

CONCLUSION

R WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT proves that the Report of the President's Commission was a whitewash. It does this with the Commission's own printed evidence, which invalidates or casts into serious doubt all of the major conclusions of the Report.

WHITEWASH II: THE FBI-SECRET SERVICE COVER-UP proves that the FBI and the Secret Service did engage in a cover-up. It does this largely with the until then secret files of the Commission, with the documents of the FBI and the Secret Service. It leaves no doubt that there was such a cover-up and that the Commission staff lent themselves to it. It infers it is the CIA that was being shielded. Both books indicate Oswald had CIA relations.

CIA WHITEWASH: OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS shows that the CIA and its involvement in the assassination were whitewashed. It shows who did it and how. It discloses much of the suppressed evidence and some of what was, not by accident, ignored.

At the end of ^a the book, it is customary for the author to draw together all the contents and from this evidence state his conclusions.

The essential conclusion of this book is so simple the title states it. The minor conclusions are explicit throughout and are

too numerous to recapitulate. Should there be any who doubt that what did happen could have, as the professional doubters and apologists pretend, I ask that they draw their own conclusions from questions that cover part of the cited evidence. In each case the answers are obvious, unavoidable and unequivocal:

Do you believe that the FBI is incompetent and is rivaled in this by the Secret Service? Do you believe that J. Edgar Hoover does not know the ^{of} business he invented, that he read all the reports and did not understand that they were not reports and did not account for real investigations?

Do you believe that Warren deBrueys was at the Cuban Revolutionary Council as part of his social life? That Orest Pena's complaints about deBrueys, twice made in person to the FBI office, once in the presence of his lawyer, were not known to the Commission when Liebler did not go into them?

Do you believe that Wesley J. Liebler, Professor of Law at the University of California, did not know what he was doing, for one minute believed that he conducted an investigation of Ferrie (or Albert Jenner with him), that he really investigated that handbill distribution by Oswald, that he made even a pro forma effort to find out who was with Oswald, that he did not know Dean Andrews's office had been ransacked with no valuables taken, just the files that might have held these otherwise unimportant records, that he did not know that Sam Monk Zelden would confirm Andrews's testimony, and that the FBI did not know that Andrews had held and used a telephone repeatedly while it was reporting he could not?

Do you believe that he did not know of all the other characters around Ferrie and Oswald who should have been vigorously

investigated and whose names are not in the interrogations he conducted? Do you believe that any competent lawyer can be satisfied with his interrogations and misuse of the evidence that was available - not what the FBI did not get but what the Commission had?

Do you believe the Oswald arranging for the purchase of trucks for the "Friends of Cuba" should have been ignored, the incident suppressed?

Do you believe that Liebler did not know the whole story of this invasion training camp, the arsenals and the FBI raid, that his performance of his duties did not require this knowledge, that the information he put in evidence did not tell the story?

Do you believe that FBI Agent Wall did not know Guy Banister's detective agency was a detective agency, that it was in the same building as the Cuban Revolutionary Council although he gave a different address for it, that he did not know what Banister was up to and knew, that he would not have asked him if he did not know he should not, that he did not know who Arcacha was without asking Banister, that he asked about Arcacha immediately after the assassination because he and the FBI believed there was no connection, that he did not find and severely question Arcacha because the Cuban Batistiane was not available, that he cannot conduct a better investigation than he reports in 47 words, that he cannot find what is in the telephone book without a mockery of an investigation, that he does not know that a businessman has record books, that a rentor has a lease, a contract or an agreement - has records, that he had wanted to leave the mystery about who/rented the former Cuban Revolutionary Council office as a mystery, that Newman had no receipt in the name

of the man who made the deposit, that Oswald gave the building that had housed the Cuban exile group and still housed its ally and associate Banister as a return address on his literature for no purpose, or that as a genuine friend of Castro he knowingly booby-trapped those to whom his pretendedly pro-Castro literature would appeal into revealing themselves to their violent, sometimes vicious, enemies?

Do you believe that Oswald, the defector to the Soviet Union, got himself arrested in an ostentatious pro-Castro display and then asked for the FBI for no reason, or the FBI's explanation that this happens all the time?

Do you believe that there ever was any real investigation of David William Ferrie, intended or made? That those mockeries called reports, one of which Ferrie himself wrote, represent anything like an investigation or were ever intended to, or that the FBI did not know about Ferrie, friend of deBrueys' friends, attended the meetings deBrueys attended?

Do you believe it is only coincidence that deBrueys left his assignment in New Orleans when Oswald left New Orleans, was in Dallas when Oswald was there, and returned to New Orleans when Oswald was dead?

Do you believe that deBrueys for one minute believed the pap he reported about Rudolph Richard Davis and did not know before his "investigation" and "report" on it that his own FBI had raided that training camp and why? Or that he did not know the whole story of that camp and the people connected with it?

Do you believe that Liebler's interrogations of the extreme

rightists, Walker and Bringuier, were serious, were anything but a mechanical gesture, and that he did not know the questions he should have asked and did not, of each? That he did not know the answers to the questions he did not ask, or could not have without asking them, had he the desire?

That all the FBI agents involved in the too-little-too-late-too-foolish non-investigation of the characters in the case of The False Oswald did not know they were not investigating? That the FBI could not get the police pictures in Dallas, could not remember to show the contemporaneous pictures to the Odio women and, instead, showed them pictures of young men taken as much as five years earlier? Or could not, as Garrison did, draw whiskers on a picture of Oswald after Sylvia Odio described the repulsively bearded condition of "Leon" Oswald?

Do you believe the game played with Mrs. Odio about the beards is an accident or was an effort to make identification difficult or impossible? Was it necessary, normal FBI operations?

Do you believe the FBI could not have learned more of the activities and associates of the men in the story of The False Oswald had it wanted to, that it never thought of asking the Odio women whether their entirely unnecessary "war names" could have been Alonzo rather than Angelo, or Lorenzo or Leovino rather than the improbable Leopoldo? Or that they did not recognize the signs that these men had been in New Orleans?

Do you believe that neither the FBI nor the Commission knew it had to investigate The False Oswald and find the men before the investigation was ended?

Do you believe that the FBI investigated Clay Shaw because it did not have reason to connect him with the assassination, and that it did investigate him for the Commission without the Commission's having a single file with his name, a single one of the over-advertised 25,000 interviews mentioning his name? Or that he could have been investigated without knowing it?

Do you believe that it is just another accident that Orest Pena was set upon just that night he was going to report what he knew to me and at just the time he was going to do it, and that this assault, to which no police responded when he called, was not connected with our previous correspondence or the telephonic arranging of the call, and that it is just coincidence that this followed threats? Or that it is just because there are lots of baddies in New Orleans that he was assaulted, or that his bartender, Evaristo Rodriguez, also was shot at only because there are bad people around, and not because he could make identifications, and that this had nothing to do with threats previously made to him? And that none of this is connected to Pena's effort to make it known that FBI Agent Warren G. deBrueys regularly attended Cuban exile meetings?

Do you believe that the documents in the Commission's files that were omitted from its deliberations, suppressed from its Report and printed evidence, were expunged by accident, through an all-pervading "sloppiness"?

Do you believe that "sloppiness" is a defense against the deficiencies of or errors in an official investigation of the murder of an American President?

Do you believe that it is accident or "sloppiness" that parts of files are in evidence and other parts are not - that it can be accidental that the real Castro speech quoting what may fairly be interpreted as a prediction of the assassination is not in the evidence but the inappropriate speech is, with the proof of its misinterpretation and misuse - that it can be accidental those puerile pretenses of reports on the Cuban invasion camp that was raided were not printed when all the trash found ample space?

Do you think it is accidental that the FBI expunged from its reports the right-wing extremist sponsorship under which Bringier traveled and spoke, that it could not and in other cases would not have found him, even had it not known his day-by-day whereabouts, had it really been in a hurry to learn what the Commission asked of it?

Do you believe that a threat to kill a president is either some kind of "joke" or a "colloquial^{of} expression"?

Do you believe that Wesley Liebeler - or the FBI^{By} and other federal investigators or the Commission and its staff - had "only Truth for a client", or that they served it well?

Can you believe these things?

Can you believe that the FBI does not know its business? Can you believe it incapable of playing a good game of cops and robbers?

Can you possibly believe these things and the too many others like them are accidental, that this is the way grown men of serious intent investigate and report on the assassination of a president?

I do not and cannot believe an appreciable number of them

are or can be accidental.

I believe they are part of the whitewash. Without them there could have been none.

I do not believe all these men are incompetent.

And I do believe they have wrought the greatest shame in our history, while whitewashing the CIA.