

The JFK ASSASSINATION AND ITS INVESTIGATIONS AND THE MEDIA AND ITS FAILURES

Of all the many media failures during my now long lifetime I recall none as serious as its abandonment of traditional concepts and practices when President John F. Kennedy was assassinated and thereafter, first during the supposed official investigation of it and then with regard to the critical literature about both.

This failure is perpetuated by the Post's use of the Jefferson Morley article to commemorate that assassination in its November 24, 1993 Outlook section. In it Morley displays a determined ignorance of the established official fact of the assassination and the childish concept that what he refers to as ^{ad of} "consensus" ^{is} is a more than acceptable substitute for the established official fact.

More^{ly}, knowing nothing about the officially established fact and for several years fiercely determined not to have the slightest inklings of it ^{state,} citing no source or authority, that "the overwhelming evidence of Lee Harvey Oswald's sole guilt for the assassination" is something that those he refers to as "conspiracy theorists" are "intellectually incapable of accepting."

Not only ^{is} the officially-misrepresented official evidence to the contrary, three members of the Commission refused to accept its basic assumption, which was not and could not be a fact, that single-bullet "theory" of Arlen Specter's.

The Commission's own evidence is that the best shots in the country could not duplicate the shooting attributed to the ^Y "differ" Oswald, the man who was ^{re} vated by the Marines as a "rather poor 'shot.'" ^{is} This did not require diligent searching of the Commission's published evidence because I published it citing the Commission's publication of it, in the first book on the Commission and the assassination, my Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report. It was completed in ¹ mid-February ⁴, 1965. The Post had a copy of the manuscript for two months and it got an advance ^{copy} of the book when it was published.

(I enclosed pages referring to those tests for the Commission in my 1995 NEVER AGAIN! that to Morley and the Post has not~~ed~~ existed for the more than a year since it was published.)

Senator Richard Russell, the most conservative member of the Commission, and Senator John Sherman Cooper, a moderate Republican member, both adamantly refused to agree with this basis of the lone-assassin Report, that single-bullet *fabrication that has no evidence to support its mythology.*

Senator Russell forced an executive session to consider his disagreements with the Report then in page proof. The Commission was to have had all those sessions taken down ^{w/} for the record for history but it was careful not to have the court reporter there while pretending to Russell and Cooper that a stenographer was taking it all down as agreed to in advance. ^{OK} I had a relationship with Russell from the time I could ^{see} prove that his and Cooper's trust had been imposed upon and the record they believed they were making for history was memory-holed. In its stead was an obviously phony pretense of a stenographic transcript that was kept from the Commission members but I obtained at the Archives and published in facsimile in 1974 in "Whitewash IV (pages 131-2).

That executive session was on September 18, 1994. The Commission's own records of its court reporting services established that it had no court reporter that day. (Appropriate ^{page} records from the Commission's PC-2 file enclosed)

Senator Russell asked me to get from the Archivist a statement that the phony "transcript" is the only one in the Commission's records. His letter to me stating this is enclosed.

Even what Senator Russell prepared to say at that executive session did not exist in the Commission's files in 1966-8 when I examined them. However, his file carbon copy of those remarks is in his archive at the University of Georgia at Athens. (I enclose the first page of those five pages, all of which I have.)

Senator Russell assigned the reading of my then four books to his legisla-

tive assistant Charles E. Campbell. ^{favorable} Campbell's report on them cites the non-existence of the transcript that was required to exist. It also establishes ^{that they} the Commission's own members, at least two of them, ^{were} as its first critics, those ⁱⁿ all of whom are to more "paranoid" at best:

"One of his (my) strongest points of departure with the Commission is ⁱⁿ the number of shots fired and on which shots hit Connally and/or ~~Kennedy~~ the President. He completely agrees with your thesis that no one shot hit both the President and the Governor." (None of the subsequent fabrications, like those of Gerald Posner in his mistitled Case Closed, can or does get around this total refutation of the ^{one} lone assassin preconception. It was not even a theory.

(That there was a de facto ~~was~~ government conspiracy on the highest level ^{not to investigate the crime}) is documented at the very beginning of my NEVER AGAIN! (You can have copies of those documents if you'd ~~like~~ like.) Before any investigation was possible there was the official decision, first formulated inside the government by the then Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, and J. Edgar Hoover ^{it was by President Johnson} and agreed to as soon as he could be reached after Oswald was killed - which meant there would be no trial ^{by the new president, Lyndon Johnson.})

Of the considerable amount of proof that Russell and Cooper absolutely refused to agree with that indispensable preconception if there was to be a lone-assassin Report I enclose a page from an oral history prepared for the Russell archive by Senator Cooper. His and Russell's determination not to agree with that, which both preserved to their graves, is quite pointed: "I'll never sign that report... if this Commission says categorically that the second shot passed through both of them."

The language they were led to believe incorporated their doubts did not. It is a rephrasing of the Report's language on that single-bullet fiction. When I put that information in Russell's hands he ended his long friendship with LBJ.

The actuality is overwhelming as Mozley's repetition of the official myth is not. There is no evidence actually incriminating of Oswald and only ignorance

of the long available official evidence itself makes such foolish beliefs as his possible. The Commission not only could not and did not place Oswald at the scene of the crime in time to do the alleged shooting, its actual evidence proves the impossibility of that.

The real questions are not of fact. Nor are they as Morley's childish concept has it, of government secrecy. It is of the lack of government honesty with that part of the official evidence it could not withhold at the outset, when I first began the long study on which I draw from this writing.

It is childish, no better, for Morley to be hung up on what he refers repeatedly to as "consensus." Fact is not established by opinion - and the opinion on which he draws is notoriously uninformed and prejudiced. ^{Truth} It is established by fact. There is no ^{world} substitution for fact when fact exists. As those who, Morley-like, insisted ~~with~~ the words was flat until Columbus made that belief untenable. It is only by determined preservation of subject-matter ignorance that Morley can believe and say such childish things.

There is no substitute for fact! Not if truth is the objective!

There is also fiction in his article. ^Q The book of the La Fontaines is fiction.

When their article for which he was responsible was published by Outlook two years ago I sent it a crushed and lengthy criticism of it and of the untruths in it. Morley asked if he could send that to the La Fontaines. I not only agreed, I said I would respond in writing to anything they might say. ^Q When I obtained and sent Outlook a diagram of the Dallas jail which proved the absolute impossibility of what was basic in that lengthy LaFontaine fiction, he sent that also to the La Fontaines. I never heard a word from either one of them. They altered their book to eliminate the impossibility, making up what they believed might not be impossible - without which they have no book.

Their book ^Q of which Morley has so high an opinion, is not about the assassination, despite his and their boasts of it. ^H It assumes Oswald's lone guilt and rather is about another fiction, that he ~~is~~

5

was a Dallas police snitch on a gun^{running} deal. That deal supposedly involved Jack Ruby as the paymaster. There was no snitch on it, despite the LaFontaines and Morley. The car carrying the grand total of five weapons- ^{there were} for which allegedly a conspiracy of five men, ~~and~~ ^{sup} supposedly including Oswald and Ruby, was wrecked when the ^{two} men in it were caught speeding by the police. They wrecked the car in the chase ~~and were caught.~~

While deciding which of the many books supposedly on the JFK assassination is the most inaccurate is not an easy chore, the subject-matter ignorance^{of} the LaFontaines puts them close to the top if not at the pinnacle.

They have already begun to change what~~x~~ they made up out of nothing of real substance and a more than adequate amount^{of} of misrepresentation. On the Oprah Winfrey Show aired on the day of the anniversary Mary LaFontaine said Oswald was an FBI, not a Dallas police informer. The actual evidence is that he was neither^{of}.

With the ^{available} official evidence what it is, and it is only barely indicated above, ~~and~~ with that official evidence long available, the call for a "consensus" on "Lee Harvey Oswald's sole guilt" is a call not unlike what the German press found convenient and ^{exp}edient rather than doing its job in the ~~early~~ 1930s.

If a free society is to stay free, its press must report truthfully, accurately and fully to the people so that representative society can function as intended, in our case by our founding fathers-those who to me^x are the greatest political thinkers of all time.

While he has seen to it that he would not be aware of it, Morley's call for what he refers to as ^a "consensus" is actually a call to perpetuate the ample reason the people have for ~~not~~ trusting their government. it is a call to perpetuate the false epitaph with which JFK was interred, that dishonest ~~not~~-investigation of ~~it~~ ^{the crime}.

There will be no ~~smoking~~ smoking gun in the disclosed and to-be-disclosed records because the decision not to investigate ^g the crime itself means there

is no such evidence in official files. But there is nothing wrong with the existing and available official evidence other than that the big thinkers and opinion makers found it easier and less uncomfortable to live with their preconceptions by seeing to it that they would not examine the readily-available evidence.

It is the misrepresentation of the exculpatory evidence that could not be entirely ignored that ~~we~~ makes possible such uninformed think-pieces as Morely's. He seems not to be aware of it but he would perpetuate the situation he says his childish "consensus" would eliminate, ~~the~~ distrust of ~~the~~ government.

Conspiracy is a matter of fact, not of theory. *Or of opinion.*

With the crime beyond the capability of any ~~one~~ man there was without any question at all a conspiracy. This is beyond reasonable question in the publicly-available official evidence. Who conspired is not known but that there was a conspiracy is a matter of official fact.

There does not appear to be much likelihood that who conspired will ever be known. But absent that, there is nothing that could do more to

justify popular trust in the government—and in the media, too—than honest admission of error and expression of regret for it.