


Case 19: How to Analyze Cover-ups-- JFK Assassination Example





JFK warned of a covert group taking over America from within. He said that it is our duty to expose it (please watch the 10-minute video **JFK Speech--A WARNING TO ALL PEOPLE** at www.youtube.com/watch?v=YjVD1s0BamQ , <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UEGLTyYjVjE> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HVqvCuOwpZU> , <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HH-eC4LgZT4> ,). Please see the 8-minute clip of quotes by many famous people who confirmed JFK's warning of a covert group taking over America from within at **Money-David Rockefeller, Henry Kissinger and more** at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Da1TUeuLIaE> .



‘Daddy Bush Attacks JFK "Conspiracy Theorists"'

Former President triumphs Warren Commission at Ford's funeral;

See <http://www.propagandamatrix.com/articles/january2007/030107daddybush.htm> .

<i>Preface: Why Does Bush, Sr. Insist You Believe Lies?</i>	5
<i>How to Investigate a Crime Based on the Cover-up of It</i>	9
<i>The Warren Commission--Was President Johnson Planning a Coverup Committee?</i>	14
<i>Why Does the Warren Commission Have Rambo Force Coverup Power? Did Johnson pick people for the Warren Commission whom he could count on to cover-up the truth? 24</i>	
<i>Who Put the White Supremacist Who Approved of Lynching on the Warren Commission?</i>	30
<i>Who Appointed that Specialist in Pardoning War Criminals to the Warren Commission?</i>	33
<i>What Did Rockefeller and the Forerunner of KBR Have to Do with It?</i>	40
<i>Did Two Directors of CIA Help Murder JFK to Get Vietnam War Profits?</i>	44
<i>The Clark Report: Why Did LBJ Order the Autopsy Team 5 Years Too Late?</i>	47
<i>What? Was Nixon a Conspirator In It Too?</i>	49


<i>How Did Ford and Rockefeller Get Into the White House?</i>	53
<i>Did Rockefeller Plan to Protect His Tool, the CIA, from Harm?</i>	56
<i>Three JFK Assassination Item Inside CIA in Plain View</i>	65
<i>Did Frank Sturgis Rape that Under Age Girl in Dallas to ‘Blow Off Steam’?</i>	69
<i>A Public Photo Album on Picasa From a Man Who Was Friends with Sturgis</i>	78
<i>Did Nixon Use of Those Particular CIA Thugs for a Reason?</i>	94
<i>Did Reagan’s Role in the Coverup Earn Him the Presidency?</i>	95
<i>House Select Committee on Assassinations</i>	99

Preface: Why Does Bush, Sr. Insist You Believe Lies?


The CIA coined the term “Conspiracy Theory” and disseminated propaganda to make it a derogatory term. They intended to discredit witnesses of their crimes by labeling them as “Conspiracy Theory” crazies. That propaganda largely succeeded.

"The individual is handicapped by coming face to face with a conspiracy so monstrous he cannot believe it exists." ---J. Edgar Hoover, former head of the FBI

It is my hope that one day everyone will be a remote viewer able to make excellent educated guesses about who is plotting wars. Then they could also collect the evidence of the official lies faster. That way societies could avoid falling prey to them. If my wishes came true, then everyone reading these pages would come to accept their God given intuition.



Almost every event recorded in history books is due to a conspiracy. Every election is a conspiracy in so much as politicians rarely tell the public the whole truth. Essential details of which bankers are running them behind the scenes and what they really intend to do when in office are omitted. The voter usually discovers the lies only after the election and then is unable to rescind their vote. Wars are the result of small groups of men getting together to plot mass murder. Groups of men do that with regularity.



The wife of Mayer Amschel Rothschild, Gutle Schnaper, said, “If my sons did not want wars, there would be none”. (See the 5-minute clip **THE ROTHSCHILDS** at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fXVJzXsraX4>.) Perhaps she was right. Perhaps the person claiming that the Rockefellers were the American agents of the Rothschilds were right too. Some people claim that there is a Jewish banking conspiracy that started WWI. After extensive reading in the Rockefeller Archives, I agree that there was a conspiracy to cause WWI and WWII involving bankers. But I did not find them to be practicing Judaism as their religion of belief. They were practicing greed and death worship, not the worship of our One God.

It is not possible to worship both Money and God at the same time.



I also did not find convincing evidence that the Nazis were dedicated to eliminating all Jews because wealthy “Jewish bankers” were destroying Germany. The Nazis often left the wealthy Jews in place after accepting big bribes. They liquidated the wealth and bodies of the middle class and poor Jews. Thus, it seemed to me that they were also practicing greed and death worship, not worship of our shared One God.

The Nazis claimed to be Christians. But, I would no more judge all Christians by their behavior, than I would judge all Jews by the behavior of the greedy, death worship bankers who might claim to be Jewish.

It is frankly silly to judge a group of people by a few criminals among them. No one makes the mistake to think that all Italians are Mafia just because some are and commit murder. And it is equally absurd to think that all Republicans are the same, or all Democrats. Or that all Muslims are terrorists. When our leaders kill others, they are terrorists or murderers also, according to whether many innocent people died, or just one.



British historian Taylor said that the motive of war is always economic. Killing leaders is usually too. They rarely die of jealous lovers or fired employees. And when they die of so-called random violence, there is usually a 'hidden hand' that compelled them.

As I read through the minutes of the "Cook the Intelligence" Committee, I realized that what I really needed to see was its secret files to understand why it was spending about 30% of its time in long-standing cover-ups. 30% of its time over a 10-year period was a lot, especially since the 8 or so active members of the committee were high up in the Dept. of Intelligence. Frankly, I had trouble understanding how it could take 10 years to deal with a problem, even a major problem. WWII had lasted only about 5 years and the same for WWI. So, it boggled my mind that they had spent 10 years at these cover-ups without resolving the problem.



Some people will undoubtedly say to me--but that is the nature of cover-ups--they last until everyone guilty is dead. I was not a person who believed that problems could not be solved. Many times I had been asked by the DCI to work on a CIA debacle that had spun out of control into major blow back. As far as I could tell that was probably why I had been given the title of Special Operations Advisor to the DCI, because I had managed to correct some very bad messes the CIA made. The CIA usually did not bring me such a case until they had tried every other option. That was because they did not much like the way I corrected things, even though they acknowledged that what I did worked. They did not like what I did because they feared "all Hell would break loose" if anyone actually told the fundamental truths about the CIA, or the operation that caused the blow back. But telling the truth and correcting the injustices,

is precisely what is needed to correct the aftermath of a black op. People at the CIA usually thought that the US could not survive, if the truth was told about what the CIA really had done. But in fact, the public and the country are more harmed by the lies, than by the truth. The real reason that they resisted as much as possible the truth being told was because of their selfishness. They did not want the public to know how they had stolen their power to govern themselves, their privacy, their rights, and their moneys.



When I looked in the committee's file on the JFK assassination, I learned that they were trying to destroy the loose ends in the case without having any clear idea what they were. That is, suppose for a moment that one thought that a cover-up could succeed and was ethical to accomplish. Then one would start with the truth of the crime and try to prevent that truth from being published in the media, etc. The Committee's files did not have a clear picture of the who were the conspirators and what they had done. Furthermore, they had little idea of what had been done beforehand to try to cover it up. It was thus clear that the guilty parties were preventing the Committee from having the information they needed to do an effective cover-up. That meant that their were guilty parties over their heads preventing them from having

that information. It was not just that the information that they needed had been shredded already. I knew of 3 pieces of evidence inside the CIA which were almost in plain view. The guilty parties were clearly not roaming inside the CIA often. Or they would have insisted that those 3 item be hidden or destroyed. I will tell you about the 3 items in a minute. First, I want to finish giving you the framework free of specific details. It is important to learn how to look at the structure of a problem. Otherwise, you remain easy to fool through distraction, such as the planting of red herring false details. So, on these pages I am trying to train you how to do that by modeling it over and over again. It is possible to solve a crime by focusing just on the cover-up and who is doing it. They rarely try to cover-up the cover-up. That leaves a lot of truth flapping in the news to expose the guilty.

How to Investigate a Crime Based on the Cover-up of It



We will just be looking at the coverup, not the details of the assassination. The contents of coverup reports are designed to skillfully mislead you. Why waste your time reading propoganda and lies? So, we are only judging the report and actions as either satisfactory at being an effective, transparent, honest, and enthusiastic effort to get to the truth or not. It usually takes only a few minutes to figure that out. If the actions do not not meet that standard of excellence, then there is a cover-up. Forget the excuses given and just focus on the result.

It is the duty of the officials in the government and the press to give the public in a

democracy **the whole truth and nothing but the truth**. National Security requires almost no secrecy. Only a few things like launch/security codes, the names of personnel, military-intelligence protocols/facilities, hardware/software details, the “tools of the trade”, etc. should not be published. When the CIA negotiated an intelligence sharing agreement with the Chinese and Russians in 2004 to fight against terrorism, that was the information the CIA decided could not be shared. 98% of the so-called “National Security” secrecy in the US is jut to cover up the misdeeds of officials and CEOs. Only about 1% of the population is paranoid and may not be taking their prescribed anti-psychotic medication. The rest of the paranoia in a society is usually well grounded in specific historical injustices; the US really does run black ops. When more than a few percent of the well-informed public does not feel satisfied with the government’s explanation it is likely there is a coverup. Once you have determined that a coverup occurred, then keep track of every action that furthered that coverup, who did it, and who profited from it.



To discover who is doing the coverup look for;

- 1) who benefited from the crime(s),
- 2) dereliction of duty to investigate effectively,
- 3) dereliction of duty to ensure others investigate well,
- 4) secrecy or bogus claims of National Security needs,
- 5) slow release or destruction of evidence,
- 6) intimidation or killing of witnesses,
- 7) “trust us” language,
- 8) the creation of cover stories or changing stories,
- 9) who is printing the propaganda or telling the lies,
- 10) media bias and who the media is quoting when biased,
- 11) media blackouts and who it serves,
- 12) and claims of incompetence or excuses.

Bush: "I don't think anyone could have anticipated the breach of the levees."



Beyond Incompetence

Forget incompetence as an excuse. Incompetence is the result of someone allowing it. They are allowing it in order to cover something else up. That is true because at the top of every political structure are bankers. They do not get or stay bankers by being incompetent. Bankers only allow so-called incompetence in their politicians, when it is in their interests to do so. That is, when it serves to cover-up their crimes.

[Note: There is oil under New Orleans. See Spike Lee's “**The Day the Levee's Broke**”.]



Forget ideology, political parties, brands, and labels of all kinds. Those are red herrings used to divide people so that they can be fooled.

It is a reasonable first step to form the hypothesis that those responsible for the coverup are covering up the crimes of themselves or their co-conspirators


The principles of such an investigation are;

- 1) Look at the big picture--the power structure--and avoid getting lost in the details.
- 2) Start as high up in the power structure as you have data for to avoid wasting time and effort. Look for the highest responsible parties, not the fall guys and patsies.
- 3) Who benefitted in terms of increased power such as a promotion?
- 4) Who benefitted in terms of being in a position to get kickbacks?
Assume that kickbacks are occurring, until proven otherwise, as 90% of the time you will be right. Then look for the evidence in terms of past scandals, associations with lobbyists, living high off the hog, making decisions that favored bankers or corporations at the expense of the poor or working class, etc..
- 5) Examine the behavior of people to determine whether they carried out their duties honestly and effectively to serve the public good.
- 6) When they deviated from doing so, list the likely one or two motivations which would cause that particular kind of deviation. That motivation is a hypothesis you are making, not a fact, until it is confirmed. However, when a person is a banker, the motivation of money can be taken for a fact based on their choice of profession. The motivation of a politician is often power.
- 7) Assume money is the motive, until proven otherwise. But don't forget blackmail.
- 8) Count each deviation from the common good as a piece of the evidence.
- 9) Make hypotheses and check them by looking for other evidence that confirms or discredits it.
- 10) This method could convince you that a person committed one crime, when they are trying to cover-up another crime.
- 11) Don't hesitate to write the person and politely demand that they do the right thing. Then use their response, or lack thereof, as another piece of data.
- 12) Create new methods and solutions.
- 13) Network with small groups of trusted friends. Immediately exclude troublemakers.
- 14) Use your suspicions to provoke investigations. Don't just be passive victims. Train in active non-violent resistance. Use wisdom, not hatred. Use a Higher Power, as needed. Be brave and make a difference.



15) Membership in the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), Tri-lateral Commission, or a secret society such as Skull and Bones means that the person is seeking power, and probably wealth as well, at the expense of the public's power in a democracy to decide. Note that Clinton, Kerry, and both Bushes are members of Skull and Bones. Since the voter had no choice in the Presidential Elections but to vote for a member of Skull and Bones. That is often the case in terms of only having members of the CRF or close associates of the CRF to vote for. The CRF was started by the Rockefeller Family in order to ensure their dominance in US politics and foreign affairs that favored their financial interests. Those financial interests included destroying worker's rights to fair wages, safe jobs with real OSHA protection, national health coverage, a clean environment, and a world without war profiteering. By

making it so that only candidates with huge financial backing can get the nomination, the voters were deprived of a choice to get out from underneath agendas to which that they never agreed. The voters allow that by being passive.




They allowing the TV news and the Mainstream Media to form their ideas of what is really happening. Most people spend 2 to 3 hours a day allowing the powers-that-be to in effect brainwash them. You can choose to get out of that brainwashing by making a little extra effort to find and use non-commercial sources for your news and even entertainment. People have lost their connection to their families and friends through having the TV or radio always on. The thing that the CIA is most afraid of citizens doing is discussing events with friends and deciding to take action like the Quakers do. So, the news supplies you with a fake discussion of the news to steer your opinions and fill that need for discussion. See Bill Moyers: 'Journalism in Profound Crisis' (Video) <http://www.alternet.org/mediaculture/87376/>

Look for non-commercial sources of news like; <http://www.alternet.org/> , www.buzzflash.com , etc.



The lone gunman theory is not credible per a physician who examined JFK's body in the ER.



Reviewers at Amazon.com wrote of this book;


“1) He [Dr. Crenshaw] states that shortly after the assassination, the Dallas Police mobile phones went dead, the electricity and telephones for the book depository went out, and that the phone lines for a large section of Washington, D.C. went out of service.... He also states that the bullet wound in the neck of the president was an entry wound. ...

The Warren Commission based their conclusion on an "illustration" of JFK's wounds, not actual autopsy photos. The illustration later turns out to be extremely inaccurate.

2) Chuck Crenshaw was a friend of mine at Parkland Hospital. We both were there at the time of the assassination. We were both residents in general surgery. He was in the trauma room with Kennedy. ...The facts he related were identical to those of all the other physicians who were in attendance. They were all friends of mine and I knew them well. I heard what each of

them had to say moments after the ordeal. They all saw the same wounds which were described by Dr. Crenshaw. The things seen at Parkland and reported by all these doctors are clear evidence of a conspiracy... Another good book is "Best Evidence." It is more thorough.”


The Warren Commission--Was President Johnson Planning a Coverup Committee?



Thus, we know that the Warren Commission is a coverup because JFK had been shot from in front in the neck, not just from behind.

The Warren Commission was appointed by President Johnson and wikipedia lists its members as;


- [Earl Warren](#), Chief Justice of the United States;
- [Richard Russell, Jr.](#), U.S. Senator from [Georgia](#);
- [John Sherman Cooper](#), U.S. Senator from [Kentucky](#);
- [Hale Boggs](#), U.S. Representative from [Louisiana](#);
- [Gerald R. Ford](#), U.S. Representative from [Michigan](#);
- [Allen W. Dulles](#), former [Director of Central Intelligence](#)
- [John J. McCloy](#), former President of the [World Bank](#).



This is the signature page from the Warren commission.

Now that much is certainly fact in the JFK assassination.

You can't usually look at the body, the bullets, and the police reports yourself. The evidence that you have available for your direct scrutiny is this kind-- the coverup commission's published reports. Even the absence of a commission (or its report being kept secret) is powerful evidence in a crime. I will tell you about JFK assassination evidence of the type that you are used to over several Cases in this series, but you will have no way to verify it. I want to teach you this way to investigate cases, because this method is applicable to other important government cover-ups, including 911 and starting wars, etc. It is something you can do quickly from your own home without any expense except having an internet connection.



We will not be establishing guilt--that is for God to determine or Courts to decide. What we will be doing is collecting facts in the coverup and letting people decide for themselves if they are relevant or not. Clearly, it is inappropriate for us to have as leaders in a democracy those who engage in excessive secrecy, coverups, or war profiteering.

To facilitate that tracking I will be using the following system;




1) Names will be listed by the first 3 letters of the last name, except where a standard alternative like LJB for Lyndon Baines Johnson or JFK for John F. Kennedy exists. Dul on these pages will always refer to former Director of CIA Allen Dulles, not his brother former Secretary of State, John.



- 2) The first number after the name will be the number of times that person took an action that facilitated the cover-up. The number after the “ / “ will connote the number of times or ways the person benefited from the assassination directly. The number after the second “ / ” will be the number of times or ways that the person benefited from an action taken by another person who had taken at least one action relevant to the JFK assassination or its coverup. For example LBJ became President after the death of JFK is a fact stating his direct benefit of gaining power and is listed as the first fact. **LBJ=0/1/0** . Thus, to find all the places that relevant LBJ facts are search on LBJ= using the Find command. Clearly, becoming President does not mean that he plotted to kill JFK. We are not asserting on these pages that any given facts or levels of tallies imply guilt.
- 3) A chart in the Appendix shows the final tallies in some detail.
- 4) I encourage you to seriously consider each fact as we come across it and decide for yourself if it merits your attention, and to keep a tally for yourself of the facts that you considered important.
- 5) Unless otherwise stated, all of the quoted information comes from Wikipedia articles. Since the CIA has exercised some review and censorship of them already, we can hardly be considered on the lunatic fringe when those articles are quoted. See the BBC article Wikipedia 'shows CIA page edits' <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/technology/6947532.stm> . To find a referenced quote such as “Johnson was renowned for ...his arm-twisting of powerful politicians.” do an internet search on part of the text in quotes such as “ his arm-twisting of powerful politicians” and click on the Wikipedia article http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lyndon_B._Johnson . That will allow this text to be less cluttered with links. I am trying to prove to you that you can do a pretty good job of investigating very quickly. One of the other ways to get information quickly is to look at the reviewer’s comments of books on Amazon.com for facts listed in books. Books are not censored as much as the mainstream media. Books by insiders or historians can be especially helpful. For example, I read Mark Lane’s book Plausible Denial: Was the CIA involved in the JFK Assassination? but that information did not appear in the mainstream media. Mark Lane was a lawyer who defended ex-CIA operative Marchetti in a libel suit by ex-CIA

operative E. Howard Hunt. I am traveling out of suitcases in Europe and do not have the books to quote from with me. But the reviewers often restate facts from the books. Ignore any comments or opinions and only focus on facts. The CIA has its staff write negative reviews and add them to keep you from reading certain books. Learn to recognize reviews which are dismissive or derogatory.

Here is a first use of a review comment on Amazon as an example.



The book Breach of Trust: How the Warren Commission Failed the Nation and Why was written by historian McKnight. It can be searched online. First one looks to see if the book was well researched. One reviewer says; "Too many books on the JFK assassination get sidetracked by the many false leads there to tempt sober analysis. This remarkable addition to the literature is unique for its restraint, refusal to indulge in speculation, and careful focus on what can be documented, and no more."

Another says;

"This is a "safe" book, in that there is no speculation (or even examination) of the motives of the WC or possible explanations for the many gaffs pointed out in the committee operations."

A third says;

"Though serious researchers will probably not find anything new in the book as far as information is concerned, the specific angle of the author's research has the immense merit to bring new shine to old data. And the facts, as they say, are stubborn."

The political bias that subverted the WC working is dully detailed and exposed. The ominous poker game between the FBI, the CIA and the Commission regarding crucial elements of the

assassination record is irrefutably documented and takes on even more sinister undertones. ...

The WC, which relied for its investigation on the FBI and the Secret Service, reached a solution to the crime (the single bullet theory) which contradicts the findings of these two agencies (which by the way don't agree either with one another, but that's another story...). ...

The crime was declared "solved" (one shooter, no accomplices) by Hoover a couple of hours after Oswald's arrest. Even surmising that they could have, in such a short time, established beyond doubt that Oswald was the assassin, there is no conceivable way that the FBI could have determined at that point that Oswald had received absolutely no help whatsoever in his endeavor."

See http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0700613900/ref=cm_cr_pr_product_top

So, the book looks meticulously researched. One can then search inside the book to verify the facts of interest, if one has purchased from Amazon before. For example, a search on the word "solved" brought up several references. Clicking on the first brought up several pages of material which confirms that Hoover had declared the crime solved before the commission met. Not only that but not enough time had passed to conduct an investigation. Hoo=1/0/0 It also mentions a key figure Katzenbach.



Wikipedia on Katzenbach confirms the rush to judgement saying;

“In the 1979 account from the [House Select Committee on Assassinations \(HSCA\)](#), it came out that on [November 25, 1963](#), only 3 days after the [John F. Kennedy assassination](#) and before any investigation had been conducted, Nicholas Katzenbach, then deputy [attorney general](#), had written a memo to presidential assistant [Bill Moyers](#) at the [White House](#). Katzenbach's [memo](#) comes the closest of any known official document ([Katzenbach's memo](#)) to discussing a government coverup :

"The public must be satisfied that Oswald was the assassin; that he had no confederates who are still at large; and that evidence was such that he would have been convicted at trial.....We need something to head off public speculation or Congressional hearings of the wrong sort."

Also see the 5-minute video clip Cover-up: The Warren Commission in <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tspWgqJApYA>;

‘Lyndon Johnson admits that the Warren Commission was a fraud, telling Senator Richard Russell in a phone call, "all you're going to do is evaluate a Hoover report he's already made."

See the 1 minute clip Cover up in progress - Phonecall between LBJ and J. Edgar Hoover at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tosw3kKsKDY>

See the RFK Vs. LBJ http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_M9MHPHK-cM&NR=1



The Committee's final report implies Katzenbach, [FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover](#), and others were the key actors behind the creation of the [Warren Commission](#). According to the [report](#), [Hoover](#) told staff members on November 24, 1963 that he and Katzenbach were anxious to have "something issued so we can convince the public that [Oswald](#) is the real assassin," though the idea of a commission was initially opposed by [President Johnson](#)."

Notice that I clipped out excuses for the coverup that were given. It is essential to ignore all excuses and not buy into them. Otherwise, you will believe lie after lie after lie given by those responsible for the coverups. Believing lies will tend to paralyze your mind and prevent you from reaching correct inferences. And that will enslave you to those who want to take advantage of you.

What have we found out so far. LBJ initially opposed the formation of the commission. [LBJ=1/1/0](#) . LBJ intended the Warren Commission to be a coverup and in the call to Hoover says that he will form a commission in order to prevent the Congress from having one outside of his control. [LBJ=2/1/0](#) . That is confirmed in the call to Senator Russell when he tells him that all he has to do on the Commission is review Hoover's Report. [LBJ=3/1/0](#) .

Note: Please forgive me that I have not had the time to continue revising this text to make it consistent with this more refined grading system. In the interests of the public good, before I am kidnapped by the CIA and rendered into endless torture and detention, I have to get this out to Congress immediately. Therefore, you will find that the tallies are too low in the old numbering system below. Maybe someone will be kind enough to correct the tallies on these pages and in the associated Excel file.



[The Warren Commission submitting its report to LBJ. (left to right): John McCloy, J. Lee Rankin (General Counsel), Senator Richard Russell, Congressman Gerald Ford, Chief Justice Earl Warren, President Lyndon Johnson, Allen Dulles, Senator John Sherman Cooper, and Congressman Hale Boggs. See [www.tomflocco.com/ fs/ Bush41RevivesLinks.htm](http://www.tomflocco.com/fs/Bush41RevivesLinks.htm).

“The [Warren Commission](http://www.vintageculture.net/1960s-and-1970s/) asked Americans to accept its conclusions about a lone gunman in the murder of President Kennedy. And some people did.” [www.vintageculture.net/ 1960s-and-1970s/](http://www.vintageculture.net/1960s-and-1970s/)]

Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson (LBJ) was a prime suspect because he became President as a result of JFK’s death. He should have recused himself from the investigation because he had a clearcut vested interest. He did not. Therefore, would a reasonable person consider him a prime suspect twice over? Furthermore, he had a duty to the public to immediately ensure that JFK’s death was properly investigated, openly and professionally, and the truth put before the public. Since the public was not satisfied that they were given the whole truth and nothing but the truth afterwards, he failed in that duty. He twice failed in that duty; he failed again during his 4 years after being elected President in 1965. Would a reasonable person thus consider him a suspect for those 4 reasons?



He was not alone in that failure however. J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the FBI also had that duty. He failed at it immediately, then for 4 years of LBJ's second term. If LBJ was blocking the investigation not himself, you would have expected him to succeed in it in the 2 years he served under Nixon. He failed at it that 3rd time as well. Would a reasonable person consider that 3 points of evidence towards his being involved in the coverup? Note: These pieces of evidence are not circumstantial, like happening to be in the same town as the

murder occurred which a million other people were too. They are deliberate actions taken by those people; failure to give the public all of the relevant information as it became available, failure recuse oneself from appointing the investigators, and failure to ensure a professional investigation. The later two points almost seem contradictory. However, it is possible to allow a truly independent investigation and be critical of their proceedings to ensure a fair and honest result. That did not happen. All the small players in the assassination drama had no ability to coverup the FBI's investigations. Since we are not interested in finding mere fall guys and patsies, we should start the investigation further up. That will allow us to bypass the many red herrings of disinformation or operational cleverness that the plotters would use to confuse and distract us.

The big players in the JFK assassination would likely be those who prevented an effective, thorough, and transparent investigation.

A reasonable person might form a hypothesis that LBJ was guilty of plotting the assassination of JFK. They could then look to see what other actions LBJ took to determine if their hypothesis was confirmed or denied.



[Photo of JFK a few hours before he died. LBJ is standing at the right end of the row behind him. Some people did not like the expression on LBJ's face. That is not evidence--it is highly subjective and does not prove murder in a court of law. Such arguments of guilt based on flimsy or subjective evidence should be avoided. They undermine the credibility of the public's efforts to get to the truth.]

Why Does the Warren Commission Have Rambo Force Coverup Power?

The Warren Commission



Earl Warren



Gerald Ford



Richard Russell



John Cooper



John McCloy



Hale Boggs



Allen Dulles





**Arlen Specter
(Assistant Counsel)**



**David Belin
(Assistant Counsel)**

Did Johnson pick people for the Warren Commission whom he could count on to cover-up the truth?

The people a conspirator could most count on to coverup the JFK evidence would be other conspirators in the assassination. Next would be people whom he had conspired with in other crimes. And then people whom he had blackmailed, bribed, or sworn secret brotherhood. A conspirator would not want a single independent person on the committee because they might finger him for murder. Thus, each person on a cover up commission will likely have a vested interest in not exposing the truth. This is the normal way such investigations operate in government. They are just cover-up committees and one is certain of that when part of their proceedings or reports are secret or obfuscating.



National security in a democracy is best served by giving the public the truth. They can then help ensure the investigations are thorough. That is necessary to make sure that criminals do not become their leaders through committing assassinations. No competing interest in National Security can take precedence over that need to ensure that our leaders honestly represent the interests of the public.

A person looking at a committee's ability to carry out a successful cover-up might think that;



The Chief Justice is on the Committee to write a convincing report and ensure that other judges go along with it. The senators are there to make sure that other senators will go along with it. The Representative are there to make sure that other Representatives will not oppose the report. The former Director of CIA (DCI) is to make sure no one at the CIA or in law enforcement will oppose the committee's conclusions. And the former President of the World Bank is to make sure that no bankers oppose it.

Was the committee formed in order to successfully cover-up who murdered JFK? Would a reasonable person conclude that the chosen members likely did have the influence or power to rein in dissidents below them? It would be hard to pick someone more likely to have that power than the Chief Justice, Warren, a former head of the World Bank, McCloy, and a former DCI, Dulles.

According to recently released documents, DCI Dulles had hoped to force US public opinion into supporting an invasion of Cuba.

The National Security Archive

[Home](#) [About](#) [Search](#) [News](#) [Documents](#) [Publications](#) [FOIA](#) [Internships](#) [Research](#)



BAY OF PIGS

40 YEARS AFTER

AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
HAVANA, CUBA - MARCH 22-24, 2001

DOCUMENTS REVEAL CIA'S DULLES WANTED CUBA TO ASK FOR SOVIET BLOC ARMS IN 1959

*BRITISH CRITICIZED U.S. "EFFERVESCENCE
AND VIOLENT FEELINGS" ABOUT CUBA*

Cuba expected 6,000 men in the invasion force as of January 1961

Havana, Cuba: [British documents](#) released on the first day of an historic conference on the Bay of Pigs show that CIA Director Allen Dulles hoped that British refusal to sell military items to Cuba would force the Cuban government to request arms from the Soviet bloc, providing a pretext for U.S. intervention.



in the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Dulles got his invasion of Cuba---the Bay of Pigs. Vice President Nixon was heavily involved in the planning of it. Kennedy inherited the plan from Eisenhower. Congress had not authorized it. It was a CIA, not US military war. The invasion was a fiasco. Dulles blamed Kennedy for not giving it the second wave of air support he wanted.

The Cuban missile crisis, in Oct. 1962 followed the Russians selling weapons to the Cubans. Nuclear war was narrowly averted.

DCI Dulles's actions had not only caused many deaths

They had almost caused the death of much of the world in a Nuclear Holocaust.



[Allen Dulles on the left with JFK, not long before he was fired as DCI.]

Allen Dulles had stock in Rockefeller's United Fruit Company when the CIA under his command fomented a bloody take over of Guatemala to protect United Fruit's interests. No doubt United Fruit wanted to take Cuba back as well when Dulles launched the Bay of Pigs invasion. Dulles stood to make a fortune. Dulles is thus a corrupt person who had a financial interest in killing JFK to change US foreign policy. It is implausible to think LBJ did not know that in the wake of the huge Bay of Pigs fiasco which was much discussed while he was Vice President under Kennedy. Would a reasonable person count the appointment of a corrupt person intent on overthrowing JFK's foreign policy as the 5th piece of evidence against LBJ and the 1st piece against Dulles?

Allen Dulles had experience in running coups, e.g. Guatemala and Iran. Is his appointment to the Warren Commission by LBJ and his accepting the appointment which helps him potentially keep running the coup, the 6th piece of evidence against LBJ and the 2nd against Dulles?

In addition Dulles had experience ordering assassinations, but no experience in doing a forensic autopsy to investigate an assassination. Would this count as the 7th item against LBJ and the 3rd against Dulles?

Also, Dulles had experience in coverups. It might be reasonable to have a person of impeccable integrity who was an expert in exposing coverups on the Warren Commission. But Dulles coverup expertise is from unethically covering up CIA crimes, not writing exposes to reveal the truth.

Would a reasonable person count the appointment of an unethical coverup expert as the 8th piece of evidence against LBJ in ordering the assassination of JFK and the 4th against Dulles?

Furthermore, Dulles had helped Nazi war criminals safely escape from the Nuremberg Trials. Did LBJ want Dulles close to the investigation and him at the White House so that Dulles could help him escape at a moment's notice? Note that Dulles had no expertise in doing homicide investigations to find the guilty. Would a reasonable person see his appointment by LBJ and his accepting it even though he knows he has the wrong credentials as the 9th piece of evidence against LBJ and the 5th against Dulles?

The Wikipedia article on Dulles mentions;

‘President Kennedy did not trust the CIA, and he reportedly intended to dismantle it after the Bay of Pigs failure. Kennedy said he wanted to "splinter the CIA into a thousand pieces and scatter it into the winds."’

Kennedy fired Allen Dulles. So, Dulles has a potential personal motive to want JFK dead. Is it possible that Dulles felt angry and had a motive of revenge which should count as the 6th piece item making him suspicious in the JFK assassination?

Dulles also had a reason to protect the CIA whose actions frequently increased the worth of his stock. We have already counted his financial motive. But in addition he is leaving behind many buddies in the CIA who will be out of jobs if he does not coverup the CIA's role in the JFK assassination. So, does that motive to protect his buddies count in your mind as the 7th item?

Who Put the White Supremacist Who Approved of Lynching on the Warren Commission?



The wikipedia article on Russell says he was a powerful Senator and Chairman of the [Senate Armed Services Committee](#) for 18 years. It also states that he was a white supremacist who did not hide that fact. Apparently he was in favor of lynching people, or at least allowing them to be lynched by others. A defense lawyer would rightly exclude him from being a juror in a murder trial for having that obvious and relevant bias.

So two of the committee members, Dulles and Russell, were known to be in favor of killing people to further their agendas. Thus, Johnson apparently chose them, not to help prosecute any of JFK's murderers, but to ensure that he would be excused. Is this picking members in favor of assassination is the 10th piece of evidence against LBJ?



[Photo: President Lyndon Johnson with Senator Richard Russell at the White House, December 7, 1963]



Boggs, shown in this photo with LBJ was Majority Whip for many years. He was the only one who later said he had doubts about the lone bullet [making 7 wounds]. His plane went missing in 1971 mysteriously.

Ford was Minority Whip. We will see him again

later. Is his helping the cover-up while on the Warren Commission the first item against him as participating in the coverup of the JFK assassination? He apparently went along with the ridiculous single bullet, lone gunman coverup story.



The wikipedia article on Special Council to the Warren Commission, Congressman Arlen Specter, says;


“As an assistant counsel for the commission, he authored or co-authored the controversial "[single bullet theory](#)," which suggested the non-fatal wounds to President Kennedy and [Texas Governor John Connally](#) were caused by the same bullet. This was a crucial assertion for the Warren Commission, since if the two had been wounded by separate bullets, that would have demonstrated the presence of a second assassin and therefore a conspiracy.”

The Warren Commission picked by Johnson has the broad based power needed to convince others of official lies and suppress dissent among their colleagues. Is this the 11th piece of evidence that suggests Johnson was guilty of the conspiring to kill JFK?

Have you noticed yet that none of these people are experts in criminology, in homicide investigations, or forensic pathology? Had the point been to uncover the truth based on objective evidence, wouldn't experts of that type would have been appointed? Is this lack of forensic expertise the 12th piece of evidence that Johnson is guilty of plotting JFK's death?

Who Appointed that Specialist in Pardoning War Criminals to the Warren Commission?

[Photo: John McCloy, Former President of the World Bank]



Some bankers are higher than politicians in power. The politicians are in those positions of power because someone backed them financially. Forget the regulations that only so much money can be given by one person. Those restrictions are a synch to outwit. A common way to outwit them is for a wealthy person to give all of their

relatives, friends, or employees the maximum allowable donation to give to the candidate. So, next we want to make an assessment of who is financially behind the JFK assassination. Our chief suspect, LBJ, appointed a banker. It is very likely then that person or someone in banking above them is the person(s) who stands to financially profit from LBJ's take-over. So, who John McCloy fronts for is very important in this assessment. I am trying to show you that you can do these assessments fairly easily; I am just referring to the Wikipedia articles. Maybe they will be scrubbed by the CIA in the future and web articles will have to be used. Here is what wikipedia says about McCloy;

“He served as chairman of the [Chase Manhattan Bank](#) from 1953 to 1960, and as chairman of the [Ford Foundation](#) from 1958 to 1965; he was also a trustee of the [Rockefeller Foundation](#) from 1946 to 1949, and then again from 1953 to 1958, before he took up the position at Ford.

From 1954 to 1970, he was chairman of the prestigious [Council on Foreign Relations](#) in New York, to be succeeded by [David Rockefeller](#), who had worked closely with him at the Chase Bank. McCloy had a long association with the [Rockefeller family](#), going back to his early Harvard days when he taught the young Rockefeller brothers how to sail.”

Well, that information is quite clear, he works for the Rockefellers.


McCloy's background was very interesting (from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_J._McCloy);



- McCloy was notably supportive of the Third Reich at least until 1939 and was photographed sitting with Hitler at the [1936 Berlin Olympics](#). *[citation needed]*
- a legal counselor to the major German chemical combine [I. G. Farben](#), [Assistant Secretary of War](#) from 1941 to 1945,
- refused to bomb the railway lines to Auschwitz to stop the killing at the death camp
- Military Governor for the U.S. Zone in Germany as the [U.S. High Commissioner for Germany](#) and held this position until 1952, at his direction, a campaign of wholesale pardoning and commutation of sentences of Nazi

criminals took place, including those of the prominent industrialists [Alfried Krupp](#) and [Friedrich Flick](#) . Some of the less notable figures were retried and convicted in the newly independent West Germany.

- Designed the Pentagon's Pentagram shaped building, called "McCloy's Folly"



Who were some of the people he pardoned?

“Friedrich Flick was a funder of the [Nazi](#) party, profited from the liquidation of Jewish property, and became one of Hitler's major armaments producers. His factories became notorious for using slave labour from [concentration camp](#) inmates. The Flick family has refused to pay compensation to wartime victims.

Alfried Krupp produced submarines, tanks, artillery, naval guns, armor plate, munitions and other armaments for the German military. A huge number of civilians from occupied countries and Allied prisoners of war were used as forced laborers by Krupp during the war,...the highest number at a reference date was ca. 25 000 civilian workers and prisoners of war in January 1943.”

LJB appointed McCloy to investigate JFK's assassination? McCloy's expertise is in getting mass murderers and war profiteers their freedom after they commit unspeakable acts! Why wasn't Allen Dulles's setting up the ratlines to help the Nazi war criminals escape through

the Vatican enough expertise for LBJ on this committee? Is LBJ that frightened that he will be charged with JFK's murder that he has two top notch Nazi war criminal helpers on this Committee. The answer appears to be yes.


Would a reasonable person consider the appointment of Nazi enablers as an appropriate choice in JFK's assassination investigation? Clearly, LBJ did not print that in the newspaper when he announced their names. Would a reasonable person consider it the 13th reason to suspect LBJ that he appointed such an expert pardoner? Wasn't the point to find JFK's murderers and prosecute them? Would a reasonable person consider it the 14th reason to suspect LBJ that he did not publish McCloy's full background when he appointed him? It is not plausible to believe the Johnson did not know. Dulles, former head of the CIA was on the Committee and McCloy's pardon of the war criminals was done officially while he served in Germany. It was not a secret. Dulles would certainly have had one of his old friends in the CIA give him a run down on whom all the other Warren Committee members were. The current DCI McCone no doubt had briefed Johnson on their backgrounds prior to his appointing them.



The three principal camps in the Auschwitz complex, as photographed on June 26th, 1944 by a Mosquito plane from the South African Air force's 60 Photo Recon Squadron http://www1.yadvashem.org/exhibitions/album_auschwitz/air_photo/air_photographs_964_7a.html

McCloy had been legal counsel for IG Farben which made the Zyklon B that killed millions of people at Auschwitz. He pardoned those who used the slave labor and made money while millions were killed. Had the public understood that they would never have respected anything associated with him. He should have recused himself. He did not. Is LBJ's appointment of him to the Warren Commission the first evidence that he was a conspirator in the coverup? Is his not recusing himself the second? If he was not a conspirator already in the actual plotting to murder JFK, why did LBJ take the risk of appointing him for the coverup? There was a real risk that an investigative reporter would point out the public evidence from Germany. Would a reasonable person consider that McCloy therefore was likely a suspect in the murder, not just in the coverup? He subscribed to the ridiculous theory that a single bullet made 7 wounds. Is that the 3rd reason to suspect him? He was an expert in pardoning war criminals, not holding them accountable, fourth reason?





He twice refused to bomb the crematoria and railway lines at Auschwitz. He had such a strong motive to make money that he apparently overlooked the deaths of millions to do so, fifth reason? Not only did he have that motive, he was acting on it. He was working for Nelson Rockefeller's interests and making money off war profiteering, sixth reason? His connection to Nelson Rockefeller is so close that one could suspect that he was Rockefeller's eyes, ears, and hands at the Warren Commission, seventh reason?

From Support from the Wealthy
http://www.eugenics-watch.com/eugbook/euod_ch1.html

"In 1930 John D. Rockefeller and John D. Rockefeller Jr. were members of the American Eugenics Society. Furthermore, in the Twenties Raymond Fosdick, an important official of the Rockefeller Foundation, was a

member of the American Eugenics Society Advisory council. In this period the Rockefeller Foundation gave money to build quarters for Ernst Rudin, the man who later wrote Hitler's 1933 Sterilisation Law.(6) As co-founder with Alfred Ploetz of the German Eugenics Society, Rudin claimed credit as the inspiration for all Hitler's racial laws, including the Nuremberg laws which made Jews second class citizens in Germany.(7) ... These acts began a gigantic eugenic experiment in population control."(9) After this came the genocide. That which we now call genocide was then called eugenics.(10) Auschwitz showed the world the true face of eugenics. Yet some among the wealthy continued to support it.(11) For example, we find the names Rockefeller and Harriman, supporting the introduction of abortion and contraception, the means of eugenics. John D. Rockefeller III gave Margaret Sanger money with which to develop a contraceptive. Mrs. E.H Harriman's son was Averill Harriman, Governor of New York in the Fifties. Harriman allowed Robert Moses to follow a policy of letting Harlem deteriorate. (See Robert Moses and the Fall of New York., Robert Caro) It was then possible for the next governor, Nelson Rockefeller, to speak of the dreadful conditions in Harlem and the need for contraception and abortion as a solution for the problems of the people trapped there. Hence, in the Sixties, abortion, a eugenic goal, came to be seen as "progressive" in New York State. In the early Seventies, Nelson Rockefeller signed one of the first state law allowing widespread abortion, and the Rockefeller family gave money for the first legal abortion facility in New York State.... <http://www.eugenics-watch.com/roots/chap10.html> John D. Rockefeller's leadership in the Population Council was not the first Rockefeller foray into eugenics. When Alexis Carrel wrote his book advocating euthanasia institutions with a suitable gas for exterminating various people, he was on the staff of the Rockefeller Institute. The Rockefellers financed the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute in the 1920s, and provided funds for Ernst Rudin for genetic research in the 1920s."

What Did Rockefeller and the Forerunner of KBR Have to Do with It?



Nelson Rockefeller was probably the wealthiest man in America. He admitted in the Senate Confirmation Hearings for his being appointed Vice President by Ford that he had paid no taxes for the past 11 years.

See <http://www.rense.com/general27/rockf.htm> .

Is this one piece of evidence of a willingness to consider oneself above the law? Would a reasonable person consider this as one suspicious count against Nelson Rockefeller? It is not a count related to the JFK assassination, but of his motive to have money overriding his duty to the country.



In this photo of President Johnson and Nelson Rockefeller, the photographer showed who was more powerful as far as the media was concerned by showing Rockefeller's face, not LBJ's.



Kennedy wanted to stop the CIA's growing war in Vietnam. The public has a misconception that the politicians are in wars to win them. They make money from them whether the wars are won or lost. Would LBJ stand to make money off the Vietnam War?

Wikipedia's article on him says, "Johnson steered the projects towards contractors that he personally knew, such as the [Brown](#) Brothers, Herman and George, who would finance much of Johnson's future career." Those Brown Brothers were part of Root and Brown who later joined with Halliburton and Kellogg to become

Halliburton's current KBR.

Root and Brown was probably the biggest contractors in the Vietnam War;

Johnson stood to make millions in



kickbacks. Could the motive of money have moved Johnson to kill JFK? Is that the 15th reason suggesting he ordered the hit?

Would the Rockefeller Family make a lot of money if LBJ replaced JFK? Wikipedia tells us that Standard Oil is owned by the Rockefellers.

They made a lot of money in WWII through selling oil.

A war in a distant country like Vietnam would require a lot of fuel to get US ships and planes there, and to wage the war.



Has
the



Rockefeller Family used war profiteering as one of their favored methods of accumulating wealth? Some of that information was in the wikipedia article on John McCloy although you would have to have read some other background to recognize it. But a simple google search on “Rockefeller” and “War profiteering” brings up over 20,000 articles. The first one I clicked on was second on the list. I clicked on it because it was on Rockefellers in the Civil War and I thought it would prove my point about how long-standing their war profiteering was. That article stated;

Is that modus operandi of the Rockefeller Family of making wealth by war profiteering the third piece of evidence that a Rockefeller was likely involved in the JFK assassination?

Did Two Directors of CIA Help Murder JFK to Get Vietnam War Profits?

Since Dulles also had a modus operandi of war profiteering, is now a good time to consider that the 10th piece of evidence that he is a suspect for the conspiracy to murder of JFK? Since LBJ appointed Dulles to the Warren Commission, is that the 11th piece of evidence? Isn't the fact that Dulles went along with the ridiculous one bullet theory of the Warren Commission the 12th piece of evidence? Isn't the fact that he did not supply a more plausible theory, as the member of the committee most knowledgeable about assassinations, the 13th fact to consider him a suspect in the conspiracy to kill JFK? It was also Hoover's duty to provide a credible account. Is Hoover's failure to do so the 4th fact which makes him suspect?

Didn't the Director of the CIA, McCone, also have a duty to point out to the public that the single bullet lone gun man theory was not credible? Is that the first fact that makes him suspect in the JFK cover-up? The CIA men came under suspicion quickly. Didn't McCone have a duty to reveal how many CIA officers were in Dallas that day and the roles of each one, even if he withheld their names? Isn't that the 2nd fact that makes him suspect? And didn't he have a duty to supply a credible account of the assassination once the CIA came under suspicion. Was his failure to supply a credible account the 3rd reason to suspect him?

Who suggested that JFK appoint McCone DCI? Wikipedia was unhelpful in answering that question? But I immediately came across relevant information at www.spartacus.com ;

“Under pressure from right-wingers in the intelligence community, Kennedy appointed **McCone** as the new director of the CIA.” www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/JFKmccone.htm

That article on McCone at Spartacus was very helpful as it gave hi financial background. McCone in the 1930's was a sales Manager for Consolidated Steel. It that the same Consolidated Steel which had Prescott Bush as a manager? Then he merged with Bechtel to form Bechtel-McCone. It lists Rockefeller's Standard Oil as its primary customer. The article details massive WWII war-profiteering fraud, including;

‘In 1942 **McCone** and [Stephen D. Bechtel](#) obtained a contract to build aircraft at Willow Run in Alabama. The War Department agreed to pay all the company's costs plus 5 percent on work estimates presented by [Bechtel-McCone](#) every six months. A 300-acre factory was built and 8,000 employees hired to staff it. However, no aircraft were built. Employees were paid for doing nothing. A local man, George P. Alexander, discovered details of this scam and collected affidavits from workers who admitted that they “went in every day at 9.00, punched the time clock, then went home”. They then returned to the factory at 5.00 to “punch out”.

Alexander filed suit against Bechtel-**McCone** in federal district court on 31st July, 1943. He claimed that the company had made “many and various claims against the government of the United States, or a department or officer thereof, knowing such claims to be false, fictitious or fraudulent.” However, the judge dismissed the case. The problem was with the

contract, not the claims by Bechtel-**McCone**. As John **McCone** admitted to [Fortune Magazine](#) on 17th May, 1943: “Every six months, we estimate how much work we expect to do in the next six months and then we get a fee of five percent of the estimated amount of work regardless of how much work we actually do turn out.”

Bechtel-**McCone** was also involved in another scandal concerning war contracts. Lieutenant General [Brehon Somervell](#), head of the Army Sources of Supply Command, decided to build “a major refinery at the Norman Wells oilfields in Canada’s Northwest Territories, and run a pipeline from there 1,200 miles southwest through the Yukon Territory into Alaska.”

The contract to do this was given to John **McCone** and Steve Bechtel. The terms of the contract were very unusual. The Bechtel-**McCone** Corporation was guaranteed a 10% profit on the project. The other surprising thing about the [Canol Project](#) was that it was to be a secret contract. It seems that Somervell did not want anyone outside the War Department and the Bechtel-**McCone** Corporation to know about this deal. The reason for this is that [Harold Ickes](#), as Interior Secretary and the head of the Petroleum Administration for War, should have been the person who oversaw this project.

The \$35 million for the project came from within a massive war appropriations bill that was passed by Congress in April 1942. After working on it for a year the cost had reached over \$100 million. It was finished in May 1945. However, the wrong sized pipes had been used and it was discovered that to pump the oil it cost \$150 per barrel rather than the \$5 estimated by Somervell, Bechtel and **McCone**. Less than a year after it was finished, the plant and pipeline was abandoned. It had cost the American taxpayer \$134 million.

After the war the “General Accounting Office told a House Merchant Marine Committee investigation that the company had made \$44,000,000 on an investment of \$100,000. The same committee a few months later complained that Mr McCone's company was “paid \$2,500,000 by the government to take over a shipyard costing \$25,000,000 and containing surplus material costing \$14,000,000.” <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/JFKmccone.htm>

Is McCone’s proven corruption the 4th reason to suspect him now? And more specifically isn’t his war profiteering modus operandi for making money the 5th reason? McCone was DCI when JFK was assassinated. His motive to make money even when it kills others to do so, is that the 6th reason to suspect him in plotting the death of JFK, not merely in covering it up?

We also find out that Dulles was the one who got war-profiteer McCone inside the US Govt.;

“[John L. Simpson](#), chief financial officer to the various corporations owned by [Stephen D. Bechtel](#), introduced **McCone** to [Allen Dulles](#) at a meeting in 1947. It was at this time he became friends with [William Knowland](#) and [Dwight D. Eisenhower](#).

In 1948 [Harry S. Truman](#) appointed **McCone** as Deputy to the Secretary of Defense. According to [Laton McCartney](#), despite his title “it quickly became apparent that he was the department’s real boss.” In 1950 he became Under Secretary of the Air Force. While in these posts **McCone** gave contracts to Standard Oil and Kaiser Aluminum, two companies in which he had financial connections.” <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/JFKmccone.htm>

Dulles was working for Rockefeller’s Standard Oil in the overthrow of Iran. He was also working for Rockefeller’s United Fruit Co. in the overthrow of Guatemala. War profiteer Dulles got war profiteer McCone into the US govt. where he could dole out contracts. War profiteering appears to be a big motive in the assassination of JFK because it quickly yields millions of dollars without careful oversight. Is Dulles’s maneuvering McCone into position to give out contracts, the 7th highly relevant fact against McCone and the 14th against Dulles in the JFK assassination?

We just found out that McCone preferentially gave out contracts to Rockefeller. And we have already tagged Rockefeller as the financial king who apparently considers himself above the law. Was McCone’s giving contracts to Rockefeller now the 8th fact against McCone in the JFK assassination because it shows his prior loyalty to Rockefeller? Preferentially giving contracts out defrauds the US taxpayer of their money. Was it also the 4th fact against Rockefeller because it reveals McCone and Rockefeller were co-conspirators in previous crimes?

David Rockefeller



Dulles maneuvered McCone into that position in which he threw Rockefeller contracts. Did Dulles use his right wing friends at the CIA to maneuver McCone into the position of DCI? It certainly looks that way because ‘right wingers in intelligence prevailed on Kennedy’ to accept McCone as DCI. Nelson Rockefeller had the power to prevail on Kennedy and was the major player in US intelligence. Both the OSS, precursor of the CIA, and MI5/6 had been set up in Rockefeller Plazas in WWII. The Rockefeller Family had more than a little power over US intelligence. Some people at the CIA said that the Rockefellers had set up the CIA to serve their interests. I allege that it was the Rockefellers who prevailed over Kennedy to get McCone appointed as DCI. Since I have not seen proof of that outside the CIA or Rockefeller Archives, I will allege it, without counting it in the tallies.

Now, McCone had another duty--to investigate whether Hoover was being run by foreign agents that the FBI had not properly investigated the JFK assassination. McCone's sworn duty was to protect the US from enemies both foreign and domestic. McCone might not publish in the newspaper that Hoover was foiling the investigation. But he had a duty to get him replaced since Hoover was not running an effective investigation. Although some might claim that McCone couldn't get him replaced if LBJ was guilty, the CIA specializes in assassinations so McCone could have forced his replacement. McCone did not get Hoover replaced. Is that the 9th fact against McCone? LBJ also did not remove Hoover for doing a dreadful job of investigation JFK's assassination. Is that the 16th reason to suspect LBJ in the murder of JFK?

Furthermore, it was clear that LBJ was preventing an effective investigation of JFK's death by the way he selected the Warren Commission. McCone had a duty to forcefully speak out against that or get LBJ replaced. He did not. Is that the 10th fact against McCone? Hoover also had that duty to get LBJ replaced for who he appointed to the Warren Commission. He also failed. Is that the 5th reason to suspect Hoover? Furthermore, Hoover had a duty to get McCone fired for not providing the public with a full honest account of what the CIA did in Dallas that day. Even if a few covert people had to quit the CIA because their cover was indirectly blown, McCone should have provided that information. Was Hoover not getting McCone fired the 6th reason to suspect Hoover?

LBJ also had a duty to remove McCone for his failure to provide an accurate accounting of the CIA's activities in Dallas that month. Was that the 17th reason to suspect LBJ in the murder of JFK?

The Clark Report: Why Did LBJ Order the Autopsy Team 5 Years Too Late?

The next investigation was in 1968 which consisted of 4 medical experts appointed by Attorney General Ramsey Clark;



“The Clark Panel determined that Kennedy was struck by two bullets fired from above and behind him, one of which traversed the base of the neck on the right side without striking bone and the other of which entered the skull from behind and destroyed its upper right side.” See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_F._Kennedy_assassination#Rockefeller_Commission

Since the surgeons examining JFK immediately said the neck wound was from a bullet entering from in front, the Clark Report is clearly another coverup.

The Warren Commission investigated the forensic evidence using medical illustrations, not photos. LBJ was in control of the Commission. Therefore, would a reasonable person conclude he was a suspect in the murder because he had medical illustrations, not photos used? Is this the 18th reason to suspect LBJ? And the 7th to suspect Hoover since he should have ensured a proper investigation?



Since Ramsey Clark was appointed Attorney General by LBJ, and appointed by LBJ to conduct this investigation, we still do not have an independent investigation. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ramsey_Clark . Again, LBG should have recused himself and did not. Is that the 19th piece of evidence against him?

The Clark Report was written by forensic experts; it is too bad that it was not an independent investigation. See HOW FIVE INVESTIGATIONS INTO JFK'S MEDICAL/AUTOPSY EVIDENCE GOT IT WRONG at <http://www.history-matters.com/essays/jfkmed/How5Investigations/>

[How5InvestigationsGotItWrong_3.htm#_edn180](http://www.history-matters.com/essays/jfkmed/How5Investigations/How5InvestigationsGotItWrong_3.htm#_edn180) .

To save ourselves time, effort, and mind-numbing confusion we are not delving into the details. But the fact that the Clark Commission's forensic experts still got it wrong means that crucial photos of the injuries were missing. Is this the 20th reason to suspect LBJ? And the 8th to suspect Hoover? So, far we do not have a motive for Hoover. Perhaps he was blackmailed into cooperating.

In this case, I did not quickly come across information on the 5 forensic experts that was sufficient to judge their motives, associations, etc..

What? Was Nixon a Conspirator In It Too?

Vice President Nixon helped plan the Bay of Pigs invasion with DCI Dulles.

Since a reasonable person may have concluded that there were already up to 15 reasons to consider Dulles a conspirator, is this a first reason to consider that Nixon may be one?



Lyndon Johnson meets with Presidential candidate Richard Nixon at the White House, July 26, 1968. http://teachpol.tcnj.edu/amer_pol_hist/thumbnail464.html Why?

What was the history behind that Dulles-Nixon collaboration? I ran a search on “Dulles Nixon” and immediately found this article by a historian John Loftus;

“Richard Nixon’s political career began in 1945, when as a navy officer he was assigned to review some captured Nazi documents. Allen Dulles told Nixon to keep quiet about what he had seen and, in return, arranged to finance the young man’s first congressional campaign. The documents that Dulles was eager to cover up concerned Karl Blessing, the former Reichsbank officer and then head of the Nazi oil cartel called Kontinentale 01 AG, or “Konti.” Konti was in partnership with Allen and John Foster Dulles’ principal Nazi client, I.G. Farben, the infamous chemical/weapons producer.

Both companies had despicable records regarding their complicity with the Nazis and their ill treatment of Jews during the Holocaust...” See full article The Nixon-Bush Nazi Connection at http://coat.ncf.ca/our_magazine/links/54/54_35.pdf.

Dulles and Nixon were conspirators in a Nazi coverup. It is also shocking because another likely conspirator in the coverup of the JFK assassination was McCloy. Remember that he had been a lawyer for IG Farben and pardoned Nazi war criminals when he was **U.S. High Commissioner for Germany** from 1949 to 1952. Is this older coverup conspiracy between Dulles and Nixon, the 2nd fact against Nixon and the 16th against Dulles. This resurfacing of the IG Farben topic seems to confirm that McCloy is indeed in part of an older conspiracy with Dulles.




Nixon with J. Edgar Hoover and ?



No investigation occurred under Nixon's Administration, yet the public still had unanswered questions. He had a duty to expose who ordered the death of JFK, but failed in that duty. Is that a third reason to consider Nixon as a possible conspirator in the coverup?

From A Satchel Full of Dirty Tricks: The Watergate 7 Trial;



(c)1974 Philip Lief and Marcel Feigel. All rights reserved.

‘ Supervised by two presidential aides, Egil Krogh, Jr. and David Young, the Plumbers reported directly to Charles Colson, another White House aide, but operated under the final authority of John Ehrlichman, the president’s domestic policy advisor. On Colson’s initiative, the group soon added two new members,

Hunt, a former CIA operative, and Liddy, a former assistant district attorney of Dutchess County, New York, who had also served five years as an FBI agent. Liddy was the strangest character even in the Watergate saga, which hardly lacked for colorful characters. While prosecuting a criminal case in New York, he had pulled a gun out of his jacket pocket and fired a live round of ammunition into the courtroom ceiling. He claimed to have killed and eaten a rat in order to overcome his dread of rodents, and to have climbed a tall tree during a thunderstorm to overcome his fear of lightning. Early in his tenure with the Plumbers, Liddy offered to do away with the newspaper columnist Jack Anderson, who had written critically of the President's Vietnam policy.

Liddy's superiors wisely rejected Liddy's plan, but when the Plumbers disbanded in 1971, they appointed him general counsel at the Committee to Re-elect the President. His title was misleading at best. Entrusted with overseeing intelligence-gathering activities, Liddy spent more time breaking the law than managing the committee's compliance with it. In January 1972, he presented the details of "Gemstone," a political espionage program, to Attorney General John Mitchell, who was weeks away from resigning his government post to run the President's reelection race. The proposal was budgeted at \$1 million and outlined yet more illegal wiretaps and break-ins, as well as the kidnapping and mugging of political opponents and the use of prostitutes in a targeted blackmail and confidence scheme--"not quite what I had in mind," Mitchell responded gruffly. When Liddy returned eight days later with a scaled-back plan (\$500,000 and no prostitutes, kidnappings, or muggings), the President's counsel, John Dean, shut down the discussion: "I don't think this kind of conversation should go on in the Attorney General's office." In the spring of 1972, it appears Mitchell ordered Liddy to bug the Democratic National Committee's offices, thus setting in motion the events soon to become known as "Watergate."

After the 1973 "Watergate 7" trial, the White House dam began to crumble. At every turn, the public discovered that Nixon had either directed or been kept abreast of his staff's extracurricular activities. From the very start, he had worked closely with H.R. Haldeman, his chief of staff, John Erlichman, and John Dean to arrange payoffs for the burglars and to suborn perjury from key staff and campaign workers.

At the time, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., a prominent historian and onetime advisor to John F. Kennedy, blamed much of this abuse of power on the growth of an "imperial Presidency." ' <http://www.americanheritage.com/articles/web/20080110-watergate-scandal-richard-nixon-trial-cia-impeachment-gordon-liddy-watergate-7-creep.shtml>

Nixon became famous as President for his using (ex)-CIA people to do dirty deeds for him. He clearly had no ethics worth mentioning. Is that the 4th fact to consider him as a conspirator in the JFK assassination?

How Did Ford and Rockefeller Get Into the White House?

Rockefeller once admitted to desiring the presidency;

"Ever since I was a kid. After all, when you think of what I had, what else was there to aspire to?" [www.answers.com/ topic/nelson-rockefeller](http://www.answers.com/topic/nelson-rockefeller)

The 25th Amendment to the Constitution was ratified in 1965 which allowed a Vice President to be appointed, if a vacancy occurred. Had it been put in place more quickly, it would have allowed Johnson to make Rockefeller Vice President.

Gerald Ford was on the Warren Commission appointed by LBJ. Isn't that the first reason to consider him as a likely conspirator in the cover-up? He went along with the one bullet, one gunman coverup story. Is that the second reason to consider his a conspirator? Since he is a politician it is safe to assume that his motive was to get power. Is that motive then third reason to suspect to suspect him? How did he get to be President?

“He was the first person appointed to the vice presidency under the terms of the [25th Amendment](#), and became President upon [Richard Nixon's](#) resignation on [August 9, 1974](#). Ford was the fifth U.S. President never to have been elected to that position, and the only one never to have won a national election at all.“



[Unelected Gerald Ford as President and Unelected Nelson Rockefeller as Vice President]

It appears that Ford had pleased Nixon or his financial backer mightily. Since Nixon was working with Dulles to get Cuba back for Rockefeller's United Fruit (Castro having nationalized a million acres of it), Nelson Rockefeller most likely backed Nixon for President. Helping someone cover up their conspiracy to murder JFK, is exactly the sort of thing that would please a guilty person mightily. It would likely please them enough to recommend you into being Vice President. The Vice Presidency appears to be the reward to Ford from Rockefeller for his role in the cover-up while on the Warren Commission. Is that the fourth piece of evidence against Ford for the coverup? Next, Ford turns around and appoints a Rockefeller as his Vice President! This confirms that Nelson Rockefeller was likely the person recommending Ford. Is that the 5th piece of evidence that Ford is involved in the cover up of the JFK assassination? Is it the 5th piece of evidence against Rockefeller?

Ford was on the Warren Commission picked by LBJ to be part of the coverup efforts, it appears. Ford appoints Nelson Rockefeller to head the investigation into the CIA/JFK assassination! Would a reasonable person consider that the 6th piece of evidence against Ford and the 6th against Rockefeller?



William Colby applauds as George Bush finishes remarks after being sworn in as director of the Central Intelligence Agency on Jan. 30, 1976, in Washington, succeeding Colby in the position. President Gerald Ford is at right. (AP Photo/files)

Did Rockefeller Plan to Protect His Tool, the CIA, from Harm?



“Part of the [Rockefeller] commission's work dealt with the Kennedy assassination, specifically the head snap as seen in the [Zapruder film](#) (first shown to the general public in 1975), and the possible presence of [E. Howard Hunt](#) and [Frank Sturgis](#) in Dallas. The commission concluded that neither Hunt nor Sturgis were in Dallas at the time of the assassination, and that the head snap did not necessarily imply a shot from the front.” See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_F._Kennedy_assassination#Rockefeller_Commission

John_F._Kennedy_assassination#Rockefeller_Commission

Frank Sturgis




“The Rockefeller Report is seen by many as a "whitewash".”
See the report at http://history-matters.com/archive/contents/church/contents_church_reports_rockcomm.htm

E. Howard Hunt, famous for his role in the WaterGate Break-in and his role in the book Plausible Denial: Was the CIA involved in the JFK Assassination?

Is the Nelson Rockefeller’s Report being a whitewash the 7th piece of evidence against Ford? Is it also the 7th reason that Nelson Rockefeller is a suspect in plotting the JFK assassination? Had he merely profited from it after the fact, there would be no reason for him to cover up who killed him.

Before we precede further, let me briefly mention a couple of examples of how Nelson



Rockefeller had already used the CIA to support his financial empire and make money. In 1954 DCI Allen Dulles had stock in Rockefeller’s-Schoeder’s United Fruit Company. Democratically elected Socialist leader Arbenz in Guatemala offered to buy fallow land to give to the peasants who were starving. The CIA overthrew the Guatemala, allowing United Fruit to keep exploiting the peasants at starvation wages. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1954_Guatemalan_coup_d%27%C3%A9tat. We will go into that further later.



Then later in the 1950's, the CIA overthrew the popular leader Mosaddeq in order to re-install the Shah of Irah. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mohammed_Mosaddeq . That allowed Rockefeller's Standard Oil to get part of the Iranian oil. Thus, the CIA was a tool that the Rockefeller family used to gain wealth. Since Kennedy wanted to shut down the CIA, Rockefeller had a strong financial motive to kill JFK before that happened.

[Photo: Mosaddeq]

Let's look at the background and qualifications of the men Nelson Rockefeller appointed for this investigation of the CIA and assassination of JFK.




“John T. "Jack" Connor was [United States Secretary of Commerce](#) from [January 18, 1965](#) to [January 31, 1967](#)....entering politics as the co-chairman of the Johnson-Humphrey Campaign in 1964.”

It appears that he was picked for his known loyalty to Johnson. Did he know that Johnson had JFK killed and had kept silent about it? Additionally, since he had been Secretary of Commerce, did Nelson pick him to ensure that the CIA served his commercial interests? What qualifications did he have to provide oversight of the CIA?



“**Clarence Douglas Dillon** was 57th Secretary of the [United States Department of the Treasury](#) (1961-1965)... Appointed by Democratic president [John Kennedy](#) to the Treasury post, Dillon was himself a Republican. His policies provided for a solid economic expansion and president [Lyndon Johnson](#) kept him in his job after Kennedy's assassination...A close friend of [John D. Rockefeller 3rd](#), he was also a trustee of the [Rockefeller Foundation](#) from 1960 to 1961.”



Dillon's signature, as used on American currency”

Wasn't Dillon chosen to serve Rockefeller's interests on this committee, especially his financial interests? This is the second financial appointee Rockefeller made to this committee. Is Rockefeller much less interested in investigating the CIA than making it profitable to him? Does this form the 8th piece of evidence that Rockefeller likely ordered the CIA to kill JFK for financial profit?



“**Erwin Nathaniel Griswold** was one of the great appellate attorneys of his time and argued more cases than any other lawyer in twentieth century before the U.S. Supreme Court. Griswold served as [Solicitor General of the United States](#) (1967-1973) under [Presidents Lyndon B. Johnson](#) and [Richard M. Nixon](#).

As Solicitor General, Griswold unsuccessfully argued against the publication of the [Pentagon Papers](#) by [The New York Times](#), because such publication would cause a "grave and immediate danger to the security of the United States." Years later, he reversed his position in an op-ed piece in [The Washington Post](#), writing, "I have never seen any trace of a threat to the national security from the publication" of the Pentagon Papers. He suggested that government demands for secrecy be treated with some skepticism by the public.”

It appears that this appointment was to help Nelson continue using the CIA secretly for war profiteering. Is this the 9th reason to suspect Rockefeller?



“**Lyman Louis Lemnitzer** ([August 29, 1899](#) – [November 12, 1988](#)) was an [American Army general](#), who served as [Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff](#) from 1960 to 1962. He then served [Supreme Allied Commander, NATO](#) from 1963 to 1969...Lemnitzer approved the plans known as [Operation Northwoods](#) in 1962, a proposed plan to discredit the [Castro](#) regime and create support for military action against [Cuba](#) by staging [false flag](#) and other criminal acts of terrorism. Lemnitzer presented the plans to Secretary of Defense [Robert McNamara](#) on March 13, 1962. It is


unclear how McNamara reacted, but three days later President [Kennedy](#) told the general that there was no chance that America would take military action against Cuba. Within a few months, after the denial of Operation Northwoods, Lemnitzer was denied another term as JCS chairman. He was a strong proponent of a staging a full-scale military invasion of Cuba, and then keeping all of its inhabitants under a state of martial law until they began to accept U.S. doctrine. When his suggestions were repeatedly denied in favor of more covert



[CIA](#) programs based around espionage and propaganda, he began making proposals to attack U.S. citizens and servicemen, and blame it on Cuba, in order to garner public support for a military invasion. One such proposal, known as [Operation Northwoods](#) involved such ideas as firing mortar rounds into U.S. military bases,

switching a real plane for a remote controlled plane and blowing it up remotely - blaming it on Cuba, or sinking a U.S. naval vessel stationed near Cuba.” See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lyman_Lemnitzer

It appears that Kennedy fired him. Does his appointment by Rockefeller count as the first evidence he was in the conspiracy? Does his likely motive of revenge at being dismissed count as the second? Didn't he have a duty to recuse himself because he had been dismissed by JFK? Is that the third evidence against him that he did not? Does his helping recreate



the whitewash count as the fourth? The Warren Commission had everyone needed on it to run a successful coup and coverup for LBJ--except a general. Do we finally have the general LJB was counting on named?

Nelson Rockefeller chose him after he had propounded that Operation Northwood Terrorist methods. Thus, it is clear that Nelson approved of such methods and wanted the CIA to keep using them in his pursuit of profits. Would a person with those views refrain from a conspiracy to murder when there were great profits to be had by doing so? Does appointing Lemnitzer thus counts as the 10th

piece of evidence that the Rockefeller Family was guilty in the assassination of JFK?



“**Ronald Wilson Reagan** ([February 6, 1911](#) – [June 5, 2004](#)) was the 40th [President of the United States](#) (1981–1989) and the 33rd [Governor of California](#) (1967–1975). Born in [Illinois](#), Reagan moved to [Los Angeles, California](#) in the 1930s, where he was an [actor](#), president of the [Screen Actors Guild](#) (SAG), and a spokesman for [General Electric](#) (GE).”

This appointment by Nelson appears to have been for the purpose of having a charming actor be able to put across his conclusions later.

“**Edgar F. Shannon, Jr.** ([June 4, 1918](#) – [August 24, 1997](#)) was a professor of English and president of the [University of Virginia](#) from 1959 to 1974.”

This appointment would ensure that the Commission's report would be beautifully clothed in English prose.

“David W. Belin A successful [businessman](#), Belin owned a number of Midwestern publications and co-owned The Tribune in Ames, Iowa, with [Michael Gartner](#), the former president of [NBC News](#). Belin was assistant counsel to the [Warren Commission](#), which investigated President [John F. Kennedy's](#) assassination. He concluded that [Lee Harvey Oswald](#) had worked entirely on his own as Kennedy's assassin, which the commission affirmed in its final report. Belin stood by the findings of the Warren report until his death, and was known to become incensed at any mention of an assassination conspiracy. As he lay in a coma in his final days, his friends would whisper conspiracy theories about the JFK assassination into his ear to confirm his unconsciousness by his unprecedented lack of response....Belin wrote two books on the JFK Assassination, including "Final Disclosure" in [1975](#)...Belin's former Warren Commission member and then-president [Gerald Ford](#) appointed him executive director to the [Rockefeller Commission](#)...”

Belin was likely chosen because he had a proven track record in cover up from the Warren Commission, and was willing to immediately publish books and articles supporting Rockefeller's conclusions.

The choice of the appointees shows no intention to investigate either the CIA or the JFK assassination; no human rights advocates, no detectives, no intelligence academicians, and no investigative journalists, etc.. Quite the contrary, it appears shows an intention to profit from black ops and violence. It also appears to show the intention to have a slick PR front to cover up those crimes.



YOU WRITE WHAT YOU'RE TOLD!



THANKS, CORPORATE NEWS!
We Couldn't Control The People Without You

A MESSAGE FROM THE MINISTRY OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Is the capacity to sell the cover up to the public and Media, the 11th piece of evidence against Rockefeller?

Is the lack of investigative credentials in this commission, the 12th piece of evidence that Rockefeller was suspect in the JFK assassination?

Not investigating properly is a very serious crime in terms of the consequences to a nation and its citizens. That is because it enables all the many crimes that follow. Those crimes which followed in the wake of the JFK assassination which would likely not have happened if he lived including the continued buildup of the Vietnam War and the about 50,000 US deaths and over a million Vietnamese deaths that followed.

Historian Howard Zinn is famous for his superb and fascinating tome [A People's History of the United States](#). Here are comments his after it was announced that the Rockefeller Commission cleared the CIA and its operatives of wrongdoing;

“**Rockefeller Inquiry Clears CIA of Major Violations**” was the headline in the New York Times. Now we can relax. Except for one troubling question: who will clear Rockefeller?



Photos of Attica Prisoners and Nelso Rockefeller



‘All these fellows go around clearing one another. It seems that only at the top levels of government is serious attention paid to the principle that criminals should be tried by juries of their peers. What would be the public reaction to the headline: **"Boston Strangler Clears Cambridge Mugger"**? Is that more shocking than: **Attica Massacre Chief "[Rockefeller] Clears Assassination Plotters"**?...[For more info on Attica Massacre see <http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history.do?action=Article&id=5342>.]

‘The CIA ran a program of assassination, torture and imprisonment in Vietnam between 1967 and 1971, called Operation Phoenix, headed by the present CIA director William Colby, who admitted over 20,000 Vietnamese civilians were executed without trial. That is a blood bath, by any definition.’


‘One more fact: no President, no Congress, no Supreme Court, for 25 years, has done anything to stop these activities.’

‘There is murder and deceit on the record of the CIA. But we mustn't abolish it, because we need it to fight Communism. Why do we need to fight Communism? Because Communism roams the earth, conspiring to overthrow other governments. And because we don't want to live in a society where secret police tap our wires, open our mail, and have the power to quietly eliminate anyone they decide will hurt "national security." Once, there was the Stone Age. Now, the Age of Irony. It is only fitting that Rockefeller and his commission should befriend the CIA. It would confuse us if they denounced members of their own club. The Rockefeller report clears the air; our problem is not the CIA, but the club itself.’ See **The CIA, Rockefeller, and the Boys in the Club** www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Zinn/Rockefeller_BoysClub.html

The truth of who conspired to kill JFK was not uncovered while Ford was President. Was that the 8th reason to suspect Ford?

Three JFK Assassination Item Inside CIA in Plain View

The CIA's headquarters in Langley Virginia is a very large complex of buildings with thousands of people working inside. Most offices have the usual furniture, computers, and desks. But people also had added pictures and memorabilia to both common areas and their own offices. Sometimes they know all of the historical implications of those items. But since most of them are not remote viewers they can reasonably be expected to overlook some of their historical significances.




The first item was in a hallway in the CIA, not an office. It was a large column, or rather a front third of a column. It was old and the column was nicked in places. One of the nicks was made by a bullet hitting it at a sharp angle. The column had been on the front of a building. The problem was that the shots were supposed to have only come from the Book Depository, not hit the front of it. The CIA had gone to a lot of trouble to exactly match that column and replace it. It is hard to believe that the people placing that column in a hallway in the CIA did not know its significance. It had not always been there since the replacement. It must have been stored somewhere as a piece of memorabilia for a number of years. I first remember seeing it soon after Bush, Sr. was sworn in as



DCI. The CIA has its own mini Hall of Fame. That column was placed in an out of the way location of it, after you turned to go into a distant set of bathrooms. Almost no one used those as there were nicer bathrooms closer. I doubted that Bush, Sr. ever used those small second class bathrooms. They had originally only been used by the janitors.

The second item was a bullet down in the CIA's morgue in a display case. It was a bullet recovered during John Connally's surgery. It was inconvenient to mention because it was recovered from the wrist and could not be explained by the lone gunman from the Book Depository. Many pathologists in the CIA's morgue had seen it in the display case. But seeing an item is not the same as knowing its significance.



I already mentioned that the CIA is called Bush, Sr.'s CIA. It has many pictures of him in hallways, lounges, and they used to even be one of them in a ladies's restroom.

The third item was a picture which showed him on a city street. None of the buildings in the photo was labeled the The Book Depository like the one in the last case. Perhaps no one, other than myself, ever noticed that the street was in Dallas and the newspaper he was reading was from the morning of the assassination. It was remarkable also because of who else was standing near him in the photo. There were two other men within about 4 feet of him. One was squatting with his back to the camera. The other was facing forward looking down a little.

That photo always had bothered me because it showed the butt of a rifle slightly visible between the legs of the squatting man. Neither men were dressed in police uniforms. The man stooping was famous from the Rockefeller Commission's exoneration of him. His name

was Frank Sturgis. I did not think he was the one who killed JFK, but he was at the assassination. He was briefly arrested with a rifle in hand by the Dallas police before the CIA got him and the other 2 with him released. Maybe I will write up that history as I remember it in another case. I did meet Sturgis several times. I am not an unbiased person in speaking of him however, as I "had history" with him which was highly unpleasant to me. Fortunately, it was brief.

Now, my telling you about those items, is just one eyewitness's account of their existence inside the CIA. It does not tell you who pulled the trigger. My telling you about those items inside the CIA confirm that the CIA was involved in the JFK assassination. It is one more piece of evidence in the case. It is only a small piece of the evidence because it is only one person's say so. But the

evidence from the coverup is not a person's say so. Who appointed the members of the commission, their names, and positions are solid facts.

There is more information on Sturgis ;

To: Peter Paul:
Thanks for helping to show
the world what "Castro"
really is.
Best wishes
Frank Sturgis



'Sturgis [center] claims that the [Watergate](#) burglars had been instructed to find a particular document in the [Democratic Party](#) offices. This was a "secret memorandum from the Castro government" that included details of [CIA](#) covert actions. Sturgis said "that the Castro government suspected the CIA did not tell the whole truth about this operations even to American political leaders." <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/JFKsturgis.htm>

But it was also true that the CIA had not told the whole truth of the JFK assassination to American political leaders and that was much more explosive. Why did he leave out that the memorandum from the Cuban govt. touched on the JFK assassination and had his name in it?

When a person changes their story while in prison, consider that the CIA might have managed to brainwash them while they were in it. About half of that article looks like disinformation to me, mostly due what he said. From my reading of documents inside the CIA's vault, not file room, I agree that Sturgis met Oswald in Dallas before the assassination, was present at the assassination, and wanted to kill JFK because buddies of his died in the failed Bay of Pigs invasion. But what he



Lee Harvey Oswald. Photo taken in Minsk.

COMMISSION EXHIBIT NO. 2892

said in 1976 was sheer lies. Oswald went to Russia during the Cold War for the CIA, playing a looser as his cover. He was not a Cuban agent, nor a Russian one. But he sure might have wanted to defect to Russia when the CIA started putting the heat on him. He was also helping the FBI. Someone in the CIA, maybe the DDO at the time, framed him because they didn't like his leaks to the FBI. Oswald, like Kennedy, had concluded that the CIA was a criminal outfit and was working to try to shut it down. They were both killed in the same CIA run op for that. I think Hoover came close to being killed for trying to shut down CIA operations against Cuba, before he was forced through blackmail and threats to his life to cave in.

I think that it is risky to talk about who did the actual shooting. The risk is that you will feel satisfied that you know who killed JFK and stop holding those who ordered it accountable. Focusing on the hit men wastes time and effort as well. It also increases my risk of being sued without adding anything to the liberty of Americans or the world.

Did Frank Sturgis Rape that Under Age Girl in Dallas to 'Blow Off Steam'?


I think that it is risky to talk about who did the actual shooting. The risk is that you will feel satisfied that you know who killed JFK and stop holding those who ordered it accountable. Focusing on the hit men wastes time and effort as well. It also increases my risk of being sued

without adding anything to the liberty of Americans or the world. But since I continually receive requests to address the JFK assassination at that level I will tell you about one of those CIA hit men who is dead. I picked him because he made an impression on my mind, even if it was not a good one.

The name of the man standing near Bush, Sr. was Frank Sturgis. That does not mean that he shot JFK, but it sure was suggestive that he had been so well implicated in it that it took a whole lot of effort by many famous and powerful men to cover up his and E. Howard Hunt's activities that day. The shadows in the photo showed that it was taken not long before noon.



Photos of Frank Sturgis



I knew of other evidence at the CIA related to Frank Sturgis that was not in plain view. One of his buddies at the CIA had a photo album of their Operation 40 attacks on Cuba. There was one photo of a man raping a young girl of about age 15. The setting was on a jungle path. His back was to the camera. The photo was labeled "Frank [Doing It] Again!" I asked the owner of the album which Frank it was and he said Sturgis. I had met Sturgis more than once at the CIA. Given the way he had related to me as a young female, I did not doubt that he was "rough and ready". Usually I had been able to give him wide berth.

But at one point before his trial in the WaterGate Burglary, the CIA assigned me to meet with him. I don't remember exactly who gave me the assignment; I got a call to report to Langley. But since I was a remote viewer for DCIs, it was likely the DCI at the time who was behind the call. When I showed up I was briefed on the assignment by the DDO. He was very hesitant to tell me

much. He did not even give me the man's name. He said that there was a prisoner that the CIA wanted to not to talk. He said that since I had not talked under recent torture by the KGB that I was assigned to go to the prison and train that prison. I was told he had a big mouth which had caused the CIA trouble before. I tried to object by saying that my not talking to the KGB might be something I might not be able to repeat, and might not be a transferrable skill. I also pointed out that I had not been in the hands of the KGB long. He insisted that I go anyway and "do my best". He also said that the man was unlikely to be tortured, but giving him alcohol might be like torture in his case. That was the first time I had ever heard of drinking a beer as being akin to torture, but I let it pass. Then I was driven out to the prison by the CIA.

I was a medical student at the time in my non-covert life. I was studying anatomy and pathology and had an exam in them the next week. So, this must have been about August 1972. I was studying my notes on the way over to the prison. When I went into the prison they were confiscated from me and I never did get them back.

When I was ushered into the interviewing room, Sturgis was already there. I had a momentary revulsion when I recognized him. When he offered to shake my hand, my first impulse was to slap him for what he had done to me before. The DDO had not bothered to ask me if I had history with that man. I refused to shake hands with him.

Twice before I had encountered Sturgis in “CIA activities”. One was operational. During the early part of the Cuban Missile Crisis, when I was a child, the CIA had inserted me into Cuba. I had been given to a Cuban woman who was a housecleaner in Castro’s Office Palace. I was 9 years old. I had been flown to an island near Cuba and then put on a small boat with about 18 CIA men. Sturgis had been one of them. It was a very unpleasant voyage both ways with those men. Young girls were not safe in their hands. I don’t know that anything came out of smuggling me into the Palace. But it certainly was easier to get a small girl in than an adult male. No one asked me any questions, which was just as well because Spanish is not my native language.

The second time I had met Sturgis was at a CIA party given by Colby. Sturgis was drunk. I was not. I had slapped him then, but I doubted that he had remembered it, which is why I wanted to do it again so he would remember it. Had I not been in a prison where I could immediately be charged with assault, I likely would have.



Sturgis did not remember ever having met me. I wished that I could have said the same thing about him. He asked me why the CIA had sent me out. He tried to pat me down as if to search me for a weapon. I did not think that that was all he had in mind. The CIA had arranged to have the interview unsupervised by a guard. That did nothing to protect me. I told Sturgis I was unarmed and threatened to bring my knee up into his crouch if he did not back off. He however had an exceedingly short memory and/or a one track mind.

Anyway, I had been assigned to try to anticipate would loose threads might be exposed if he or his compatriots went to trial

in the Watergate break-in. The CIA was worried that even they did not know all the things that those men had done that could embarrass them--that was why a remote viewer was used. It was hoped that I could intuitively guess their pasts and what might happen at the trial. It was a tall order and there was a lot of pressure on me. Particularly, it was feared that he might accidentally reveal links to the JFK assassination. And worse, it was known that one of his likely prosecutors was a JFK assassination buff and might “go fishing”.

Sturgis had a big mouth and a reputation for bragging when drunk. The CIA considered assassinating him in advance of the trial, they were that worried. The CIA considered arranging jail

cell “accidents” for more than one of them. I am being careful here because I do not want to be sued for libel. Some people sue even though they are guilty! The CIA decided that it would look too bad if some of the WaterGate buglers died in jail--there was too much publicity already.

Anyway I had to sit in a room with Sturgis and talk to him a couple of hours. It was uncomfortable for me because he had been without a woman for some time. He kept staring at my breasts under my blouse and trying to put his hand on my thigh. I had been instructed to sit next to him and whisper so that the guards would not overhear. In the end I had to move to the other side of the table. Sexually harassing me was more on his mind than his legal problems. There were no guards inside the room. Twice I almost called one in to try to stop his ludicrous advances. They did not endear me to the man.

Sturgis had had three brushes with the US law that the CIA had managed to get him out of. One was the rape of a girl in Dallas a few days after the JFK assassination. Some people said he had just been “blowing off steam after a difficult assignment”. I doubted that the 14-year-old Hispanic girl felt that way about it. The CIA had paid her family to keep quiet. But rumor had it that she had meet with “a fatal accident” a few months later. I had determined that she was indeed dead before I met with Sturgis. The CIA had tried to erase all record of it. They wanted Sturgis not to bring it up himself. He was not likely to intend to do so. But he could get angry and “loose it”.

Flyer from Bruin Walk Dated October 10, 1973

watergate is a direct consequence of the American political-economic system, a system whereby a few giant corporations control the daily lives of the majority of American working people without consulting them and without caring about their wishes. Our political leaders learned to manipulate others in the field of business and high finance, where manipulation of others is the rule and not the exception.

Yet the public is bombarded by Establishment propoganda which claims that Watergate is merely a temporary straying from the basic soundness of the American political system. Even news commentators are careful to distinguish between the allegedly guilty persons in Watergate and the overall innocence of the American political system, claiming in fact that Watergate will improve the system, as though murder improves the legal system.

Politicians try to tell us that Watergate is the first time that such a thing has ever happened in America, and that therefore the system cannot be at fault. But what about Johnson's bombing of Vietnam and the cover-up and lying which surrounded it, as revealed by the Pentagon Papers? The truth is that the American economic-political system has always been a gigantic Watergate, holding back the power of the people.

(This article has been printed because of the unwillingness and inability of FANSHEN, SDS, and other groups to print a coherent account of Watergate.)

M.W.O. Bulletin

OCT 10 1973

The second brush he had with the law before WaterGate was about 2 months after that first one. He got in a bar room brawl and broke a man's jaw. He said that the fight was because the man was ‘crying over the death of the President’ and saying that ‘the bastards who did it should be strung up by their thumbs’. Sturgis had lost control of himself and instead of walking out of the bar like he was supposed to, had started yelling and throwing punches. The CIA ordered 3 hits of people in the bar to cover up what Sturgis had said before he degenerated into just yelling swear words.

I had read the CIA's file on Sturgis and the bare bones of those incidents were in it. The “JFK pages” had been removed. That is, the pages from the day of the assassination until the brush with the law over the rape. Those pages still existed in a vault in the CIA at the time. I had asked to see

them and that was arranged. I had to read through them next to the walk in vault while a security guard watched my every move.

People wonder how I know so much about the CIA. I guess I was curious and made it my business to know. People in the CIA were always asking me as a remote viewer to give my educated guesses. It helped me give them to have as much background as possible. Unlike military remote viewers at Fort Detrick, I was not kept in the dark.

There were only 4 documents in the vault that had been in Sturgis's file. One was an arrest record on the day of the assassination in Dallas. The next was a release without charges shortly afterwards. One was a rambling handwritten account by his supervisor explaining what went wrong that he got arrested. And the last was a typed report giving a flak analysis, if his arrest in Dallas was exposed.

It appeared that those 4 documents were already scrubbed forgeries of the originals. There was handwriting that inexplicably had the loops below the line cut off. Also, some sentences endings did not match sentence starts on the next line. There was no mention of JFK or the assassination. It was only the dates and Dallas jail that tied the pages to the assassination. It should be remembered that I was looking at these about 10 years later.

What his supervisor said was that the Dallas police were not properly briefed by the head of their police dept. on what to do that day. He also faulted the CIA officer who was the liaison to the head of the Dallas police. He mentioned a couple of other things that he alleged the liaison officer had done wrong. One was he had been seen in the company of LBJ. He was supposed to be in the role of an extra police officer added to the Dallas police during the President's visit. But when Sturgis et al were arrested, the liaison officer had gone over to LBJ's hotel and asked him whether to release them. LBJ had said yes. The supervisor of Sturgis said that the liaison officer should have referred the matter back to the CIA. The other complaint he had about the liaison officer was that he had not managed to block the arrests at the front door of the police station as previously planned. Apparently, the liaison officer had taken a "bathroom break". I did not have his report so his explanations are missing from this discussion.

Frank Sturgis and Bernard Barker (1972)



The police report was already redacted in critical places. I thus tried to find out if there were originals in that same vault. To do that I had to go back to the DCI and ask. He did not know but gave me a signed note to take back to the vault's reference librarian. She found me 7 documents without redaction or omissions that I could ascertain. 3 of them were from the 4 before. The release page was not in that set, but I had not seen evidence that it was scrubbed. The release form did not say much except that there had been a mix up due to a case of "mistaken" identity. The arrest form was in Sturgis's name and the release form in an alias. That was very strange. I wondered why he had given his name as Sturgis. When I met with him I asked him. He said that he knew he was going to be finger printed and that his prints were already matched to the name of Sturgis in the FBI's computer.

The arrest form without the redaction showed that he had been arrested carrying a rifle. It said that the rifle was unregistered. The form did note that Sturgis claimed to be working for the CIA undercover to 'help protect the President's motorcade'. It said that he was arrested at the side of the Book Depository towards the Grassy Knoll and had first tried to resist arrest. He was in the company of two others who were arrested at the same time. But he claimed not to know them.

The parts of the supervisor's report that had been redacted included whom he had called when notified that Sturgis was in the Dallas jail. First off, I should say that it was clear that the supervisor was in Dallas on that day. The liaison officer had given him the news in person by walking a short distance. It appeared that the CIA had set up a mini station virtually inside a vacant room of the Dallas police station and were hiding in it out of view except for the liaison officer. That was part of the reason that the supervisor was so mad about the liaison officer going over to LBJ's hotel instead of taking the short walk down a hallway to give hand the problem back to the CIA. Really, this was the standard sort of turf war that we frequently see. The liaison officer probably thought that it would take too long for him to get an answer if it had to go through the CIA's field people up

to the DDO then the DCI to ask Johnson. So, he went straight to Johnson. He probably thought that the longer Sturgis and the other 2 were in the jail, the more likely the operation was to be exposed.

The flak report was the same in meaning but the words JFK appeared in the original.

The other 3 documents had to do with all 3 of the arrests. The first was an operational review of what went wrong. All three men were supposed to have 'melted into the crowd after disposing of their rifles'. Where they were supposed to leave them had not worked out. The CIA had put a large trash can on that side of the Book Depository to store the rifles in. Two of the 3 had taken the rifles out. The third was a look out. There was another set of CIA men on the grassy Knoll; they exited further in that direction. This team was the backup for that team. It was not supposed to fire as they lacked adequate cover to do so covertly. They were re-enforcements in case the primary team was 'overrun'. They were supposed to keep their weapons with them but out of sight. The trash can was not in sight when they went to put the 2 rifles back. That threw the timing off and the 3 were arrested with the rifles either in hand in Sturgis's case or against the wall behind them in one other 2 case. The two men who were supposed to carry the weapons away in the can had walked off with the can immediately after the assassination. They had not lifted the lid to check that the weapons were inside. That operational review said that the assassination had been conducted more like a military assault than an assassination and had too many CIA people falling over each other. The real error was to try to assassinate JFK in the first place, something he never mentioned. Black ops are ridiculous to try to run in the first place. And it annoyed me when after the fact I was asked to try to intervene in them using more incorrect methods.

The next document was a discussion of the pros and cons of killing all three of these men. It was the longest of them all, about 10 pages. It agonized over it. I did not read all of the middle of it. The conclusions were wishy washy and recommended a wait and see policy with reviews by others. In essence it was for killing them after waiting a suitable interval to make it look less suspicious, but did not want to come right out and say that straightforwardly. It said that the men had made mistakes to justify killing them. But in fact, the operation was not only unethical but it was poorly planned. It had not been written by the best of the CIA's op writers because they would not have gone along with it. So, it had used a third rate op writer who was unscrupulous. And it had used these CIA men who were more criminals than they were professional spies. Cuba was like a backwater for the CIA, sending its party drunkards out to play and rampage in the sun. Those kind of CIA thugs would not have stayed alive for a day inside of Russia. The KGB would have chewed them up alive.

After that document there was one that addressed loose ends and how to manage them. I found that one to be of the lowest quality of the lot of them. It was shallow in its treatment of the problem. Basically it was 'deny, deny, and keep on denying'. It was about 3 pages long, single spaced. Someone had put pencil marks on it to check off having done what it recommended. About 80% of what it recommended had been done. Mainly that entailed shredding papers at the Dallas police station and making sure that their internal security camera footage was reviewed. The footage was supposed to be deleted. Probably it was or the tapes discarded.

There should have been follow up reports on the loose threads, but they were not in the stack I was handed. By then I had seen enough for what I needed.

Most of what I did with Sturgis in the two sessions was go over questions I guessed would be asked him at trial relative to his past and have him answer. I tried to teach him anger management. I also tried to teach him to be more honest so that he would not trip himself up so much. People think that lies are the best strategy. Telling the truth skillfully is much more effective. It is probably something that takes a lifetime to learn, not just two sessions of a couple of hours.

I will give you an example of from my sessions with Sturgis in which we play acted.

I asked, "Did you rape that girl?"

His first response was intense anger and denying it, and then he started calling her a bitch and worse. It was a dreadful performance.

We went through it enough times until I got him to where he could say "I like girls. I don't take enough care about how they feel probably. I got carried away and just thought about what I wanted. I am sorry that I took advantage of her. I am really sorry that I ruined her life by what I did."

I also asked him, "Did you kill the President?"

Again, his first responses were awful. The first one was "The fucking bastard deserved to die. Johnson said to kill him. He killed some of my buddies. They never came home."

As we worked through his anger and his guilt for surviving while his buddies died, he went to saying, "I hated Kennedy. What he did to us was wrong. But I never got a chance to kill him. Others got the go on me."

At the end he said, "My buddies died in Cuba. I blamed Kennedy for that. I wish I had killed him, but I never got the chance."

The CIA had a lawyer ask him questions on a tape about a week later. The CIA was not entirely happy with me. But they liked that better than the tape they had made before they asked me to see him.

A Public Photo Album on Picasa From a Man Who Was Friends with Sturgis

I stumbled upon that photo above of Sturgis with the writing to Paul on it this morning at <http://picasaweb.google.com/scuzzler/PeterPaul19781998/photo#5048925433683963154> . I had no idea who Paul was but I went through part of the Picasa web album looking for more photos of Sturgis.



Caption

‘Paul with friend and ally in the battle to overthrow or assassinate Fidel Castro, Frank Sturgis’



Caption

“Peter Paul Reunites with President Nixon at His Yorba Linda Presidential Library Fifteen Years After Their Last Dinner In Key Biscayne. Paul represented Nixon's best friend Bebe Rebozo in the sale of the infamous Key Biscayne Bank”

I found a picture of Nixon with Paul and thought about how Nixon got his start in politics.

I wanted to know why Paul knew both Sturgis and Nixon.

All Captions from Picasa Photo Album--Vericity Unproven



“Third Most Wanted Nazi War Criminal - Chief of Gestapo Heinrich Mueller - located and exposed by Peter Paul in Peru when he was a teen in 1966. His first whistleblowing action came about by chance when he encountered the third most wanted Nazi war criminal after Eichman was captured in Argentina. Paul encountered Gestapo Chief Heinrich Mueller in the Peruvian jungle as an exchange student in Peru in 1964 when he was a guest of Mueller's granddaughter at Mueller's logging farm in Oxapampa, 13 hours by car outside of Lima in the Amazon. Mueller controlled a city populated entirely by germans and indians. Paul provided this information to the West German war crimes prosecutor in the Hague, where Paul, while studying International Law at the Peace Palace, attended a reception for the Queen of the Netherlands in 1973.”



“Paul became the protege of World Trade Centers founder and developer of the Twin Towers in New York, Guy Tozzoli. Paul began developing World Trade Centers with Tozzoli's blessing in South America and the Caribbean. Paul later protected Tozzoli from possible indictment when the New York Times commissioned an audit of Tozzoli's expenses, and many expenses were falsely attributed by Tozzoli to travel and dinners with Paul and a fictitious third person.”


**Peter F. Paul
President and Developer, Miami World Trade Center 1976- 1979**



The office tower Paul developed with air rights he was granted by the Miami Mayor and City Council at age 28 when he associated I.M.Pei to design what has become a Miami landmark.”



“The largest Foreign Trade Zone in the US, the Miami Free Zone, was founded by Paul in 1976 pursuant to a grant by the U.S. Department of Commerce after Paul was selected by the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, from a group of 8 international developer applicants. Paul sold his interest in the Miami Free Zone in 1977 to advance his development of the Miami World Trade Center”



“Talk show icon Larry King, mug shot from 1971- then Miami's most famous deadbeat. Serving Larry a subpoena was Paul's first official duty as a law clerk in Miami . Larry King was charged with various financial frauds in Miami in the early 1970's. Paul found and served a subpoena on King early one morning hiding in the DuPont Plaza Hotel, in his underwear, from creditors and process servers.”



“Larry King and his wife Shawn, ... in 2001, They were guests and donors at the Hillary Clinton Spago Lunch and Tea in Bel Air hosted and underwritten by Paul June 9, 2000, and at the infamous Hollywood Gala Salute to Pres Clinton fundraising event for Hillary, August 12, 2000”

It worried me when I saw these photos on the internet. It seemed to me that Peter Paul had put them up. Was he in the business of running black ups to destroy people's reputation?

executive branch."

He told Fessler and McDonald that if they kept the deal outside the United States, they would break no American laws. In fact, he was convinced the only way they would be arrested in Miami was if they actually did sell coffee to Cuba. That would violate the embargo, which fell under the Trading with the Enemy Act.

On Thursday, July 27, as Peter Paul was about to leave for the Dominican Republic on a business trip, he received a telex from Fessler, asking him to look up a Dominican businessman and pass along a message. The fellow was to use his bank to send a wire to Curacao indicating that 40,000 bags of coffee were available. Fessler had already been waiting a week for the confirmation, and he was getting anxious.


Peter Paul met the man in a Dominican hotel lobby, but the fellow was bitter, claiming the German owed him money. He didn't want to have anything more to do with him.

Paul phoned Fessler and McDonald to see what they wanted to do. They suggested he find someone else.

The next day, he did: Jiro Lezaca, the Colombian sales manager of the Plaza Dominicana Hotel. Lezaca had once rented space from him in Miami, and the two knew each other well.

"Hey, Jiro," Peter Paul greeted him. "How would you like to f - - Castro? And make a few million dollars?"

The attorney said he thought the garment bag contained only coffee samples, but inside were 5 pounds of cocaine.



"Today it is widely speculated that someone high up in Washington decided the scam should be ignored. Perhaps the CIA became involved. Such a scenario is entirely plausible." Page 23'



*To Peter Paul
With best wishes,
Ronald Reagan*

"President Reagan's support of Paul's efforts to reestablish himself in California after he left the Anti-Castro intrigues of Miami enabled Paul to be appointed to preside over California's role in the three year bicentennial commemoration of the Constitution and Bill of Rights working closely with US Supreme Court Justice Warren Burger's National Commission in Washington"

The
CONSPIRACY 
CHANNEL
COVERING THE COVERUP **.com**

THE SECRET HISTORY



IN SEARCH
of the **AMERICAN**
DRUG LORDS

The CIA & the Mob
From Dallas to Mena

[This is supposed to be an excellent documentary about those involved with this coup](#)

To understand the CIA/mob connections of the assassination

DARK ALLIANCE

THE CIA,

THE CONTRAS,

AND THE

CRACK COCAINE

EXPLOSION

GARY WEBB

FOREWORD BY U.S. CONGRESSWOMAN MAXINE WATERS



Paul explaining project to Chief Justice Burger in Washington

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER
RETIRED

March 4, 1988

Dear Mr. Paul:

Thank you for joining us in Washington, D.C. for an exchange of ideas to commemorate the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution. We congratulate you on your accomplishments to enhance an understanding of the Constitution.

The Framers volunteered their time, energy, and intelligence to create an effective government. Your initiative contributes to our efforts to honor the Constitution and to make the Bicentennial a history and civics lesson for all of us.

Cordially,

William E. Burger

Mr. Peter Paul
State of California Commission
on the Bicentennial of the U.S.
Constitution
700 N. Brand Boulevard, Suite 550
Glendale, California 91203

From Wikipedia on Warren Burger:

“In 1969, President [Richard M. Nixon](#) nominated Burger to the Chief Justice position....According to President Nixon's memoirs, Nixon in the spring of 1970 had asked Justice Burger to be prepared to run for President in 1972 if the political repercussions of the [Cambodia invasion](#) were too negative for Nixon to endure. A few years later, in 1971 and 1973, Burger was on Nixon's short list of vice-presidential replacements for Vice President [Spiro Agnew](#), along with [John Connally](#), [Ronald Reagan](#), and [Nelson Rockefeller](#).”

Now wait a minute! Nixon said he was considering for Vice President who? Wasn't Connally a Democrat?

John Connolly was wounded in the JFK assassination;

“In the 1948 Democratic primary for the [U.S. Senate](#) seat vacated by the retiring [W. Lee O'Daniel](#), Connally was the LBJ campaign manager, as the congressman opposed former Governor [Coke R. Stevenson](#) of [Junction](#), the seat of [Kimble County](#) in central Texas. During the tabulation period, Connally journeyed to [Alice](#), the seat of [Jim Wells County](#) in south Texas, and through "political boss" [George Parr](#) procured a revision of the totals from Precinct 13. Some 203 names were added to the LBJ tabulation, all signed in blue ink and in the same handwriting. Some of the names were of deceased persons. The list was thereafter burned in a fire. This change in tabulation plunged Johnson into an 87-vote primary runoff majority.^[3]

Connally then persuaded the [Temple publisher Frank W. Mayborn](#) to return to Texas from a business trip in [Nashville, Tennessee](#), to cast the decisive vote in the 29-28 decision by the Democratic State Central Committee to certify Johnson as the party nominee by the disputed eighty-seven votes. [United States Supreme Court](#) Justice [Hugo Black](#) had deemed that the decision in the Johnson-Stevenson race rested squarely with the central committee....


In 1961, President Kennedy named Connally, at Johnson's request, as [Secretary of the Navy](#). Connally resigned eleven months later to run for the Texas governorship. At the time, the Navy was one of the largest employers in the world, with more than 600,000 in uniform and 650,000 civilian workers, stationed at 222 bases in the United States and 53 abroad. It had a budget of \$14 billion.^[6]....During the [Vietnam War](#), Connally [hawkishly](#) urged Johnson to "finish" the engagement by any military means necessary.

Connally was seriously wounded while riding in President Kennedy's car in [Dallas](#). In the [single bullet theory](#) espoused by the [Warren Commission](#), he was injured five

times when a bullet, having already injured Kennedy, passed through Connally's chest, exiting below the right nipple, then entered his right wrist, shattering the radius bone, and upon exiting embedded itself in Connally's left thigh. In this scenario, the bullet that injured Connally was the second one fired and injured him 4.9 seconds before the fatal head shot to Kennedy. Critics of the [Warren Commission](#) have questioned whether a single *magic bullet* could have caused all of these injuries.”

Connally didn't become a Republican until 1973. Is the fact the Nixon was considering a man who LBJ got appointed into a position which could influence war profiteering profits, the 9th reason to suspect Nixon, and the first to suspect Connally? If Connally was part of the plot to murder JFK then it would be expected that he would receive a big payback from another conspirator.

Poster from Peter Paul's Co.



There are hundreds of politicians that Nixon could have considered for Vice President. But in conspiracies involving deep dark secrets people only trust those they can count on-- mostly people already in on the conspiracy. So, their options are very narrowed. That results in 'incestuous' appointments, also known as cronyism. Here the 3 people Nixon considered are loyal to Johnson or later seen to be willing to lie to coverup the JFK assassination. Their level of expertise in politics is as that of governors of states. Suppose that there were 100 people in the country for Nixon to choose from and 10 conspirators. If Nixon was not part of the conspiracy, his chances of his first choice being a conspirator is 1 in 10, of the second is 1 in 10, and of the third is 1 in 10. The chance that all 3 would be is 1 in 1,000! Is Nixon's considering Reagan and Rockefeller as Vice President, both of whom later help coverup the JFK assassination, the 10th and 11th fact supporting Nixon is

suspect? One could count it as one or two pieces of evidence. If each piece of evidence was only likely to result from chance alone 1 in 10 times, then 10 pieces of independent evidence would mean that there was only a 1 in 10,000,000,000 chance that the person was free of conspiracy. However, as I stated earlier, they could be involved in a different conspiracy. It is the specifics that many of the facts we are looking at directly have to do with covering up of the JFK assassination, that make it likely that the conspiracy is about his death. Many of the pieces of evidence are less than 1 in 100 due to chance alone, not just one in 10.

Similarly, if there was no conspiracy, there is less than a 1 in 10 chance by chance alone that Reagan would be considered. Is that the 3rd piece of evidence against Reagan? The first would be being picked by Rockefeller for the coverup and the second would be going along with the coverup's conclusions. Is that the 14 piece of evidence against Rockefeller?

UNFINISHED

Here is part of what Wikipedia had to say about Peter Paul ;



“As a result of what Paul described as anti-Communist and anti-Castro political activities,[4] he directed a fraud on the [Cuban](#) government of \$8.75 million dollars by selling agents of Cuban dictator [Fidel Castro](#) nonexistent coffee. The plan apparently also involved sinking the ship that was to deliver the nonexistent coffee to hide the fraud from Castro and, according to TIME Magazine, to defraud its insurer, but the ship was abandoned in Costa Rica and never sunk.[2] [5]

Paul pleaded guilty to federal conspiracy charges. When his home was raided by the police in connection with this crime, they found cocaine in his garage, and Paul also

pleaded guilty to possessing cocaine with intent to distribute.[2] He was sentenced to eight years in prison for the cocaine charge, and a concurrent three years for fraud; he was paroled after three years. His license to practice law was suspended as a result of the convictions,[6][7] and he claims to have been sued by the Cuban government as well.[4]

In 1983, Paul was caught traveling to [Canada](#) using the identity of a dead man;[8] he pleaded guilty to federal charges of making false statements to customs inspectors. This was a violation of his parole terms from the 1979 felonies, and he went back to jail.[2]

After being released from federal prison in California, Paul moved to [Los Angeles](#). In 1985, he was appointed President of the California Bicentennial Foundation for the

Constitution and Bill of Rights, a foundation designated by the California state legislature and governor to direct California's role in the Bicentennial celebration of the Constitution and Bill of Rights.[9] Paul's efforts on behalf of the Foundation were derided in the Los Angeles Times, in part because the commission was selling a book that described blacks as "pickaninnies," and slaveowners as "the worst victims of slavery,"[10] and in part because Paul referred to the founding fathers of the United States as "39 sweaty old men arguing in Philadelphia",[9] and remarked that most Californians weren't able to understand the 18th century language in the constitution anyway.[11] Prior to the Los Angeles Times article, Chief Justice [Warren Burger](#) had commended Paul for his efforts in a letter that read in part "We commend you for the many contributions you have made during the national commemoration of the Constitution's 200th anniversary".[12][13] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peter_F._Paul



Peter Paul discusses the activities of the American Spirit Foundation founded by Paul and actor Jimmy Stewart, and actively supported by President and Mrs Reagan



SLM Bankruptcy Filings



Sched B SLM Assets in bankruptcy

Peter Paul, Stan Lee, and Senator Hillary Clinton

The maker of the clip talked to Peter Paul and excused his previous drug running as working for the government.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-C9kP6wz5I4>

So, it appears he was CIA.


It says that you can find out more by going to his website www.peterpaul.com but that goes to regular solenoid manufacturing company in business for 60 years. Maybe that is called deep cover.

Here is what he said in one of his writings on the internet;

‘He was Executive Editor of the Washington Times' **Insight on the News** magazine when he published the first of four feature stories, "Paul Takes the Fall?" on my political corruption allegations [regarding Hillary Clinton]. I spent hours on the phone, emailing and instant messaging him from deep in the bowels of a Brazilian dungeon. I had the first court ordered laptop computer (with a secret wireless connection to the internet) in the history of (North or South) American prisons.’ http://www.peterfpaul.com/2005/11/the_scandal_that_could_sink_hi_1/

It appeared that CIA wanted him to be able to keep up his allegations against Hillary and made the arrangements for the court ordered laptop and the ‘secret wireless connection to the internet’. Was he assigned to destroy Hillary Clinton’s reputation?





Peter Paul with legendary actors James Stewart and Bob Hope who were Paul's original allies in entering the entertainment business in 1989 when Stewart founded a new entertainment industry foundation, American Spirit Foundation, with Paul



Peter Paul discusses the activities of the American Spirit Foundation founded by Paul and actor Jimmy Stewart, and actively supported by President and Mrs Reagan

Did Nixon Use of Those Particular CIA Thugs for a Reason?

Ford pardoned Nixon after Nixon used Sturgis and E. Howard Hunt to break into the Democratic Convention in the WaterGate Scandal. Wasn't that the 9th reason to suspect the Ford was part of the same coverup of the JFK assassination? And isn't that the 5th reason to suspect Nixon as well? Why did Nixon use some of the same exact CIA men who had been involved in the JFK assassination? Was it because he knew he 'had the goods on them'? Was it because they were long time co-conspirators going back to the Bay of Pigs? Nixon had not been living in Miami or on islands off Cuba. Or was it because they were co-conspirators from the JFK assassination? Is using the same men from the JFK assassination the 6th reason to suspect Nixon?

In the last case I mentioned that Bush, Sr. called Nixon to ask him to resign before the WaterGate investigation tracked back to something worse. Since the same men were used in the JFK assassination, didn't that mean that Bush, Sr. meant the JFK assassination? Is that the 7th piece of evidence that Nixon was suspect in the JFK assassination? Is that also a piece of evidence against Bush, Sr.? Call that the first piece for the sake of counting as I haven't started a tally yet on Bush, Sr. Nixon promptly resigned in response to Bush's request. Is that acknowledgment of the danger then the 8th piece of evidence against Nixon and the second against Bush?

In the Zapata Corporation wikipedia article several ex-CIA types have linked Bush, Sr. to the JFK assassination directly or indirectly. The photo of outside the Book Depository was also suggestive. I have added my voice as well, but I am just another person whose testimony may or may not be true. I think that what I know is valid, but why should you trust what I say? The beauty of the method that I am trying to teach you is that it is fairly robust. The more you use actual data from official coverups the less likely you will be thrown off by hearsay, red herrings, and false assumptions. Thus, I am not going to count in the tallies anything that I have said because I might not be impartial. That way you can stop worrying about whether what I said was true and focus instead on the other evidence. At least that is what I will hope that you will do.



One inconvertible fact is that at Ford's funeral Bush, Sr. tried to impugn the character of those who did not believe the lies of the Warren Commission. He called such people "conspiracy theorists" to try to put them down. That is trying to defeat the views of others using dirty tactics, instead of facts and valid logical arguments. When you hear someone do that, it is rather like hearing an admission of guilt or defeat for their point of view. It is an acknowledgement that they have no validity for their view--no facts to back themselves up. Is Bush, Sr.'s trying to emotionally intimidate others into silence on their disagreement with the Warren Commission the 3rd fact that makes him suspect?

Did Reagan's Role in the Coverup Earn Him the Presidency?



[Notice Nelson Rockefeller just to the right of Ford and Reagan at the Republican Convention in 1976 as Ford's appointed Vice President].

It is beginning to look like serving on one of these white washes of the JFK assassination gives you about a one in 7 chance of being President! Did Ronald Reagan mightily please Nelson Rockefeller by helping him cover-up his guilt in ordering the JFK assassination? Did Nelson give massive financial or political backing to Reagan and Bush, Sr. when they ran for office? Would a reasonable person count Reagan becoming President as the 7th piece of evidence that Nelson Rockefeller was highly suspect in the JFK assassination? Was Reagan serving on the Rockefeller Commission the first piece of evidence he was involved in the cover-up? Was his becoming President the second?



Synopsis

That recent appraisal reflects a growing consensus that the Warren Commission largely failed in its duty to our nation. Echoing that sentiment, the Gallup organization has reported that 75 percent of Americans polled do not believe the Commission's major conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald was the "lone assassin." Gerald McKnight now gives profound substance to that view in the most meticulous and devastating dissection of the Commission's work to date. The Warren Commission produced 26 volumes of hearings and exhibits, more than 17,000 pages of testimony, and a 912-page report. Surely a definitive effort. Not at all, McKnight argues. "The Warren Report" itself, he contends, was little more than the capstone to a deceptive and shoddily improvised exercise in public relations designed to "prove" that Oswald had acted alone. McKnight argues that the Commission's own documents and collected testimony - as well as thousands of other items it never saw, refused to see, or actively suppressed - reveal two conspiracies: the still very murky one surrounding the assassination itself and the official one that covered it up.

The cover-up actually began, he reveals, within days of Kennedy's death, when President Johnson, FBI Director J Edgar Hoover, and acting



Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach all agreed that any official investigation must reach only one conclusion: Oswald was the assassin. While McKnight does not uncover any "smoking gun" that identifies the real conspirators, he nevertheless provides the strongest case yet that the Commission was wrong - and knew it. Oswald might have knowingly or

unwittingly been involved, but the Commission's own evidence proves he could not have acted alone. Based on more than a quarter-million pages of government documents and, for the first time ever, the 50,000 file cards in the Dallas FBI's "Special Index," McKnight's book must now be the starting point for future debate on the assassination. It should also inspire readers to echo the "Journal of American History's" praise for his previous book: "McKnight's insistence upon remaining within the bounds of the evidence inspires confidence in his judgment."

Role in JFK assassination investigation

In the 1979 account from the [House Select Committee on Assassinations \(HSCA\)](#), it came out that on [November 25, 1963](#), only 3 days after the [John F. Kennedy assassination](#) and before any investigation had been conducted, Nicholas Katzenbach, then deputy [attorney general](#), had written a memo to presidential assistant [Bill Moyers](#) at the [White House](#). Katzenbach's [memo](#) comes the closest of any known official document ([Katzenbach's memo](#)) to discussing a government coverup (although in the context of the memo it seems just as likely that he hoped to head off panicked media speculation about a Communist plot - hence to avoid inadvertently escalating the Cold War):

"The public must be satisfied that Oswald was the assassin; that he had no confederates who are still at large; and that evidence was such that he would have been convicted at trial...Speculation about Oswald's motivation ought to be cut off...Unfortunately the facts on Oswald seem about too pat—too obvious (Marxist, Cuba, Russian wife, etc.)...We need something to head off public speculation or Congressional hearings of the wrong sort."

The Committee's final report implies Katzenbach, [FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover](#), and others were the key actors behind the creation of the [Warren Commission](#). According to the [report](#), [Hoover](#) told staff members on November 24, 1963 that he and Katzenbach were anxious to have "something issued so we can convince the public that [Oswald](#) is the real assassin," though the idea of a commission was initially opposed by [President Johnson](#).

He served in the [U.S. Department of Justice](#) as [Assistant Attorney General](#) of the [Office of Legal Counsel](#) in [1961-1962](#) and as [Deputy Attorney General](#) from [1962](#) to [1965](#). [President Johnson](#) appointed Katzenbach the 65th [Attorney General](#) of the United States on [February 11, 1965](#), and he held the office until [October 2, 1966](#). He then served as [Under Secretary of State](#) from [1966](#) to [1969](#).

He was named chairman of the failing [Bank of Credit and Commerce International \(BCCI\)](#) in [1991](#).

House Select Committee on Assassinations

In 1975, [Frank Church](#) became the chairman of the **Select** Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities.

In 1959, Senate Majority Leader [Lyndon B. Johnson](#) appointing Church to the Foreign Relations Committee. Church, like his idol, [William Borah](#), held independent political views and in 1965, Church began to criticize U.S. involvement in [Vietnam](#).
www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USAchurchF.htm

This committee investigated alleged abuses of power by the [Central Intelligence Agency](#) and the [Federal Bureau of Intelligence](#). In September, 1975, a subcommittee under [Richard Schweiker](#) was asked to investigate the performance of the intelligence agencies concerning the **assassination** of [John F. Kennedy](#).

In its final report, issued in April 1976, the **Select** Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities concluded: “Domestic intelligence activity has threatened and undermined the Constitutional rights of Americans to free speech, association and privacy. It has done so primarily because the Constitutional system for checking abuse of power has not been applied.” The committee also revealed details for the first time of what the CIA called [Operation Mockingbird](#).

The committee also reported that the [Central Intelligence Agency](#) had withheld from the [Warren Commission](#), during its investigation of the **assassination** of [John F. Kennedy](#), information about plots by the Government of the United States against [Fidel Castro](#) of [Cuba](#); and that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had conducted a counter-intelligence program (COINTELPRO) against [Martin Luther King](#) and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

In 1976 [Thomas N. Downing](#) began campaigning for a new investigation into the **assassination** of [John F. Kennedy](#). Downing said he was certain that Kennedy had been killed as a result of a conspiracy. He believed that the recent deaths of [Sam Giancana](#) and [Johnny Roselli](#) were highly significant. He also believed that the Central Intelligence Agency and the [Federal Bureau of Investigation](#) had withheld important information from the [Warren Commission](#). Downing was not alone in taking this view. In 1976, a *Detroit News* poll indicated that 87% of the American population did not believe that [Lee Harvey Oswald](#) was the lone gunman who killed Kennedy. In September, 1976, Schweiker became a member of the [House Select Committee on Assassinations](#) in September 1976. The resolution authorized a 12-member select committee to conduct an investigation of the circumstances surrounding the deaths of [John F. Kennedy](#) and [Martin Luther King](#).

“Richard Schweiker was born in Norristown on 1st June, 1926.
During the [Second World War](#) he served in the [United States Navy](#).

After graduating from Pennsylvania State University in 1950 he was employed as a manufacturing and sales executive. A member of the Republican Party he was elected to Congress in November, 1960.

In 1976 [Antonio Veciana](#) was interviewed by the [House Select Committee on Assassinations](#). The founder of the anti-Castro organization, Alpha 66, he told the committee about his relationship with his [Central Intelligence Agency](#) contact, Maurice Bishop. He claimed that in August, 1963, he saw Bishop and [Lee Harvey Oswald](#) in Dallas. Veciana admitted that Bishop had organized and funded the Alpha 66 attacks on the Soviet ships docked in Cuba in 1963.

Veciana explained the policy: "It was my case officer, Maurice Bishop, who had the idea to attack the Soviet ships. The intention was to cause trouble between Kennedy and Russia. Bishop believed that Kennedy and Khrushchev had made a secret agreement that the USA would do nothing more to help in the fight against Castro. Bishop felt - he told me many times - that President Kennedy was a man without experience surrounded by a group of young men who were also inexperienced with mistaken ideas on how to manage this country. He said you had to put Kennedy against the wall in order to force him to make decisions that would remove Castro's regime."

Schweiker, speculated that Bishop was [David Atlee Phillips](#). Schweiker arranged for Veciana and Phillips to be introduced at a meeting of the Association of Retired Intelligence Officers in Reston. Phillips denied knowing Veciana. After the meeting Veciana told Schweiker that Phillips was not the man known to him as Bishop.

Schweiker was unconvinced by this evidence. He found it difficult to believe Phillips would not have known the leader of Alpha 66. Especially as Phillips had been in charge of covert action in [Cuba](#) when Alpha 66 was established. Another CIA agent who worked in Cuba during this period, claimed that Phillips used the code name, Maurice Bishop.

During the investigation Schweiker studied a large number of classified intelligence files. In 1978 he told the author, [Anthony Summers](#): "Either we trained and sent him to Russia, and they went along and pretended they didn't know to fake us out, or in fact, they inculcated him and sent him back here and were trying to fake us out that way."

In 1981 President [Ronald Reagan](#) appointed him Secretary of Health and Human Services. Two years later he became president of American Council of Life Insurance. "<http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/JFKschweiker.htm>

“The **United States House of Representatives Select Committee on Assassinations** was established in 1976 to investigate the [John F. Kennedy assassination](#) and the [Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. assassination](#). The Committee investigated until 1978, and in 1979 issued its final report, concluding that President John F. Kennedy was assassinated by [Lee Harvey Oswald](#), probably as a result of a [conspiracy](#). The members of this probable conspiracy were not identified. However, the committee noted that it believed that the conspiracy did not include the governments of the [Soviet Union](#) or [Cuba](#), nor the [FBI](#), the [CIA](#), or the [Secret Service](#). It also stated it did not believe the conspiracy was organized by any [organized crime](#) group, nor any anti-[Castro](#) group, but that it could not rule out individual members of either of those groups acting together.

The House Select Committee on Assassinations suffered from being conducted mostly in secret, and then issuing a public report with much of its evidence kept secret. [1] In 1992, Congress passed legislation to collect and open up all the evidence relating to Kennedy's death, and created the [Assassination Records Review Board](#) to further that goal.

The HSCA committee was a followup to the Hart-Schweiker and [Church Committee](#) hearings that had revealed [CIA](#) ties to other assassinations and assassination attempts. The HSCA resulted from public demands following hundreds of books, magazine articles, and video documentaries completed by private citizens and professional investigators since 1963 and the public outcry after the [Zapruder film](#) was first shown in motion on TV in March [1975](#) after having been stored by *Life* magazine out of view of the public for almost twelve years.”

The CIA was one of the prime suspects. The HSCA was intended to be a cover-up from the beginning because its meetings were secret. Unfortunately, this wikipedia article does not tell us who made the decision to launch this cover-up, appointed its members, and made the hearings secret. Thus, we are missing some key information. Those omissions are part of the evidence. The omissions tell us that between the time that committee was formed and when it was last modified in 2008 that the JFK assassination was still actively being covered up. Which group(s) had enough power to maintain the cover up of who made those cover-up decisions in this investigation? Clearly, the Rockefellers, the CIA, and Skull and Bones.





Both Bushes and Clinton were members of Skull and Bones. Bush, Sr. was DCI Jan. 30, 1976 to Jan. 20, 1977. The above excerpt tells us that the HSCA was started in 1976 while he was DCI. Later in the article we read that:

“The Chief Counsel of the Committee later changed his views that the CIA was being cooperative and forthcoming with the investigation when he learned that the CIA's special liaison to the Committee researchers, George Joannides, was actually involved with some of the organizations that Lee Harvey Oswald was involved with in the months leading up to the assassination, including an anti-Castro group, the DRE, which was linked to the CIA, where the liaison, Joannides, worked in 1963. Chief Counsel Blakey later stated that Joannides, instead, should have been interviewed by the Committee, rather than serving as a gatekeeper to the CIA's evidence and files regarding the assassination. He further disregarded and suspected all the CIA's statements and representations to the Committee, accusing it of [obstruction of justice](#).”

This is then a solid piece of evidence that Bush, Sr. was a conspirator in the cover-up, call it number 1. He ensured that the Committee did not have the evidence it needed when it started. The CIA person he choose to be the liaison to the Committee Joannides was linked to the anti-Castro group who we see Blakey suspects of being part of the JFK assassination team. Thus, it was reasonable to form the hypothesis that the CIA's anti-Castro group and

Joannides were part of the JFK assassination, not just the cover-up. The wikipedia article titled CIA activities in Cuba states;

“The CIA-organized [Bay of Pigs Invasion](#) of [Cuba](#) in 1961, failed, using plans that the regular military advised against. Kennedy also required the invasion to be less visible, and reduced its air support. Recently declassified documents show that President Kennedy had officially denied the CIA authorization to invade Cuba.”

Members of the HSCA were ;

- [Thomas N. Downing](#), ([Virginia](#)) First Chairman
- Downing was a strong believer that there was a conspiracy and cover up in the assassination of President [John F. Kennedy](#), pushed for re-opening investigations, and chaired the [House Select Committee on Assassinations](#).
- [Louis Stokes](#), ([Ohio](#)), Second Chairman
- [L. Richardson Preyer](#), ([North Carolina](#))
- [Walter E. Fautroy](#), ([District of Columbia](#))
- [Yvonne Brathwaite Burke](#), ([California](#))
- [Christopher Dodd](#), ([Connecticut](#))
- [Harold Ford, Sr.](#), ([Tennessee](#))
- [Floyd Fithian](#), ([Indiana](#))
- [Robert W. Edgar](#), ([Pennsylvania](#))
- [Samuel L. Devine](#), ([Ohio](#))
- [Stewart McKinney](#), ([Connecticut](#))
- [Charles Thone](#), ([Nebraska](#))
- [Harold S. Sawyer](#), ([Michigan](#))

[\[edit\]](#)

Committee Staff

- [G. Robert Blakey](#)
- During 1967, he was a Consultant on organized crime for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, serving under [Lyndon B. Johnson](#).
- A reviewer of the book he wrote called [The Plot to Kill the President](#) had this to say about the book;

“When G. Robert Blakey wrote this, he had spent a good part of his career trying to bring down organized crime. I can't help but think that his "the mob killed Kennedy" HSCA theory was, in the end, his own pure speculation, crafted to help further his agenda. But you have to hand it to him, his Jihad against the mob (through his RICO legislation etc.) worked. I'm just not sure how honest his book is about the Kennedy assassination.”

The conclusions of the committee are reported by Wikipedia to be;

Conclusions regarding the JFK assassination

The HSCA concluded in its 1979 report that (*emphasis added*):

1. *Lee Harvey Oswald fired three shots at President John F. Kennedy. The second and third shots he fired struck the President. The third shot he fired killed the President.*
2. *Scientific acoustical evidence establishes a high probability that two gunmen fired at President John F. Kennedy. Other scientific evidence does not preclude the possibility of two gunmen firing at the President. Scientific evidence negates some specific conspiracy allegations.*
3. *The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that President John F. Kennedy was probably assassinated as a result of a conspiracy. The committee was unable to identify the other gunmen or the extent of the conspiracy.*
 - *The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that the Soviet Government was not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy.*
 - *The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that the Cuban Government was not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy.*
 - *The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that anti-Castro Cuban groups, as groups, were not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy, but that the available evidence does not preclude the possibility that individual members may have been involved.*
 - *The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that the national syndicate of organized crime, as a group, was not involved in the assassination of President Kennedy, but that the available evidence does not preclude the possibility that individual members may have been involved.*

- The committee believes, on the basis of the evidence available to it, that the *Secret Service, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Central Intelligence Agency were not involved in the assassination* of President Kennedy.
4. Agencies and departments of the U.S. Government performed with varying degrees of competency in the fulfilment of their duties. *President John F. Kennedy did not receive adequate protection.* A thorough and reliable investigation into the responsibility of Lee Harvey Oswald for the assassination was conducted. *The investigation into the possibility of conspiracy in the assassination was inadequate.* the conclusions of the investigations were arrived at in good faith, but presented in a fashion that was too definitive.

The Committee further concluded that it was probable that:

- four shots were fired
- the third shot came from a second assassin located on the [grassy knoll](#), but missed.

The HSCA agreed with the [single bullet theory](#), but concluded that it occurred at a time point during the assassination that differed from any of the several time points the Warren Commission theorized it occurred.

The [Department of Justice](#), FBI, CIA, and the [Warren Commission](#) were all criticized for deficient job performance in their subsequent investigations, deficient in revealing to the Warren Commission information available in 1964, and the [Secret Service](#) was called deficient in their protection of the President.

There are some interesting photos of people in Delay Plaza on the day of the assassination, comparing them with photos of men in the Bay of Pigs invasion/CIA at www.manuscriptservice.com/FFiDP-2/ . I mention it only as an aside as I stumbled across it.

George Bush Sr. on a Zapata Oil Rig



The CIA's name for the Bay of Pigs invasion was Operation Zapata, the name of Bush, Sr.'s oil company. This is the 3rd piece of evidence against Bush, Sr., only this time, it is evidence that he was involved in the assassination attempt. And we have a likely motive, anger at JFK for not conquering Cuba and likely financial gain in getting more oil if it had been conquered. The article on

Zapata tells us that Bush's Zapata oil company was operating on an island close to Cuba. Furthermore, two of the ships used in the Bay of Pigs invasion were called the Houston and the Barabara. That is suggestive that Bush, Sr. was high up in the invasion plans. That strengthens the 3rd piece of evidence that Bush, Sr. was involved in the anti-Castro activities of the CIA before JFK was assassinated.

In the Zapata Corporation article in Wikipedia we are supplied with the Hoover memo that says that George Bush was in the CIA and was briefed 24 hours after the JFK murder.

- 1 - Rosen
- 1 - Liaison
- 1 - Nasca

NOV 29 1 31 PM '63
 REC'D - READING ROOM
 FBI

Date: November 29, 1963
To: Director
 Bureau of Intelligence and Research
 Department of State
From: John Edgar Hoover, Director
Subject: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY
 NOVEMBER 22, 1963

YIT

Our Miami, Florida, Office on November 23, 1963, advised that the Office of Coordinator of Cuban Affairs in Miami advised that the Department of State feels some misguided anti-Castro group might capitalize on the present situation and undertake an unauthorized raid against Cuba, believing that the assassination of President John F. Kennedy might herald a change in U. S. policy, which is not true.

Our sources and informants familiar with Cuban matters in the Miami area advise that the general feeling in the anti-Castro Cuban community is one of stunned disbelief and, even among those who did not entirely agree with the President's policy concerning Cuba, the feeling is that the President's death represents a great loss not only to the U. S. but to all of Latin America. These sources know of no plans for unauthorized action against Cuba.

62-109060-1396
 FBI - MIAMI
 NOV 29 1963

An informant who has furnished reliable information in the past and who is close to a small pro-Castro group in Miami has advised that these individuals are afraid that the assassination of the President may result in strong repressive measures being taken against them and, although pro-Castro in their feelings, regret the assassination.

Let

The substance of the foregoing information was orally furnished to Mr. George Bush of the Central Intelligence Agency and Captain William Lockwood of the Defense Intelligence Agency on November 23, 1963, by Mr. W. T. Forsyth of this Bureau.

1 - Director of Naval Intelligence
 1 - [Signature]
 1 - [Signature]

DEC 9 1963
 XEROX
 TELETYPE UNIT

We have already tagged Hoover as a conspirator in the cover-up because as Director of the FBI he had a duty to investigate JFK's death and expose the full truth about it and he failed to do so. Thus, his briefing Bush, Sr. at the CIA promptly about his investigations must be seen as one part of the assassination plotters briefing another part in order to ensure an effective cover-up. This forms the second solid piece of evidence against Hoover, and the 4th against Bush, Sr. Also, notice that Hoover briefed a captain in the Defense Intelligence

Agency (DIA) apparently at the same time. Why are members of the CIA and DIA both briefed by Hoover with a tag to the Office of Naval Intelligence? Hoover is writing the cover story that he is doing that because of unrest in the Miami FBI area caused by the death of JFK and the possibility that the anti-Castro people will launch a boat invasion of Cuba. But his letter denies that that is the case. I count this as the third piece of evidence against Hoover because the letter is obviously a cover-up pretext for briefing other members of the conspiracy. Furthermore, Hoover mentions a possible change of US foreign policy within 24 hours of the assassination. He has just let slip that he knows what Johnson's policies would be separate from JFK's. That strongly implies that he has discussed with Johnson how he would run the country after JFK's death. I count that as a piece of evidence that Hoover was a conspirator in the assassination, not just in the cover-up later. When did he have time to become part of the cover-up in that first 24 hours? So, it is clear that he was a part of the conspiracy to commit the murder. Furthermore, Hoover in the first 24 hours should be focusing all of his time and attention on the investigation of the murder, not on briefing others about non-problems. I count that as another solid piece of evidence against Hoover. He is being negligent in his investigation of the murder.

Because Hoover has briefed Bush, Sr. and the DIA Captain on his investigations of the JFK assassination, we know that Bush, Sr. and the DIA Captain are in charge of the CIA's and DIA's teams to cover-up the assassination. That counts as a piece of evidence against both of them. They are not high enough up in their agencies to have made those assignments. It is unreasonable to assume that they are rogue agents because LBJ would not have relied on such low level people to keep those agencies in check. He would have relied on heads of agencies to ensure that the coup succeeded and that people inside those agencies did not report irregularities to people he could not control. We already know that former DCI Dulles was on the Warren Committee and had been fired by Kennedy. DCI McCone took office in 1961, at least a year before the JFK assassination. It is possible that Dulles still has control of the DDO at the CIA and is running the assassination through him. But given that McCone is DCI until 1965, a good year after the assassination and the coverup holds, it is likely that McCone took active steps to further the cover-up under Johnson. That is, it is inconceivable that someone inside the CIA would not have tipped McCone off in that amount of time and he should have resigned immediately, if he did not want to be part of the coverup. Bush, Sr. is thus reporting to the DDO (Deputy Director of Operations), and likely his old DCI Dulles and probably McCone as well. This is one piece of evidence that that DDO and McCone are part of the conspiracy to assassinate JFK. It also strengthens the evidence that Dulles was a conspirator.

Next, the article on Zapata Corporation gives us this document,

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : SAC, HOUSTON

FROM : SA GRAHAM W. KITCHSL

SUBJECT: UNKNOWN SUBJECT;
ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
JOHN F. KENNEDY

DATE: 11-22-63

At 1:45 p.m. Mr. GEORGE H. W. BUSH, President of the Zapata Off-shore Drilling Company, Houston, Texas, residence 5525 Briar, Houston, telephonically furnished the following information to writer by long distance telephone call from Tyler, Texas.

BUSH stated that he wanted to be kept confidential but wanted to furnish hearsay that he recalled hearing in recent weeks, the day and source unknown. He stated that one JAMES PARROTT has been talking of killing the President when he comes to Houston.

BUSH stated that PARROTT is possibly a student at the University of Houston and is active in political matters in this area. He stated that he felt Mrs. FAWLEY, telephone number SU 2-5239, or ARLINE SMITH, telephone number JA 9-9194 of the Harris County Republican Party Headquarters would be able to furnish additional information regarding the identity of PARROTT.

BUSH stated that he was proceeding to Dallas, Texas, would remain in the Sheraton-Dallas Hotel and return to his residence on 11-23-63. His office telephone number is CA 2-0395.

GNK:djw
(2) djw

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 10-15-93 BY 9803 RDD/KSL

Schmidt - (JFK)
of Jackson

62-2115-6

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED 211	FILED 211
NOV 22 1963	
FBI - HOUSTON	

MKR

This document makes no sense. Why does Bush rush to Dallas? If he has evidence he can give it at any police station in Texas. Furthermore, it convicts him in being derelict in his duty to have reported that threat to the President's life immediately upon hearing it. I count that dereliction of duty as another piece of evidence against him as a conspirator in the assassination. We have only his word that he was in Tyler at the time of the call. This document is clearly an attempt by Bush, Sr. to make an official alibi to place himself outside of Dallas, and explain why he later shows up there. His preparing this alibi is another solid piece of evidence against him. But he does not just provide an alibi as to where he was presumably at the time of the assassination, he blames another person without giving any

specifics. Since we already have him tagged as a conspirator, I count his laying blame on someone else, as the next piece of evidence against him.

What other evidence do we have that Bush, Sr. was a conspirator in the cover-up? This article started with the picture of Bush, Sr. trying to get the people at Ford's funeral to believe the Warren Commission lies because I stumbled across that fact as I was writing this up. That forms another fact that is incontestable evidence that Bush, Sr. was a conspirator in the cover-up.



Bush as Vice President under Reagan for 8 years, 1981-1989, and President 1989-1993. He been DCI and knew how to get things done at the CIA. Since he had the power to have the JFK assassination properly investigated again and did not do so, I count that as another piece of evidence against him. The public is still very concerned with finding out the truth of who killed JFK, it has never become a 'dead issue'. Reagan was President for 8 years and he is already tagged as a likely conspirator for

his helping cover-up the JFK assassination during the Rockefeller Commission. His failure to have the assassination properly find the culprits is also another piece of evidence that he was involved in the cover-up, not the assassination.

Carter was President for 4 year from 1977 to 1981. The HSCA investigation was started in 1976 and continued through 1978, giving its report in 1979. He appointed Admiral Turner to be DCI. Given that investigations were ongoing and he had appointed another person at CIA, perhaps he did all that he could.

Towards the end of the Reagan-Bush, Sr. era, a non-investigation was launched;

“The **Assassination Records Review Board** was created as a result of an act passed by the [US Congress](#) in 1992, entitled the "President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act." The Act mandated the gathering and release of all US Government records related to the [Assassination of John F. Kennedy](#). The Act was passed following the public outcry about the assassination after the [1991 premiere](#) of [Oliver Stone's](#) film *JFK*, which proposed [Kennedy assassination theories](#) involving plots to kill the President. The ARRB collected evidence starting in 1992, then produced a final report in 1998.

The ARRB was not enacted to determine who or why the murder was committed but to collect and preserve the evidence for public scrutiny. After the enactment of the federal law that created the ARRB, the Board collected a large amount of documents and took testimony of those who had relevant information of the events. The Committee finished its work in 1998 and in its final report, the ARRB outlined the problems that government secrecy created regarding the murder of President Kennedy. [\[1\]](#)

During the 1990s it collected the assassination documents which have been slowly released for public scrutiny.[\[2\]](#)”

Since the intention was not to expose who killed JFK and ensure that those who did so were excluded from power in the US, I count this as evidence of a continued coverup of who killed JFK. Since Bush, Sr. was President when the ARRB legislation was passed. He had the duty to ensure that the legislation was effective at protecting American democracy. His failure to do so is another piece of evidence against him.



Clinton was President for 4 years from 1993 to 2001. The documents were slowly released to the public during that time. The only reason to slowly release them was to be able to screen the declassified documents to make sure that the incriminating ones would not get to the public. Thus, I hypothesized immediately that the actual function of the ARRB was to prevent the public from getting documents. Criminals often distort their speech to mislead others.

Johnson was behind the Freedom of Information Act of 1966. On the surface of it, it was a way to provide the public with Govt. information. In practice, it was a way to subvert democracy by ensuring that citizens could not get information from the govt. in time to do meaningful oversight of it. It put in place a censorship system. Every document released to the public could have all the information that could expose CIA crimes and Johnson's role in the JFK assassinations blacked-out. In many cases whole reports were withheld. From my position inside the CIA, I would say that 95% of the CIA material which did not need to be classified, was withheld from the public to protect the guilty.

“Between 1982 and 1995, President Reagan's [Executive Order 12,356 of 1982](#) allowed federal agencies to withhold enormous amounts of information under Exemption 1 (relating to national security information). [8] The outcry from the effect that the Reagan Order had on FOIA requests was a factor in leading President Clinton to dramatically alter the criteria in 1995.[9] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freedom_of_Information_Act_%28United_States%29

The standard rule of thumb was not to release documents until at least after 25 years. That is, under the FOIA the public could start requesting them from the CIA after about 25 years. Since the JFK assassination was in Nov. 1963, then the documents could start being released in Nov. 1988. Thus, the ARRB being enacted under Bush, Sr. right before he left office in 1992, provided a mechanism to continue to deny material on the JFK assassination to the public. The timing of that enactment I count as another piece of evidence against Bush, Sr. The ARRB also provided a way to make censorship of the documents and evidence more uniform. Under the older system, many agencies (CIA, FBI, Secret Service, State Dept., Dept. of Defense, NSA, etc.) had documents and their own staff to decide on what to declassify and release to the public. That meant that over the decades, hundreds of people had had to be bribed/compromised/enticed to ensure they they did not release clues as to the culprits. The ARRB consolidated the coverup so that only a tenth as many people had to be controlled to maintain the coverup. I count the increased ease of coverup that occurred under Bush, Sr. as another piece of the evidence against him in the coverup.

The ARRB put the ability to destroy/hide evidence under the control of the President. That happened late in Bush's presidency, but we do not know from these outer sources whether he used the opportunity to have evidence destroyed. However, the minutes of the “Cook the Intelligence” Committee were clear. In the last year of the Bush Presidency, the committee turned its attention away from the 1991 Iraq War and focused most of its efforts on the coverups. Those three coverups were; the JFK assassination, the Bush-Rockefeller Nazi connections, and specifically the Bush-Rockefeller Auschwitz connections. I have listed Auschwitz as the label, though in fact the Nazi death camps shared the same connections and funding. During the last year of his presidency roughly 80% of the committees work went to ensuring the coverup of these conspiracies. The ARRB legislation had evolved out of earlier recommendations by that committee. I will go further into what the evidence was in later cases.

Clinton formalized the 25 year rule by executive order in 1995. By then the ARRB already had the JFK documents in its control. I count that as one piece of evidence against Clinton in the cover-up of the JFK assassination. Did he do that based on financial contributions he received from the Rockefeller Family? Did he do that based on his allegiance to Skull and Bones, knowing that Bush, Sr. was a “brother under the skin”? I formed the hypothesis that Clinton was a witting part of the JFK assassination coverup.

Clinton appointed the members of the ARRB report. In its 1998 report the members are listed, see <http://ftp.fas.org/sgp/advisory/arrb98/part13.htm> . The members are mainly historians and archivists. That seems innocuous. But as one reads the short couple of lines about each of them some red flags appears.



The Honorable John R. Tunheim. He served as Staff Assistant to U.S. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey. Humphrey was picked as a running mate for Vice President by Johnson after the JFK assassination! Humphrey is someone whom LBJ apparently felt he could rely on to keep his secrets safe. Thus, the appointment of

Tunheim does not look independent to me regardless of who recommended him. He headed the ARRB.

“Henry F. Graff. ... In the 1960s he served on the National Historical Publications Commission, having been appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Kermit L. Hall. ...
Dean Hall was appointed by Chief Justice William Rehnquist to the Historical Advisory Board of the Federal Judicial Center...



[Photo: Rehnquist being sworn in as Chief Justice after being selected by Reagan who was on the Rockefeller Commission.]

The only information on the other 2 members of the Assassination Records Review Board did not permit any conclusions on how they fit into the power structure of America. One of them, Anna Kasten Nelson, a historian had published articles on secret agents and in the Cuban Studies Political Science Quarterly.

Since 3 of the 5 members did have significant obvious ties to those whom we had seen had taken actions which covered up the culprits in the JFK assassination, I judged that the members of the committee were appointed for their biases that would ensure that continued cover-up.

In the Executive Summary of the **Final Report of the Kennedy Assassination Records Review Board** by John R. Tunheim he states;

“Since both the Board and its staff had high level security clearances, no agency could prevent a through search through every file. After locating files designed by the agencies, the Review Board staff members pursued new sources of assassination records. Most of the Review Board’s additional requests for records went to the CIA and FBI...”

In order to keep a high level security clearance you have to remain silent on taboo subjects like who actually killed JFK. We have already tagged former heads of both the FBI and CIA in this conspiracy to cover-up the culprits. Since none of the FBI or CIA Directors had come forward with evidence in the ensuing years, they were all at least passively covering it

up. This committee complained about the massive volume of records that the US govt. had withheld from the public. It is not as if those Directors of CIA and FBI lacked additional evidence to give the public. So, having a clearance acted as a strong gatekeeper on the evidence. At any point, if one of those committee members did not 'tow the line' they would have lost their clearance and been kicked off the committee. I count the committee being forced to retain a security clearance as a condition of their work as another point of evidence against Bush, Sr. since the legislation was passed under his command.

The author is lying to assure the public that all the relevant materials were searched by the fact of their having clearances. He immediately goes in to say that the committee put in requests for the records to the agencies. He knew that he had no way to go inside the CIA and search through every file as he claimed. Even I inside the CIA with the highest level clearances had trouble getting to all of its records. It used all of my 30 plus years of skill in espionage to get to many of those records and stay alive afterwards. He knew that he was lying to fool the public. I thus count this as a piece of evidence against him as being a witting conspirator in the cover-up of the JFK assassination.

It was President Clinton's duty to ensure that the members were independent and impartial. He failed to do that. I count that as a piece of evidence against him in the coverup of the JFK assassination. Did he do that based on financial contributions he received from the Rockefeller Family? Did he do that based on his allegiance to Skull and Bones, knowing that Bush, Sr. was a "brother under the skin"?

Supposedly, the point of the ARRB Legislation was to release the records to the public.

"All remaining documents are to be released by 2017."

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_F._Kennedy_assassination

The point of that appears to be to ensure that the culprits get away with murder.

There was absolutely no doubt that the CIA was actively involved in both the execution and coverup of the murder of JFK. He had wanted to shut down the CIA and the CIA killed him for it.

As to whether you as a reasonable person decide that the pieces of evidence I have presented here convict others in your mind, is your own decision. How many pieces of evidence you need to be without doubt may vary. The pieces of evidence I have presented are almost all part of the public record that anyone can verify for themselves.

Please check whether this type of analysis was useful to you or not by looking at;

Please watch the 90-minute documentary Bush [Sr.] Link to Kennedy Assassination at <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-4315024059102108031> by Alex Jones.

Please watch the interview of Lyndon Johnson's mistress, Madeleine Duncan Brown, at <http://21stcenturycicero.wordpress.com/jfk/jfk/interview-with-lbjs-mistress-on-jfk-assassination-alex-jones/>). It was so slow moving that I almost turned it off a couple of times. I am glad that I didn't because she was at the party the night before the assassination with LBJ and gets around to naming names, included his;

'In a television interview, *A Current Affair*, the mistress of Lyndon Johnson, Madeleine Brown, described the meeting of 21st November, 1963, when she was at the home of Clint Murchison. Others at the meeting included Harold L. Hunt, J. Edgar Hoover, Clyde Tolson, John J. McCloy and [at another meeting earlier with LBJ] Richard Nixon. At the end of the evening Lyndon B. Johnson arrived... "Tension filled the room upon his arrival. The group immediately went behind closed doors. A short time later Lyndon, anxious and red-faced, reappeared... Squeezing my hand so hard, it felt crushed from the pressure, he spoke with a grating whisper, a quiet growl, into my ear, not a love message, but one I'll always remember: **"After tomorrow those goddamn Kennedys will never embarrass me again - that's no threat - that's a promise."**

It's important to note that John J. McCloy was a member of the now discredited Warren Commission which "investigated" the assassination, appointed by none other than Johnson. Nixon himself was in Dallas on the day of the assassination." <http://itwasjohnson.impioustdigest.com/part1aa.htm>

Note that each person's first hand knowledge is likely to cover different aspects and include other names as well.



Please practice analyzing coverups to get good at them.


You could start with 911. Christian theologian David Ray Griffin has written an excellent book *The 911 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*.

He later said that he should have called it 571 pages of sheer lies. So, start with the fact that the Commission was a cover-up.

Bush at swearing-in of Director of National Intelligence J. Michael McConnell, Feb. 2007



Many US officials had the responsibility to bring you the full truth and failed to do so.



Here is the wikipedia article on the 911 Commission Report website so you can practice investigating who covered up 911 as an indication of who caused it. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Commission_on_Terrorist_Attacks_Upon_the_United_States .