

30 DEC 71

Page Two

THE MIDLOTHIAN MIRROR

A TRUE REFLECTION OF LOCAL EVENTS

Second-class postage paid at Midlothian, Texas 76065. Office of publication is 214 West Avenue F Midlothian, Texas 76065. Any erroneous reflection upon the character, standing or reputation of any person, firm or corporation, appearing in the columns of The Mirror will fully and gladly be corrected upon being brought to the attention of the editor of this paper.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

For One Year in Texas	\$5.00
For One Year Outside Texas	\$8.00

Single Copies 15c
Editor Penn Jones Jr.
Publisher The Midlothian Mirror, Inc.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY

Winner of the 1963 Elijah Parish Lovejoy Award for Courage in Journalism.



EDITORIALS

WHERE ARE THE CAREFUL STUDIES

In the Christmas issue of The Mirror, we ran the first of several installments of a speech delivered by Vincent Salandria to a group in Massachusetts. We forgot to include a line saying the speech was to be continued.

We feel it is an important speech in the continuing effort to unfold the mystery surrounding the assassination of John Kennedy.

We disagree with Salandria's conclusion (in last

week's issue) regarding the non-participation of President Lyndon Johnson. Salandria says: "No, many careful studies show absolutely no evidence that President Johnson was involved in producing the assassination."

The speech is heavily documented, but Salandria does not document the above statement. On the contrary the study by this newspaper shows evidence withheld, and evidence destroyed by the office of President Lyndon Johnson. We think no governmental agency would have assassinated President Kennedy, until that agency had an advance firm commitment that the new President would protect the killers. There is evidence the plotters knew from the time of the 1960 Democratic Convention that Lyndon Johnson would co-operate, if it became necessary to kill Kennedy.

The Assassination of President John F. Kennedy: A Model for Explanation

Vincent J. Salandria, Attorney
Philadelphia, Pa.

COMPUTERS and AUTOMATION for December, 1971

President Kennedy said: "It's possible. It could happen in this country, but the conditions would have to be just right."

The conditions outlined by the President were as follows:

1. The country would have to be led by a young President.
2. There would be a Bay of Pigs.
3. Military criticism of the President would follow.
4. Then, if there were another Bay of Pigs, the military would consider overthrowing the elected establishment, and finally.
5. "...if there were a third Bay of Pigs, it could happen."

Mr. Fay concluded this episode by describing how the President "pausing long enough for all of us to assess the significance of his comment, ...concluded with an old Navy phrase, 'But it won't happen on my watch.'"

These conditions were approximated during the Kennedy administration. President Kennedy was in fact a young President. There was a Bay of Pigs. The missile crisis which followed resulted not in the bombing of Cuba — as the military advisors had urged upon the President — but rather in a detente with Russia. This was followed by a nuclear test ban treaty which "...the Joint Chiefs of Staff declared themselves opposed to under almost any terms."²

The American University speech by President Kennedy following his reexamination of the Vietnamese policy, completely fulfilled the conditions set forth by President Kennedy for a take-over to happen on his watch.

Evidence for Military Involvement in the Assassination

There is much evidence to indicate military involvement in the assassination. There was the startling and incriminating action of the then Commander James J. Humes, the head of the Navy Bethesda autopsy team, who took the original autopsy notes — and then burned them.³ The autopsy was under the control of an army general who was not trained in medicine.⁴ The autopsy was never completed.⁵ The findings of the autopsy were contrary to the find-

ings of the non-military physicians at Parkland Hospital. The pathologists were directed not to look at the Kennedy neck wound.⁶ The x-rays were never turned over to the Commission by the military. The burning of the notes by Commander Humes did not deter the military from promoting him to Captain.

Military-CIA Interests Coincided

Although at the time of the assassination the interests of the CIA and the military coincided, now evidence of a CIA-military rift abounds. The Boston Globe of July 20, 1971 stated that the Pentagon Papers revealed that "one agency...comes out...with a record for calling its shots correctly." So Ellsberg did not do badly by his "ex" employer. The Boston Globe of July 3 offered an item which indicates the "ex"-Pentagon people are hitting back at the "ex"-CIA Ellsberg. "A former Pentagon liaison officer with the Central Intelligence Agency said in London that President Kennedy engendered the hate of the CIA by trying to curb the agency's power. He also said he did not think Lee Harvey Oswald 'by himself killed President Kennedy.'"

"L. Fletcher Prouty, a retired Air Force colonel and the director of special operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1962 and 1963, said Kennedy issued two directives in 1961 to limit the CIA's power but the documents never surfaced and were not im-

plemented."

Jack Anderson on April 21, 1971 said:

"International espionage is seldom as efficient as the inter-departmental spying that goes on in Washington.

"...the Central Intelligence Agency never makes a move without the Defense Intelligence Agency keeping close surveillance.

"...Government agencies, in the best cloak-and-dagger tradition, snoop upon one another."⁸

I view the American military's motive for involving itself in the killing of Kennedy as pervertedly patriotic in nature. But at that period of time, there was, as we will demonstrate, a congruence of interests between the American military and the CIA. Kennedy was the enemy of both power groups at the time he was killed.

The Pentagon Papers — a CIA Jab at Military?

Of late, with the issuance of the Pentagon Papers

by a long-standing CIA agent, Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, this alliance between the CIA and the military seems to have become strained. Dr. Ellsberg was one of the exclusive Society of Fellows at Harvard with McGeorge Bundy and his brother William.⁹ When Ellsberg leaked the documents, he was employed at MIT's Center for International Studies and numbered among his colleagues Mr. William Bundy. In my assassination research I learned that ex-CIA people who undertook work to assist the research on the Kennedy assassination almost invariably turned out to be present CIA people. I would recommend that the public remain skeptical about Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, the ex-marine, ex-CIA, ex-hawk, ex-Kissinger aide

and present fellow researcher of Mr. William Bundy at MIT. 10

In fact, I would urge that the public hold open the hypothesis that the Pentagon Papers are designed as a thrust against the military by the CIA. I suggest that there has been a falling out between these two anti-democratic power blocs. The military is still determined to defeat Communism abroad, while the CIA is now primarily concerned with maintaining its power domestically.

How can we accept the Pentagon Papers as an honest and complete peering into the inner workings of our government? These papers predate and postdate November 22, 1963. Yet, these papers make no reference to the assassination and the enormous power and policy shift which occurred on that historical day when the republic expired.

Can the purpose of the disclosures of the Pentagon Papers really be to aid the CIA non-ideological elements in our government against the right wing, military, virulently anti-communist elements? Does not the evidence offered to support the existence of a present rift between the CIA and the military also support the concept that the Pentagon Papers were the offerings of the CIA to enlist assistance in its intra-governmental struggle against the military? And should decent, freedom-loving constitutionalists join either power bloc? or should they rather use this fortuitous rift to benefit freedom in this society and in the rest of the world by denouncing both cliques as the enemies of humankind?

6. Did the CIA Kill President Kennedy?

Well, then, we are reduced by the process of elimination to the question, "Was the CIA the prime mover in the killing of Kennedy?" Was the CIA sophisticated enough to have run Oswald across the whole gamut of political ideology in America in order to place all ideologists on the defensive as possible suspects? and in order to insure that the nation would be so divided ideologically that there

could be no coalescence of forces which would seek retribution for the killing?

We will now examine the question of whether the CIA was the specific federal agency which was the prime mover in the killing of President Kennedy.

After the assassination of President Kennedy, the government which had refused to act on conspiracy evidence resorted to amazingly fast action in an area where one might have anticipated a slow and tentative feeling of the way. The fact is that after the assassination key foreign policy changes were put into effect immediately.

CIA Opposed Kennedy Anti-Cold War Policy

Before the assassination, thanks to President Kennedy, we were on a course which could have ended the Cold War. That course was described by D.F. Flemming as follows:

"Fortunately, we had in President Kennedy at a new turning point in history a leader with both vision and courage. He had made certain that there were no missile gaps against us. He had won the acclaim of the West by the way he successfully played

showdown nuclear politics in the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. He had faced the last of man's ultimate decisions on earth.

"Then, in the summer of 1963, Kennedy turned his face resolutely toward life and unmistakably signaled the end of the Cold War.

Behind the patriotic facades of nuclear militarism, he saw the death of his own children and of all children. In a series of magnificent addresses, he urged us to reconsider our attitudes toward peace, the Soviet Union, and the Cold War. He won a treaty ending atomic testing above ground and then paused to wait a little for the more embattled of his cold-war compatriots to catch up with the times.

"At that moment, he was struck down..."¹¹

"President Kennedy today faces his greatest opportunity to negotiate a permanent peace, but because of division inside his own Administration he may miss the boat.

"That is the consensus of friendly diplomats long trained in watching the ebb and flow of world events..."

President Kennedy knew that his efforts to end the Cold War were dangerous to his life. In this regard I quote Arthur Schlesinger:

....when he saw Nixon after the Bay of Pigs he said, "If I do the right kind of a job I don't know whether I am going to be here four years from now.... If someone is going to kill me," he would say, "they are going to kill me."¹²

President Kennedy saw the danger to his efforts to end the Cold War which lay in the power of the CIA. So the New York Times quoted him as saying, that he wished "to splinter the CIA into 1,000 pieces and scatter it to the winds..."¹³

But that purpose was never accomplished by President Kennedy. The CIA is a policy-making body still. Eugene McCarthy is of this opinion. I quote him as

follows:

"The general evidence is that in addition to gathering and interpreting information, the CIA does play an important part in influencing foreign policy, and certainly has become an important operating arm of the executive branch in this area of government responsibility."¹⁴

Andrew Tully states the position of the Kennedy administration with respect to the CIA after the Bay of Pigs:

"The official concern, then, was not so much that the CIA had bungled in the past, but that it either had been entrusted with or had seized the broad responsibility for making policy which belonged to the State Department."

"...during most of Eisenhower's tenure, his Secretary of State was John Foster Dulles, and John Foster relied much more heavily on brother Allen's estimates than he did on the reports from his ambassadors. In effect brother John Foster made of brother Allen's

CIA a kind of super Foreign Service and apparently found nothing incongruous in the fact that in some embassies CIA personnel outnumbered Foreign Service employees. It was small wonder that the average citizen was confused, after Cuba, as to who was making foreign policy for the United States. Some top drawer members of the Washington diplomatic community were just as confused..."¹⁵

Kennedy Fired Dulles as CIA Head

After the Bay of Pigs, President Kennedy accepted the resignation of the head of the CIA, Allen Dulles. He had called in Dulles, Cabell and Bissell and told them that the three would have to be replaced. "Under the British system," he said, "I would have to go. But under our system I'm afraid it's got to be you."¹⁶ But Allen Dulles was to return to government service immediately after the killing of President Kennedy. He appeared as one of the Warren Commissioners. Let us see whether the father of the CIA served the people and the search for truth concerning the death of the departed President, or whether he served the interests of the intelligence communities not only in the United States but in the Soviet Union as well.

Dulles Suppressed Evidence of Oswald's Soviet Intelligence Connections

On January 21, 1964, in a secret executive session, the Warren Commission had to deal with the problem of Marina Oswald giving evidence that Oswald was a Soviet agent.¹⁷ Senator Richard Russell said: "That will blow the lid if she testifies to that."¹⁸ And so it would have. How did the Commission deal with that problem? Well, we learn from the transcript of the secret executive session that Isaac Don Levine was helping Marina Oswald write a story for Life Magazine, which never got published. Allen Dulles, the original director of the Central Intelligence Agency who was fired from his position by President Kennedy, decided to see Levine. Dulles said simply: "I can get him in and have a friendly talk. I have known him."¹⁹ Does that not sound as if Allen Dulles was contemplating suppression of information?

Isaac Don Levine had a central role in the Hiss case. I quote Whitaker Chambers as he described in his book, Witness, how Levine nursed him through his uncertainty about launching into his allegations against Mr. Alger Hiss. I quote:

"The meeting was arranged by Isaac Don Levine... For years he has carried on against Communism a kind of private war which is also a public service. He is a skillful professional journalist and a notable 'ghost.'"

It was Levine who led Jan Valtin out of the editorial night and he was working with General Krivitsky on I Was in Stalin's Secret Service when, sometime in 1938, I met both men.

"From the first, Levine had urged me to take my story to the proper authorities. I had said no. ...When he proposed that he arrange a meeting at which I might tell my story directly to President Roosevelt, I was reassured."²⁰

And why was a Cold War warrior like Isaac Don Levine not interested in raising the specter of a political assassination by the left? Why was the idea of a leftist conspiracy unthinkable in the Cold War America where for twenty-five years a virtual paranoia concerning communist plotting had prevailed? Yet there was — as we have seen — some evidence of a leftist conspiracy, and it was not acted upon. Why not? What caused our government at the public level to be so immediately and permanently wedded to the lone-assassin myth?

We are introduced through the transcript of this secret executive session to a new ghostly role for

the literary ghost, Isaac Don Levine. Levine, as a result of the intervention of his friend, Allen Dulles, apparently was successful in erasing from the prospective testimony of Marina Oswald any references to Soviet intelligence connections with Oswald. The intelligence communities across iron curtain lines apparently cooperate to keep the truth from their peoples.

Did Soviet and American Intelligence Agencies Cooperate?

Is it irrational to suggest that the Soviet and American intelligences cooperated in the American governmental game of killing the President? Could an intelligence assassination have been perpetrated against the head of the American state unless the Soviet intelligence services could have been counted on to remain silent?

2. Schlesinger, Arthur M., A Thousand Days (Boston, The Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965), p. 818.
3. Hearing Notes of the Warren Commission, Vol. XVII, p. 48.
4. State of Louisiana v. Clay L. Shaw, Testimony of Pierre A. Finck, February 24, 1967, pp. 48-9
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Hearing Notes of the Warren Commission, Vol. II, p. 371.
8. The Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, April 21, 1971, p. 42.
9. The Philadelphia Inquirer, August 22, 1971, Section 7, p. 1.
10. The Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, June 30, 1971, p. 19, col. 2.
11. Flemming, D.F., "The Costs and Consequences of the Cold War," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, 1966, p. 137.
12. Schlesinger, Arthur M., Op. Cit., pp. 738-9.
13. The New York Times (April 25, 1966), p. 10, col. 3.
14. McCarthy, Eugene J., The Limits of Power (New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), p. 91.
15. Tully, Andrew, CIA — The Inside Story (Greenwich, Conn., A Fawcett Crest Book, 1962), pp. 208-9.
16. Alsop, Stewart, The Center (New York, Harper & Row, 1968), p. 229.
17. Document Addendum to the Warren Report (El Segundo, Cal., Sighttext Publications, 1968), p. 200.
18. Document Addendum to the Warren Report, Op. Cit., p. 200.
19. Loc. Cit.
20. Chambers, Whitaker, Witness (New York, Random House, 1952), p. 457.

(Continued next week)