


Submitted main text to Congressman Waxman's Webform on Saturday 7 June 2008

since my computer appeared to be blocked from accessing his Govt. Oversight and Reform Committee's Webform. Note: when I submitted it, his website showed me the finished product, unlike the Committee's website. Thus, I learned that the formatting was not preserved when one pastes text in. I then tried to insert a paragraph break by hand in a second message. Again the formatting was not preserved. So, I sent a message for him to look for Case 18 in a separate PDF file at www.libertycalling.com so he and his committee could actually read what I wrote with the links, etc. intact.

Case 18: The "Cook the Intelligence" Committee's Payments to Bush, Sr. and the Rockefellers cousins



The director of the documentary IRAQ FOR SALE, Robert Greenwald, stated that;

the CEO of Halliburton made \$100 million since the start of the Iraq War,
and the CEO of CACI [company of the privatized torture scandal at Abu Ghraib
prison] made \$20 million last year!

See online IRAQ FOR SALE documentary at <http://freedocumentaries.org/film.php?id=130>
See <http://iraqforsale.org/facts.php> for more Iraq corruption information.

My Investigation of the “Cook the Intelligence” Committee

Although I was in high level of meetings at the Pentagon and CIA, I was intermittently still collecting intelligence in the war zones. I was never a 2-star general of military campaigns; I oversaw the intelligence collection of officers. I trained officers in remote viewing. Those educated guesses were next to worthless unless one diligently collected the hard data-- regardless of the risk. When I trained them in the field, I was like a soldier sharing the same hardships. We ate the same food and slept on the same the hard desert ground, through heat, cold, rain, or sandstorms. So, their hardships were not something that I could ignore while I sat on meetings.



I was shot at both in the war zones and at one of those meetings. My work inside the CIA and Pentagon was much more dangerous to me--people knew who I was there and that I was coming back at fixed times. And many of them had personal grudges against me. I believed that God did want everyone to act with integrity. I tried to clean up problems as I came across them.

The “Cook the Intelligence” Committee was not within my domain to attend; I had started as an operative. I did manage to obtain a full set of their minutes. I also informally ‘interviewed’ 2 of their members about the Committee’s work.

The History of the “Cook the Intelligence” Committee

That Committee had been meeting since 1990. Many people jokingly referred to it as the Middle East War Committee since it was started about 2 days after Hussein invaded Kuwait in Aug. 1990. That committee had never been disbanded in the decade between the 1991 Iraq War and 911 in 2001. The minutes justified those 10 years of work by saying that Bush, Sr. had not finished off Hussein and ‘more work needs to be done to ensure US goals in the area are met’.



One major goal of the committee was to provide intelligence on the oil reserves of the Middle East ‘to politicians’. Another was to provide intelligence on the stability of the region and how to get the oil out of it. More ominously one of its goals was to recommend which foreign leaders could be assassinated to aid in getting the oil out. About 40% of its efforts went to figuring out how to start a war in the Middle East that the US public would support.

About 10% of its efforts forecasting how much money could be made from going to war in the Middle East.

About 20% of its efforts went into writing ultra top-secret reports on how to position selected US companies to get the most financial benefit from such a war.

About 10% of its efforts went into covering up the real motivation behind the 1991 Iraq War waged by Bush, Sr..

Oddly, 5% of its efforts centered on making sure that the Kennedy assassinations remained covered up.

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

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

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

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
 NOV 29 1963
 COMM-FBI

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

DEC 9 1963

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

TELETYPE UNIT
 XEROX
 DEC. 9 1963

[Handwritten signatures and initials: *was/wad*, *DOH/JEFF DIN*, *REC.D*, *md*]

[Memo from J. Edgar Hoover to the State Department's Intelligence & Research Bureau (INR), dated 29 November 1963, advising of a briefing given by an FBI agent to "Mr. George Bush of the Central Intelligence Agency" on 23 November 1963. Obtained from US National Security Archives. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zapata_Corporation .]



And about 10% on making sure that the Bush-Rockefeller-Nazi connections were covered up.

And about 5% on making sure that the Bush-Rockefeller-Auschwitz connections remained covered up. (Please see references at the end of Case 12.) It was not an easy task.

Bush, Sr. had called Nixon to ask him to resign so that investigation of the Water-Gate Scandal did not track back to nastier events than merely breaking into the Democratic Convention. Nixon had resigned the next day (see Former Federal Prosecutor John Loftus confirms the Bush-Nazi scandal at www.john-loftus.com/bush_nazi_scandal.asp).

So, about 30% of the Committee's efforts were aimed at keeping a lid on some very nasty historical facts. That strongly implied that those tasking that committee had a lot to lose if those facts were publicly known. Why did they want to cover-up the JFK evidence? Why were they still recommending assassinations of people with that evidence?


The Committee Had Ordered Hits to Cover-up Loose Threads of JFK's Assassination

I found in the minutes more than 3 instances in which they had recommended such assassinations. And I was able to confirm in the Clandestine Dept. that three of those people had been killed by it.

One of them was an old CIA buddy of Bush, Sr.'s from Operation Zapata who had told people that Bush, Sr. worked for the CIA in the Bay of Pigs debacle. He was killed the day before a CNN reporter was due to interview him, if I remember correctly.

Another was a woman who had been his secretary at Zapata Oil, but who was also a CIA employee. The more I looked into it the more it appeared that Zapata Oil was a CIA front.

Everyone who worked for it at the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion had been vetted by it and their salaries were being paid by the CIA.



The 3rd hit was ordered against a journalist who had been given a very incriminating piece of evidence. It was a photograph taken from behind the Grassy Knoll on the day of the Kennedy assassination just after the assassination. It showed a crowd of people rushing towards the camera in the background. In the foreground was a man with a rifle jumping into a sedan. I was able to locate a copy of the photo in a CIA file of the dead journalist. It was in that Committee's own file room adjoining its meeting room. That meeting room and file room were locked except when in use by that committee. I scanned the photo into a computer, clipped the figures out of the picture and asked 3 of the CIA's photo

identification experts who the two men were. I did that to ensure that I had been correct, not because the photo was blurry. The photo was taken about 10 feet from the front of the car. They knew immediately without having to go to their files. E. Howard Hunt was the man standing... .

One of the 3 experts when he saw the picture of the man sitting behind the driver's wheel said to me angrily, "You shouldn't be looking into this. You could be killed for it. I could be killed for even telling you who that is a photo of." But his photo was displayed in many, many places in the CIA.



Already published photo which placed Bush, Sr. in Dallas on the day of the assassination of JFK. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zapata_Corporation

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : SAC, HOUSTON

FROM : SA GRAHAM W. KITCHEL

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 RJD/KSL

Schmidt - (JFK)
of Jackson

62-2115-6

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

MR

Since there was no independent confirmation that Bush, Sr. was outside of Dallas at the time of the JFK assassination, his calling and saying he was, was this his self-constructed alibi for his presence in Dallas at that time. Why did he feel he needed to create such a piece of false evidence? People have since pointed out that the man whose name he gave as a suspect was later a friend of his. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zapata_Corporation.

Bush, Sr.'s Payment by the Committee for Endless Speeches



Bush, Sr., although he had been a DCI for only one year in 1976 was listed as a member of that committee.

He was the only member of it not currently working at the CIA.

Occasionally, about twice a year, he did attend that meeting inside the CIA.

Big Barbecue for CIA: Bush 41 Guest of Honor

September 18, 2007 3:46 PM

Justin Rood Reports:



The CIA threw a 60th birthday party barbecue for itself at its Langley, Va., headquarters today, with former President George H.W. Bush as the special guest of honor.

According to a CIA statement, Bush, the director of the CIA from 1976 to 1977, spoke to

some 1,500 CIA employees and criticized "doomsayers who know so little about what you do."



The CIA is called "Bush, Sr's CIA" on some of its most important signs. When I investigated if he was getting paid by the CIA's creative accounting computer for attending, I learned some disturbing facts.

Similar to Tenet, he was paid for a 'speech'. The amount was \$60,000 in 2004, and had been about \$40,000 in the 1990's after the Gulf War ended. The first payment I could find was from about 1995. But what was so alarming was he was getting paid for a 'speech' whether he attended a meeting or not, day in and day out. The cost to the taxpayer was so mind boggling that I had to check my findings from querying the computer. I had it print

out the individual payments for the whole time that they had been made, about 10 years. I then located the corresponding forms for the recent year. They were indeed the same form the other committee members used. Each one had the box checked next to the word present.

I rushed up to Tenet to show him and ask him what it could possibly mean. Tenet turned away from me and looked out his top floor window a moment. Then he turned back and lamely offered that, “Perhaps it is an error in accounting.” He was the one signing those forms day in and day out. Unlike Bush, he usually did have a pretty good understanding of what he was signing before he put his signature on a page. The exception to that rule was if he was in a dreadful rush



from an emergency. It was not reasonable to assume that he had been in such a rush every day of the year for almost the 7 years he was DCI. During that time Bush, Sr. was paid over \$40,000 five times a week.

Year	Payment per “Speech”	~# of Weeks	~# of Speeches	Total in Millions
1995	\$40,000	10	50	\$2
1996	\$40,000	50	250	\$10
1997	\$40,000	50	250	\$10
1998	\$40,000	50	250	\$10
1999	\$40,000	50	250	\$10
2000	\$40,000	50	250	\$10
2001	\$60,000	50	250	\$15
2002	\$60,000	50	250	\$15
2003	\$60,000	50	250	\$15
2004	\$60,000	10	50	\$3
Total			2100	\$100

The amount the CIA's computer gave for the figure was a little over \$100 million. The above table is not meant to be an accurate accounting as the amount of time he was paid already in 2004 was not exactly 10 weeks, nor the amount in 1995 either.



F 360410 002 Texas FILE PHOTO CIRCA 1968
FILE PHOTO: George Bush, Sr. (right) proudly displays the officer's bar of 1st Lt. George W. Bush of the Texas Air National Guard during a special ceremony where Bush was sworn into the Air National Guard circa 1968.
Photo Credit: Liaison Agency

But the jump in the fee came within a week of Bush, Jr. being inaugurated at the end of January in 2001.

The signs at the CIA claiming it was Bush, Sr.'s CIA were right in some financial sense that I had not previously understood. It made no historical sense to call it Bush, Sr.'s CIA by the amount of time he had spent as DCI--one year. I then looked up past DCI's on the CIA's creative accounting computer to see if they were getting the taxpayer's hard earned money mainlined into their

Swiss bank accounts. I could find no evidence of that as a rule, other than generous 'pensions', often for only a year or few years of work at the CIA.



It should be remembered that many people in America were working 2 jobs to be able to pay their rent. Many had no pensions because companies downsized. And many had no health insurance because they could not afford it because corporations were not paying them a livable wage. There was plenty of Corporate Welfare.


But this appeared to be straight embezzlement.

Bush, Sr.'s Standard Speech



The screenshot shows the CIA website's 'Speeches & Testimony' section. The header includes the CIA logo and the text 'CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY' and 'THE WORK OF A NATION. THE CENTER OF INTELLIGENCE.' A search bar is located in the top right. The left navigation menu includes links for 'CIA Home', 'About CIA', 'Careers', 'Offices of CIA', and 'News & Information'. The 'News & Information' menu is expanded, showing 'Press Releases & Statements', 'Speeches & Testimony', 'Speeches & Testimony Archive 1999', 'Dedication Ceremony Photos', 'CIA & The War on Terrorism', and 'Featured Story Archive'. The main content area is titled 'Speeches & Testimony' and 'Dedication Ceremony Photos'. It includes a breadcrumb trail: 'CIA Home > News & Information > Speeches & Testimony > Speeches & Testimony Archive 1999 > Dedication Ceremony Photos'. A photo shows DCI George J. Tenet and President and Mrs. George Bush at the opening of the dedication ceremony. The caption reads: 'DCI George J. Tenet and President and Mrs. George Bush stand for the presentation of colors at the opening of the dedication ceremony.' On the right, there is a 'Speeches & Testimony Archive' list with years from 2007 to 1995.

I called up Bush, Sr. and complimented him on a recent speech he had given that was reported in the press. Then I asked him if it was hard going around the world giving so many speeches. He said that it wasn't too bad, he was only doing about one a week. I asked him what he usually spoke about. He said that he was talking to Defense Contractors and 'drumming up business'. I asked him how business was going and he said, "Pretty good. I am a little disappointed that foreign govts. have not been more enthusiastic about the Coalitions efforts." I asked him what he would like to do differently. I was taking notes and told him that I was recording his answers for the CIA's analysts. I did give them a copy. He is a good speaker and a brilliant man. He spoke for about 10 minutes and then asked if I had other questions. I asked his permission to forward questions from CIA analysts to him and get his response, as a one-time courtesy, if he would be so kind. He agreed and that turned into an hour video conference call. Many of the "Cook the Intelligence" committee members asked questions during it. Other CIA analysts complained that they had blocked other questions by taking up all of the time. They had asked 80% of the questions--there had only been time for 5. The fifth was not by a committee member. But by then 90% of the scheduled 50 minutes had been taken up. Bush, Sr. did not answer the 5th question and excused himself early. I was later able to prove that the Committee had faxed him the 4 questions in advance. In addition, they had conspired to make sure that their questions were asked by the supposedly independent MC. That MC had said that he had received hundreds of good questions from the analysts and had chosen the best based on their merits. A brief examination of the actual questions made that a very difficult to believe claim. In fact, Bush, Sr.'s answers came straight out of his usual canned speech. Almost every one of the analysts had heard it before. In case that was not the case, I had played it on the CIA's internal TV at lunchtime in the cafeteria the day before. That helped wise up the analysts who was on the Committee to "cook the intelligence" and how they were doing it by restricting the inputs to the analysts.



What Tenet Said about Why He and Bush, Sr. Took the Millions

I asked Tenet why he had lied to me and how he was going to justify that \$100 million, if the taxpayer found out about Bush, Sr. being paid for speeches he never gave. It was a tricky question, because Tenet also was getting paid for speeches he never made. I knew that for a fact because occasionally I was with him all day and long into the night in a crisis or even at social functions. He had first declined to comment. That afternoon he met with lawyers for the CIA and discussed it. The next day I pressed him to put an end to those payments. He looked uncomfortable and said, "I can't". I asked him why not. He said, "Political realities on the ground here at the CIA, just like for you on the ground in Iraq". He seemed to be referring to an incident about 10 days before in which bullets had rushed past my head. I asked him if he needed a change of bodyguards. He frowned and said that he had tried that and 'it hadn't held". I offered to try to make a change in them that would stick. He said he would think about it.



He was DCI, but David Rockefeller was picking his bodyguards, not him. That meant, that he was unsure that they were guarding him entirely for the sake of protecting him. When he had tried to change that system, he had run into major flak--a car bomb was found in his car, a bomb threat was called into the CIA and left on his answering machine, and a death threat to him was left on his wife's answering machine, if I remember correctly the details. There were 3 threats to his life made. But they were made right before his new body guards were to start, not afterwards. It was certainly not due to incompetence on their part. Since he usually received less than 4 death threats a month, he took 3 in one day as a warning that perhaps he was doing something Rockefeller did not like. I told him that he should buck that control and have his own guards to really protect him. He did not take my advice.

The “Cook the Intelligence” Committee’s Stumbling Block--When in Doubt Kill

When I informally interviewed 2 of the “Cook the Intelligence” Committee’s members, I had to be careful. I knew that they were the paid servants of Bush, Sr. and David Rockefeller and getting paid a lot of money to stay that way. The first one was a man, the minute taker of the meeting. He had accidentally left his handwritten minutes of the week before OUTSIDE of the CIA. He did not know where. He did know that they were ultra sensitive on that particular day. No doubt it was his nervousness that caused him to lose them that particular day.



In his notes he had written down the code name and the real number of the mobile phone of an assassin. That assassin did not work at the CIA. That increased the plausible deniability. I had, without being asked, recovered those notes for him after finding a day missing in the month of his notes he had loaned me. So, I had a bit of “credit” with him. That was really how I had stayed alive at the CIA, by being so helpful in a field in which there was little competition, remote viewing.

I did not ask him about the Committee’s work. I asked him how his work was going. I listened and then offered to help him with a rush report he needed to finish. He accepted my help and we spent about 5 hours together in his office. During that time, I had access to all his files to look up the references his report needed. What I learned from that ‘working interview’ was that the committee had serious internal friction in it. Two people of about the 8 were in grave danger of ‘meeting with a fatal accident’. Those two had been sent on an assignment outside of the building on the day the name of the assassin was written down. He was upset that he had been tasked to give their names and addresses and daily routines to the assassin. He wanted my help to get out of his role in their killing. He did not much object if they were killed, however. So, he was hoping to talk me into conveying the information. I explained to him that it was morally as culpable to pass me the assignment as to pass it to the assassin. He said, “But I would feel better about it.” I explained to him that I don’t let that kind of assignment pass through me, as it is against my principles. I offered instead to write an op so that those wanting the two dead which change their minds. He said to me, “But you don’t know who they are!” I said, “Let me guess, Bush, Jr. and David Rockefeller.” He acted surprised and asked me who I had heard it from. I said that I just guessed. But he did not trust that I could change their minds. I asked him to give me 2 days before he called the assassin. He agreed to that as he was loathe to call anyway and this gave him a convenient excuse.

The committee was split over a particular issue. Only 2 members wanted to give Congress some information that they wanted, and neither Bush nor Rockefeller wanted the information given. All except those 2 agreed to cook the documents to provide disinformation to Congress. Well, that is not quite accurate. They all wanted at least an 80% cooking of the documents. They disagreed on the last 20% of the cooking. That was not due to ethical considerations perhaps as much as experience. They did not think that the committee would get away with that last 20% because the committee had other documents which revealed 15% of the problem. But the next defensible denial was at the 20% mark.

So, 2 people were about to die to cover up the 5% difference which the committee could logically figure out on their own. I sent that Congressional Committee an article from a declassified source. They figured out that 5% immediately instead of the next week. Thus, there was no point to the assassination anymore. When I explained that to Bush, Jr. and Rockefeller they told me to cancel the “correction of the committee’s numbers”, and the hit was aborted.

The content that the Congressional Committee was looking into was not classified, they just didn’t have the information. Like the Cola Coca’s formula is secret, but not classified because it is of no National Security importance, this information was the same. Because the information was being kept secret to enable corruption, it was important to expose it. I would need to write it up as a case to do it justice. For now I will just mention it roughly speaking. The committee wanted to know why it was unable to get the information it needed from the CIA on a specific topic. But the reason it couldn’t get that information was the same as why it could not get 90% of the information it wanted from the CIA. The reason for that was because the CIA was not working for the US public, and unwilling to expose that. Yet it did expose that by not providing the information that they needed.

The Congress had asked the CIA for an itemization of its war expenditures so that they could know the true cost of the war. That is, after all necessary in order to budget appropriately. The CIA had given them the salary information for its staff. That was about

15% of the information, NOT THE COST! The article I sent them was on the cost of the propaganda campaign. That was not a secret because journalists were being paid and they had an interest in the topic. One of them had already written an excellent article on the subject which was based on fact, not fantasy. The cost of the CIA’s propaganda effort was about \$1.6 billions. It was afterwards confirmed by the GAO

Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20515

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
February 13, 2006

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Karen Lightfoot (Waxman): (202) 225-5051
Brendan Daly/Jennifer Crider (Pelosi): (202) 226-7616
Andrea Purse (Miller): (202) 225-7387

Bush Administration Spent Over \$1.6 Billion on Advertising and Public Relations Contracts Since 2003, GAO Finds

WASHINGTON, DC — Today Rep. Henry A. Waxman, Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi, Rep. George Miller, Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, and other senior Democrats released a new Government Accountability Office report finding that the Bush Administration spent more than \$1.6 billion in public relations and media contracts in a two and a half year span.

“The government is spending over a billion dollars per year on PR and advertising,” said Rep. Waxman. “Careful oversight of this spending is essential given the track record of the Bush Administration, which has used taxpayer dollars to fund covert propaganda within the United States.”

“No amount of money will successfully sell the Bush Administration’s failed policies, from the war in Iraq, to its disastrous energy policy, to its confusing Medicare prescription drug benefits,” said Democratic Leader Pelosi. “The American people know the Bush Administration is on the

see <http://oversight.house.gov/Documents/20060213150722-78812.pdf>

See “Bush, our dictator...?” at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w5CcvNYP2YY> . That

Bush Administration Spends \$1.6 Billion On Propaganda

August 15, 2007 · No Comments



is, even if the CIA's analysts had written the truth in their reports, the US Administration was drowning it out by feeding propaganda directly into the media. They did that by having military, foreign policy experts, and govt. officials give their propaganda as if it was the truth.

The NY Times exposed about 10% of that recently in its article “**Behind TV Analysts, Pentagon’s Hidden Hand**” at <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/20/washington/20generals.html> .

The article “**TV News Blackout on Pentagon Pundits**” at <http://www.fair.org/index.php?page=3361> pointed out that;

“Two weeks after a **New York Times** story ([4/20/08](#)) revealed a Pentagon propaganda campaign that had been feeding talking points to TV military analysts, many of whom also had ties to military contractors, the cable and broadcast networks that employed these analysts have almost entirely failed to report this crucial news story.”

The media were complicit in preventing an adequate public debate on the topic, preferring to allow the public to continue being sent to war through ignorance. That means that the heads of the major media corporations who did that are getting kickbacks on the war. What precisely does that mean? It means the taxpayer's money is being stolen from them “at gunpoint” and the media is not trying to take the gun away but taking some of the mugger's money instead. The gun to the taxpayer's head is the lie “Pay for this war or the terrorists will kill you and your family.” Reagan said the “Nicaraguans are coming”. Hitler said “the Poles are coming”. Bush, Jr. said that the Taliban was coming, and then the Iraqis. Please watch **The Power of Nightmares** Parts 1 to 3 at <http://freedocumentaries.org/film.php?id=135> to see through that propaganda.

The amount of propaganda that the US public is being fed by the US Administration via the CIA is enormous. Most people spend about 2 hours a day allowing themselves to be brainwashed by those who have an interest in sending them to war and stealing their money. Listening to only the major media and newsprint is dangerous to your sanity and your longevity. You can end up believing all sorts of lies as if they were reality. (See Senate Panel Rejects Case for War at <http://www.truthout.org/article/senate-panel-rejects-case-war>).

Most of the news is designed to distract you from the truth. Suppose you knew that JFK had been assassinated but had not been told anything else. You would immediately think, “Johnson did it to become President.” Then you would watch to see if he had it investigated to your satisfaction, openly, thoroughly, and transparently. When that did not happen, you would say to yourself “Not only did he have a motive, he is acting like he did it by preventing an adequate investigation. Then you would say to yourself, “Johnson did it until proven otherwise.” Without distractions, you would then ask yourself, “Whose help would he need to carry it off and cover it up?” He needs likely needs the CIA or Mafia to carry it off professionally. He needs the cooperation of the local police, the FBI, and the local media and much of the major media to cover it up. Then instead of looking at the details, just evaluate whether each of those did their duty sincerely to uncover the truth and bring you that truth. If they did not that means they or their boss were complicit in it. To fix a problem you have to go to the top of the problem, not keep finding the fall guys. So, start at the top each time and judge how thoroughly, sincerely, and transparently they acted to bring the public the whole truth. If they acted correctly, go to the people below them, until you find the highest person who did not act that way. Then you have your culprit. At the top of the heap of power is not the President, it is the bankers who funded his campaign. If you don't start at the top, you can change Presidents endlessly without ever correcting the problem. FOLLOW THE MONEY!

The Chairperson of the “Cook the Intelligence” Committee and the Brick Wall



The other person from the Committee who I ‘interviewed’ was a woman. She was the Chairperson of that committee. The setting in which that interview occurred was that I knocked on her door and asked if she had time to answer a question. She said yes and we spoke for about 20 minutes. I explained that I had written reports on the lack of supplies of the soldiers and wanted to know if she had gotten any of them. She at first pleaded ignorance and then to try to get rid of me, admitted she had already read them. She pulled them out of a file cabinet. They had been written on and underlined in places, though by whom was not proven. I asked her what progress was being made on getting the soldiers

what they needed. She said honestly and bluntly “None”. That does not mean that was her fault. I asked her what seemed to be the difficulty and offered to help her solve it. I was trying to solve the problem, not find fault. She paused for a moment and then said that she was up against a brick wall. I asked, “Tenet?” She said, “I think that the problem goes above him and that is why nothing I say to him makes a difference.” I told her that I had had the same experience and thanked her for her time.

She was one of the 2 people on the hit list. She was already doing all that she could to pull the Committee in a better direction. That was not easy.

[Photo above “Federal Reserve” Bank of New York]

Who Else Was Getting Kickbacks from the “Cook the Intelligence” Committee?



Then I queried the CIA’s creative accounting computer to ask if it was paying any Rockefellers for speeches. That was another eye opener. Each of the Rockefeller ‘cousins’ was making speeches 5 times a week at \$1,000 a “speech” in the 1990’s.


Since there were about 20 of them that was \$20,000 a day.

They had been paid that since the same day that Bush, Sr. started getting the \$40,000 a day in 1995. They had been bumped up to being paid about \$1,500 a “speech” when Bush, Jr. took office. So, roughly they had been paid total a fourth of what Bush, Sr. had been, \$25 million. The actual figure was closer to \$20 million, if I remember correctly.

I then looked for the data entry forms. Each one was being paid on the same form as Tenet for the “Cook the Intell” committee as if they were speakers to that committee like Tenet. They were not even allowed into the CIA building. I checked and could find only one of them who had been ‘a guest’ for a one day pass.

I then called up about 5 of them and asked them if they were willing to come to the CIA to give a talk to CIA analysts on a pertinent topic. Two of them agreed and I scheduled an auditorium that seated about 250 people for them at a time convenient to them. One said that he never gave talks and declined. The other two said that they would think about it and never got back to me. I was curious what the other 2 would have to say that would be so useful to the CIA as to justify the cost of even one payment of \$1,500. One of them gave an excellent talk which the surveyed analysts said was worth that cost. The other, a housewife, had nothing of intelligence utility to say; she had no good stories about David Rockefeller that could be used for blackmail purposes! The analysts were quickly bored and most

walked out within 10 minutes. Many of them asked me why in the world I had invited her to speak. I told them truthfully that the CIA had already paid her about a million for her “speeches” and I was trying to get them to stop doing that.



Tenet heard what I had done and asked me to ‘give an accounting’ of it. I showed him segments of her video speech made into a fake Fox news report which ended with, “Why did the CIA pay this woman \$1 million to talk?” I suggested to Tenet that if he had to go on paying them they should at least be given speech lessons and sent on speaking tours to recruit CIA agents or do fund raising for the CIA. I even offered tongue-in-cheek to train them to be spies to send into Russia so that the US taxpayer could get something from paying them each \$1,500 a day. But, Tenet neither crossed them off the books nor made them work for the pay.

Later, I reviewed the call between Tenet and David Rockefeller in which Tenet told Rockefeller that I was ‘putting the heat on him’ to take the cousins off the CIA’s books. I had not threatened Tenet with anything. I had pointed out the predictable blow back when the US public found out. Rockefeller liked the idea of putting the cousins to work for the CIA, but said that some of them already had jobs. He also like the idea of the CIA giving them speech lessons. But nothing came of my suggestions. The costs to provide them with the full contingent of body guards that David Rockefeller demanded that they would have to have would have cost much more than \$1,500 a day. The body guard package he wanted for each was more than that for Tenet as DCI.