basic in Occam's philosophy is "Seek the simplest solutions." At no place in his book has Blakey done that and he does not do that in his brief handling of

Ruby here. He makes it unnecessarily complicated as nhe looks for what is not <sup>there to be found</sup>. Again. Blakey is aided by what he suppresses. And in his investigation, had he at any point been genuinely serious in it, he should have learned that in the psychiatric examination for the court he was found to be dangerously insane. The head of the University of Okalahoma psychiatric department, Dr. ~~Dr.~~ Jocelyn West, was quite pointed on the danger of the psychiatric condition he diagnosed in Ruby.

His recommenday was "Immediate psychiatric hospitalization, study and treatment. Close onbservation. Suicidal precaustions." Along with other warning and urged precautions he found that Ruby was insane as of the time of that report, April, 1964. I have a copy of his report and subsequent events confirm both his <sup>analysis</sup> ~~diagnoses~~ and his recommendation.

Anyone who says he considers Ruby's "role" first of all assumes he had a role, of which there is no proof of any kind. And, anyone who says he is making an impartial examination of this alleged but non-existing Ruby "role" without regard <sup>a for</sup> Ruby's mental condition neither believes nor practises Occam's wisdom.

Having earlier made <sup>up</sup> another Ruby "role" Blakey here says that that they had regarded as Ruby's "conduct" ~~was~~ "lay elsewhere," that Elsewhere <sup>being</sup> in Occam.

Blakey then goes to what he terms "The Stalking of Oswald" (pages 310-323). He begins this disagreeing with the Warren Commission ~~use~~ examination of Ruby's "activities immediately preceding and following the death of President Kennedy revealed no sign of any conduct which suggested that he was involved in the assassination." Blakey says this extended to whether Ruby stalked Oswald before he killed him, implying that he did not."

that "we (meaning we are to presume, his committee) found that substantially~~ly~~ evidence that Ruby had in fact stalked Oswald before he killed him "(page 310). Despite all the attention Blakey gives to that part of all that he made up about the assassination, he does not prove what he says his committee concluded.

Common sense is never an barrier to what Blakey wants to say and it is not in this matter, either.

"The State of Texas Versus Jack Ruby"(pages 323-333). Blakey rambles much and most of this chapter is not literally about that trial. It is a good cover for more of Blakey's endless objection and liking for surring. He even quotes a juror as deprecating all medical evidence (page 331), particularly about the insanity. Of the authorities cited, the defense psychiatrist, who was proven to have been on the ball, is never mentioned(pages 332-333).

Hardly impartial writing, hardly a concern for truth,

"The Testimony of Jack Ruby"(pages 333- 338) was not testimony at his trial, where he did not testify. It was after the trial and I believe was other than Blakey says, I believe it was what Ruby said in a *polygraph examination*. And of this ~~we~~ even Blakey says that Ruby was "incoherent"(page 334). Or, there is nothing at all to it.

The last less than a page of this chapter(pages 338-9) is titled "Elements of Conspiracy." Because it is so short we use all of it. This obvious to any intelligence reading of this full and direct quotation <sup>of it</sup> is, in effect, the conclusion to sixth pages that, other than in a work of fiction, not a single legal "element" of any real "conspiracy":

125

As we brought our investigation of Ruby to a close, we came to a number of important conclusions. We could not accept the Warren Commission's benign view of Ruby's background, character, associations, and conduct. Nor could we accept its belief that Ruby killed Oswald out of genuine shock and grief over the President's assassination. For us, the truth was far from benign. Ruby's violent character had been molded in a matrix of crime and corruption in Chicago, one of the nation's centers of organized crime. His business activities were an integral part of a system of criminal operations, even if they were not illegal as such. At least on his trip to Cuba, Ruby played an important, if minor, role in a sophisticated syndicate operation that involved one of the most powerful underworld leaders. Ruby's associates in Dallas for the years and months prior to the assassination included a number of prominent organized-crime figures. He was in serious financial difficulty in the period leading up to the assassination, and a number of

heavy pressure from the Kennedy organized-crime program, had a strong motive to assassinate the President.

Ruby's professed motive for killing Oswald — that he wanted to spare Mrs. Kennedy the ordeal of a trial — was admittedly false. Ruby told a number of other lies to conceal the truth, the most significant being that he killed Oswald on the spur of the moment, when the evidence was overwhelming that he stalked his prey for nearly two days before gunning him down. The murder of Oswald by Jack Ruby had all the earmarks of an organized-crime hit, an action to silence the assassin, so he could not reveal the conspiracy. It was time to turn to Oswald, to see if his background, character, associations, and conduct might provide new evidence as to the identity of his coconspirators. *pages 338-9*

This is all fiction and it is based on what Blakey was supposed to investigate and did not. If the proof that Oswald was not and could not have been the assassin was unknown to Blakey, as it would not have been if he hadn't wasted all that time and thousands of FBI documents on his baseless hangup on the mafia and as it also would not have been if he had investigated instead of propagandizing, then his baseless concoction comes also from his ignorance. He assumes that Oswald was the assassin and without that all this childish nonsense <sup>of his</sup> falls apart. But without that there is nothing to it other than what Blakey made up in support of the rest of what he made up.

And in all of this he has not a word about Ruby other than ~~the~~ that he was violent. As are millions of other men.

Ruby's well-known desire to be where he believed the action is

Blakey converts into Ruby's stalking Oswald. Which in addition to all else, makes no sense at all.

The conspirators wanted to kill Oswald allegedly to close his mouth that was ~~done~~ the one place there would be no escape. It would, for example, have been much easier to get him and get away if he were hit when he left the building. Or as he walked, as the official story has it, seven blocks to get a bus he soon left. And then when he was walking to the bus station, <sup>to get a cab.</sup> Or when he was in that cab. And after that, while he was walking some unnecessary blocks to his rooming house. Or when he left that rooming house and walked about a mile, a mile during which nobody reported seeing him.

What Blakey refers to as the truth is a child-like concept of a novel. It is not evidence as lawyers understand evidence to be. It certainly is not what he would have produced in a courtroom. If he did he'd have been a laughing stock.

For all his big talk, Blakey is entirely ignorant of Ruby. If he made any investigation of Ruby it had to be incompetent ~~xxxxxx~~ for him to write such utter nonsense. Nobody who knew Ruby would have trusted him with anything that required silence and care. The real Ruby was a blabber who wanted attention and whose personal behavior made him a menace as an associate in anything like what Blakey here makes up.

For one example, and this was known, <sup>Ruby</sup> he referred to his dachshund Sheba as his wife. About that, and I have seen this letter, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty <sup>to animals</sup> wrote <sup>D.A.</sup> Henry Wade <sup>before</sup> the Ruby trial, telling him that Ruby was treating his dog as his wife.

There is more like this, such things as Ruby fondling girls just entering puberty and explaining that by saying he was br<sup>e</sup>aking them



in to work for him. Again, the record exists and that also I have seen.

Aside from the fact that Ruby really was insane, with this kind of behavior who in the world would have trusted him?

*as what Blakey says*  
~~All of this is fiction~~ Blakey makes up to try to give a semblance of reality to his preconception that had no basis in ~~fact~~ fact.

Blakey began by calling this a "reconsideration." It is no such thing. It is a refabrication because there is not a word of truth in ~~it~~ it.

But even if it had been a reconsideration, it is impossible, absolutely impossible, ~~made~~<sup>made</sup> up by Blakey without regard to any relevant fact and it is demolished by that relevant fact.

~~Is~~ <sup>re</sup> Is his "consideration" of Oswald and his "role" any more meaningful? ~~But~~ Blakey's chapter 12 <sup>is</sup> <sup>d</sup> title, "Lee Harvey Oswald: His Role Reconsidered" (pages 340-366) .

As he does under the title of each chapter, Blakey has an attributed quotation. In this chapter it is "All the Marine Corps did was to teach you to kill, and after you got out... (sic) you <sup>M</sup>ight be (a)(sic) good gangster." Lee Harvey Oswald, Warren Commission Hearings Volume VIII."

Blakey at his best! He <sup>finally</sup> has a citation! There is little more uncommon in this book than a citation!

But as always with Blakey, what he says ranges from doubtful to impossible and it without question was impossible for Lee Harvey Oswald to have testified and for his testimony to have been included in Volume VIII.

Volume VIII does include the testimony of forty-five people, the first <sup>testimony</sup> in the volume was taken on April 7, 1964.

And Lee Harvey Oswald, as even Blakey knew, was killed on November 24, 1963. With the Commission not created until a week after his death it is even more unlikely that Oswald testified to it. But if by some of Blakey's rare performances with reality Oswald had testified and his testimony had been taken down by the court reporter, Blakey's citation to Warren Commission Hearings Volume VII is a citation to four hundred and seventy two pages, the number of pages in that book. And, not surprisingly, there is a list of witnesses in the front of that book and Lee Harvey Oswald is not listed as a Commission witness.

This is to say that Blakey at his best is horrible and entirely undependable, completely untrustworthy.

*sentence in his*  
 In his first ~~aparagraph~~<sup>paragraph</sup> of his first page Blakey has one of his phony confessions or error: when <sup>"NO WE"</sup> ~~they~~ undertook ~~to~~ re-examine Lee Harvey Oswald... we did not expect there would be much to add to ~~what~~ what was already known about his role in the assassination. We were wrong. After a careful reconsideration... we were able to see the President's assassin in an entirely new light." (page 340).

When Blakey could see - and even quote - what he says was Lee Harvey's testimony <sup>given after his death</sup> ~~nothing~~ else appearing within those transcripts, is there anything at all that Blakey cannot see - and "reconsider?"

Despite this promise much of what follows is the Warren Commission's records rehashed

Blakey does "reconsider" what the Warren Commission said about what Blakey has in a brief parenthetical expression about what has no introduction and no later comment: "Oswald gave a talk on Russia to the seminarians," In the Warren Commission's work this came out as so strong an indictment of the Soviet Union and of Communism that one of the priests urged Oswald to be more moderate in his condemnation of the Soviets so he could be more influential in his criticisms of the USSR.

This the Oswald <sup>officially</sup> said to be a Communist - *and by Blakey too.*

On the same page (page 342) and even in the same paragraph Blakey states that "after Oswald was arrested for ~~for~~ fighting with anti-Castro Cubans, on August 9, 1963, (he had been passing out pro-Castro leaflets), a prominent <sup>m</sup> friend <sup>friend</sup> of <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ Murrets (Oswald's uncle) a liquor store owner and a state boxing commissioner, Emile Bruneau, bailed him out of jail..." (page 342\*).

What this does <sup>not</sup> say is that when Oswald's request for assistance reached the Murret home only the married daughter, just up from Texas, answered the phone and, through her family knowing who was the

local ward heeler was, <sup>she</sup> <sup>d</sup> phone him. He did bail Oswald out, for a pittance, and when Oswald, who was innocent, entered a guilty plea, <sup>a</sup> the fine also was a pittance (page 342).

Blakey then says much about Murret, including that "he was connected with the organized crime operations of <sup>Carlos</sup> ~~Carols~~ Marcello" (page 343).

What he means by "connected" Blakey does not Humpty Dumpty for us so we have to guess, which was what Blakey wanted, because if Bruneau wrote numbers in those days, a widespread practise then, that could be Humpty Dumptyed by Blakey into what he <sup>m</sup> implies, a real "connection" with Marcello.

Again lacking any source and again falsehood to help <sup>d</sup> build Blakey's false case he says that at the time Ferrie was a CAP <sup>leader</sup> <sup>(years after Oswald was not in the CAP)</sup> leader he "was an 'operative' of Carlos Marcello in 1963" (page 346).

Each time he mentioned the non-existing Ferrie-Marcello relationship Blakey adds a little <sup>d</sup> to what did not exist and ~~now~~ look where he is, for the nobody <sup>b</sup> Ferrie, hired as a case investigator <sup>chief lawyer</sup> by a Marcello lawyer on the authorization of <sup>the</sup> Washington immigration lawyer.

Blakey knew what he was doing with his early quotation of Humpty Dumpty from Alice in Wonderland and he farther he gets into his book the better a Humpty Dumpty with words Blakey becomes.

Adding weak conjecture to what he is making up and making Murret, with whom Oswald had very little to do after he got his first job, which was after living with the Murrets <sup>o</sup> for two weeks, Blakey makes this up... "Like Murret, and intermediary through whom organized crime figures could have (emphasis added) learned about Oswald...." (page 347). What in the world ~~for~~ Blakey leaves to ~~the~~ Humpty Dumpty in each word, there being no real meaning or

legitimate <sup>in this prejudiced</sup> <sup>competition</sup>  
 purpose of any kind, <sup>Other than more of Blakey's playing</sup>  
<sup>truth and with,</sup>  
 Humpty Dumpty with the history that means nothing to him.

After a bit more Blakey's impressive if unintended purpose in his early citing of Humpty Dumpty on words, Blakey does that with his questioning of the very few people who had any basis for ~~era~~ <sup>really</sup> knowing Oswald, if only a little bit of him. Blakey welcomes their conjectures, particularly Priscilla Johnson McMillan, <sup>she</sup> who had written an anti-Oswald book she had to justify, (page 348).

Next George de Mohrenschildt, of whom Blakey says he "committed suicide on the very day in 1977 he was ~~he~~ contacted by one of our investigators..." (page 349) <sup>he was not "contacted."</sup>

this is a different kind of Humpty Dumpty with words in which Blakey implies that it was de Mohrenschildt's "contact" with that investigator which triggered his suicide. Dirty Humpty Dumpty.

de Mohrenschildt had been harrassed for about a decade by those seeking to make something not there in <sup>de Mohrenschildt's</sup> ~~his~~ brief association with Oswald. This included even a kidnapping by a Dutch TV reporter from whom, in his own account, de Mohrenschildt escape<sup>d</sup> in Europe and made his way home. In Dallas he was put in the psycho ward at Parkland hospital for <sup>6-13</sup> month and when he was discharged, Earl <sup>6-13</sup> ~~6-13~~, Dallas Morning News investigative reporter, warned all those he knew had been <sup>making</sup> ~~making~~ life a living hell for de Mohrenschildt to leave him alone ~~because~~ because of the state of his mind. He told each about de Mohrenschildt's month at Parkland, too. <sup>He tells me this himself</sup>

None of which Blakey mentions. Nor does he mention that the three days before the day of his suicide and including that morning, Edward J. Epstein, who imagines himself to be a Sherlock Holmes, had been giving de Mohrenschildt a very hard time. All were trying to make

131A follows

him out to be some kind of important connection in the importance they gave ~~to~~ Oswald, making de Mohrenschildt to be some kind of sinister person in the assassination.

The Blakey Committee's actual connection with all of this is that atop all the other <sup>pressures and</sup> abuses, very considerable abuses of de ~~Mohrensch~~ Mohrenschildt, particularly that very difficult and very crazy with that <sup>session</sup> ~~idiot~~ with a PhD, Epstein, when de Mohrenschildt ~~d~~ go to the home of a woman friend who was giving him sanctuary, he found the message waiting for him that atop all that was already too much for the dangerously sick man, the idiot Blakey was subpoenaing him, meaning public testimony nationwide on both TV and Radio, for all the sick imaginings ~~each~~ assassination not building on the fabrications of those before him, ~~and~~ that was too much for him. A different employment of Humpty Dumpty <sup>w</sup>ould come out that Blakey drive de Mohrenschildt to suicide.

It is not modesty which persuaded Blakey not to say this (page 349).

As Blakey wanders along with what is well known and really means nothing, including in this so-called "reconsideration" he gets to a subsection titled "Hunter of Fascists." (pages 353-357). That is a comment <sup>of Oswald</sup> he wrote on a print of his picture of himself holding that rifle.

Expecting Blakey to be straight on anything with his private Humpty Dumpty on rolling, what he says, after reporting that Marina told Oswald that she would like to see the city in <sup>which</sup> ~~which~~ he ~~was born~~ grew up and to meet his relatives, nothing a thing unnatural in that, particularly not when she regarded Dallas as a dangerous place for Oswald. He adds that "Oswald ~~was~~ apparently was just as eager to get to New Orleans possibly because he wanted to be closer to the Cuban revolution..." (page 356).

This dirty el estuoides ignores his ignornce and despite knowing this he is ignorant ~~it~~ makes up what he intends to be a dirty crack but while there may have been more Cuban refugees in ~~New Orleans~~ New Orleans than there were in Dallas <sup>a</sup>exile activity, anti-Castro activity <sup>y</sup>was greater in Dallas than in New Orleans.

But with his fabrication Blakey continues to build his <sup>w</sup>weak and ~~artificial~~ <sup>dishonest</sup> case <sup>u</sup>supposedly against Oswald

There is little of any real significance in Blakey's "Return to Dallas" (pages 357-360) He has a different <sup>c</sup>version of Bruneau's bailing Oswald out (page 359).

Under "Return to Dallas: 1963" (pages 360-363) <sup>he</sup>first makes very brief mention of Oswald's trip to Mexico

Blakey says that on the morning of the assassination <sup>Oswald</sup>he left the Paine residence in Irving "taking his rifle with him" (page 362). While this is essential to the official fiction formalized as official policy in the Katzebach memorandum, it is worse than fiction. At each and every point, from Irving to the TSBD, there was and is ~~a~~ irrefutable proof that he had no rifle <sup>w</sup>with him. (In addition, in the suppressed official evidence is the <sup>proof</sup> ~~fact~~ that the rifle <sup>could</sup> not have been used in the assassination. The actual proof is that he <sup>id</sup> did not carry that rifle that morning and the actual official fact <sup>he</sup> is that he did not take ~~that~~ rifle with him when he left New Orleans for Mexico and the official records <sup>is</sup> that he <sup>o</sup>could not have.

All of which demands <sup>or</sup> investigation ~~on~~ Blakey omits.

Under "Elements of Conspiracy" (pages 363-363) Blakey has nothing that is new but he Humpty Dumptys it, giving it his own twist.

He begins saying that his House assassination "came to a number 1

Here again, Blakey at his best, with what is basic in his fabrication and ~~not~~ a single fact to support it, with all that he has to ~~seem~~ <sup>him</sup> to support <sup>A</sup> of alleged opinion, and when it is not wrong from the evidence of which Blakey is ignorant- or about which he lies - it is the opposite of what Blakey represents. This also is another of the endless proofs that when he headed the House assassins committee he did not make the investigations he was supposed to make and instead devoted himself and that committee to trying to disprove allegations of an inadequate and incomplete investigation made about the <sup>y</sup> Warren Commission. <sup>A Why I call it the House assassins committee</sup>

*they assassinated truth*

Shyster-like, he wants his conjectures regarded as unquestionable fact because with nothing but those conjectures he attributes the assassination to Oswald.

Here it is worth remembering that when Blakey had that Katzenbach memo and quoted it the part he never ~~quoted~~ quoted, referred to or in any way told his reader existed, the ~~in~~ national policy which as soon as he was dead made Oswald guilty) and told all not to investigate the crime itself <sup>and it</sup> which was never investigated officially.

~~And~~ again it here is appropriate to repeat that the ~~ignored~~ official evidence that had been suppressed <sup>provs</sup> that Oswald was not and could not have been guilty.

Humpty Dumpty in Blakey's mind as well as his words,



of important conclusions)."

One is "Our analysis of his character led us to believe that Oswald was preoccupied with his political ideology, and it was ~~it~~ likely that he acted in the assassination in the light of that ideology." (page 363\*), 1334 here

Blackey never says what the alleged ideology was but he implies throughout that Oswald was a Communist when in fact, whatever he may have been before he went to the USSR, the virulence of his anti-Communism was beyond question. (I have about four pages of selections from what the Commission published, without a word about fit, beginning on page 120 of Whitewash and it cites the much greater list of these Oswald anti Communist writings.)

But this particular el estupidos who cares little for even ~~the~~ sensibility when he thinks he can manufacture an explanation and is so much el estupidos he can't realize how he is refuting himself in his manufacture.

If Oswald ~~was~~ "as preoccupied with his ideology" how does that explain eliminating the more liberal Kennedy and putting the much less liberal Johnson in place? Especially with the great differences in their ~~differences in~~ military policy and in foreign involvements?

Obviously, ~~if~~ if ideology was a factor, there would have ~~been~~ been no assassination.

"He offered the Soviets knowledge he gained as a Marine," for all the world as though this could mean anything at all, which it did not and could not. All Oswald knew was a bit about radar and, as Dino Brugioni, former CIA expert ~~made~~ abundantly, overwhelmingly clear in his CIA-approved book, Eyeball to Eyeball, the Soviets knew all they needed to know, much more ~~than~~ <sup>than</sup> the mere radar

operator, Oswald, could have told them. It is less than honest, much less than honest. for Blakey to write and give significant <sup>to</sup> to such a great misrepresentation without including with it that the ~~Soviets~~ <sup>KGB was</sup> were contemptuous of his offer and ordered his expulsion as soon as his visa expired. *without talking to him*

Here Blakey reports the earlier fabrication, that Oswald <sup>ed</sup> tried to kill rightwing extremist General Edwin Walker despite the fact that the Walker bullet, said by the Dallas police to be ~~30-6~~ <sup>(caliber)</sup> .30-06 <sup>(was)</sup> much too large to have fit in a 6.5 mm rifle.

Having said that Oswald remained a "leftist" after his disillusionment in the USSR (which Blakey did not mention earlier when honesty had required that), he ~~here~~ here says that "Oswald had a willingness to commit murder for a political purpose" (page 363).

*Made up entirely with no facts support it*  
 For a "leftist" there was a political purpose in killing the liberal Kennedy to get the much less liberal and much more militaristic Johnson? Nonsense! Does Blakey think he writes only for political idiots? Or has <sup>o</sup> he this low opinion of all readers?

Then, we had to believe, therefore, that the plot to assassinate the President, for Oswald at least, was rooted in his fundamental leftist political <sup>e</sup> beliefs" (page 363).

This kind of political ~~is~~ insanity does not let up. Humpty Dumpty of the mind controls Blakey, who continues to go downhill in both political <sup>w</sup> knowledge and common sense: "As the Commission knew from the testimony of Carlos Bringuier, Oswald made an effort to lend active support to the anti-Castro Cuban Student Directorate, arguably to infiltrate the organization" (page 365), As Blakey knew from the Vo., record. to <sup>o</sup> which his own "investigation" added not a think. <sup>s</sup> not a single word of this is true. All Oswald did, besides make trouble for Bringuier behind his back, was to ~~to~~ give Bringuier his marine manual. which was of no value to him at all.

Aside from the fact that it was Blakey's responsibility to investigate the crime, not to propagandize, he cannot possibly fake the case that from the first he was making without the most obvious and deliberate dishonesties- all of which are <sup>part of</sup> also <sup>this</sup> determined effort to corrupt our history, the history that is precious to most decent people. And, of course, being Blakey he needs neither proof nor reason.

As when he says the number-writer <sup>04-2</sup> ~~Dart~~ Murret "was in an ideal position to connect his nephew with organized crime." Even if as a number ~~w~~-writer he was in such an allegedly ideal position, what evidence is there that <sup>and Oswald</sup> Murret <sup>had</sup> such <sup>an</sup> intent or interest? For what purpose <sup>o</sup> could it have been <sup>n</sup> especially when organized crime needed no shooters-which Oswald was not <sup>in</sup> any way.

Writing numbers made Murret an "underworld figure?" Even old ladies and children used to write them!

In the only way he can say that Oswald was <sup>c</sup>connected with organized crime, as he was not in any way, in this completely dishonest way that is Blakey's intent. It would be a new kind of organized crime: uses people who can do <sup>o</sup> nothing <sup>it</sup> for <sup>a</sup> and keeps them as broke as they can be and still ~~survive~~ survive-while doing not a damned thing for organized crime <sup>!!</sup>!

Aside from this not being true, it ~~is~~ also makes no sense at all.

*Beside which there was no way in which Oswald could have helped the Bringuier*

As we saw earlier, Blakey's childish fabrication that Oswald wanted to "infiltrate" the one-man Cuban Student Directorate in New Orleans is <sup>invention</sup> ludicrous and there is not even an impossible ~~basis~~ <sup>basis</sup> for arguing that pointless ~~that purposeless~~ fabrication.

But, aside from his <sup>w</sup> knowingly impossible fabrication of Oswald's alleged intent to "infiltrate" Bringuier and Bringuier alone, <sup>none</sup> ~~not~~ of this is new or ~~reconsidered~~. It is ~~only~~ made up and made up of nothing <sup>except</sup> the <sup>my</sup> Huffy Dumpty in Blakey's head, *and for it* as ~~it turns~~ <sup>serve</sup> to <sup>serve</sup> his needs in his book that has no validity at all.

Here still again el estupidos Blakey refers <sup>Japanese</sup> to the businessman Ehara who was looking at a handbill Oswald gave him as Oswald's Latin-looking associate who was ~~never~~ identified. "

All that Blakey makes up based on <sup>w</sup> hat he made up that was both ignorant and stupid and perhaps <sup>a</sup> worse, describes his New Orleans "investigation" as a fraud, and an incompetence that would shame a child!

Everybody in that old trade mart building <sup>o</sup> could have identified Ehara and Alice, to whom, <sup>o</sup> although with Ehara, Blakey attributes nothing.

There is much that is unreal and there is much that Blakey attributes to <sup>g</sup> and bases on the unreal but there is no need to go into all of <sup>h</sup> that after what we have seen about Blakey and about his book. But as he fabricate the impossible, he has this kind about what he ~~earlier~~ had exaggerated about Oswald's uncle "Dutz" Murret: "Dutz ~~Mure~~ Murret was in an ideal position to connect his nephew with organized crime, since he himself was an underworld figure" (Page 364) from writing numbers when the penny-gambling was a big thing. *135 A here*

Among <sup>with</sup> all the baselessness in this Blakey does not even make

up any reason for Oswald to want any kind of co connection with organized crime. But if he had had any ~~such~~ connection, can it be believed that there was so little difference ~~between~~ <sup>bet</sup> the <sup>1</sup> income Oswald ever earned and ~~what~~ what he got ~~to~~ from unemployment? That he <sup>and</sup> and his family would have led the life kind of life they led and with ~~me~~ <sup>me</sup> ver an extra penny over the absolute minimum for survival?

They ~~make~~ Blakey makes up a long list of unnecessaries and impossible, with nothing at all in support of any of that wild stuff he shamelessly put on paper. They did not regard <sup>Murphy</sup> ~~Murphy~~ as a "co-conspirator" in the assassination "but we did regard him as a likely conduit of information about Oswald - his character, his political beliefs, his violent bent (specifically the assault on Walker) - into people who had the motive and the capability to plot the assassination. We recognize that there might have been a need for a family link to organized crime since Oswald's pro-Castro ~~beliefs~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~political~~ ~~stance~~ political stance was public knowledge in New Orleans.... (page 374). This childish making up of the beginning of the Blakey assassination plot stinks. It is obviously and thoughtlessly made up, with ignorance <sup>basic</sup> and with fabricated need controlling no matter how silly, how ignorant, how stupid all this childish irrationality is.

There is, assuming it was real, <sup>as</sup> as it was not, no "communications link" and there was no need for one. Other than <sup>for</sup> ~~in~~ a childish storybook. ~~If~~ If by any chance organized crime was looking for an assassin, they would not have considered an Oswald for an reason and if they did have such a project in mind, the professionals were accessible to them. ~~They~~ They'd not have selected as lousy a shot as Oswald to do that their killing for them. ~~For~~ <sup>2</sup> would they have armed him with a rifle that was known as Mussolini's contribution to humanitarianism

humanitarian warfare. They would have armed him with a much more suitable weapon than the army surplus from Mussolini's failed war,

Murret was "an underworld figure" because he sold numbers, chances? But if so there then were thousands of them and among them there was no special qualification Oswald had and flaws that nobody in his right mind, other than a Blakey, would ignore.

So, and this all made up, with nothing to support <sup>any of</sup> the fabrication, is Blakey's explanation of how the President was assassinated: Murret, how Blakey does not say, knew of some bigger mob people who wanted to kill the President. Blakey does <sup>not</sup> name them but he appears to have no need for that. He also has Murret fully informed and communicating with his unnamed mafia people about it. ~~his sad and that Oswald did~~ and ~~that his failure to hit a sitting target marked~~ red him as the kind of assassin the mafia was looking for!

It gets crazier, more <sup>senseless</sup> senseless all the time: "...we deemed significant Oswald's adolescent association with David Ferrie, the sightings of Oswald and Ferrie together in Clinton...and the mysterious 544 Camp Street connection..." which had no existence at all.

What "significance" Blakey attributed to all this rubbish exceeded his Dumpty Dumpty capabilities for he does not even hint what he imagined that was.

Which was probably the best way to handle <sup>it</sup> that, there being none,

He then says that "we had a direct link between Oswald" and Ferrie "who was directly connect to - in fact worked for - Carlos Marcello, the organized crime leader in New Orleans. There were therefore elements of the conspiracy in New Orleans..." (page 365).

There is not only not a word of truth in any of this so much of which, from his own earlier writing in this book Blakey just made up, a childlike ~~story~~ story that made no sense at all and could not have

been, in any part or in any way, a prelude to anything at all like a murder plot and <sup>leat</sup> of all the assassination of a President. What Blakey makes up could not have succeeded in robbing the corner grocery. But as Blakey ends ~~the~~ this sick paragraph, his words are "We came to believe that there were elements that matured into the conspiracy <sup>a</sup> that succeeded in November" (page 364).

Rabid, childish, pointless, unnecessary and fraught with inducements to failure, the beginning of what had to represent a small army, and without ~~a~~ a word of truth, of fact or of common sense in it,

But Blakey being Blakety, soon undermines this r/uthouse junk:

There were, therefore, ~~the~~ elements of ~~the~~ the conspiracy in New Orleans; know; edge of an expected Presidential trip to Texas; a violence-prone, pro-Castro Oswald; and an alliance of anti-Castro ~~figures~~ and underworld figures whose common hatred was a bond hatred ~~of~~ of the U.S. President. We came to believe that these were the elements that matured into the conspiracy that succeeded in November. ~~On~~

There were, however, other ~~elements~~ items of evidence that led us to believe that the actual contract with Oswald ~~for~~ for the ultimate purpose of killing Kennedy may have occurred much closer to the date of the assassination. We found it significant, for example, that <sup>on</sup> (the trip to Mexico City in late September Oswald used his real name. ...this would argue for ~~carefully~~ against the notion that he was an active plotter when he went to Mexico. ...It appeared to us logical that it was after her returned to Dallas on October 43 that he was contacted by <sup>6</sup> agents of the conspiracy who had concluded that his participation in the plot was desirable ~~since~~ since he would, if publicly ~~iden~~

identified, draw attention from their own complicity.

Oswald ~~must~~ <sup>must</sup> not have expected to escape, since he left his weddingring and most of his money with his wife . . ." (page 365).

As Blakey makes up this silly child stuff he concludes these inventions with: "The Options of his fellow conspirators were circumscribed once Oswald was in custody. Who was available to silence him? Who could gain access to the police station and smoothly accomplish the objective? Given ~~the~~ Jack Ruby's background, he was a logical choice. Unlike Oswald, Ruby knew how to hold his tongue." page 365).

~~There~~ <sup>none of this is real,</sup> is not a word of ~~truth~~ <sup>this</sup> in any of ~~the~~ and some of it is is spectacularly false, the opposite of the truth. Ruby was a blabber and so little is known of Oswald it is not possible to be honest and say that he was the blabber. But in what is known of his life, for long periods of time he said nothing that amounted to anything at all .

When Blakey uses words like "direct link," , which he said Oswald had with those who were violently and outspokenly opposed to Castro, his use of "direct" and "link" are empty Dumpty uses - the opposite of the truth. Oswald had nothing that could, by honest men, be called a "link", most certainly not a "direct link." It is a deliberate lie that is essential to the juvenile fabrication of a book by Blakey that compels him to make up and say things like this because without <sup>it</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>m</sup> he cannot have the frzud of a book that with his endlessly dishonesties he has clobbered up.

Ferris, as we have seen, did not work for Marcello. He worked for Marcello's Washington lawyer who, Blakey pays <sup>no</sup> ~~no~~ attention to ~~when~~ when Ferris was his investigator. His, not Marcello's



Blakey had no evidence, he did not even have a good reason to believe <sup>anything</sup> other than that Ferrie worked for Jack Wasserman. Which Wasserman himself told me <sup>not in Mexico, which Blakey made up.</sup>

The alleged "alliance" of all those anti-Castro forces with those of the underworld did not exist. Blakey <sup>made</sup> ~~made~~ it up <sup>for</sup> the same reason he made so much more up: without it <sup>he</sup> had no book. ~~And~~ And when that book <sup>needs</sup> ~~was~~ necessary of that non-existing alliance was necessary, accustomed as he is to making up <sup>what</sup> what he thinks he needs and plain-out lying. that is <sup>what</sup> what Blakey does. <sup>he has out he makes up.</sup>

Blakey says we, meaning his committee. <sup>believe</sup> ~~came~~ to that those non-existing "elements" combined "into the conspiracy that matured into the conspiracy that succeeded," another manufacture.

And, of course, all this depends on the motorcade <sup>going</sup> past <sup>the</sup> the TSBY - which <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ not decided until a few days before the assassination. But, naturally, this is <sup>not</sup> necessary for Blakey. Besides which there was nothing he could make up to refute it.

Blakey says they found it significant that on his trip to Mexico Oswald used his correct name. Not that some of his uses of a name not his own might have been by others, not that the FBI, in his belief, was getting him fired from jobs, which could have led him to use other names. But how easy would it ~~be~~ ~~be~~ to succeed in getting a visa under a <sup>false</sup> ~~fake~~ name and how easy would it be to get a Cuban visa under a fake name. ~~Particularly~~ Particularly when he wanted to use his free publicity of the newspaper stories ~~Bringuer~~ ~~arranged~~ arranged for him, as Blakey does not say, under Oswald's provocation.

Everything in this silly thing <sup>Blakey has made up</sup> ~~is~~ ~~is~~ ~~is~~ ~~is~~ up is, to him, "conspiracy related." When except in Blakey's <sup>in</sup> ~~in~~vention there was no such thing and when Blakey does not produce a single fact that justified this suspicion that there was.

It seemed logical to Blakey ~~et al~~, Blakey says, for Oswald to return to Dallas after he got fired from his job in New Orleans. He does not say how long that was after Oswald was fired but he and his family were on relief ~~most~~ most of the time <sup>they</sup> they were in New Orleans/. And for his New Orleans time Blakey does not produce a single friend or associate Oswald had in New Orleans nor does he even suggest how Oswald would have supported his wife and two babies were he in Cuba. As he knew Ruth Paine would for him.

Aside for all that is not real that is essential to this Blakey non-existing plot that he just makes up, he omits all that he knew about and ignored when it did not fit in his childish fabrication.

One of his omissions Marina explained to the Commission, the money Oswald left that morning. It was for Marina to buy a washing machine so she's not have to wash up for two babies, at least one in diapers, when they got the Dallas apartment she said they planned to get. Of this Blakey says <sup>-made up-</sup> it was because Oswald knew he's be killed. Why did he expect to be killed? Because this demon in-

vestigator made up what is necessary if he is going to pin his bad rap on Oswald, that in his political beliefs, which Blakey says were on the left, he was drive to kill the President who was more of the left ~~and then was an angel to the left~~ in order to make the less liberal Johnson <sup>less of the left and</sup> the pro-military man who was never of the left his successor.

Political genius, that Blakey, when he can invent a motive for Oswald, ~~is~~ motive enough to get himself killed ~~over~~, just to <sup>make</sup> Lyndon Johnson not liked by the left the President president <sup>let</sup> who, after the Cuba missile crisis <sup>Ke</sup> was like by the left, the Kennedy who was in secret correspondence with Khrushchev

to see if they could work out a detente, who has guaranteed Castro against any invasion, which Khrushchev could not do, hence that Cuba missile crisis, the Kennedy who had agree to try and work things out with Castro, <sup>with no such</sup> ~~nothing~~ ~~so~~ ~~things~~ ~~as~~ ~~expectable~~ from Johnson. <sup>My better reason on the left is still Kennedy's case at that time?</sup>  
Beautiful Blakey reasoning!

<sup>Genius, that Blakey!</sup>  
~~If~~ ~~he~~ there were a kindergarten in teaching foreign affairs, ~~Blakey~~ could not qualify to teach it.

Before proceeding with more of this insanity that Blakey thinks is a book, ~~as~~ as the Times Books also did, a word about what Blakey means an "association," "an assassination contact," all those things that were not and could not have been what he made up for them when they could not be what he made up for them to be. ~~Blakey had ever so much more "contact" with the FBI than he did with Bringuier.~~

~~Yet~~ Blakey does not make the BI part of that ~~conspiracy~~ he <sup>invented</sup> ~~invented~~. Oswald spent more than an hour with the Dallas FBI people assigned to him with John W. Fain in charge and they are not part of Blakey's made-up conspiracy but ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~Bringuier~~, <sup>with</sup> with whom Oswald spent <sup>only</sup> a matter of a ~~couple~~ ~~couple~~ of minutes and for whom Oswald made trouble behind the ~~scenes~~ scenes. <sup>another</sup> of these endless Blakey omissions, ~~is~~ ~~the~~ ~~vital~~ ~~key~~ in his imagined conspiracy with Bringuier.

Blakey then converts Ruby into "atypical hit man" (page 366) because of what he does not go into detail about, "his background" (page 365). Like making love to his dog, the dog <sup>here</sup> actually called his wife? By running up debts he could not pay? By fondling girls just entering puberty? By ~~not~~ even able to keep a set of books in his business or using checks, ~~also~~ ~~Blakey~~ ~~omitted~~, so he could have a record that <sup>he</sup> ~~needed~~ ~~a~~ ~~record~~, <sup>as people in business do?</sup>

Blakey connects Ruby to the conspiracy <sup>established</sup> Blakey thinks he made  
 up <sup>when</sup> ~~she~~ <sup>he</sup> did no such thing, without any proof of this as  
 there is no proof of any of his convoluted, nonsensical, impos-  
<sup>really stupid</sup> sible fabrication because Ruby was, for other reasons ~~not~~ in any  
 way connected with Blakey's childish manufacture. So what does, in  
 fact, make Ruby the "hit man" is that for other reasons entirely,  
 fr not a thing that Blakey ~~mentions~~ mentions. Ruby did kill  
 Oswald. He did that not because he was a hit man but because the  
 police, in their stupidity ~~and~~ in their quest for a good  
 press, made it possible

As we have seen, there is not a thing <sup>h</sup> that could be called proof  
 in this sick thing that Blakey <sup>M</sup> made up. There is nothing that is  
 both factual and relevant. There is no reason to believe that  
 this Blakey nonsense was even possible. And, there is official  
 evidence that was public and of which Blakey preserved his pure  
~~state~~ state of ignorance, suppresses or draws on both to invent  
 what we have just examined, the sick, the irrational, the ignorant  
 Blakey fabrication of his "solution" to the assassination - all of  
 the actual official information that makes his kid stuff impossible,  
 all accessible to <sup>him</sup> ~~no~~ and ~~is~~ none mentioned by him,

What superb qualifications for attorney General of the  
 United States of America!

And so he Humpty Dumptyed "reconsidered".