

What is truly ironic (and doubly so) about Cockburn's "rolodex" remark is what has been turning up in recently released secret CIA files. It turns out that the CIA has released a listing of the general membership of the Fair Play for Cuba members for the years of 1962 and 1963. These were the years in which Oswald, in one way or another, expressed his greatest interest in that organization. The 1962 listing of which I have a copy does not show Oswald's name in it nor should it since he actually did not join the FPCC as a member until 1963. So what does the 1963 CIA listing show—the fearless and dreaded FPCC member—Lee Harvey Oswald?!! No, it doesn't! Somehow he managed not to wind up on the CIA's "rolodex" for the entire year of 1963! Incompetence, I can hear some readers cry. Or did the CIA just "slip up" and make a human error? Were they "out to lunch" during the year of 1963 when Oswald joined? Don't they, as part of their job assignments, read newspapers, listen to the radio and watch TV? (Oswald was notorious that year appearing in the press, was on radio and television and if you have been reading John Newman's book on "Oswald and the CIA" the CIA was busy opening up and reading his mail). Add to this the liaison between the FBI and the CIA when he was arrested in New Orleans for the "crime" of distributing FPCC leaflets.

It could be that during the time Oswald was up to all his "dirty tricks" (and hanging out his dirty laundry no less) the CIA "clerks" were too busy watching Oswald's favorite TV show, "I Led Three Lives." You'll remember that show because it purported to be a true account of an FBI informant posing as a real live "Commie" who reported back to the bureau the nefarious "dirty deeds" of his "comrades."

Who knows, we may one day discover in one of J. Edgar's "lost files" a document establishing this as "fact" and it could wind up appearing in a Cockburn column!

28

MIND CONTROL AND THE JFK CASE

by

Harrison E. Livingstone

As I write this, in mid-1995, I believe we have reached the moment that all those who oppose evidence of conspiracy in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy have been waiting for. Researchers and critics of the Warren Report are in disarray, betrayed by their former leaders, tied in knots by conflicting evidence, overwhelmed in the media by Doublespeak and a tremendous onslaught of stories about Lee Harvey Oswald having committed the crime alone. Sincere truth seekers have too many choices of theory and evidence to make sense out of it anymore, and there is no clear leadership getting through to enough people to clarify what the facts really are.

This has come to pass because planned and deliberate operations of sophisticated mind control and propaganda techniques divided and conquered, making it impossible for any central provable concepts and evidence to get a fair hearing. The FBI office in Dallas was a source of those operations in place for more than thirty years. We all know what one of their offices did to Martin Luther King, and they did it to the Kennedy case, not to speak of others. I have to add that I don't mean this as a blanket condemnation of the FBI, which can be otherwise admired for all its mistakes.

There are two basic aspects to the kind of mind control I wish to discuss. One has to do with the operation functioning among researchers and critics of the Warren Report, and the other is that operating in the media. They are interconnected, as was demonstrated after the 1994 Coalition on Political Assassinations (COPA) meeting in Washington. I start with the COPA extravaganza because it is a symbol of the great failure after thirty years to make real headway in presenting a coherent case for conspiracy, or at least a case that will make waves and mean something to the press. An examination of the failure of the 1994 COPA conference is a good way to lead into the question of mind control in the JFK case, both in the media and in the research community. COPA, basically a convention of interested parties, lacked real focus or intent to blow the case apart and to truly instruct with regard to what we now know of the evidence. It was all very carefully defused, and

Harrison E. Livingstone
P.O. Box 7149
Baltimore, MD 21218

the three hundred or so victims were politely delivered into the tender mercies of official Washington. Politics is a rough game, and they're taking names.

Some will instantly jump at that statement and remind us that "polls show that 90% of the public believe there was a conspiracy in the assassination of President Kennedy." So what? What good has this done? Have we ever prosecuted anyone proven to be part of the plot? Has there ever been a convincing case put before the public or the media? Re-read this last question. Have researchers ever been able to convince anyone of anything other than an overwhelmingly emotional argument that there was a conspiracy? In most cases the alleged evidence has not held up. The very act of crying wolf for so many years, for more than three decades, may have made it impossible to get the proof out. If such proof is lucky enough to be printed, it must then compete with a hundred different opposing views. Everybody and his brother will oppose it because it's all in the game.

The claim that most people believe there was a conspiracy is a good starting point to show mind control: The mere statement that there was a conspiracy is the same as what the House Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA) did: Throw the public a bone, especially if there is no meat on it. If there is no substance to the evidence backing it up, then it is meaningless. What we have is a political move made to pacify a large segment of the population. Nothing will be done because that would antagonize another large segment of the population. This is like rehabilitating Nixon not so very long after his disgrace. It would not do for his constituency—for a time the majority—to be endlessly antagonized by what they felt was purely a political prosecution leading to the President's downfall.

Political considerations become paramount in how these things are dealt with, and the only way to understand what goes on in the JFK assassination research is to see it in its political context.

What we have that blocks further progress in this case or the success of real, hard evidence of conspiracy, are two sides of the same coin: a kind of mind control pack journalism both among the research community and among the media itself.

Many in this research carve out a piece of turf with their own unique angle on the evidence and then defend it to the death, trying to knock out everybody else's interpretation of the evidence. Daryll Weatherly describes what we have had for most of the last thirty years as a form of rabbinical council

endlessly arguing minutiae of things that matter little or not at all. It is not even the argument or the evidence itself that matters so much as the arguing, and like The New York Times' reason for wanting to believe Gerald Posner's abuse of conspiracy theory, it is the style of the argument that is so elegant, and therefore must be convincing and true. The circle of disputationists might be likened to a gang of madmen endlessly fighting over esoteric points in the evidence and never coming together. Nobody wins, and everyone is entitled to their own opinion, in a kind of vast mental gymnastics. The leveling process equals things out to nothing.

Is there some method to this madness? Does it all happen as part of a program? Is the whole thing rigged?

Certainly the evidence itself is politicized. Depending on the political persuasion of the researcher or reporter and the feelings they might have for John Kennedy, their position on both the evidence and how they deal with it might be greatly influenced. Kennedy, like any politician, had his opponents and enemies, and this carries over into how people think about the evidence put forward suggesting conspiracy in his death. Although some who seem to profess belief in a conspiracy did not like Kennedy, they keep this well hidden from the community of researchers, blending in with everyone else. Far too often these same people proffered evidence or theories that are irrational and throw a monkey wrench into the work that is being done.

Far too often the enemies of Kennedy, many of whom totally misperceive his true nature and objectives, his true political philosophy, and who think they are opposing "liberalism" will first disrupt the research or ideas of opponents in subtle ways and then try to go in for the kill with open warfare. Those interested only in the truth are always losers in the endless battling that leads nowhere. Various "authorities" establish themselves as the arbiters of disputes and sometimes the saints and Gods that all are warned not to question or resist.

For a long time there was an accepted group of "critics" at the top who influenced public opinion. No one ever scratched the surface to find out how deeply divided this group was. They exercised a form of absolute control in the sense that neophytes and fans could select which among the rabbinical council they chose to follow, but there really wasn't anyone outside that group. Once they chose a master, they were prisoners without knowing it.

Far too often there is such fear of inquiring into just who are the people we're dealing with, what their backgrounds are,

their political persuasions, and what they believe that the question never gets asked. Many are suckered by those with a hidden agenda.

The violent branch of the right wing casts a shadow over all, frightening presidents and researchers alike. All are subtly afraid and don't realize how influenced they are by the fear that was instilled. The terror of violence was always in the background subliminally distorting rational thought. If they could kill Kennedy, they could kill lots of people. Fear and violence was the bottom line of the political process.

There wasn't anything of substance in the evidence that the old leadership provided for thirty years, either. What they had was weak and watered down, based on insubstantial "trajectory" analysis which merely substituted a different trajectory for that of the Warren Commission—using the same false assumptions. Analysis of the medical evidence, or what was known of it, was based on what the government gave out which had to be held authentic at all times, and which was always focused on discrediting every single medical witness and their observations in Dallas and at Bethesda Naval Hospital. The obvious conflicts between authentic documents and what they said was never addressed by the deans of the "critical community." Visual evidence such as the Zapruder film was an obvious fraud containing conflicts necessitating a massive mind control operation to tell the people what to see in the film and what to think about the film. The film, also, was claimed to prove that there had been a shot from in front of the President, throwing his head backwards, but the mere perception of the film was not proof at all—only conjecture which a small degree of science easily encountered. Nobody ever asked if that film was anything more than an animated cartoon.

Clearly, if all of this material and the official explanation for John Kennedy's murder was so seriously conflicted, and those who guided the nation did not want its affairs disrupted by those conflicts, then the way to deal with it was by political means and the use of political warfare: Mind Control. A battle ensued for the hearts and minds of Americans, as well as researchers, and it continues to the present day.

I have had the terribly disheartening experience of seeing whatever that is solid in the case, whatever evidence that appears to establish conspiracy beyond a shadow of a doubt repeatedly eclipsed, wrecked by those who cannot allow that evidence to stand or survive along with the bearer of the message. Those who have the power don't dare give the evidence the media attention it deserves. There is no devotion

to truth. The only devotion is to keeping the lid on such evidence, until it is diffused or watered down.

Why has not the media undertaken truly serious investigation? Some will immediately attack this last statement and point to the long history of articles and efforts made by Life, The Saturday Evening Post, The Washington Post and many others, including television networks (CBS) and shows such as Front Line. None of it was on the right track, and I don't think they wanted to be on the right track. Everyone was too frightened of where the truth might lead them.

An example of how corraling researchers and critics and delivering them bound and gagged, so to speak, into the hands of the media is that the only significant news coverage of COPA's 1994 three day meeting was the article written by Max Holland for the Washington Spectator, a four page newsletter. This relatively small newsletter guides readers, especially a few in the media and officials, how to think. Holland, who has considerable experience in Washington, also writes for The Nation, and could not be expected to stick his neck out and depart from The Official Story in the Kennedy case. Evidently, not even the Nation wanted to carry coverage of COPA.

In other words, no important or influential organ of the media bothered with COPA's meeting, and it was left to one commentator to nail the lid on the coffin in an obscure publication. This should have been expected to happen by anyone familiar with Washington or the media in general, knowing the intent of COPA to show a united front on the Kennedy case. The vast differences nearly all researchers and critics have both on the evidence itself in the assassination of Kennedy, and in speculating on who committed the crime (if it was a conspiracy) have been to a great extent the reason for rejection by the media of conspiracy evidence itself.

Holland wrote, "The COPA conference had its share of the absurd. During an hour long 'breakout' panel entitled 'Whodunit?' an unsuspecting hotel guest who detoured into the meeting room might have thought it was a rehearsal for a Saturday Night Live skit about Sotheby's auction house. Conspiracy buffs were out bidding each other. 'Whodunit?' the chairman asked, and his audience responded energetically with more and more dazzlingly competing suspects: The Federal Reserve banks and Wall Street because an independently wealthy Jack Kennedy was challenging the capitalist system; the Israelis (no reason given); the local police because Dallas was a font of right-wing hatred; H.L. Hunt; the right-wing Cubans; anti-Castro Cubans; and/or the U.S. Joint Chiefs

of Staff. There was a conspiracy for every contingency."

In my opinion, this is one of the things that killed COPA's effort at the start. The media is going to stay home and laugh and not even bother. Somebody had to record the event and tell the rest of the herd in Washington why it was not worthwhile, and Holland was appointed. He wrote for only a handful of people with a need for intelligence data.

Martin Shackelford, the indefatigable researcher from Saginaw, Michigan, and one of the most knowledgeable in the field, wrote that "In standard pack journalism tradition, Holland begins by referring to researchers in the case as 'buffs.' long considered an offensively pejorative term in the research community...Mr. Holland's uninformed and uninformative report on the COPA conference ill served the readers of the Spectator. In years of reading the publication, his article comes the closest to a content-free piece of reporting I've seen. I'm accustomed to better journalism on these pages."

As an opinion-maker, Holland tells everyone else in Washington what to think in his article, and it does the trick of saying nothing of substance, as Martin writes. The subliminal message of no substance comes across to the reader/victim: There was no substance at COPA. Shackelford found a great deal at the COPA meeting to report which is of interest to those who follow the case. I personally felt that the entire approach of an academic meeting or convention of researchers was all wrong.

Some who had much to contribute were turned away, and the organization of the coalition itself is antithetical to an honest effort in the case. In other words, the very board of directors emblazoned all over the literature and publicity handouts was guaranteed to turn the media off. The press knows about these people in ways that most of those who coughed up a small fortune to travel to Washington, rent rooms, and pay their fees for attendance could not know. COPA was sabotaged by itself from the start, perhaps intentionally. But then, maybe it was just another attempt, like the Assassination Symposium on John F. Kennedy (ASK) in Dallas, to create a nice tourist business in the assassination case and new publicity—putting a nice face on for the founders. The real questions: Were all of the organizers of pure mind when they planned this affair? Is it part of the search for truth? Is there some other possible purpose for it all?

Shackelford and many others would prefer to have these gatherings structured in an entirely different way—far more open and loose without intricate agendas. But as usual, no one outside the organizing group was asked for their opinion, and

the usual arrogant tyranny of those who never questioned that they knew what was best and how to conduct the convention prevailed. I guess none of them lived through the 60's, or cared not to remember different ways of teaching.

And what of the academic atmosphere? Would not one think that Dr. Gary Aguilar's attempt to introduce what I imagine he thought would be sanity and collegiate order into the mix would raise our deliberations to a higher order? Holland writes about this in his article. "Ordinary citizens came to the conference, too, paying a convention registration fee of \$150. But the meeting was far from a gathering of conspiracy—consumed John and Jane Does. Many fervent conspiracists are highly educated people—physicians, diplomats, lawyers, and Ph.D's. Given the variety of their views, it was striking to observe their comity and the courtesies they extended to each other. In some haughtier academic settings, scholars who present such wildly incompatible views often go for each other's throats, flinging aspersions and ridicule. Here there was respect and democracy with a small 'd'. All conspiracy buffs were given equal time. The real heretics are elsewhere. They are everyone who does not believe in an assassination conspiracy theory."

There is a lot to say about this because COPA very successfully defused controversy, and as Holland implies, the members put a lid on their violent disagreements themselves. They have learned discipline well from the bitter examples made of other researchers by those among them who suppress public expressions of dissent. To what purpose? COPA didn't get media coverage of what might have been of value, or any reporting of the meeting at all, except in a small and either slightly influential (or doubtfully so) local news letter. What it got was Max Holland telling everybody in Washington not to bother with any further drivel from this group. That was a predictable result. In fact, nothing more could have been expected from all COPA's attempts to get publicity. The doomsayers, of whom I was one, saw it coming. Who is going to listen to these people? No one.

Perhaps the only real value of the many meetings in the research community is the networking that occurs. People come together from all over the nation and exchange information. Any real unity of thought or understanding isn't going to happen. What is lost for researchers by working in small groups? Is there strength in unity or solidarity with large groups for those doing this work? I don't think so. Not after the failure of COPA's conference, and that of ASK and the other conven-

tions. Another possible benefit is the exposure to many ideas and the cutting edge of some people's research, unfortunately concealed among a vast amount of misinformation. Another problem is the appearance of those with only their own ideas to sell, and the scattering effect such meetings have on outside observers.

For me, the best route is that of small groups of like interest having lines of communication out to others, with occasional open meetings of more people. The negative side of small groups is that they may fail to test their ideas on others who could provide valuable criticism, and their work becomes too isolated. Both sides of the coin have presented major problems for JFK researchers.

If there are going to be meetings, they should be truly open and democratic, but the sponsors of the researcher and fan meetings never were like that. Meetings should not be based on submitting papers. Such arrogant control of a false academic veneer was imposed on this research by a few authoritarians who never examined their presumptions. It is unconscionable, even if they think they have the right to do it because it is "their meeting" and they have the right to shape it. How about those paying for tickets having a say?

I always felt that one writer working alone can make a difference, and history is full of countless examples. My pen is my sword. Although I'm glad for the assistance I get, myself and many others are not so insecure, and like me, don't need to belong to a big group. If anything, such groups can be a great hinderance. Any connection at all with the old gang that led this research can be very destructive and dangerous, and certainly works to discredit one among the media.

Shackelford goes on to write that "In general, the media has failed the public in this case. To admit conspiracy, the media would have to accept the shame of its failure, and I don't think they are big enough to do that." The research community has failed everybody as well.

So one might ask how did such a thing come to pass? COPA's apparent intent was to make some sort of a splash with press conferences and a show of a united front. Yet the entire effort failed. What it succeeded in doing was putting everyone that came there under the close scrutiny of the concerned agencies in Washington.

I agree with Holland's reminder of Richard Hofstadter's 1963 admonition that "the paranoid style in American politics was heated exaggeration, suspiciousness, and conspiratorial fantasy" as typifying JFK assassination research. Holland

wrote that "The conference in Washington confirmed that, while the Kennedy conspiracy choir has a few members on the far right, the majority hold liberal or leftist political views. Several spoke of 'an enslaved nation' that has 'lost control of its government' and 'lost its nationhood.'" Yes, effusive and excessive political or social statements such as this are guaranteed to kill any actual evidence of conspiracy. This is a conference that turned away papers which were critical of dishonesty in its community, yet shot itself in the foot.

There were three historical phases in the attempt to assert leadership in assassination research, or control as I feel the real name of the game was. The first was the Rabbinical Counsel, so to speak, many of whose members had their origins in New York and whose character and morals were often shaped by the mores of that city—which might be quite different from the nation as a whole.

The second phase was a brief attempt by the Dallas and other Texas based researchers to re-center the whole community and its research in the place where John Kennedy met his tragic end. Not only was that effort located in what had become a garish, raucous, and glitzy collection of cowboy and rock and roll bars and other tourist traps one block from the death scene, but it sought to perpetuate itself on the doorstep of the local FBI. The "JFK Assassination Information Center" soon became the mecca of researchers, and a convention organizing corporation was hired to establish annual meetings called ASK in a vastly expensive hotel owned by one of H.L. Hunt's sons. The dazzling present and future of this stupidly ignorant and commercial circus soon collapsed of its own weight and the whole Dallas capital of conspiratorialism evaporated, having done a vast amount of damage to not only the case, but much of the evidence that was of value, embellished as most of it was, packaged and sold to the highest bidder.

The third historical phase came into play at the same moment in the winter of 1993-4 as the organizers of COPA sought to move things to Washington, an infinitely more sober site for serious meetings. But COPA, a group composed of several small organizations mostly incompatible with each other, brought with it the very seeds of its destruction for what they professed to do: Solve the Kennedy case. What we got was a desperate attempt by some of the original leaders—some appearing to have sinister intent—to re-assert themselves and their leadership. COPA bred still more backlash, and this time the opposition would field Norman Mailer, the

Great American Novelist.

Much of what we have recently experienced in JFK assassination research since the start of the new decade has flowed from three watershed events: The creation of the Oliver Stone movie, "JFK"; the series of articles in *The Journal of the American Medical Association* (JAMA); and the publication of Gerald Posner's Case Closed.

Each case, in my view, is an example of mass mind control at work, and the entire focus of it is to stop hard evidence of conspiracy. Where the physical evidence demonstrated this beyond a shadow of a doubt, it had to be stopped. The only real way to get around it was for a propaganda attack and rewriting history such as George Orwell describes in 1984, and what we saw with not just Adolph Hitler and Nazi Germany, but so much of the history of modern nations when it suited them.

That propaganda attack opened with the Stone movie. Stone, an ardent supporter of Richard Nixon—Kennedy's bitter enemy—was able to co-opt the hopes and allegiances of researchers and become their champion while blunting the major thrust of the evidence which he knew to be developing, and basically bury it. As we had seen with the HSCA, the Warren Commission, and other organs in the past, it had become politically necessary to throw the public another bone—claiming again that there has been a conspiracy. Stone stated it as fact, offering the very weak theories of the worst of the researchers, and capped it by stating that it was all over Vietnam—in part true, but of course grossly simplistic. Political expediency still ruled. In the beginning, of course, the public did not want to know or think there had been a conspiracy, and that's what the Warren Commission gave them in 1964. But they suspected it, so later they got that too. It's different strokes for different folks.

The question then arises as to whether Stone, along with Time Inc., the owner of the movie company and always a quasi government propaganda asset, deliberately planned the film as a propaganda exercise? I think so, because not only did the movie greatly satisfy nearly all critics of the government's official story, but it made targets out of them. It was easy to utterly wreck the serious evidence—recently developed by the exposure of the autopsy photographs—by associating conspiracy theory with Jim Garrison, whom the media (if not Garrison himself) had thoroughly discredited. There is no question in my mind but that the selection of Jim Garrison as the means of telling the story, and the use of a weak nerdish

actor to play that giant of a man—whatever he was for better or worse—struck a near death blow to the only true direction a solution to the JFK case could have taken—which had to do with the medical evidence. The Stone film would create a ferocious backlash, and I have no doubt that events were being manipulated to do just that. Mass mind control and brain washing was working to obliterate in advance where the evidence was going. Just as the Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, and the Attorney General of the United States, Ramsey Clark, had the galleys for Josiah Thompson's pending book, Six Seconds in Dallas in 1967, Stone and the powerful forces that had backed Nixon against Kennedy had the cutting edge of the new research that would tear down the cover-up forever. They had to stop that research.

The best way to stop it was to connect conspiracy theory and Jim Garrison to any evidence that lent support to a conspiracy. In other words, stop the evidence itself, and tell some other story. Do it so sensationally that there would be a backlash. That backlash came with the second great watershed event: publication by JAMA of a series of articles in May, 1992, attempting to close the Kennedy case.

The JAMA articles created a storm of media attention, as did the Oliver Stone film, and were propaganda in its purest form—stated conclusions without valid premises. They had no real substance at all. The tabloid also viciously attacked one of the Dallas doctors, Charles Crenshaw, who had helped treat the dying Kennedy when he was brought to the hospital. Crenshaw published a book, Conspiracy of Silence, which came out at the same moment as my second, and spoke for most of the other Dallas doctors if not all when he described wounds that clearly came from in front—putting the lie to the official story which the government and its operatives have invested so much in to this day. Crenshaw sued JAMA for what it had to say about him and won a large settlement and an apology of sorts.

But it was clear that JAMA's real target was Crenshaw and myself, not mentioned by name in their articles. As the *New York Times* shortly noted, my book, High Treason 2, exposed some of JAMA's larger lies. The real target for manipulation was the government itself, and that had apparently become a desperate business for the secret political operatives in place.

Crenshaw's book was sabotaged in the process with a statement attributed to the new president, Lyndon Johnson, who called the Emergency Room when Oswald was dying after Ruby shot him, and taken out before publication. The

statement was, "Make sure the son-of-a-bitch dies. You can drown him in his own blood." Crenshaw hotly denies ever writing or knowing about it, but it was documented as having been slipped into the ms by someone, apparently one of his co-authors. Such a statement would catastrophically discredit the book and make a target out of Crenshaw. Even if not printed but seen and talked about by enough people prior to publication, nobody in the media would take Crenshaw seriously—although the statement was not public knowledge. The jungle telegraph would do the rest. I find the clandestine insertion of this statement a good example of the pattern of embellishing stories and testimony of witnesses so common in Dallas, having the intent of discrediting whatever was being offered. Dallas is the one place that has got to cover everything up at all costs.

The third watershed event was the huge media splash surrounding the publication of Gerald Posner's Case Closed—an example of one of the worst pieces of alleged scholarship in American history. But, like good dogs, all the leading writers and commentators laid down and rolled over.

Big names like Norman Mailer promptly got in line to feed at the trough, jumping at a chance to pick up pay checks and attack handy moving targets such as Lee Harvey Oswald, Posner's innocent victim. Posner had quite a few other victims in his book, too, including many of the medical witnesses. His book can only be described as one more example of pure propaganda, lacking in real substance or any truth. Again, this book was intended to make it look like—as were the JAMA articles—all questions had been answered. The idea was to head off at the pass new research and muzzle it.

The "leaders" of the Kennedy assassination research are ludicrous as a group. It is interesting that they are privately so at one another's throats, yet they will publicly pretend everything is all right. Privately, they will turn, as a group, and jump the weakest of their number if threatened by that person's writing or research. There is much talk of the need for unity, and this is a handy cover to enforce conformity, though certainly not over interpretations of the evidence. Most of their positions on that score were repeated by rote for many years, and they little questioned their presumptions. For example, with regard to the trajectory analysis, few if any ever questioned just what Dr. Cyril Wecht put in place of that of the Warren Commission. What he did was substitute one window for another in the same building, based on imaginary lines drawn from what I believe to be imaginary wounds on

Kennedy's body upwards and backwards to an imaginary window. I can't think of anything sillier than that whole exercise.

But adherence to this or any of the theories of evidence put forward by Harold Weisberg, for instance, were enforced at the pain of very vicious retaliation if ignored. One was to be a disciple of the master, and only a disciple. Going off on one's own and doing original work could be very dangerous. No one in the research community ever questioned Weisberg's basic presumptions because they were very hard to pin down, and his writing was impenetrable from outside this circle. The media could not understand it, which I think was intentional, now that he has made the mistake of declaring what he really believes. For thirty years he wrote only for other researchers and told them nothing.

Weisberg, the dean of the researchers for so long, at various times exercised control over the minds of probably most researchers. This was not a mere healthy exchange of ideas, but he directed thought processes themselves. It took a long time to get free of his influence because one was subtly convinced that there was no other source or right and truth but him. He did this deliberately, and he had no scruples in exercising such control over impressionable people, often in great shock over what was done to Kennedy.

If he damned something, it was lost. If he praised something, which was rare, then it or the person became an object of worship. Outsiders laughed at this spectacle—especially the cynical and iconoclastic media. Now I know they were right and I know why they were right. Weisberg went from a critic of the Warren Report to a critic of the critics or other researchers.

The bottom line of his game, as it seemed to be with many of the main stream critics, was to make sure nothing new or no one new got into the public's eye, except the latest inventor of a phoney angle on the evidence (we might ask just how come the Liftons, Weisbergs, Shaws, Macks, Ferrells, and Grodens of the case got national attention, and those who did honest work got little or none).

The early leaders had to appear to represent the entire critical community of researchers, and that they had examined all the issues and made their pronouncements. Not that the game was to arbitrarily divided up territories and invent entirely new angles for which there was no real evidence. Who would guess it all was just a game and the intricate evidentiary constructions were mere confections invented out

of whole cloth?

Weisberg's writing repeats over and over that he has the answer and yet we never get almost anything of substance. He never addresses the evidence of a faked case and instead merely dismisses those critics who argue this. Weisberg—trained in political warfare and propaganda by the OSS (the precursor of the CIA) during WWII—personally practices that warfare on the rest of us and this nation.

He began by finding what looked like holes in the Warren Report and convincing us that this was what we needed to believe there was a conspiracy. When the Clark Panel came along he insisted that their findings—upon looking at the autopsy X-rays and photographs, something neither he nor anyone else saw then or for many years afterwards—overthrew the Warren Report or the autopsy report or something. He never questioned that the pictures or X-rays might be faked. There we get to the nitty gritty of his argument—like that of JAMA, the HSCA, Gerald Posner, and Norman Mailer: the autopsy photographs and X-rays, and the Zapruder film et al are authentic. He has nothing to base this on and in order to say it, must dismiss all the other official testimony of the medical witnesses, even to the extent of saying that the autopsy doctors are very wrong. It was Weisberg and Wecht who told us all along that the autopsy doctors were not to be believed and not credible on anything. Granted, they may have withheld something, and may even have lied, but where they have made statements on matters that are clearly not in their best interest, we might have a very strong reason to believe them.

The autopsy doctors, like the Dallas doctors, tell us that the autopsy photographs haven't got the wounds in the right place and aren't representative of what they saw. JAMA even reported this in 1992 without understanding what the doctors were saying. The autopsy doctors were very strong about it to the HSCA, which wrote that "The panel continued to be concerned about the persistent disparity between its findings and those of the autopsy pathologists and the rigid tenacity with which the prosecutors maintained that the entrance wound was at or near the external occipital protuberance."

Weisberg is another example of one of those throwing us a bone, and is an example of organized mind control at work in the research community. The same was true when the theory of body theft and alteration came along, which Weisberg bitterly opposed. Pretty soon, everyone adhered for some years to Lifton's crazy theory that Kennedy's body was stolen

and altered to account for the wide disparity between it and the photographs. Again, no one questioned the probability that the photos were simply altered. By then most of us had been taught a way of interpreting the evidence and problems with it, and it was a backwards way of reasoning. If Weisberg asked "why would anyone fake something only to run the risk of being caught?" we believed that settled the matter. The material could not be fake. Not that anyone would have seen it for very many years—if ever—after the faking. They only needed to have it faked long enough to flash at the right people.

I find that this is an example of the manipulation and control of people's minds because Weisberg has to have quite deliberate intent to not only deceive in this instance, but provide powerful support for the government's position. He was planted early in the case in order to co opt such issues. He and a few others who divided up the turf. They gave us opposing theories, but they're all there to bamboozle us, and they're secretly in league with each other.

The rank and file of researchers were to be torn between all of these opposing theories, clearly dividing them. After thirty years of softening up, there would be no hope of unity. A pattern of disputation had been imposed. Was there free thought? I don't think so because adherence to a particular theory of evidence was a knee jerk reaction to how the individual had been brought up to interpret phenomena. The brain washing we all live with is far too insidious to train the average intelligent person who examines the evidence in this case to ask the right questions as a policeman would. Cops are used to hoaxes, cons, and flim/flams.

Only radical change in the way the JFK research community operated could place new ideas before them for rational choice. Only a frontal assault on the old leadership could weaken their power. Perhaps only a general purge (or attempt to do so) could impart any kind of real freedom in the marketplace of ideas. Unity was not what was needed. Intelligent understanding of the evidence was what was needed, and that had never been very possible because there wasn't much that was rational in what the leading critics proposed.

After more than thirty years the damage was done. When enough material became available to rationally attack the official story, the softening up process had not just taken its toll, but had worn everybody out. Crying wolf so many times turned off the media and the public. I well recall the times those big guns in Dallas told me why they were doing this or

that which seemed premature: "We need the publicity," as in the fatally embellished Roscoe White story.

That is what we got from COPA: publicity for itself, and it failed miserably. Will they listen to anyone else that says that their whole approach was wrong, even including their idea of imposing the discipline of academic studies and meetings which would bring an even more vicious petty politics? Trying to present a major united front for lobbying purposes led by such a disparate bunch of lunatics, each believing, as Max Holland wrote, that "it is a political wonderland linking the CIA, the FBI, drug dealers, Anastasio Somoza and Oliver North, among others..." and that the Mafia did it, Castro did it, Khrushchev did it, the anti Castro Cubans did it, and so on, would be self defeating.

The critics and researchers in the Kennedy case have always been the first victims of the mind control at work in this case orchestrated by government and other operatives. It is too easy to explain the antics that go on as flowing from the personal animosities, differences and opinions of the individual critics, but it is clear as a bell to me that they simply divided up the case into different areas: One had visuals, one had medical, one had trajectories and so on. As time went by more operatives were fielded, pointed at us by their handlers or their own self propelled political motives, who then sucked up more of our time with often deliberately fabricated theories. Everyone who was honest was then associated with all the nuts and lunatics in the case, and sometimes became as nutty as they.

The final result? Everyone's mind was controlled by one manipulator or another. That was the goal. There wasn't anyplace to go to where one did not fall under the spell of someone else's theory, and if there was a real one out there, such as a faked case and fabricated evidence, you might have two Oswald's and frame up of the patsy, but no safe interpretation of the medical evidence in those same terms. That is, most of the students of all these writers would be equally divided up, and like the New Hampshire primary, one candidate out of 10, each taking 10% of the vote save one who got 9% will see a man with no chance at a majority win with 11%. It doesn't matter that he won if he doesn't prevail over the majority. Nobody will be happy.

It doesn't matter to the media, therefore, when they are looking at 100 different theories of the assassination and one hundred different presentations of evidence. Nobody wins, if they don't take a great deal of time themselves and study

what's real and what isn't. The case has become a lottery—pick a number. That fact is greatly distressing.

Everyone is burned out by now. The years of total immersion take too long for the neophyte to sort through it all. Who is going to listen?

The only winner is the mind control that made it all happen: standard and well tested techniques of propaganda and mass mind control.

They are the winners in the end because a massive shell game with the truth was played out on the stained fields of our nation's honor and history—with the minds and hearts of its people. A terrible game whose first perpetrators were the early critics of the Warren Commission who failed so miserably all of these long years.

These people are largely still among us, still seeking to control things, still preventing attention from being drawn to those who may possess the real truth.

Still making all very diffuse, like the early morning fogs and mists and finally like darkest night.

•••

CRUCIAL MUCHMORE FRAMES ARE ABSENT FROM THE Z-FILM

by

Allan R.J. Eaglesham, PhD

Milicent Cranor's interesting article "The Magic Skull" in the July TFD [1] led me to dig out my video copies of the Zapruder, Nix, and Muchmore movies and to painstakingly reappraise them one frame at a time. I am happy to report that I see an anomalous triangular shape (like a shark's fin) on President Kennedy's head, in frames 17 to 22 of the Nix film, that is completely consistent with Milicent's description in "The Magic Skull." In addition, I am shocked to find a two-frame disappearance of President Kennedy on the Muchmore film. It is clearly apparent on freeze-frame and occurs as the limousine passes in front of the Newman family, at approximately Z-280. [2] This disappearance is consistent with JFK having fallen across Jackie's lap, as was described by many eye-witnesses. In the Z- film there is no such movement by the President before the final head shot.

Allan R.J. Eaglesham, PhD
100 Graham Rd., #10C
Ithaca, NY 14850

My copy of the home movie exposed on that fateful day by Marie Muchmore is on the 1993 videotape "JFK: The Case for Conspiracy," produced by Robert Groden. As Mrs. Kennedy's pink jacket and hat initially appear on the right of the picture, camera jiggle causes the images to be blurred—nevertheless Jackie's form is unmistakable. As the limo proceeds, the image clears somewhat, the left front wheel becomes hidden behind the Brehms, Jackie obscures from the camera the child holding Gail Newman's left hand, and the dark form of JFK's head, right shoulder and back are clearly visible. The President has slumped to his left against his wife, his torso at about 35 degrees from vertical. Within a frame he simply disappears [3]: where he had been before, the green grass on the north side of Elm Street is visible. In the next frame, the Newman child can be seen beyond where JFK had been (although this image is very blurred), with Jackie's form coinciding with that of Mrs. Newman. JFK's slouched form returns in the next frame.

The President's reappearance occurs in a frame that is striking in clarity. Within a single frame the image has gone from extremely blurred to sharp, and all visual references show that the limo has moved about 2 feet further down Elm Street—for example, Jackie moves from in front of Mrs. Newman to between Mr. and Mrs. Newman. Moreover, within that single frame, the camera has panned significantly to the left so that the Babushka lady is now fully in the picture. By my reckoning, two M-frames are missing. [4]

The Newmans were not called to testify before the Warren Commission. However, in a recent personal communication with Milicent Cranor, they asserted that JFK was directly in front of them when he was hit on the head. Now that we know that the Z-film was edited to conceal information, we must be on our guard not to rule out any possibility without due cause; eye-witness accounts, such as those in "The Magic Skull", take on renewed importance.

The \$64,000 question is: Why was JFK's collapse over Jackie's lap excised from the Z-film? Perhaps the rapid dynamics of his movements left no doubt that he had taken a glancing shot to the head from the right (as proposed by Milicent Cranor) and not from behind. Of course, even if JFK's movements were consistent with a shot from behind, there would remain the problem of accounting for too many shots when only three shells had been found on the sixth floor of the TSBD. The excision from the Muchmore film may have been an attempt at similar concealment, as much as was feasible

without causing a visible jump in the action.

Notes

1. Milicent Cranor, "The Magic Skull," *The Fourth Decade* 2#5, July, 1995, pp. 32-37. I thank Ms. Cranor for generously sharing data and information, for her encouragement to write this article, and for her thoughtful and constructive criticism of the manuscript.

2. The Z-280 estimate was made from the map of Dealey Plaza in Richard E. Sprague's article "The Assassination of President John F. Kennedy: The Application of Computers to the Photographic Evidence," *Computers and Automation*, May 1970, pp. 29-60.

3. My video equipment is old and not of superior quality; accurate counting of freeze-frames is not easy. Assuming that my segment of the Muchmore film runs from M-1, I estimate that JFK's disappearance occurs between M-7 and M-8, he continues hidden in M-9 and reappears at M-10.

4. According to Chuck Marler in "Questioning the Limousine's Speed on Elm Street," *The Fourth Decade* 1#4, May 1994, the limo had an average speed of 10.4 MPH between Z-161 and Z-185. This is 15.2 ft per second; at 16 frames per second a movement of approximately 2 ft would occupy two frames.

OSWALD AND THE FBI: PART TWO

by

William Weston

If the statements made by Lee Harvey Oswald in the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City are to be accepted as true, then the FBI was victimizing him unmercifully. In the latter part of September 1963, he twice visited the embassy and spoke to three Soviet officials (all of whom were members of the KGB). He said that he was an American who believed in Communism and belonged to an organization that defended Cuba. A few years before, he had lived in the Soviet Union. He came to the embassy, because he wanted to get a visa and go back to Russia as quickly as possible. Life for him in the United States had become much too unbearable. FBI agents were constantly harassing him. They kept him under continual surveil-

William Weston
10291 D'Este Dr.
Anaheim, CA 92804