

6.4x More questions and a Magic Rifle  
factual range

Blakey's is endless ignorance and hid demonstrations of his prejudices also never end.

~~No point in this unless contrary to the actual fact, by presuming Oswald's guilt as he does~~  
The title of his next chapter is "Castro and the Risk of Retaliation" (pages 135-156). The first part is headed, "Cuban-American Relations." Blakey writes it like a schoolboy pretending to be his professor and, as usual flaunts his lack of knowledge so he gives low-grade street information as the considered official opinion as well as his own. To the uninformed this can sound like the real stuff but in fact none of it is true except that there were many who gave it no thought or did not know what the other and significant factors <sup>are</sup> and they would be included among the many who believed what Blakey here pontificates, for all the words as though he knew what he was talking about: - as he does not!

indirect  
single  
space

When a national leader is assassinated, his adversaries are immediate suspects, so when John F. Kennedy was struck down in Dallas, two names in particular came to mind: Nikita Khrushchev of the Soviet Union and Fidel Castro Ruz of Cuba. Then, when the arrest of Lee Harvey Oswald was followed by word that the alleged assassin had demonstrably paid allegiance to the Communist government of Cuba (his Fair Play for Cuba Committee activities in New Orleans in August 1963; his attempt to travel to Cuba via Mexico in September 1963), the notion that Castro had a hand in the President's death became all the more prevalent. When the Warren Commission concluded in 1964 that Oswald had acted alone, the suspicions abated, but they were revived when doubts about that conclusion were given new impetus by findings of a Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Activities in 1975 and 1976. By developing the details of the CIA-Mafia plots to kill Castro, the Senate Committee (or Church Committee, for its chairman, Senator Frank Church of Idaho) established that the Cuban president had a reason to retaliate and seek the death of his American counterpart. The job before us in 1978 was to evaluate Castro's vindictiveness as a possible factor in the assassination, in light of the CIA-Mafia plots, the existence of which had been withheld from the Warren Commission. There was, in addition, evidence of possible Cuban participation in a plot, which also was not brought to the attention of the Commission (a report, for example, that Oswald was in contact with a Cuban intelligence agent who made a statement shortly after the assassination that could be read as foreknowledge). We began our evaluation by examining the course of Cuban-American relations during Kennedy's incomplete term. pages 135-156

Or, with the best of his (high school) thinking, Blakey explains that B-Eisenhower gets Castro gets ~~even~~ even with Eisenhower, who tried to kill him, by having Kennedy killed.

That, in Blakey's logic, is ~~Castro~~ Castro getting even with Eisenhower, by killing Kennedy, *not Eisenhower, who lived his normal life out*

When a national leader is assassinated, suspicion that it was by an opposing national leader is street talk not fact. It is extraordinarily rare ~~but~~ that national leaders start knocking each other off because there is always the threat of retaliation. In recent year the most prominent such illustration is not John Kennedy wanting Castro assassinated. Rather is the fact that the assassination attempt attributed to Kennedy was by Eisenhower, who kept more, much more, secret from Kennedy. ~~At~~ Eisenhower authorized that assassination in August, 1960, before Kennedy was ~~even~~ elected.

7 SA here

Only among ~~those~~ those who imagine what they believe and then believe what they imagine is fact, like Blakey, was it true, other than on the street, that when Kennedy was assassinated, the immediate suspects were Khrushchev and Castro.

Not on the informed government level and not among private ~~citizens~~ citizens who were other than political ignoramuses. The fact is that among those who were well informed, Khrushchev and Castro would not have been suspects. One obvious reason is that neither preferred or had any reason to prefer the hawk Johnson to the hawk-turned-dove Kennedy. In addition, Khrushchev and Kennedy had started private communications by which they hope to come to some degree of detente and both wanted to reduce their high military expenses. Castro, of course, would never dream of getting rid of his only real protector in the world, which Kennedy became with the solution he ~~proposed~~ proposed and Khrushchev accepted, that on Kennedy's guarantee to protect Cuba against any invasion he would remove his nuclear-tipped missiles in Cuba.

That was a guarantee even the USSR could not make. It could help wipe Cuba out in defending it against invasion but unlike

Kennedy, Khrushchchev could not prevent an invasion. Not by any real force.

So, while the Blakeys and the other uninformed with mouths as big as his could and did suspect the impossible, that does not mean that the impossible was believed by others not as uninformed as the Blakeys.

Just because Oswald distributed some cheap single-sheet handbills he had had printed does not mean at all that his act "demonstrably paid allegiance to the Communist government of Cuba." The fact is that whatever Oswald's political beliefs were before he went to the Soviet Union, before he left there he was so feebly anti-Soviet he did express himself on that publicly. He did more so in his private writings that the Commission published, ~~and~~ <sup>many</sup> pages of them. I published a selection of what the Commission published - in the first book on the assassination and the Warren Report, on pages 120 ff.

The Cubans, in fact, told Oswald to his face that he was no friend of theirs, as Blakey also know. That happened in what to him is important, inside the Cuban consulate in Mexico City and it was testified to before <sup>his</sup> ~~aid~~ committee, with that testimony telecast from coast to coast. *no secrets except to Blakey's readers.*

And what cannot be repeated too much, it is only the official ignoramuses who, like Blakey, are determined ignoramuses, who did not obtain and use what was public of the originally-withheld official evidence, which proves beyond question that Oswald was not and could not have been the assassin. (Illustrations of this are included in a number of the books of this series.)

Or, there is no point in all this political god by Blakey, other than his obvious political goals and perhaps an effort to

make it appear that he had conducted the investigation he did not make.

The Church committee did not "establish" that Castro had reason to retaliate against Kennedy. The plotting against Castro were independent of Kennedy, were by Eisenhower, who kept it all secret from Kennedy.

And no effort was made to assassinate Eisenhower.

Against whom the Cubans had many legitimate complaints and about which they did nothing.

With all that was done against Castro by the United States of Eisenhower origin, much as the Blakeys attribute it to Kennedy, the would-be scholar mentions Eisenhower in two places in this chapter. The first follows what we have just examined:

*indent  
single  
space*

Kennedy set the tone for the Cuban policy of his administration in a State of the Union address on January 30, 1961: "In Latin America, Communist agents seeking to exploit that region's peaceful revolution of hope have established a base on Cuba. . . . Our objection with Cuba is not over the people's drive for a better life. Our objection is to their domination by foreign and domestic tyrannies. . . ." Such domination in the Western Hemisphere, Kennedy vowed, "can never be negotiated." Inevitably, Kennedy administration policy would be rooted in certain commitments of his predecessor, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who along with Vice-President Richard M. Nixon, the 1960 Republican candidate, had been accused by Kennedy during the election campaign of paving the way for the "communization" of Cuba by not recognizing the Cuban revolution for what it was from the outset. Unbeknownst to Kennedy, Eisenhower, in March 1960, had quietly approved a CIA covert action plan that included organizing, training, and logistically supporting Cuban exile troops for the purpose of invading Cuba and overthrowing Castro. By September, a Cuban-exile expeditionary force, Brigade 2506, was in place in Guatemala. Kennedy was informed of the operation after he was elected, and in due course he authorized a landing at the Bay of Pigs, on the southern coast of Las Villas province. It was launched on April 17, 1961, but was soon defeated by Cuban troops said to be commanded by Castro himself. While the President had ordered that no American troops were to set foot on Cuban soil, U.S. sponsorship of the landing was readily apparent, and Kennedy promptly took full responsibility for the aborted invasion. (page 136)

The Eisenhower invasion was popularly attributed to Kennedy but the Cubans <sup>Under Eisenhower</sup> knew better. They regularly informed the United Nation about what was coming <sup>N</sup> and although <sup>the</sup> skipped in the United States media, it was reported by the UN and it was reported by the papers of other lands,

There was much more anti-Castro political act<sup>ivity</sup> by Eisenhower, all at the end of his term, all in violation of sound practise, to allow ~~to~~ the incoming administration to form its own policies and all intended by Eisenhower to <sup>create and control</sup> form Kennedy's policies for him, for ~~all~~ the world as though it was Eisenhower who had been elected. He let others know, told many of them, that he did not trust Kennedy and therefore was compelling Kennedy to hew the Eisenhower <sup>line</sup>. (This also <sup>with documentation</sup> appears through the books of this series, with much of it in ~~the~~ Faking Kennedy: with Hersh-It Journalism and some in a number of other books.)

Still flogging his dead horse, that Oswald was the assassin which it was his job to know and report was not true:

While the Committee did not naively believe that the Cuban government would not lie when it was in its best interest to do so, it did not believe that it would have lightly run the risk of being publicly unmasked as deceitful on the question of Oswald's alleged threat, which might have implied more than a failure to report it. The Committee disagreed, however, with Castro's moral assessment that it would have been his duty to report the threat to the United States. Assuming that Oswald had made the threat, the Committee felt that the Cuban government would have been under no moral obligation to report it to U.S. authorities, since there would have been no reason, when it was made, to regard it seriously. We shared the Committee's judgment on this aspect of its evaluation of Castro's position. Such threats are commonly heard by public officials and properly ignored. Nevertheless, our assessment of Castro's denial of the threat differed from that of the Committee. It was our judgment that the threat probably did occur. While Marina Oswald and others testified that Oswald spoke only highly of President Kennedy, there was evidence that he talked about "shooting the President" at various times in his life. He once made "a threat," for example, against President Eisenhower to a boyhood acquaintance, Palmer McBride. (McBride thought the threat was not "made in jest.") (page 147).

Winfert  
original  
space

It is ~~is~~ apparent that although Blakey was well enough aware of the fact that what he attributes to Kennedy was in fact what Eisenhower, not Kennedy did; and that as a practical matter for a politician it was impossible for Kennedy to do other than what Eisenhower required him to do, Blakey does not mention the possibility that if Castro wanted revenge he should have ~~thought~~ <sup>gotten</sup> it from Eisenhower. In this Blakey is careful not to attribute what he knows was Eisenhower's responsibility, not Kennedy's, to Eisenhower because nobody assassinated—or even tried to assassinate—Eisenhower,

For Blakey his biggest asset ~~in~~ his writing is his ~~ignorance~~ ignorance and his lack of honesty. Otherwise, instead of a book, he ~~would~~ not even have had a letter-to-the-editor,

There is little in this chapter that is worth even a few words but a little should be considered.

On page 144 Blakey has less than the minimum of what is contrary to what he likes, no matter how irrational it is, that Castro could have inspired Oswald to assassinate Kennedy. There he merely mentions that "The Cuban ambassador to the United Nations, Carlos Lechuga, was in contact with William <sup>Attwood</sup> ~~Attwood~~ of the U.S. Delegation, and better relations seemed to be <sup>in</sup> the offing. (In fact, by October 31, approved by Kennedy, of an <sup>A</sup>merican diplomat meeting secretly with Castro in Havana) It also had become known that Jean Daniel of L'Express, a French newspaper, had met with President Kennedy ... but nothing happened until Kennedy learned Daniel was soon to ~~go~~ go to Cuba. ... In his talk with Daniel, Kennedy ... showed a sympathy toward Cuba...invited Daniel to come and see him when he returned ...According to Daniel, Castro said, 'I believe Kennedy is sincere...In the last analysis, I believe anyone else would be worse

Comer Clark is, according to Blakey, a "British journalist" who "interviewed Castro in July 1967." (page 145).

And, of course, what Clark says that Castro told him and him alone is that when ~~os~~ Oswald was in Mexico he blabbed to the Cuban staff there that he was going to kill Kennedy.

No matter ~~that~~ the live informers, the real spies, that the United States had in the Cuban and Soviet embassies who reported no such thing. No matter ~~that~~ the United States wiretaps on the phones on both embassies disclosed no such thing. What Clark says is what Blakey ~~says~~ in his own way throughout his book: Oswald was the assassin and nothing else matters.

Not even truth. Reason. Common ~~sense~~.

Blakey likes it therefore it is real, has to be true.

What would be expected of a reasonably ~~intelligent~~ high-school boy we need not expect from Blakey ~~because~~ in this brilliant writing, augmented by the experience of a former editor of Life magazine in its heyday, it is not there.

A reasonably-intelligent ~~high-school~~ "journalist" would be expected to ~~ask~~ why, if Castro was to make such a confession, he did not make it to the New York Times. Or when Clark had such a sensational scoop he did not sell it to the times or to his own British Times of London.

With such a sensational, international scoop, why would ~~Clark~~ Clark, "journalist" that he is, ~~let~~ the scandal-sheet The Enquirer have it?

And our high-school "journalist" would tell himself what the brilliant Blakey, head of that committee's investigation and with all the FBI's and CIA's records available ~~to him~~ <sup>did not</sup>, that if Clark could have placed his scoop in a reputable paper he would have done that. ~~He could not because it was a fake. A BUT Blakey liked it and used it!~~



80B  
2  
Or, a child could be expected to display better judgement that this outstanding investigation<sup>n</sup>, committee-boss and organized-crimd socialist as the lawyer he is here displays.

More, in another such matter, Blakey writes<sup>A</sup> that when Castro said that if he or Cuba knew any such think they would have told the United States immediately. In saying he does not believe that Blakey does not have in mind that Kennedy was Castro's only real defender in the world, that Castro had taken the initiative in an effort to better relations, that Kennedy had agreed to that and, had he not been assassinated in Texas, would have met with his representative in those just-started negotiations, on his return

No question about it, the Clark/Enquirer lie supports the preconceived Blakey lie, the lie that he could imagine made him a more acceptable candidate for attorney general, the lie of Oswald's lone guilt.

And that alone but more so because publication was in the nation's most successful scandal sheet, reflects Blakey's credentials for doing a book like this and for having been in charge of the House investigation for which it lavished the largest ~~appropriation~~ appropriation it had even given any investigation.

If Blakey had not spent so much of that appropriation on the mafia and ignored so many publicly-available FBI records he might have learned from the FBI, which did investigate it and did report on it, that Clark was a faker and that having had no interview with Castro, Clark had made it all up.

Reason enough to believe that Cuba/Castro would not have told the United States is they had wind of such an exploit, Blakey's opinion? Enough to get Blakey, if not Clark/Enquirer, a Pulitzer?

be an emissary of peace, despite everything.'"

Daniel was with Castro when Castro got word that Kennedy had been shot. He then repeated, three times, that it was bad news (page 144).

What is missing from this Blakey account is that the meeting with Lechuga was Castro's idea and it was to lead to better relations.

Before leaving for Dallas, as Blakey also omits, Kennedy told Attwood to see him on his return and they would discuss this further. Also omitted is that the Lechuga Attwood meetings were at the UN had White House approval.

It is hard to seem, as Blakey does not mention, why Castro had taken the initiative on trying to better relations and at the same time inspiring Kennedy's death, particularly when he believed that from his point of view, anyone else would be worse.

And, the Lechuga-Attwood meetings were Castro's idea and he arranged for their meeting in confidence with an ABC-TV reporter <sup>Lisa Rowell</sup> who had a party <sup>in her apartment</sup> where their meeting would not have any special <sup>meaning</sup> meeting attributed to it.

Then, beginning on the next page, Blakey <sup>has</sup> what the FBI reported was a fake, which Blakey does not mention. He reports, for all the world as though it were real, were a fact, that a British reporter, Homer Clark, had interviewed Castro. Clark quoted Castro as saying that Oswald had gone to the Mexico City embassy several times and said, in effect, that to help Cuba he would kill ~~Ken~~ Kennedy (page 145)

How Blakey could report this known fake as though it were real, particularly when he had to do no work at all to prove it was a fake that was published by the least dependable of sources, The National Enquirer, only a Blakey can explain. And only a National Enquirer would credit him. <sup>80 A & B.</sup>

Here Blakey's subchapter ends and more of the same kind of

litarzry and historical junk follows, under the subheading "The 1977 CIA Task Force Report" (pages 148-153). Nothing new in it and much of what is in this section Blakey did not like anyway.

*Copied* Next is another piece of Blakey ~~fiction~~ <sup>fiction</sup> subjeaded, "A Cuban Defector's Oswald Story" (pages 153-4). In this, in Blakey's writing about a Cuban defector, for all t e world as though that defection would have bee and remained unknown to Cuba and to Castro, he substitutes for the defector's name "A-1". So, A-1 reported that a woman in the Cuban Mexico City embassy, Luisa Calderon, was "a likely agent of ~~the~~ <sup>Cuban</sup> DGI, the Cuban Intelligence Directorate. When the Blakey hot shots interviewed A-1 in 1978, "he told us that in 1963 she might have had a relationship with Oswald that extended beyond ~~the~~ <sup>her</sup> as a secre tary" in the consulate.

From all these reports of <sup>Cuban</sup> embassy women having had other than secretarial relations with Oswald, they kept the beds so hot he'd hardly have had time to make the phine call that the Blakeys and those before him bdlieve was to Kostikov - *and won't*.

With all this hot stuff , hot at least in Blakey's mind, he ~~was~~ had worked himself up to the end of ~~this~~ <sup>At</sup> this chapter supoposedly on the risk of retaliation" when the only real cause of any retaliation seems to have been in bed.

~~He~~ <sup>He</sup> begins his end excukpating the Cuban government in the assassination, hardly a form of "retaliation"

They, good old Clark and that Pulitzer journalism, he writes, "We believed that Oswald had, in fact, uttered a threat to murder the President within earshot of consular officials in Mexico City." That, he says, big secret, that "we did not trust the word of the Cuban government."

What better source acan a committee of the house of Representatives have than The National Enquirer? And Blakey uses that to him prime source.

Maybe Blakey sees in all of this some <sup>R</sup> "Risk Of Retaliation" but other than for the alleged bed activities, in all of it I do not.

But can it be imagined that if someone were to have been seeking revenge he'd have selected an Oswald, who had ~~to~~ have his shooting scores fattened up a bit <sup>years earlier</sup> when he shot in the Marines, to have been the alleged retaliator?

The Oswald not known to have fired a rifle since the last time ~~he~~ was required to by the Marines?

And then, of all the good weapons available for any retaliation, to ~~have~~ selected a ten-buck war-time surplus rifle that, while it could be fatal, also stuck ~~over~~ much of the time <sup>even</sup> after it was overhauled not once but twice.

The kind of shooting attributed to Oswald and that rifle requires regular, almost ~~daily~~ practise and <sup>for</sup> ~~at~~ least four years Oswald had not fired any rifle and <sup>then</sup> did that allegedly superb firing the first time he is ~~know~~ <sup>allege</sup> to have fired that surplus rifle.

Which was not placed in his possession from the time he left New Orleans and then was with a dubious source and a dubious story.

It is without ~~question~~ <sup>question</sup>, from the Commission's own evidence, ~~&~~ that Oswald did not take that rifle from New Orleans to Mexico and then frok Mexico to Dallas, but this was of no concern to the so-called invetigators of the FBI, the Secret ervice, the Warren ~~ommission~~, the Senate's Church or intelligence fommittee or to the Blakey bunch.

I was interested in how that rifle got from where Oswald allegedly ~~practised~~ <sup>practised</sup> with it without ammunition on his darkened back ~~porch~~ in New Orleans to and from Mexicob<sup>r</sup> ~~in~~ any other way and into the TSBD for him to have shot Kennedy from there, and in all those <sup>e</sup> very many thousands of records I obtained from all tha t FOIA <sup>t</sup>

lawsuits and from all the Commission <sup>did not publish and</sup> (published in its Report and ten million words of appendix in those twenty-six volumes there is not a word on this. Officially it just happened or it <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ just made up. There are several references to how it ~~it~~ could not have <sup>happened</sup> ~~appeared~~ but that does not get ~~it~~ where it had to be for it to have been used to assassinate the President.

The fact is <sup>h</sup> ~~that~~ even the required post office record of Oswald getting it from Klein's in Chicago does not exist.

This is to say that along with <sup>that</sup> ~~the~~ magic bullet with the career not equalled in science or mythology we have a rifle ~~th~~ <sup>at</sup> that just appeared in the ~~TSBD~~ when all the actual, official evidence is that it did not and could not ~~have~~ have.

The magic rifle.