

## **CHAPTER 38**

### **Trying to Connect with "The Texas Connection."**

In this chapter and elsewhere in this book Livingstone proves no connections of any kind in his amateurish mixture of his own limitless conjectures with those of the most dubious of sources who make not even a pretense of impartiality. All who know what he wants to hear and tell him just that. His and their conjectures and the redundant errors of his own and of his utterly worthless sources and his flagrant ignorance of the official evidence, particularly of the sworn testimony, are what he refers to as the "connection."

It does not exist.

He gets this chapter title from one of the most dubious of books, The Texas Connection. It was, as he says of this first page of this chapter (465), published by Craig I. Zirbel. Livingstone's summation of its contents is that it "presents the case for Lyndon Johnson's involvement in the assassination, along with powerful businessmen in Texas, in the assassination."

What does he mean in saying that Zirbel makes a "case"?

That he has no "case" at all!

This is how he puts it: "Although Zirbel seemingly has no actual evidence to back his case, his argument for Johnson's involvement is strong."

In this Livingstone describes himself, his attitude and belief and all his books, notoriously this one. "Evidence" is what he wants to believe and if he wants to believe it he needs no proof. If there is no proof any "argument" the Livingstone believes, with or without reason, is "strong," it becomes proof and that makes a "case" for Johnson's "involvement" in the assassination.

Is there anything that to the sick mind cannot be "proven" this way? No matter how false it may be?

Simplified, this means that whatever Livingstone wants to be is true merely because he wants it to be true, no matter how untrue it obviously is.

And that is what makes his book. Not fact. He has none. But as he says of Zirbel, he needs "no actual evidence." And that is what Livingstone has, here and throughout this book as throughout his other books. Nothing.

It is because he has "no actual evidence" and has his great longing to be acknowledged as the leader in bringing fact to light that he found it necessary to make all his vicious and palpably baseless attacks on all others. It is because his conjectures are destroyed by the fact, the evidence that others bring to light that he has to try to make their work seem to be without credibility.

This is what makes a book and with him has made best-sellers. That this formula has made money in the past is all that makes publishable what ought not be given even a second glance.

After Zirbel his next source is Madeleine Brown. He says of her, "I know Madeleine Brown, a former mistress of Johnsons, rather well and find her mostly credible. It is hard for me to believe that she is making up all she says. Brown has, in the past, maintained that LBJ told her that John Kennedy was going to be assassinated in advance of it happening." (page 466) There is no such thing as a source being "mostly credible." A source is credible or is not credible.

In saying "it is hard for me to believe that she is making up all she says" he makes the involuntary admission that he knows she does make at least some of it up. And is he can see that, when what he wants to be becomes real on his mere longing, how entirely incredible a source she is becomes apparent.

Brown is far from the only woman who, after the assassination and its investigations "confessed" to sleeping with those prominent in the story. One of Ruby's strippers "confessed" to sleeping with both him and Oswald. She did not "confess" until after she got religion. She claims also to be the mysterious woman who is shown in other pictures shooting film that has never been found. She gets around her not being able to show that film by claiming that federal agents took it from her.

Then there is Marita Lorenz whose accounts of the beds she shared begin with Fidel Castro's. She claims also to have driven to Dallas from Florida with those she says were the assassins. They all called her a liar. Thus she has a book, in addition to all the fame they all want and too many get.

No matter how incredible their stories are, there are always suckers like Livingstone to give them the attention they crave.

Who can believe that if Johnson did know that Kennedy was going to be killed he would have uttered a word to anyone! That alone made him an accessory at the least.

There are people who crave attention and do anything at all to get it. Witness Livingstone.

By her own account, as Livingstone retails it, Brown knew everybody, was everywhere, as included in all secret conferences, at least those Livingstone wants to have been both assassination conferences and secret. No matter what their level in society, she knew them all and connects them all where she and/or Livingstone want a connection.

If this is not enough, Livingstone presents as fact what even she does not claim she can prove, not that she ever proves anything. For him it became fact, truth for a book and information to tell the people and to record for our history, if she says only that she believes it: "She said that she believes that he (referring to Johnson) worked together with H.L. Hunt and others in the murder." (page 466)

In Texas politics it is impossible to find any two who were more at opposite extremes in their

strongly-held views, two less likely to agree on anything at all, than Johnson and Hunt. So, merely because Brown says she believes it, Livingstone treats what she says she believes as unquestionable fact.

With this kind of "proof," proving that the moon is made of green cheese is easy.

Livingstone on his own adds to this particular "proof."

Livingstone also has his own standby, what he says is instant fact. Thus some of his most outrageously false and impossible statements have no source. Sometimes it is a simple statement, like "Johnson personally intervened at the Dallas Police Department and later at Parkland Hospital when Lee Harvey Oswald lay dying." (page 467)

No source. No explanation. And no sense at all. "Intervened"? What does that mean? With the police? What for? To get Oswald a cell with a private bath? To get him rough treatment? To put someone in the cell with him to later claim that Oswald confessed to him?

It is enough for Livingstone to suggest whatever is in his befogged mind. He does not have to make sense of it. He need only say it with the belief that the reader will give it the meaning he wants given it.

This, another of the many rare qualities of this book, is also what makes it so publishable it is announced to have an initial print of at least 50,000 copies.

What could Johnson do to "intervene" at the hospital? Have the doctors, on his word, see to it that Oswald died? Keep him from dying when his wound was certain to kill him?

He "makes" his case Zirbel-like, without any evidence and not infrequently with what is known to be false. Needing no sources for publication, as his past assured him, he is safe in having none for what he wants to be rather than what is known not to be true.

Making his "case" by argument - well, this is not even argument - here is what he says, without a single source citation, without any proof at all or any reason suggested, to make an ogre of his assassin,

Johnson:

Look at some of the things Johnson did within hours or days of Kennedy's death. He had his own baggage removed from his plane and put on *Air Force One*, and insisted that the coffin ride with him. He forced the widow and Kennedy's men - all of whom were in deep shock and disliked Johnson - to stand with him while he was sworn in as president. He took over Kennedy's cabin. He would not allow the plane to leave until a federal judge was found who swore him in as president. As soon as he was in Washington Johnson gave Mrs. Kennedy three days to get out of the White House, and had all of Kennedy's possessions removed at once.

Perhaps from his following paragraph he did have a source.

These types of callous activities demonstrate the cold ruthlessness of a man who was neither stricken with fear over a possible conspiracy, nor in any way mourning the loss of a leader," Zirbel writes. Johnson took over with great force and speed. (page 46 470)

Zirbel? Who "has no actual evidence to back his case"? He is a dependable source?

First of all, there is no evidence to back up a single one of these allegations and some are false from what is well and publicly known. But are there not questions and considerations to be addressed?

In that cold-war era, did the President's plane have communications not on the vice president's, like that fabled "black box" of nuclear retaliation?

Johnson did not "have the coffin ride with him." It was in a different compartment of that plane. But was it Johnson's idea that he use that plane or did the Secret Service require it? Ought considerations like this be addressed in any writing, particularly if it is to be responsible writing?

Ought the reader not be told that as of the moment those shots were fired in Dealey Plaza Johnson was the de facto President and as of the moment death was official he was in fact the President on being sworn in.

Was it safe for the country for him to leave the ground without taking the oath of office? Suppose there had been a vast conspiracy, would he be the next target? If so, what would or could that mean for the country if he had not taken the oath of office? Did that leave succession clear as a matter of Constitutional succession? Was it his idea that he be sworn in before the plane was airborne? And what about all those published reports that the attorney general, the slain President's brother, sent word that he should be sworn in immediately?

Not only is there no proof of any of what he says and suggests, it without question is false to say that "He forced the widow and Kennedy's men - all of whom ....disliked Johnson - to stand with him while he was sworn in."

He "forced" nobody and he could not have. Rather than "all" of JFK's men "standing" with him, all but one refused to. That one was Kenneth O'Donnell. Was it because he and the others who went to work for Johnson immediately did so because they so intensely "disliked" him? In fact they all did not. O'Donnell in particular did not from his oral history I cite in NEVER AGAIN!

What is the proof that LBJ gave the widow "three days to get out of the White House"? There is none. Nor is there any proof that Johnson "had all of Kennedy's possessions removed at once." He had nothing to do with that. But then like the Zirbels, Livingstones do not need proof. What they want to be is real to them as soon as they recognize their need for it in what they write.

Livingstone casts Johnson as an assassination conspirator therefore anything he says to make a villain of Johnson is instant truth no matter how false it is.

It is only from the grossest and most determined ignorance that he does not know for example that O'Donnell was the only one of the JFK party to stand with Johnson when he was sworn in. It is no less a pervading and dominating ignorance that indicates that no others of the JFK Whit House staff

went to work for Johnson. Several did.

This typifies all of Livingstone's writing. he just says what he wants to say without regard for proof or truth. If he wants it, that satisfies all writer and publisher requirements.

Referring to the well-known and officially reported and testified to threats that Oswald would be killed made late the night after the assassination, Livingstone says, "This had to be Ruby" making those calls. (Page 470) His source for this, one who did not make what he claims to know public sooner, one who did not report it officially or testify to it, and who also told him that Ruby said they had to "change their plans on moving Oswald from the basement." Why? So he would not be able to kill Oswald? And how could he possibly have known that "the basement" was involved in any "plans" to move Oswald?

Why not the obvious, just walk him out with an adequate guard and put him in a police car for that short drive?

How, in fact, could Ruby have known that Oswald was going to be moved at all?

There was no such requirement. Because there was no such requirement, Livingstone just imagined Ruby knew what he could not have known.

There just is no limit to the absolutely incredible and permeating displays the insensitive Livingstone makes of his ignorance and of its depth and breadth. It is omnipresent in all areas.

He, this man who wails forever of his great personal loss in the assassination of the man he loved and respected so deeply knows so little about him he has to make up what JFK said in one of his most famous speeches:

Kennedy's speech at American University in June 1963 perhaps wrote his death warrant because he announced a unilateral halt by the United States on above-ground nuclear test, and this threatened far too many financial interests with a stake in nuclear

armaments. (page 473)

That is not what JFK said in that speech. It is best known for his telling the people that we all lived in one world, breathed in the same air, and had to learn to live together in it and at peace.

He did not "announce" any "unilateral halt" in any nuclear tests.

What he actually did is, rather quietly because he expected political opposition to it, was, a month later to send the elder statesman, Averill Harriman to negotiate what he did then negotiate, a limited test-ban agreement. It was limited and it was mutual, not "unilateral."

And it was not in that speech in any event.

Without "perhaps" the Livingstones would be muzzled.

That speech "perhaps wrote" JFK's "death warrant"? Not his settlement of the Cuba missile crisis of the year before that left the USSR in Cuba? Not his overt efforts to curtail the military expenditures? Not his groping for peace in private with Khrushchev in their exchanges of some 40 letters following the settlement of that Cuba crisis? Not any other Kennedy policies, like the cancelling of some military contracts and international agreements some of which caused real international controversies and commotions? Like the contract to make Blue Streak missiles for Britain?

The well-known truth is that JFK did not do "write his death warrant," in announcing what he never "announced." He did not in that speech or anywhere, announce any "unilateral halt" in nuclear testing.

But in this convenient lie Livingstone plants the notion that it was all that Texas money at risk, "this threatened far too many financial interests with a stake in nuclear armaments." The manufacture of which proliferated in any event!

How that, even if true, involved only Texas money he does not say. He can't because it is not

true.

He then goes a step farther and, again based on what is not true and still has not happened, "by the conclusion of a nuclear test ban agreement with the Soviet Union, (he) signed his death warrant."

(page 473, his emphasis)

The agreement was limited to above-ground testing and those underground have not ended. Nor has the manufacture of nuclear warheads. There was no nuclear test ban agreement.

Or, how totally ignorant can you be to become a best-selling author and to have all you imagine published as fact?

Should it be, given the record of publishers in general and of his publisher in particular in this field, how totally and sincerely ignorant must you be to be publishable?

In any event, this is the beginning of the "Texas connection" as he starts to lay it out. It continues with Zirbel-like "evidence," his "arguments":

The argument that I have repeatedly made is that a consortium came together from the conservative right to kill Kennedy, and it included either Nixon (whose chief backers were these same Dallas oilmen) or those interests whom Nixon represented, and his personal gang of agents. This later led to Watergate. Texas was chosen because the situation could be controlled in Dallas. The levers were there to plant evidence on the police. Each big city police force has men allied with military intelligence who will do their bidding. Men trained in the military get civilian jobs and go on doing this sort of work, and coroners are in place to cover it up.

He could not very well acknowledge that Farewell America is the French spook fraud that it is when that phony "solution" is the one he was suckered into believing by his "Texas Connection" and he presents as his own "solution," not as cribbed from the French spooks -- which it is.

No source is indicated. True genius never does, so needs none. Nor does he need a source for saying how any of this "later led to Watergate," perhaps fortunate because that has no "Texas

connection." Except in his own sick mind where it became instant fact and an essential in his imagined assassination "Texas connection."

Without his nonexisting "Texas connection" he has no "solution," no book, no ticket to fame and fortune all like him seek and, the more irresponsible, the more ignorant, the more palpably impossible they are the more likely they are to get it.

He begins this chapter so vital to his concoction, to his book and his condemnations of all he imagines are his competitors, by admitting that Zirbel has no evidence and substitutes arguments for evidence. He draws to its end by doing precisely that himself, and by a rare honesty, describing it, as we see above, as only an "argument." Even though from here on he treats his Zirbel-indebted argument as established proof. He ends the chapter saying that for all of this "needed" a "major propaganda effort" for the purpose he described beginning here as factual, "to counteract the evidence of a conspiracy...."

On the very same page in which he describes what he writes as only an "argument" he makes it into "evidence of a conspiracy" and one in Texas at that. Thus he continues, referring to the Warren Report, "Once the press was trapped into accepting the findings of the commission" it had thereafter to "ridicule and humiliate those who continued to look into the murder and not accept the official story." (pages 473-4)

When it comes to "ridicule and humiliate" there is no more convenient target that blissfully unaware of it he makes of himself. He cannot be treated any more kindly, nor can his writing, than by "ridicule."

But then that omnipresent ignorance by which he misses the larger and legitimate point. Nothing "trapped" the press into accepting the Warren Report. For him to be published, once again, he needs

no source, no proof. The press was not "trapped" and he does not even suggest that it was or how it was. If he were less ignorant and less tied inseparably into what he makes up because when he makes it up it seems like what best serves his purposes in making it up; if he had any of the qualities or the knowledge of an authentic student of the assassination, he would know that the truth is an even more powerful case than the one he makes up: The press did not have to be "trapped into accepting" the Report. It did that monolithically and spontaneously without any compulsion, and that is even more of an indictment of it than is his partial exculpation that it was "trapped" and had no real choice.

And, again ignorance, that Commission did not make, his word, "findings." That implies a factual determination, based on real proof. It merely theorized and based on its theorizing reached "conclusions." Conclusions are a determination that need not be based on fact and with this Commission, they were not based on its own fact but are contrary to it.

As with those critics he regards as enemies and competitors, Livingstone has no actual case, not actual fact, not even a single instance of any harm to him or any single act against him - based on which he can allege any conspiracy against him. Needing no fact, he merely alleges it based on nothing at all.

That is what he does in what he does not and cannot establish, "The Texas Connection" to assassination.

This is not to say that there was no "Texas Connection" of any kind.

As we shall see, our Bearded Baltimoron who is so devoutly convinced that he is Sherlock Holmes reincarnated, had his own "Texas Connection" he chided me for not making so that I could leave Texas as thrilled as he by what is so transparently baseless no self-respecting high-school kid would believe it.