

Conclusions

WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT, ~~proved~~ that the Report of the President's Commission was a whitewash. ^{does} It ~~did~~ this with the Commission's own printed evidence, which invalidates or casts into ~~such~~ serious doubt all of the major conclusions of the Report. ~~That none can be believed.~~

WHITEWASH II: THE FBI-SECRET COVERUP, proves that the FBI and Secret Service ~~were~~ ^{did} engaged in a coverup. It ~~did~~ ^{does} this ~~almost entirely~~ ^{largely} with the until-then secret files of the Commission, with the documents of the FBI and the Secret Service. It leave no doubt that there was such a coverup, and that the Commission staff ~~leaned~~ ^{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 ~~it was, indeed,~~ the CIA and its involvement in the assassination ~~throughout its work~~ ^{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 book, it is customary for the author to draw all the contents together and from this evidence state his conclusions.

The ~~additional~~ ^{conclusion} conclusion of this book is so simple the title states it. The minor conclusions are explicit throughout and are ~~too~~ ⁴³³ numerous to recapitulate. Should there be any who doubt that what did happen could have, as the professional ~~and~~ doubters and apologists pretend, I ask them ~~to~~ ^{if they try} draw their own conclusions. ^{from questions} To help ~~ask~~ ^{that} ~~questions~~ ^{that} they ask themselves. In each case the answers are obvious, unevitable and unequivocal.

9

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 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 Crest Pena's complaints about deBrueys, made ^{twice in person} to the FBI of ^{once} ~~ice, in person and in person~~ in the presence of his lawyer, were not known to the Commission when Liebelser didn't go in to them?

Do you believe that Wesley J. Liebelser, Professor of Law at the University of California, did not know what he was doing, ~~know~~ 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} were with Oswald, that he didn't know Dean Andrews' office had been ransacked with ~~no~~ valuables taken, just the files that might have held these otherwise unimportant records, that he didn't know that Sam Monk Zelden would confirm Andrews' testimony, and that the FBI didn't 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~~ misuse of the evidence ~~was~~ that was available - not what the FBI didn't 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 ~~Wobley~~ Liebeler did not know the whole story of this ^{and the ~~Wobley~~ and the FBI said,} invasion training camp, that his performance of his duties did not require this knowledge, that the information he ~~had~~ ^{put in evidence} did not tell the story:

Do you believe that FBI Agent Well did not know Guy Banister's detective agency was a detective agency, that it was in the same building as the Cuban Revolutionary Council ^e 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 didn't know he should not, that he didn't know who Arcachia ^e was without asking ^e Banister, that he immediately after the assassination asked about Arcachia ^e because he and the FBI believed there was no connection, that he didn't find and severely question Arcachia ^e because the Cuban Batistiana was not available,

that he cannot conduct a better investigation than he reports in 47 words, that he cannot find what is in the phone book without a mockery of an investigation, that he doesn't know that a businessman has ^{rent} books, that a renter has a lease, a contract or an agreement - has records, that he had to leave the mystery about why wanted to rent 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 ~~litera~~ 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 ^{ve} investigation of David William Ferrie, intended or made? That those mockeries called reports one of which Ferrie wrote himself represent anything like an investigation or was ever intended to, or that the FBI did not know about Ferrie, friend of deBrueys' friends, attended ^{of} hte meetings deBrueys attended?

^{only coincidence}
~~Do~~ you believe it is ~~an~~ ^{was in Dallas when Oswald was there,} coincidence that deBrueys left his assignment in New Orleans when Oswald left New Orleans and returned to it when Oswald was ~~deceased~~?
 just by coincidence?

Do you believe that deBrueys for one minute believed ~~the~~ ^{the} pep he reported about Rudolph Richard Davis and did not know before ^{at} his "investigation" and "report" ¹ that his own FBI had raided that st 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 Liebeler's ¹ 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 ~~ask~~ asked and didn't, of each:
That he didn't know the answers to the questions he didn't 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 ~~all~~ 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 show them pictures of young men taken as much as five years

Sylvia Odio
earlier: for would not, as Gennaro did draw whiskers on a picture of Oswald
after the disputed the repulsively bearded mention of "Leon Oswald"?

11

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 the game played with Mrs. Odio about the beards ~~is an~~
~~accident of these men~~ is an accident or was an effort to make identification
difficult or impossible: ^{it} Was necessary, normal FBI operations:

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.

487 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 having} a single file with his name, a single one of the over =
advertised ²⁵ 25,000 ^{with names} reports mentioning his name: Or that he could have been in-
vestigated 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* telephonically arranged ^{ing/} ~~appointment~~ of the call, and that it is just coincidence that this followed threats: Or that *it* is just because there are lots of badies in New Orleans that he was assaulted, or that his bartender, Evaristo Rodriguez ^{at only} also was shot ~~also~~ 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 ~~the~~ ^{PENNY} effort to make it known that FBI agent Warren C. de Bruijn regularly ~~attacked~~ ^{with} ~~that~~ ^{meeting?} ~~regularly?~~*

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 ~~of officials~~ against the deficiencies of or errors in an official investigation of the murder of an American President?

488 Do you believe that ~~it~~ is accidental 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, ~~and~~ with the proof of its misinterpretation and misuse - that it can be accidental those puerile pretenses of ^{invasion} reports on the Cuban/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 Bringuier travelled 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 expression"?

Do you believe that Wesley Liebeler - or the Fbi 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 ~~any~~ 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 incompetents.

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