

CHAPTER 39

Out From Under The Rocks or Digging It Up From *The National Enquirer*

As he eased into his allegations that the assassination was a Texas-wide conspiracy, Livingstone, with Madeleine Brown as his source for anything she thinks he wants to say which she then accommodates him by saying he says that Lyndon Johnson is part of the conspiracy he imagines. But as he ends this chapter he backs off a bit and says he is not certain that Johnson was that. This and the also unsourced that precedes it is what he tries to carry forward in his next chapter, "Dallas":

There were backup patsies in case something happened to Oswald. The conspirators had a lot of money, and none of this was any problem, since the number of informants and other operatives available for clandestine operations at the time in the United States was large. It has been admitted that there were at least fifty thousand Pentagon spies, operatives, and informers on college campuses during the Vietnam War that followed.

Whether or not Lyndon Johnson knew what was going to happen to JFK, I am sure that he actively helped to cover up the murder (page 473).

"Whether or not," his words applied to Johnson, there "were backup patsies," he offers no proof of any. Indeed, he does not bother even to offer a suspicion. It is enough for history's record or for him to be so publishable for him merely to say it. When he says it, it becomes instant fact.

But how anyone else would be connected with that rifle or those bullets or placed in that or any other location like it - in any way, real or conjectured, made into "a backup patsie" he does not say and he does not have to say. That is just as true in what he contrives to connect it all to Dallas.

But he begins in France, with his source save for his "Texas Connection," for all that is not of his fabrication about those he regards as his competitors and presumed enemies and who really want nothing to do with him, to be left alone by him. He made earlier mention of the fake book by the French

counterpart of the CIA, then known as SDECE. Here he makes that fake his own, making up at the same time a new attack on all others writing in the field:

Years ago, somebody went to a lot of trouble to publish a book, *Farewell America*, that pinned the crime on the Texas oilmen, Lyndon Johnson, and elements of the intelligence and local police agencies. The book was published in Europe and offered to *Ramparts* magazine, a bastion of the New Left in the sixties, and which attempted to investigate its origins. The fact was that the author knew an awful lot about the inner workings of the CIA, and this seemed to establish the book's authenticity.

Farewell America was always looked down on by the community of assassination researchers, but it is not clear why, other than the suspicion that it came from the KGB, which does not necessarily impugn the truths in it. Warren Hinckle tells the story in his book *If You Have a Lemon, Make Lemonade*. The consensus was that the book originated with French Intelligence. It was possible that the Kennedy family had something to do with it. Daniel Patrick Moynihan had conducted an intense private investigation for Robert Kennedy and the Justice Department.

With his perfection of Livingstonian proof he has no source for any of this. That is fortunate because much of it is false, and sourcing the false can present problems. It is better to be publishable without needing sources, to have the most dubious of unsupported words accepted as without question.

In saying that "the author knew an awful lot about the inner workings of the CIA" Livingstone says first of all that he does, too, otherwise he could not have said that the fake book is factual on that, when in fact he knows nothing at all about this alleged "inner workings" and thus has no way of knowing whether any of what the book says is true or for that matter whether it or any of it was public knowledge.

He also says that means he has not read the book or did not understand what he read because according to the book itself, it did not have one author. Lamarre is the chief honcho on the project and supposedly on the writing. But the book itself presents itself as an international authorship.

When he says that *Farewell America* was always looked down on by the community of

assassination researchers, which does not exist as any "community," he is either making it up or displaying his ignorance again because for most the exact opposite was the truth - they went for it big! Particularly Garrison.

There was a minority, however, of whom I was one, that recognized it as a fake immediately. Livingstone says "it is not clear why" the book "was looked down on," not that those of whom he says this did in fact merely "look down" on it. The short answer is that it was an obviously false and impossible story in too many ways and had virtually nothing at all to do with the assassination itself despite boasting of direct contact with the alleged assassins. Having any such sources, the killers themselves, to have so little on the crime and that little in only well-known generalities is self-destruction.

Moreover, it alleged a conspiracy of such enormity, secrecy would have been impossible. It is only those lost in the vapors of the conspiracies they imagine or also-lost numbskulls who could or did believe that fine writing of such arrant nonsense.

Livingstone is both and he became irretrievably both when he was suckered, lock, stock and longing, by that gang of Texans who used him for their own vengeance, their own dirty deeds for their own dirty purposes.

And was he ever the willing sucker! I warned him and he asked not a single question about why I warned him. I told him I had files on it and he did not want to see those files.

He had his own purposes and for that fakery a fake was his ideal source and ideal weapon. It was, in fact, his only one and when they suckered him they saved him because without that fakery he was reduced to his wild charges against those he does not like or imagines are his competitors and his enemies.

That alone made no book.

And he had a contract for a book.

For all that he says about *Farewell America* and those alleged collaborators he has no source. Nothing unusual in that: there is no source for what is not true. Besides, it would not have been easy to say all those nasty things about me and to believe in the fake book if he looked at my files that show it was a fake. So, instead of reporting what I told him he refers, with no source, for there is none, to an alleged "consensus" about the French spooks and their fake book.

Next he says that Moynihan did conduct an investigation for Robert Kennedy and the Justice Department and that "maybe" the Kennedy family had "something to do with" *Farewell America*. Elsewhere as I recall he says that in fact the Kennedys were involved with the French CIA. "Maybe" evidence is the very best expectable from him.

This cannot be checked though through his index. Moynihan is not even in it and the listings for those who are, are incomplete.

This is all the demon investigator who claimed he would have "broken the case wide open in three weeks," the man who in a moment of honesty that is so unusual for him wrote, "I have never denied being nuts," (page 375) his only real justification for being considered publishable, had to say and all he need say to be so publishable: "The consensus was that the book originated with French intelligence."

Consensus of whom? Livingstone being so eminently publishable, another possible reason for it being that his *High Trash 2* made much money, need not say to have it published. His next sentence is likewise without any source, "It was possible that the Kennedy family had something to do with it. Daniel Patrick Moynihan had conducted an intense private investigation for Robert Kennedy and the Justice Department..." (page 476).

The "possibility" that the Kennedy family "had something to do with" *Farewell America* is about as good as that cows jump over the moon other than in Livingstone's head. It is the cock-and-bull story foisted off by Lamarre.

Having "never denied being nuts" is all his publisher needed not to identify Moynihan as a full-time United States Senator from New York for whom "an intense private investigation" of the assassination was impossible even if he had wanted to conduct one.

For whom, again with the credentials of never having denied "being nuts," was this nonexistent "intense private investigation" conducted? "For Robert Kennedy and the Department of Justice" (page 476).

It is convenient for him not to say when Moynihan donned that special Holmesian hat because Robert Kennedy was the Attorney General of the United States at the time of the assassination and in that role he needed no outside help for any investigation - which was never made for him in any event. And the Department of Justice, with all the skilled and experienced lawyers working for it and the FBI among investigating agencies on which to draw actually asked a United States Senator to do that for it, get a full-time and busy United States Senator to "conduct" an "intense private investigation" for it?

With the fabled FBI, one of its investigative arms? The FBI that, Livingstone says, does not lie? And more, when that "intense private investigation" developed "crucial evidence" of "a domestic plot?"

That would have caused Moynihan, Robert Kennedy and the Department of Justice to stop there and go no farther?

Naturally, there is no source for any of this and if one is a Livingstone who "never denied being nuts" and with a public record affirming that not needing any source for an initial print of at least 50,000 copies, he needs no source.

Admitting being nuts, of which Livingstone admitted to me he has such a medical history, a fair interpretation of his own spontaneous admission to never having denied it, is all required for the impossibility to be so publishable, with no question about it asked by the publisher and no source other than his own irrationality for his irrationality.

But, then, his book abounds in such craziness so why make a point of this particular insanity in a book that abounds with them?

Because of what follows:

I had developed several witnesses whom I judged to be in a position to know what had really happened to John Kennedy. The problem we have in proving anything - getting corroborated or credible testimony - is enormous. There is a certain amount of luck and guesswork in investigating. We often have to follow our hunches. I follow many trails to see where they lead. That can be a great drain of energy.

I came across certain people who were in touch with the Dallas researchers. These people were often kept hidden from view by those same researchers. As explained elsewhere, it eventually appeared that this same Dallas research group was responsible either deliberately or unwittingly for a great deal of misinformation. They were cutting out a bunch of witnesses and turning them into professionals, and staging various press conferences and meetings that promoted a massive amount of false information....

I gradually uncovered this disaffected underground of witnesses as well as a group of largely unknown researchers and sympathetic observers. Some of them led me to high-ranking citizens who, at one time or another, were in a position to know (page 476).

When Livingstone talks about those he refers to as "witnesses," not saying to what, his record encourages the belief he is talking about the substitute for real evidence and for reality that is the essence of his work. He is not talking about witnesses to the crime. Not that this is below him. Besides, he knows nothing about it and never treats with it.

When it is he who "judged" them to be "in a position to know what had happened to John Kennedy," what he "judged" them to be "in a position to know" is no more than what they could have

read in the papers, what just about all the people of the world know: he was assassinated.

If in this he refers to what follows as his "evidence" of the conspiracy he stole from the French spooks and presents as his own, we risk splitting our guts on that later.

And although he gives no hint of who his "disaffected underground of witnesses" he says he "discovered" are, in this, as we shall soon see, one place he could have "discovered" one of them is in a 1977 issue of *The National Enquirer*, the supermarket tabloid.

He could have "discovered" the other of his two main "witnesses" in a popular book. That is how "underground" they were.

He could have "discovered" Madeleine Brown in a variety of public sources that rival each other in undependability.

But the reality is that our literary Christopher Columbus Magellan, in saying that he "had developed" these "witnesses" is really talking about how he was sought out for them to use him as their vehicle for their revenge and for loading him with the trash they knew he'd not check out and could not but would believe because they had made up what he was looking for, does not exist - what neither he nor his cops kept secret, what they practically advertised for in Dallas!

Leading into his fantasy of all the great number involved in his imagined conspiracy, essentially the one made up by those French spooks, he has four pages on "the Murchisons" (pages 478-83). He refers to Clint and his sons, Clint, Jr., John Dabney and Burk, the latter dying young.

They did accumulate vast wealth. According to Livingstone this including, within the city, of New Orleans alone, thirty-six thousand acres, which was slightly less than one third of all the land within the limits of that town and the structures on it! This is not only hard to believe - it is impossible (pages 477-8)! A "town" New Orleans isn't. It is a major city in which many thousands own property and the

accumulation of a third of it by any private interests represents, in the acquisition alone, an enormous undertaking. Just locating and speaking to those many thousands of individual property owners in an attempt to acquire a third of the city is an impossible task for even the most fabulously wealthy.

Who in less than a page he has with "creditors at the door" (page 480)!

In his account of Clint's death, of the man "who had risen higher and fallen farther than most men," he sums it up this way, the line unsullied by any proof at all, "One more of the killers of Kennedy did not have a pleasant end."

His next section is "Murchison's Party" (pages 483-7). It was the night before the assassination, a very big party. With his ever-at-hand and never identified "some," Livingstone intones, "Some have called this a 'victory' party, or a 'command conference,' celebrating the planned murder of President Kennedy the next day."

His prime source on this utter insanity, that so large a number of such prominent people who conspire so publicly and in advance celebrate no less publicly, is Penn Jones. Jones' imagination and dependability, the latter always at the opposite end of the scale, was close to nil, as we have seen, when Livingstone spent - or did not spend - depending on whose word is taken, Livingstone's or Jones' wife's, all that time with him. Jones did have this neat invention of his in one of his books. And, naturally, the ever-on-the-spot Madeleine Brown was there for what Livingstone refers to as "confirmation" for him. He says he "verified" the presence of "at least J. Edgar Hoover, Lyndon Johnson, H.L. Hunt, John Curington, George Brown, of Brown and Root (major contractors), former Texas Republican Congressman Bruce Alger, and John J. McCloy of Chase Manhattan Bank and the Rockefeller interests." "Verification" means no source or sources given. There is no verification that it was that "command conference" of that in-advance "victory party," with "some" his source, naturally has

no end note identifying "some." But his "conspirators" were on the ball: "McCloy was placed on the Warren Commission within the week" (page 484).

Livingstone has a source to whom he gives the name "George Healey" to "protect" him. For what he is quoted as saying, the least he needed is protection! The "Healey" explanation for the assassination celebrated in advance is, "they believed Kennedy (who most had supported) was going to flood the country with cheap money, and they were not going to get any more money for their oil. . . .no constraints on how much money was printed. The Federal Reserve was independent" (page 484). "They were going to flood the country with cheap money," those Kennedys were (page 485).

As "Healey" continues to delineate the thinking if not the inspiration for the assassination he is quoted as saying, "You couldn't build up any wealth because of the income and inheritance tax structure. You couldn't pass wealth on unless you had some method of getting tax-free money."

This no doubt explained, to Livingstone's satisfaction anyway, how it was then, that all those Texans got so rich and how Clint Mutchison passed so much on to his sons - how he managed to get to own a third of the city of New Orleans, among other vast and costly holdings.

Livingstone adds Richard Nixon to the pre-assassination celebration/command conference (page 485). Nixon was there also representing "the Rockefeller interests." Not as counsel for Pepsi-Cola then holding its annual meeting, what all other than "Healey" and his prize sucker feline believe.

Then there is this trenchant observation: "Some enterprising newspaper reporter ought to ask Nixon what he was doing there behind closed doors" (page 485). Nothing like suggesting what he dare not say, that Nixon, too, was part of his (from *Farewell America*) vast celebration in advance of what had not yet happened.

Ever dependable Madeleine Brown was there to get and remember the best quotations from the

bragging conspirators, a new species of assassins, even for novels,

It was at this party that Lyndon Johnson made his now famous statement to Madeleine and those standing with her. He had come late to the party and, as Madeleine Brown was preparing to leave, he came out of the private meeting red-faced and told her, "After tomorrow, that's the last time those goddamned Kennedys will embarrass me again" (page 486)!

For this he does have a source, his private interviews with Madeleine Brown, the woman who knew and laid everyone, was everywhere and heard everything, like her lover-boy telling her in advance that the President was going to be killed, making him at least an accessory in that coming murder.

How killing only one and leaving two other Kennedys to "embarrass" him ended their embarrassing him, as both did, did not concern Brown or Livingstone. He had a quote, didn't he? And that quote tied Johnson in on that conspiracy as vast as those French spooks and Livingstone's above-ground "underground" could make it.

Is it not to wonder how many times Livingstone bought the Brooklyn Bridge?

He then adds these "Texans" to his growing conspiracy, growing with every Madeleine Brown burp, "John Connally, one of the next day's victims, Alvin Wertz, Abe Fortas (who was not a Texan, who came from Tennessee), Clark Clifford and, naturally, J. Edgar Hoover (page 486).

Cutting another slice of the fruit cake, he quotes Penn Jones book,

"All the major forces in this country were involved, and had to be accounted for at the final conference before the strike." Jones says that a conference was necessary. The party was the cover for the conference that occurred. Jones feels that J. Edgar Hoover was the commander and "present to confer with his troops, to issue last-minute instructions, to review the final plans and to give the word to 'go' or to cancel as necessary" (page 486).

This would not be credited in the cheapest of novels but it is what makes Livingstone so publishable.

It is tragic that poor Jones, paranoid beyond belief before the tragic illness that reduces him to communicating with nods of the head, according to the previously quoted Cleburne newspaper, is ill. But neither this illness nor his reported senility renders him less than the most dependable of sources for Livingstone. Who is fortunate that ever-at-hand Madeleine Brown has no such illness or limitations. She is again indispensable to him in the next section, "H.L. Hunt," (pages 487-92) followed by another Hunt section, "Was H.L. Hunt Involved" (pages 492-8)?

He and Brown knew each other "quite well." Of course! She knew everyone to be quoted, particularly those safely dead, who could not dispute her or sue for libel. She says that Hunt called her over three days before the assassination to hand her one of those flyers advertising President Kennedy as "Wanted for Treason" investigated by the Commission. Livingstone, who knows better than the Commission, better than those who had the flyers printed and distributed and testified before the Commission, says of them, "H.L. Hunt paid for the flyers, just as Hunt oil money paid for the full-page ad denouncing Kennedy that was carried in *The Dallas Morning News* the day of the murder." If this is not what the official sworn evidence says, it does lead to the next precious Brown line, that when she told her good pal Hunt, "you can't do the President that way," he snapped back with a sugary smile, 'I can do anything I want. I'm the richest person in the world'" (page 488).

This gives Livingstone all he thinks he needs to say, "There is a lot of money out there paying some of the leading people in the research community." He'd said that about me, like here, with no source (page 488).

There is no end to the improvements that can be made in our history and in official, sworn-to evidence with an uninhibited fertile imagination unrestrained by established fact. Thus, without the nuisance of a publisher demanding sources and confirmation, Livingstone says of one Sergio Arcacha

Smith that he was a "suspect in the case." Certainly not in the Commission's and certainly not in the case Garrison took to court. Arcacha "had worked for H.L. Hunt," with proof not even hinted at. Arcacha "had been the New Orleans director of the Cuban Revolutionary Front (FRD), which was a linchpin of the Bay of Pigs operation" (pages 490-1).

This does have a nice ring to it, especially for the phony case being built against the safely-dead H.L. Hunt, but it is not the ring of truth and it is another of the endless examples of the profundity of Livingstone's abysmal ignorance of established fact.

There was no such thing as the Frente being a "linchpin" in the 100 percent CIA organized and controlled Bay of Pigs disaster. For it the CIA had seen to it that the Frente no longer existed. The CIA compelled it and the more liberal, labor-based anti-Castro refugee organization to merge into the Cuban Revolutionary Council.

Historian Arthur Schlesinger, then in the White House, gives a detailed account of that shotgun wedding at the Skylark Motel in Miami in his *A Thousand Days* (Boston, Houghton-Mifflin, 1965). An apparent reason for Livingstone's ignorance is that Schlesinger's book is listed in Livingstone's bibliography (page 570). Meticulous scholar that Livingstone is, he gives this famous historian two different names on consecutive bibliography listings. So, No-Sources Livingstone continues with his improvements of reality to buttress his case against H.L. Hunt that, to here, rests on the feeble shoulders of Penn Jones and the slack jaw of Madeleine Brown. Not knowing that the Cuban Revolutionary Council (CRC) included the Frente to which Arcacha Smith had belonged, Livingstone next says that "Another group he belonged to was the Cuban Revolutionary Council, a CIA organization that was based at 544 Camp Street in the same building where Guy Banister had an office. Smith worked closely with David Ferrie from the time of the Bay of Pigs. Smith provides one link between Howard

Hunt and H.L. Hunt" (page 491).

The CRC was never "based at 544 Camp Street" in New Orleans. It was always based in Miami. The CIA withdrew its support of the CRC in April, 1963. The CRC's New Orleans branch was officed in that building for a short period of time. The owner, Sam Newman, confirmed to me in January, 1969, what the Commission records reflect, that he put them out in 1962 for nonpayment of rent. That Smith worked for Howard Hunt and for H.L. Hunt exists only in the clouds on which Livingstone floats whenever he needs a "link." Moreover, according to the CIA's Hunt's own book, his Bay of Pigs role was to draft the constitution for the provisional government the unsuccessful invaders were to have established. He also wrote that he was so deeply offended by the inclusion of pro-labor people in the CRC when it was created at that forced shotgun wedding, he resigned from the project and then had no connection at all with it. And that was in early 1961, prior to the failed April invasion.

These are among the reasons Livingstone has no given source for all the above.

Besides, who ever heard of a cloud being listed in an end note?

Livingstone next reports that H.L. Hunt had his still unnamed "security director" keep up with Garrison's doings.

For all his faith in *Farewell America*, faith undeterred by its factual errors, a fault Livingstone has ample reason for sympathizing with, he next says that because of the assassination the old man "did not go to Mexico. He was in Washington, D.C., under the protection of the new President, Lyndon Johnson, and J. Edgar Hoover." His source for the above is the as yet unidentified, name misspelled John "V Curtington." Livingstone has no source, there being none for the rubbish, that H.L. Hunt "probably helped dictate the shape of the new administration."

That is a nice touch, Livingstone's belief being that the old Hunt by running the assassination (this varies from time to time in the book, but allowance must be made for true genius) made Johnson President.

And the Hoover of that joint protection was the one of that "command conference" of the night before, wasn't he?

Only neither offered any protection and none was sought. This I say based on what the to-be named Hunt security director and Livingstone's source as well as Texas lawyer, told me. It is that fearing there might be those who blamed the old man for the assassination, he consulted with the FBI, for which he had worked. It recommended that Paul Rothermel take Hunt to Washington, Rothermel was all the protection Hunt did not need anyway.

More fabrication and falsehood:

Harold Weisberg and other "researchers" mounted a major operation to determine who wrote *Farewell America* and who was behind the book. It is unclear why they went to such trouble, except that Weisberg's trips to Dallas were being paid with Hunt oil money, and the main point of *Farewell America* is that the oilmen were behind the murder of JFK. (page 491)

Part of this is probably as close to accurate as anything of which Livingstone is capable. It is accurate enough to say that "the main point of *Farewell America* is that the oil men were behind the murder of JFK." None of the rest of it is true. Including his attribution of all of it to my January 14, 1969 letter to Rothermel (page 606).

There never was any "major operation to determine who wrote *Farewell America*."

From the time the ridiculous attribution to the KGB was proven to be false, and that was early on, there was no doubt of it. In early 1968 "Lamarre" claimed the project as his and that summer Garrison sent one of his assassination staff, Steve Jaffe, to France. He returned with confirmation that

included the calling cards of some of those on that project. I have copies.

And, as reported above, “Hepburn” Lamarre gave me his account.

One of Livingstone's kindergarten-level touches is identifying me as a "researcher," his quotation marks. It no doubt is because I am not a researcher that he spent so much time here and paid his cop the thief Waybright for so much travel and time to be here and go through my non-research ever so many times and make so many xeroxes.

That “major operation to determine who wrote *Farewell America* and who was behind the book” also is from those special Livingstone clouds from the fuzziness of which he dreams up what he wants to be true and isn't.

That there was no such campaign and there was no need for it, Lamarre having almost immediately identified himself as the chief author, naming others, whether or not they were that, and he also said he was with SDECE, the CIA's French counterpart. All this and more – not always faithful to fact, however, from their need to cover their own asses – Livingstone should have learned from his sources, Warren Hinckle and Bill Turner, whose book he has already cited.

It is indeed "unclear why they went to such trouble" because nobody did, there being no such need.

I do not know of anyone else outside of Garrison's staff, with which, as I have already indicated, I worked on something else entirely, who ever had any questions about the origin of *Farewell America*. The only interest we had was the possibility that the French spooks did that job for their United States chums, the CIA, in getting Garrison to make a public endorsement, which could lead to a mistrial in the Shaw case. I did want that to go to trial!

But is it not strange that for all the time he spends with his head in those clouds dreaming up

"evidence" and "proof" that it never once occurred to Livingstone that maybe, just maybe, the CIA had no interest in helping Garrison and had the opposite interest? Is this why he believes that the fake book tells the truth anyway, what he told me without explaining it - why the CIA wanted to "help" Garrison by "solving" the case for him with *Farewell America*?

But, of course, genius being what it is, it can see and understand what mere plodding mortals cannot and do not see.

Here Livingstone has a decided advantage. It comes from his career of seeing what is not there to be seen and of reporting that as unquestionable fact.

This is not to be sneered at. From it he was well supplied with money. It also gave him his synthetic fame that was restricted to those who are like him and as separated from reality as he is.

Of whom there is not all that few.

So, the reason it is "unclear why they (meaning not me alone when in fact I was all alone on that trip) went to so much trouble" is because nothing like it happened. That alone makes it prime copy for Livingstone, as does the falsity of what he next says, that all those imagined trips of mine were paid for "with Hunt oil money." He has no source indicated on this, by far the best writing technique for overt lies.

Sourcing lies can be tricky and complicated anyway. Besides which his publisher obviously made no such demands, require no proofs at all of anything at all..

Thus there appears on the next page (page 492), referring to our's, the "police state was perpetrated by J. Edgar Hoover, one of the killers of John Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, and Martin Luther King, Jr., not to speak of many other political murders."

How did he manage to miss Malcolm X and Mohandus Ghandi?

There are times when Livingstone has a downright aversion for existing sources. It is not just that he cannot. In the same paragraph he writes, "according to Summers," referring to the British writer Anthony Summers, "when Hoover used evidence of John Kennedy's sexual indiscretions to force JFK to pick Lyndon Johnson as his running mate."

If Tony Summers actually wrote that, then there is a book and a page or so to be cited. Unless there is this strong aversion to citations. Especially to what is 100 percent fake, as this is.

This aversion did not strike him earlier in this same paragraph. He does cite Summers, book and page, for the statement that Hoover could be compromised by his own sexuality. He was, according to Summers, a homosexual. Who was never so "compromised."

Oh, well, such is genius and it has to be lived with.

With Carroll and Graf seeing to it.

Having already said that H.L. Hunt was part of this large Texas conspiracy to kill the President he titles his next subhead, "Was H.L. Hunt Involved" (pages 492-499)?

What he says he does is "consider" whether Hunt was involved in the assassination. His deep thinking on this is credited to undescribed and unidentified sources. That is as safely as it can be handled, it not being true.

Here he makes passing reference to Bunker Hunt's "being prosecuted for wiretapping, obstruction of justice and other crimes." Prosecution for criminal offenses of the son of the man he says conspired to have the President killed, the man to whom he gave this thought as a possible assassin, that needs no source so he wastes no time or space to give any source or even indicate who was wiretapped. With almost 800 pages, economy with space and words was, obviously, not a prime need and his motive was not really to save space. More like saving face he seems to be quoting Craig Zirbel

(who wrote The Texas Connection) but the presence and absence of quotation marks leaves this somewhat in question.

(It was his source/lawyer/unnamed "Hunt's man" Paul Rothermel who was wiretapped and who caught the wiretappers. The Hunt sons were after him, Curington and others as thieves. Aside from what appeared in the papers I have an account from the lawyer who represented one of the wiretappers who was caught. Livingstone does not report that his lawyer/source Rothermel was charged with being a thief or what his defense was. He also did not look at my files on this.)

Still writing about Bunker Hunt's political contributions or contributions to what is of interest to the radical right, Livingstone says he "gave more than \$10 million to 'Here's Life,' part of Bum Right's Campus Crusade for Christ" (page 493). He can't even get well-known names right. As neither "Right" nor under his correct name, Bright, does he appear in the index, where most seem not to be than to be.

If he uses Zirbel, this indicates how authoritative Zirbel is.

After ticking off a few other large contributions he says that "compared to other wealthy Texans, these and other gifts were a drop in the bucket, but it should give you an idea of how much money the rich Texas political activists have to buy doctors, witnesses, politicians, investigatory commissions (Warren's perhaps?), police, jet fighter pilots and generals for hustling back and forth bone fragments, film, and testimony" (page 493).

Source for all this? Who needs sources? Especially when there are none!

This time, longer as his list of the bought and paid for is, it does not include "researchers" not to his liking, as, "There is a lot of money out there for paying some of the leading people in the research community," like me (page 491), as he says only five pages earlier.

But it is not quite like what he says on page 485, only three pages earlier: "You couldn't build

up any wealth because of the income and inheritance tax structure. You couldn't pass wealth on unless he had some methods of getting tax-free money."

What better proof of the impossibility of accumulating any money in Texas could there be than what appears above this in the same paragraph, that only one of the many contributions of large sum to the Campus Crusade for Christ was a paltry \$10,000,000?

He does give an impressive account of such large contributions while at the same time and in the same place saying it was impossible to "build up any wealth...."

Did they have their money specially printed for them? Some good ol' boy counterfeiter?

If consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds, then Harrison Edward Livingstone is not hobgoblined. Not a bit.

Then, and if this has gotten as involved as he makes it, his next numbered point is (or is it his?) "I uncovered evidence that Hunt money and Ruby continued their association up to the time of the assassination, and that Ruby supplied him with women, including one or two who became Hunt's close girl friends. Hunt was glad to pay for what he got.

This does, as written, refer to the octogenarian father, not any of his sons.

No source? Stop picking nits. If Livingstone says it, isn't that enough? As to his publisher to whom anything for which he lists for sources is just fine. Especially if defamatory.

On the same page he gets to what is made a bit confusing because of question marks and their omission, but what he seems to be doing is accepting as an authority the very man he said earlier has arguments, not evidence, Craig Zirbel, as quoted by that Ray Carroll. A careful reading indicates that he has within quotation marks what does not belong there and vice versa. This has to do with a letter to

a Mr. Hunt "purportedly written by Lee Harvey Oswald on November 8, 1963." This combo says that the results of the FBI's investigation of that letter "have not been released." That explains, I suppose, how it is that I got from the FBI the report that says its handwriting analysis was inconclusive. It was released to me because it was not released at all?

Getting through all these fantastic sums tossed around by all those fantastically rich Texans and all the other fantastic details, at least in his account details, is not a bit painful. But as there is a limit to the time the most exceptional of geniuses can take, so also is there a limit to what the stomach or the mind can take

Painstakingly building his massive proofs of that massive conspiracy to assassinate the President, forging his chain link by link, each hammered close by the most probative of witnesses - what else is required when a President is assassinated and true genius goes to work on it - he gets back to Madeleine Brown, this time not in bed with LBJ. Under the subhead "The Order to Kill," Livingstone writes:

Madeleine Brown says that she thinks it worked like this: Vice President Lyndon Johnson got the order from H.L. Hunt to kill Kennedy, and Johnson called Mac Wallace.

Wallace called Jack Puterbaugh to change the route of the motorcade, Brown says, and just before they all got into the car, there was a violent fight between Connally and Johnson.

"Wallace was the mastermind and he hired the other two shooters. There were three shooters." How does she know this? Did she hear it, and if so, from whom? Or is it her opinion? Brown is friendly with a former FBI man and chief of security for one of the oilmen. He ought to know. Did she hear it from him? "No. I heard it in bits and pieces from Johnson and the others around him. From Billie Sol [Estes]."

She went on. "Meanwhile, people were dropping dead in Texas all over the place from the agriculture scandal. And Billie Sol was in deep shit," she said, with true Texas flair. "Lyndon was in trouble over Estes, Bobby Baker, and Walter Jenkins, who was caught in a gay bar. Hoover framed him, I think. Hoover was real good at making trouble like that for people."

I liked Madeleine. My assessment of her was that she was about 65 percent accurate....

In an effort to minimize the built-in confusions I eliminate Livingstone's digression into one of the biggest of all fakes, Ricky White's claim that his father Roscoe was one of the Grassy Knoll assassins.

It appears that Brown is again being quoted:

"Charles Cabell handled the rest."

"What do you mean?!"

"He took care of the Washington end of it, and kept his brother [Earle Cabell, the mayor of Dallas] in line. They needed the Mayor's help to cover it up." Earle Cabell went to Washington the following year as a congressman (page 499).

General Charles Cabell was deputy CIA director. A nitpicker could interpret Livingstone's "assessment" of Brown to be that more than a third of the time, 35 percent of the time, she was wrong. And he is pretty broad-minded on what is wrong. But if it is so doubted that she really slept with Lyndon Johnson, that is a modest claim compared to Marita Lorenz's, that she slept with the two political extremes of dictators, Cuba's Fidel Castro and Venezuela's Marcos Jimenez Perez. Among other lovers. Brown is modest for such ladies.

Forging his imaginary chain link by careful link, Livingstone gets to his subhead, "John Curington" (pages 500-3).

Without, remember, any further references to any wiretapping prosecution or any other kind of prosecution or civil law suit. But he does, right off the bat, establish Curington's credibility. As is required when the crime being investigated is that massive, Texas-wide conspiracy to kill the President, credibility has to be the greatest, Livingstone gives no "assessment" of Curington's credibility but it seems to be right in there with Madeleine Brown's.

Well, maybe a tad less high because he did have a problem.

As Livingstone tells it, Curington immediately regretted that Livingstone had not looked him up earlier. He also said, "I ran the entire operation," Curington said of his job with Hunt" (page 500).

These are the book's next words:

Unfortunately, Curington was taken away to jail not long after we talked to him, and the feds wouldn't tell me where they took him. I spoke to his son and learned that they had been forbidden to reveal where he was. The indications were that he had been set up and his conviction was some sort of retaliation for opening his mouth to the wrong people. Of course, others who had known him well said that he would do anything for money. When I interviewed Curington, I had no idea he was going to go to prison. Sometimes I am too late and they are already dead or taken away, so I was lucky to have had the opportunity to talk to him. Eventually I learned he was in a facility in Tennessee.

What are the "indications...that he had been set up?" In Livingstone's own words, "He pled guilty to a charge of uttering a false statement to a financial institution, probably something of which many people are guilty. This not to say that I condone law breaking, because I don't" (page 500). He did not remember the laws broken by him and his cops/thief, but one can't remember everything.

It is, Livingstone then says "since I was able to corroborate what Curington" said he feels that "much of what he said is good information." Sort of like his estimate of Madeleine Brown being wrong only a little more than a third of the time, in his opinion, that is. In any event, this alleged "corroboration" is not here cited. Livingstone's first three paragraphs summarize his Curington's "good information."

There is what Livingstone does not say about Curington, but after all, with all he says and all his genius, cannot a few "oversights" be excused? He has said often enough that he dug up all this new and sensational information, and he does say that I was there and missed it all while fooling around with trivia like fact and evidence. But he does not say how he dug up all this sensational evidence from Curington.

That was not because he did not know. Just an oversight, naturally.

He begins this Curington wrapup saying, "I also want to add that Curington confirmed every

point in the article in *The National Enquirer* tabloid in 1977." Then he has an end note. How Curington "confirmed" or with what is the kind of detail, that only nitpickers, not geniuses, stop on.

In his source notes, this one reads, "*The National Enquirer* (June 14, 1977, p. 4)."

It happens that what *The National Enquirer* published in 1977 is what Livingstone says he dup up himself only about a decade and a half later. He got it from that sheet. As he does not say, that little "oversight."

It was for it, not for Sherlock Livingstone, this oldest of the supermarket tabloid wrote - and it was written by two friends of mine, the late Bill Dick and Ken Potter who had so much faith in it they never mentioned it to me - that Curington was "breaking his silence for the first time."

This rag's headline on its scoop is "JFK Assassins Got \$\$ From Kennedy-Hating Billionaire." Its first sentence is, "John F. Kennedy was assassinated by men who received money from the late billionaire H.L. Hunt, claims the former number one aide to the Texas oil tycoon."

And then what Livingstone reports as his own derring-do investigatory diligence and persistence follows.

It even includes Curington saying what I report earlier that Rothermel used me for, to protect the old man from those who would have used money from him in ways that could have gotten him into trouble, with specification and detail not in this one sentence I quote, "An amazing group of political parasites was drawn to Hunt because of his radical right-wing views."

The Curington in the *Enquirer's* photo, like the Curington I recall, does not have that fine mustache that so intrigued Livingstone as so much else also intrigued him.

H.L. Hunt had told Curington that there was a conspiracy in the assassination. "Whenever we had a message to give to Lyndon, it went through one person, Boothe Mooney, and was directly communicated by him to Johnson. He'd have a world of

correspondence."

Curington, an attorney, was a wiry good ol' boy, affecting the costume of old-time Texas hard-ass, just like in the movies: cowboy boots, handlebar mustache, and a black Stetson wide-brim cowboy hat. Having worked the oil fields of West Texas and Hobbs, New Mexico, as a roustabout was an advantage because I could talk the native language.

"I have no doubt that Lyndon Johnson may have ordered John Kennedy's murder. He or his wife. She was more vicious than he. Even more brutal." Curington explained that Johnson was about to be destroyed forever politically. "It was either him or Kennedy. He might have brought down the whole Kennedy presidency with the scandals he was involved in. And Johnson was valuable to us and a lot of people in office."

Curington said that H.L. Hunt was involved in that massive conspiracy. He had "no doubt" that Johnson may have ordered John Kennedy's murder."

Opinion, not evidence. But there is that "corroboration."

Before getting to that Livingstone reports that *The National Enquirer* checked on Curington "with a voice stress analysis." It then gave him "a clean bill of health" (page 503).

"Madeleine Brown" is the next section (pages 503-8). And, startling as to most it would appear to be, she wrote a book, or at least it bears her name, and what she told Livingstone is not in her book.

That is not, in his version, what she told him is not in her book. Poor woman. She must have been overwhelmed by more than what she told Livingstone, about LBJ, that "money and power surrounded him, and that enhances sex appeal" (page 503), not to have remembered what could have sold so very many more books:

"John Connally knows something about the assassination but won't talk about it. They tried to kill him because he knew what happened" (page 504).

"Lyndon Johnson did not die naturally. She thought that his Secret Service people killed him. 'They just hated him,' she said" (page 504).

"'Talk to John Norris,' Madeleine said. '...you'll find out there were three plots to kill Kennedy, and the other two were backup plots. One of them was LBJ's plot, which took JFK out with the KGB's help'" (page 504).

Unless there then was more than one John Norris working for the Secret Service, the John F. Norris, who retired to Glen Dale, Maryland, has phoned me often, has written to me, and hasn't even hinted at any such thing. But then he had not written a book and was not going to be a major figure in another, as was Madeleine Brown.

She surely did know everybody. Even Roscoe White who for a short period of time as was a Dallas policemen and who was blessed with a son who tried to sell a story and a movie both of which identified him as the killer of the assassination and of the Officer J.D. Tippitt. Whatever she remembered of Roscoe, Livingstone does not use. Long before his book was out Ricky's story had been demolished.

Poor as Brown's memory was when it could have meant money to her in her book she got young and healthy again for Livingstone. She may have been the one who first pushed him toward that celebrate-in-advance party at Clint Murchison's: "Why, Harry, why do you think John J. McCloy and Richard Nixon were there when Kennedy died? Don't you know it was a joining of the forces, that they put aside their warfare and came together to kill Kennedy?"

Livingstone added, "That was in line with my own feelings."

He added, "We need to pay attention to what she says. She isn't always right...." (page 506).

That is no exaggeration. It is the understatement of years.

Lots and lots of words. But not a single item of proof. It is as Livingstone said of Zirbel's book, no evidence but he liked it anyway.

The "LBJ" section takes up less than a half page, despite all that precedes it saying that he was at the least one of the conspirators and it is suggested much more than that. It holds only the well-known FBI report that Johnson suspected there had been a conspiracy and that the CIA was part of it.

One of those I offer all who come here.

There is nothing in his "The FBI and Dallas" subchapter worth taking any time for. There has been no shortage of conjectures and no more are needed.

And so Livingstone gets to the Conclusion (pages 516-8) of his "Dallas" chapter as he spells his conspiracy out. What he says, no evidence cited, is much less than he wrote: "What I found in Dallas was that a plot was plausible. It utilized elements of the military, and possibly the Mob, though in a very small way and at a low level" (page 517). Yet look at all there is from those super sources he said he dug up about a conspiracy he does not mention in his conclusions in this, this last but two chapters on that alleged conspiracy.

An immediate question is if he believed it why does he omit it from his chapter Conclusion? And if it is not worthy of mention in his chapter summing up, was it worth mentioning at all?

The only thing to this point that can be said to bear on whether there had been a conspiracy is unsupported words coming from the most dubious and least credible sources with nothing at all to back them up. Not even enough for a reasonable suspicion.