

On Dec. 1, 1963, Malcolm X was asked at a New York rally what he thought about the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Despite Elijah Muhammed's order to all Muslim ministers that they <sup>not</sup> make any comment, Malcolm said he thought it was merely a case of "the chickens coming home to roost." The news carried that statement widely because it was dramatic. Elijah Muhammed saw the resultant outcry as the excuse he needed to remove some of Malcolm's power and it brought about the split that had been developing between Malcolm and Muhammed for some time. What no one realized was that it was more accurate than any other analysis of the assassination given at that time. Malcolm said that night that it was "the same thing as had happened with Medgar Evers, with Patrice Lumumba, with Madame Nhu's husband." In likening it to the assassination of Lumumba and Ngo Dinh Diem (Madame Nhu's husband), Malcolm became the first person to point the finger of guilt at the assassins of John F. Kennedy. Lumumba, Diem and John Kennedy were all killed by, or with the assistance of the United States Central Intelligence Agency.

In fact, there are many strange parallels between the assassinations of four of our major leaders in the past five years: John F. Kennedy, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy. In many cases all four assassinations seem to have been staged by the same scriptwriter. In this article we will explore some of the implausibilities and strange coincidences in the assassination of Malcolm X, and show that many of them are duplications of what happened in Dallas on November 22, 1963.

? It was necessary for the CIA to eliminate Malcolm X because after his break with Elijah Muhammed he became the most visionary American leader of this century. It took Martin Luther King until 1967 to join with the anti-war movement in opposition to the United States involvement in Viet Nam, and even then he was criticized by most of the ~~assassinated~~ other Civil Rights leaders. Most of them have since realized that Dr. King was right. But Malcolm was speaking out against U.S. involvement in Viet Nam in 1964.

2

2

On January 28, 1965, less than a month before his death, in an interview on WBAI-FM in New York, Malcolm said that the problem of Viet Nam was the same problem as the Congo and the same problem as Mississippi and New York: the problem of the oppressed versus the oppressor.

It was Malcolm X, in his speech "Ballots or Bullets," who said:

"So our people not only have to be reeducated to the importance of supporting Black business, but the Black Man himself has to be made aware of the importance of going into business. And once you and I go into business, we own and operate at least the businesses in our community, what we'll be doing is developing a situation wherein we will actually be able to create employment for the people in the community. And once you can create some employment in the community where you live, it will eliminate the necessity of you and me having to act ignorantly and disgracefully boycotting and picketing some cracker complace else, trying to beg for a job.:

It sounds like something Operation Breadbasket said in 1966 or 1967, but it was Malcolm X in 1964.

He also spoke out for Blacks controlling the political structure in their neighborhoods; it was Malcolm who first brought to the fore the need for Black pride. It was Malcolm who pushed for the Black Man to cast off the label "Negro," and to stop processing and straightening his hair. So on the domestic scene, sharp observers could see that Malcolm X was the most advanced of all the leaders; and his charisma caused politicians and supporters of the establishment some concern. But when he realized that the Civil Rights struggle was a meaningless labor of Sisyphus, when he theorized that the Civil Rights struggle could be elevated to a human rights struggle and taken to the United Nations, he became the concern of the State Department. But when, in Spring of 1964, he announced he was going to Africa to establish liaison with the African leaders, and when he said:

3

3

"The same man who has colonized them all these years colonized you and me too, all these years. And all we have to do now is wake up and work in unity and harmony, and the battle will be over," it ceased to be a philosophy and became an action; and Malcolm X became the concern of the CIA.

During that first trip to Africa, and his pilgrimage to Mecca, Malcolm was received warmly by everyone. But what was most disturbing to the United States Government was the number of high officials who received him. In the month he was abroad he first stayed at the home of Dr. Omar Azzam, United Nations city planner who is directing the reconstruction of Arabian holy places. In Algeria he was heralded by the Chinese Ambassador, the Algerian Ambassador, the Nigerian Ambassador, the Ghanaian Minister of Culture, the Ghanaian Minister of Defense, and Mrs. W.E.B. DuBois. The Chinese Ambassador gave a state dinner in his honor, the Press Club in Ghana gave a soiree, The Nigerian High Commissioner, a luncheon; and the Cuban Ambassador, a party; all to honor Malcolm X. He spoke at the University of Ghana and the Kwame Nkrumah Ideological Institute in Ghana, as well as the Ghanaian Parliament. He also had personal audience with Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, chief of state ~~xxxx~~, ~~chief of state~~ of Ghana and Prince Faisal of Arabia. In one month Malcolm had not only become a world figure, but had forever shattered the myth that Black Africans were not interested in what was happening to their ~~xxxxx~~ American brothers.

When Malcolm returned, neither the civil rights leaders nor the Black citizens in the United States rushed to join his United Nations campaign. The civil rights leaders had been successfully brainwashed by the White Establishment, and still didn't believe that Africans felt any tie with Afro-Americans. Malcolm was too radical for them; many who now evoke Malcolm's name as a great leader--some right here in Chicago--were very quick to reject him then, in 1964. The people of Harlem, where his Organization of Afro-American Unity had its headquarters, were still wary of Malcolm:

4

4

when he was Elijah Muhammed's Harlem leader they'd seen the Muslims do little more than talk, and they seemed to be waiting for him to prove himself to them. His lieutenants in the OAAU were very unhappy about his being away so much; they needed him there in Harlem to organize the community.

In spite of this, Malcolm returned to the Middle East and Africa in the summer of 1964. This trip was much more effective than the first one. He had private audiences ~~xxx~~ with, among others: President Gamal Abdel Nasser, of Egypt; President Julius K. Nyerere, of Tanzania; President Nnamdi Azikiwe, of Nigeria; Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, of Ghana; President Sekou Toure, of Guinea; President Jomo Kenyatta, of Kenya; and Prime Minister Dr. Milton Obote, of Uganda. In July Malcolm was in Cairo, and was invited to address the African Summit Conference. This was the chance he'd been waiting for; to urge all the African nations, together, to take a stand opposing racism in the United States. The American Embassy tried to block his speaking to the Conference, but both the Egyptian Government and the Conference organizers refused to yield. By special invitation, Malcolm was staying aboard the Isis, a yacht moored on the Nile, with Freedom Fighters from the unliberated African nations. But when the yacht became full and guests were still arriving Malcolm took a room at the Nile Hilton with his friend Milton Henry, a lawyer from Detroit. On the day before he was to address the Conference, Malcolm became ill after eating dinner in the hotel dining room and was rushed to a hospital where his stomach was pumped. Analysis of this showed that a "toxic substance" was in his stomach.

Despite the attempt to murder him, Malcolm addressed the Conference, and the delegates received his speech with adulation, passing a resolution that condemned U.S. racial~~xxx~~ policies. Malcolm urged them to take the question to the United Nations, but the Conference balked. Malcolm continued to lobby for bringing it before the U.N., and many delegates and government leaders agreed to work with him.

On January 2, 1965, the New York Times indicated that Malcolm's

5

5

campaign was beginning to have some success. M. S. Handler, on page 6, reported that Malcolm had been urging African delegates to raise the question of U.S. racial policies during the debate on U.S. intervention in the Congo. The article states:

"The spokesmen of some African states acted precisely within the framework of these recommendations last month in the Congo debate at the United Nations. They accused the United States of being indifferent to the fate of Blacks and cited as evidence the attitude of the United States government toward the civil rights struggle in Mississippi.

The African move profoundly disturbed the American Authorities, who gave the impression that they had been caught off guard."

Threats against Malcolm were not unusual, but now they became so frequent that in late January when he went to Los Angeles and Chicago, he was met in both cities by special squads of police, assigned to protect him while there.

On February 9th, Malcolm arrived in France. He was met at the airport by French Authorities who said he'd been declared an "undesirable person" by the French government and refused to allow him to enter France to address the Congress of African Students in Paris.

Eric Norden, who has done considerable research on the assassination, reports that a North African diplomat told him (Norden) that the French Department of Alien Documentation and Counter-Espionage knew that the CIA planned to assassinate Malcolm, and that's why they wouldn't let him remain in France: they didn't want it to happen in their country. The diplomat's country had been informed of this ~~affair~~ ~~being~~ as a safety precaution, in case Malcolm had gone there ~~after~~ ~~being~~ refused entry to France.

XXX

When Malcolm returned to New York, on February 13th, in the middle of the night his house was torn apart by a bomb blast: someone had thrown Molotov cocktails through the livingroom window.

All through these incidents, Malcolm had been blaming the Muslims, saying that they were getting their revenge. Malcolm had organized the

6

6

Muslim retaliation programs, and had a profound respect mixed with a little pride for their ability to do almost anything. He often remarked that he knew what they could do, because he had taught them. But finally, on February 20, he conceded in a phone conversation with Alex Haley, his biographer:

"But you know, I'm going to tell you something, brother--the more I keep thinking about this thing, the things that have been happening lately, I'm not at all sure it's the Muslims. I know what they can do, and what they can't, and they can't do some of the stuff recently going on. Now, I'm going to tell you, the more I keep thinking about what happened to me in France, I think I'm going to quit saying it's the Muslims."

The next day Malcolm X was dead, shot down during a rally at the Audubon Ballroom.

One of the most noticeable things at the Audubon February 21, 1965, was the absence of uniformed police. Normally at Malcolm's rallies there were at least a dozen standing by the entrances and inside the ballroom. But on this day, less than a week after his house had been fire-bombed, less than a month after the Los Angeles and Chicago police had taken extraordinary precautions to protect him, and after he had applied for and been refused a permit to carry a pistol, the New York City Police Department felt no need to have uniformed patrolmen inside the ballroom. They did station one, a patrolman Gilbert Henry, in a side room, the rest were stationed in the hospital across the street. Patrolman Henry was equipped with a walkie-talkie, on which he was told to notify the police in the hospital if anything happened, such as shots or other sounds of trouble. Why were they stationed across the street if they were expecting trouble? The only answer can be that they wanted to arrive after it was over.

As Malcolm began his speech, there was a disturbance in the audience. Someone yelled "Get your hand outta my pocket, nigger," smoke was seen at the back of the ballroom, Malcolm started to step away from the podium, and suddenly several men began firing at him. In a matter of moments, he was on the

7

7

floor of the stage, mortally wounded. There have been several different eyewitness accounts of how many men were firing and from where. One says the men rose from the center of the audience and walked toward the stage, in another they were at the back of the room, in another they were seated in the front row and merely stood up. But these ~~may~~ all may have been part of a team, and each different witness just saw one part of the team.

A police car cruising past the Audubon stopped when the two patrolmen saw a man being pursued by a group of Malcolm's followers who were shouting "Malcolm's been shot, get him." They arrested Talmadge Hayer (also known as Thomas Hagan) who'd been shot in the thigh and charged him with the assassination.

Patrolman Thomas Hoy, who was outside the Audubon, heard the shooting and rushed inside. Peter Khiss reported in the New York Times of February 22, 1965, page 10, column 3:

"Patrolman Thomas Hoy, 22, said he had been stationed outside the 146th Street entrance when I heard the shooting and the place exploded. He rushed in, saw Malcolm lying on the stage, and grabbed a suspect who, he said, some people were chasing.

As I brought him to the front of the ballroom, the crowd began beating me and the suspect, Patrolman Hoy said. He said he put this man, not otherwise identified later for newsmen, into a police car to be taken to the Wadsworth Avenue Station."

In the City Edition of the New York Herald Tribune for February 22, which goes to press early Sunday Evening, the sub-head of an article by Jimmy Breslin reads, "Police Rescue Two Suspects." Breslin goes on to report:

"The first suspect, Hayer, was taken to Bellvue Prison Ward, while "the other suspect was taken to the Wadsworth Avenue precinct, where the city's top policemen immediately converged and began one of the heaviest homicide investigations this city has ever seen."

In the late City Edition of the Tribune the subhead is changed to "Police REscue One Suspect," and the second suspect has been deleted from Breslin's story.

This episode had a direct parallel in Dallas.ImmeRiately

after the assassination of President Kennedy, several people inside the Dal-Tex Building, across the street from the Texas Book Depository Building, tapped on a closed window to attract the attention of a policeman. They indicated the area ~~af~~ above them, the policeman entered the Dal-Tex Building and arrested a suspect. His name was never broadcast, although Lee Harvey Oswald's name was given almost immediately after his arrest. This suspect, too, disappeared, and even though the arrest was reported by some of the news media in the early hours after the assassination, and was recorded on the police log, no one has been able to determine the identity of this suspect.

What makes this even more mysterious is that a ~~ma~~ picture taken by Associated Press photographer J.W. Altgens definitely shows a long, dark object projecting from a window in the Dal-Tex Building at the moment of the assassination. The picture was used by the Warren Commission in its report, but they cropped it so that area of the Dal Tex Building does not show up.

Although the suspect in the Dal-Tex Building is the most dramatic instance, District Attorney Jim Garrison of New Orleans ~~has found records indicating~~ <sup>SAYS</sup> that no fewer than 10 men were arrested in the Dealey Plaza area that day: no names were made public, and all mention in the news media was deleted ~~in~~ after the first few hours.

Allen Morrison, in Ebony Magazine of October, 1965, said he saw the man Patrolman Hoy arrested, and described him as a "thin-lipped, olive-skinned, Latin-looking man." This matches, almost verbatim, a description Malcolm had given of a man who had been following him the week before, when he was denied entry to France, and this ~~is~~ same man, Malcolm said, was on the plane he took back



to New York. Malcolm's sister, Mrs. Ella Collins, later said that several people told her the man looked like a Cuban or Puerto Rican.

It is, of course, widely known that a number of anti-Castro Cuban exile groups ~~are being~~ <sup>were organized and</sup> paid by the Central Intelligence Agency through several dummy foundations <sup>and in other ways.</sup> The CIA <sup>had</sup> ~~has~~ constantly been supplying them with arms, ammunition, virtual immunity from the law, and training. Lee Harvey Oswald, of course, has been portrayed as being pro-Castro, but a close scrutiny of Oswald's activities in New Orleans during 1963 show that Oswald's pro-Castro activities were in fact an effort to establish a "cover," and that his <sup>only tactical</sup> ~~allegiance~~ <sup>connection</sup> was with the anti-Castro Cuban exile groups. This has been thoroughly documented by Harold Weisberg in his book ~~entitled~~ OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Cuban exile groups on the payroll of the CIA continually appear in the investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy currently being conducted by District Attorney Jim Garrison; and just the possibility that the "mystery suspect" in Malcolm's assassination was a Cuban raises some serious doubts.

The question of whether the mystery suspect could have been a CIA-paid Cuban exile takes on a frightening aspect when viewed in conjunction with a small news clipping related to the assassination of Robert Kennedy. It relates how Jose Duarte <sup>one</sup> -- <sup>claiming to be</sup> an exiled Cuban Army Officer, whose name has appeared in investigations of anti-Castro groups in Miami <sup>I AM ME</sup> -- had a "scuffle" with Sirhan in May, 1968. Duarte and some friends <sup>he a Negro</sup> went to a meeting in a house in Hollywood, California, because <sup>in Duarte's account,</sup> they'd gotten leaflets saying slides of Cuba were going to be shown. Sirhan got into a political argument with Duarte, accused Duarte of being a CIA agent, and they fought briefly.

*is fiction, but it*

This "scuffle" ~~is~~ has a familiar ring. On August 9, 1963,  
Fair Play For Cuba

Lee Harvey Oswald was passing out ~~xxxxxxx~~ leaflets in the 700

*1st wife's jobmen*  
block of Canal Street in New Orleans. He was confronted by *extreme right*  
Carlos Bringuier, they argued, a fight followed, and ~~the~~ Oswald  
was arrested. On the leaflets Oswald was passing out, the address

of the Fair Play For Cuba Committee was given as 544 Camp Street,  
New Orleans. The owner of the building at 544 Camp Street

never rented space to Lee Harvey Oswald or the Fair Play For

Cuba Committee, but 544 Camp Street was the headquarters of the

Cuban Revolutionary Council. The Cuban Revolutionary Council

was created on March 18, 1961 in Miami, through the consolidation

of the two major anti-Castro exile groups: the Frente Revolucionario

Democratico and the Movimiento Revolucionario del Pueblo. The

merger was ordered by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, and no

one tried to hide the fact that the Cuban Revolutionary Council

was synonymous with CIA. Carlos Bringuier was the head of the

"Student Revolutionary Council," another anti-Castro exile group.

*non-existent*  
Oswald used his arrest in this incident to get publicity

for his Fair Play For Cuba Committee, of which Lee Harvey Oswald

was the only ~~New Orleans~~ member. Later, armed with newspaper

clippings about ~~the~~ ~~the~~ incident, ~~the~~ Oswald presented himself

at the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City saying he was a friend of

Castro and asking ~~xxxxxxx~~ to be admitted to Cuba immediately.

The Cuban embassy told him he'd have to wait, and he left.

So the possibility of the "mystery suspect" at the Audubon

Ballroom being a Cuban has no meaning; Sirhan Sirhan having a

fight with a Cuban counter-revolutionary at a meeting has no

meaning; but when seen with the likelihood of Lee Harvey Oswald

working with anti-Castro exile groups to establish a "cover," it

begins to look more like the same cast of characters than mere coincidence. Sirhan Sirhan might yet live to answer the questions about himself. But we can no longer ask Oswald or the Warren Commission, and in the case of Malcolm X, Eric Norden has tried to locate Patrolman Thomas Hoy through the New York City Police Department and can find no record of him.

According to Peter Khiss in the New York Times of February 22, Malcolm was wounded by at least "bullets of two different calibers as well as shotgun pellets." In the same article, Khiss reports that the police theorize at least five persons were involved in the conspiracy. According to the autopsy, Malcolm died of X "Multiple shotgun shells and bullet wounds of chest, heart, aorta. also wounds of arms, legs, ~~the~~ chin." In addition, Talmadge Hayer had been wounded in the thigh, and two spectators, William Harris and William Parker were wounded. REuben Francis, one of Malcolm's bodyguards, was charged with shooting Hayer, no one was ever charged with shooting Harris and Parker. All these shots, a rain of bullets, and yet the only weapons the police, through their massive investigation, ~~we~~ could find were the pistol Reuben Francis had in his pocket -- the one he used to shoot Hayer -- and a shotgun that was hidden behind the ballroom.

Of course, it's not unusual that the New York City Police Department could only find one shotgun that had been conveniently left where they could find it. When the President was ~~he~~ shot in Dallas there were a total of seven non-fatal wounds inflicted on him and Governor Conally, and -- although ~~the~~ the autopsy photographs have been locked up for 75 years and it's difficult to determine without them -- ~~all available~~ evidence indicates that the President was hit ~~at least~~ twice in the front of the head,

the right side of his head was torn off by ~~a bullet that came from~~  
~~the right~~ and at least <sup>+two</sup> ~~one~~ bullet missed <sup>the</sup> mark entirely, hitting  
the sidewalk and ~~left~~ <sup>leaving</sup> a large gash. <sup>The other causing other injury to a by bystander.</sup> In spite of all <sup>these wounds</sup>  
the best the F.B.I. and the Warren Commission, in the official ver-  
sion, could come up with was a rifle that was conveniently hidden  
under boxes where they decided to look, and a bullet that just  
happened to fall off Governor Connally's stretcher at Parkland  
Hospital. <sup>Neither was ever proved to have been used in the assassination</sup>

Faced with a conspiracy that, by their own admission, involved  
at least five people, the police finally arrested Thomas (15K)  
~~William~~ Johnson and Norman B (3K) Butler, enforcers for Muslim Mosque  
#7, charged them with being part of the conspiracy, and ended the  
investigation.

In January, 1966, nearly a year after the assassination,  
the three accused assassins -- Hayer, Butler and Johnson -- were  
finally brought to trial. The comparisons between the handling of  
the trial of these three and the Warren Commission hearings are  
too numerous and complicated to go into here. During the Warren  
Commission hearings there were so many cases of obvious and/or  
admitted perjury, destruction of evidence, disregard of evidence,  
that those hearings stand with the Scottsboro Trial, the Sacco-Vanzetti  
Trial, and the trial of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg as monuments to  
injustice. No less is true of the farcical justice meted out to  
Hayer, Butler and Johnson. And in both cases the State started out  
with a guilty party and then used inductive logic to prove his  
guilt.

*Handwritten note:* This shooting was with a rifle

*Handwritten note:* SINGLE

?

The New York Times, which is noted for printing "all the news" carries very little mention of the trial's progress for the first two months. It was during those two months that the State performed its most amazing feats of legal bgermain.

One of the star witnesses for the prosecution was Gary Thomas. At the trial Thomas testified that he saw the entire shooting, saw Butler, Johnson and Hayer go together, and that Johnson fired the shotgun while Hayer and Butler created the diversion. Unfortunately, this did not exactly fit with what he had told the Grand Jury. At the Grand Jury hearings he said Hayer fired the shotgun while Butler and Johnson created the diversion. On close scrutiny, it became impossible for Hayer to have fired the shotgun: when he was captured he had in his pocket only four unused .45 caliber shells, so the immediate question is, if he fired the shotgun, why was he carrying .45 shells? More than that, ~~the witness~~ was apprehended outside the ballroom almost immediately after the shooting, which would not have allowed time for him to go behind the ballroom, hide the shotgun where the police could find it, come back into the ballroom, be wounded, then get outside. Faced with this dilemma, the prosecution merely had their witness change his story to better fit their version, and didn't charge him with perjury.

Another witness, Charles Blackwell, before the Grand Jury, was asked if he saw anyone actually firing a gun, and replied that he hadn't. At the murder trial he gave a graphic description of Hayer and Butler firing at Malcolm. Perjury? He, too, was never charged.

In an unprecedented move for a homicide case, two secret witnesses were heard after the press and spectators were led from the courtroom. Eric Norden, reporting in *The Realist* of February, 1967, says that the secret witnesses were a Ronald Timberlake, identified as a Transit Authority employee, and an FBI agent named Sullivan. Norden reports that the Transit Authority has no record of ever having an employee named Ronald Timberlake. As nearly as I can determine, the F.B.I. has never given testimony that need to be secret. In fact, the only government agency that needs to give secret testimony in a homicide case is the Central Intelligence Agency.

On March 1, 1963, a dramatic development in the trial broke the silence of the New York Times. Calmar Hayer took the stand and admitted his involvement in the assassination, absolved Butler and Johnson, said he had three accomplices, but refused to give their names. He testified that he'd been approached by early in February, 1965, by ~~three~~ men who were not Muslims, and offered \$5,000 to assassinate Malcolm. Neither the defence, the prosecution, the judge, nor the Police Department ever pursued this testimony, although Hayer said that the name of the people who'd paid him had almost come up in the trial. Norman Butler took the stand on March 2, and Thomas Johnson on March 3; neither man's attorney mentioned their having been absolved by Hayer.

But testified that on the day of the assassination he was at home under orders of a doctor, because he had a bad leg and wasn't able to move around well. His wife corroborated this testimony. Doctor Kenneth Seslove of Jacobi Hospital testified

that on the morning of the assassination Norman Butler had in fact come to Jacobi Hospital and had been treated for "superficial thrombophlebitis," which makes walking difficult. According to the New York Times, Seslove gave Butler a shot of penicillin, bandages, and told him to keep his leg elevated. Butler left the hospital shortly before one PM.

Johnson took the stand on March 3, and said that at the time of the assassination he, too, was at home, in the company of his wife, his four children, his mother-in-law and two friends.

On March 5, the testimony ended, and the Judge charged the jury. In his charge, he instructed the jury to consider Hayer's confession only as it regarded his own guilt, not as regarding the possible innocence of the other two defendants.

On March 11 the jury brought in a verdict of guilty, and the three defendants were sentenced to life imprisonment. In another move unprecedented in jurisprudence, each juror was given a \$200 bonus for sticking out such a difficult trial.

ask him

Curiously, on September 8, 1966, the New York Times carries an article that says the law firm of Edward Bennet Williams, one of the most prominent and expensive trial lawyers in the country, was commissioned to handle the appeal of the three. Williams did not disclose who had put up the money for such an expensive appeal, and now one knows how three men who had such second-rate legal counsel at their trial suddenly found the wherewithall to hire one of the best. After that, the story again drops out of the news, and the three men are still in prison.

In the propanganda passed out by the American press, the

Black Muslims are the assassins; but that verdict does not stand the test of logic. Elijah Muhammed ~~historically~~ historically has been a man of talk, not action. Malcolm often complained that it was very difficult to overcome the image of the Muslims talking tough and never doing anything. Elijah Muhammed believes in a laissez-faire attitude toward other groups, because of the narrow interests and strict discipline of the Muslims. Surprisingly, when Malcolm left the Muslims he took only a handful of followers with him. This seems to have been partly because the Muslims believe that Elijah Muhammed is infallible, and partly because they distrusted the outreach of Malcolm's Organization of Afro-American Unity and his Muslim Mosque, Inc..

So the majority of the Muslims were too deeply entrenched in their own communities and religious ideals to leave and follow Malcolm; he was considered a heretic. Both the OAAU and the Muslim Mosque Inc. were in trouble because Malcolm was too busy with his trips abroad and organizing at the U.N. to devote as much time to them as would have been necessary to build a strong organization. Malcolm's aides often implored him to do more organizing in Harlem, but there was never enough time. In February, 1965, Malcolm was hardly a threat to Elijah Muhammed. It would ~~be~~ have been foolhardy for Muhammed to have risked anything to conduct a vendetta against Malcolm, and Muhammed has never been foolhardy.

Immediately after the assassination there was a rash of arsons and bombings of Black Muslim Mosques, restaurants, and at least one apartment. Then ~~in~~ just as suddenly as they had started, they stopped. I have been told by a source close to Malcolm's former aides that the Muslims called a peace conference,



where they showed Malcolm's followers positively that the Muslims had nothing to do with the assassination, and as a result of this the acts of retaliation ended.

In the New York Times of February 22, Peter Khiss quotes Percy Sutton, a leader in New York and friend of Malcolm, as saying that Malcolm planned on that day to "disclose the names of those that were trying to kill him." This is just one more lead that was never followed by the police in their investigation. If that was his plan and if his assassins could have known of it and wanted to remain anonymous, it would have been necessary for them to kill him before he spoke. Of course, this absolves the Muslims, because Malcolm had been accusing them steadily. This ~~xxx~~ statement, coupled with Malcolm's telling Alex Haley on the phone he'd realized a lot of the things that were happening could not have been done by Muslims, indicates that Malcolm may have come to the conclusion that it was Washington, not Chicago, and he planned to disclose it. The C.I.A. had both the means to hear what Malcolm was saying, and the need to remain anonymous. Of course, this may not be true, but wouldn't it be nice if we knew?

The question of how many people were involved in the actual shooting and who fired the shotgun is ~~xxxx~~ merely a diversion. On February 25, against the redoubtable Mr. Khiss came up with another piece of enigmatic reporting. He reports that the police had motion pictures of the entire assassination, and there's no explanation who told him. The movies were never used, and no one seems to have asked why. There was no need to speculate, there was no need to accept the testimony of unreliable, perjured witnesses, it had all been photographed. The only reason for not producing the movie at the trial was

copy  
for WFO

that it would have shown something other than the official state version of the assassination. Of course, this, too, is not at all unusual when compared to the fact that the Warren Commission did not <sup>even know of 95%</sup> consider ~~90%~~ of the photographic evidence available to them in the assassination of your President, and ~~many~~ <sup>all</sup> of the pictures used by them -- the Zapruder movie and the Altgens most notably -- were cropped, altered or <sup>in official Gov/100?</sup> ~~or~~ <sup>horrible</sup> mutilated to better fit the official version of the crime.

Other questions arise: was it the policy of the New York Police Department to make movies of all Malcolm's rallies? Was it the policy of New York Police Department to hide uniformed officers in ante-rooms equipped with walkie-talkies to communicate with other officers stationed <sup>some distance away - to</sup> ~~across the street and~~ report any <sup>only when it was too late to prevent the murder?</sup> shots or other signs of trouble? When, prior to that day, the New York Police Department had had uniformed officers by the dozens at Malcolm's rallies, are we to assume that they suddenly became worried about offending the sensitivities of Malcolm's followers and decided to be less conspicuous? Or is it more likely to assume they were given orders from higher up not to get in the way? And who from "higher up" could have issued those orders? And why should we have to assume anything?

When one of our great world leaders is brutally gunned down before scores of witnesses, why must all these unanswered questions still exist three years later?

In the final, revised official version, we are told that Johnson fired the shotgun, and Hayer and Butler created the diversion. There is also considerable eyewitness testimony that indicates two men were firing pistols while one was

wielding the shotgun. So are we to believe that after the shooting the crowd attacked Hayer, while Johnson casually went to the area ~~mm~~ behind the ballroom, hid the shotgun and made his escape; and Butler disappeared entirely? And if the others were firing pistols -- and Hayer did have .45 caliber shells in his pocket -- where were the pistols? How could Hayer have disposed of his .45 between ~~mm~~ the ballroom and the sidewalk without anyone being able to find it?

Here, as in Dallas, the investigation was handled by the group with the most to lose: the ~~mm~~ local police department. In both cases, for the local police department to discover that a massive conspiracy was in operation would be to admit their own incompetency. On February 24 James Farmer of the Congress of Racial Equality made himself conspicuous by being the only Civil Rights leader to call for an investigation of Malcolm's assassination. He sent a telegram to the Justice Department, saying that the assassination had international and political implications, and demanding a federal investigation. He never got a reply.

Another familiar, macabre note was sounded a month after the assassination. On March 13, 1965, Leon Ameer, Malcolm's representative in Boston, delivered a speech to the Boston Militant Labor Forum, in which he said, "I have facts in my possession as to who really killed Malcolm. The killers aren't from Chicago. They're from Washington." He said he had documents and tapes in his possession that Malcolm had given him which established the responsibility of the "power structure" in the assassination. "I know my life is worth nothing," he said. The next morning he was found dead in his hotel room. The police

decided he had died from an epileptic seizure, but his wife said he'd never had an epileptic seizure in his life. It will be some time before we find out what was in the tapes and documents, because Earl Grant, another Malcolm aide, fled to Ghana with them after Ameer's death.

Of course, Ameer's death compares frightening with the strange deaths of people connected with the investigation of the Kennedy assassination that have been researched and documented by Penn Jones in his book Forgive My Grief. A used car salesman who had failed to identify Oswald as the murderer of Officer Tippit was shot through the head; a man in Florida committed "suicide" by hurling himself through a plate glass window thereby cutting his throat; a reporter died from a karate chop someone gave him in his own apartment; another reporter was accidentally shot through the heart in a police station; there have been auto accidents, other strange suicides, and deaths from natural causes that seem very unnatural.

*All of these many deaths may be natural, are among those who is like representation every kind of man up to page 22, hazard is known to have died. The total is some 14 which is partly to the official story. The witness presented, too*

In the City of Chicago a few years ago there were over 200 restaurants that were bombed by the Crime Syndicate. The Chicago Police Department did not have prima facie evidence that the crime syndicate was behind these bombings, but from the modus operandi they concluded that the same people had done most of them, and that the crime syndicate was the only group with a believable motive. The modus operandi in New York on February 22, 1965 was the same as that in Dallas on November 22, 1963, and in both cases the group with the most logical motive was the Central Intelligence Agency. Even more important is the fact that this same modus operandi, the same group of characters, appears in

the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy. The links between all four assassinations will be developed completely in a forthcoming book by Harold Weisberg entitled COUP D'ETAT.

Vincent Dermody, prosecuting attorney in the Hayer-Johnson-Butler trial, asked, in his prosecution summary, why the crime was committed in public. He supplied a revealing answer:

"Is it abusing your common sense to say that it was an object lesson to Malcolm's followers, telling them that this is what can happen and will?"

No, Mr. Dermody, that doesn't abuse our common sense. But applying common sense to the myth your prosecution case created about the assassination leads us to say to your Central Intelligence Agency that it was an object lesson we refused to internalize. Unfortunately for the C.I.A., trying to kill an idea is like taking heroin: the more you do the more you need to do. They killed John Kennedy because he refused to cooperate with those reactionary forces that wanted to bring us to the brink of nuclear war with Russia by attacking Cuba; they killed Malcolm X because he refused to cooperate with the Uncle Toms and The Establishment, because he was the one man capable of taking the United States before the world court of the United Nations; they killed Martin Luther King because he was becoming too militant, he was no longer willing to "get out of town by sundown;" and they killed Robert Kennedy because he had at least indicated that he planned, if he got to the White House, to find out who really killed his brother. Who'll be next in the circle? How many of our leaders will we let them gun down before we demand an answer?

Since the end of World War II the United States has sent

its Central Intelligence Agency throughout the world, with license to overthrow governments and assassinate world leaders: a crew of well-trained, highly disciplined murderers who get a starting salary of \$12,000 a year plus expenses. It was only a matter of time before they would assume they could do the same things here that they do everywhere else. How many of us will go home after that final demonstration, when the United States has finally gotten out of Viet Nam, and think we've won a victory? And how many of us will be concerned about the CIA's activities in Africa, in Latin America, in other parts of Southeast Asia, and in the United States?

Students of history should be particularly concerned about these assassinations, because we are being told we didn't see what we saw. In that house in ~~Art~~ Arlington, Virginia, the espionage establishment wrote the story of what happened, gave it to their public relations men, they distributed it, and the vast majority of the American public swallowed the lie and began believing they hadn't seen what they'd seen. George Orwell was a little off in his timing when he showed Big Brother rewriting newspapers in the year 1984: it's already been happening here for five years.

While we've been marching on Washington, sitting in college hallways and offices, demonstrating at the Democratic Convention, and in other ways confronting the abstract, impersonal "Establishment" a small group of courageous men has been daily confronting the C.I.A., a much more sinister, very personal, very dangerous thing to confront. These men -- District Attorney Jim Garrison, Harold Weisberg, Mort Sahl, Penn Jones -- have been doing this at great expense and risk, with little remuner-

no

ation. And these men I've named only represent ~~the~~ the top of the iceberg: under them are hundreds of people with nothing to gain and everything to lose, who've been assisting them in many ways. They've been doing it because they believe the Central Intelligence Agency should be made to answer for its crimes, they believe it should be disbanded. They need your support and encouragement. Four of our great leaders have been murdered, scores of people who could have tied up some of the loose ends have died strange, violent deaths; many sympathetic people in the news media have lost their jobs -- one right here in Chicago -- and still these men haven't been willing to internalize the "object lessons" the C.I.A. has provided for them. I ask you to give something far less than your life. ~~Frankly~~ Talk to people about it, encourage others to be interested, go to hear these men speak whenever possible, and give your financial support by buying their books. And if you're sitting by a telephone wishing you had someone to call, call your local CIA office -- in Chicago their number is 922-1814 ~~ext~~ -- ask them why they killed JFK, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy, I ask them who's next, let them know that you know and won't forget. If enough of us become concerned we may be able to return to 1968 from 1984.