

XXX

8.

*"Connections" Must Do Not Comment*

When I finished reading Blakey's Chapter 10, "Organized Crime in Perspective," I wrote this note at its beginning: Not a word in this long chapter gives or can give any 'perspective' on the mafia in connection with the assassination, which does not exist in Blakey's book. "long" is from pages 179 through <sup>259</sup> 278, ~~hundred~~ ~~page~~.

Blakey ~~titles~~ subtitles his first words in this chapter simply, "Organized Crime" (pages 179-180) Here is how he starts it:

*indent  
single  
space*

We concluded from our investigation that organized crime had a hand in the assassination of President Kennedy. We had come to the investigation predisposed to conclude that organized crime figures would not have taken the considerable risk entailed in plotting the assassination of the President. The reasoning process that led us to change our minds only becomes explicable when the myth and folklore are put aside. With the true nature of organized crime, as opposed to the public perception of it, rightly understood, we believed, that fateful day in Dallas would, as it did for us, finally appear in sharp focus. (page 179)

No matter what Blakey means by "had a hand in the assassination," there is no fact that justifies his use of those words.

As we have seen, not a single thing that reasonable people can refer to as both a fact and relevant.

Blakey's record with and on the House assassins contradicts what he then said, that he began "predisposed" to believe it was not so, that the mob would not run what he says is "the considerable risk entailed in plotting the assassination of the President alone. There is greater, ever so much greater risk <sup>after</sup> past the "planning," in the execution, but that Blakey does not mention.

The great volume of mafia records Blakey got from the FBI, greater than the number of pages of FBI assassination records, contradicts Blakey on this.

He says it was "the reasoning process that led us to change our minds" and "that it only becomes explicable when the myths and

"followe"

are put aside." If one does <sup>that</sup>, nothing remains of Blaley's <sup>R</sup> book because despite what he pretends it is, there is not much else relating to the mafia in it, certaining not a single real fact connecting it to the assassination.

And what claimed connections there is depends on the belief in the grossest of ~~massassination~~ myths, that Oswald was the assassin. <sup>The ignored official records, which I have, prove the Oswald and Blakey merely assumes it, he makes no effort to prove it and he cannot!</sup>

He has and he depends on conjecture and that is what he next says, "With the true nature of organized crime, as opposed to the <sup>perception</sup> public of it, rightly understood, we believe that fateful day in Dallas would, as it did for us, finally appear in sharp focus."

<sup>o</sup> Note that in all this Blakey does not mention a fact. Not a single fact! <sup>Al</sup> Now whatever he may mean by "the true nature of organized crime," it did not and it cannot fire bullets, <sup>to</sup> that "nature" and ~~if~~ "the public perception" of the mafia could be any worse, ~~that~~ that is hard to imagine. Except for the Blakeys who lack proof of what <sup>say they</sup> they believe, <sup>they</sup> not even a reasonable expectation of truth and <sup>they</sup> certainly have preserved a deliberate ignorance of it, from the House assassins report <sup>and</sup> from ~~wh~~ what Blakey writes.

But none of this Blakey <sup>book</sup> ~~paper~~ relates to the crime of the assassination in terms and evidence that can be <sup>examined and</sup> credited.

And, <sup>his</sup> the total ignorance of what <sup>became</sup> public when the FBI disclosed it to me in those FOIA lawsuits is a sufficient Blakey certification of not only his ignorance but of his personal determination to preserve that ignorance and not let it be tainged by a word of the available official evidence that he does not mention in this book. ~~To~~ which it should be added that he deliberately avoided an enormous amount of that evidence. <sup>official evidence</sup>

Just stop and think of ~~it~~ this a moment. There is an abundance of the official evidence of the assassination, evidence that is ~~very~~ basic in the crime, and was officially suppressed, and <sup>when</sup> it is freely available to Blakey, he ignores about half of it and instead fools around with mafia records, his hangup from his days in the Department of Justice organized crime world and, dreaming a dream like a schoolboy imagining a story, he runs an official investigation and writes this book without citation of a single word of that evidence which proves Oswald was not the assassin.

But if Blakey had not ignored that, he could not have invented what he calls "connections" and are no such thing but even if they were, they would involve the mafia by means of two ~~connect~~ "connections" we have seen are no such thing. Oswald had no real connection with Ferrie and Ferrie's connection was not with Marcello but with one of the many lawyers Marcello used.

Thus it is that ~~in~~, like a schoolboy, in faking his non-existing case, Blakey has to ignore the actual evidence relating to Oswald, which exculpates him, and just begins with the <sup>in</sup> <sup>that</sup> ~~assumption~~ ~~that~~ Oswald was the assassin.

And that, as we have seen, became national policy as soon as Ruby eliminated any trial by killing Oswald.

This means that Blakey has to turn his imagination to Ruby, as he does..

~~And~~ that how he became a professor of law at Norte Dame, by <sup>what</sup> ~~doing~~ all lawyers are not supposed to do.

All of which became his with a simple request of the FBI, all of it having been disclosed to me and then was automatically available to anyone.

I do not have access to <sup>my</sup> the records now but what <sup>Blakey</sup> he ~~ignored~~ and instead wasted his time and resources on his mafia hangup comes to well over a hundred thousand pages and I think more than a hundred and fifth thousand <sup>and</sup> pages-on the assassination in the FBI's files, not on the mafia.

And, as we see, after his examination of all that irrelevant mafia tripe, so far as the assassination is concerned, <sup>Blakey</sup> he has not a word of it that he can quote-or even cite - in his book.

Neither here nor anywhere else <sup>N</sup> or at any time since the assassination have I hidden or disguised my opinion that it was not by the mafia or for it. But in fairness to those who may believe that my references to and citation of the widely-ignored official evidence can be taken as prejudice, I report that after reading this chapter to page 25<sup>9</sup> I added a note to the margin of page 180 reading, "What does ~~this~~ any of this have to do with the assassination? Not a thing! And page after page of it all with not a thing connecting the mafia to the assassination. And no connection with the assassination <sup>or any</sup> official investigation. Only propaganda for the preconception?"

If there is now any contradiction of this opinion it will surface <sup>2</sup> as we proceed to page 59. It is at that page that Blakey's photographs <sup>begin</sup> appear,

And until we get there I'll wonder what Blakey's "sharp focus" on his organizer crime involvement might be, there having been no report of it elsewhere and there being no sharp focus on any assassination fact in his book to this point.

There is no such sharp focus on page 180. Some unrelated generalities about some of the mafia figures of the past, their acceptability in New York City, things like that. This is followed by a quotation from Alice in Wonderland in which Humpty Dumpty is quoted as saying that when he uses a word it means what he ~~uses~~<sup>chooses</sup> it to mean. Blakey then says you can substitute organized crime for humpty Dumpty because that is their way with words. *(as it also is Blakey's way.)* His subheading ~~to~~<sup>on what</sup> begins at the bottom of <sup>h</sup>this page and extends onto page 189 is "The National Awakening." That refers to what he wants to say about organized crime but not to the assassination.

In it he <sup>7</sup>quotes what a number of prominent people said about organized crime, to the Kefauver committee of the United States Senate, which conducted a related investigation, to several books, but nothing really new and not a word about the assassination or of any organized crimes <sup>with</sup> connection ~~at~~ it.

As he continues with his dissertation on his version of organized crime his next section is titled "The Appalachian Meeting" (pages 189-191). A little more about the history of the mafia but not a word along the line of Blakey's promise at the opening of this long chapter. It is followed by his continuation of that history, the next subhead being "Robert F. Kennedy and the McClellan Committee" (pages 191-195). More history, well-known history but not a word about the assassination or nor is there any of that promised "Sharp focus." Then there is more of the ~~xxx~~ history of the mob made so public by Robert Kennedy, the subsection titled "The Kennedy Organized Crime Program" (pages 195-200). There are few people alive who had TVs or looked at newspapers who were not aware of what Blakey here repeats, again with no mention of assassination and with no "sharp focus."

Blakey's next subsection was also well publicized before he started this writing. His title for it is "Joseph Valachi in perspective" (pages 200-201). More well-known history and nothing relating to the assassination or anything <sup>that</sup> can be or contribute to that missing "sharp ~~and~~ focus."

Still more of that well-known history that required no House investigation for the writing, which could have been done from the very extensive contemporaneous reporting, "The Investigation of James R. Hoffa" (pages 201-204) followed by "The Death of James R. Hoffa" (pages 204-208), again what was very well reported contemporaneous. It was so well reported that a New York Times reporter who was supposed to be visiting me phoned me from the Florida west coast to tell me he had been rushed ~~to~~ there to see Hoffa's body floating ~~pass~~ encased in concrete. But Blakey, like the rest of us, knows nothing about Hoffa's death. His title, if he <sup>care</sup> ~~care~~ about accuracy, should have <sup>said</sup> ~~said~~ that Hoffa disappeared and was presumed dead. But still again, nothing new. More mafia history, *still all entirely unrelated.*

Next Blakey has "The FBI Electronic Surveillance Program" (pages 208-210). ~~Again~~ rehash and that is a surprise when it is remembered that instead of getting the assassination records he did not have - even though I had made them public - Blakey got about a hundred and fifth thousand pages of FBI mafia records, long on ~~xxxxxxx~~ their transcripts of taped mafia conversations, and Blakey finds <sup>so</sup> ~~now~~ <sup>little</sup> of that worth including in his short section?

"Charles Luciano: 1896-1962 (pages 210-222) is more history with more names but still nothing about the assassination and no "sharp focus" of any kind that can relate to the supposed subject of

this book. True also of the next section, "Vito Genovese" (pages 222-228). More of the history of the mafia, none of it unknown and none of it re-related to the assassination or providing any of that ~~but still missing~~ promised ~~of~~ "sharp focus."

"Havana Gambling" (pages 228-30 adds to the ~~same~~ unsecret mafia history with the same omissions.

Less than a page (page 231) is devoted to "Santo Trafficante." More history but ~~not~~ much less of it.

It is followed by "The Federal Narcotics Program", which takes up three lines more than a page (pages 231-2) and is more of the same and has the same omissions.

The <sup>one</sup> comes "The National Structure of Organized Crime" (pages 233-236). But even though here Blakey finally uses a few lines from those FBI intercepts, not a thing that he promised and no ~~any~~ connection with the assassination.

It is <sup>quite</sup> closer in "Organized Crime and Kennedy (before Dallas)" (pages 236-240). Here again some of those mafia intercepts, beginning with one reported earlier in the Jack Anderson syndicated newspaper column. A Philadelphia thug says that the President should be killed. Far from the only such belief, even longing. This section includes a few more expressions of that desire, that the President be killed. But still again, no "sharp focus" and no connection with the actual assassination.

"Carlos Marcello" (pages 240-247) continues with Blakey's history of the mafia in this country. Marcello's history is a little different in that the government forced him into exile, with no court proceeding. Here also Blakey has another threat against the President. It was from a man Blakey does not fully identify, <sup>an</sup> an FBI informer named Edward Becker. Becker was <sup>duping</sup> doubling, being <sup>thr</sup> thr

Or, in fact, any kind of focus on it. Blakey stays away from the fact of the assassination, here and throughout,



A prime source for a crime book by a successful writer of them, Ed Reid. The <sup>hotter</sup> better the stuff Becker gave Reid, the better the income from the book. What Reid published that supposedly came from bureau files quoting Becker <sup>who attributed it to Marcello,</sup> is that the President should be killed because if Bobby were killed "the President would use the Army and the Marines to get them" (page 245). The FBI gave me the report of its interview with its fink Becker after he left Marcello and nothing like that is in it.

Reid quotes Becker, not any FBI report.

And that is the myth that the President was killed to end Bobby's campaign against the mafia. Only it did not work that way. Bobby remained attorney general and he remained hot after the mafia. But at least there <sup>is a fictional</sup> reference to the assassination in this <sup>connection,</sup> fiction.

"Sam ~~Giancana~~ Giancana 1908- 1975" (pages 247- 52) is next and in his unrelated history but for some reason Blakey does not go into the fact that the CIA got Giancana, and two other mafia thugs to try to assassinate JFK. They did not get the job done and after another try with them the CIA cancelled out,

"Organized Crime and Political Power" is next (pages 252-256), more history and no relevance. Then comes "Organized Crime and Kennedy (after Dallas)" (pages 256-259). It reports nothing on the assassination and provides nothing that reasonable people can <sup>10A</sup> consider a "sharp focus" on the assassination. <sup>17</sup> Perhaps Blakey believed his book in which he has the mafia involved in the assassination, <sup>one felt that he</sup> needed what portrays the mafia as bad guys, but ~~if~~ there is any other reason for all this history of the mafia it is not apparent.

In all of those pages, all of those words, there is no <sup>connection</sup> ~~link~~ of

any kind between the mafia and the assassination.

*And in fact none*  
~~So~~ there is ~~not~~ except in ~~Blayle~~ Blakey's mind.

*no*  
 It is conspicuous that ~~the~~ experienced lawyer, this organized crime investigator, after heading the House assassins committee that was supposed to investigate that assassination, has not a word on ~~the~~ *the crime* nuts and bolts of it in his book.

And how in the world he can write about the assassination and even suggest who was behind that crime without any real evidence of the crime perhaps he can answer, but ~~there~~ there is not a word of this in his book.

This attitude and his void<sup>2</sup> permeate all of the book, as we have seen and will see more. It extends even to the photographs Blakey ~~choise~~ choice to include in his book. There are a <sup>m/</sup> number of the mafia thugs, a couple for <sup>or</sup> smaltz and otherwise, <sup>More is</sup> not ~~a~~ one that connects anyone, <sup>u</sup> particularly mafias, to the assassination. /

In Blakey's selection of the picture<sup>u</sup> for his book we should be able to see and we are entitled to believe that

112  
They ~~that~~ are the pictures Blakey considers relevant to or important in his book that is supposed to convince people that the mafia was involved in or behind the assassination of President Kennedy? <sup>not a single picture does</sup>

that, On page 261 it is a partly ~~shaded~~ shadowed picture of John and Robert Kennedy at the Los Angeles convention which nominated John.

Page 262 is of some of the Kennedys declining the Capitol Steps after viewing the body, with President <sup>& Johnson</sup> and some of his people at the top of those long steps.

Page 263 is a picture of the funeral cortege as it crosses the Memorial bridge on its way <sup>to</sup> Arlington cemetery.

The top of page 264 <sup>shows</sup> ~~displays~~ B Ruby shooting Oswald and the bottom is an outside view of Ruby's joint.

The top of page 265 is of Ruby <sup>holding the</sup> ~~holding the~~ microphone on the stage in his joint.

The bottom photograph on that page is of Mickey Cohen and the stripped, Candy Barr. <sup>caption</sup> The caption does not say what the arrangements of the picture suggests, that the Cohen/Barr photo was taken in Ruby's <sup>drive</sup> ~~drive~~.

The top of page 266 ~~shows~~ <sup>photo</sup> expert Mark Weiss testifying about the acoustic study. The bottom of the page is a <sup>photo</sup> ~~photo~~ of Warren Commission. <sup>On the next page is a motion picture of the arrival with</sup> Six small photos of ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~noyote~~ <sup>noyote</sup> ~~vide~~ <sup>vide</sup> as below it.

On page 258 the top half shows Robert Kennedy sitting with the chairman of the McClellan committee. The bottom half is of the Kefauver committee.

Jimmy Hoffa testifying before the McClellan committee is the top half of Page 269. The bottom half is of Joseph Valachi.

The top half of page 270 is of Tom Dewey taking an oath. The bottom half is one Luciano and one of <sup>200 of his</sup> ~~his~~ madams.



14  
no connection between any of the people in these entirely unrelated picture<sup>s</sup> and ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> assassination except that the President was assassinated. But there is no evidence of any kind, not even a legitimate basis for any wild susp<sup>icion</sup>, that any of these thugs in the pictures ~~other than themselves killed killed or had~~ anything to do with the killing of the President.

Not, <sup>except</sup> when Blakey does not allege that Sirhan Sirhan was of the mafia, does he even have a legiti<sup>m</sup>ate basis for including that picture.

Blakey "myth<sup>s</sup> AND "folklore" <sup>are</sup> clear enough, in his ~~writing~~ <sup>writing</sup> and in this kind of photographic irrelevancy- except perhaps as his own "myth" and "folklore," but <sup>that</sup> it has no place in responsible writing that is supposedly on the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and Blakey's baseless argument that it ~~was a nazi job or~~ in some way was <sup>o</sup> connected with the mafia.

Of which he ~~had~~ has nothing not lauhable <sup>c</sup> to now.

In addition to this preposterous nonsense about his non-existing popular misunder<sup>standing</sup> of the mafia because of popular myth<sup>s</sup> and folklore, a comment of which a self-respecting scholar or just an honest writer should be ashamed, this chapter is mistitled, with the title propaganda, not responsible-or even honest-writing. The title is "Organized Crime in Perspective." In this book or in any other ~~book~~ making the same pretenses, the ~~persp~~ perspective had to ~~refer~~ at least relate to the assassination and Blakey has not a thing on that. Not a single real fact. Not a single reasonable conjecture, if there could be this ~~persp~~ perspective " from mere conjecture.

Before going on, and we cannot do that a bit too soon when this is the kind of ~~stomach-turner~~ <sup>stomach-turner</sup> ~~stomach-turner~~ turned out by the former head of

45  
that House investigation that was so well funded, so generously staffed and so widely supported. It will ease stomachs and perhaps, who can tell, with more of this intellectual skill ahead, can ease troubled minds a bit. Minds that hold any actual knowledge about the assassins at all, minds that can perceive what makes no sense at all, can stand to be eased as Americans are concerned about what none of their leaders has yet told them was a coup d'etat:

Blakey has three more chapters. The first two are what Blakey says he means by "reconsidering" and the third, (of also) argument rather than fact, his version of his plot to kill the president. So, with this Blakey's fact, as we have seen it is not, this is an appropriate point for further comment

For one thing, and this relates to all inquiry and writing in support of the assassination mythology which is ~~just~~<sup>what</sup> all version of the official story is, basic is the Katzenbach memo we have seen in its full text, even in its handwriting original of so short a period of after Oswald was killed. Which means as soon as it was appreciated that there would be no trial at which evidence would be produced, examined and cross-examined.

We have no way of knowing who did know of this <sup>policy</sup> and who did not but in all the many accounts in support of the official assassination line I have never seen one which violated it. If all had been given that memo of instructions, if all had been told that the President approved it, which made it national policy the early night of the day Oswald was killed, it could not have been abided by more totally.

It was followed as though it were the basic law of the land.

As we have seen, Blakey did have a copy. As we have also seen, he made use of all the provisions except the one he did not articulate

and still abided by as though he had been compelled to.

This, of course, is dishonest, grossly, intendedly, knowingly dishonest. It also was dishonest of him to quote the other provisions of that memo/national policy ~~except~~ <sup>and suppress</sup> the one that was most important, the one he knew about and did not quote and the one he abided by when he controlled the House assassins committee and still abides by in his book a decade after his investigation.

Blakey knew of the CIA's plotting with the mafia to get Kennedy assassinated but he made no mention of that. Even though his book and his long-held belief is that the mafia was involved, which he makes no case for at all.

Yet he discloses no indication at all of having obtained from the United Nations what Cuba was making public there with regularity. He knew that some of those who claimed knowledge were talking, that some of them were in TV, yet he discloses no interest in speaking to any one of them or of any interest to speak to even a single one of them.

I knew two who were willing to talk and who could be informative. Alberto Fowler One, when I knew him, was in a responsible job in New Orleans and although he had a light accent, was quite articulate and well informed. I do not recall that he told me of any of those plots. The other, of Canadian birth, spoke accentless English. His father owned the farm next to Castro's father's farm and they were friends as boys.

Both were veterans of the Bay of Pigs. Lethbridge was with Castro when one of those plots barely failed. He told me about it.

There was a convoy, partly or entirely of jeeps. They took a rest stop and soon after they started up again the jeep in which Castro had been before the rest stop got a direct hit from an ambush.

But Castro had shifted to another jeep, so he survived without

Switching jeeps is all that saved Castro that time.

What else they or other Bay of Pigs veterans knew of could have known Blakey does not report making the slightest effort to know.

Blakey knew about some of those plots that were public and he writes a little about them but leaves out the mafia involvement in them when this is supposedly a book on the mafia plotting to assassinate Kennedy. *As the government several times contracted with them through Robert Maheu.*

Phyllis McGuire, mentioned several times by Blakey, was indirectly the cause of the exposure of the first of those CIA+mafia plots but Blakey does not mention ~~that~~ *that first* ~~one~~ *assassinate Castro plot* was authorized by President <sup>brought</sup> Eisenhower just before he left office, which it to say with the intention that Kennedy be held responsible for his criminal activity which could have <sup>begun</sup> ~~been~~ a chain of them. The second one,

according to disclosed official records, was the CIA's own ~~idea~~ *idea* and was without any authorization.

Sam Gancana, also no stranger to Blakey's book, was having an affair with that one of the well-known McGuire sisters, all singers. *with another prominent man Dan Martin* When he suspected that she was two-timing him he asked the former FBI agent who the ~~had~~ *had* his own privacy, Keogh, to find out for him. The agent of the hired firm, James Balletti, was ~~caught~~ *caught* wiring Dan Martin's Vegas room for sound. When he told the sheriff that ~~if~~ *if* he went down ~~xxxxx~~ he's not go a lone the sheriff <sup>if</sup> brought the FBI in and Balletti spilled his gits <sup>u exposing</sup> ~~in~~ that mafia plot. I have the FBI files on that, as Blakey could have-should have had. But instead he leaves all of that out, the first bit of realism in all this sordid tale.

Before Blakey's House assassins committee existed, President Johnson had several times referred to CIA efforts against Castro and some were, again before that <sup>was</sup> ~~committee~~ *committee* existed, public knowledge (Pick Up with Kurler, Inc in Carib.)



I remember it clearly enough but for a combination of reasons I cannot <sup>now</sup> quite and cite the FBI document <sup>in</sup> that is my source. This inability has two causes.

The first is that all the <sup>e/</sup>records obtained through FOIA are at Hood College, where they will, when prepared, be a permanent public archives. The second is that the file of duplicates that I had <sup>in a bin</sup> on my desk, near our copier, was burglarized rather systematically.

It was always a disappointment when those who wanted copies and could have made their copies on our machine, with no charge, instead stole them. That had the effect of denying copies, even access, to others.

What had happened is that shortly after news of what Jim Garrison was up to in New Orleans, Jack Anderson, who then had one of the top columnists went down to New Orleans to see him. As were many of us, Anderson was very impressed by Garrison and in his return talked to a number of people. He was referred around until he saw the assistant to the FBI director, Cartha DeLoach. After that DeLoach phoned his White House contact, Marvin Watson, and after listening to DeLoach Watson told him that just the night before Johnson had told him that, and these are pretty much ~~the~~ exact words, that we were operating a Murder, Incorporated in the Caribbean, and that the CIA was part of it.

In DeLoach's report, which was to get to Hoover, DeLoach reported that he would inform Watson of anything new but they had told him of the exposed CIA-Mafia plot, the first of them and ~~the~~ one that Blakey here omits although he knew of it.

There ~~is~~ more that is known, was disclosed on this, that Blakey, consistently, suppresses, more on that same subject, <sup>for</sup>

to Robert Kennedy

There is the CIA's account of of that dismal failure. It was written by Sheffield Edwards and was forwarded by the CIA's then general counsel, Larry Houston. The Department of Justice disclosed it to ~~me~~ <sup>and the CIA</sup> as it assuredly would have to Blakey but he either did not bother to get it or <sup>he</sup> ignored it, either alternative indicating he had a higher <sup>fr</sup> of the factless fiction he made up ~~and is the~~ supposed ~~subject~~ subject of his book. C

He could have had access to the copies and he could also have had access to that information as I used it, often meaning made sense of what was scattered widely in the original files. I used it in a number of manuscripts, including what

~~Also use CIA memo to Bobby?~~

There is much of this that I obtained in all those FOIA lawsuits but by then I was severely handicapped and did not have access to most of my records because use of the basement stairs, first difficult and dangerous for me, became impossible. However, I remember that some of the withheld evidence all of which was accessible to Blakey and all of which he should have had and used in his supposed examination of the assassination. <sup>1184</sup> AS I used it from here, Blakey also should have gotten it, <sup>that</sup> which presented no problems to him, and used it, as I did. Among the books in this series I believe I used some of that evidence in ~~are the books~~ I wrote about Sy Hersh and his book, Faking Kennedy: with Hersh-It Journalism (John?) Riebling's Wedge: How the FBI Caused the JFK Assassination; The Castro Kickback: Live by The Sword; mad Travesty and Tragedy, a critique of John Newman's Oswald and the CIA.

Much has been written about this, particularly about efforts to assassinate Castro and supposed retaliation but very little of it has included what is not congenial to the preconceptions with which those writers began, preconception not uncongenial to the official line, which is the approved national policy first expressed in writing in that Katzenbach memo we have seen.