

OPIUM LORDS
ISRAEL,
THE GOLDEN TRIANGLE,
AND THE KENNEDY
ASSASSINATION



BY SALVADOR ASTUCIA

Released by RareReactor.tk

INTRODUCTION

Synopsis

After President John F. Kennedy was killed in 1963, America became deeply involved in the Vietnam War. Within a few short years, heroin addiction in America reached epidemic proportions. In the background, Israel expanded its borders by force and became a colonial empire ruling a nation of hostile Palestinian subjects. This book reveals how Israel exploited the Western powers' long history of opium trafficking as a means of toppling the young American president. The following points summarize the information presented:

- ♦ Opium was the glue that held together the rivaling factions that conspired to kill JFK.
- ♦ The main factions in the conspiracy were Zionist instigators, the American Mafia (headed by Jewish mobster Meyer Lansky and his lieutenant, Santo Trafficante), French-Corsican crime syndicates in Marseilles, France and Southeast Asia, and the US military.
- ♦ Heroin smuggling was first introduced to the American Mafia in the 1920s by [Jewish gangsters](#) such as Meyer Lansky, "Legs" Diamond, and "Dutch" Schultz.
- ♦ One of the reasons President Johnson escalated US involvement in Southeast Asia was because the American Mafia and French-Corsican heroin traffickers needed a new source of opium for their heroin factories. Turkey had been the main source, but its government was about to eradicate opium production.
- ♦ Joseph Kennedy, Sr's three sons were viewed as a new American dynasty that threatened Israel's plans to expand its borders. The Kennedy Dynasty would last until 1985 if each son served two terms in the White House. It is widely known that Joseph Kennedy Sr developed a strong loathing of Jews from his business dealings with them in finance, Hollywood, and politics.
- ♦ A decree was issued to kill JFK by Nahum Goldmann, founder of the World Jewish Congress and its president in 1963.
- ♦ Louis Bloomfield of Montreal was assigned to set up the coup d'état. He was an influential international lawyer with an extensive espionage background (e.g., British intelligence, Haganah, OSS, CIA).
- ♦ Martin Agronsky and other Jewish journalists and media moguls collaborated in the plot by pushing a false cover story that Lee Harvey Oswald alone killed JFK.
- ♦ Right-wing extremists joined the coup initially but broke ranks and declared a holy war against Jews immediately after JFK was killed.
- ♦ The assassins were the lieutenants of French-Corsican heroin trafficker and convicted Nazi collaborator, Auguste Joseph Ricord. He was living in Argentina at the time of the assassination. Later he moved to Paraguay which became a major hub for smuggling heroin into the United States.
- ♦ The assassins were Lucien Sarti, François Chiappe, and Jean-Paul Angeletti—all French-Corsicans.
- ♦ Nixon was driven from office because he destroyed Ricord's heroin cartel, established détente with the Soviet Union, withdrew forces from Vietnam, and ended the draft.

- ♦ Under Nixon's orders, police in Mexico City tried to arrest Lucien Sarti—the man who fatally shot JFK in the head. When Sarti fled, Mexican police opened fire. He died in a hail of bullets on April 27, 1972.
- ♦ JFK made enemies within the military establishment and Israel when he attempted to establish détente with the Soviet Union in the summer of 1963. He also wanted to prevent Israel from acquiring the Bomb.
- ♦ JFK was viewed as a threat to Israel because of pro-Hitler statements he wrote in his 1945 diary (later published) and two books: *Why England Slept* and *Profiles in Courage*.
- ♦ President Johnson aggressively supported Israel because he and his wife were secretly Jewish.
- ♦ Texas—a former Spanish colony—became a haven for Sephardic Jews expelled from Spain in 1492. Jewish migration continued from other countries in the 19th and 20th Centuries.

Once Kennedy was out of the way, President Johnson began to shift America's foreign policy dramatically. First of all, he increased military forces in South Vietnam from 16,000 non-combat advisors to over 500,000 draftees by the time he left office in January 1969. Secondly, he joined America and Israel at the hip by increasing financial and military aid and becoming its ally during the Six Day War, an aggressive land-grab that was immediately labeled illegal by the United Nations per Resolutions 242 and later 338. Since then, one president after another has given Israel virtually everything it wants. During Kennedy's last year in office, in 1963, the United States provided a mere \$40 million per year to Israel. Within only two years, President Johnson had increased that amount to \$130 million per year, over three times Kennedy's allowance. Most of the Johnson money was for military buildup. Since Kennedy's death, the annual subsidy to Israel has grown into the billions (presently about \$3 billion per year), but the Johnson administration marked a true turning point.¹ In fact, American aid to Israel has far exceeded the total US payments to reconstruct postwar Europe under the Marshall Plan.²

The Truth About the Sixties

From the day President Kennedy was killed, on November 22, 1963, until Lyndon Baines Johnson stepped down as President in January 1969, the United States government was under siege by hardened criminals, carpetbagger politicians, war mongering generals, and ruthless friends of Israel. Their primary goals were threefold: firstly, to fill their pockets with illicit drug money attained from the sale of heroin within the United States and other countries; secondly, to prolong the Vietnam War as a means of smuggling opium from Southeast Asia for large-scale production of heroin which was ultimately smuggled back into the United States; and thirdly, to quietly support Israel's expansion of its borders into Arab-occupied territories. These three things were the mainstay of American foreign policy throughout the 1960s. The implementers of this policy were the same forces who killed President Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Robert Kennedy, Malcolm X, and countless others.

Ironically, the situation began to change by an unlikely soul. He was a man hated by many for his awkward ways, his lack of charisma, even the way he looked and talked.

He was not a handsome man or a skilled orator. He was a streetwise man who often used vulgar language and privately expressed ethnic slurs in a seemingly bigoted manner. But despite his outward character flaws, deep within his spiritual being this man believed strongly in God, loved his mother, his wife and children, and was extremely kind—on a personal level—to almost anyone in need. Unlike President Kennedy, this man was not born into wealth; but like Kennedy, his former adversary, this man had an innate understanding of right and wrong.

Richard M. Nixon assumed the Presidency in January 1969. His campaign had included a war on drugs,³ as many presidents have done since; but Nixon evidently took his anti-drug campaign a bit farther than his successors. He went after Auguste Joseph Ricord, a French Corsican, former Nazi collaborator, and international heroin smuggler.⁴ Ricord was protected by the hardened criminals, the carpetbagger politicians, the war mongering generals, and the ruthless friends of Israel.⁵ The same forces who had martyred America's finest would stage a bloodless coup against President Nixon for attempting to exorcise the demons from America's possessed soul.⁶

Nixon's war on drugs was the impetus that led to Ricord's arrest in Paraguay on March 25, 1971.⁷ A diplomatic tug of war ensued between Paraguay and the United States over custody of the wily heroin kingpin. Consequently, Ricord sat in a jail cell in Tacumbu Penitentiary in Asunción, Paraguay for a year and a half while the two governments disputed his custody. Finally in September 1972 Ricord was extradited to the United States and prosecuted for conspiracy to smuggle narcotics into America.⁸ On December 16, 1972 he was convicted of that crime, and on January 19, 1973, he was sentenced to 20 years in prison and fined \$25,000.⁹

Nixon's pursuit of Auguste Ricord may have been part of a broader plan to end the war in Vietnam. By breaking up the international heroin cartel, Nixon destroyed one of the main reasons for US involvement in Southeast Asia, but there were others. He also re-opened relations with China and used that alliance as leverage to establish détente between the United States and the Soviet Union in May of 1972.¹⁰ Nixon also increased foreign aid to Israel dramatically; he gave the Jewish State about \$1.61 billion from 1971 through 1973. That was a huge increase—approximately the same amount that America had given Israel over its entire 22 year history (from 1948 through 1970).¹¹ By doing this, Nixon divided his Jewish enemies. Essentially he bought them off. Nixon further divided his enemies by pushing for a military victory in Vietnam. In December of 1972 he began a relentless bombing campaign of North Vietnam (known as the "Christmas bombing"). This aggressive approach divided the military and was ultimately used to force North Vietnam into serious negotiations in Paris for a peaceful solution to the war. As a result, a peace agreement was soon reached. At that point Nixon withdrew American forces from Vietnam and ended the draft.

It is significant that Nixon's visit to the Soviet Union occurred just one month before the Watergate burglary which occurred on June 17, 1972.¹² The Soviet Union continued to exist until December 1991, but Nixon essentially ended the Cold War in May of 1972 when he and Soviet Premier Leonid Brezhnev signed of the SALT I (the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks) agreement.

Although Nixon has been judged harshly by many, much about his character was revealed in his farewell address to the White House staff on August 9, 1974:

... the greatness comes not when things go always good for you, but the greatness comes when you are really tested, when you take some knocks, some disappointments, when sadness comes, because only if you have been in the deepest valley can you ever know how magnificent it is to be at the highest mountain.

... We want you to continue to serve in Government, if that is your wish. Always give your best, never get discouraged, never be petty; always remember others may hate you, but those who hate you don't win unless you hate them, and then you destroy yourself.

... And so, we leave with high hopes, in good spirit and with deep humility, and with very much gratefulness in our hearts. I can only say to each and every one of you, we come from many faiths, we pray perhaps to different gods, but really the same God in a sense, but I want to say for each and every one of you, not only will we always remember you, not only will we always be grateful to you but always you will be in our hearts and you will be in our prayers.

Thank you very much.

(President Richard M. Nixon¹³)

The story about to be told is not merely about the death of President John F. Kennedy, it also answers many questions about President Richard M. Nixon, the Watergate Scandal, the Vietnam War, the Six Day War, the corrupt American news media, and the continuing Arab-Israeli conflict that ultimately led to terrorist attacks on America on September 11, 2001. The most troubling aspect of this book is the cynical business of opium smuggling by the Western powers, something that has been going on for nearly two centuries. In fact the West fought two Opium Wars with China in the 19th Century to force China to import opium.^(Footnote 1) As a result, China developed a serious addiction problem which continued until the communists took over in 1949 and banned all narcotics. But the practice went underground in the latter half of the 20th Century.¹⁴ Consequently, wealthy interests within the Western powers delegated the smuggling of narcotics to international crime syndicates and espionage services.¹⁵

Furthermore, heroin smuggling and prostitution were introduced in the United States in the 1920s by Jewish gangsters such as Meyer Lansky, "Legs" Diamond, and "Dutch" Schultz. Those two enterprises had been ignored by the Italian Mafia because of Sicilian traditions which forbade such practices. In the mid-1920s, heroin was banned in the United States. In 1930 a Mafia war broke out regarding the illicit sale of narcotics. Over sixty gangsters were killed and a new generation of leaders emerged with little regard for the traditional code of honor. The leader of the new American Mafia was the legendary Lucky Luciano who forged an alliance between the Italian Mafia and Meyer Lansky's Jewish gangs. This alliance survived for almost 40 years

and became the dominant characteristic of organized crime in the United States in the 1960s and 70s.¹⁶ This book demonstrates that Israel exploited Meyer Lanksy's heroin smuggling connections in the United States and abroad as a means of toppling President Kennedy.

To some this book may seem like a painful view of reality; to others it may seem like divine truth; still others may deny the facts completely. Whatever the case may be, I for one have learned that truth is indeed stranger than fiction.

The Motives

The primary motive behind the assassination was Kennedy's efforts to establish détente with the Soviet Union in the spring and summer of 1963; however, he was apprehensive about how American Jews and the US military would react to a shift in Cold War policy. He reportedly told Soviet diplomat Andrei Gromyko that there were "two groups of the American population which are not always pleased when relations between our two countries are eased." One was "ideological," the other "of a particular nationality who think that, always and under all circumstances, the Kremlin will support the Arabs and be an enemy of Israel. This group has effective means for making improvement between our countries very difficult."¹⁷

In October of 1962 the United States discovered that the Soviet Union had been supplying Cuba with nuclear missiles. A war of nerves ensued between the two superpowers known as *the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Kennedy insisted that the missiles be removed, and ultimately, he prevailed; however, he was not boastful about his victory. During the crisis the US generals wanted to attack Cuba, but Kennedy feared a US assault would escalate into nuclear war. There was a great deal of tension between Kennedy and the military at that time. In fact it is generally accepted among scholars that one of the reasons that the nuclear stalemate ended peacefully is because both Kennedy and Khrushchev feared a military coup might arise against Kennedy if a settlement was not soon reached.¹⁸

In the months that followed, a genuine friendship developed between Kennedy and Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev. By the spring of 1963, the two leaders had made great progress towards ending the Cold War, limiting the nuclear arms race, and signing a nuclear test ban treaty. Right-wing elements within the US military resisted détente for ideological reasons.¹⁹ Israel opposed détente as well because they feared the Kremlin and Washington were more interested in Arab oil than a Jewish state located in a barren desert without natural resources or strategic interests of value to either superpower. In short, détente would mark the beginning of the end for Israel as a world power because neither superpower had a strategic interest in Israel.²⁰

On June 10, 1963, President Kennedy delivered a speech, *Strategy of Peace*, before the graduating class at American University. Many refer to it as "The Peace Speech." The *Manchester Guardian* called the American University speech "one of the greatest state papers of all time." The speech was the most eloquent and powerful of Kennedy's career; it contained a spiritual ethos with a gripping message of hope for mankind, but it was also practical. Here are a few excerpts from the Peace Speech:

... What kind of a peace do I mean and what kind of a peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men and women—not merely peace in our time but peace for all time. ...

... I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all the allied air forces in the Second World War.

It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn. ...

... I am not referring to the absolute, infinite concept of peace and good will of which some fantasies and fanatics dream. I do not deny the value of hopes and dreams but we merely invite discouragement and incredulity by making that our only and immediate goal. ...

... World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together in mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement. And history teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever. However fixed our likes and dislikes may seem, the tide of time and events will often bring surprising changes in the relations between nations and neighbors.

So let us persevere. Peace need not be impracticable, and war need not be inevitable. By defining our goal more clearly, by making it seem more manageable and less remote, we can help all peoples to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it. ...

In short, both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race. Agreements to this end are in the interests of the Soviet Union as well as ours—and even the most hostile nations can be relied upon to accept and

keep those treaty obligations, and only those treaty obligations, which are in their own interest.

So, let us not be blind to our differences—but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal. ...

The United States, as the world knows, will never start a war. We do not want a war. We do not now expect a war. This generation of Americans has already had enough—more than enough—of war and hate and oppression. We shall be prepared if others wish it. We shall be alert to try to stop it. But we shall also do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just. We are not helpless before that task or hopeless of its success.

Confident and unafraid, we must labor on—not toward a strategy of annihilation but toward a strategy of peace.

[END]

(JFK, American University, June 10, 1963)

On June 16, 1963, six days after Kennedy's American University speech, David Ben-Gurion resigned as prime minister of Israel. Michael Collins Piper suggested in his book, *Final Judgment*, that Ben-Gurion resigned in order to go underground and carry out Kennedy's assassination. It is my suspicion, however, that Nahum Goldmann (president of the World Jewish Congress) issued the order to kill Kennedy immediately after the American University speech. I further suspect that Ben-Gurion was personally moved by Kennedy's eloquent words and refused to participate in the plot to kill him. Ben-Gurion may have had an epiphany of sorts after hearing or reading Kennedy's speech and was apparently overcome with shame at the thought of plotting to kill such a wise man. In his later years, Ben-Gurion renounced Zionism stating, "I'm no longer a Zionist, I'm no longer a Socialist, I don't belong to [Histadrut](#), I resigned from the Knesset."²¹

There were other motives for the assassination besides Kennedy's Cold War policy. To fully understand Israel's motivation for killing Kennedy, it helps to understand Israel's overall strategy. Israeli scholar and publisher Simha Flapan explained that expansion was always Israel's main objective. With respect to the original partition plan, in 1948, Flapan stated that "acceptance of the UN Partition Resolution was an example of Zionist pragmatism par excellence. It was a tactical acceptance, a vital step in the right direction—a springboard for expansion when circumstances proved more judicious."²²

In essence, Simha Flapan was saying that the founding fathers of Israel had planned to violate UN treaties from the day Israel was founded in 1948. The breaking of vows—Jews recite a prayer called the *Kol Nidre* (all vows) on the eve of Yom Kippur which sanctifies the breaking of vows for the ensuing year²³—has been a controversial part of the Jewish culture for centuries. In fact, most Rabbis omitted the *Kol Nidre* from Yom Kippur services in the 19th Century because of its controversial nature, but it was reinstated in 1945.²⁴

Having stated that, I believe most fair-minded students of Middle Eastern history would agree that Israel had the following five-point strategy in 1963:

1. Israel planned to expand its borders by force.
2. Israel wanted the Cold War to continue (as Gromyko pointed out). In other words, Israel did not want détente between the two superpowers.
3. Israel wanted the Bomb.
4. Israel wanted to weaken Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser because he was a lightning rod for Arab unity.
5. Israel wanted to divide the Arab nations.

None of these five points could be achieved with a Kennedy in the White House. The Israelis distrusted President Kennedy because of his father. It is widely known that Joseph Kennedy Sr developed a strong loathing of Jews from his business dealings with them in finance, Hollywood, and politics. And the elder Kennedy had groomed four sons for the White House, but his oldest—Joe, Jr—had been killed in World War II. President Kennedy's inauguration in January 1961 marked the beginning of a dynasty that would likely continue until 1985 (after the three surviving sons had each completed two terms).

With this background information, it becomes clear that there was one primary motive for the assassination: to destroy the Kennedy Dynasty. The reason Israel acted when they did was because Kennedy was on the verge of ending the Cold War. He was also making plans to prevent them from acquiring the Bomb. This called for a drastic response.

Destroying the Kennedy dynasty would allow Israel to continue its annexation program, thereby acquiring more Arab land, something that would be impossible while a Kennedy was in the White House. The culmination of Israel's expansion was the Six Day War, in June 1967. Had the Kennedy Dynasty not been destroyed, this could not have occurred until at least 1985. This is not to suggest necessarily that precise planning for the Six Day War was underway in 1963; however, it is widely accepted that Israel planned to expand its borders since its founding in 1948, as Simha Flapan observed.

This explains why Bobby Kennedy was assassinated, on June 5, 1968, in a similar style as John. But despite stories that Bobby's "alleged" assassin—Sirhan Sirhan, a Palestinian immigrant—hated him because of his loyalty to Israel, in reality Bobby Kennedy was not supported by American Jews in his 1968 presidential campaign.²⁵ A year later Ted's political career was nearly destroyed when he "accidentally" drove his car off an unmarked bridge on Chappaquiddick Island, near Martha's Vineyard,

Massachusetts, and his companion in the car, 28-year-old Mary Jo Kopechne, was drowned.

In fact, Joe Kennedy Sr believed President Roosevelt was responsible for the death of his oldest son, Joe Jr. Kennedy believed that Roosevelt reviewed the order to send his son on a high-risk bombing mission over France in which Joe Jr was killed. During the 1944 presidential campaign, Kennedy asked Senator Harry S. Truman, Roosevelt's running mate, "Harry, what the hell are you doing campaigning for that crippled son of a bitch that killed my son Joe?"²⁶

Truman responded, "If you say another word about Roosevelt, I'm going to throw you out the window."²⁷ Obviously there was no love lost between Truman and Kennedy either.

At this point, we have established two reasons why friends of Israel wanted to assassinate President Kennedy: (a) to prevent détente between the United States and the Soviet Union, and (b), to destroy the Kennedy Dynasty. But there were several other motives.

First of all, in 1945 a young Jack Kennedy wrote the following words in his diary in praise of Adolf Hitler:

After visiting these two places (Berchtesgaden and the Eagle's lair on Obersalzberg), you can easily understand how that within a few years Hitler will emerge from the hatred that surrounds him now as one of the most significant figures who ever lived. He had boundless ambitions for his country which rendered him a menace to the peace of the world, but he had a mystery about him in the way that he lived and in the manner of his death that will live and grow after him. He had in him the stuff of which legends are made.

(Prelude To Leadership - The European Diary of John F. Kennedy, Summer 1945, Regnery Publishing, Inc., Washington DC, p. 74)

Second point: In 1940 John Kennedy wrote a book, *Why England Slept*, which explored why Neville Chamberlain's Britain was unprepared for war with Hitler's Germany. The book appears to be a fair-minded analysis; however, it was a sensitive topic because Chamberlain was actually pro-Hitler. Consequently, even a balanced analysis of Chamberlain's leadership would be frowned upon by influential friends of Israel.

In *Why England Slept*, Kennedy made the bold observation that Sir Arthur Balfour had essentially recanted the spirit the *Balfour Declaration*, a brief document officially authored by Balfour in 1917 and bore his name.^(Footnote 2) The Balfour Declaration stated the following:

His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment in

Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

(Balfour Declaration, November 2, 1917)

In *Why England Slept*, Kennedy pointed out that that Sir Balfour's opinion had changed considerably between 1917 and 1933. Kennedy wrote the following:

In reading statements like that of Sir Arthur Balfour, Chairman of the Balfour Steel Company, made in 1933, "One of the gravest menaces to peace today is the totally unarmed condition of Germany," we should not dismiss it as being blindly stupid. We must remember that in the summer of 1939 a sufficient number of the Senate of the United States believed there would not be a war in Europe this year, and refused to repeal the embargo on arms. Every country makes great errors, and there is usually a good reason for it at the time. We must also remember that we are looking at the problem from the vantage point of 1940. In reading statements like Balfour's we should try to realize that in 1933 the facts may have appeared to warrant an entirely different interpretation.

(Why England Slept, JFK, 1940, Introduction, page xxv)

Sir Balfour's cited statement from 1933 indicates that he was obviously pro-German. This is significant because Hitler became chancellor (Kanzler) and Führer of Germany in 1933, and everyone knows that Hitler was anti-Jewish from the beginning. Therefore, by making pro-German statements the very year that Hitler rose to power in Germany, Balfour was in effect reneging on the terms of the Balfour Declaration which committed Britain's support to Palestine as a Jewish homeland. Kennedy had subtly pointed that fact out to informed readers of his book. [\(Footnote 3\)](#)

Third point: In 1956 then-Senator Kennedy indirectly criticized the Nuremberg Trials by naming Senator Robert Taft as a courageous profile in the acclaimed book, *Profiles in Courage*. Kennedy cited Taft for the "courageous act" of criticizing the Nuremberg Trials while they were in progress in 1946.

Fourth point: In July 1957, Senator Kennedy made the front page of the *New York Times* when he delivered a speech on the Senate floor denouncing French colonial occupation of Algeria. When Algeria was given independence in 1962, it became another Arab nation. In the eyes of Zionists, this posed yet another threat to Israel's existence. In Kennedy's speech, he also criticized French brutality in the French Algerian War. By supporting independence for Algeria, Kennedy had indirectly aligned himself with Israel's nemesis, Egyptian President Nasser. In the Arab world,

Nasser was as charismatic as Kennedy later became in the West. Nasser openly promoted pan-Arab policies which garnered admiration among most Arab leaders and the Arab people. Nasser had publicly endorsed Algerian independence from France, a position that would unite France with Israel against Egypt in the Suez Crisis of 1956.

Fifth point: Both Kennedy and Khrushchev had stronger ties with Egyptian President Nasser than with Israel. Their befriending of Nasser, a living icon symbolizing Arab unity, was a signal to Israel that both superpowers had more interest in the Arab world than in Israel's continued existence as a Jewish homeland, let alone its expansion into neighboring Arab territories.

Sixth point: President Kennedy had voiced strong, albeit private, opposition to Israel's development of the Bomb. The Kennedy Administration was well-aware of Israel's nuclear reactor in Dimona. In fact, Kennedy and Ben-Gurion got into a heated personal exchange over that issue. Kennedy was concerned about Israel's nuclear capabilities and made a secret deal for regular American inspections of the nuclear reactor in Dimona in exchange for Hawk anti-aircraft missiles, something that Ben-Gurion wanted. Ben-Gurion allowed an inspection once, but it was a deception. The Dimona facility was disguised to look like a nuclear power plant, but the CIA advised Kennedy that this was not the case and advised the President to push for further inspections. Kennedy followed their advice. Historian Michael Beschloss wrote that "in the fall of 1963, Kennedy and Rusk were indeed casting about for some kind of cooperation with the Russians to keep Israel from going nuclear."²⁸

After Ben-Gurion resigned as prime minister in June 1963, he was replaced by Levi Eshkol. On July 5, 1963, President Kennedy sent a strongly worded communiqué to Eshkol that American commitment and support of Israel "could be seriously jeopardized" if Israel did not let the United States obtain "reliable information" about Israel's efforts in the nuclear field. (Reference [Appendix A](#) for a transcript of the letter.)

Seventh point: The Yemen War (the forgotten war) was another reason the Israelis disliked Kennedy. His strategy in that war was to maintain Arab unity; however, part of Israel's five-point strategy was to divide the Arab nations. The Yemen War is largely undocumented by Western historians, but President Kennedy became entangled in a civil war in Yemen which was still in progress when he was killed. Initially, the Yemen War pitted Egypt and the United States against Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Great Britain.

Confusion erupted in Yemen following the death—of natural causes—of its leader, Imam Ahmed, on September 18, 1962. Imam Ahmed was an extraordinary but archaic man with the same values of rulers from the Middle Ages. He was succeeded by his son, Prince Mohammed al-Badr; however, the younger Imam was even more eccentric than his father. While on official delegations, he would stop and climb trees and sit on a tree branch indefinitely. Clearly he was not suited to rule a nation in the Twentieth Century. Within a week after the father died, the Prince was overthrown by Colonel Abdullah al Salal, a commander of the Royal Guard. The Colonel had been imprisoned for five years by the elder Imam and had endured inhuman living conditions while incarcerated.²⁹

Badr, escaped to the mountains and rallied loyal tribesmen to his cause, launching an armed struggle to regain the throne. He received generous assistance from two monarchs, the kings of Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Salal sent an emissary to Egypt who asked Nasser for help. Wanting to get Yemen out of the Middle Ages, Nasser sent troops to Yemen to support the new republican government. Nasser's support was important and understandable. He was not only the president of Egypt, but a charismatic advocate of the pan-Arab movement who strove to maintain solidarity among Arab nations.³⁰ This made him the arch-enemy of friends of Israel since their goals were to divide and conquer Arab nations and expand its borders into their territories.

Kennedy's primary interest in Yemen was to hold the coalition of Islamic states together and deal with the conflict as a civil war. He encouraged the Yemenite government to resolve its problems internally without support from outside nations. Consequently, he encouraged all Arab nations—Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt—to withdraw military forces from Yemen.³¹ Kennedy's policy of encouraging solidarity among Arab nations during the Yemen conflict was likely another reason why friends of Israel wanted him killed. Israel has always wanted to divide, not unite, the Arab nations. With Kennedy out of the way, the Arab coalition became much weaker as the Israelis planned their efforts to expand its borders. In addition, Nasser's influence diminished greatly. This was largely due to Egypt's prolonged involvement the Yemen War.

The following is historian William Cleveland's description of how solidarity among Islamic States was obliterated by the Yemen War:

By 1965 nearly 70,000 Egyptian troops were engaged on the side of the military regime in Yemen. Bugged down in difficult terrain and harassed by guerrillas, the Egyptian forces suffered heavy losses and were finally withdrawn in 1968. In this case, Egypt's intervention divided Arab loyalties instead of unifying them; it presented the spectacle of Arab fighting Arab and of the heads of state of Saudi Arabia and Egypt hurling insults at one another.

(William Cleveland, *A History of the Modern Middle East*, p. 296)

To summarize the motives, friends of Israel had no use for Joseph Kennedy, Sr or any of his sons because of the elder Kennedy's well-known dislike of Jews. And John Kennedy had displayed similar views throughout his adult life. But it was the young president's efforts to end the Cold War, to prevent Israel from acquiring the Bomb, and his efforts to maintain Arab unity in the Yemen war that made pro-Israel forces decide to stage a coup d'état in the fall of 1963.

The Plot Against Kennedy

After years of research, I have developed the following scenario of how the plot against President Kennedy was conceived and accomplished:

I believe the assassination was decreed by Nahum Goldmann, founder of the World Jewish Congress and its president in 1963, after taking counsel from influential friends of Israel. They likely included, but were not limited to the following individuals:

- ♦ David Ben-Gurion, Prime Minister of Israel and head of the Mapai Party (1948-53 & 1955-63)
- ♦ Levi Eshkol, Prime Minister of Israel and head of the Mapai-Labour Party (1963-69)
- ♦ Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel and head of the Labour Party (1969-74)
- ♦ Menachem Begin, former commander of the terrorist organization, Irgun Zvai Leumi (Hebrew: National Military Organization), Prime Minister of Israel and head of the Likud Party (1977-83)
- ♦ Yitzhak Shamir, former member of the terrorist organization known as the Stern Gang, also a former member of Irgun Zvai Leumi, Prime Minister of Israel and head of the Likud Party (1983-84 & 1986-92)
- ♦ Yitzhak Rabin, Prime Minister of Israel and head of the Labour Party (1974-77 & 1992-95)
- ♦ Samuel Bronfman, billionaire businessman, former bootlegger, owner of Seagram-Distillers Corporation; resided in Montreal
- ♦ Louis Bloomfield, international lawyer (and Bronfman's attorney), contractor for the CIA and FBI, formerly a British Intelligence officer who served in Palestine under the command of General Charles Orde Wingate training Haganah soldiers during the Arab Revolt in the 1930s; resided in Montreal
- ♦ Bernard Bloomfield (brother of Louis), influential businessman; resided in Montreal

One can easily see Goldmann, speaking not only for himself, but as President of the World Jewish Congress that year, prophesying that President Kennedy should die for the nation of Israel. And his death would not only be for that nation, but for all friends of Israel scattered abroad.

From that day forth they plotted to kill him.

Louis Bloomfield was directed to manage the assassination. And he did so with the full knowledge and support of Lyndon Baines Johnson and J. Edgar Hoover.

In 1963 the top underworld figure in the American Mafia was Jewish mob leader Meyer Lansky.³² In addition to heroin, Lansky had major interests in gambling, especially in Florida, pre-Castro Cuba, the Bahamas, and Las Vegas.³³ Santo Trafficante was one of Lansky's chief lieutenants³⁴ who controlled the Florida-Cuba-Bahamas corridor.

Bloomfield met with Lansky about hiring assassins. It was agreed that the Guerini Family, a leading French-Corsican crime family, would provide the hit men.³⁵ This was a logical choice since the CIA had a long history with the Guerini Family since the late 1940s.³⁶ The assassins chosen were close associates of Auguste Joseph Ricord, a French-Corsican gangster living in Argentina after being convicted of collaborating with the Third Reich and sentenced to death in absentia by the Permanent Military Court of Paris. Their names were Lucien Sarti, François Chiappe, and Jean-Paul

Angeletti; originally from Marseilles, France. A fourth man, Christian David, was also offered the contract, but he refused. David and the three hit men eventually became Ricord's lieutenants when he emerged as the number one smuggler of heroin into the United States in the late 1960s and early 70s.³⁷

Bloomfield knew that the American Mafia and the French-Corsican syndicates of Marseilles were looking for a new source of heroin and morphine base because their previous source, the Mediterranean Basin, had developed insurmountable problems.³⁸ Faced with the prospect of either finding a new source or going out of business, Bloomfield helped them establish Southeast Asia as a primary source.³⁹ Links had already been established between Corsican gangsters in Marseilles and those in Southeast Asia during the First Indochina War (1946-1954), but the relationship needed to be strengthened.⁴⁰

A deal was apparently struck—brokered by Bloomfield—between the American Mafia and the Corsican crime syndicates. If the Corsicans would supply the assassins, Bloomfield would have Kennedy's replacement, President Johnson, escalate American involvement in the Vietnam War and allow the Corsicans to re-enter the narcotics industry in Southeast Asia. Under the leadership of General Edward G. Lansdale (then a Colonel), the Corsicans were driven out of Vietnam in 1955 after the French had been defeated in the Indochina War. Lansdale did more than any single person to drive the Corsican drug smugglers out of Vietnam, depose the corrupt Prime Minister Bay Vien (head of Binh Xuyen) and put Ngo Dinh Diem in power.⁴¹ Years later, Lansdale was implicated in the assassination of JFK by several so-called researchers in an apparent vendetta against the General for driving the Corsicans out years earlier.

It appears that Bloomfield also assisted the heroin traffickers in laundering large sums of money generated from the criminal enterprise. Being a skilled lawyer, Bloomfield apparently set up fake corporations⁴² in order to funnel heroin money into numerous banks throughout the world.⁴³ The proceeds from the narcotics enterprise would be divided among the participants by channeling the illicit drug money to appropriate bank accounts. Bloomfield would also use this vast international criminal enterprise to finance assassinations of other political figures. Such targets included assassination attempts on French President Charles de Gaulle⁴⁴ and the murder of Moroccan political exile Mehdi Ben Barka.⁴⁵ Both men supported Algerian independence,⁴⁶ as did John Kennedy when—as a United States Senator—he made a controversial speech in support of Algerian independence.⁴⁷ Israel was opposed to granting Algeria its independence because it would mean the establishment of another Islamic state.

The Assassination

In the fall of 1963, the three assassins were flown from Marseilles to Mexico City where they spent some three or four weeks at the house of a contact. They were then driven from Mexico City to the US border at Brownsville, Texas. They crossed the border using Italian passports. They were picked up on the American side of the border at Brownsville by a representative of the Chicago Mafia with whom they conversed in Italian. They were then driven to Dallas and put up in a safehouse which

had been prepared for them so as not to leave hotel records. They spent several days taking photographs of Dealey Plaza, and in the evenings at the safehouse they studied the photographs and they arranged a "crossfire" with three guns.⁴⁸

On November 22, shortly before the presidential motorcade drove through Dallas, the assassins were driven to Dealey Plaza. Chiappe and Angeletti took their positions in two office buildings; one was high, one was low. Sarti stood behind a picket fence on top of a hill near the middle of Elm Street, his rifle loaded with exploding bullets. He was disguised as a policeman. As the limousine approached the center of Elm Street one shot was fired from a lower-level window of the Dal-Tex building directly behind the car; a bullet struck Kennedy in the back of the neck.⁴⁹ He clutched his throat with both hands, his elbows raised high.⁵⁰ Four seconds later,⁵¹ a second shot rang out from an upper-level window of the Texas School Book Depository, hitting Texas Governor John Connally in the back,⁵² above his right armpit; his torso was turned to the right as he was struck.⁵³ He sustained five wounds from one bullet, each wound being to the left and below the previous. He was sitting directly in front of Kennedy.⁵⁴

One second later⁵⁵ Sarti fired from behind the picket fence hitting Kennedy in the right temple slamming his body backward and to the left, then slumping sideways in the seat. The bone in his right temple fell beside his ear as the back of his head exploded.⁵⁶ He was declared legally dead shortly thereafter.

A fourth shot was fired that missed the car completely, but grazed onlooker James Teague in the cheek;⁵⁷ it was fired simultaneously with one of the other shots.⁵⁸

The Framing of Oswald

Within hours a low-level intelligence officer who worked for the United States government was arrested and subsequently charged with the murder of President Kennedy. His name was Lee Harvey Oswald; he was also accused of shooting Dallas police officer Jefferson Davis Tippet shortly after Kennedy was killed.

Oswald was completely innocent.⁵⁹ Bloomfield had used him as a patsy, a scapegoat to throw the public off the trail of the true assassins.⁶⁰ Under Bloomfield's direction, Oswald's associates and handlers had given him assignments for months designed to self-incriminate.⁶¹ While living in New Orleans in the summer of 1963, his handlers were Guy Banister⁶² and Clay Shaw⁶³ (aka, Clay Bertrand) who reported directly to Bloomfield.⁶⁴ One of Oswald's associates was David Ferrie, an eccentric homosexual and professional pilot.⁶⁵ Ferrie had flown the assassins from Dallas to Montreal in a private plane several days after the assassination.⁶⁶ From there Bloomfield arranged to have them flown back to Marseilles, France.⁶⁷

Two days after the assassination, Oswald was shot and killed by Jack Ruby, a Dallas clubowner with links to Meyer Lansky⁶⁸ and other mob figures; he had also worked as an FBI informant. Ruby was part of the conspiracy; eye-witnesses saw him in compromising situations on the day Kennedy was killed. Julia Ann Mercer testified before the Warren Commission—her testimony was later illegally altered—that she saw a young man with a rifle dismount from a pickup truck driven by Jack Ruby at

Dealy Plaza about an hour before the assassination.⁶⁹ While in custody, Oswald had not cooperated with the conspirators and it was decided that he must be killed. Ruby's handlers advised him to kill Oswald or be implicated in Kennedy's murder as well.⁷⁰ This was done under the direction of Bloomfield.

The Warren Commission

Upon assuming the presidency, Johnson immediately formed a commission ostensibly to investigate the assassination, but the real agenda was to cover-up the truth from the American public. It was named the *The Warren Commission* after its distinguished chairman, Chief Justice Earl Warren. After months of research, the commission issued a report which concluded that Oswald had acted alone and there was not a conspiracy.

A large percentage of the commission's members, however, were Jewish; not as ranking members, but as assistant counsel and staff members. The following is a complete listing of the members of the Warren Commission:

Ranking Members

Chief Justice Earl Warren, Chairman
 Senator Richard B. Russell
 Senator John Sherman Cooper
 Representative Hale Boggs
 Representative Gerald R. Ford
 Mr. Allen W. Dulles (former CIA director, fired by Kennedy)
 Mr. John J. McCloy
 J. Lee Rankin, General Counsel
 Assistant Counsel

Francis W. H. Adams	Albert E. Jenner, Jr.
Joseph A. Ball	Wesley J. Liebeler
David W. Belin	Norman Redlich
William T. Coleman, Jr.	W. David Slawson
Melvin Aron Eisenberg	Arlen Specter
Burt W. Griffin	Samuel A. Stern
Leon D. Hubert, Jr.	Howard P. Willens

Staff Members

Phillip Barson	Richard M. Mosk
Edward A. Conroy	John J. O'brien
John Hart Ely	Stuart Pollak
Alfred Goldberg	Alfreda Scobey
Murray J. Laulicht	Charles N. Shaffer, Jr.
Arthur Marmor	Lloyd L. Weinreb

Commission Attorneys David Belin and Arlen Specter

Two Jewish assistant counsels for the Warren Commission, David Belin and Arlen Specter, rose to prominence in the years following the assassination. Belin wrote books and made numerous talk show appearances endorsing the Warren Report. As assistant counsel, Belin had a gift for changing the subject when questioning witnesses about to reveal important information. In other words, his task was apparently to prevent the crime from being solved. For example, Belin questioned Dallas Police officer, Sergeant D.V. Harkness, who told Belin (under oath) that he saw several strangers using a departing train to leave the area where President Kennedy had just been murdered. Belin responded:

"I want to go back to this Amos Euins. Do you remember what he said to you and what you said to him when you first saw him?"⁷¹

Amos Euins was another witness who had nothing to do with trains or the grassy knoll. Belin was clearly changing the subject.

Arlen Specter authored the portion of the Warren Report that critics call the "Magic Bullet Theory." Years later Specter was elected US Senator representing Pennsylvania for the Republican Party. In 1994, Specter chaired the Senate Intelligence Committee after the Republicans had won control of the Senate in the fall elections. The Senate Intelligence Committee provides oversight of all US intelligence services including the CIA and FBI. In fact, Specter chaired the powerful oversight committee when the Murrah Building, in Oklahoma City, was bombed on April 19, 1995. There is strong evidence to suggest that Israel was behind the bombing of the Murrah Building as well. That act of terrorism was not unlike the bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem by Jewish extremists on July 22, 1946. Both topics are discussed later.

The Means: Division Five and Permindex

J. Edgar Hoover allowed Bloomfield to run what is known as FBI Division Five, an "independent" covert enterprise set up by Hoover and William Sullivan. Division Five was not an official part of the government, although many of its leaders held high-ranking official positions. This was the mechanism Bloomfield used to stage the coup against Kennedy. Lyndon Johnson was fully aware of Division Five and was an active participant with Bloomfield and Hoover in setting up the coup.⁷²

It should be noted that William Sullivan, co-founder of Division Five, was shot and killed with a high-powered rifle near his home in New Hampshire in November 1977. Sullivan had just completed a preliminary meeting with investigators for the House Select Committee on Assassinations. The man who shot him was the son of a state policeman and claimed to have mistaken Sullivan for a deer. He was arrested, charged with a misdemeanor—"shooting a human being by accident"—and released into the custody of his father. No further investigation was ever done.⁷³ In addition, Sullivan was finishing an exposé on Hoover's FBI, with journalist Bill Brown, when he was killed. Two years later, Brown published Sullivan's book entitled, *The Bureau: My*

Thirty Years in Hoover's FBI. It was a major indictment of J. Edgar Hoover and Lyndon Johnson.

Division Five was apparently given that name because it managed spy networks within five different political/military groups. With Bloomfield managing those five groups, a more accurate name would have been Division Six, because he added Israel's interests to the overall agenda. He added a sixth layer, Permindex, a dummy trade corporation used to finance Israeli espionage and political assassinations. In addition Permindex was a tool for laundering illicit heroin money for American and French-Corsican-Latino crime syndicates.

By combining Permindex with Hoover's Division Five, Bloomfield had control of the following six intelligence units:

- ♦ *The Security Division of NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration)* – This group represented the munitions industry. They were opposed to Kennedy because he was trying to make peace with the Soviets and end the Cold War. Since the Security Division was in the war business, Kennedy was of no value to them. He was a threat to them financially. NASA was used mainly as a cover because the American public associated it with space travel. In fact, the security division of NASA was headquartered at the Defense Industrial Security Command (DISC) in Alabama and Ohio. DISC was the police and espionage agency for US munitions makers.
- ♦ *The Solidarists* – This group represented Jewish exiles from Russia and Eastern Europe.
- ♦ *The American Council of Christian Churches* – This group supported right-wing political agendas mixed with Evangelical Christianity. The latter supported the state of Israel for religious purposes. The ACCC also had operatives in right-wing extremist groups like the Ku Klux Klan and the John Birch Society. The common thread who supported Israel.
- ♦ *The Free Cuba Committee* – This group consisted of anti-Communist extremists who opposed Castro.
- ♦ *The Syndicate* – US mobsters with gambling casinos in Havana, Cuba and the Caribbean; headed by Meyer Lansky and his lieutenant Santo Trafficante.
- ♦ *Permindex* – A dummy trade corporation created by Bloomfield to finance covert activity internationally for the state of Israel; also used to launder illicit heroin profits for American and French-Corsican-Latino crime syndicates. This was separate from the FBI's Division Five, but since it was run by Bloomfield, it was a de facto leg of the Division Five intelligence network.⁷⁴

Joseph Milteer Corroborated Jewish Conspiracy

Joseph Milteer was a wealthy southerner from Georgia with right-wing extremist political beliefs. He was an active member of the Constitutional America Party and had acquaintances in the Ku Klux Klan.⁷⁵ His politics were a mixture of ultra-right extremism mixed with Evangelical Christianity which included the belief in Armageddon. Evangelicals believe Jews are needed to establish a Jewish state so that Jesus will return, gather all Jews in Israel, and build a Temple. The world would then

end and practically all the Jews would be killed at Armageddon. The few Jewish survivors would convert to Christianity.⁷⁶

Evangelical ministers Pat Robertson and Jerry Falwell are both big supporters of Israel because of their belief in Armageddon. Robertson in particular is a big believer in Armageddon. The bizarre thing about Evangelicals is they do not hesitate to encourage Jewish conversion to Christianity; however, they also feel that Jews are needed in order to fulfill the scriptures.

When Menachem Begin was cautioned that Evangelical aid was provided to Israel only because they believed that a new Jewish state was needed for the second coming of Jesus, and the conversion of Jews to Christianity, he reportedly responded: "I tell you, if the Christian Fundamentalists support us in Congress today, I will support them when the Messiah comes tomorrow."⁷⁷

On November 9, 1963, Miami police informant William Somerset met with Joseph Milteer who proceeded to outline the assassination of President Kennedy. Milteer stated that Kennedy would be shot "from an office building with a high-powered rifle," and "they will pick somebody up within hours afterwards, if anything like that would happen, just to throw the public off."⁷⁸ This was thirteen days before Kennedy was assassinated. Milteer definitely knew what he was talking about.

On November 23, 1963, the day after Kennedy was shot, Milteer met with Somerset again and stated that there was a "Communist conspiracy by Jews to overthrow the United States."⁷⁹ He further stated that Martin Luther King and Attorney General Kennedy were now unimportant, but the next move would be against "the big Jew."⁸⁰

This information is extremely important because Milteer was clearly a man with prior knowledge about the plans to kill President Kennedy. Despite his extremist politics, Milteer was a person to be taken seriously. His comment about Martin Luther King, Robert Kennedy, and "the big Jew" tells us three things. First, his reference to "the big Jew" corroborates my thesis that one Jewish individual—likely Louis Bloomfield—ran the coup against Kennedy. Second, it reveals that right-wing extremists had broken ranks with the Jewish-led coup immediately after Kennedy was killed. Apparently, Milteer and his associates had made a pact with Bloomfield to support the coup while they secretly plotted to kill him—Bloomfield—after Kennedy was executed. Third, it suggests that contingency plans were in place in 1963—by the right-wing extremists—to kill Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy.

Further evidence indicates that Milteer personally declared a right-wing war on the Jews. On November 24, just two days after Kennedy was killed, Milteer apparently delivered a speech before the *Constitutional American Party* at Columbia, South Carolina. He reportedly made the following statements:

... to all Christians: The Zionist Jews killed Christ 2000 years ago and on November 22, 1963, they killed President Kennedy. You Jews killed the President. We are going to kill you.⁸¹

Such an action against Jews was not surprising in light of the origins of the Ku Klux Klan. Originally formed in Nashville, Tennessee in 1867 by Confederate cavalry general Nathan Bedford Forrest, the Klan disappeared by 1882 because its original objective—the restoration of white supremacy throughout the South—had largely been achieved during the 1870s. In addition, Forrest had ordered it disbanded in 1869, because of the group's excessive violence.⁸²

The second wave of Klan activity began when it was reorganized in 1915, not because of strong anti-black sentiment, but because white Protestants in small-town America felt threatened by the Bolshevik revolution in Russia and by the large-scale immigration of the previous decades that had changed the ethnic character of American society.⁸³

Milteer's call to arms against Jews may have intensified hatred by the Ku Klux Klan against Jews and blacks alike in its opposition to the Civil Rights movement. On June 21, 1964, three civil rights workers—Michael Schwerner, Andrew Goodman and James Earl Chaney—were abducted and killed by the Ku Klux Klan in Mississippi. Two of those men were Jewish; only one was African-American. Their abduction occurred just seven months after Kennedy's assassination.

As soon as the three workers turned up missing, President Johnson and J. Edgar Hoover launched a massive investigation. The fate of the three men was uncertain, but their disappearance provided the final impetus needed for the 1964 Civil Rights Act to pass. The bodies of Goodman, Schwerner and Chaney were found five weeks later, buried in a mud dam. Eventually, 19 men, including the county sheriff and a deputy, were convicted of federal conspiracy charges in connection with the murders.

On the surface, Johnson and Hoover seemed courageous in their fight against right-wing extremists; but in reality, they had plotted jointly with the same forces to kill Kennedy. The chickens had indeed come home to roost.

George Wallace and Curtis LeMay

Did Joseph Milteer have enough influence—even within his group of right-wing extremists—to declare a war against Jews? As it turns out, he may have had assistance from at least one prominent politician, namely Alabama Governor George Wallace who was friendly with right-wing General Curtis LeMay, a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Kennedy administration. LeMay was a hawkish adversary of Kennedy's during the Cuban Missile Crisis.⁸⁴ Their animosity toward one another has been widely documented.

The *Constitutional American Party*—the group that Milteer reportedly addressed on November 24, 1963 when he declared war on the Jews—later evolved into Wallace's third-party, *The American Independent Party*, when he ran for president in 1968.⁸⁵ General LeMay was his running mate.

George Wallace loathed the Kennedy brothers and Martin Luther King because they shamed him in June 1963 during a standoff at the University of Alabama where

Wallace stood in the doorway to block enrollment of black students. Under President Kennedy's direction, Bobby Kennedy called out the Alabama National Guard who forced Wallace to step aside. Martin Luther King was in the middle of the conflict as well. In fact, he solicited the aid of the Kennedy brothers to deal with Wallace.

Wallace wanted to be president badly, probably more than Lyndon Johnson. And he would not have a chance until 1985 when the Kennedy Dynasty was over (after John, Bobby and Ted had each served two terms).

LeMay was one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the Kennedy administration. He was an ardent cold warrior, and partly for this reason his tenure as chief was neither successful nor happy. LeMay found himself at constant odds with the management policies of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and the "flexible response" military strategy of Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman General Maxwell Taylor.⁸⁶

Kennedy's relationship with the military was strained,⁸⁷ to say the least, but he and Lemay displayed mutual contempt for one another. Kennedy once remarked after one of his many walkouts on the General, "I don't want that man near me again."⁸⁸

LeMay was one of the generals who put heavy pressure on Kennedy to attack Cuba during the Cuban Missile Crisis. Having been ill-advised once before by the Joint Chiefs during the Bay of Pigs Invasion, Kennedy was not willing to make the same mistake twice. He remarked, "Those sons of bitches with all the fruit salad just sat there nodding, saying it would work."⁸⁹

In his four years as chief, LeMay argued vigorously for new air weapons like the B70 bomber and the Skybolt missile, and against the swingwing "fighter" plane, the General Dynamics TFX (later named the F111). He lost all these battles. In addition, LeMay had strong feelings regarding American involvement in Vietnam, arguing against the gradual response advocated by the Administration. Once again he was ignored.⁹⁰

Lemay was in effect arguing on behalf of the munitions industry. As previously stated, the munitions industry was represented in Hoover's Division Five the powerful intelligence apparatus used by Louis Bloomfield to orchestrate the coup against Kennedy. More specifically, the munitions industry was represented within Division Five under the auspices of the Security Division of NASA which was headquartered at the Defense Industrial Security Command (DISC) in George Wallace's home state of Alabama and also Ohio. DISC was the police and espionage agency for US munitions makers. This was all under the control of Louis Bloomfield through his control of the FBI's "free-lance" espionage unit, Division Five.

Joseph Milteer's reference to the "big Jew" corroborates that there was in fact a Jewish conspiracy apparently headed by one Jewish individual. That person was Louis Bloomfield.

The Assassinations of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King

Division Five was apparently used to kill Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy in 1968 and blame the murders on patsies, James Earl Ray and Sirhan Sirhan.

Malevolent forces converged against King and Kennedy because the latter was about to assume the presidency and former was endorsing him. Both wanted to end US involvement in the Vietnam War, but several interests would prevail over their wishes. First, the right-wing extremists hated both men because of they—along with President Kennedy—had embarrassed George Wallace in June 1963 when the Alabama National Guard forced him to allow black students to enroll at the University of Alabama. Second, Israel absolutely did not want the son of Joseph Kennedy to become president. None of the Kennedys could be counted on to support Israel's annexation program of expanding its borders into neighboring Arab territories. Third, American and French-Corsican-Latino crime syndicates wanted the Vietnam War to continue because they were reaping huge profits from the Golden Triangle from its production of opium. Those profits were apparently being shared with senior military personnel and various wealthy interests within the Western Powers.

In March of 1967 Senator Robert Kennedy announced a peace plan for Vietnam and soon became an outspoken antiwar advocate.⁹¹ Martin Luther King quickly followed the senator's lead. On April 4, 1967, at Riverside Church in New York City and again on the 15th at a mammoth peace rally in that city, King committed himself irrevocably to opposing US involvement in the Vietnam War. Once before, in early January 1966, he had condemned the war, but official outrage from Washington and strenuous opposition within the black community itself had caused him to acquiesce.⁹²

On Jan. 30, 1968, the Tet Offensive began. It was a massive attack launched by the North Vietnamese on the Tet (lunar new year) Vietnamese festival. It marked a new beginning of anti-war sentiment amongst many Americans. Gene McCarthy had been campaigning for the presidency on the Democratic ticket. On March 16, 1968, Robert Kennedy announced his candidacy for the presidency;⁹³ Martin Luther King immediately endorsed him. On March 31, 1968, President Johnson startled television viewers with a national address that included three announcements: (1) he had just ordered major reductions in the bombing of North Vietnam, (2) he was requesting peace talks, and (3) he would neither seek nor accept his party's renomination for the presidency.⁹⁴ On April 4 King was killed by a sniper's bullet while standing on the balcony of a motel in Memphis, Tennessee where he and his associates were staying. On March 10, 1969, the accused assassin, James Earl Ray, pleaded guilty to the murder and was sentenced to 99 years in prison.⁹⁵ Ray later recanted his confession.

By June 4, 1968 Robert Kennedy had won five out of six presidential primaries, including one that day in California. Shortly after midnight on June 5 he spoke to his followers in Los Angeles' Ambassador Hotel. As he left through a kitchen hallway he was fatally wounded by a Palestinian immigrant, Sirhan Bishara Sirhan; at least that's the official story. Robert Kennedy died the next day on June 6, 1968.⁹⁶

The Coup Against Nixon

As it turns out, Watergate was not the only cover-up in the Nixon White House. Joan Hoff, a research professor of history at Montana State University, recently wrote an article asserting that on December 21, 1971—six months before the Watergate burglary occurred—Nixon approved the first major cover-up of his administration; however, he was not covering up his own misdeeds. He was covering up the Navy's. Nixon had learned that Admiral Thomas Moorer, head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had authorized his subordinates to spy on the White House's National Security Counsel. For thirteen months, from 1970 to late 1971, Navy Yeoman Charles E. Radford systematically stole and copied NSC documents from Alexander Haig, Henry Kissinger, and their staff. When Nixon learned of this, he ordered it hushed up; but he let the military know he was aware of its spying. Apparently Nixon and his aides thought that approach would give them more leverage dealing with a hostile defense establishment.⁹⁷

To evaluate Nixon fairly, one must consider the times in which he served as President. He took office just six years after a coup d'état which pushed America deeply into a war in Southeast Asia, a conflict that evolved into an opium war. The aftermath of President Kennedy's assassination was a highly unstable government in which a variety of carpetbaggers lined their pockets, profiteering from the sale of illicit heroin made from opium grown in the Golden Triangle. This volatile state of affairs created havoc within the US intelligence community. One set of federal agents worked desperately to stop the flow of heroin traffic from entering US borders while another group looked the other way.

Vietnam was a cynical war run by a variety of interests. It became a continuation of opium smuggling that had been practiced by the Western Powers for nearly two centuries. In the 1940s, opium trafficking went underground and was handled secretly by international crime syndicates working jointly with various espionage services. Practically speaking, it was not within Nixon's power to end the war by issuing an Executive decree. He did, however, manage to withdraw American forces by first severely crippling Auguste Ricord's drug cartel, then establishing détente with the Soviet Union followed by relentless bombing of North Vietnam (the Christmas Bombing, Dec. 1972). The latter effort was done to force North Vietnam back to the Paris peace talks where a cease-fire and peace agreement was subsequently reached. Finally Nixon withdrew US troops from Vietnam and ended the draft. In addition he dramatically increased financial aid to Israel, apparently an effort to divide his enemies in that country and supporters abroad.

Within the context of history, many of Nixon's actions regarding China, the Soviet Union, Vietnam, and the heroin war were indeed bold and courageous.

Media Moguls

The most important tool, however, to ensure success of the 1963 coup d'état was a non-government entity: the American news media. This is where the ancient Jewish culture comes into play. A thorough analysis of the media's coverage of President Kennedy's assassination reveals a vast presence and relentless participation of Jewish journalists and correspondents supporting the cover story that Lee Harvey Oswald

alone shot and killed Kennedy. Examples include Martin Agronsky, Elie Abel, Irving R. Levine, Peter Hackes, Kenneth Bernstein, Lief Ede, Gabe Pressman, and Walter Lippmann to name a few.

It is difficult to believe that such widespread endorsement of the Oswald cover story could have occurred by chance. The sheer magnitude of Jewish participation within the news media leads to the logical conclusion that a clear signal must have been given by a central figure and symbol of authority within the Jewish culture in 1963. I have concluded that the individual in question was Nahum Goldmann, founder of the World Jewish Congress and its president in 1963. I have further concluded that the World Jewish Congress is tantamount to the Sanhedrin, the Jewish Council in ancient Palestine under Roman rule that issued the order to kill Jesus.

The high-priest of the Sanhedrin, Joseph Caiaphas, issued the decree to kill Jesus. Caiaphas was appointed by Roman procurator (governor) Valerius Gratus, predecessor of Pontius Pilate. Caiaphas questioned Jesus before handing him over to Pilate for crucifixion.⁹⁸ As president of the World Jewish Congress, Nahum Goldmann was the 1963 equivalent of Joseph Caiaphas. Once a decree to kill Kennedy was issued by high-priest Goldmann, then Jewish individuals within the American news media became active participants in the 1963 coup d'état.

Today, seven Jewish Americans run the vast majority of US television networks, the printed press, the Hollywood movie industry, the book publishing industry, and the recording industry. Most of these industries are bundled into huge media conglomerates run by the following seven individuals:⁹⁹

- ♦ Gerald Levin,^(Footnote 4) CEO and Director of AOL Time Warner
- ♦ Michael Eisner, Chairman and CEO of the Walt Disney Company
- ♦ Edgar Bronfman, Sr.,^(Footnote 5) Chairman of Seagram Company Ltd
- ♦ Edgar Bronfman, Jr.,^(Footnote 6) President and CEO of Seagram Company Ltd and head of Universal Studios
- ♦ Sumner Redstone, Chairman and CEO of Viacom, Inc
- ♦ Dennis Dammerman, Vice Chairman of General Electric
- ♦ Peter Chernin, President and Co-COO of News Corporation Limited

Those seven Jewish men collectively control ABC, NBC, CBS, the Turner Broadcasting System, CNN, MTV, Universal Studios, MCA Records, Geffen Records, DGC Records, GRP Records, Rising Tide Records, Curb/Universal Records, and Interscope Records.

Most of the larger independent newspapers are owned by Jewish interests as well. An example is media mogul Samuel I. "Si" Newhouse, who owns two dozen daily newspapers from Staten Island to Oregon, plus the Sunday supplement Parade; the Conde Nast collection of magazines, including Vogue, The New Yorker, Vanity Fair, Allure, GQ, and Self; the publishing firms of Random House, Knopf, Crown, and Ballantine, among other imprints; and cable franchises with over one million subscribers.

NBC was founded by David Sarnoff, a Russian born Jew who studied the Talmud as a child, rose to prominence by picking up the sinking Titanic's distress signal, later served under Eisenhower in World War II, and was made a brigadier general.¹⁰⁰

Another Jewish media mogul in Kennedy's time was William Paley, president of Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS). Paley was also a highly trained expert in psychological warfare, which is a military term for propaganda. The Encyclopedia Britannica provided some interesting facts about Paley's World War II activity in the "Mediterranean":

During World War II Paley served the US government as supervisor of the Office of War Information (OWI) in the Mediterranean, and later as chief of radio in the OWI's Psychological Warfare Division (1944-45), finally becoming deputy chief of the Psychological Warfare Division.¹⁰¹

One of the most influential and widely respected newspaper commentators in Kennedy's time was Walter Lippmann, an ardent Zionist. In 1917, Lippmann served briefly as an assistant to Secretary of War Newton D. Baker. In 1919, President Woodrow Wilson sent Lippmann to France to take part in the negotiations for the Treaty of Versailles.

The stated examples of behind the scenes political influence and manipulation may explain, to a degree, why Jews were expelled from virtually every country in Western Europe from 1290 through 1551. With such control of American political institutions and the news media, Jewish political forces have the ability to manipulate war and peace, crush nations, and topple sitting heads of state. This was the situation when Jesus walked the earth two-thousand years ago,¹⁰² it is the situation today, and it was the state of affairs in President Kennedy's time.

Endnotes

1. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, pp. 9 - 13
2. *ibid*, p 256
3. Nixon's war on drugs is widely documented. It is mentioned throughout several books. Examples include *Contrabandista* by Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock; *The Great Heroin Coup* by Henrik Krüger; and Encyclopedia Britannica: Richard Nixon.
4. Nixon's pursuit of Auguste Ricord is the thesis of a book, *Contrabandista*, by Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock.
5. My assertion that "Ricord was apparently protected by the hardened criminals, the carpetbagger politicians, the war mongering generals, and the ruthless friends of Israel" is corroborated in Alfred McCoy's book, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*. Part of McCoy's general thesis is that heroin smuggling was condoned by the US military. Ricord is mentioned in the book, along with the Guerini brothers and the French-Corsican heroin network.
6. Authors Len Colodny and Robert Gettlin made the argument in their book, *Silent Coup*, that Nixon was brought down by the US military because of his policies in Vietnam, China and the Soviet Union. Michael Collins Piper made a similar argument in his book, *Final Judgment*.
7. Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista*, pp. 3 - 8
8. *ibid*, p. 212
9. *ibid*, p. 230
10. Encyclopedia Britannica: Nixon, China and the Soviet Union
11. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 281

12. Encyclopedia Britannica: Union of Soviet Socialist Republic
13. President Richard M. Nixon, Farewell Speech to White House Staff, August 9, 1974 (<http://www.shabbir.com/nonmatchbox/whithous.html>)
14. Encyclopedia Britannica: Opium; Opium Wars
15. The assertion that "wealthy interests" of the Western powers sanctify narcotics smuggling by international crime syndicates and espionage services is essentially the thesis of Alfred McCoy's book, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.
16. Alfred McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, pp. 17 - 18
17. JFK reportedly told Andrei Gromyko that Jews would not support détente. This was mentioned by Michael Beschloss in the *Crisis Years*, pp. 648-649. Beschloss got the information from Gromyko's book, *Memoirs*, pp. 181 - 2.
18. Stephen R. Shalom, *Terrorists and Madmen*, March 27, 1999, ZNET, <http://www.zmag.org/sustainers/content/1999-03/mar27shalom.htm>
19. Richard Mahoney, *Sons & Brothers*, p. 45; Herbert Parmet, *Jack*, p. 141; Merle Miller, *Plain Speaking*, p. 186
20. *ibid*
21. Ben-Gurion's statements are from *Herzl, Hess, and Histadrut*, by Nahum Guttman, p. 18.
22. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 23
23. The Kol Nidre prayer is described in the Talmud's book of Nedarim, 23a.
24. Encyclopedia Britannica: Kol Nidre
25. Richard Mahoney, *Sons & Brothers*, p. 359
26. Richard Mahoney, *Sons & Brothers*, p. 45; Herbert Parmet, *Jack*, p. 141; Merle Miller, *Plain Speaking*, p. 186
27. *ibid*
28. Michael Beschloss, *Crisis Years*, p. 649
29. Mohamed Heikal, *The Cairo Documents*, pp. 214 - 215
30. William L. Cleveland, *A History of the Modern Middle East*, p. 296; Mohamed Heikal, *The Cairo Documents*, pp. 214 - 215
31. Letter from Kennedy to Nasser per Mohamed Heikal, *The Cairo Documents*, pp. 216 - 217
32. Alfred McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, pp. 17 - 18
33. Encyclopedia Britannica: Meyer Lansky
34. Santo Trafficante was one of Meyer Lansky's chief lieutenants. Reference Alfred W. McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*; reference *The Mafia Comes to Asia*, p. 216.
35. Christian David stated, in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, that he was offered the contract by Antoine Guerini. He was one of the Guerini brothers, also known as the Guerini Family.
36. CIA had long history with Guerini Family. Alfred W. McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*; reference *The Mafia Comes to Asia*, pp. 37 - 47.
37. Lucien Sarti, François Chiappe, Jean-Paul Angeletti, and Christian David were identified as Auguste Ricord's lieutenants in *Contrabandista* by Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock, p. 91. Clark and Horrock stated that the four men were extremely violent. Christian David stated, in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, that he was offered the contract by Antoine Guerini, but he refused because it was too dangerous. David further stated that Lucien Sarti was one of the assassins. In the stated documentary, David conveyed to researcher Steve Rivele that Sarti shot Kennedy from the grassy knoll, that he used exploding bullets, that he was dressed as a policeman, and that there were two other Corsican assassins. David would only reveal Sarti's name because he was dead, but the other two were still alive, and David feared reprisals if he identified them. David's story was corroborated by Michel Nicoli in the same documentary. Nicoli's face was covered, but it was revealed that he had been in the heroin trafficking business. Clark and Horrock also indicated that Michel Nicoli worked for Christian David in Auguste Ricord's worldwide heroin cartel, pp. 186-187, 217-218.
38. Alfred W. McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*; reference *The Mafia Comes to Asia*. McCoy cited his source as an interview with John Warner*, Washington, D.C., October 14, 1971; other U.S. officials including Representative James H. Scheuer, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia and Pacific Affairs have observed this shift to Southeast Asia. (U.S. Congress, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, *International Aspects of the Narcotics Problem*, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., 1971, pp. 61, 119, 149.) The statement, "Bloomfield knew that [American and Corsican gangsters needed a new opium source]," was deductive reasoning based on my knowledge of Louis Bloomfield, Auguste Joseph Ricord and his four lieutenants: Christian David, Lucien Sarti, François Chiappe, and Jean-Paul Angeletti. Bloomfield notwithstanding,

- the fact that American and Corsican gangsters needed a new opium source was information supplied by McCoy using the referenced cites herein.
39. *ibid.* The statement, "Bloomfield helped them establish Southeast Asia as their primary source," was deductive reasoning based on my knowledge of Louis Bloomfield, Auguste Joseph Ricord and his four lieutenants: Christian David, Lucien Sarti, François Chiappe, and Jean-Paul Angeletti. McCoy did not write about Bloomfield specifically; however, he did write that "Corsican syndicates of Marseille turned to their associates in Southeast Asia for help."
 40. Alfred W. McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*; reference *The Mafia Comes to Asia*. McCoy cited his source as an interview with Police Col. Smith Boonlikit, Bangkok, Thailand, September 17, 1971.
 41. Alfred W. McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, pp. 90-125
 42. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 100 - 104. Describes Bloomfield's two front corporations, Permindex and Centro Mondiale Commerciale (the World Trade Center). It is highly significant that Garrison listed ex-Nazis and ex-members of Mussolini's Italian fascist government as members of the board of directors for Permindex and Centro Mondiale Commerciale. Auguste Ricord was not a Nazi per se, but he worked for the Gestapo when Germany occupied France during World War II. In 1950 Ricord was sentenced to death *in absentia* by the Permanent Military Court of Paris for collaborating with the Nazis. (Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 16)
 43. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 184. A narcotics intelligence report (1971), provided by US Customs, is cited by the authors. It states the following about Auguste Ricord's heroin network: "The magnitude of this investigation is so great that it has become necessary to computerize the financial data in order to properly coordinate it."
 44. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, p. 103; Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 499; Michael Collins Piper, *Final Judgment*, p. 199. Garrison cited the following source from the Italian Press linking Permindex to attempts on de Gaulle's life: *Paesa Sera (Rome)*, March 4, 1967. Piper cited the following source for Permindex-de Gaulle's assassination attempts: Executive Intelligence Review, *Dope, Inc.* (New York: New Benjamin Franklin House, 1986 [second edition]), p. 434. Marrs cited a similar source, *Dope, Inc.*, but used the first edition, published in 1978, and he cited pp. 301-329).
 45. *ibid.*, p. 76. Authors Clark & Horrock wrote that Auguste Ricord's bodyguard, Christian David, was "wanted in Paris for the murder of Police Commissaire Gallibert—who, when he was shot, was investigating the kidnapping and murder of the Moroccan political exile, Mehdi Ben Barka."
 46. Encyclopedia Britannica: Charles de Gaulle, Mehdi Ben Barka
 47. New York Times, July 3, 1957, *Kennedy Urges U.S. Back Independence for Algeria*, p. A-1
 48. Steve Rivele, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*
 49. *ibid*
 50. Zapruder film
 51. *ibid*
 52. Steve Rivele, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*: Christian David stated that the second shot hit the other man in the car (everyone knows that was John Connally). The four second delay was determined by viewing the Zapruder film. The general location of the of the individual who shot Connally was easily determined by analyzing his five wounds. (ref. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 281-282) Each wound was below and to the left of the previous. Therefore, the shot was fired from above and to the right. Hence, the shot that hit Connally was fired from an "upper-level window of the Texas School Book Depository."
 53. The fact that Connally's torso was turned to the right was determined by viewing the Zapruder film. It also matches his description of the shots (*The Men Who Killed Kennedy*). His sitting position is critical because it establishes the direction from which the bullet was fired. Some researchers get confused on this point. (example, J. Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 308-d: sketch shows Connally seated in wrong position)
 54. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 281-282
 55. The one second delay between Connally being shot and Kennedy being fatally shot in the head was viewed in the Zapruder film. This is critical because it discredits the Warren Report which states that two consecutive shots cannot be fired from an Italian made Mannlicher-Carcano (the rifle Oswald "allegedly" used) in less than 2.3 seconds. (Reference Warren Report. Go to the section known by researchers as the "single bullet theory." Unfortunately, a

- specific page number cannot be referenced because the Warren Report's page numbers vary among its many publications.)
56. Zapruder film
 57. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, p. 281
 58. Steve Rivele, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy* (Christian David told Rivele that four shots were fired, but two were fired simultaneously. This is important because it explains why so many witnesses claim they only heard three shots.)
 59. Most researchers believe Oswald was innocent (unless they support the Warren Report of course).
 60. William Torbitt, *Nomenclature of an Assassination Cabal*, Reference Section I: *Permindex and its Five Subsidiaries*
 61. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 71, 80, 81, 126-128, 326, 337
 62. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 26-30, 35, 40-41, 48, 50, 67, 71, 80, 216, 326, 337-338
 63. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 91-92, 122-123, 183-184, 215-216, 274-276
 64. William Torbett, *Nomenclature of an Assassination Cabal*; reference *Section II, J. Edgar Hoover, Ferenc Nagy, Clay Shaw, L.M. Bloomfield, and Permindex*. Also, Jim Garrison implied that Bloomfield managed the "cabal." Reference *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 101, 102, 137.
 65. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 4-5, 10-11, 30-31, 50, 122, 123, 216
 66. The statement that David Ferrie flew the assassins from Dallas to Montreal in a private plane several days after the assassination is based two things. First, Christian David told Steve Rivele that the assassins were flown from Dallas to Montreal about ten days after the assassination (reference *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*). Second, it has been established by Garrison and others that Ferrie provided pilot services on an as needed basis for members of the "cabal." Garrison specifically pointed out that Ferrie had flown Shaw to Montreal on numerous occasions. (Reference *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 136-137.)
 67. Steve Rivele, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*
 68. Encyclopædia Britannica: Meyer Lansky. The article stated that the House Select Committee on Assassinations had linked Jack Ruby (aka, Jack Rubenstein) to Lansky.
 69. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 251-255
 70. Jim Garrison's statements in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*
 71. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 20-22
 72. Division Five has been mentioned in at least different sources: (1) William Torbitt, *Nomenclature of an Assassination Cabal*, Reference Section I: *Permindex and its Five Subsidiaries*; (2) Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 499. Marrs cited Konstandinos Kalimtgis, David Goldman and Jeffrey Steinberg, *Dope, Inc.: Britain's Opium War Against the US*, pp. 301-329; (3) Michael Collins Piper, *Final Judgment*, p. 192.
 73. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 564
 74. I developed a composite of Division Five based on descriptions from the following three sources: (1) William Torbitt, *Nomenclature of an Assassination Cabal*, Reference Section I: *Permindex and its Five Subsidiaries*; (2) Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 499. Marrs cited Konstandinos Kalimtgis, David Goldman and Jeffrey Steinberg, *Dope, Inc.: Britain's Opium War Against the US*, pp. 301-329; (3) Michael Collins Piper, *Final Judgment*, p. 192. NOTE: In my opinion, the stated descriptions of Division Five are based largely on reality, but contain a degree of disinformation. Therefore I have modified the descriptions based on my knowledge of the case.
 75. Joseph Milteer's post-assassination remarks to Miami police informant, William Somerset, are in an FBI report in National Archives file number 180-10123-10039. The "originator" is the US Secret Service. The text of the referenced document was obtained from John McAdams' website. (<http://mcadams.posc.mu.edu/somerset.txt>) The cited report states that Milteer "had contact with Robert Shelton who is a KK leader but he thought Shelton could not be depended upon as he opposes violence."
 76. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, pp. 203
 77. *ibid*
 78. Joseph Milteer's prophetic statements about JFK's assassination, on November 9, 1963, to Miami police informant, William Somerset, are on John McAdams' website (<http://mcadams.posc.mu.edu/milteer.htm>). The same transcript is available in Anthony Summers' book, *Conspiracy*, p. 404. Milteer's statements are also in the documentary, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, by Nigel Turner.

79. Joseph Milteer's post-assassination remarks to Miami police informant, William Somerset, are in an FBI report in National Archives file number 180-10123-10039. The "originator" is the US Secret Service. The text of the referenced document was obtained from John McAdams' website. (<http://mcadams.posc.mu.edu/somerset.txt>)
80. *ibid*
81. *ibid* (NOTE: Although the cited FBI report does not explicitly state that Milteer made a speech at the Constitutional American Party, it is strongly implied. The report states that, on Nov. 24, 1963, Milteer "made some notes prior to the arrival of members of the Constitutional American Party who were to have a meeting [in Columbia, S.C.] and captioned the notes 'notes to all Christians --- The Zionist Jews killed Christ 2000 years ago and on Nov. 22, 1963, they killed President Kennedy. You Jews killed the President. We are going to kill you'.")
82. Encyclopedia Britannica: Ku Klux Klan
83. *ibid*
84. Ernest May & Philip Zelikow, *The Kennedy Tapes*, pp. 5, 6, 8, 9-10, 12, 26, 32, 43, 177, 178, 182, 185, 186, 205, 247, 263, 265, 306, 565, 683, 699
85. Delmar Davis, *The American [Independent] Party*, (1992), (http://www.visi.com/~contra_m/cm/features/cm04_american.html). Davis wrote that "The American Party grew out of the George Wallace movement of 1968." He also wrote of Christian extremism: "The Christian who does not want the world to be totally Christian is not totally Christian." Clearly an Evangelical group, Davis gave tacit support to Israel in the following statements: "Iran is Islamic. Israel is Jewish. Why do we hesitate to make America Christian?" He essentially endorsed Judaism, something commonly associated with right-extremist groups; however, it is common among Evangelical Christians because of their belief in Armageddon. Davis wrote the following on the topic of Jews: "We also drew fire from the 'far right', as it is sometimes called. Those who claim that all our problems are caused by Jews who are not 'real Jews' could not support our party because we believe that no single group has caused the downfall of America. It is the abandonment of *principles* that has destroyed us. When correct principles - the Word of God - are adhered to, then no group can bring about our downfall. When those principles are ignored, any group can crush us." Also, Davis's 1992 description of the American Party stated that its two groups, The American Party and The Christian Party, were respectively located in Provo, Utah and Epworth, Georgia. Joseph Milteer was also from Georgia.
86. Airpower Journal, The Professional Journal of the United States Airforce: Reference *Curtis E. LeMay*, <http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/cc/lemay.html>
87. Richard Reeves, *President Kennedy: Profile of Power*, p. 306
88. *ibid*. p. 182
89. *ibid*. p. 103
90. Airpower Journal
91. Michael Jay Friedman, *Congress, the President, and the Battle of Ideas: Vietnam Policy, 1965-1969*, (1999), <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/journals/EH/EH41/Friedman41.html>
92. Encyclopedia Britannica: Martin Luther King, Jr.
93. Encyclopedia Britannica: Robert F. Kennedy
94. Encyclopedia Britannica: Lyndon Johnson
95. Encyclopedia Britannica: Martin Luther King, Jr.
96. Encyclopedia Britannica: Robert F. Kennedy
97. Joan Hoff, *The Nixon Story You Never Heard* (article). Collusion between Admiral Moorer, Yeoman Radford, and others within the US military is also discussed at great length in *Silent Coup* by Len Colodny and Robert Gettlin.
98. Caiaphas is mentioned in the King James Bible: John 18:13 & 14. Caiaphas' appointment as high priest of the Sanhedrin is described by Josephus (Roman historian), *Antiquities*, XVIII, iv, p. 3; & XVIII, ii, p. 2.
99. Yahoo.com, stock quotes & corporate profiles
100. Encyclopedia Britannica: David Sarnoff
101. Encyclopedia Britannica: William Paley
102. Holy Bible, King James, Matthew, 27, v. 1-26

Chapter 1: The Media Coup

Analysis of NBC Coverage of JFK Assassination

Although President Kennedy was removed violently from office, the real strength of the coup was its ability to cover up the crime afterwards. Anyone with money can hire assassins, but covering up the crime is more difficult. This required the full cooperation of key people within the American news media. One such participant was correspondent for NBC television, the late Martin Agronsky. It's interesting that Agronsky, a Jew, began his journalism career in 1936 as a reporter for the *Palestine Post*, now the *Jerusalem Post*.¹

As it Happened, a four hour film showing NBC-TV's live coverage of President Kennedy's assassination on November 22, 1963, reveals that Agronsky aggressively promoted Lyndon Johnson as an able replacement for the slain Kennedy rather than merely report the tragic events. Agronsky's behavior suggests that he and Johnson were both active participants in the coup d'état of 1963 and therefore had prior knowledge of Kennedy's murder.

The raw NBC footage reveals how the media coup was executed. There were two types of news men: those "reporting" the news and those "interpreting" the news. Those reporting the news were almost exclusively gentiles. They included Frank McGee, Bill Ryan, Chet Huntley, David Brinkly, Robert McNeil, Charles Murphy (of WBAP-TV Fort Worth, Dallas), and Tom Whelan (also of WBAP). In stark contrast, the ones interpreting the news—or "correspondents" as they called themselves—were almost all Jewish. They included Martin Agronsky, Elie Abel, Irving R. Levine, Peter Hackes, Kenneth Bernstein, Lief Ede, and Gabe Pressman.

The Oswald cover story and supporting propaganda/disinformation was shaped and controlled by three factions: (1) the Jewish correspondents, (2) the Dallas Police, and (3) the Associated Press. The Jewish correspondents' jobs were to promote Lyndon Johnson as Kennedy's replacement, to prepare the public for shifts in foreign affairs, and to generally control the flow of information by putting a spin on things as needed. The Dallas Police department's job, from a propagandistic viewpoint, was to leak the cover story to the AP wire and other media outlets that Lee Harvey Oswald had killed Dallas Police officer J. D. Tippett and had shot and killed President Kennedy from the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository. The AP's function was to flood all levels of the news media with a cover story that vilified Oswald, portraying him as a lone gunman, a nut, an expatriate who moved to the Soviet Union and married a Russian woman, an unstable man who supported Communism and belonged to a pro-Castro group in New Orleans.

As previously stated, Agronsky's role was mainly to promote the new president, Lyndon Johnson. On November 22, 1963, Agronsky gave four brief commentaries aggressively supporting the new president.

Transcripts of Martin Agronsky's Commentaries

During his first commentary, Agronsky mentioned that House Speaker John McCormack would be next in line to the presidency if something would happen to Johnson. That was a reasonably acceptable observation, although it indicated that Agronsky had thought things through in a moment of crisis; clear thinking indeed. Agronsky's comment was made only twenty minutes after Kennedy's death had been announced to the world. Here is the transcript:

Bill Ryan:

The Capitol is now starting to react to what has happened in Dallas, and for a report on that, we go now to Martin Agronsky, NBC News in Washington.

Martin Agronsky:

... Senator Mansfield has made no statement, the Senate majority leader. Speaker McCormack, who is now in the position in relation to President Lyndon Johnson that Lyndon Johnson was in relation to President Kennedy, has made no statement. ...

(As it Happened, NBC coverage of the Kennedy assassination)

An hour later, Agronsky made a second commentary. In the midst of a national crisis, he told a light-hearted anecdote about Lyndon Johnson and then Texas Governor Connally, who had been shot and gravely wounded while riding in the Presidential limousine with Kennedy. Agronsky told how he had bet fifty dollars with Texas Governor John Connally, in 1960, that Lyndon Johnson would accept the number two spot on the Democratic presidential ticket if Kennedy offered it to him. According to Agronsky, Connally was certain that Johnson would turn down the number two position. As it turned out, Connally was wrong about his "close friend," Johnson. Possibly Agronsky was merely sharing an innocent, personal encounter with Connally as an attempt to lighten a stressful situation. On the other hand, Agronsky may have been insulating Johnson from charges that Johnson participated in a coup against Kennedy. After all, even if Johnson disliked Kennedy; how could he allow his "good friend" John Connally to be placed in harm's way? Here is the transcript:

Agronsky:

... I think back to a night of the convention in nineteen hundred and sixty when Vice-President Lyndon Johnson accepted the nomination. Governor John Connally was then the floor manager for Lyndon Johnson. He was the man who was always his closest assistant in all of his political campaigns. That is Governor Connally of Texas who now lies wounded in a hospital in Dallas.

About two o'clock in the morning, when there was much talk that Lyndon Johnson would be offered the vice-presidential nomination, John Connally told me that he was positive he would

never accept it. I had talked earlier to the late speaker, to Sam Rayburn. He told me too that Lyndon Johnson would never accept the vice-presidency, would never give up the job of Senate majority leader to take it.

And I bet John Connally then, fifty dollars that Lyndon Johnson would take the vice-presidential nomination. And at two o'clock that morning, John Connally made that bet with me, clearly positive that his very close friend, Lyndon Johnson, would not accept it. This I suppose is the way that history is made. Had Lyndon Johnson not accepted it, he of course would not be president of the United States today.

No one could ever have believed or dreamed that a president so young would not conclude the term of office, that death would interrupt. There is very little else to report here in Washington, just the general reaction from – oh and a bulletin has just come in from Dallas: "A sniper, armed with a high powered rifle, murdered President Kennedy today," according to the Associated Press dispatch, "barely two hours after President Kennedy's death, Lyndon Johnson has taken the oath of office as the thirty-seventh president of the United States."

So it is President Lyndon Baines Johnson, fifty-five years old, the new president of the United States. Now, back to New York.

(As it Happened, NBC coverage of the Kennedy assassination)

About two hours after Kennedy's death was announced, Agronsky delivered his third commentary. At that point, he stepped up the pro-Johnson rhetoric quite a bit. He immediately attempted to cut to film footage of three prominent Senators. Unfortunately there was a "mechanical failure" and the audience saw Senator Mansfield's lips moving, but without sound. Agronsky apologized for the malfunction, and proceeded to tell what appeared be a bald-faced lie—that the senators were "rallying" around the new President Johnson. Later he showed the footage again, in working order, but none of the three even mentioned Johnson by name. In fact, all three senators—Mike Mansfield, Everett Dirksen, and Wayne Morse^(Footnote 7)—praised the slain Kennedy and spoke only of the tragic loss. Morse did state, however, that Americans should "pray for the president, and pray for the country." I assume he meant to pray for President Johnson.

Agronsky had planted a seed of disinformation that three prominent senators had quickly rallied around the new President Johnson. Agronsky used this false premise to shower Johnson with praise, stating that Johnson was a "well-known intimate friend of all the members of the Senate of the United States." Agronsky also stated that Johnson had "a more vast governmental experience behind him than any president we have ever had." It looks very much like Agronsky faked the mechanical failure which showed Senator Mansfield's lips moving without sound as a pretext for building the new president up in the eyes of the American public. This mysterious "malfunction"

allowed Agronsky to make the transition to his obviously prepared text which praised President Johnson immensely. Here is the transcript:

Agronsky:

The leaders of the Congress of the United States have united in bipartisan unity in this tragic moment. Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield of Montana, a man who now occupies the office last held by our new president, Lyndon B. Johnson, his Republican opposite Illinois' Senator Everett Dirksen, the Republican minority leader in the Senate, and Oregon's Democratic Wayne Morse speak now.

[Video of Senator Mike Mansfield is shown on the screen for eighteen seconds, but no sound is heard. Agronsky returns and explains the "mechanical failure."]

Senator Mansfield was just speaking. Unfortunately, a mechanical failure has cut off the sound from the picture. We'll come back with the statements of Senator Mansfield, the majority leader; the minority leader, Senator Everett Dirksen; and Democratic Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon later.

The man around whom they are now rallying, Senator—President Lyndon Baines Johnson is a very, very close friend; a very, very, well-known intimate friend of all of the members of the Senate of the United States. Lyndon Baines Johnson, at the age of fifty-five, takes office as president of the United States with probably a more vast governmental experience behind him than any president we have ever had. He has been in the House of Representatives for, I think, four terms. He was elected twice to the Senate of the United States, served as the Senate majority leader where his record was as an extremely able legislative leader, a man who accomplished much in the office. His knowledge, his companionship with the members of the Senate of the United States must certainly serve him in good stead as they did his predecessor, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Additionally, throughout the Kennedy administration, then Vice-President Lyndon Johnson, now President Lyndon Johnson served the president of the United States in many capacities that gave him an intimate knowledge and insight into the duties of the office that he now assumes. He was on the National Security Council and the National Security Council Executive Committee. He served in every possible way, and had every possible experience that a man could have [known] intimately the workings of our government. He is eminently qualified certainly in terms of experience to assume the terrible duties that await him

now.

And now we are informed that the mechanical obstruction to hearing the words of the Senate leaders has been removed, and we hear now first from Senator Mansfield of Montana, the majority leader, then from the Republican minority--[cut to video]

[film and voice of Senator Mike Mansfield]

The passing of John Fitzgerald Kennedy is not only a tragedy for a nation which he so ably represented, but is I think also a mark upon the respectability and the responsibility of some of our citizens. This good, this decent, this kindly man, this harassed man who had so much on his shoulders and received from some people, so little in the way of support in return; this man has now gone to his reward. And I will miss him as a personal friend, the nation will miss him as a great president, and the world will miss him as a great leader.

[film and voice of Senator Everett Dirksen, sitting beside Mansfield]

There are some things that are simply incredible, and leave one absolutely speechless. This is one of them.

[film and voice of Senator Wayne Morse]

In this dark, tragic hour, all I can say is what I said on the floor of the Senate. This is the time for every American to pray. Pray for the president, and pray for the country.

[back to Agronsky]

So the leaders of the Senate of the United States demonstrated in these words the traditional and the central unity that goes beyond party in this particular moment of national tragedy. There can be no doubt that the Congress of the United States will unite, and unite firmly, and will help in every possible way, their new president, Lyndon Baines Johnson. He is their close friend, as his predecessor was; and there is every certainty that the new president of the United States will receive every possible help that he possibly can, that can be afforded to him by the Congress of the United States, regardless of party.

The words you have just heard from Mr. Mansfield, the majority leader; from Senator Everett Dirksen, the minority leader; from Wayne Morse of Oregon, all indicate what is truly a feeling that permeates the entire Congress of the United States today, and demonstrates the kind of essential unity that exists now in the

Congress as it rallies behind the new president.

And now, back to New York.

(As it Happened, NBC coverage of the Kennedy assassination)

Agronsky's fourth commentary was even more dramatic. At this point, the world had learned of Kennedy's death slightly less than three hours earlier. Agronsky opened his fourth commentary by mentioning that Kennedy's cabinet had been on a jet to Japan during the assassination, and had subsequently turned around to return home. Amazingly, Agronsky stated that it was traditional for cabinet members of a dead president to automatically submit their resignations to the new president. One has to ask, Where did Mr. Agronsky find such a piece of trivia? After all, presidents don't die in office that frequently. I doubt that a standard protocol had been established. Agronsky was apparently using his power as an opinion leader to allow Johnson to fire some of Kennedy's cabinet members without creating a public controversy. In reality, Johnson kept some of Kennedy's cabinet members and other advisors, but Agronsky's spin surely made it easier for a new government to be assembled.

Agronsky then proceeded to heap more praise onto President Johnson, stating that Kennedy's cabinet members would surely rally around the highly qualified and respected Johnson. Here is the transcript:

Agronsky:

The chief members of the cabinet of the United States, that is the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk; the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Macnamara; the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges; and the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall; are all on the plane [to Japan], that Frank [McGee] has just mentioned, that has turned around and is trying to get back now to Washington. It is the custom, it is the tradition when a president dies that each member of the cabinet submits automatically his resignation. The incoming president then either accepts the resignation or instructs the cabinet officer to remain at his post. Automatically those resignations, we can assume, will be submitted at this time, and President Johnson will then have to make up his mind whom he wishes to keep and whom he wishes to have go. ...

[Agronsky then describes the pending funeral plans for JFK.]

The members of the cabinet of course must rally around the new president, will, fully intend to, will offer all of the advice that they possibly can. This is a government that under John Fitzgerald Kennedy worked very closely together, not in the sense of holding frequent cabinet meetings, they didn't; but everyone else always knew what the other was doing. And Vice-President Lyndon Johnson, or President Lyndon Johnson—fortunately—

throughout the Kennedy term of office was included in all of the meetings with the cabinet, participated fully in many of the major decisions—the state decisions, was a contributing member of the National Security Council, the chief advisory council which dealt with all of the great problems of state, and sat at the President's right hand throughout all the moments of crisis, such as the Cuban emergency. He is fully familiar with all of the duties that he is called upon to assume, and of course will get every kind of help that he possibly can get from the members of the cabinet.

It is much too soon to speculate. No one wishes to, no one is in the mood to speculate as to which members of the cabinet President Johnson will keep, which he will ask to go. This is a matter that will be decided much later I'm sure when the first shock of this terrible tragedy has worn off, and when President Johnson begins to function in his new office.

These are the primary developments that have occurred so far here in Washington. It's a question now of waiting the arrival of President Lyndon Johnson who will make a statement to the nation when he arrives at the airport which will be in approximately fifty minutes or so from now if all goes according to schedule. We will hear then the reaction of the new president to the terrible tragedy and to the enormous responsibility that has fallen upon his shoulders. He has not been quoted yet as having said anything and apparently will be trying to compose his thoughts as he makes this tragic flight back from Dallas here to the Capitol of the United States and from where he will now assume the duties of the presidency as he has already been sworn in as the president of the United States.

And that's the story as it has developed so far here in the Capitol. Now, back to you Frank [McGee] in New York.

(As it Happened, NBC coverage of the Kennedy assassination)

Transcript of Elie Abel's Commentary

Another Jewish correspondent from Washington, Elie Abel, delivered a commentary about the impact that President Kennedy's death would have on US relations with the Soviet Union. Here is the transcript:

Bill Ryan:

... One of the changes will take place in the area of foreign policy. How much? Reported now by NBC state department

correspondent, Elie Abel, in Washington.

Elie Abel:

All we can be sure about at the moment is the great shock wave felt around the world, not only among friends and allies, and neutrals; but also, I suspect, in the Communist ruled countries. The controlled Soviet press has much of the time been sharply and automatically critical of US policy; but the person of John F. Kennedy was treated with respect.

Just a week ago, the Soviet people were told that [name unclear], arrested as a spy, was being released because of the President's concern over the case. He had met Soviet Premier Khrushchev in Vienna in 1961, resisted Soviet encroachments on Berlin, played and won that deadly game of nuclear poker with Khrushchev over Cuba.

He was also the man who agreed to a limited test ban treaty and persuaded the US Senate to ratify that step. The guess here is that President Lyndon Johnson will carry on much the same policy. He was certainly very much directly involved in that policy. He showed the flag in many distant parts of the world as President Kennedy's personal emissary.

But just as the Western allies may hesitate while pledging full support to the new president, the Soviets presumably are not sure at the moment what to expect out of Washington. They have tended to place a certain faith in John Kennedy personally as a man they disagreed with, but a man who wanted peace. He was trying to defuse some of the explosive situations around the world, who favored in the long run a policy based on mutual recognition that nuclear war is no rational option for mankind in this day and age.

The Russians know less about Lyndon Johnson, and they may well play a waiting game until they have a surer feel of his reactions and attitudes. Elie Abel, NBC News, reporting.

(As it Happened, NBC coverage of the Kennedy assassination)

Elie Abel has an interesting background. Like Sam Bronfman and Louis Bloomfield, Abel was a Canadian born Jew. He was a graduate of McGill University and began his career in journalism at the Montreal Gazette in 1941.

Another NBC Jewish correspondent, Irving R. Levine, also had an interesting background. Levine covered the violence that marked independence of the Islamic nation of Algeria.² As previously stated, Senator John F. Kennedy made a controversial speech in 1957 denouncing France for its occupation of Algeria. To put

it bluntly, Kennedy's Algerian speech was not only a criticism of French policy, it was also a slap in the face to Israel and an endorsement of the Islamic states.

Martin Agronsky's conduct was by far the most aggressive of the Jewish correspondents at NBC, but it was merely the tip of the iceberg. As previously stated, immediately after Kennedy's assassination, an Oswald cover story was put out by the Dallas Police—and propagated by the Associated Press wire service—to confuse the public about the true nature of the crime. The cover story portrayed Lee Harvey Oswald as the lone assassin, that he was a known Communist, was pro-Castro, had lived in the Soviet Union, and was married to a Russian woman. NBC's televised coverage of the assassination actually broadcast all of these details less than two hours after announcing Kennedy's death. Within that timespan, they also mentioned that Oswald had applied for Soviet citizenship on November 1, 1959. That was quite impressive detective work indeed.

Transcript of Charles Murphy's Coverage of Oswald

Charles Murphy of WBAP-TV, Dallas/Fort Worth was the first reporter to mention Oswald by name during NBC's live coverage of the assassination. Here is the transcript:

Charles Murphy:

Late word just in from Dallas. Homicide detective Levelle told WBAP news man James Curr in Dallas a few minutes ago, they have little doubt that 24-year-old Lee Oswald of Dallas is the man who shot and killed Dallas Police Officer J. D. Tippit shortly after President Kennedy was shot to death this afternoon. Oswald was pulled screaming and shouting from a Texas theater by officers who had gone there on a tip that Oswald was there. He brandished a pistol which officers took away from him after a struggle. Oswald was quoted as saying, "It's all over now."

A large crowd had congregated around the theater and police had to hold back the crowd because they were of the impression that the man was the president's assassin.

Officer Tippit had been killed by a man answering the description of Oswald in the neighborhood a short time before. A coincidence in the case is that Oswald worked as a stock man at the Texas Book Depository, the building from which the sniper shot President Kennedy. Dallas police have declined to say whether they think Oswald is connected with the assassination.

This other late word in, a 24-year-old man who said two years ago he wanted Russian citizenship was questioned today to see whether he had any connection with the assassination of

President Kennedy. He was identified as Lee Harvey Oswald of Fort Worth. He was pulled screaming and yelling from a Texas theater in the ... section of Dallas shortly after a Dallas policeman was shot to death.

As more late film arrive, we will show them instantly, unedited, unscreened. This is Charles Murphy reporting from WBAP-TV, Fort Worth/Dallas.

[A few minutes later, Murphy gave more information about Oswald.]

Here is more information about the suspect, Oswald. On November 1st, 1959, Oswald told the United States embassy in Moscow he had applied for Soviet citizenship. He said he had been a tourist in Russia since October 13th of that year. Oswald was reported to have a Russian wife.

The Fort Worth Star Telegram confirmed that the man held in Dallas was the same Oswald and said his mother was being taken to Dallas police headquarters to see him. Oswald put up a wild fight in the theater. Charles Murphy reporting from WBAP-TV, Fort Worth/Dallas.

(As it Happened, NBC coverage of the Kennedy assassination)

The cover story about Oswald was broadcast over the major radio and television stations and printed in the major newspapers.

Endnotes

1. Martin Agronsky died on Sunday, July 25, 1999 at the age of 84. An AP obituary was published on July 26 stating that Agronsky was Jewish and he began his career in 1936 as a reporter at the *Palestine Post*, now the *Jerusalem Post*. The article appeared in the *Jefferson City Tribune*, among other places, entitled *TV veteran Martin Agronsky dies at age 84*. http://www.newtribune.com/stories/072699/ent_0726990004.asp
2. Irving R. Levine's coverage of the French-Algerian War was mentioned in a bio about Levine published by InterSpeak, Inc., 144 Duke of Gloucester Street, Annapolis, MD 21401, tel 301-896-9700, fax 410-990-1131, Info@Inter-Speak.com, <http://inter-speak.com/levine.htm>

Chapter 2: Inside Parkland Memorial Hospital

Senator Ralph Yarborough's Account of the Assassination

On November 22, 1963 Senator Ralph Yarborough was in the Presidential motorcade that drove through Dallas. Yarborough rode with Vice-President Lyndon Johnson and his wife Claudia Alta Taylor Johnson (aka, "Lady Bird"), two cars behind the Presidential limousine. In an interview years later, Yarborough described the following sequence of events right after the shots rang out:

The Secret Service in the car in front of us [the car behind Kennedy's car] kind of casually looked around, looked up at the back of them and were rather slow to react. We went under the overpass and as we came up on the other side, I could see then the President's car. And there was [Clint] Hill whom I knew as a Secret Service man assigned to protect Mrs. Kennedy. He was lying across the back [of the car] to hang on with his arm over in there so he could hang on at that high speed. His face turned back towards us, just ... agony; and beating with his hand [against the car] like a terrible thing had happened. I knew then that Kennedy'd been shot.

And within several minutes, we came to Parkland Hospital and the Secret Service immediately jumped out the minute Johnson – they practically pulled him out and formed a cordone around him, four or five, and one of them said "Mr. President." I knew then Kennedy was dead.

And I walked up to the car where Mrs. Kennedy was still there on the back seat, lying there with her head bowed over covering her husband's head, his blood running down her leg and on her clothes, and twice saying, "They've murdered my husband. They've murdered my husband." It's the most tragic sight of my life.

(Senator Ralph Yarborough, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy – The Coup d'état*, N. Turner, 1988)

Senator Yarborough's heartbreaking reaction to President Kennedy's death was described by NBC's Chet Huntley during live coverage of the assassination. Huntley stated that "Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas, talking only a few minutes before to news men, collapsed in sobs as he told of witnessing the slaying of the president."

Dr. Charles Crenshaw's Description of Bizarre Events

On November 22, 1963, Dr. Charles A. Crenshaw was a thirty-year-old attending physician at Parkland Memorial Hospital. Years later Crenshaw wrote his

recollections of pandemonium mixed with grief and naked aggression at the hospital where Kennedy was taken immediately after being shot. The following is an excerpt from Dr. Crenshaw's book, *JFK: Conspiracy of Silence* (1992):

Once we reached the bottom of the stairwell, we opened the door and rushed into the emergency room. There is always a commotion around trauma, but what I saw was sheer bedlam. As we flew by the nurses' station, I yelled, "Which room?" A nurse with tears streaming down her face raised one finger.

I looked to my left and saw a man in a suit running. To my amazement, another man in a suit jumped in his path and smashed a Thompson submachine gun across his chest and face. The first man's eyes immediately turned glassy, and he fell against a gray tile wall, and slithered to the floor unconscious. When I heard that gun slam against his face, I just knew the man's jaw was broken. Normally, I would have rushed over and treated the poor guy, but the president of the United States was waiting for me, and his condition was worse than broken bones. I was to learn later that the man with the gun was a Secret Service agent, and the one who had been hit was an FBI agent.

(C. Crenshaw, et al, *JFK: Conspiracy of Silence*, 1992, p. 75)

Ambulance Driver's Description of how Secret Service Stole the Body

Aubrey Reich was an ambulance driver for O'Neal Funeral Home, the company that transported the President's body from Parkland Memorial Hospital to the airport to be flown back to Washington, DC. In a filmed interview years later, Reich described a confrontation between Secret Service agents and doctors at Parkland Hospital. Reich made the following comments:

They [the Secret Service] told us to go into the trauma room and prepare the President to be moved. They had his head wrapped in sheets. At the time I didn't know where he had been shot or what. We was all very sad. Everyone was chokin' back tears.

... The state authorities wanted to do an autopsy which is state law in the state of Texas, and the federal people wanted to take it back to Washington, DC. There was a lot of pushing, shoving, cursing. We would try to roll the casket out. Someone would grab it and try to roll it back towards the trauma room. This went on for quite a while. It was a push and shove type thing. Quite a bit of, like I say, obscene language. I had to hold onto the cross on the casket because of the friction where people was pulling it backwards and forwards. I was scared to death. I was really

frightened.

(The Men Who Killed Kennedy, N. Turner, 1988)

Dr. Crenshaw's Description of how Secret Service Stole the Body

Reich's description of the confrontation at Parkland Hospital was corroborated by Dr. Crenshaw. The following is Crenshaw's recollection of events from his book, *JFK: Conspiracy of Silence*:

As though on cue, a phalanx of guards poured into Trauma Room 1 just as the coffin was being rolled out. They looked like a swarm of locusts descending upon a cornfield. Without any discussion, they encircled the casket and began escorting the President's body down the hall toward the emergency room exit. A man in a suit, leading the group, holding a submachine gun, left little doubt in my mind who was in charge. That he wasn't smiling best describes the look on his face. Just outside Trauma Room 1, Jacqueline joined the escort and placed her hand on the coffin as she walked along beside it. I followed directly behind them.

When the entourage had moved into the main hall, Dr. Earl Rose, chief of forensic pathology, confronted the men in suits. Roy Kellerman, the man leading the group, looked sternly at Dr. Rose and announced, "My friend, this is the body of the President of the United States, and we are going to take it back to Washington."

Dr. Rose bristled and replied, "No, that's not the way things are. When there's a homicide, we must have an autopsy."

"He's the President. He's going with us," Kellerman barked, with increased intensity in his voice.

"The body stays," Dr. Rose said with equal poignancy.

Kellerman took an erect stance and brought his firearm into a ready position. The other men in suits followed course by draping their coattails behind the butts of their holstered pistols. How brave of these men, wearing their Brooks Brothers suits with icons of distinction (color-coded Secret Service buttons) pinned to their lapels, willing to shoot an unarmed doctor to secure a corpse.

"My friend, my name is Roy Kellerman. I am special agent in charge of the White House detail of the Secret Service. We are

taking President Kennedy back to the capitol."

"You are not taking the body anywhere. There's a law here. We're going to enforce it."

Admiral George Burkley, White House Medical Officer, said, "Mrs. Kennedy is going to stay exactly where she is until the body is moved. We can't have that ... he's the President of the United States."

"That doesn't matter," Dr. Rose replied rigidly. "You can't lose the chain of evidence."

For the second time that day, there was little doubt in my mind as to the significance of what was happening before me.

"Goddammit, get your ass out of the way before you get hurt," screamed another one of the men in suits. Another snapped, "We're taking the body, now."

Strange, I thought, this President is getting more protection dead than he did when he was alive.

Had Dr. Rose not stepped aside I'm sure that those thugs would have shot him. They would have killed me and anyone else who got in their way. Dr. Kemp Clark wanted to physically detain the coffin, but the men with guns acted like tough guys with specific orders. A period of twenty-seven years has neither erased the fear that I felt nor diminished the impression that that incident made upon me.

They loaded the casket into the hearse, Jacqueline got into the backseat, placed her hand on top of the coffin, and bowed her head. As they drove off, I felt that a thirty-year-old surgeon had seen more than his share for one day.

(C. Crenshaw, et al, *JFK: Conspiracy of Silence*, 1992, pp. 118 - 120)

Major General Chester V. Clifton

NBC coverage of the Kennedy assassination (*As it Happened*) showed a Major General Chester V. Clifton walking into the entrance of Parkland Memorial Hospital. General Clifton was a military aide and Defense Liaison Officer to President Kennedy—he served as a liaison between the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staffs—and continued to serve in a similar capacity under President Johnson.¹ One has to ask, What did General Clifton observe at the Parkland hospital when Kennedy's corpse was immediately whisked away without an autopsy conducted by

the local authorities in clear violation of Texas state law and at the vociferous protest of Parkland doctors?

During NBC's live coverage of the Kennedy assassination, Charles Murphy—a news man at WBAP-TV Dallas/Fort Worth—re-broadcast film footage of the motorcade, the confusion during the assassination, and the scene at Parkland Memorial Hospital. Murphy provided live commentary about the film as it was broadcast by NBC to the televisions of millions of Americans. The film showed a military officer entering the front of the hospital. Murphy identified him as "Major General [Chester V.] Clifton, the military aide." Again, what did General Clifton observe while inside the hospital?

Historians should take note of General Clifton's name and his possible involvement in the coup d'état of 1963. The General was filmed walking into Parkland Hospital immediately after the assassination; he was also identified by television reporter Charles Murphy. Given the General's cool demeanor and his apparent lack of command during a hostile confrontation between Parkland doctors and the Secret Service, the odds are quite high that General Clifton was an active participant in the conspiracy to murder President Kennedy.

Endnotes

1. WBAP-TV reporter Charles Murphy identified Major General Chester V. Clifton walking inside Parkland Memorial Hospital during NBC's live coverage of the Kennedy assassination (*As it Happens*). Murphy stated that Clifton was a military aide to President Kennedy. The Kennedy Library also has a file on General Clifton stating that he was also a Defense Liaison Officer, which was a liaison between President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff; http://www.jfklibrary.org/fa_clifton_wh.html. A bio about General Clifton's life—published on the Arlington National Cemetery website—stated that Clifton was a military aide to President Johnson as well as Kennedy. He died in 1991 at the age of 78 and is buried at Arlington National Cemetery; <http://www.arlingtoncemetery.com/cvclifton.htm>

Chapter 3: The Importance of Jim Garrison

Prosecution of Clay Shaw

In 1967, New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison prosecuted New Orleans business man Clay Shaw for conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy. Garrison suggested in his book, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, that Shaw received instructions from Louis M. Bloomfield.¹ In addition, Garrison discovered that Shaw and Bloomfield were board members of two trade organizations, *Permindex* and *Centro Mondiale Commerciale*, both expelled from Italy in 1962 for subversive intelligence activity.²

Clay Shaw was a tall distinguished man with silver hair and a polished manner; born in Kentwood, Louisiana on March 17, 1913. During the 1930s, he worked in New York City as an executive for Western Union Telegraph Company and later as an advertising public-relations consultant. By 1963 Shaw had become a wealthy real estate developer in New Orleans. He was director of the International House—the World Trade Center, a "nonprofit association fostering the development of international trade, tourism and cultural exchange."³

Researcher Jim Marrs wrote in his renowned book about the Kennedy assassination, *Crossfire*, the following description of Shaw's military background:

By 1941, Shaw was with the U.S. Army and, while his official biography states simply that he was an aide-de-camp to General Charles O. Thrasher, Shaw later admitted he was working for the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) as a liaison officer to the headquarters of Winston Churchill. It was here that Shaw may have become entangled in the murky world of intelligence.

Although there is precious little reliable information on exactly what Shaw's wartime experiences included, he did retire from the U.S. Army in 1946 as a major—later he was made a colonel—with the Bronze Star, the Legion of Merit, France's Croix de Guerre, and Belgium's Order of the Crown.⁴

It is significant that Shaw received France's Croix de Guerre while serving as a Colonel in the US Army in the 1940s. There is strong circumstantial evidence that Shaw may have also served as a Colonel in the French espionage organization, Service de Documentation Exterieur et de Contre Espionage (SDECE), under the aliases of a Colonel René Bertrand and Colonel Beaumont. This would tie Shaw directly to professional assassin Christian David who revealed in the late 1980s that French Corsican assassins were hired to kill President.

Jim Garrison proved that Clay Shaw often used aliases Clay Bertrand or Clem Bertrand. Danish journalist, Henrik Krüger, wrote in his 1976 book, *The Great Heroic Coup*, that a Colonel René Bertrand, alias Colonel Beaumont, worked for SDECE in the 1940s. According to Krüger, Colonel Bertrand used his influence in 1949 to get French gangster Jo Attia's prison sentence reduced from life to four years. Attia had

been convicted in France for illegal possession of weapons and involvement in the death/murder of another gangster, Pierrot le Fou. Attia had saved Colonel Bertrand's life during World War II and evidently asked Bertrand to return the favor by getting his sentence reduced.⁵

Jo Attia was one of France's most colorful criminals, and was the first gangster in that country to become an international spy. It was Jo Attia who, according to Krüger, introduced heroin trafficker Christian David to international espionage. Jo Attia also worked with French Corsican crime family, the Guerini brothers.⁶ Christian David told an interviewer—in Nigel Turner's documentary, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*—that Antoine Guerini, of the Guerini crime family, offered him the contract to kill President Kennedy; but David refused because it was too dangerous. Christian David and Jo Attia were both involved in the 1965 kidnapping and murder of Moroccan political activist Mehdi Ben Barka. They were also closely associated with, according to Henrik Krüger, the men who killed Patrice Lumumba of the Congo.⁷

Given that Clay Shaw was a Colonel in the US Army in the late 1940s, that he admitted to working for the OSS, and given that he was awarded France's *Croix de Guerre*, and given that Shaw resided in New Orleans which has a strong French heritage, and given Shaw's known propensity to use aliases, it is possible that French SDECE officer, Colonel René Bertrand, alias Beaumont, was actually Colonel Clay Shaw. This "missing link" about Shaw's background connects the dots to many of Jim Garrison's discoveries about Shaw's past, his links to international espionage, and his involvement in the assassination of President Kennedy. In addition, Henrik Krüger wrote that Colonel Bertrand, alias Beaumont, is one of the names most associated with SDECE espionage involving assassination, kidnapping, and other notorious scandals.⁸

Dean Anderson Linked Clay Shaw to Oswald

A major discovery in Garrison's investigation was linking Clay Shaw to Lee Harvey Oswald per the testimony of New Orleans attorney Dean Andrews. Garrison had known Andrews well for years. They went to Tulane Law School together, although they did not attend the same classes. They both practiced law in New Orleans for years, although Garrison was the District Attorney and Andrews had a private practice.⁹

Andrews told FBI and the Warren Commission that a "Clay Bertrand" had contacted him on November 23, 1963 to provide legal representation to accused assassin Lee Harvey Oswald. Clay Bertrand turned out to be an alias used by Clay Shaw. Jim Garrison wrote the following description of statements made by Andrews to the authorities:

In my reading I had learned that, at the time of his first FBI interview shortly after the assassination, [Dean] Andrews had described Clay Bertrand, his New Orleans caller, as a man approximately six feet two in height. He had gone on to say that

Bertrand was a man who called him from time to time to help young friends of his who had become involved in minor scrapes with the law. Then—and later in more detail—he explained that in the summer of 1963, when Lee Oswald was living in New Orleans, Bertrand had called him and asked him to help Oswald with some citizenship problems his wife, Marina, was having. Oswald, consequently, had met with Andrews several times in his office.

It had readily become apparent to me, however, that the more Andrews realized that his having received a phone call to defend Lee Oswald was a potential danger to him, the foggier the identity of Clay Bertrand became in his mind. By the time Andrews appeared before the Warren Commission in July 1964, Bertrand's height had shrunk from six feet two all the way down to five feet eight inches. Apparently in response to subtle pressure from the FBI agents, Andrews told them, "Write what you want, that I am nuts. I don't care." The agents obligingly wrote in their final report that Andrews had come to the conclusion that the phone call from Bertrand had been "a figment of his imagination." This not only allowed the Bureau to conclude its investigation into Andrews but harmonized with its announced conclusion that Lee Oswald had accomplished Kennedy's assassination alone and unaided.

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 92 - 93)¹⁰

Garrison read Andrews' multiple testimonies in the volumes of the Warren Report. In early 1967, he decided to meet Andrews for lunch at Broussard's Restaurant (in New Orleans). This is their exchange as documented by Garrison in his book, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, later depicted almost verbatim in Oliver Stone's famous movie, *JFK*:

Andrews:

We've been friends since law school days. Why do you want to treat me like I have leprosy?

Garrison:

Because you keep conning me, Dean. You admitted to the Warren Commission that on the day after the assassination—while you were a patient at Hotel Dieu hospital—you were called on the phone and asked to fly to Dallas and to be Lee Oswald's lawyer. When the Warren Commission asked you the caller's name, you replied that it was 'Clay Bertrand.'

Andrews:

That's right.

Garrison:

Now, when I tell you I want to know who Clay Bertrand is, you tell me he's a client of yours but you really don't know what he looks like because you never see him.

Andrews:

Scout's honor, my man.

Garrison:

That might be good enough for the Warren Commission, Dean but it's not good enough for me.

Andrews:

Pipe the bimbo in red. [He pointed to beautiful young lady.]

Garrison:

... She's pretty. Could we get to the point? Just who is Clay Bertrand? Where do I find him? I want to talk to him.

Andrews:

God almighty. You're worse than the Feebees (FBI). How can I convince you that I don't know this cat, I don't know what he looks like, and I don't know where he's at. All I know is that sometimes he sends me cases. So, one day, this cat Bertrand's on the phone talkin' to me about going to Dallas and representing Oswald. [He put his hand over his heart.] Scout's honor, man. That's all I know about the guy.

[Andrews continued eating his "Crabmeat Louie." Garrison grabbed Andrews by his fork-hand thereby preventing him from taking another bite.]

Garrison:

Dean, I think we're having a communication problem. Let me see if this will clarify it for you. Now stop eating that damn crabmeat for a minute and listen to me. I am aware of our long friendship, but I want you to know that I'm going to call you in front of the Grand Jury. If you lie to the Grand Jury as you have been lying to me, I'm going to charge you with perjury. Now am I

communicating with you?

Andrews:

[stunned] Is this off the off the record, Daddy? [Garrison nodded.] In that case, let me sum it up for you real quick. It's as simple as this. If I answer that question you keep asking me, if I give you the name you keep trying to get, then it's goodbye, Dean Andrews. It's bon voyage, Deano. I mean like permanent. I mean like a bullet in my head—which makes it hard to do one's legal research, if you get my drift. Does that help you see my problem a little better?

Garrison:

Read my lips. Either you dance in to the Grand Jury with the real moniker of that cat who called you to represent Lee Oswald, or your fat behind is going to the slammer. Do you dig me?

Andrews:

[He stood up suddenly.] Do you have any idea what you're getting into, my man? You want to dance with the government? Is that what you want? Then be my guest. But you will get sat on, and I do mean hard.

[Andrews dropped his napkin on to of his Crabmeat Louie.]

[mumbling] Thanks for lunch. It's been lovely.

[He stormed out. Garrison noted that he had "jigged" into the restaurant when they met, snapping his fingers to an imagined tune. He was not jigging when he left.]

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 91 - 95)

Dean Adams Andrews, Jr., testified before the Warren Commission on July 21, 1964. His sworn testimony was taken by Mr. Wesley J. Liebeler, assistant counsel of the Warren Commission, at the Old Civil Courts Building, Royal and Conti Streets, New Orleans, Louisiana. Liebeler grilled Andrews extensively about the discrepancy between what he told the FBI and the Commission regarding Clay Bertrand's height; however, once Liebeler realized this was a sensitive area, he quickly changed the subject and asked if Bertrand was homosexual. The following are excerpts from that testimony:

Liebeler:

I am advised by the FBI that you told them that Lee Harvey

Oswald came into your office some time during the summer of 1963. Would you tell us in your own words just what happened as far as that is concerned?

Andrews:

I don't recall the dates, but briefly, it is this: Oswald came in the office accompanied by some gay kids. They were Mexicanos. He wanted to find out what could be done in connection with a discharge, a yellow paper discharge, so I explained to him he would have to advance the funds to transcribe whatever records they had up in the Adjutant General's office. When he brought the money, I would do the work, and we saw him three or four times subsequent to that, not in the company of the gay kids. He had this Mexicano with him. I assume he is a Mex because the Latins do not wear a butch haircut.

(portions deleted from original)

Liebeler:

Did there come a time after the assassination when you had some further involvement with Oswald, or at least an apparent involvement with Oswald; as I understand it?

Andrews:

No; nothing at all with Oswald. I was in Hotel Dieu, and the phone rang and a voice I recognized as Clay Bertrand asked me if I would go to Dallas and Houston--I think--Dallas, I guess, wherever it was that this boy was being held—and defend him. I told him I was sick in the hospital. If I couldn't go, I would find somebody that could go.

(portions deleted from original)

Liebeler:

Now what can you tell us about this Clay Bertrand? You met him prior to that time?

Andrews:

I had seen Clay Bertrand once some time ago, probably a couple of years. He's the one who calls in behalf of gay kids normally, either to obtain bond or parole for them. I would assume that he was the one that originally sent Oswald and the gay kids, these Mexicanos, to the office because I had never seen those people

before at all. They were just walk-ins.

(portions deleted from original)

Liebeler.

Do you have a picture in your mind of this Clay Bertrand?

Andrews.

Oh, I ran up on that rat about 6 weeks ago and he spooked, ran in the street. I would have beat him with a chain if I had caught him.

Liebeler.

Let me ask you this: When I was down here in April, before I talked to you about this thing, and I was going to take your deposition at that time, but we didn't make arrangements, in your continuing discussions with the FBI, you finally came to the conclusion that Clay Bertrand was a figment of your imagination?

Andrews.

That's what the Feebees put on. I know that the two Feebees are going to put these people on the street looking, and I can't find the guy, and I am not going to tie up all the agents on something that isn't that solid. I told them, "Write what you want, that I am nuts. I don't care." They were running on the time factor, and the hills were shook up plenty to get it, get it, get it. I couldn't give it to them. I have been playing cops and robbers with them. You can tell when the steam is on. They are on you like the plague. They never leave. They are like cancer. Eternal.

Liebeler.

That was the description of the situation?

Andrews.

It was my decision if they were to stay there. If I decide yes, they stay. If I decide no, they go. So I told them, "Close your file and go some place else." That's the real reason why it was done. I don't know what they wrote in the report, but that's the real reason.

Liebeler.

Now subsequent to that time, however, you actually ran into Clay

Bertrand in the street?

Andrews.

About 6 weeks ago. I am trying to think of the name of this bar. That's where this rascal bums out. I was trying to get past him so I could get a nickel in the phone and call the Feebees or John Rice, but he saw me and spooked and ran. I haven't seen him since.

Liebeler.

Did you talk to him that day?

Andrews.

No; if I would have got close enough to talk to him. I would have grabbed him.

Liebeler.

What does this guy look like?

Andrews.

He is about 5 feet 8 inches. Got sandy hair, blue eyes, ruddy complexion. Must weigh about 165, 170, 175. He really took off, that rascal.

Liebeler.

He recognized you?

Andrews.

He had to because if he would have let me get to that phone and make the call, he would be in custody.

Liebeler.

You wanted to get hold of this guy and make him available to the FBI for interview, or Mr. Rice of the Secret Service?

Andrews.

What I wanted to do and should have done is crack him in the head with a bottle, but I figured I would be a good, law-abiding citizen and call them and let them grab him, but I made the biggest mistake of the century. I should have grabbed him right

there. I probably will never find him again. He has been bugging me ever since this happened.

Liebeler.

Now before you ran into Clay Bertrand in the street on this day, did you have a notion in your mind what he looked like?

Andrews.

I had seen him before one time to recognize him.

Liebeler.

When you saw him that day, he appeared to you as he had before when you recognized him?

Andrews.

He hasn't changed any appearance, I don't think. Maybe a little fatter, maybe a little skinnier.

Liebeler.

Now I have a rather lengthy report of an interview that Mr. Kennedy [FBI agent, Regis L. Kennedy] had with you on December 5, 1963, in which he reports you as stating that you had a mental picture of Clay Bertrand as being approximately 6 feet 1 inch to 6 feet 2 inches in height, brown hair, and well dressed.

Andrews.

Yes.

Liebeler.

Now this description is different, at least in terms of height of the man, than the one you have just given us of Clay Bertrand.

Andrews.

But, you know, I don't play Boy Scouts and measure them. I have only seen this fellow twice in my life. I don't think there is that much in the description. There may be some to some artist, but to me, there isn't that much difference. Might be for you all.

Liebeler.

I think you said he was 5 feet 8 inches before.

Andrews.

Well, I can't give you any better because this time I was looking for the fellow, he was sitting down. I am just estimating. You meet a guy 2 years ago, you meet him, period.

Liebeler.

Which time was he sitting down?

Andrews.

He was standing up first time.

Liebeler.

I thought you met him on the street the second time when you---

Andrews.

No, he was in a barroom.

Liebeler.

He was sitting in a bar when you saw him 6 weeks ago?

Andrews.

A table at the right-hand side. I go there every now and then spooking for him.

Liebeler.

What's the name of the bar you saw him in that day, do you remember?

Andrews.

Cosimo's, used to be. Little freaky joint.

Liebeler.

Well, now, if you didn't see him standing up on that day--

Andrews.

No.

Liebeler.

So that you didn't have any basis on which to change your mental picture of this man in regard to his height from the first one that you had?

Andrews.

No.

Liebeler.

I am at a loss to understand why you told Agent Kennedy on December 5 that he was 6 feet 1 to 6 feet 2 and now you have told us that he was 5 feet 8 when at no time did you see the man standing up.

Andrews.

Because, I guess, the first time--and I am guessing now--

Liebeler.

Is this fellow a homosexual, do you say?

Andrews.

Bisexual. What they call a swinging cat.

Liebeler.

And you haven't seen him at any time since that day?

Andrews.

I haven't seen him since.

Liebeler.

Now have you had your office searched for any records relating to Clay Bertrand?

Andrews.

Yes.

Liebeler.

Have you found anything?

Andrews.

No; nothing.

Liebeler.

Has this fellow Bertrand sent you business in the past?

Andrews.

Prior to--I guess the last time would be February of 1963.

(portions deleted from original)

Liebeler:

I don't think I have any more questions. Do you have anything else that you would like to add?

Andrews:

I wish I could be more specific, that's all. This is my impression, for whatever it is worth, of Clay Bertrand: His connections with Oswald I don't know at all. I think he is a lawyer without a brief case. That's my opinion. He sends the kids different places. Whether this boy is associated with Lee Oswald or not, I don't know, but I would say, when I met him about 6 weeks ago when I ran up on him and he ran away from me, he could be running because he owes me money, or he could be running because they have been squeezing the quarter pretty good looking for him while I was in the hospital, and somebody might have passed the word he was hot and I was looking for him, but I have never been able to figure out the reason why he would call me, and the only other part of this thing that I understand, but apparently I haven't been able to communicate, is I called Monk Zelden on a Sunday at the N.O.A.C. and asked Monk if he would go over--be interested in a retainer and go over to Dallas and see about that boy. I thought I called Monk once. Monk says we talked twice. I don't remember the second. It's all one conversation with me. Only thing I do remember about it, while I was talking with Monk, he said, "Don't worry about it. Your client just got shot." That was the end of the case. Even if he was a bona fide client, I never did get to him; somebody else got to him before I did. Other than that, that's the whole thing, but this boy Bertrand has been bugging me ever since. I will find him sooner or later.

(Warren Commission Hearings, Volume 11, pp. 325 - 339)

Dean Andrews' testimony before the Warren Commission became a critical link to Israel's involvement in the Kennedy assassination. Under oath, Andrews identified Clay Bertrand as the man who phoned him requesting legal representation for Oswald. Later it became known that Clay Bertrand was actually Clay Shaw, who was linked to international espionage activities with Louis Bloomfield, one of Israel's most influential supporters. Obviously Andrews had reason to fear serious reprisal if he revealed to the authorities that Clay Bertrand was in fact Clay Shaw. This is why he clearly backpedaled regarding Bertrand's height and was eventually convicted of perjury for lying about the true identity of Clay Shaw, the man who had asked him to represent Lee Harvey Oswald for the murder of President Kennedy.

Garrison Proved That Shaw and Bertrand Were the Same Person

Although Garrison lost the conspiracy case against Shaw, he proved in a separate proceeding that Clay Bertrand and Clay Shaw were in fact the same person.¹¹ In subsequent testimony before a grand jury in Louisiana, Andrews denied that Clay Bertrand and Clay Shaw were the same person. The grand jury responded by convicting Andrews of perjury. Subsequently, in August 1967, Andrews was found guilty of perjury by a jury of New Orleans citizens.¹² As a result, Andrews was sentenced to five months in the Parish prison.¹³ The stated perjury conviction linked Bloomfield directly to Oswald because Shaw was obviously Oswald's handler, and Shaw and Bloomfield were linked to subversive intelligence activity via Permindex and Centro Mondiale Commerciale.

Garrison Linked Clay Shaw to Louis Bloomfield

To my knowledge, Jim Garrison was the first to expose Louis Bloomfield, Centro Mondiale Commerciale, Permindex, and Clay Shaw's association with them. This is what Garrison wrote in his book, *On the Trail of the Assassins*:

It was not until much later, well after the Shaw trial when it could have been of any use to us, that we discovered Shaw's extensive international role as an employee of the CIA. Shaw's secret life as an Agency man in Rome trying to bring Fascism back to Italy was exposed in articles in the Italian press which we obtained from Ralph Schoenmann, secretary to philosopher Bertrand Russell, who had been one of the earliest supporters of our investigation.

According to these articles, the CIA—which apparently had been conducting its own foreign policy for some time—had begun a project in Italy as far back as the early 1960s. The organization, named the Centro Mondiale Commerciale (the World Trade

Center), had initially been formed in Montreal, then moved to Rome in 1961. Among the members of its board of directors, we learned, was one Clay Shaw from New Orleans.

The Centro Montiale Commerciale's new headquarters, according to the Roman press, was elegant. Its publicity, announcing the new, creative role it was going to play in world trade, was impressive. The Centro opened an additional office in Switzerland, also an impressive move.

However, in 1967, the Italian press took a close look at the board of directors of the Centro Mondiale Commerciale and found it consisted of a very curious collection of individuals. The board contained at least one genuine prince, Gutierrez di Spadaforo, a member of the House of Savoy, whence came Umberto, the last of Italy's kings. Spadaforo, a man of considerable wealth, with extensive holdings in armaments and petroleum, had once been the undersecretary of agriculture for Il Duce, Benito Mussolini. Through his daughter-in-law, Spadaforo was related to the famous Nazi minister of finance, Hjalmar Schacht, who had been tried for war crimes in Nuremberg.

Another director of the Centro was Carlo D'Amelio, the lawyer for other members of the former Italian royal family. Another was Ferenc Nagy, the exiled former premier of Hungary and the former head of the leading anti-Communist political party. Nagy also was described by the Italian newspapers as the president of Permindex (ostensibly a foundation for a permanent exposition and an offshoot of the Centro Mondiale Commerciale). Nagy, the Italian newspapers said, had been a heavy contributor to Fascist movements in Europe. Yet another director was a man named Giuseppe Zigiotti, the president of something with the congenial title of Fascist National Association of Militia Arms.

One of the major stockholders of the Centro was a Major L.M. Bloomfield, a Montreal resident originally of American nationality and a former agent with the Office of Strategic Services, out of which the United States had formed the CIA.

This then was the general makeup of the Centro Mondiale Commerciale, on whose board of directors Clay Shaw served. Judging from the background of its members and the fairly heavy activities in which they were engaged, the organization could not be confused with the Shriners or the 4-H Club. The Centro was described in 1969 by writer Paris Flammonde in *The Kennedy Conspiracy* as apparently representative of the paramilitary right in Europe, including Italian Fascists, the American CIA, and similar interests. He described it as "a shell of superficiality...composed of channels through which money

flowed back and forth, with no one knowing the sources or the destination of these liquid assets."

The Italian government had no problem distinguishing the organization from the Shriners and the 4-H Club. Before 1962 was out, it had expelled the Centro Mondiale Commerciale—and its half-brother, Permindex—from Italy for subversive intelligence activity.

Perhaps because of its Montreal origin, the Centro aroused the interest of a Canadian newspaper, *Le Devoir*. Referring to Ferenc Nagy, one of the Centro's director's it wrote in early 1967: "Nagy...maintains close ties with the CIA which link him with the Miami Cuban colony." Nagy subsequently emigrated to the United States, making himself at home in Dallas, Texas.

With regard to Major Bloomfield, *Le Devoir* observed that although now ostensibly a Canadian, he had been involved in "espionage" in earlier years for the United States government. It went on to point out that Bloomfield was not only a shareholder of the Centro but of its affiliate group, Permindex, as well.

Summing up the fate of the two related enterprises, *Le Devoir* stated: "Whatever the case may be, the Centro Commerciale and Permindex got into difficulties with the Italian and Swiss governments. They refused to testify to origins of considerable amounts of money, and they never seem to engage in actual commercial transactions. These companies were expelled from Switzerland and Italy in 1962 and then set up headquarters in Johannesburg."

The ultimate evaluation of Clay Shaw's Centro Mondiale Commerciale by the *Paesa Sera* stated: "Among its possible involvements (supported by the presence in directive posts of men deeply committed to organizations of the extreme right)...is that the Center was the creature of the CIA...set up as a cover for the transfer of CIA...funds in Italy for illegal political-espionage activities. It still remains to clear up the presence on the administrative Board of the Center of Clay Shaw and ex-Major (of the OSS) Bloomfield."

Paesa Sera made an additional observation about the Centro. It was, the newspaper observed, "the point of contact for a number of persons who, in certain respects, have somewhat equivocal ties whose common denomination is anti-communism so strong that it would swallow up all those in the world who have fought for decent relations between East and West, including Kennedy." That just happened, as well, to be the trenchant one-line description of the parent organization, the Central Intelligence

Agency.

As for Permindex, which Clay Shaw also served as a director, the Italian press revealed that it had, among other things, secretly financed the opposition of the French Secret Army Organization (OAS) to President de Gaulle's support for independence for Algeria, including its reputed assassination attempts on de Gaulle.

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 100-103)

Garrison's citing from Paris Flammonde's book, *The Kennedy Conspiracy*, seems highly significant given what we have learned about Auguste Ricord's involvement in the Kennedy assassination. Flammonde wrote that Centro Montiale Commerciale was "a shell of superficiality...composed of channels through which money flowed back and forth, with no one knowing the sources or the destination of these liquid assets." The money Flammonde described was likely not generated by the CIA, the US government or any government per se. It was probably the profits from the illicit sale of heroin produced from opium grown in the Golden Triangle; hence, the Vietnam connection. This money was likely laundered by Centro and Permindex and distributed to all participants in a criminal enterprise which included drug traffickers, the CIA, Mossad, SDECE, and a host of other intelligence services.

Involvement of French Corsican heroin traffickers in the Kennedy assassination also explains the presence of ex-Nazis and European fascists on the board of directors of Centro and Permindex even though both agencies were headed by a highly influential Jewish friend of Israel, Louis Bloomfield. Many French Corsican underworld figures like Auguste Ricord were Nazi collaborators during World War II. Such alliances were formed primarily for convenience rather than political ideology. The mobsters were merely co-existing with the ruling power in France at the time. They dealt with Nazis and Jews alike if the alliances fulfilled their business plans. In that sense the mobsters were—and are—equal opportunity employers. This mindset is nothing new in the underworld culture.

Permindex Funded Assassination Attempts on de Gaulle

In 1962, French president Charles de Gaulle publicly accused Permindex of channeling money to OAS (Secret Army Organization),¹⁴ which made several attempts on de Gaulle's life for liberating Algeria. Keep in mind that "Senator" John Kennedy publicly denounced France, in 1957, for its colonial rule over Algeria and for the brutality exhibited in the French-Algerian War.¹⁵

It appears that Permindex may have financed the 1965 kidnapping and murder of Moroccan exile leader Mehdi Ben Barka as well.¹⁶ When Morocco and Algeria had a brief war in 1963, Ben Barka sided with Algeria and went into exile.¹⁷ This is highly significant because it establishes an even stronger pattern that any head of state who openly supported Algerian independence was assassinated—or an assassination was

attempted—by Israel via Permindex. De Gaulle, Kennedy, and Ben Barka all supported an independent Algeria. Israel's objective was apparently to keep all Islamic nations oppressed.

Danish journalist Henrik Krüger asserted in his 1976 book, *The Great Heroin Coup*, that Christian David was involved in the kidnapping and murder of Ben Barka.¹⁸ American journalists Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock made a similar suggestion in their 1973 book, *Contrabandista*.¹⁹ All three writers agree that David was wanted for murdering French policeman Lieutenant Maurice Galibert—on February 2, 1966—who was investigating the Ben Barka affair.²⁰ As previously stated in this Chapter, there is strong circumstantial evidence that Clay Shaw may have established a relationship with Christian David from contacts Shaw made with the Guerini brothers—a French Corsican crime family—during Shaw's World War II intelligence service with the French intelligence agency SPECE using the aliases Colonel René Bertrand and Colonel Beaumont.

Endnotes

1. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins* (1988), pp. 136-138. Jules Ricco Kimble accompanied Clay Shaw and David Ferrie on a private Cessna plane trip to Montreal. Shaw was known to have a fear of flying. Therefore, Garrison deduced that the Montreal flight must have been "a more than routine mission for which Shaw felt personally responsible."
2. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins* (1988), p. 102
3. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 498
4. *ibid*
5. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 42
6. *ibid*, p. 40
7. *ibid*, p. 43
8. *ibid*, p. 46
9. Garrison's acquaintance with Dean Andrews is stated in *On the Trail of the Assassins*, p. 93.
10. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 92 - 93. The source of Garrison's statements about what Andrews told the FBI and the Warren Commission came from Volume 11 of the Warren Report: Warren Commission Hearings, pp. 325 - 339.
11. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins* (1988), pp. 198-199
12. *ibid*
13. *ibid*
14. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire: The Plot That Killed Kennedy* (1989), p 499
15. New York Times (July 3, 1957), *Kennedy Urges U.S. Back Independence for Algeria*, p A1
16. It is well documented that Christian David was involved in the kidnapping and murder Mehdi Ben Barka. Reference Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, pp. 59 - 73; Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 76. Christian David was one of Auguste Ricord's top lieutenants, and Permindex apparently laundered money for Ricord's heroin cartel. Also, it appears that Clay Shaw may have used the alias Colonel René Bertrand and Beaumont for the French spy agency, SDECE. (Reference the beginning of Chapter 3 of this document.)
17. Encyclopedia Britannica: Mehdi Ben Barka
18. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, pp. 59 - 73
19. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 76
20. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 73; Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 76

Chapter 4: Louis M. Bloomfield, the Assassination Engineer



Left to Right: Louis Bloomfield, Bernard Bloomfield (brother), David Ben-Gurion. This picture was taken in Israel on May 4th, 1949 when the Bloomfield brothers met Israeli Prime Minister Ben-Gurion at a garden party celebrating Israel's first birthday. (Photo from *Israel Diary*, by Bernard Bloomfield, 1950)

(To view the Bloomfield Photogallery, click [here](#).)

Background

Overwhelming evidence indicates that the man who engineered and organized the assassination of President Kennedy was Louis Mortimer Bloomfield, of Montreal, Canada. Bloomfield was an extraordinary individual in the sense that he operated behind the scenes influencing the highest echelons of power within many countries. He was a prominent Jewish philanthropist in Canada and Israel,¹ a well connected international lawyer,² a spy,³ a soldier,⁴ and a diplomat,⁵ all rolled into one human being. A declassified document from the State Department described Bloomfield as "intense, more inclined to talk than to listen, but polite—almost courtly."⁶

I do not know if Bloomfield is still alive; however, he would be somewhere between ninety-three and ninety-seven years old as of this writing (2002). He was about sixty years old when President Kennedy was killed in 1963.

Little is known about Bloomfield's personal life, although the previously mentioned declassified document from the State Department revealed that he was "married to the daughter of Rabbi Sterne,"⁷ and that his "wife is approximately twenty years his junior."⁸

Profile of Bloomfield Written by Brother Bernard

A revealing profile of Bloomfield was presented in the forward the 1950 book, *Israel Diary*, written by his brother Bernard Bloomfield. Here is that forward in its entirety:

In 1902 my late father, Harry Bloomfield, and his brothers made a pilgrimage from Canada to Palestine. As small boys my brother and I never tired of hearing his stories of the Holy Land, and when he died of influenza during the epidemic in 1918, we resolved, young as we were, to keep alive his devotion to the ancient homeland of the Jews.

The years that followed were exciting ones. The [British] Mandate; the gradual dismemberment of the National Home to a quarter of its original area; the riots; the various Commissions culminating in the U.N.S.C.O.P.; partition; the American volt face; the Declaration of the State of Israel; the Arab invasions; bloody battles and ultimate victory.

The sacrifices of the Jews in Israel, the stirring and excitement accompanying the birth of the New State, the first painful stages of its growth, created in us a strong desire to see this phenomenon on the spot.

On March 12, 1949, in a blinding snowstorm that delayed our departure several hours while the runways were being cleared, we took off from Montreal's Dorval Airport. Our journey to Israel was circuitous. My brother is an international lawyer and had certain matters to attend to en route. So we traveled via London, Gibraltar, Tangier, Madrid, Rome, Athens and Nicosia. On March 28 our plane landed at Haifa. We traveled extensively throughout Israel from Dan to Beersheba, and, through the courtesy of the Israeli Army, across the Southern Negev Desert over the Scorpion's Ladder with the first convoy of newspapermen and photographers to reach the Gulf of Aqaba since the war's end.

I am a businessman and had never written for publication. My wife is an ardent Zionist (her grandmother was a delegate to the

Second Congress at Basle in 1898), and wanting her to share my soul-stirring experiences in Israel, I wrote to her at length as I saw, heard, and thought. These letters, together with detailed notes I kept of our travels, form the basis of this diary. Its transformation into a book is due, in great measure, to the painstaking help and encouragement of my friend Abe Goldberg and my brother Louis.

On the barren, eroded slopes of Neve Ilan, a French Maquis kibbutz in the Jerusalem Corridor, Louis and I planted, one bright spring morning, the Bloomfield Memorial Forest, in honor of the man who taught us to be loyal Canadians and good Jews. We planted it in territory allotted to the Arabs under the Partition Plan, but won by the Jews after bitter fighting and many casualties. We did it as a symbol that this ground, stained by the blood of our heroes, must ever remain in Jewish hands.

(B. Bloomfield, *Israel Diary*, pp. ix & x)

Bloomfield, the Jewish Philanthropist

As a Jewish philanthropist, Louis Bloomfield worked extensively with his brother, Bernard. They built the Bloomfield Stadium⁹ in Tel Aviv which hosts Israeli and international soccer games even today. They also built the Sir Mortimer B. Davis Jewish General Hospital¹⁰ in Montreal. I suspect that Sir Mortimer B. Davis was an uncle or other close relative of the Bloomfield brothers. It is worth noting that Bloomfield's mother's maiden name was Sadie Davis.¹¹ Obviously, Bernard and Louis Bloomfield admired Davis a great deal since they named a hospital after him. In addition, Louis' parents, Harry and Sadie, may have given Louis the same middle name, Mortimer, as Sir Davis.

Sir Mortimer Barnett Davis was a whisky supplier to Sam Bronfman during prohibition.¹² Davis also made a fortune in the tobacco business.¹³ He owned the Canadian Industrial Alcohol Company and operated Corby and Wiser distilleries.¹⁴ If Louis Bloomfield was in fact the nephew of Sir Mortimer Davis—the bootlegger and business associate of Sam Bronfman from the prohibition period, this would indeed explain Bloomfield's extraordinary influence and power.

In 1971, Louis and Bernard Bloomfield built a student union building, named the Bloomfield Center, at Saint Francis Xavier University in Antigonish, Nova Scotia, Canada.¹⁵ In addition, Louis and Bernard Bloomfield were principals in Israel's labor union, *Histadrut*.¹⁶ In 1967, Louis Bloomfield was given a *Histadrut* award for "outstanding work in aid of pioneering Israel."¹⁷ Previous recipients of the *Histadrut* award included Sam Bronfman, Arthur Goldberg, Harry Truman, and Eleanor Roosevelt.¹⁸

Criticism of Histadrut by an Israeli Intellectual

In my research, I found an article by a highly qualified and disinterested source, Dr. Steven Plout, a senior lecturer in economics and business at the University of Haifa. In his article, Plout asserted that [Histadrut](#) is nothing more than organized crime in Israel. Plout wrote the following:

The main body of organized crime in Israel is an institution called the Histadrut. It is often thought that the Histadrut is the Israeli version of the AFL-CIO in the US or the TUC in the UK, but it is in many ways more closely related to the Corleone crime family.

...

The fact is that the Labor Party is behaving like those sandbox brats who say that if they cannot own the toy they will bust it, and if they cannot be in power in Israel, they will maximize the damage to the country by Histadrut syndicalism and Bolshevism.

(Steven Plout, *The Histadrut Crime Family* (article), December 31, 1996)

Bernard Bloomfield's Obituary

Around September of 1984, Louis Bloomfield's brother Bernard died of kidney disease at the age of 79. His obituary—which appeared in the *Globe and Mail*, a Toronto newspaper—reveals the magnitude of power and influence that the Bloomfield brothers wielded internationally. Here is the full obituary:

JEWISH PHILANTHROPIST—A prominent member of Montreal's Jewish community, who was president and director of the Canadian Manufacturers Sales Co. Ltd. And the Israel Continental Oil Co. has died.

Bernard Manfred Bloomfield died Thursday in the hospital of complications resulting from a kidney ailment. He was 79.

He led a Canadian trade mission to Israel in 1962 and was a delegate to the prime minister's economic conference in Israel in 1968. He served with the Eldee Foundation, the Jewish National Fund of Canada, the Canada-Israel Chamber of Commerce in Israel, the United Israel Appeal, the Jewish People's Schools and the State of Israel Bonds Association.

Mr. Bloomfield was born in Montreal and graduated from McGill University with a bachelor of commerce degree in 1927.

In 1943, he married Neri Judith Loewy and they had two children, a son Harry, a Montreal lawyer, and a daughter, Evelyn.

Mr. Bloomfield received numerous honorary degrees, the Queen Elizabeth Medal and was made Grand Commander of the Star of Africa. The Queen honored him with the Order of the Knight of Justice and the Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem.

(*The Globe and Mail*, newspaper, Toronto, Ontario; September 1, 1984)

Bloomfield, the International Lawyer and Author

As a lawyer, Louis Bloomfield was an expert on international boundary disputes.¹⁹ In 1968, he was urged by the US State Department to go to Belize to learn about the situation there.²⁰ At that time, Belize was struggling for independence from Great Britain.²¹ In 1970, Bloomfield was an unpaid advisor to the opposition party in British Honduras. He authored at least three books on international law: *The British Honduras Guatemala Dispute* (1953), *Egypt, Israel and the Gulf of Aqaba* (1957), and *Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons* (1975). The latter book was co-authored with Gerald F. FitzGerald. In addition, Bloomfield was a member of the committee that drafted the *Helsinki Rules of the Uses of the Waters of International Rivers* (1966).²²

Bloomfield's Work at Phillips and Vineberg, a Montreal Law Firm

Bloomfield worked for years at the law firm of Phillips and Vineberg in Montreal.²³ The firm's founder, Lazarus Phillips, was a personal friend of Sam Bronfman.²⁴ Phillips and Vineberg handled most of Bronfman's legal and financial affairs.²⁵ In 1968 Phillips was appointed to the Canadian Senate,²⁶ a position that Bronfman had sought but never gained. The political ambitions of Phillips had created a rift between the two men years earlier, but Phillips and Vineberg continued handling Bronfman's affairs anyway; however, most of the work was done by Phillips' partner and nephew, Philip Vineberg.²⁷ Today Phillips' law firm—now Goodman, Phillips, Vineberg—is one of the most prestigious international law firms in Canada.

It is significant that Phillips and Vineberg opened a law firm in Paris in 1961.²⁸ This is important because it gave Bloomfield a legal presence near Marseilles, France, the heart of worldwide heroin production by the French Corsican underworld. Marseilles was also the city where professional assassins were recruited to kill Kennedy.

Bloomfield, the Haganah Soldier Trained by General Wingate

As a spy and soldier, Bloomfield was first and foremost a Jew, a Zionist, and one of the principal founders of the modern Jewish state of Israel. On May 4th, 1949, he and his brother Bernard, met Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion at a garden party, hosted by Ben-Gurion, in celebration of Israel's first birthday.²⁹

At the age of about thirty-three, Bloomfield sought to help fulfill his father's dream of establishing a Jewish homeland in Palestine.³⁰ He joined the British military and served in Palestine as an Intelligence Officer under General Charles Orde Wingate.³¹ Bloomfield and Wingate trained the Jewish army, Haganah, from 1936 through 1939, during the Arab Revolt.³² The British—who controlled Palestine at that time and had supported the Zionist movement under the British Mandate—were caught off-guard by massive Arab resistance. The British responded by sending more than 20,000 troops into Palestine.³³ Bloomfield was one of those soldiers.

To counter the onslaught of Arab attacks, General Wingate and Bloomfield trained Special Night Squads, comprised primarily of Haganah fighters, the illegal Jewish army.³⁴ Their tactics were based on the strategic principles of surprise, mobility, and night attacks, and they served effectively both as defensive and offensive units, successfully pre-empting and resisting Arab attacks.³⁵ By 1939 Wingate, Bloomfield and fellow Zionists had armed more than 15,000 Jews to defend the Zionist nationalist movement in Palestine.³⁶ Wingate was killed in an airplane crash in Burma in 1944, and is buried in Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia.³⁷ When the O.S.S. was formed in the early 1940s, Bloomfield was recruited and given the rank of major.³⁸

More Espionage

In 1947, the O.S.S. evolved into the CIA, and Bloomfield continued doing contract work for them as well as the State Department/CIA through 1970.³⁹

There is circumstantial evidence suggesting that Bloomfield and Clay Shaw (using the aliases of Colonel René Bertrand and Colonel Beaumont in the French spy agency, SDECE) solicited Antoine Guerini—leader of the *Guerini Family*, the top French-Corsican Mafia at Marseilles, France—to hire hit men to assassinate President Kennedy.⁴⁰ The Guerini Family had extensive ties to the CIA since the late 1940s.⁴¹ The men Antoine Guerini selected later became the lieutenants for Auguste Ricord. Their names were Lucien Sarti, François Chiappe, and Jean-Paul Angeletti. Guerini asked a fourth man to participate as well, but he refused. His name was Christian David. Like the other three assassins, David later became one of Auguste Ricord's top lieutenants.⁴² The relationships between Sarti, Chiappe, Angeletti, David, and Ricord were documented by Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock in their 1973 book, *Contrabandista*.

Using the Paris law office of Phillips and Vineberg as a front,⁴³ Bloomfield was able to manage the legal affairs of the French-Corsican underworld figures and to set up European bank accounts—via Permindex—to launder illicit heroin profits.

Endnotes

1. The following Canadian newspaper clippings, supplied by the Bloomfield Center at St. Francis Xavier Antigonish, Nova Scotia, corroborate the philanthropic endeavors of the Bloomfield brothers:
 - ◆ *University Centre Named for Bloomfield Family* (Sept. 1971), Antigonish, Nova Scotia, Vol. 9, No. 2
 - ◆ *Bloomfield Centre to official open Nov. 7* (Sept. 1971 assumed), paper unknown
 - ◆ *Bloomfield Centre to Open Soon* (Sept. 21, 1971), Sydney Cape Breton Post, Nova Scotia

The following newspaper article further and accompanying profile corroborates it: *Histadrut Award: Bloomfield to be Honored* (1967), Montreal Newspaper article, declassified document (Sept. 1, 1982), FOI Case No. 8201020, United States Department of State

2. *ibid*
3. [Bloomfield] Multiple sources listed below:
 - ◆ Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp 100-103
 - ◆ Bernard Bloomfield, *Israel Diary* (1950), pp 5 - 7, description of Louis Bloomfield's visit with Lorna Wingate, widow of General Charles Orde Wingate, and five-year-old son, Orde.
 - ◆ *General Charles Orde Wingate* (brief biography), The Pedagogic Center, The Department for Jewish Zionist Education, The Jewish Agency for Israel (NOTE: Given Bloomfield's friendship with Wingate's widow in 1950, and Bloomfield's service with British Intelligence in the late 1930s, one can surmise that Bloomfield assisted Wingate in the training of Haganah soldiers during the Arab Revolt (1936 - 1939).
 - ◆ Jim Marrs, *Crossfire: The Plot That Killed Kennedy* (1989), p 499. Author cites 1981 special report by investigative reporters David Goldman and Jeffrey Steinberg stating that Bloomfield was "recruited into the British Special Operations Executive (SOE) in 1938, during the war was given rank within the US Army, and eventually became part of the OSS intelligence system, including the FBI's Division Five. Reportedly, Bloomfield became quite close with J. Edgar Hoover."
 - ◆ Bernard Bloomfield, *Israel Diary* (1950), p 5. The author, Louis Bloomfield's brother, wrote that Louis had been a major in the Army Service Corps. Bernard wrote: "We had dinner at the hotel and then went to a night club. There Amos [brother-in-law*] met a soldier whom he hadn't seen for twelve years. They were at that time involved in the same arms smuggling plot, back in 1936, for which Amos was sent to jail. They had quite a reunion. He was a fine big fellow, a major, married, with children. When he learned Louis was a major in the Army Service Corps, in which he also had served, he became more communicative and told Louis and Amos that he was fed up with life—all his friends having been killed or wounded. He couldn't get out of the army because he was such a good soldier; they wouldn't release him. He said he received 38 [Israeli pounds] per month as pay, and it cost him 75 [Israeli pounds] to live. He made a very good impression on us—a decent and serious fellow."
 - ◆ Encyclopedia Britannica: *Arab Revolt* (1936 - 1939)
4. *ibid*
5. *Histadrut Award: Bloomfield to be Honored* (1967), Montreal Newspaper article, declassified document (Sept. 1, 1982), FOI Case No. 8201020, United States Department of State. An anonymous person who apparently worked for the State Department or CIA wrote a rough profile of Bloomfield that accompanies the newspaper clipping. The not states the following: "9-23-70: You'll find Louis Bloomfield to be intense, more inclined to talk than to listen, but polite – almost courtly. He's an expert on international boundary disputes – having written several books on specific disputes – see clippings. He and his brother Bernard (recently named Hon. Con Gen of So. Korea) are philanthropists – built stadium in Tel Aviv which bears their name and research center for Jewish General Hospital in Montreal. Married to daughter of Rabbi Sterne. (Wife is approximately 20 years his junior) Is unpaid advisor to opposition party in British Honduras. Went to Belize 1968 at my urging to learn more about actual situation there."
6. *ibid*
7. *ibid*
8. *ibid*

9. *Histadrut Award: Bloomfield to be Honored* (1967), Montreal Newspaper article, declassified document (Sept. 1, 1982), FOI Case No. 8201020, United States Department of State. Profile on Bloomfield brothers mentions that they "built [a] stadium in Tel Aviv."
10. *Histadrut Award: Bloomfield to be Honored* (1967), Montreal Newspaper article, declassified document (Sept. 1, 1982), FOI Case No. 8201020, United States Department of State. Profile on Bloomfield brothers mentions that they "built stadium in Tel Aviv which bears their name and research center for Jewish General Hospital in Montreal." The Google search engine indicates that the stated hospital is actually the *Sir Mortimer B. Davis Jewish General Hospital*.
11. Biography of Bernard Bloomfield on Internet stated that his mother's name was Sadie Davis. Reference <http://www.stfx.ca/campus/service/art-gallery/pieces/28.html>
12. Michael Marrus, *Sam Bronfman: The Life and Times of Seagram's Mr. Sam* (1991), p. 112
13. *ibid*
14. *ibid*
15. The following Canadian newspaper clippings were supplied by the Bloomfield Center at St. Francis Xavier Antigonish, Nova Scotia:
 - ◆ *University Centre Named for Bloomfield Family* (Sept. 1971), Antigonish, Nova Scotia, Vol. 9, No. 2
 - ◆ *Bloomfield Centre to official open Nov. 7* (Sept. 1971 assumed), paper unknown
 - ◆ *Bloomfield Centre to Open Soon* (Sept. 21, 1971), Sydney Cape Breton Post, Nova Scotia
16. The following references corroborate Bloomfield's involvement with Histadrut:
 - ◆ *Histadrut Award: Bloomfield to be Honored* (1967), Montreal Newspaper article, declassified document (Sept. 1, 1982), FOI Case No. 8201020, United States Department of State
 - ◆ Bernard Bloomfield, *Israel Diary* (1950), pp. 24, 32, 34, 41, 42
 - 17. *ibid*
 - 18. *ibid*
 - 19. *Histadrut Award: Bloomfield to be Honored* (1967), Montreal Newspaper article, declassified document (Sept. 1, 1982), FOI Case No. 8201020, United States Department of State
 - 20. *ibid*
 - 21. Encyclopedia Britannica: *Belize*
 - 22. Louis Bloomfield & Gerald FitzGerald, *Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons: Prevention and Punishment, an Analysis of the UN Convention* (1975). Reference *About the Authors*.
 - 23. Michael Piper, *Final Judgement*, p 191
 - 24. Michael Marrus, *Sam Bronfman: The Life and Times of Seagram's Mr. Sam* (1991), pp. 213, 224, 225, 227, 229, 249, 294, 321, 412, 459, 466
 - 25. *ibid*
 - 26. *ibid*, p 410
 - 27. *ibid*, p 409
 - 28. *LEXPERT—Canadian Legal Directory*—Goodman Phillips & Vineberg (legal ad), reference the following URL: <http://www.lexpert.ca/firms/goodmanphil.html> (2000)
 - 29. Bernard Bloomfield, *Israel Diary* (1950), pp. 162-163
 - 30. See Bloomfield endnote.
 - 31. *ibid*
 - 32. Encyclopedia Britannica: *Arab Revolt* (1936 - 1939)
 - 33. *ibid*
 - 34. *General Charles Orde Wingate* (brief biography), The Pedagogic Center, The Department for Jewish Zionist Education, The Jewish Agency for Israel (NOTE: Given Bloomfield's friendship with Wingate's widow in 1950, and Bloomfield's service with British Intelligence in the late 1930s, one can surmise that Bloomfield assisted Wingate in the training of Haganah soldiers during the Arab Revolt (1936 - 1939).
 - 35. *ibid*
 - 36. Encyclopedia Britannica: *Arab Revolt* (1936 - 1939)
 - 37. *ibid*
 - 38. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire: The Plot That Killed Kennedy* (1989), p 499

39. *Histadrut Award: Bloomfield to be Honored* (1967), Montreal Newspaper article, declassified document (Sept. 1, 1982), FOI Case No. 8201020, United States Department of State
40. Transcript of Steve Rivele's interview from Nigel Turner's documentary, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy* (1988). Rivele stated that the Corsican assassins "were flown by a private plane from Dallas to Montreal... the people who met them in Montreal were established contacts who were used to moving people in and out of the country. And that from Montreal they returned to Marseilles." These established contacts were likely Bronfman and Bloomfield et al.
41. CIA had long history with Guerini Family. Alfred W. McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*; reference *The Mafia Comes to Asia*, pp. 37 - 47.
42. Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista*, p. 91. Christian David stated, in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, that Lucien Sarti was one of the assassins. In the stated documentary, David conveyed to researcher Steve Rivele that Sarti shot Kennedy from the grassy knoll, that he used exploding bullets, that he was dressed as a policeman, and that there were two other Corsican assassins. David would only reveal Sarti's name because he was dead, but the other two were still alive, and David feared reprisals if he identified them. David's story was corroborated by Michel Nicoli in the same documentary. Nicoli's face was covered, but it was revealed that he had been in the heroin trafficking business. Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock, the authors of *Contrabandista*, revealed that Auguste Joseph Ricord had four violent lieutenants: Christen David (Ricord's bodyguard), Lucien Sarti, François Chiappe, and Jean-Paul Angeletti. Clark and Horrock also indicated that Michel Nicoli worked for Christian David in Auguste Ricord's worldwide heroin cartel.
43. Phillips and Vineberg opened an office in Paris in 1961. Source: *LEXPERT—Canadian Legal Directory*—Goodman Phillips & Vineberg, reference the following URL: <http://www.lexpert.ca/firms/goodmanphil.html> (2000)

Chapter 5: The French-Corsican-Latin Connection

Overview of Researcher Steve Rivele's Theory

In 1988, researcher Steve Rivele appeared in Nigel Turner's documentary, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. Rivele presented information that he obtained from interviewing French-Corsican hit man, heroin trafficker, and international spy, Christian David. According to David, the contract to kill President Kennedy originated in Marseilles, France by Antoine Guerini, leader of the Corsican Mafia in that city. Three hit men were hired—all members of the Corsican Mafia. According to David, the hit men were flown out of Dallas, after the assassination, to Montreal. From Montreal they were flown by private plane back to Marseilles, France. I found David's account to be plausible because of the Montreal connection. After all, Louis Bloomfield, his brother Bernard, and Sam Bronfman all lived in that city.

Equally intriguing, David's description of the shots fired at President was different from anything I had read or heard before. David learned from the gunmen that there were "three guns, four shots, three hits, one miss." Kennedy was hit twice: once in the back/neck and once in the head. Connally was hit once, but the single bullet apparently caused five wounds in his body. A fourth shot missed the car completely. In addition, two shots were fired almost simultaneously. This explains why so many witnesses stated that they only heard three shots.

David had aroused my curiosity. I got a copy of the Zapruder film and began studying it, comparing it with David's description. Amazingly, his description matched the film completely. Even more astonishing, David's description was completely different from that of acclaimed pathologist, Dr. Cyril Wecht, who also appeared in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. It became clear that Christian David was a man to be taken seriously, even if Dr. Wecht was not. I will critique Dr. Wecht's analysis later. At the moment, however, we will focus on the assassination of President Kennedy from the viewpoint of Christian David, as told to researcher Steve Rivele.

Transcript of Rivele's Interview From The Men Who Killed Kennedy

The following is a transcript of Steve Rivele's research as presented in the documentary, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*:

Steve Rivele:

... The initial turning point was the first meeting that I had with the French narcotics trafficker at Leavenworth Penitentiary. His name was Christian David [pronounced Dah-veed]. He had been a member of the old French Connection heroin network. He had then been a leader of the Corsican drug trafficking network in South America known as the Latin Connection. And he had also been an intelligence agent for a number of intelligence services around the world. In exchange for my help in finding him an

attorney to represent him against the possibility of his deportation to France after he finished his sentence at Leavenworth, he agreed to give me a certain amount of information concerning the assassination based upon his own knowledge. The first thing that he told me, very reluctantly and only after four or five hours of my arguing with him, was that he was aware that there had been a conspiracy to murder the president, and indeed in May or June of 1963 in Marseilles [France], he had been offered the contract to kill President Kennedy. That was the initial breakthrough, if you will. He was eventually deported to France. I remained in contact with him. I went to Paris to interview him in two prisons in Paris. And in the fear that he would be either committed to an asylum or that he would be convicted of an old murder charge, he gradually gave me additional information about the assassination.

NOTE: The "old murder charge" was the murder of French policeman Lieutenant Maurice Galibert on February 2, 1966.¹ Galibert had been investigating the kidnapping and murder of Moroccan political exile, Mehdi Ben Barka, and David was the prime suspect.²

Rivele (continued):

[David's] position was that there were three killers, and that they had been hired on a contract which had been placed with the leader of the Corsican Mafia at Marseilles, a man named Antoine Guerini. Guerini, he said, was asked to supply three assassins of high quality, experienced killers to murder the President, and that Guerini did so. In the course of one of the first significant conversations I had with David on this subject, he told me that he had been in Marseilles in May or June of 1963, and that every evening he went to Antoine Guerini's club on the old Port of Marseilles to meet people who owed him money. And one evening, Guerini sent for him, asked him to come to the office which was above the club. Guerini told him that he had an important contract, and he asked David if he were interested. David said, "Who's the contract on?" Guerini said, "an American politician." David asked, "Well is it a congressman, a senator?" And Guerini said, "higher than that... The highest vegetable." At that point of course David knew who he was talking about. David asked him where was the contract to be carried out. And when Guerini said it would be done inside the United States, David refused on the grounds that that was much too dangerous.

Now David initially would only give me the first name of one of the three men on the grounds that two of the three were still alive and since they were members of this Corsican milieu, which has a code of silence and a code of vendetta, if he named them, he himself would be murdered. However, he did agree to give me

the first name of the third man who he said was dead. And that man he said was named "Lucien." I then spent a great deal of time in Paris and Marseilles trying to find out who this Lucien was. And through contacts that I made in the journalistic and police and intelligence communities, I was able to determine that this Lucien was in fact a Corsican drug trafficker and killer of the 1960s and 70s by the name of Lucien Sarti. Sarti had been killed in Mexico City in 1972.

I confronted David with the name of Sarti, and he in effect confirmed that that was the man he had referred to. He was an extremely reckless, very daring man, known and despised even by his colleagues for taking enormous chances. But that same recklessness made him one of the most successful contract killers and drug traffickers of his era.

[Narrator's voice:]

Having identified Sarti, Christian David, fearing for his life, refused to name the other two assassins recruited to kill Kennedy. Nonetheless, in successive interviews, he slowly began to reveal how the contract placed ... in Marseilles, had been carried out.

Steve Rivele:

In the fall of 1963, the three killers were flown from Marseilles to Mexico City where they spent some three or four weeks at the house of a contact in Mexico City. He said that they were then driven from Mexico City to the US border at Brownsville, Texas. They crossed the border using Italian passports. He said that they were picked up on the American side of the border at Brownsville by a representative of the Chicago Mafia with whom they conversed in Italian. They were then driven to Dallas and put up in a safehouse which had been prepared for them so as not to leave any hotel records. He said that they spent several days taking photographs of Dealey Plaza, and in the evenings at the safehouse they studied the photographs and they arranged what he called a crossfire with three guns.

On the question of the actual murder, he was reasonably specific that two of the assassins were in buildings behind the President's limousine. He did not know which buildings. However, he did specify that one was high and one was low. In fact he said ...[in French]... "almost on the horizontal." And he went on to add, "You can't understand the wounds unless you understand that one of the men was almost on the horizontal."

NOTE: I interpreted Christian David's comments about "the horizontal" to mean that one of the assassins fired at Kennedy from behind on the ground level, likely from the Dal-Tex Building. When David stated that "You can't understand the wounds unless you understand that one of the men was almost on the horizontal," it seems that he was suggesting that Kennedy's neck wound was caused by a gunman firing from the ground level. As I stated before, the bullet that hit Kennedy in the neck probably entered the back of the neck and exited the front. Again, this is corroborated somewhat by Connally's immediate reaction—which was captured on the Zapruder film—when he turned and looked behind after hearing the first shot.

Rivele (continued):

In a separate conversation with David, I asked him based upon what I knew about Sarti's penchant for changing his appearance, whether Sarti had ever said anything to him about having worn a disguise. And David said, "What do you mean by a disguise?" I asked him, "Did Sarti ever indicate that he wore clothing other than he normally would have worn?" And David thought about it for a moment and said, "He wore a uniform." I asked him what kind of uniform and he refused to answer. But he did add that on jobs like this, they were always in disguise. He said if, for example, there were a military post nearby, they would dress in military uniforms.

He said that there were four shots; that the first shot was fired from the rear and struck the president in the back. The second shot was also fired from the rear, and as David said, "hit the other man in the car." The third shot was fired by Sarti from the front, struck the President in the head; and the fourth shot was fired from the rear and missed the automobile entirely. So his scenario as he claims to have learned it from the gunmen was "three guns, four shots; three hits, one miss." He also added at one point that two of the shots were fired almost simultaneously.

He said that in the moment of panic which always follows an incident of this kind, they were able to get away from Dealey Plaza and go back to the safehouse. He made the specific point that the worst thing that you can do at a moment like that is to try to escape. And so they stayed in their safehouse for some ten days until things quieted down sufficiently, and then they were flown by a private plane from Dallas to Montreal.

He said that the people who met them in Montreal were established contacts who were used to moving people in and out of the country. And that from Montreal they returned to Marseilles.

Now having told me all of this, I presented to him the obvious problem which was his personal lack of credibility. And I asked

him, "Was there anybody in the world who could substantiate this story?" And it was at that point, after thinking about it for a minute, that he advised me to go and look for a man named "Michel".

[Narrator's voice:]

Michel Nicoli could have been anywhere in the world. A former narcotics trafficker turned government informant, he had become a United States federally protected witness and had officially "disappeared".

Steve Rivele:

I searched for him in Europe, North America, Central America, South America. I traveled many thousands of miles, spoke to hundreds and hundreds of people. I was given a lot of false leads. I took out coded ads in newspapers all over the world addressed to him using language that he would understand. And finally in June of 1986, I almost by accident found the one person in the US Government who knew where he was. He was a very high official of the Drug Enforcement Administration. I was able to persuade this man to put me in touch with him, without telling him why I wanted to talk to Michel. And he agreed to do so. My DEA contact at one point said to me that in the thirty years that he had been in the business, Michel was the best witness he'd ever had. He had never given the government false or misleading information. And if he said something was true, as my friend said, "You could go to the bank on it." Another DEA official whom I spoke to in Marseilles who has known Michel as a witness said he's always been, in his words, "a dynamite witness".

[The scene changed to Michel Nicoli whose face was electronically blocked from view. The actual conversation was in French. Interpreters translated to English.]

Interviewer:

Have you had any contact whatever with Christian David recently?

Nicoli:

No, I haven't.

Interviewer:

For how long?

Nicoli:

Not since we were in Brazil together. I caught sight of him in prison. Only in passing, that's all. We haven't been in touch.

Interviewer:

So that's how long it's been since you have had any contact with him.

Nicoli:

In 1972 we came back from Brazil together. I met him in prison. Or rather I caught a glimpse of him in criminal court. That's all. I just caught sight of him. That's all. Since then, I haven't seen him.

[Scene switches back to Steve Rivele interjecting a comment.]

In the course of three subsequent conversations, among other things, Michel confirmed that Lucien Sarti was one of the three killers. And I went through with him the details that David had given me. He confirmed all of the details with the exception of two, in which case he said he did not know those specifics. But he did say that he had learned the details from the same source at the same time as David had.

[Scene switches back to Michel Nicoli.]

When we met in a bar in Argentina in 1966 I think. Christian David was present. There were four or five, five or six of us. I can't remember exactly.

NOTE: Nicoli may have been referring to a bar in Buenos Aires, Argentina known as the Maison des Anciens Combattants Français. Journalists Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock wrote in their 1973 book, *Contrabandista*, that the Maison was frequented by Auguste Ricord during his post-war years in Argentina, and that Christian David was "one of his principal associates." Clark and Horrock added that the Maison was a "veritable haven for international gangsters."³

Narrator's voice:

The final pieces of the puzzle were falling into place. From the lips of Michel Nicoli, Steve now had the names of the other two assassins. He now sought to confirm their participation from his first informant, still awaiting trial in his prison cell in Paris.

Steve Rivele:

At that point I then went back to David. I gave him all three names, and in effect, he confirmed them. When I showed David an aerial photograph of Dealey Plaza, the first thing he said was, "Show me where the railroad bridge is." I pointed out the bridge over Elm Street, and he said "That was where Sarti wanted to be, but on the morning of the assassination, the bridge was guarded, and he was forced ... to move onto the little hill with the wooden fence." He took up a position from behind the wooden fence from which he fired one shot. And David specified that he used an explosive bullet. He said that Sarti was the only one who used that kind of ammunition, a remark which he refused to explain, and which I didn't understand at the time, until I put the question to Michel. When I asked Michel if it were true that Sarti had used an exploding bullet, Michel sighed and said "Yes, that was what I had heard".

[Scene switches back to Michel Nicoli.]

Nicoli:

Oh yes, it's Lucien Sarti. Me too. I sometimes carried them with me, but I didn't use them.

Interviewer:

What was the advantage of having bullets like that?

Nicoli:

It makes a larger hole in the body. When the bullet flattens out, there aren't any traces. No marks. Nothing.

[Scene switches back to Steve Rivele.]

On the question of payment, Michel agreed with David that the assassins had been paid in heroin. And he went a bit farther. In my first conversation with him, he indicated that although he did not know it at the time, it was he who converted the heroin payment into cash for the assassins. He indicated at least initially, that the three men had appeared at his apartment in Buenos Aires in the months following the assassination with, as he put it, "a substantial quantity of heroin." He was surprised because to his knowledge, it was the first time that any of the three of them had dealt in heroin. But given his reputation for not asking embarrassing questions, he simply agreed to convert the heroin into cash for them.

[Scene switches back to Michel Nicoli and interviewer.]

Interviewer:

Did they ever give you any indication about who was behind this contract?

Nicoli:

No, they didn't talk to me about that. It was Christian David who told me that it was someone in the Mafia, but I don't know who it was.

Interviewer:

But it was known more or less generally [accepted] in this circle of Frenchmen in South America that it was the Mafia that was behind it.

Nicoli:

Yes.

[Scene switches back to Steve Rivele.]

Steve Rivele:

My own conviction at this point is that the contract probably originated with Carlos Marcello of New Orleans who placed it in Marseilles through his colleague Santo Trafficante, Jr. who had the closest relations with Antoine Guerini. Beyond that, it seems reasonable that Giancana of Chicago was involved if we accept David and Michel's idea that the assassins were met at the border by representatives of the Chicago Mafia. And the fact that Sarti's customers were primarily in New York, and the fact that the assassins evidently moved out of the United States through the Montreal corridor, which was very closely linked to the New York Mafia, also suggests that Gambino may have been involved.

[Scene switches back to Michel Nicoli and interviewer.]

Interviewer:

In your view, why would they go so far to find assassins for such a job?

Nicoli:

In my opinion, to obliterate any traces; to fool the government. It's

more difficult to find foreign killers. It's more difficult, in my view.

[Scene switched back to Steve Rivele.]

Steve Rivele:

The Mafia had to hire white men for the job since it was to take place in the American South, which meant that they could not go to the other two centers where one found assassins at that time, namely Beirut and Hong Kong. Secondly, they needed highly experienced, skilled assassins. Thirdly, they needed assassins who if they were caught could not directly be tied to the American Mafia, also who were not known to the American police. And fourthly, once again, if they were caught, assassins who could be counted on not to talk.

[Scene switched back to Michel Nicoli and interviewer.]

Nicoli:

When someone has a contract to kill someone, he is not rubbing out the name; he is rubbing out the person. You just have to kill him, that's all. And according to who it is, you get paid more; according to who it is, and that's all.

Interviewer:

But after all, it was the president of the United States they were talking about.

Nicoli:

If they did it, it's because they didn't give a damn. There are people like David who refused to do it. There were others who didn't refuse.

Interviewer:

But Sarti, would he have been capable of that?

Nicoli:

Oh yes. As a killer, he's capable of anything. It's not a question of sentiment. No sentiment with him.

Portions are deleted. Steve Rivele explained how he went back to the DEA official who had put him in contact with Michel Nicoli. Rivele's DEA contact subsequently referred the case to the FBI who essentially did nothing. In addition, Christian David refused to testify until he was freed from French prison, but he wrote a letter of what

he knows about the Kennedy assassination and gave it to his lawyer in a sealed envelope which was placed in a safe deposit box.

Narrator:

Christian David is still in Paris [prison] on the old murder charge, the shooting of a French policeman [Lieutenant Maurice Galibert⁴] in 1966. He vehemently protests his innocence. His defense lawyer [narrator gave the lawyer's French name, but it could not be discerned] has great faith in the credibility of his client and his extensive knowledge of the criminal underworld.

Lawyer [has heavy French accent]:

David is not anybody. He's a serious man, and American authorities know that David is a serious man. David has been a long time in jail during his life but, anyway, he has [done] a lot of things during his life. Then when David says something, it's serious.

Narrator:

But David has always been extremely reluctant to impart any details of what he knows about the killing of Kennedy, even to his own lawyers.

Lawyer:

He says, 'Yes, I know certain things.'

'Could you tell me those things?' I asked him.

He told me, 'No, I'll talk when I'll be free.'

But he told me, 'I can, if you want, write to you what I know.'

I said, 'All right.'

And then, he wrote to me a letter—a closed letter [in a sealed envelope]. And on this letter it's written [on the outside of the sealed envelope]:

[The lawyer reads, in French, David's note on the sealed envelope. He then translates to English.]

'This letter must be kept in [a safe] deposit by my lawyer until I am free. It is impossible to open it without my authorization.'

There are two signatures: Christian David, Christian David.

I think there is in this envelope details important to find murderers; because I think there were murderers, not only one murderer. That's what ... is in this envelope. That's what I think about that.

[Final comments by Steve Rivele:]

I've become convinced that Oswald had nothing to do with the assassination, and that he was very carefully chosen and very carefully set up to take the blame. Based upon what I've learned, it seems to me that all the principals involved in the plot to kill the President had ties of one kind or another with US intelligence agencies. There was Trafficante and Giancana who had been conspiring with the CIA to assassinate Fidel Castro; Antoine Guerini who had had a relationship with both the OSS and the CIA dating from 1943; and there was Oswald whom I'm satisfied had been used as a low-level intelligence operative. So even though I don't think that the CIA, for example, had anything directly to do with the assassination; on the day after the assassination, they found themselves in a horribly compromised position, a position in which they could very easily have been blackmailed by the plotters into covering up whatever they knew about the assassination.

(*The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, N. Turner)

Criticisms of Steve Rivele's Conclusions

At this point, I must interject a note of sanity. I chose not to omit Steve Rivele's conclusions about the Mafia because I felt it was fair to present his entire theory. Having stated that, I wish to publicly criticize his conclusions and his overall presentation of Christian David's story. Furthermore, I wish to state that I believe Christian David's story is generally true; however, Rivele appears to be misleading the audience about certain key facts. First of all, Rivele omitted the important fact that Christian David and Lucien Sarti eventually became Auguste Ricord's top lieutenants, along with Jean-Paul Angeletti and Francisco "Francois" Chiappe. In addition, Michel Nicoli worked for Christian David in Ricord's heroin cartel in South America.⁵

Secondly, Rivele omitted the fact that Christian David, Lucien Sarti, and Michel Nicoli are discussed at great length in two books: *Contrabandista* (1973), by Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock; and *The Great Heroin Coup* (1976) by Henrik Krüger. Rivele gave the impression that he alone discovered Christian David; however, that is simply not true. This explains why Rivele has never published a book, in English, on the information he disclosed in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. Rivele has, however, authored a French book, *The Murderers of John F. Kennedy*, published in France in 1988.⁶ To my knowledge that book was never translated to English or published in America. This is quite odd. Why wasn't his book written in English so Americans

could read it? After all, his expertise was the assassination of an American president, not a French one. As far as I can determine, the only American work Rivele has authored is the screenplay for Oliver Stone's movie, *Nixon*. I shall have a view things to say about Stone later.

Thirdly, Rivele made a few comments that appear to be disinformation intended to disassociate linkage between the assassins and heroin trafficking which would point to Auguste Ricord. Rivele stated that the three assassins "appeared at [Michel Nicoli's] apartment in Buenos Aires in the months following the assassination with, as he put it, 'a substantial quantity of heroin.' He [Nicoli] was surprised because to his knowledge, it was the first time that any of the three of them had dealt in heroin." Nicoli reportedly converted the heroin to cash for the assassins, although he claimed he did not know they had killed Kennedy at the time. He learned that about three years later.

Rivele's claim that the French-Corsican hit men had never dealt in heroin is difficult to believe. How can that be? If they were gangsters from Marseilles, France, surely they must have dealt with heroin. Marseilles was a major production center of heroin at that time, and Turkey was its primary opium source. When the Mediterranean supply became unavailable, the French-Corsican Mafia in Marseilles migrated to Southeast Asia as their primary source. Rivele himself stated that Christian David had been a "member of the old French Connection heroin network." If David dealt with heroin and he worked with the underworld figures who killed Kennedy, it seems difficult to believe that his "colleagues" would not have dealt with heroin as well. You will recall that according to Rivele, Christian David was offered the contract to kill Kennedy by Antoine Guerini, one of the Guerini brothers—a French-Corsican crime family from Marseilles that was quite familiar with heroin trafficking.

Rivele's "never dealt in heroin" remark becomes somewhat comical when you realize that Michel Nicoli was living in an apartment in Buenos Aires, Argentina when the assassins looked him up in early 1964. Authors Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock indicated in their 1973 book, *Contrabandista*, that Auguste Ricord—the heroin kingpin—was living in Buenos Aires at that time. For people who had never dealt in heroin before, these guys (the assassins) sure knew a lot a folks in that line of work. It is quite clear that Steve Rivele was protecting Auguste Ricord.

Fourthly, one has to question Rivele's credibility when he made the following statement: "I don't think that the CIA, for example, had anything directly to do with the assassination." Like so many others, Rivele tried to blame the conspiracy solely on the Mafia. The CIA's only crime, according to Rivele, was that they had done business with the Mafia in the past. Therefore, they had reason to cover-up the truth about the Kennedy assassination. Given Rivele's obvious knowledge of the Kennedy assassination, this conclusion is absurd. Rivele admitted that Antoine Guerini had a relationship with the OSS dating back to 1943, but he did not mention Louis Bloomfield—a well-known OSS/CIA operative and major supporter of Israel—who also had a law office, Phillips in Vineberg, in Paris.⁷

Rivele should have mentioned Bloomfield since David stated that the assassins were flown, after the assassination, from Dallas to Montreal and from Montreal to Marseilles. Louis Bloomfield lived in Montreal. So did his brother Bernard Bloomfield and Sam Bronfman. All three men were highly influential Zionists. Given

that Bloomfield had been an OSS and CIA operative and was an ardent supporter of Israel, this points to Mossad as well. These facts point more to Israel than the Mafia, not to mention the CIA. And Christian David had a vast background with French intelligence, specifically SDECE, which surely interacts with the CIA. Obviously there was a strong presence of American and French-Corsican underworld figures in Kennedy's murder. But in plain English, Rivele's dismissal of CIA involvement was nonsense.

Even Rivele's statements about the Mafia were off-track. He stated that Santo Trafficante was likely involved, but he failed to mention that Trafficante was a top lieutenant for Jewish Mafia chief Meyer Lansky. Lansky's involvement in heroin trafficking and opium smuggling from the Golden Triangle was documented in Alfred McCoy's 1972 book, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.⁸ In addition, the 1979 House Select Committee on Assassinations linked Meyer Lansky to Jack Ruby.⁹

Lastly, it is highly possible that Clay Shaw asked Antoine Guerini to recruit French-Corsican assassins to kill President Kennedy. Shaw also worked for the OSS in the 1940s and held the rank of Colonel.¹⁰ As previously stated in Chapter 3, there is strong circumstantial evidence that Shaw also served as a Colonel in the French espionage organization, Service de Documentation Exterieur et de Contre Espionage (SDECE), under the aliases of a Colonel René Bertrand and Colonel Beaumont.¹¹ The French Colonel was close friends with Jo Attia who worked with the Guerini brothers—which included Antoine Guerini, the man who Christian David claimed offered him the contract to kill President Kennedy in May or June of 1963 in Guerini's club in Marseilles. According to Danish journalist Henrik Krüger, it was Attia who first introduced Christian David to the world of espionage.¹² I suspect this information is in Christian David's letter which is in a sealed envelope in a safe deposit box.

The Three Assassins

I have mentioned several times the 1973 book, *Contrabandista*, written by Evert Clark and Nicholas Horrock. *Contrabandista* corroborates much of Christian David's story, and it reveals the identities of two other hit men who worked with Lucien Sarti that I believe were his accomplices—assassins—in murdering President Kennedy. Their names were Jean-Paul Angeletti and Francisco "Francois" Chiappe. Several facts point to them as the assassins.

First of all, the book *Contrabandista* fits David's description of the assassins like a glove. Although the book discusses David a great deal, it is really about Auguste Joseph Ricord—the French-Corsican underworld figure, Nazi collaborator, and heroin kingpin of Latin America. The book named five individuals as Ricord's main assistants. Of those five, three appeared in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. They were Christian David, Michel Nicoli, and Lucien Sarti (posthumously). It was stated in the documentary that two unnamed French-Corsican hit men assisted Sarti in the assassination. In *Contrabandista*, Clark and Horrock named two additional men—of the five top people in Ricord's cartel—who fit the descriptions of the two unnamed assassins. They were Jean-Paul Angeletti and Francisco "Francois" Chiappe. Those

two men, plus Sarti and David, became Auguste Ricord's top four lieutenants in the late 1960s. Michel Nicoli—another man who appeared in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*—was one of two deputies who reported to Christian David. The other was William Perrin.¹³ (Footnote 8)

Secondly, Angeletti and Chiappe were wanted for murder, as were David and Sarti (according to Clark and Horrock). *Contrabandista* states that David, Sarti, Angeletti, and Chiappe were extremely violent men who carried guns constantly and did not hesitate to use them.¹⁴ The authors specifically stated that Sarti and Chiappe were what Latins call "pistoleros."¹⁵

Thirdly, Henrik Krüger wrote in his 1976 book—*The Great Heroin Coup*—that François Chiappe's nickname was "Big Lips."¹⁶ This is significant because several eye witnesses to the Kennedy assassination said they saw a "negro" man with a rifle looking out of a window on the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository minutes before the assassination.¹⁷ With a bit of dark make-up, a white man with big lips could easily pass for being black, especially from a distance. In addition, Christian David told Steve Rivele that "on jobs like this [political assassinations], they were always in disguise." (Reference transcript from *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*.)

Fourth point: Krüger wrote that Chiappe "had worked for the Guerini mob"¹⁸ which means that Antoine Guerini very well might have offered him the contract to kill Kennedy, just as he had offered it to Christian David.

Fifth point: Angeletti, Chiappe, and Sarti were very big players in the heroin business. They were also French-Corsicans with ties to The Guerini Family of Marseilles. Alfred McCoy—primary author of *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*—linked the Guerini Family to heroin smuggling from Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War. In addition, Kennedy's assassination has been linked to escalation of the Vietnam War (reference Jim Garrison and other researchers). Angeletti, Chiappe, and Sarti all worked as lieutenants for Auguste Ricord who was a direct beneficiary of drugs produced in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War. He smuggled narcotics made from opium grown in the Golden Triangle back into the United States. Ricord was the number one smuggler of heroin into the United States during the late 1960s and early 70s. Put it all together and this makes Angeletti, Chiappe, and Sarti prime suspects in the assassination of President Kennedy.

Christian David

Christian David was a French Corsican who eventually became Auguste Ricord's bodyguard and headed one of Ricord's five divisions. He was also a bold international criminal, highly respected and feared within the underworld, who had lived with violence since his childhood in occupied France. His criminal career swung like a pendulum, mostly doing mercenary work for both the French underground but often performing assignments for that country's secret political police as well.¹⁹

David was born in 1929 in the city of Bordeaux in the south of France.²⁰ He was about 33 or 34 years old when President Kennedy was killed on November 22,

1963.²¹ He was only 58 when he appeared in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy* 1988, although he looked like an old man in the documentary because he had endured severe torture in a Brazilian prison in 1972.²²

Of medium height and slender physique, a swarthy complexion common among Corsicans, a younger healthier Christian David walked with the firm, assured stride of a warrior, preferred elegantly tailored Continental-style clothes, and always carried a weapon. He was carrying a pistol with a silencer and a grenade when the Brazilian police arrested him in 1972.

Danish journalist Henrik Krüger wrote the following description of Christian David in his book, *The Great Heroin Coup*:

[Christian David has] been a pimp, robber, hired assassin for French intelligence, hatchet man in Algiers torture chambers, arms trader, spy, narcotics trafficker and true to form, lover of beautiful women. He's one of the few alive who knows the truth about the Ben Barka affair that shook France in 1965; he knows details of the brutal power struggle within French intelligence agency SDECE; of SDECE collaboration with the Corsican Mafia; and of the secret CIA operations in Latin America. Ample grounds for anyone's paranoia. But David is cunning and tough, and that is why he's still alive.²³

David liked to gamble; he loved the casinos in Rio, Buenos Aires, Asunción, and Montevideo. Although he was Corsican—known for their code of silence—David had a reputation as a talker. He once boasted that in 1969 Ricord's organization had moved 1,000 kilograms of heroin into the United States in one big load. The heroin had been concealed in bags of money, placed in an armored truck, driven from Mexico to Houston, Texas, where it was stored in a warehouse then later distributed to buyers in Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, and New York.²⁴

Often using aliases, Jean-Pierre, Eduardo, and Beau Serge,²⁵ David was often seen with Auguste Ricord at the Maison des Anciens Combattants Français, a well-known haven for international gangsters in Buenos Aires, Argentina. David was an international criminal at that time. In the 1960s he was wanted by the French authorities for murdering Paris Policeman Lieutenant Maurice Galibert²⁶—who, when he was shot, was investigating the kidnapping and murder of Moroccan political exile, Mehdi Ben Barka.²⁷ This indicates that Christian David was likely involved in Ben Barka's death.

Mehdi Ben Barka was a Moroccan revolutionary politician who lived in exile in Paris in the early Sixties. It was widely viewed that Ben Barka would soon be president for the Republic of Morocco. When Morocco and Algeria had a brief war in 1963, Ben Barka sided with Algeria and went into exile. He was subsequently accused of high treason for an alleged plot against King Hassan II and was sentenced in absentia to death. He moved to Paris and became leader-in-exile of the opposition to Hassan. On October 29, 1965, Ben Barka disappeared. He was never found, and investigators concluded that gangsters were paid to kidnap and murder him. It was suggested

several times that the plot was headed by General Muhammad Oufkir, Hassan's minister of the interior. The Ben Barka affair created a political crisis for the government of French President Charles de Gaulle and led to ruptured diplomatic relations between France and Morocco for almost four years.²⁸

In the spring, summer, and fall of 1972, the governments of South and Central American were working with the Nixon administration to stop heroin from being smuggled into the United States. In October 1972 the Brazilian federal police arrested David and Nicoli along with several other Brazilian underworld figures. Most of them were using false identity papers. David, Nicoli, and another Frenchmen were transported by air to federal police headquarters in Brazilia, the nation's capital, where Brazilian police interrogated them in a manner that has made Brazil notorious throughout the world.²⁹

David was stripped of his clothing and hung upside down in the interrogation cell. He claimed he was tortured with electric shocks applied to his testicles and the head of his penis. Evidently he did not talk; however, the torture became so severe that he attempted suicide by swallowing a light bulb rather than undergo more. He later cut his wrists with glass fragments. After that he walked bowlegged from the pain.³⁰ This was the Christian David that the world saw in Nigel Turner's documentary, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*—a man of 58 using a walker who appeared to be closer to 80.

Ultimately David was extradited to the United States, along with Auguste Ricord, for heroin smuggling. This was part of the Nixon administration's war on drugs. David was taken to a Brooklyn courthouse where his bail was set at \$2.5 million. Within two weeks federal judge Jacob Mishler sentenced David to twenty years in prison for smuggling half a ton of heroin into the United States. In addition, the trial revealed David's ties to the French intelligence service known as Service d'Action Civique (SAC). His tri-colored SAC ID was placed on display as he explained: "I was taken from prison in 1961 to work for an organization called SAC. It was arranged by someone with connections in the highest political circles." He also commented on his incarceration in Brazil: "I was tortured by the Brazilians for thirty days and fed nothing for twenty-six days. They stole my money. Today I can't afford a lawyer, I haven't a cent."³¹

Michel Nicoli

Michel Nicoli was the man who corroborated Christian David's claim, in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, that Lucien Sarti and two other "unnamed" Corsican assassins shot and killed President Kennedy; and that Sarti, while dressed as a police officer standing behind the picket fence on the grassy knoll, shot Kennedy in the head using an exploding bullet.

Michel Nicoli was the same age as Christian David; born in about 1929. He was about 33 or 34 years old when President Kennedy was killed on November 22, 1963.³² He was Christian David's deputy in Auguste Ricord's drug cartel. David, as stated before, was Ricord's personal bodyguard and became one of Ricord's top four lieutenants as well.

Nicoli was quite different from Ricord's violent lieutenants, Christian David, Lucien Sarti, François Chiappe, and Jean-Paul Angeletti, in that he was far less lethal; although he carried a gun from time to time for protection. In his line of work, this was not unwise; however, Nicoli was quite sophisticated and a smooth convincing talker, which made him an excellent witness as Steve Rivele pointed out in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. Although he was obviously a criminal, he had the reputation among narcotics agents for giving truthful and consistent information when he talked. Corsican criminals in particular are taken seriously because they have an ancient tradition of not talking when captured, even when tortured. Consequently, when one of them talks, people listen. But capturing Nicoli in a compromising situation where it was beneficial for him to talk was no small task.

As a drug trafficker, Nicoli exemplified the qualities that confounded and frustrated narcotics agents to no end. He was a master at changing identities. He used several aliases: Abraham Goldman, Miguel dos Santos, and Raniers, to name a few.³³

Frank DeSantis, an American Customs agent said of Nicoli in the early 1970s: "It's fantastic. These people are not jerks. We've ripped off a thousand of their couriers and this group doesn't founder. It perseveres. They change identities like we change shirts. Take Raniers [Michel Nicoli], who is Miguel—we get six countries telling us he's six different people. Bust him, and he doesn't give you just a passport—he gives you documents *like this!*" DeSantis pointed to a stack about six inches high. "Driver's license, BankAmerica, the works. The people in junk—everybody knows about complexity, but the phony identification you wouldn't believe!"³⁴

Layers of multiple identification, and supporting legal documentation, was a technique Michel Nicoli learned from Auguste Ricord who mastered this wily approach during his career with the Gestapo under German-occupied France during World War II.³⁵

In October 1972 the Brazilian federal police arrested Nicoli along with Christian David and several other Brazilian underworld figures. Like David, Nicoli was also tortured; stripped, hung upside down and tortured with electric shocks. Like Christian David he apparently did not talk, which intensified and prolonged the torture. He became depressed, began banging his head into the cell walls. Later he was examined by American authorities who observed bumps and bruises on his head, and found indications of permanent nerve damage.³⁶

Obviously he recovered by 1988 when he appeared in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. At least he appeared to be in much better physical condition than his old friend Christian David, who was the same age, 58 at the time.

Auguste Joseph Ricord, the Heroin Kingpin

Auguste Joseph Ricord was a French Corsican born in Marseilles, France on April 26, 1911.³⁷ He was 52 years old when President Kennedy was killed on November 22, 1963. He was 62 when he was convicted of drug trafficking in the United States in 1973. A small-framed man, he stood less than five feet four; a half-inch scar crossed

his right upper lip. By the early 1970s his hair was gray-white, although not much was left of it.³⁸

Marseilles is the largest commercial seaport in France and the second largest city. Founded more than 2,500 years ago, it is located on the Mediterranean's Gulf of Lion within a semicircle of limestone hills. Although a colorful city, Marseilles has a history of vigorous independence and criminal activity.³⁹ Most law-enforcement people familiar with Auguste Ricord believe it was the sinister influences within the ancient city of Marseilles that led Ricord not only to a life of crime, but developed him into a tough con artist, a master of deception.⁴⁰ A cunning, hardened man, Ricord acquired a skill for slipping out of trouble as easily as he slipped into it.⁴¹

Two weeks before his sixteenth birthday, Ricord was convicted of theft and extortion. Within a few months the Marseilles authorities had added another entry to his record: "violence, unauthorized possession of a firearm."⁴² At that point Ricord left Marseilles and became a fugitive living on the run. While in Paris, on November 15, 1927, another entry was added to his criminal record: "possession and sale of stolen property."⁴³ On January 3, 1939 the police in Paris arrested him for unauthorized possession of a side arm.⁴⁴ After that the Paris police reported that he "lived from the proceeds earned from prostitution but was never arrested for it."⁴⁵

When the Nazis marched through Paris in June of 1940 they formed alliances with various elements within the criminal underworld. Auguste Joseph Ricord was one of those people.⁴⁶ It is not known precisely what role he played with the Nazis, but in July 1950, he was convicted of collaborating with the Third Reich and sentenced to death in absentia by the Permanent Military Court of Paris. A year later the civilian court of Eure-et-Loir reduced his sentence to twenty years hard labor and ten years banishment from France; the latter sentence was for a theft conviction several years earlier.⁴⁷

After World War II Ricord knew he would soon be declared an enemy of France because of his Gestapo connections. Consequently, he fled the country, first going to Germany and Austria, then settling in Milan, Italy for a time. In 1948 he moved to Buenos Aires, Argentina, thereby escaping the French death sentence in 1950.⁴⁸

Somewhere along the way Ricord left behind a wife, probably in Paris. In Buenos Aires he remarried a shapely German-born nightclub stripper named Ingebord Gabski. Together they had a daughter, Josephine Brigitte (or Josefina Brigita in Spanish), before separating in 1960.⁴⁹

While living in Paris, Ricord reportedly owned a restaurant, called the Navarin, with his half-sister, Maria Traversa Bonsigour. They sold it for \$40,000 before fleeing the country.⁵⁰

Ricord later boasted from his jail cell in the Tacumbu prison—the largest prison in Asuncion, Paraguay—that he had left France for Italy and South America "with more than \$100,000 in my pockets."⁵¹

After moving to Argentina Ricord operated several restaurants and night clubs, with help from Maria. First he bought two night clubs, Le Fetiche and Lido. At various

times he owned and operated six restaurants: El Nido, Chez Danielle, L'Etoile, the Bar el Sol (later renamed L'Auberge Provençale), the M. André, and the Pompitor.⁵²

Ricord's business soon turned into a vast underworld enterprise. He used several aliases: M. André, Cori, Dédé,⁵³ Lucien Darguelles.⁵⁴ He also used variations of his real name: Auguste José Gallese (his parents' name), and variations on existing aliases: Lucien Dorguelle, Lucio Maria Darguelles, or Lucien Gegelles.⁵⁵ Maintaining multiple identities was a con-trick he learned as a young man in Paris.⁵⁶

Although ostensibly a restaurateur and nightclub owner, the bulk of his income came from his interest in prostitution. According to some estimates, revenues from Ricord's enterprise ran as high as \$3 million a year. His business was based in Buenos Aires but spread into Brazil, Uruguay, and Caracas, Venezuela.⁵⁷ Much of his fast-growing power was attributed to his expertise at harboring international criminals—many of them were ex-Nazis or Nazi collaborators from France when Germany occupied that country—by channeling them into his prostitution syndicate.⁵⁸ Many "trusted men" within the underworld were sent to Ricord from Marseilles, Algiers, Milan, Casablanca, Rome, and Barcelona. These fugitives would meet Ricord, or his designee, at the Bar el Sol at 380 Marconi Street in the suburb of Olivos.⁵⁹ In addition, Ricord used to frequent the Maison des Anciens Combattants Français, a well-known haven for international gangsters.⁶⁰

In 1957 Ricord was arrested by the Argentine police for corruption and criminal association after Interpol—the international police information-swapping organization—learned of his prostitution network. The French quickly learned of his arrest and requested that Argentina hand him over for previous convictions which included, primarily, collaborating with the Nazis. Interpol, however, did not recognize that as a crime. In addition, Argentina refused to extradite Ricord. Like Uruguay, Argentina was populated by many European immigrants who fled their homelands to escape political oppression. As a result, the Argentine government turned the French down and released Ricord. He immediately fled to Montevideo, Uruguay and used the alias, Lucien Darguelles. In Uruguay, France sought his extradition again, but Uruguay followed Argentina's lead and refused to hand him over to the French authorities. Ricord was soon released and quickly went underground but surfaced in Caracas, Venezuela in 1958 as the owner of Le Domino, a nightclub that was very active in prostitution.⁶¹

In 1967 François Chiappe accompanied Auguste Ricord to his lawyer's office (at 1800 Calle La Valle, Buenos Aires, Argentina) when Ricord gave Jacob Grodnitzky, alias Jack Grosby, \$20,000 to pay the bail for Ricord's nephew, Louis Bonsignour, alias Felipe Spadaro. Louis was the son of Ricord's half-sister, Maria Traversa Bonsignour. Louis had been arrested in the United States and indicted, in May 1967, for conspiring to smuggle heroin into the country.⁶² Grodnitzky had been solicited by Louis's girlfriend to fly to Argentina and get \$20,000 for his bail. Also present at Ricord's lawyer's office were Christian David, Michel Nicoli, among others.⁶³

The stated meeting is significant because it would eventually be used by US narcotics agents to reveal Ricord's South American involvement in heroin trafficking. Prior to 1967, US narcotics agents thought that most of the heroin smuggled into the US came solely from a French smuggling ring. Ricord's nephew, Louis Bonsignour, was

French and, consequently, the US narcotics agents had incorrectly assumed that France was the source of the smuggling ring. The fact that Louis's bail money came from his uncle in Argentina would eventually be used to build a case against Ricord as the kingpin of a Latin-based heroin cartel.

Around 1968 Ricord returned to Argentina. Almost immediately he helped two old acquaintances, Lucien Sarti and Francisco "François" Chiappe, both fugitive Corsican murderers on the run. Sarti was wanted for murdering a Belgian policeman and Chiappe had been sentenced to death for another murder. Shortly after arriving in Argentina, and being given safe haven by Ricord, the two fugitives held up a money order exchange. The police arrested them and Ricord. A search of Ricord's restaurant near the Rio de la Plata Football Stadium in Buenos Aires turned up a cache of arms, including machine guns. Ricord was declared *persona non grata* and kicked out of Argentina. Ironically, none of them went to jail for the crime.⁶⁴ It was the machine guns and other arms found after their arrest that got Ricord ousted from Argentina, not the armed robbery by Sarti and Chiappe.⁶⁵ Ricord then moved to Asunción, Paraguay.⁶⁶

It is not known for certain exactly when Ricord began trafficking narcotics, but a French intelligence report indicated that it began between 1957 and 1968, flourished after his arrival in Paraguay.⁶⁷ Paraguay was the perfect location to manage a large-scale heroin cartel. It was basically uninhabited—two and a half million people crowded around Asunción. The Chaco Boreal^(Footnote 9) is two-thirds of the land area but only 100,000 people live out there, and it is full of landing fields unmonitored by governmental authorities.⁶⁸

By 1969—at the age of 59—Ricord's health began to weaken. He suffered from diabetes and was frequently struck by terrible weariness or bursts of listlessness and dissatisfaction. He felt under pressure because he was a fugitive in many countries; Argentina had thrown him out twice; Uruguay once; his homeland France wanted him back but only to put him in jail.⁶⁹ His four younger lieutenants—Christian David, Lucien Sarti, Francois Chiappe, and Jean-Paul Angeletti—had strong ambitions and were greedy to establish themselves. All four had come to him from Europe fleeing police warrants. Although he gave them political safety, false documents, and responsibilities within his criminal enterprise, Ricord sometimes feared that his leadership was being eroded by these aggressive younger men.⁷⁰

One of the few things that gave him pleasure was the construction of Le Paris-Niza, an inn and restaurant in Asunción, Paraguay. It ended up costing over \$100,000, but it was more than a restaurant. It was his Franco-Mediterranean island in Latin America. He took particular pride in the restaurant. He hired an expatriate French couple to manage it and insisted that the waiters be taught the Gallic manner of serving.⁷¹

When President Nixon took office in January 1969, he stepped up the war on drugs and focused on heroin smuggling. Under Nixon's direction the Ricord Case became a joint effort between the US Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (USBND) and the Bureau of Customs.⁷²

In the late Sixties narcotics agents realized that heroin shipments were being sent to the United States by way of South America, although rumors of the Latin route had

been around since 1964 and 65.⁷³ Customs agent Albert W. Seeley—the man who built the case against Ricord—said that in 1962, the amount of heroin being smuggled into the United States was "no big deal."⁷⁴ Special Agent Bill Knierem, with the Bureau of Customs, stated the following in a 1973 interview:

From '62 to '67 it was all bodies and suitcases. [The term "bodies" means that individual smugglers/couriers strapped packets of heroin to their bodies.] They get it in France, they go to the US, Canada, Mexico. We are getting beat. They also begin to ship from Europe in freezers, in oscilloscopes. Automobiles get knocked off. They are full of it. The French must have been saying, 'You Customs guys got no imagination at all.'

'60 to '68 was still a good period for federal law enforcement. Then the red lines (he points to the smuggling routes marked in red on his flip chart) begin to fan out. Fort Lauderdale, Boston, Washington, et cetera. It's no longer just New York and Montreal—they're coming in everywhere.

We are looking at Marseilles and Barcelona and New York and Montreal and they were hitting us underneath, from Latin America. We ought to be ashamed there. We were looking the wrong way. It was basically a failure in law enforcement."⁷⁵

The observations of narcotics agents Seeley and Knierem are significant because they indicate that heroin did not become a problem until around the time of President Kennedy's assassination in 1963, and it slowly increased thereafter until becoming an epidemic in 1968. That was the year that Richard Nixon campaigned for the Presidency. The war on drugs became a major campaign issue for him.

In 1969 the "demand" for heroin in America had increased so dramatically that Ricord decided to use *Contrabandistas*—a network of light aircraft that flew cigarettes, whisky, wigs, and Levis from Miami into various South American countries. This was the only way he could send the high-volumes needed for the US market.⁷⁶

Ricord used the *Contrabandista* network in a three tiered approach. Firstly, a pilot—and usually an assistant—flew a small airplane to an appointed place and waited for instructions. They did not know the buyer of the cargo and without this "connection" they were powerless to hijack the load even if they had wanted to double-cross the system. Secondly, a couple of men were sent to meet the pilot et al and shepherd them to the delivery point. At that point, the shepherds knew where the heroin was and they would transport it to a contact man in New York. This contact man was the "third tier."⁷⁷

The third tier person knew where to drop off the heroin to the buyer. Even the third tier did not know much information about the buyer—not even his/her name. Only Ricord knew that. The third tier was only given a location where the goods would be delivered. Often the third tier would be advised to walk along a certain street at a specified time with a suitcase full of heroin. A car would stop and someone would

quickly snatch it and drive away. They would then meet the third tier in 30 minutes or so to drop off a suitcase full of cash if they felt the quality of the goods was sufficient. Ricord insisted on using a Frenchman, Pierre Gahou, as the third tier contact man with the buyer because he obviously needed someone he could trust. The first two tiers did not have to be as trustworthy because his system was essentially fool-proof at those levels.⁷⁸

On March 15, 1971 a federal grand jury in Manhattan returned a secret indictment against Ricord, charging him with conspiracy to smuggle heroin into the United States.⁷⁹ Paraguay's President General Alfred Stroessner subsequently ordered Ricord's arrest.⁸⁰ The arrest order was carried out March 26, 1971, but President Stroessner had second thoughts about extraditing Ricord to the United States to face conspiracy charges for smuggling heroin. Stroessner had cultural issues with the extradition request. In Paraguay, smuggling was a way of life; and conspiracy laws did not exist. Consequently, Ricord sat in a jail cell in Tacumbu Penitentiary in Asunción, Paraguay for a year and a half while Paraguay and the United States engaged in a diplomatic tug of war over custody of the wily heroin kingpin.⁸¹ Finally in September 1972 Ricord was extradited to the United States and prosecuted for conspiracy to smuggle narcotics into America.⁸² On December 16, 1972 he was convicted of that crime, and on January 19, 1973, he was sentenced to 20 years in prison and fined \$25,000.⁸³

Lucien Sarti

Lucien Sarti was the man who shot President Kennedy in the head with an exploding bullet from behind the picket fence on top of the grassy knoll in Dealey Plaza. Sarti was identified as the stated assassin by Christian David whose assertion was corroborated by Michel Nicoli in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. Sarti was a lieutenant for Auguste Ricord.

Sarti was a French Corsican born in about 1931 and was about 32 years old when President Kennedy was killed on November 22, 1963.⁸⁴ Sarti had been an "enforcer" for criminal elements in Europe. He had killed a policeman in Belgium—a crime that hit men normally avoided lest they incur the wrath of all other policemen in the world.⁸⁵

In December 1967, Sarti managed a heroin smuggling network based in Montreal, Canada for Auguste Ricord. The network consisted of at least 15 couriers who smuggled heroin into New York City from Montreal.⁸⁶

As previously stated the Nixon administration intensified its war on drugs in the spring, summer, and fall of 1972, and the governments of South and Central America worked closely with the United States government to bring down Auguste Ricord and his heroin cartel.

In the spring of 1972 the Mexican authorities were closing in on Lucien Sarti and his younger colleague, Jean-Paul Angeletti. The two men were arrested in La Paz, Bolivia, but were released before the police realized their true identities. Shortly thereafter,

American narcotics agents set up a trace on them. The pair traveled northward, through Peru and across South and Central America, finally stopping at Mexico City forty-five days later. The Americans quietly alerted the Polícia Judicial Federal, the equivalent of Mexico's FBI.⁸⁷

April 27, 1972 was a muggy evening in Mexico City. At about 8:40 pm, a glistening European car stopped quietly at the curb in front of 107 Temistocles Street in an upper-class residential area of Mexico City. The automobile was driven by a beautiful, thirtyish woman in casual, stylish attire. She was later identified as Lucien Sarti's wife, Liliane Rous Vaillet. Shortly after the lovely young lady parked the car, and waited behind the wheel, Sarti walked quickly from the house moving toward the automobile on the driver's side.⁸⁸

Just before he opened the car door, two Mexican agents advanced from the shadows. Instinctively, Sarti drew a .38-caliber Colt Cobra^(Footnote 10) and ran away as fast as he could. A few seconds later he was killed in a hail of bullets when ambushed by several Mexican agents hidden close to the house.⁸⁹

That night another group of Mexican policemen stormed Angeletti's hideout and surprised him while he was having sex. Being caught off-guard probably saved his life. The police officers quickly restrained him before he could grab the pistol on the table nearby.⁹⁰

The Mexican authorities seized fourteen false passports, an abundance of jewels, firearms, cash, and "several notebooks . . . with notes on large and small narcotics distributors." The Mexican police determined that Angeletti, Sarti, and their wives had landed in Mexico from Panama aboard a smuggler's small aircraft. In addition, the Mexican agents determined that the group had been planning to smuggle 100 kilograms of cocaine into the United States.⁹¹

Sarti's body was never claimed and was buried in Mexico. Angeletti, his wife, Sarti's widow, and another drug smuggler arrested with Angeletti that night were eventually extradited to France and Italy.⁹²

Around the same time that Sarti was killed, his former mistress—Hélène Ferreira, a sexy Brazilian model—was arrested in Peru and questioned about Sarti and his Corsican friends. She refused to cooperate at first, so the Peruvian authorities turned her over to the Brazilian police who were infamous for torturing suspects in order to extract information. Whatever they did to her is uncertain, but she began to talk immediately. She told them the whereabouts of an army of Brazilian, Corsican, and Italian underworld figures—including Christian David and Michel Nicoli.⁹³

In October 1972 the Brazilian federal police arrested David and Nicoli along with several other Brazilian underworld figures based on information supplied by Hélène Ferreira—Lucien Sarti's former mistress. Once arrested David and Nicoli were subjected to relentless torture by the Brazilian authorities.⁹⁴

Jean-Paul Angeletti

I have concluded that Jean-Paul Angeletti was one of the three hit men who fired a rifle at President Kennedy's motorcade. He likely took position in either an upper floor in the Texas School Book Depository or the ground floor of the Dal-Tex Building. Angeletti was a lieutenant for Auguste Ricord.

Angeletti was a French Corsican born in about 1941 and was about 22 years old when President Kennedy was killed on November 22, 1963.⁹⁵ He was fairly tall for a Corsican, a thin man with a thin face and dark, straight hair. The heavy bags under his eyes were put there by nature, but they added to his reputation as a swinger, a man who lived it up at the Carnival in Rio every year and frequented gambling casinos in Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay. His criminal record was quite extensive.⁹⁶

Angeletti and Francois Chiappe ran Ricord's heroin cartel while he was incarcerated in a Tacumbu Penitentiary cell in Asunción, Paraguay for over a year—after being arrested in March 1971—pending extradition to the United States.⁹⁷

As previously stated, Angeletti had been traveling with Lucien Sarti when, on April 27, 1972, Sarti was ambushed and killed by Mexican police after resisting arrest and brandishing a firearm. Later that evening Angeletti was arrested by Mexican authorities, caught in the act of making love. Angeletti, his wife, Sarti's widow, and another drug smuggler arrested with Angeletti that night were eventually extradited to France and Italy.⁹⁸

François Chiappe

I have concluded that Francisco "François" Chiappe was one of the three hit men who fired a rifle at President Kennedy's motorcade. He likely took his position in either an upper floor in the Texas School Book Depository or the ground floor of the Dal-Tex Building. Chiappe was a lieutenant for Auguste Ricord.

Chiappe's precise age is not known, although he was considerably younger than Auguste Ricord—presumably within the age-range of his colleagues, Lucien Sarti, Jean-Paul Angeletti, and Christian David.⁹⁹ That means he was born between 1930 and 1941, and consequently, was between 22 and 33 when President Kennedy was killed on November 22, 1963.

Chiappe, a burly, bulky 6-foot French Corsican who weighed about 210 pounds (in 1971), was under sentence of death for two murders in Paris.¹⁰⁰ Chiappe and Jean-Paul Angeletti ran Ricord's heroin cartel while the latter was incarcerated in a Tacumbu Penitentiary cell in Asunción, Paraguay for over a year—after being arrested in March 1971—pending extradition to the United States.¹⁰¹

Chiappe and Michel Russo (another leader within Ricord's syndicate) were arrested by Argentine police in Buenos Aires while attempting to transport over 100 pounds of pure heroin.¹⁰²

As previously stated, it is worth noting that according to author Henrik Krüger, François Chiappe's nickname was "Big Lips."¹⁰³ This is significant because several

eye witnesses to the Kennedy assassination said they saw a black man with a rifle looking out of a window on the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository minutes before the assassination.¹⁰⁴ With a bit of dark make-up, a white man with big lips could easily pass for being black, especially from a distance. In addition, Christian David told Steve Rivele that "on jobs like this [political assassinations], they were always in disguise." (Reference transcript from *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*.)

The Mafia Comes to Asia

Alfred McCoy, et al, described in his 1972 book, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, how the American Mafia and the Corsican crime syndicates of Marseille turned to Southeast Asia in the 1960s as their main supplier of opium. This is critical information because it reveals how the underworld benefited from opium production in Southeast Asia shortly after Kennedy's death. It also reveals that the US military knew of drug trafficking activity in Vietnam but looked the other way. Here is an excerpt from McCoy's book:

The flourishing heroin traffic among Vietnam-based GIs was undoubtedly the most important new market for Indochina's drug traffickers, but it was not the only one. As we have already seen, increasingly insurmountable problems in the Mediterranean Basin had forced the American Mafia and the Corsican syndicates of Marseille to look to Southeast Asia for new sources of heroin and morphine base. Faced with the alternative of finding a new source of morphine base or going out of business, the Corsican syndicates of Marseille turned to their associates in Southeast Asia for help. "There are people who think that once the problem in Turkey is cleaned up, that's the end of the traffic," explains John Warner, chief intelligence analyst for the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics. "But the Corsicans aren't stupid. They saw the handwriting on the wall and began to shift their morphine base sources to Southeast Asia."¹⁰⁵

The Corsican narcotics syndicates based in Saigon and Vientiane had been supplying European drug factories with Southeast Asian morphine base for several years, and links with Marseille were already well established. During the First Indochina War (1946-1954) Corsican gangsters in Marseille and Saigon cooperated closely in smuggling gold, currency, and narcotics between the two ports. In 1962 Corsican gangsters in Saigon reported that Paul Louis Levet, a Bangkok-based syndicate leader, was supplying European heroin laboratories with morphine base from northern Thailand.¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, at least four Corsican charter airlines had played a key role in Southeast Asia's regional opium traffic from 1955 to 1965. Although they were forced out of business when the Laotian generals decided to cut themselves in for a bigger share of the

profits in 1965, most of the Corsicans had remained in Southeast Asia. They had opened up businesses or taken jobs in Vientiane and Saigon to tide themselves over until something new opened up.¹⁰⁷

When Gen. Edward G. Lansdale of the CIA returned to Saigon as a special assistant to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge in 1965, he quickly learned that his old enemies, the Corsicans, were still in town. During the fighting between the French 2ème Bureau and the CIA back in 1955, the Corsican gangsters had been involved in several attempts on his life. "So I wouldn't have to look behind my back every time I walked down the street," Lansdale explained in a June 1971 interview, "I decided to have a meeting with the Corsican leaders. I told them I wasn't interested in doing any criminal investigations; I wasn't in Vietnam for that. And they agreed to leave me alone. We had some kind of a truce." General Lansdale can no longer recall much of what transpired at that meeting. He remembers that a large-busted French-Vietnamese named Helene took an active role in the proceedings, that the affair was amicable enough, but not much else. Lansdale later learned that the Corsicans were still heavily involved in the narcotics traffic, but since this was not his responsibility, he took no action.¹⁰⁸

Most of what Lansdale knew about the Corsicans came from his old friend Lt. Col. Lucien Conein, the CIA agent who had helped engineer President Diem's overthrow in 1963. As a former OSS liaison officer with the French Resistance during World War II, Conein had some experiences in common with many of Saigon's Corsican gangsters. During his long tours of duty in Saigon, Conein spent much of his time in fashionable Corsican-owned bars and restaurants and was on intimate terms with many of Saigon's most important underworld figures. When Conein left Vietnam several years later, the Corsicans presented him with a heavy gold medallion embossed with the Napoleonic Eagle and the Corsican crest. Engraved on the back of it is *Per Tu Amicu Conein* ("For your friendship, Conein"). Conein proudly explains that this medallion is worn by powerful Corsican syndicate leaders around the world and serves as an identification badge for secret meetings, narcotics drops, and the like.¹⁰⁹

Through his friendship with the Corsicans, Conein has gained a healthy respect for them. "The Corsicans are smarter, tougher, and better organized than the Sicilians," says Conein. "They are absolutely ruthless and are the equal of anything we know about the Sicilians, but they hide their internal fighting better." Conein also learned that many Saigon syndicate leaders had relatives in the Marseille underworld. These family relations play an important role in the international drug traffic, Conein feels,

because much of the morphine base used in Marseille's heroin laboratories comes from Saigon. Corsican smugglers in Saigon purchase morphine base through Corsican contacts in Vientiane and ship it on French merchant vessels to relatives and friends in Marseille, where it is processed into heroin.¹¹⁰ "From what I know of them," says Conein, "it will be absolutely impossible to cut off the dope traffic. You can cut it down, but you can never stop it, unless you can get to the growers in the hills."¹¹¹

This pessimism may explain why Conein and Lansdale did not pass on this information to the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics. It is particularly unfortunate that General Lansdale decided to arrange "some kind of a truce" with the Corsicans during the very period when Marseille's heroin laboratories were probably beginning the changeover from Turkish to Southeast Asian morphine base. In a mid-1971 interview, Lieutenant Colonel Conein said that power brokers in Premier Ky's apparatus contacted the leaders of Saigon's- Corsican underworld in 1965-1966 and agreed to let them start making large drug shipments to Europe in exchange for a fixed percentage of the profits. By October 1969 these shipments had become so important to Marseille's heroin laboratories that, according to Conein, there was a summit meeting of Corsican syndicate bosses from around the world at Saigon's Continental Palace Hotel. Syndicate leaders from Marseille, Bangkok, Vientiane, and Phnom Penh flew in for the meeting, which discussed a wide range of international rackets but probably focused on reorganizing the narcotics traffic.¹¹² According to one well-informed U.S. diplomat in Saigon, the U.S. Embassy has a reliable Corsican informant who claims that similar meetings were also held in 1968 and 1970 at the Continental Palace. Most significantly, American Mafia boss Santo Trafficante, Jr., visited Saigon in 1968 and is believed to have contacted Corsican syndicate leaders there. Vietnamese police officials report that the current owner of the Continental Palace is Philippe Franchini, the heir of Mathieu Franchini, the reputed organizer of currency- and opium-smuggling rackets between Saigon and Marseille during the First Indochina War.

Police officials also point out that one of Ky's strongest supporters in the Air Force, Transport Division Commander Col. Phan Phung Tien, is close to many Corsican gangsters and has been implicated in the smuggling of drugs between Laos and Vietnam.

From 1965 to 1967 Gen. Lansdale's Senior Liaison Office worked closely with Premier Ky's administration, and the general himself was identified as one of the young premier's stronger supporters among U.S. mission personnel.¹¹³ One can only wonder whether Conein's and Lansdale's willingness to grant the Corsicans a

"truce" and overlook their growing involvement in the American heroin traffic might not have been motivated by political considerations, i.e., their fear of embarrassing Premier Ky.

Just as most of the Corsican gangsters now still active in Saigon and Vientiane came to Indochina for the first time as camp followers of the French Expeditionary Corps in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the American Mafia followed the U.S. army to Vietnam in 1965. Like any group of intelligent investors, the Mafia is always looking for new financial "frontiers," and when the Vietnam war began to heat up, many of its more entrepreneurial young members were bankrolled by the organization and left for Saigon. Attracted to Vietnam by lucrative construction and service contracts, the mafiosi concentrated on ordinary graft and kickbacks at first, but later branched out into narcotics smuggling as they built up their contacts in Hong Kong and Indochina.

Probably the most important of these pioneers was Frank Carmen Furci, a young mafioso from Tampa, Florida. Although any ordinary businessman would try to hide this kind of family background from his staid corporate associates, Frank Furci found that it impressed the corrupt sergeants, shady profiteers, and Corsican gangsters who were his friends and associates in Saigon. He told them all proudly, "My father is the Mafia boss of Tampa, Florida."¹¹⁴ (Actually, Frank's father, Dominick Furci, is only a middle-ranking lieutenant in the powerful Florida-based family. Santo Trafficante, Jr., is, of course, the Mafia boss of Tampa.¹¹⁵ Furci arrived in Vietnam in 1965 with good financial backing and soon became a key figure in the systematic graft and corruption that began to plague U.S. military clubs in Vietnam as hundreds of thousands of GIs poured into the war zone.¹¹⁶ A lengthy U.S. Senate investigation later exposed the network of graft, bribes, and kickbacks that Furci and his fellow profiteers employed to cheat military clubs and their GI customers out of millions of dollars. At the bottom of the system were 500,000 bored and homesick GIs who found Vietnamese rice too sticky and the strong fish sauce repugnant.

The clubs were managed by senior NCOs, usually sergeant majors, who had made the army their career and were considered dedicated, trustworthy men. While the officers were preoccupied with giving orders and running a war, the sergeants were left with responsibility for all of the minor details involved in managing one of the largest restaurant and night club chains in the world—ordering refrigerators, hiring bands, selecting liquor brands, and negotiating purchasing orders for everything from slot machines to peanuts. Accounting systems were shoddy, and the entire system was pathetically vulnerable to well-organized graft. Seven sergeants who had served together in the Twenty-

fourth Infantry Division at Augsburg, Germany, during the early 1960s had discovered this weakness and exploited it fully, stealing up to \$40,000 a month from NCO clubs.¹¹⁷

In 1965 these seven sergeants started showing up in Vietnam as mess custodians and club managers at the First Infantry Division, the American Division, and U.S. army headquarters at Long Binh.¹¹⁸ Most important of all, the group's ringleader, Sgt William O. Wooldridge, was appointed sergeant major of the army in July 1966. As the army's highest-ranking enlisted man, he served directly under the army chief of staff at the Pentagon, where he was in an ideal position to manipulate personnel transfers and cover up the group's activities.¹¹⁹

At the top of the system were the civilian entrepreneurs—Frank Furci and his competitor, William J. Crum—who worked as agents for a host of American companies and paid the sergeants lavish kickbacks on huge Army purchase orders for kitchen equipment, snacks, liquor, etc.

Furci was also heavily involved in the currency black market. A U.S. Senate investigation of illegal currency manipulations in Vietnam later showed that he had exchanged \$99,200 through a single unauthorized money changer at the black market rate of 300 or 400 piasters to the dollar, considerably more than the official rate of 118 piasters.¹²⁰

Unfortunately for Furci, his competitor, William J. Crum, was also aware of these illegal transactions, and he decided to use this knowledge to force Furci out of business. Frank Furci was simply outclassed by the crippled, half-blind William Crum, an old China hand who has made a profit on almost every war in Asia since 1941. Attracted by the economic potential of the growing Southeast Asia conflict, Crum came out of his million-dollar retirement in Hong Kong and moved to Saigon in 1962.¹²¹

While the massive U.S. military buildup in 1965 had attracted other commercial agents as well, Crum seemed particularly resentful of Furci, whose competing line of liquor brands, slot machines, and kitchen equipment had "stolen" \$2.5 million worth of his business.¹²² Crum passed on information about Furci's illegal currency transactions to the Fraud Repression Division of the Vietnamese customs service through a U.S. army general whom Crum was paying \$1,000 a month for protection.¹²³ Vietnamese customs raided Furci's offices in July 1967, found evidence to support the accusations, and later fined him \$45,000.¹²⁴ Unable to pay such a large fine, Furci left Saigon. Crum later bragged that he had "paid for" the raid that had

eliminated his competitor.¹²⁵

Furci moved to Hong Kong and in August opened a restaurant named the San Francisco Steak House with nominal capital of \$100,000.¹²⁶ More importantly, Furci was instrumental in the formation of Maradem Ltd., a company that the Augsburg sergeants who managed NCO clubs in Vietnam used to increase illegal profits from the military clubs. Although Furci's name does not appear on any of the incorporation papers, it seems that he was the "silent partner" in the classic Mafia sense of the term.¹²⁷

Maradem Ltd, was not a wholesale supplier or retail outlet, but a broker that used its control over NCO clubs and base mess halls to force legitimate wholesalers to pay a fixed percentage of their profits in order to do business.¹²⁸ Maradem's competitors were gradually "squeezed out" of business, and in its first year of operation the company did \$1,210,000 worth of business with NCO clubs in Vietnam.¹²⁹

By 1968 Frank Furci had gained three years of valuable experience in the shadow world of Hong Kong and Indochina; he was friendly with powerful Corsican syndicate leaders in Saigon and had the opportunity to form similar relationships with chiu chau bosses in Hong Kong.¹³⁰ Thus, perhaps it is not too surprising that the boss himself, Santo Trafficante, Jr., did Furci the honor of visiting him in Hong Kong in 1968. Accompanied by Frank's father, Dominick Furci, Trafficante was questioned by Hong Kong authorities regarding the purpose of his visit, and according to a U.S. Senate investigation, he explained that "They were traveling around the world together at the time. They stopped to visit Furci, Frank Furci in Hong Kong and to visit his restaurant¹³¹

After a leisurely stopover, Trafficante proceeded to Saigon,¹³² where, according to U.S. Embassy sources, he met with some prominent Corsican gangsters.¹³³ Trafficante was not the first of Lansky's chief lieutenants to visit Hong Kong. In April 1965 John Pullman, Lansky's courier and financial expert, paid an extended visit to Hong Kong, where he reportedly investigated the narcotics and gambling rackets.¹³⁴

Although the few Mafia watchers who are aware of Trafficante's journey to Asia have always been mystified by it, there is good reason to believe that it was a response to the crisis in the Mediterranean drug traffic and an attempt to secure new sources of heroin for Mafia distributors inside the United States. With almost 70 Percent of the world's illicit opium supply in the Golden Triangle, skilled heroin chemists in Hong Kong, and entrenched Corsican syndicates in Indochina, Southeast Asia was a logical

choice.

Soon after Trafficante's visit to Hong Kong, a Filipino courier ring started delivering Hong Kong heroin to Mafia distributors in the United States. In 1970 U.S. narcotics agents arrested many of these couriers. Subsequent interrogation revealed that the ring had successfully smuggled one thousand kilos of pure heroin into the United States—the equivalent of 10 to 20 percent of America's annual consumption.

Current U.S. Bureau of Narcotics intelligence reports indicate that another courier ring is bringing Hong Kong heroin into the United States through the Caribbean, Trafficante's territory. From Hong Kong heroin is usually flown to Chile on regular flights and then smuggled across the border into Paraguay in light, private aircraft.¹³⁵ In the late 1960s Paraguay became the major transit point for heroin entering the United States from Latin America; both Hong Kong and Southeast Asian heroin smuggled across the Pacific into Chile and European heroin smuggled across the Atlantic into Argentina are shipped to Paraguay before being forwarded to the United States. Argentina and Paraguay are popular refuges for Marseille gangsters wanted in France for serious crimes. The most prominent of these is Auguste Joseph Ricord, a Marseille-born gangster who worked with the Gestapo during World War II. Using a variety of means ranging from private aircraft to stuffed artifacts, Ricord is believed to have smuggled some 2.5 billion dollars' worth of heroin into the United States from Argentina and Paraguay in the last five years.¹³⁶ Although law enforcement officials have always assumed that Ricord and his associates were being supplied from Marseille, current reports of shipments from Hong Kong and Southeast Asia to Paraguay have raised the possibility that their sources may have shifted to Asia in recent years.¹³⁷

(Alfred W. McCoy, et al, *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*. Reference *The Mafia Comes to Asia*, pp. 210 - 217)

Dallas Drug Smuggler Hallucinated About JFK in Open Court

As the Nixon administration began to crack down on drug smugglers from Latin America, a strange event occurred in Dallas, Texas.

In mid-April 1971 a Panamanian government official, Joaquim Him-Gonzales, was apprehended by American narcotics agents and tried in the Federal Court in Dallas, Texas for conspiracy to smuggle heroin into the United States. Also tried in the same case were J. D. Vicars, of Hurst, Texas, and a former World War II Air Corps pilot

named Robert Louis Robertson, III, of Dallas, Texas.¹³⁸ Gonzales and Robertson were part of Auguste Ricord's heroin smuggling network.

Robertson had a mysterious background. He had been president of the Robertson Aircraft Company of Dallas and had been an executive of the major international airline for eleven years. But many people in Dallas believed that Robertson may have been a CIA operative. This was never established, but in Dallas circles, it was observed that Robertson and the two or three companies he had formed in recent years flew some unusual trips into Latin America.¹³⁹

As the government prosecutors built cases against Him-Gonzales, Vicars, and Robertson, the latter became hysterical. On Friday, April 23, 1971, Robertson fell apart on the witness stand and ran from his seat shouting, "I can't tell the truth under these conditions." Federal Judge Sarah T. Hughes responded sternly, "No! You get back on the stand. You are just putting on a show for the jury. Now you collect yourself and get back up here on the stand." She later had Robertson undergo a psychiatric examination, which found him fully capable to stand trial.¹⁴⁰

The following Monday Robertson seemed even more unbalanced, babbling over and over again, "I am Judge Sarah T. Hughes ... I am John F. Kennedy. I was assassinated in Dallas, Judge Sarah T. Hughes, on November 23, 1963 ... I am a sinner, I am a sinner."¹⁴¹

Despite Robertson's erratic behavior, the jury found the threesome—Robertson, Him-Gonzalez, and Vicars—guilty two days later; however, Robertson was never sentenced. He died in his cell at the Dallas County jail four days after he was convicted. April 26, 1971 a deputy marshal gave sworn testimony that Robertson had told him, "I will be dead in five days." He was off by one day.¹⁴²

Transcript of Colonel Prouty's Interview From The Men Who Killed Kennedy

Colonel Fletcher Prouty made some interesting comments about the techniques employed to kill President Kennedy and how the crime was covered up afterwards. Here is the transcript of his remarks from *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*:

Narrator:

But the Mafia could hardly have acted alone, given the intricacy of the assassination plot and the strength of the cover-up for twenty-five years. Colonel Fletcher Prouty was Chief of Special Operations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during Kennedy's presidency. He believes even more powerful forces were ultimately responsible.

[Scene switches to Colonel Prouty:]

Colonel Prouty:

I think without any question, it's what we called "the use of hired gunmen." And this isn't new. In fact, this little manual here [Prouty holds up a manual entitled *Clandestine Operations Manual for Central America*] which is called the *Assassination Manual for Latin America* contains a line which says, talking about Latin America [reading] "If possible, professional criminals will be hired to carry out specific selective 'jobs.' " --- Jobs in quote which means murders. Well, if this manual for Latin America, printed within the last few years in a government manual says that, there's no question but what the application of the same technique was dated back in Kennedy's time. In fact I know from my own experience. You know I was in that business in those days.

So, with that knowledge, you begin to realize that hired criminals, the way this book says, can be hired by anybody in power with sufficient money to pay them, but more importantly with sufficient power to operate the cover-up ever after. Because you see it's one thing to kill somebody. It's another thing to cover-up the fact that you did it, or that you hired somebody to do it; and that's more difficult. So they used the device of the Warren Commission Report to cover-up their hired killers. Now who would hire the killers, and who has the power to put that Warren Commission Report out over the top of the whole story? You see you're dealing with a very high echelon of power. It doesn't necessarily reside in any government. It doesn't necessarily reside in any single corporate institution. But it seems to reside in a blend of the two. Otherwise, how could you have gotten people like the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to participate in the cover-up? The police in Dallas to participate in the cover-up? Et cetera. And the media. [All the media](#), not just one or two newspapers; but none of them will print the story other than Oswald killed the President with three bullets, which is totally untrue.

(The Men Who Killed Kennedy – The Forces of Darkness, N. Turner)

The "high echelon of power" to which Colonel Prouty referred is not as mysterious and elusive as he made it seem. It is merely Jewish political forces and friends of Israel within the United States and other governments. Those were the forces who sponsored the assassination of President Kennedy.

It must also be noted that Colonel Prouty's final comment about the media is no longer valid. He stated that the news media will only report that "Oswald killed the President with three bullets." That was a factual statement when he made it in 1988. But since then, the news media has retreated from the official lie for fear of losing credibility—a small victory, but a victory nonetheless after thirty-plus years. (Reference "The Exoneration of Lee Harvey Oswald" in Chapter 6.)

Endnotes

1. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 73; Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 76
2. It is well documented that Christian David was involved in the kidnaping and murder Mehdi Ben Barka. Reference Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, pp. 59 - 73; Evert Clark and *Nicholas Horrock, Contrabandista!*, p. 76.
3. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, pp. 18 - 19
4. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 73; Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 76
5. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, pp. 91 & 186 - 188
6. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 208
7. *LEXPERT—Canadian Legal Directory*—Goodman Phillips & Vineberg (legal ad), reference the following URL: <http://www.lexpert.ca/firms/goodmanphil.html> (2000)
8. Alfred McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, pp. 18, 20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 54, 55, 57
9. Encyclopedia Britannica: Meyer Lansky
10. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 498
11. A Colonel Bertrand, alias Beaumont, is cited as a key figure in SDECE in Henrik Krüger's book, *The Great Heroin Coup*, pp. 42, 46. Colonel Bertant/Beaumont's war background matches that of Clay Shaw's as described in Jim Marrs book, *Crossfire*, p. 498.
12. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 40
13. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 188
14. *ibid*, p. 91
15. *ibid*, p. 89
16. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 76
17. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 106 - 112
18. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 76
19. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 217
20. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 51
21. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 217. The authors state that Christian David was 42 in 1972. Therefore he was born in about 1930, making him about 33 on November 22, 1963 when Kennedy was killed.
22. *ibid*, p. 217
23. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 30
24. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, pp. 187 - 188
25. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 29
26. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 18 - 19
27. *ibid*, p. 76
28. Encyclopedia Britannica: Mehdi Ben Barka
29. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 217 - 218
30. *ibid*
31. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 30
32. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 217; Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 51; Clark and Horrock stated that Christian David and Michel Nicoli were both 42 in 1972. Krüger stated that David was born in 1929. Therefore, both David and Nicoli would have been 33 or 34 on November 22, 1963 when Kennedy was killed.
33. *ibid*, pp. 186 - 187
34. *ibid*
35. *ibid*
36. *ibid*, p. 217 - 218
37. *ibid*, *Contrabandista!*, p. 14
38. *ibid*, p. 9
39. Encyclopedia Britannica: Marseille
40. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 14
41. *ibid*, p. 16
42. *ibid*, p. 15
43. *ibid*
44. *ibid*
45. *ibid*

46. *ibid*
47. *ibid*, p. 16
48. *ibid*, p. 16
49. *ibid*, p. 17
50. *ibid*, p. 17
51. *ibid*, p. 17
52. *ibid*, p. 17
53. *ibid*, p. 18
54. *ibid*, p. 20
55. *ibid*, p. 20
56. *ibid*, p. 18
57. *ibid*, p. 19
58. *ibid*, p. 19
59. *ibid*, p. 18, p. 55
60. *ibid*, p. 18 - 19
61. *ibid*, p. 20
62. *ibid*, p. 47
63. *ibid*, pp. 54 - 57. The authors wrote the following about the meeting: "In a lawyer's office at 1800 Calle La Valle, [Jacob Grodnitzky] sat down with Auguste Ricord, Luis the Argentine, whom he already knew, and five men introduced only as François, Domingo, Jean-Pierre, Marcelo, and Michel." On p. 76 the authors identify Jean-Pierre as an alias used by Christian David. The description of "Michel" seems like that of Michel Nicoli who frequently accompanied Christian David. On p. 57 the authors wrote that Michel was "a man of medium build whose dark, straight hair was covered by a toupée that looked unnaturally black over his unhealthy gray complexion."
64. *ibid*, p. 21
65. *ibid*, p. 89
66. *ibid*, pp. 19, 89
67. *ibid*, p. 21. A French intelligence report stated the following: "Subsequently [to his sojourn at Le Domino in Caracas], Ricord set up a large organization trafficking in narcotics to the United States. His protégés acted as carriers. Regardless of the numerous arrests [of carriers], his business is excellent and he has established himself as the owner of the Paris-Nice Restaurant located in the outskirts of Asunción, Paraguay ..."
68. *ibid*, p. 190
69. *ibid*, pp. 89 - 90
70. *ibid*, p. 91
71. *ibid*, p. 90
72. *ibid*, p. 6
73. *ibid*, p. 37
74. *ibid*, p. 52
75. *ibid*, p. 72
76. *ibid*, p. 92
77. *ibid*, pp. 140 - 141
78. *ibid*, pp. 140 - 141
79. *ibid*, p. 6
80. *ibid*, p. 9
81. *ibid*
82. *ibid*, p. 212
83. *ibid*, p. 230
84. *ibid*, pp. 215 - 216. The authors state that Lucien Sarti was 41 in 1972. Therefore he was born in about 1931, making him about 32 on November 22, 1963 when Kennedy was killed.
85. *ibid*, p. 89
86. *ibid*, p. 58
87. *ibid*, p. 215
88. *ibid*
89. *ibid*, pp. 215 - 216
90. *ibid*, p. 216
91. *ibid*
92. *ibid*
93. *ibid*

94. *ibid*, pp. 217 - 218
95. *ibid*, p. 185. The authors stated that Jean-Paul Angeletti was 30 in 1971. Therefore he was born in about 1941, making him about 22 on November 22, 1963 when Kennedy was killed.
96. *ibid*, p. 185
97. *ibid*, pp. 184 - 185
98. *ibid*, p. 216
99. *ibid*, p. 91. Although the authors did not explicitly state Chiappe's age, it is understood that he is considerably younger than Ricord. The authors stated that Ricord felt constant pressure from his four "younger" lieutenants: François Chiappe, Jean-Paul Angeletti, Lucien Sarti, and Christian David.
100. *ibid*, p. 76, 186
101. *ibid*, pp. 184 - 185
102. *ibid*, 219
103. Henrik Krüger, *The Great Heroin Coup*, p. 76
104. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 106 - 112
105. Interview with John Warner*, Washington, D.C., October 14, 1971; other U.S. officials including Representative James H. Scheuer, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia and Pacific Affairs have observed this shift to Southeast Asia. (U.S. Congress, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, *International Aspects of the Narcotics Problem*, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., 1971, pp. 61, 119, 149.) (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
106. Interview with Police Col. Smith Boonlikit, Bangkok, Thailand, September 17, 1971. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
107. Cabled dispatch from Shaw, Vientiane (Hong Kong Bureau). to Time Inc., received September 16-17, 1965. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
108. Interview with Gen. Edward G. Lansdale, Alexandria, Virginia, June 17, 1971. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
109. Interview with Lt. Col. Lucien Conein, McLean, Virginia, June 18, 1971. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
110. French commercial shipping companies still maintain regular schedules between Saigon and France. In August 1971, for example, there were four scheduled departures from Saigon:
Leave Arrive Arrive Company Ship Saigon
Le Havre Marseille Messageries Maritimes Godavery --- August 9 October 8
Chargeurs Réunis Tobago --- August 6 September 24
Nausicaa --- August 22 October 9
Toscana --- August 26 October 26

(Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)

111. Interview with Lt. Col. Lucien Conein, McLean, Virginia, June 18, 1971. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
112. *ibid*
113. In September 1965 General Lansdale's Senior Liaison Office began advising the Vietnamese Central Rural Construction Council, headed by Premier Ky, on pacification and social reform. (Kahin and Lewis, *The United States in Vietnam*, p. 242.) (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
114. Interview with Norma Sullivan, Singapore, September 24, 1971. (Norma Sullivan is a special assistant to William Crum, and has worked in Saigon business circles since the early 1960s.) (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
115. Ed Reid, *The Grim Reapers* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1969), appendix 111, chart 8. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
116. U.S. Congress, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Government Operations, *Fraud and Corruption in Management of Military Club Systems-Illegal Currency Manipulations Affecting South Vietnam*, 91 st Cong., 2nd sess., 92nd Cong.,

- I st sess., 1971, pt. 4, p. 1017. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
117. Ibid., Report, pp. 28, 34.
118. Ibid., Report, p. 68.
119. Ibid., Report, p. 43.
120. Ibid., pt. 3, p. 637.
121. Ibid., Report, pp. 12-13.
122. Ibid., Report, p. 73.
123. Ibid., pt. 5, p. 1045.
124. Ibid., pt. 2, pp. 478-479.
125. Ibid., pt. 5, pp. 1046-1047.
126. Fine Foreign Foods Ltd., described as the "restaurant proprietor" of the San Francisco Steak House (Ground floor, 67 Peking Road, Kowloon), registered with the Inland Revenue Department, Hong Kong, on August 1, 1967.
127. Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Government Operations, *Fraud and Corruption in Management of Military Club Systems-Illegal Currency Manipulations Affecting South Vietnam*, 91st Cong., 2nd sess., 92nd Cong., 1st sess., Report, pp. 75-77. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
128. Ibid., p. 85.
129. Ibid., p. 86.
130. According to corporate records filed with the Hong Kong government, Frank Carmen Furci resigned from his position as director of Fine Foreign Foods Ltd. on March 18, 1970. He transferred 1,667 shares to James Edward Galagan, his partner for the last few years, and 1,666 shares to Setsui Morten on March 25, 1970. Since the corporate report filed in 1969 showed that Frank Carmen Furci owned 3,333 shares, it is presumed that these events marked the end of his connection with the company and its restaurant. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
131. Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Government Operations, *Fraud and Corruption in Management of Military Club Systems-Illegal Currency Manipulations Affecting South Vietnam*, 91st Cong., 2nd sess., 92nd Cong., 1st sess., pt. 2, p. 279. This testimony before the committee was given by Senate investigator Carmine Bellino, "conceded to be the best investigative accountant in the country" (Victor S. Navasky, *Kennedy Justice* [New York: Atheneum, 1971, p. 53.] (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
132. Reid, *The Grim Reapers*, p. 296. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
133. Interview with a U.S. Embassy official, Saigon, Vietnam, July 1971. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
134. Hank Messick, *Lansky* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1971), p. 241. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
135. Interview with an agent, U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Washington, D.C., November 18, 1971.
136. *The New York Times*, January 9, 1972, p. 25. (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
137. *The Evening Star* (Washington, D.C.), January 6, 1972~ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1972*, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., 1971, p. 614. This and other evidence contradict Secretary of State William Rogers' assertion that the narcotics problem in Southeast Asia is being dealt with effectively. (Sec. of State William Rogers, Testimony Before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, Uncorrected Transcript, May 15 1972.) (Note: This endnote was used by Alfred W. McCoy, et al, the authors of *Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*.)
138. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista*, p. 198
139. *ibid*, p. 195
140. *ibid*, p. 198
141. *ibid*
142. *ibid*, pp. 198 - 199

Chapter 6: Other Garrison Findings

The Exoneration of Lee Harvey Oswald

More than any one person, Jim Garrison exonerated Lee Harvey Oswald—in the eyes of the American public—for the murder of President Kennedy. Garrison eloquently summarized his feelings about Oswald in an interview included in Nigel Turner's 1988 documentary, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*:

Lee Oswald was totally, unequivocally, completely innocent of the assassination. And the fact that history—or in the rewriting of history and disinformation—has made a villain of this young man, who wanted nothing more than to be a fine Marine, is in some ways the greatest injustice of all.¹

Buell Wesley Frazier, Oswald's friend and co-worker at the Texas School Book Depository, made the following comments, in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, about his deceased young friend:

The individual that I know as Lee Harvey Oswald, I don't think had it in him to be a person capable of committing such a crime as murdering the President of the United States. I'll always believe that. The side I saw [of] him was a very kind and loving man. And that's the way I'd like to remember him.²

Garrison gave extensive interviews for *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. That same year, 1988, Garrison wrote and published a book, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, which thoroughly exonerated Oswald through presentation of facts and deductive reasoning. The book focused on Garrison's prosecution of Clay Shaw in 1969 and it provided many new facts about the assassination never before released to the public. Garrison was philosophical about the 1969 verdict that acquitted Shaw of conspiracy to murder President Kennedy. The following is an excerpt from the introduction of *On the Trail of the Assassins*:

History has a way of changing verdicts. Twenty-five years ago most Americans readily accepted the government's contention that the assassination was a random act of violence. A lonely young man, his mind steeped in Marxist ideology, apparently frustrated at his inability to do anything well, had crouched at a warehouse window and—in six seconds of world class shooting—destroyed the President of the United States. ...

The assassination was an enormously important event. But even more important, in my view, is what happened after—ratification by the government and the media of an official story that is an absurd fairy tale.

Immediately after the assassination, the federal government and

the major media adopted the posture of two giant ostriches, each unyielding to reason, each with its head firmly lodged in the sand. Having ratified the lone assassin theory, they refused to acknowledge any facts that might discredit it and attacked anyone who offered a different explanation.

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. XII - XIII)

On the Trail of the Assassins was a best seller and became the basis for a Hollywood movie, *JFK* (1991), by Oliver Stone. Garrison's words were prophetic indeed. History does have a way of changing verdicts. By the mid-1990s, the American news media essentially stopped blaming Oswald for the assassination. In fact, most modern documentaries about President Kennedy no longer mention Oswald at all. Few journalists or scholars will openly admit that they believe the Warren Report any longer for fear of losing credibility. Garrison provided so many facts exonerating Oswald that it became impossible for the various media outlets to continue supporting "the great lie." Consequently, the media adopted a paradoxical position regarding the assassination. While most media outlets no longer overtly endorse to the Warren Commission's conclusion that Oswald alone killed Kennedy, they still support it indirectly by promoting "non-journalists" who write, disseminate, and proselytize archaic propaganda in support of what Garrison accurately labeled "an absurd fairy tale." Gerald Posner is a prime example. [\(Footnote 11\)](#)

Posner appears regularly on television and radio talk shows, and is often quoted in major newspapers. His primary claim to fame is his strong opinion that the Warren Commission was correct in its conclusion that Oswald alone killed President Kennedy. According to Posner, Americans have been confused and brainwashed by people like Jim Garrison and Oliver Stone who filled their heads with silly conspiracy theories. It is interesting, however, that Posner himself supports the biggest conspiracy theory of the Twentieth Century—that Adolf Hitler had a masterplan to exterminate six million Jews in gas chambers. Posner would have us believe that some conspiracies—ones chosen by him—are acceptable, but believing "unsanctioned" conspiracy theories is tantamount to having a mental breakdown.

The media's support of people like Posner is a cynical form of damage control. Media moguls and journalists are fully aware that the American public no longer believes the Warren Report, but rather than admit they actively supported a lie, they get Posner and other non-journalists to support their old position. By using this approach, the lie continues to propagate, but if a backlash occurs against the messengers of that lie, then the media outlets have a layer of deniability. After all, Posner is technically an independent writer, not a journalist. And like most proselytizers of the Warren Report, Posner is Jewish. This supports my overall thesis that Kennedy's murder was in fact a worldwide Jewish conspiracy sponsored by the World Jewish Congress and actively supported by friends of Israel in all nations.

I will have more comments about Gerald Posner later. For now, we will focus on the exoneration of Lee Harvey Oswald. Several facts point to Oswald's "total, unequivocal, and complete innocence," to quote Garrison.

First of all, Garrison revealed that Oswald had been trained to speak Russian while in the Marines. Oswald also received training from the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI). In fact, Oswald took a Russian examination while stationed at El Toro Marine base.³ Oswald had been stationed there from November 1958 through September 1959.⁴ The mere fact that Oswald was trained to speak Russian strongly suggests that he was an intelligence operative, probably working for Naval Intelligence. He was apparently carrying out orders given from his superiors that would ultimately be used to implicate him in the murder of President Kennedy. In other words, Oswald was set up as a "patsy."

Second point: Garrison revealed that Oswald's defection to the Soviet Union was extremely suspicious and was likely sponsored by the CIA and/or the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI). While in the Marines, Oswald worked at Atsugi Air Base in Japan in 1957. Atsugi was the base where all daily super-secret U-2 intelligence flights over China originated. Oswald's unit—which required a highly classified security clearance—guarded the U-2 hangar.

In the summer of 1959, Oswald applied for a discharge from the Marines. In September of that year he was given an honorable discharge. He then visited his mother briefly in Fort Worth, Texas, then went to New Orleans. From there he departed for the Soviet Union by steamship to England; his ticket had been obtained by the Lykes office of Clay Shaw's organization—the International Trade Mart in New Orleans. From England he flew eastward to the Helsinki, Finland although the exact air service is unknown. From Helsinki, Oswald took a train to Moscow, arriving on October 16, 1959. He immediately made a series of contacts with Soviet officials and underwent extensive interrogation by the Soviets. Two weeks later, Oswald went to the American Embassy in Moscow and handed over his passport and a letter renouncing the United States and declaring allegiance to the Soviet Union.

In April of 1961, Oswald married Marina Prusakova, the niece of a lieutenant colonel in the Soviet Union's domestic intelligence service. About three months earlier, Oswald had applied at the American Embassy in Moscow to return to the United States. Unbelievably, both governments agreed that Oswald and his new Russian bride could return to America. This was at the height of the Cold War. Even though Oswald had defected to the Soviet Union, the US State Department did not consider him a threat. In fact, it authorized the American Embassy in Moscow to loan him some money—\$436, to be exact—for his return.

In June of 1962, Lee and Marina Oswald arrived in New York with their young daughter. They were not required to meet with FBI agents, or any law enforcement officers or employees of any agency. Keep in mind that prior to defecting to the Soviet Union, Oswald had performed highly classified work at Atsugi Air Base in Japan in 1957—guarding the U-2 hangar where U-2 aircraft was launched for spy missions over China. The fact that he was allowed to re-enter the United States with no questions asked strongly suggests that his stay in the East was sponsored by the US intelligence community. Although the Oswalds were not questioned by government authorities when they re-entered New York in 1962, they did, however, meet with Spas T. Raikin, head of the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Nations, Inc., a private anti-communist group with extensive intelligence connections.⁵

Third point: Garrison and others revealed that Oswald was friends with George de Mohrenschildt—of Dallas—and his wife, Jeanne. After the Oswalds returned to the United States from the Soviet Union in June of 1962, they moved to Fort Worth, Texas where Lee worked at the Leslie Welding Company until October 7, 1962. That evening, the Oswalds were visited by Mr. and Mrs. de Mohrenschildt. The next day, Lee packed up and moved to Dallas. De Mohrenschildt was apparently an intelligence operative and had given Oswald instructions to move.⁶ De Mohrenschildt was both a friend and apparently a CIA "babysitter" to Oswald during his stay in Dallas. A babysitter is a term used by American Intelligence agencies to describe an agent assigned to attend the needs of a particular individual important to the completion of a mission.⁷ This is the only plausible explanation for how two men of such vastly different backgrounds could have been friends or acquaintances.

De Mohrenschildt was a Russian-born immigrant who came to the United States with his parents after the Russian Revolution in 1917. De Mohrenschildt was born on April 17, 1911 in Mozyr, a small Baltic town in czarist Russia near the Polish border.⁸ His father, Baron Serguis de Mohrenschildt, had been governor of the province of Minsk for Czar Nicholas Romanov. George De Mohrenschildt spoke Russian, German, Spanish, French, and Polish. In World War II he worked for French intelligence.⁹ His connection with French intelligence is highly significant given the information presented in Chapter 5 about the French-Corsican underworld and French intelligence.

De Mohrenschildt, a refined member of the jet set, held a doctorate in international commerce and a masters degree in petroleum engineering and geology. He became a consulting geologist and was a member of the exclusive Dallas Petroleum Club. There he made contacts with extremely affluent people in the business world.¹⁰

De Mohrenschildt apparently provided sensitive information to Warren Commission investigators in 1964. His statements were documented and classified as "secret" (reference Commission Document 1222).¹¹

On March 29, 1977, de Mohrenschildt was found dead of a gunshot blast to the head at his sister-in-law's fashionable home in Manalapan, Florida. His death was ruled suicide.¹² He died three hours after arranging to meet investigator, Gaeton Fonzi^(Footnote 12), from the House Select Committee on Assassinations.¹³ Earlier that day, de Mohrenschildt had met with author Edward Jay Epstein.¹⁴

Epstein is a highly suspicious individual. In 1969, he wrote *Counterplot* which attacked Garrison and his prosecution of Clay Shaw. Epstein wrote another propagandistic book, *Legend* (1978), which pushed the cover story that the Soviet KGB sponsored the Kennedy assassination, and that Oswald was working for them. In 1966, Epstein wrote *Inquest*, a mild critique of the Warren Report. Author Michael Collins Piper wrote the following critique of *Inquest*:

Interesting, Epstein also wrote the book *Inquest* that was hailed by the media as an important critique of the Warren Commission Report. However, I've always felt that this volume was an Establishment "cover story" suggesting that while there were problems with the way the Warren Commission conducted its

investigation, there was nothing to worry about in the end. In any case, none of Epstein's books are of any real value.¹⁵

Given Epstein's propensity to write propaganda, his apparent ethnicity, and the fact that he met with de Mohrenschildt shortly before the latter's death, it seems highly possible that de Mohrenschildt may have inadvertently told Epstein of his plans to meet with an investigator— Gaeton Fonzi—with the House Select Committee on Assassinations. Epstein apparently passed this information to the criminal elements who killed Kennedy. Given de Mohrenschildt's prior history of talking to the feds in 1964, a quick decision was apparently made to silence him permanently.

Researcher William Torbitt made an interesting observation about de Mohrenschildt in his article entitled, *Nomenclature of an Assassination Cabal*. The following is an excerpt from that article:

Many examiners of the case have concluded that George DeMohrenschildt was a part of the conspiracy because of his close association with Oswald during the fall of 1962, and winter and early spring of 1963, but a close reading of the Russian exile's testimony before the Warren Commission shows that DeMohrenschildt was being used by the Solidarists the same as Oswald was being used, and was to have been tied in with Oswald; in connection with the assassination. However, DeMohrenschildt, a highly polished professional geologist, saved himself by moving to Haiti in April of 1963 in connection with a contract with the government of Haiti, where he still resided on the day of the assassination of President Kennedy.

DeMohrenschildt, in retrospect, knew that Division Five of the FBI and the Solidarists had intended to use him as a scapegoat along with Oswald, and he did not hesitate to name the small group within the Federal Bureau of Investigation as the instigators of the assassination of President Kennedy.¹⁶

Fourth point: Garrison and others revealed that Oswald performed top-secret work for "Jagger-Stovall-Chiles" while living in Dallas during the Cuban Missile Crisis (October 1962). As previously stated, Oswald moved to Dallas on October 8, 1962. Before the month was over he had secured a job at Jagger-Stovall-Chiles, a Dallas company under contract with the Pentagon to produce maps and charts for military use. The job required an extremely high security clearance. Oswald was given access to various classified materials. Writer Henry Hurt observed that "part of the work appeared to be related to the top-secret U-2 missions, some of which were making flights over Cuba."¹⁷

Fifth point: Garrison demonstrated that Oswald had an association with Guy Banister, a retired FBI agent with ONI experience who lived in New Orleans working as a private detective. During the summer of 1963, Oswald handed out pro-Castro leaflets on the streets of New Orleans. Oswald's organization was called "Fair Play for Cuba."

On August 9, 1963, Oswald was arrested during a scuffle with anti-Castro Cubans. The pro-Castro leaflets that Oswald handed out that day—and that day only—had the address "544 Camp Street" (New Orleans) stamped on them. Garrison revealed that 544 Camp Street was an entrance to the same building where Guy Banister had worked as a private detective, but the entrance to Banister's office was 531 Lafayette Street. Oswald had apparently stamped 544 Camp Street on his pro-Castro leaflets by mistake on August 9, but Banister—or one of his associates—apparently stopped him from continuing the practice. It was obviously embarrassing for a retired FBI agent to be linked to pro-Castro activity. Oswald had apparently worked closely with Banister, who died of a heart attack in 1964, about nine months after the assassination.¹⁸

Sixth point: Garrison demonstrated that Oswald had an association with Clay Shaw. As previously stated, Garrison proved that Shaw had called New Orleans attorney Dean Andrews on November 23, 1963 and asked him to represent Oswald. Andrews testified before a grand jury and denied that Bertrand and Shaw were the same person. The grand jury subsequently indicted him for perjury. In August 1967, he was convicted of perjury by a jury of New Orleans citizens.¹⁹ This was a significant victory for Garrison because the true identity of Clay Bertrand/Shaw was one of the main points that caused the jury to acquit Shaw of conspiracy to murder President Kennedy. Another point that Garrison failed to show was Shaw's CIA connections, but in 1979, Richard Helms—the CIA's director for covert operations in 1963—admitted under oath that Shaw had Agency connections.²⁰ Although Garrison lost the case against Shaw, truth had ultimately prevailed.

Seventh point: Garrison and others proved that other men murdered Dallas policeman J. D. Tippett. This is an important point because it refutes much of the rationale behind the Warren Commission's conclusion that Oswald killed Kennedy. A member of the Warren Commission's legal staff asked the following rhetorical question and supplied the answer: "How do we know that Lee Harvey Oswald killed President Kennedy? Because he killed Officer Tippett." Garrison pointed out that the reverse is also true: "Only a man who had just killed the President and knew he was being hunted down would have any reason to shoot a police officer in a quiet suburb at mid-day."²¹

Garrison proved through deductive reasoning that there was not enough time for Oswald to have left his rooming house at 1:00 pm and shot Tippett at 1:06 or 1:10 pm. The housekeeper/landlady at the rooming house observed Oswald standing by the northbound Beckly Avenue bus stop at 1:04. The location where Tippett was killed was in the opposite direction, about a mile south. The Warren Commission ignored the time discrepancies. Witnesses to the Tippett killing gave conflicting testimony about the physical appearance of the shooter. In fact, Aquilla Clemons stated that she saw two men working together, although only one was the trigger-man. Neither man fit Oswald's description.²²

Eighth point: Garrison revealed that Oswald was a poor marksman in the Marines. As previously stated, Oswald's closest colleague in the Marines, Nelson Delgado, stated that Oswald was not sharpshooter material. The following is an excerpt of Delgado's testimony before Warren Commission attorney Wesley J. Liebeler:

Liebeler: You told the FBI that in your opinion Oswald was not a

good rifle shot, is that correct?

Delgado: Yes.

Liebeler: And that he did not show any unusual interest in his rifle, and in fact appeared less interested in weapons than the average Marine?

Delgado: Yes. He was mostly a thinker, a reader. He read quite a bit.²³

Ninth point: Garrison demonstrated that the gun Oswald allegedly used could not have been a Mannlicher-Carcano, as the government claimed. First of all, the government claimed that Oswald—a poor marksman—fired three shots in 6 seconds, killing President Kennedy and gravely wounding Governor Connally. But no ammunition clip was ever found for the Mannlicher-Carcano. The clip feeds cartridges into the rifle's firing chamber. Without a clip, the cartridges would have to be loaded manually, making fast shooting impossible. In addition, the Mannlicher-Carcano produced as the murder weapon had a badly misaligned sight. It needed an adjustment before government riflemen could complete their test firing. Even with the adjustment, no rifle expert was able to duplicate Oswald's alleged shooting prowess.²⁴ Garrison also made some interesting comments about the rifle found at the School Book Depository by Dallas police:

Officer Seymour Weitzman, part of the Dallas police search team, later described the discovery of the rifle on the afternoon of November 22. He stated that it had been so well hidden under boxes of books that the officers stumbled over it many times before they found it. Officer Weitzmann, who had an engineering degree and also operated a sporting goods store, was recognized as an authority on weapons. Consequently, Dallas Homicide Chief Will Fritz, who was on the scene, asked him the make of the rifle. Weitzman identified it as a 7.65 Mauser, a highly accurate German-made weapon. Deputy Sheriff Roger Craig was also there and later recalled the word "Mauser" inscribed in the metal of the gun. And Deputy Sheriff Eugene Boone executed a sworn affidavit in which he described the rifle as a Mauser. As late as midnight November 22, Dallas District Attorney Henry Wade told the media that the weapon found was a Mauser.

... when the smoke cleared and all the law enforcement authorities in Dallas had their stories duly in order, the official position was that the rifle found on the sixth floor of the Depository was the Mannlicher-Carcano, which allegedly was linked to Oswald under an alias, and not the Mauser, which disappeared forever shortly after it reached the hands of Captain

Fritz.

But even this revision of the official story did not explain the third rifle. A film taken by Dallas Cinema Associates, an independent film company, showed a scene of the Book Depository shortly after the assassination. Police officers on the fire escape were bringing down a rifle from the roof above the sixth floor with the tender care you might give an infant. When the policemen reached the ground, a high-ranking officer held the rifle high for everyone to see. The camera zoomed in for a close-up. Beneath the picture was the legend, "The Assassin's Rifle." When I saw the film, I noted that this rifle had no sight mounted on it. Thus it could not have been either the Carcano or the vanished Mauser, both of which had sights.

I was not surprised to find that this third rifle, like the Mauser, had disappeared. But its existence confirmed my hypothesis that Lee Oswald could not have killed John Kennedy as the American public had been told. Setting aside the evidence of two other weapons on the scene, the incredibly accurate shooting of an incredibly inaccurate rifle within an impossible time frame was merely the beginning of the feat we were asked to believe Oswald had accomplished.

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 113 - 115)

The government disregarded the testimony of several witnesses in order to link Oswald to the murder weapon. One such witness was Buell Wesley Frazier, a friend of Oswald's and co-worker at the Texas School Book Depository. On November 21 Oswald got Frazier to drive him to the home of Ruth and Michael Paine—in Irving, Texas—where Marina Oswald was living (they were separated^(Footnote 13)). Oswald told Frazier that Marina had made some curtains for him to put in his apartment and she had some curtain rods for him to pick up. Oswald spent the night at Paine's house and caught a ride to work with Frazier the next morning. Under his arm he carried a brown paper package. The Warren Commission concluded that the package contained the rifle (Mannlicher-Carcano) used to kill President Kennedy. Frazier testified about the package before the Warren Commission. Years later he described it in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*:

Frazier:

The first time I saw the package it was on the back seat of my car and I had just glanced at it. And I asked, 'What's that, Lee?' And he said, 'That's curtain rods. Remember, I was going to bring them.' The length of the package that I saw that morning was roughly two foot long, give or take an inch or two. And it was made out of same type of packing material that you would find in any company that packed materials for shipment. It was just

brown paper and the tape that you would normally find, nothing unusual. ...

I parked in the parking lot at the Texas School Book Depository. Lee got out of the car, took the package that he said contained curtain rods and he put one end of the package in the cup of his hand and the other [end] up under his armpit. He put the package under his arm that way and he walked off toward the Texas School Book Depository up on Elm Street.

Narrator:

The package could not have contained Oswald's rifle. Even when dismantled it was three feet long. The Warren Commissioners, who investigated the assassination, ignored Frazier's unswerving testimony, insisting the weapon had been smuggled into the Depository in Oswald's brown paper parcel.²⁵

Tenth point: Garrison revealed that Oswald took a "nitrate" test which indicated he had not fired a rifle on November 22, 1963. This is the most compelling evidence that exonerated Oswald. He was given the nitrate test on the evening of the assassination. Had he fired a rifle that day, the test would have revealed deposits of nitrate on his cheek. This information was kept secret for ten months but was revealed in the Warren Report.²⁶

The government had trouble linking the Mannlicher-Carcano rifle directly to Oswald. But a smudged palm-print was discovered on the murder weapon hours after Federal agents made a mysterious visit to the funeral home where Oswald's body had been taken by mortician Paul Grudy. Grudy explained what happened in an interview shown in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*:

I had gotten to the funeral home with his body something in the neighborhood of eleven o'clock at night and it is a several hour procedure to prepare the remains. And after this time, some place in the early, early morning, agents came. Now I say agents because I'm not familiar, at the moment, with whether they were Secret Service or FBI or what they were. But agents did come. And when they did come, they fingerprinted. And the only reason that we knew they did, they were carrying a satchel and equipment and asked us if they might have the preparation room to themselves. And after it was all over, we found ink on Lee Harvey's hands showing that they had fingerprinted him and palm-printed him. We had to take that ink back off in order to prepare him for burial and to eliminate that ink.²⁷

Eleventh point: Garrison and others provided compelling arguments that the government manufactured fake photographs of Oswald holding a Mannlicher-Carcano rifle as a means of linking him to the murder weapon.^(Footnote 14) In Garrison's 1988

book, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, he cited Robert Groden's "dissent" to the House Select Committee on Assassinations that challenged the authenticity of the photographs of Oswald. The HSCA had concluded that the photos were genuine. Groden was the photographic consultant to the HSCA. His dissent was hidden from public view until Garrison revealed it to the world in his 1988 best seller. Here is an excerpt of Groden's dissent:

...in my opinion, no matter what the panel members concluded, the backyard photographs are beyond question fakes... For the record, the method used here was, almost without doubt, simply posing a man... in the backyard with a rifle, pistol and publications as part of this original picture. The only item added was the head of Lee Oswald from the middle of the chin up...²⁸

It should be emphasized that although Groden wrote his dissent in the 1970s, he did not publish any books about the Kennedy assassination until after Jim Garrison wrote *On the Trail of the Assassins* in 1988. A year later, in 1989, Groden published a book entitled *High Treason*. In 1994, Groden published *The Killing of a President*. A year after that, in 1995, Groden published *The Search for Lee Harvey Oswald*. Although technically Groden challenged the authenticity of the photographs of Oswald in the 1970s, he sat on this critical information for years (apparently it was deliberate). But through Jim Garrison's 1988 book, Groden's dissent was finally read by millions. I shall have more comments about Robert Groden later.

Garrison also noted that in the photographs of Oswald, his head did not match his neck and body. Furthermore, Oswald's facial "portrait" was exactly the same in several photographs, but his posture and the distance from the camera changed from picture to picture. In addition, if one uses Oswald's face as a standard of measurement, then Oswald was significantly taller in one picture.²⁹

The photographs of Oswald holding the murder weapon were found in Ruth Paine's garage in Irving, Texas. As previously stated, Marina Oswald had been living with Paine—apart from her husband, Lee—at the time of the assassination. Garrison checked Ruth Paine's background and discovered that she and her husband Michael Paine had strong ties to the intelligence community. Lee and Marina Oswald had met Ruth Paine in February 1963 at a party in Dallas. The Oswalds were taken to the party by George de Mohrenschildt and his wife. This is highly significant. Most researchers agree that de Mohrenschildt was one of Oswald's CIA/ONI handlers. Given that, it seems probable that Ruth Paine was involved in the conspiracy as well. She supplied the authorities with incriminating photographs—likely fakes—of Oswald holding the murder weapon.

Michael Paine was a design engineer who performed highly classified work for Bell Helicopter,^(Footnote 15) a major defense contractor. Ruth Paine was an intelligent woman who constantly wandered around the country and the world for one reason or another. One of her many interests was the Russian language. Naturally this made her fast friends with Marina Oswald, a Russian immigrant. Paine's father had been employed by the Agency for International Development, regarded by many as a CIA front

organization. Her brother-in-law worked for the same agency in the Washington, DC area.³⁰

Twelfth point: Garrison established that Oswald was not a Marxist as the Warren Commission concluded. Garrison summarized his feelings about Oswald's political leanings as follows:

The more I thought about it, the more the great disparity gnawed at me. There had been the Lee Harvey Oswald who, the government told us, was close to being the most rabid communist since Lenin. On the other hand, at our very doorstep, there had been a flesh-and-blood Oswald who used as the headquarters for his pamphleteering the office of Guy Banister—formerly of the FBI and Naval Intelligence and, more recently, the Anti-Communist League of the Caribbean. As if that were not enough, Oswald had been on a first-name basis with that swashbuckling anti-communist soldier of fortune, David Ferrie, a man who had trained anti-Castro pilots for the Bay of Pigs in 1961 and by 1963 was giving guerilla training to more Cuban exiles for some new venture against the island.

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, p. 50)

John E. Donovan (a first lieutenant at El Toro when Oswald was there) testified before the Warren Commission stating emphatically that Oswald did not have leftist political leanings. Donovan stated the following: "I never heard him in any way, shape or form confess that he was a Communist, or that he ever thought about being a Communist."³¹ Nelson Delgado was closest to Oswald in the Marines. They bunked next to each other for about 11 months. Delgado told the Warren Commission that Oswald "never said any subversive things... and he didn't show [any] particular aspects of being a sharpshooter at all."³² Garrison provided mountains of additional evidence demonstrating that although Oswald distributed pro-Castro leaflets, he was not truly a Marxist; but was merely a low-level intelligence operative—an *agent provocateur*—playing the role of a Marxist.³³

Several other friends and associates of Oswald's at the El Toro Marine base gave similar testimony before the Warren Commission that Oswald was not a Marxist. They included Donald Peter Camarata, Peter Francis Connor, Allen Graf, John Rene Heindel, Mack Osborne, and Richard Dennis Call. Only one man—Kerry Thornley—stated that Oswald had exhibited Marxist leanings. Consequently, the Warren Commission ignored the testimonies of the other men and released Thornley's statements to the media.³⁴

Garrison provided circumstantial evidence that Thornley had doubled as Oswald doing things to incriminate the latter. Thornley bore a striking resemblance to Oswald and they were about the same height, although Oswald was slightly taller. Garrison observed that Thornley had lied to the Warren Commission about Oswald's height. Thornley told the Warren Commission that Oswald was about five inches shorter than himself—who was five feet ten inches—when in reality Oswald was taller. In 1968,

Garrison had a Grand Jury subpoena Thornley who was living in Tampa, Florida at the time. Thornley admitted that he lived in New Orleans from February 1961 through the end of November 1963, shortly after the assassination. He also admitted to meeting Guy Banister and David Ferrie while in New Orleans, but denied meeting Oswald during his stay in New Orleans. In addition, Thornley lived in the heart of the New Orleans intelligence community during his time in that city.³⁵

Thornley also told Garrison that in the late spring of 1963, around early May, he took a bus trip to California to visit his parents, and had visited Dallas briefly during that journey. In late April, the Oswalds had just moved from their Neely Street apartment in Dallas to New Orleans leaving the rent still paid for. Consequently, Oswald's apartment was unoccupied for a few days. Garrison suggested that during that time, Thornley may have posed for the incriminating "fake" photographs of Oswald holding a rifle and pistol. The incriminating photos were taken of someone with a build similar to Oswald's standing in the backyard of the Neely Street apartment.³⁶

Thirteenth point: Garrison demonstrated that Oswald did not make trips to Mexico City, but the CIA had provided the Warren Commission with a fake photograph of him at the Cuban Embassy in that city. The Warren Commission used the alleged trip to Mexico City from September 16 through October 3, 1963 as further proof that Oswald was a communist. The Warren Report stated that Oswald "embarked on a series of visits to the Soviet and Cuban Embassies" in Mexico City, that his objective was "to reach Cuba by way of Mexico, and that he hoped to meet Fidel Castro after he arrived." The Warren Report further stated that Silvia Tirado de Duran, a Mexican employee at the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City, recalled an American named Lee Harvey Oswald trying to obtain a visa to Cuba in the latter part of September or the early part of October. The Warren Commission included an extensive statement from Duran in its final report.³⁷

Garrison wrote the following devastating response to the Warren Commission's assertion—a tale apparently manufactured by the CIA—that Oswald had visited the Cuban and Soviet Embassies in Mexico City:

Early in the official inquiry, the CIA informed the Warren Commission of Oswald's alleged activities in Mexico City before the assassination. Uncharacteristically, the Commission asked for more evidence. Perhaps the Commission members, aware that the Agency had 24-hour photographic surveillance of the Cuban and Soviet embassies in Mexico City, were hoping for a good picture to shore up their sparsely documented account of Oswald's trip to Mexico.

Initially, the Agency ignored the Commission's request. But after more pressure, the CIA finally handed over a murky snapshot of a portly, graying gentleman almost old enough to be Oswald's father. This, the Agency claimed, was Lee Harvey Oswald at the Cuban Embassy.

The Agency also produced a statement from Silvia Duran, a

Mexican who worked at the Cuban Embassy, alleging that Oswald had appeared there. However, the circumstances under which the statement was obtained were tainted, to say the least. On the day of the assassination, the CIA ordered authorities to arrest Duran and keep her in isolation. ^(Footnote 16) The Agency cable said: "With full regard for Mexican interests, request you ensure that her arrest is kept absolutely secret, that no information from her is published or leaked, that all such info is cabled to us..." Duran was not released until she identified Lee Oswald as the visitor to the Cuban Embassy. After her release, the CIA ordered her jailed again. These circumstances were not known to the Commission. Moreover, in 1978 Duran told author Anthony Summers that the man who came to the embassy was blond and about her own height (five feet three)—hardly Oswald.

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 73 - 74)³⁸

Fourteenth point: Garrison revealed that Oswald was set up as a scapegoat. Garrison introduced a new term to the American public: "sheepdipping." Sheepdipping is an intelligence term for manipulating someone into doing things to create a desired image that can be used later to implicate them in a crime. He described it as follows:

It had always puzzled me why Oswald had left Dallas in April 1963 to spend the summer in New Orleans, only to return to Dallas again in October. But given what I had learned, this began to make sense. Clearly, if Oswald was being set up as a communist scapegoat, his close association in Dallas with the anti-communist White Russians had to be severed. Likewise, a summer of ostentatiously handing out pro-Castro leaflets in New Orleans reinforced the image of a crazed communist assassin. In the intelligence community, there is a term for this kind of manipulated behavior designed to create a desired image: sheepdipping. It seemed to me that Oswald had been in New Orleans to be sheepdipped under the guidance of Guy Banister and that he had been sent back to Dallas when the mission was accomplished.

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 70 - 71)

A final point—not addressed by Garrison but needs to be refuted—is the Warren Commission's assertion that Oswald had attempted to kill Major General Edwin A. Walker on April 6, 1963 using the same Mannlicher-Carcano rifle that the government claimed was used to kill Kennedy.³⁹ The Commission made a feeble attempt to link the bullet found in Walker's house to the Mannlicher-Carcano, but eventually this was discredited. At one point, the Warren Report referred to the testimony of FBI ballistics expert Robert A. Frazier. The following is an excerpt from the Warren Report regarding Frazier's attempt to link the Kennedy murder weapon to the Walker shooting incident:

Frazier testified, however, that he found no microscopic characteristics or other evidence which would indicate that the bullet was not fired from the Mannlicher-Carcano rifle owned by Lee Harvey Oswald.⁴⁰

In crimes where a gun is fired, law enforcement investigators normally look for evidence linking the bullet found at the crime scene to a weapon owned by the suspect. When the FBI investigated the Walker shooting, they were apparently satisfied to make their allegation first—that the bullet came from Oswald’s weapon—then conclude that the allegation was correct because no evidence was found to refute it. This rationale—which was stated in the Warren Report—is so ridiculous that it deserves no further comment.

In addition, the government’s allegation that Oswald shot at Walker’s house with a Mannlicher-Carcano rifle—allegedly, the same murder weapon that killed Kennedy—was further weakened by critics, such as Garrison and others, who demonstrated that the Mannlicher-Carcano was not the murder weapon used in the assassination.

One of the incriminating pieces of evidence which implicated Oswald in the Walker shooting incident were three photographs of the General’s home found in Oswald’s belongings at the home of Ruth Paine (the Irving-based woman with a strong intelligence background, introduced to the Oswalds through George and Jeanne De Mohrenschildt, who allowed Marina Oswald to live with her and her husband Michael while the Oswalds were separated). One of the photographs was of a 1957 Chevrolet—reportedly owned by General Walker and parked in the General’s driveway. There was a hole punched in the photograph that prevented the license plate of the Chevrolet from being read. Dallas police and the FBI concluded that Oswald had punched the hole in the photograph in order to prevent anyone from linking the General’s automobile to him. This evidence has since been discredited.⁴¹

Furthermore, much of the evidence implicating Lee Oswald in the Kennedy assassination, the Walker shooting, and even an alleged attempt on Richard Nixon’s life⁴² came from the testimony of Oswald’s widow, Marina. Although Marina Oswald has recanted her statements against her husband, it should be noted that any testimony against him would not have been admissible in a trial had he lived. This point alone shows the injustice of the Warren Commission. Having stated that, we should also remember that Marina first told the authorities that Lee was innocent. It was only after she had been held for weeks by the federal authorities that her story began to change. But she spoke little English at the time and was completely intimidated by the federal investigators. Since then she has acquired a better command of the language and began publicly defending her deceased husband. In a 1988 interview published in *Ladies’ Home Journal*, Marina made the following statements:

When I was questioned by the Warren Commission, I was a blind kitten. Their questioning left me only one way to go: guilty. I made Lee guilty. He never had a fair chance... But I was only 22 then, and I’ve matured since; I think differently.⁴³

Researcher Jim Marrs wrote in his 1989 book, *Crossfire*, that Marina reversed her 1963-64 statements against her husband, plus she provided additional information. Marina's assertions and views are as follows (per Jim Marrs):

- ◆ The federal authorities forced her Warren Commission testimony by threatening her with deportation. They also ordered her not to read or listen to anything pertaining to the assassination.
- ◆ Marina believes there was a conspiracy to kill Kennedy.
- ◆ Marina stated that Lee Harvey Oswald was an agent who "worked for the American government" and was "caught between two powers—the government and organized crime."
- ◆ Marina believes her husband was "killed to keep his mouth shut."
- ◆ Marina stated that someone impersonated her husband to incriminate him and "that's no joke."
- ◆ Lee Harvey Oswald "adored" President Kennedy.⁴⁴

These and other facts have indeed changed public opinion about Lee Harvey Oswald in recent years. There can be no doubt—as Garrison correctly stated—that he was totally, unequivocally, and completely innocent of the assassination of President Kennedy.

Jack Ruby's Filmed Interview

An interesting fact pointing to Israeli involvement in President Kennedy's assassination is a filmed statement by Jack Ruby, the man who shot and killed accused assassin Lee Harvey Oswald. Ruby was Jewish. His real name was Rubenstein.

In March 1964, Jack Ruby was found guilty of murdering Lee Harvey Oswald and was sentenced to death. After the verdict and sentence, Ruby requested several times to be moved to Washington, DC to testify before the Warren Commission. Each request was denied. Although most of the Commission's work was done in secret, they did visit Dallas on one occasion where they interviewed Ruby. He made the following statement:

Ruby:

Everything pertaining to what's happening has never come to the surface. The world will never know the true facts of what occurred – my motives. The people had so much to gain, and had such an ulterior motive to put me in the position I'm in, will never let the true facts come above board to the world.

Questioner:

Are these people in very high positions Jack?

Ruby:

Yes.

(The Men Who Killed Kennedy – The Coup D’etat, N. Turner)

Less than three years later, in January 1967, Jack Ruby died in prison of lung cancer. He told his family he had been injected with cancer cells.⁴⁵

In 1979 the House Select Committee on Assassinations linked Ruby to Jewish Mafia chief, Meyer Lansky (aka, Maier Suchowljansky). Keep in mind that both men were Jewish. The Encyclopedia Britannica states the following about Lansky and Ruby:

[Meyer Lansky was] one of the most powerful and richest of U.S. crime syndicate chiefs and bankers, who had major interests in gambling, especially in Florida, pre-Castro Cuba, Las Vegas, and the Bahamas.

... In 1979 the House of Representatives Assassinations Committee, ending its two-year investigation of the Warren Commission report, linked Lansky with Jack Ruby, the nightclub owner who killed presidential assassin Lee Harvey Oswald.

(Encyclopedia Britannica - Meyer Lansky)

Julia Ann Mercer Saw Ruby Drop off a Gunman at Dealy Plaza

Jack Ruby had worked for the Mafia for years. He likely worked for Meyer Lansky's top lieutenant, Santo Trafficante who handled mob business in Florida and Cuba.^(Footnote 17) Ruby participated in the assassination by performing ad hoc assignments for the hitmen and their handlers.

After Oswald was arrested, the conspirators obviously decided he needed to be eliminated. They likely made Ruby an offer he couldn't refuse.

"Either kill Oswald," they must have said, "or we'll implicate you in the murder of President Kennedy instead of Oswald. We have a respectable witness who saw you drop off a man with a rifle near Dealy Plaza shortly before Kennedy was killed."

Julia Ann Mercer identified Jack Ruby as a man driving a pick-up truck who dropped off another man carrying a rifle near Dealy Plaza shortly before the assassination. The following is a description of Mercer's story from Jim Garrison's book, *On the Trail of the Assassins*:

Some of the best witnesses to the assassination found their way

to us after it became apparent to them that the federal agents and the Dallas police really were not interested in what they saw. Julia Ann Mercer was just such a witness. In fact, no other witness so completely illuminated for me the extent of the cover-up.

Mercer had been but a few feet away when one of the riflemen was unloaded at the grassy knoll shortly before the arrival of the presidential motorcade. Consequently, she was a witness not only to the preparation of President Kennedy's murder but also to the conspiracy involved.

She gave statements to the FBI and the Dallas Sheriff's office, and then returned to the FBI and provided additional statements, but she was never called by the Warren Commission—not even to provide an affidavit.

Much earlier, I had read Julia Ann Mercer's statements in the Warren Commission exhibits, but I had never had a chance to talk to her. Then one day in early 1968 her husband called me at the office. He said that he and his wife were in New Orleans on business and had some things to tell me. I agreed to meet them at the Fairmont Hotel, where they were staying.

Arriving at their suite, I found a most impressive couple. A middle-aged man of obvious substance, he had been a Republican member of Congress from Illinois. Equally impressive, she was intelligent and well-dressed, the kind of witness any lawyer would love to have testifying on his side in front of a jury. After he had departed on business, I handed her copies of her statements as they had been printed in the Warren Commission exhibits. She read them carefully and then shook her head.

"These all have been altered," she said. "They have me saying just the opposite of what I really told them."

About an hour before the assassination she had been driving west on Elm Street and had been stopped—just past the grassy knoll—by traffic congestion. To her surprise (because she recalled that the President's parade was coming soon), she saw a young man in the pickup truck to her right dismount, carrying a rifle, not too well concealed in a covering of some sort. She then observed him walk up "the grassy hill which forms part of the overpass." She looked at the driver several times, got a good look at his round face and brown eyes, and he looked right back at her.

Mercer also observed that three police officers were standing

near a motorcycle on the overpass bridge above her and just ahead. She recalled that they showed no curiosity about the young man climbing the side of the grassy knoll with the rifle.

After the assassination, when Mercer sought to make this information available to law enforcement authorities, their response was almost frenzied. At the FBI office—where she went the day after the assassination—she was shown a number of mug shots. Among the several she selected as resembling the driver was a photograph of Jack Ruby. On Sunday, when she saw Ruby kill Oswald on television, she positively recognized him as the driver of the pickup truck and promptly notified the local Bureau office. Nevertheless, the FBI altered her statement so it did not note that she had made a positive identification.

She laughed when she pointed this out to me. "See," she said, "the FBI made it just the opposite of what I really told them." Then she added, "He was only a few feet away from me. How could I not recognize Jack Ruby when I saw him shoot Oswald on television?"

The Dallas Sheriff's office went through the same laborious fraud and added an imaginative touch of its own. Although Mercer had never been brought before any notary, the Sheriff's office filed a sworn affidavit stating that she did not identify the driver, although she might, "if I see him again," and significantly changing other facts.

"See that notarized signature?" she asked me. "That's not my signature either. I sign my name with a big 'A' like this." She produced a pen and wrote her name for me. It was clear that the signature the Dallas Sheriff's office had on its altered statement was not even close to hers.

Julia Ann Mercer then wrote on the side of my copies of the FBI and the Dallas Sheriff fabrications the correct version of what she had seen then. That version had not been acceptable in Dallas, but it was more than welcome to me. Conscious of the sudden deaths of some witnesses who appeared to have seen too much for their own survival, I thought that she should sign her maiden name as she had back in Dallas right after the assassination. At my suggestion she did so.

When I got back to my office, I thought about Julia Ann Mercer. She had been only a few feet away from one of the most crucial incidents of the assassination and had tried in vain to tell the federal and Dallas law enforcement authorities the simple truth. The implications of her experience were profound. First of all, Mercer's observations provided further evidence that there was

another rifleman on the knoll ahead of the President.

But to me the responses to her statements were even more chilling. They proved that law enforcement officials recognized early on that a conspiracy existed to kill the President. Both local and federal authorities had altered Mercer's statements precisely to conceal that fact.

I already had concluded that parts of the local Dallas law enforcement establishment were probably implicated in the assassination or its cover-up. But now I saw that the highly respected FBI was implicated as well. After all, the Bureau had to have known on Saturday, November 23, when it showed Jack Ruby's photo to Mercer, that Ruby might have been involved in a conspiracy. This was the day before Ruby shot Oswald.

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 251 - 254)

House Select Committee on Assassinations Ignored Mercer's Testimony

Garrison made the following comments about the House Select Committee's deception regarding Julia Ann Mercer's eye-witness account of Ruby:

There was a coda to the Julia Ann Mercer story. In the late 1970s when I was in private law practice, the House Select Committee on Assassinations convened. Because I had seen too much critical material disappear in the hands of federal investigators, I was not enthusiastic about sending the committee anything.

However, Mercer's observations, as well as the government's alteration of them, were of overriding importance. There was no evidence more conclusive of the frontal shooting of Kennedy, of the conspiracy and of the subsequent cover-up. Consequently, I sent the committee copies of Mercer's statements to the FBI and the Dallas Sheriff's office as they appeared in the Warren Commission exhibits, with her description of the alterations written on the sides of each.

Because of the exceptionally high casualty rate among important assassination witnesses, I described her only by her maiden name, which she had signed on her statements. In an accompanying letter, I explained the reason to the committee and said that if they intended to call her as a witness and would assure me that there would be a serious effort to protect her, I

would be happy to send her married name and present address.

I never received a reply from the House Committee. Some years later I happened to be thumbing through the published hearings of the committee when I stumbled on an interesting passage. It said that I had sent to the committee alleged statements made by one Julia Ann Mercer. The House Committee's investigators, the report continued, "had been unable to locate her."

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 254 - 255)

Ruby's Association With the FBI

Garrison provided additional information about Ruby's association with the FBI in the 1950s:

Jack Ruby had a special relationship with the Dallas office of the FBI In 1959. Ruby met at least nine times with one of the Dallas Bureau's agents. At that time he also purchased a microphone-equipped wrist watch, a bugged tie clip, a telephone bug, and a bugged attaché case. These facts suggested that Jack Ruby was probably a regular informant with the local Bureau office.

But Ruby may well have been working for the CIA also. Individuals on the payroll of one agency are sometimes hired as contract employees for another agency within the intelligence community. During 1959, the same year in which Ruby was meeting with the FBI agent, he took two flights to Cuba. One was for eight days. The other was an overnight turn-around flight. Earlier in the 1950s he had consulted a war supplies dealer about the purchase of 100 jeeps, one of the most valuable items for the rebels in Cuba whom the CIA was supporting at that time. On a later occasion, he was deeply involved in gun running for the Cuban rebels supported by the Agency.

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, p. 254)

Ruby Tried to Save Oswald

After Oswald's arrest, Ruby apparently tried to save Oswald by phoning the Dallas Police Department and warning them not to move Oswald through the basement. Billy Bremer, a communications officer with the Dallas Police in 1963, was on duty

the night before Ruby killed Oswald. At around 9:00 pm, he received an anonymous but urgent call from someone who turned out to be Ruby. In an interview years later, Bremer described the phone call.

I thought I recognized the voice, but at the time I could not put a face or a name with the voice. And as we talked, he began telling me that we needed to change the plans on moving Oswald from the basement – that he knew of the plans to make the move, and if we did not make a change – the statement he made precisely was "We are going to kill him."

Bremer reported the call, then went home and went to sleep when his shift was over that night. The next morning, he saw on television that Ruby had shot Oswald.

No sooner then I had turned it on, they were telling that Jack Ruby had killed Oswald. Then I suddenly realized, knowing Jack Ruby the way I did, this was the man I was talking to on the phone last night. At that time, I put the voice with the face. And I knew within myself that Jack Ruby was the one that made that call to me the night before. And I think it was obvious because he knew me, and I knew him, and he called me by my name over the telephone. And seeing this, and knowing what I knew and what he had said, then to me, it had to be Jack Ruby.

(The Men Who Killed Kennedy – The Coup D'etat, N. Turner)

General Charles Cabell and Brother Earle, Mayor of Dallas

General Charles Cabell was a key figure in the assassination. His brother, Earle Cabell, was mayor of Dallas when Kennedy was killed. This fact was uncovered by Jim Garrison. The Cabell brothers were likely enlisted in the Israeli-born coup during or shortly after the Cuban Missile Crisis. General Charles Cabell had been fired by President Kennedy after the Bay of Pigs Invasion in 1961.

A key contribution to the coup—apparently made by the aforementioned Cabell brothers—was to change the motorcade route on the day of the assassination. The motorcade was apparently changed in order to pass by the Texas School Book Depository, thereby implicating Oswald as the assassin because he worked there. The following is Garrison's description—from his book, *On the Trail of the Assassins*—of how he discovered the Cabell brothers:

One morning I was in my office reading and rereading a newspaper. I did not hear Frank [Klein] enter.

"I have never seen you so preoccupied," said Frank.

"It's not just any paper, son," I said. "This is the front page of the Dallas Morning News for November 22, 1963."

"Well, what's got you so hypnotized?"

I gestured to the large diagram on the paper's front page, indicating the route of the presidential parade. "Have I ever shown you this before?" I asked.

He shook his head.

I turned the paper around facing his way so that he could read the diagram of the motorcade. It covered almost five-sixths of the front page.

"Frank," I said, "I want you to follow the parade route with me. Let's pick it up right here as it comes down Main approaching Dealey Plaza. Are you with me?"

"Yes," he said, his finger following the thick line indicating the motorcade. "And here is where it reaches Dealey Plaza. . ." He stopped.

"What's the matter?" I asked.

"This diagram indicates that the President's parade was supposed to continue on Main Street through the center of Dealey Plaza-without even leaving Main." He stared at it in disbelief.

"So what's wrong with that?" I asked.

His finger was moving off of Main, inches downward to Elm until he found the Depository area where the President had been shot. "if that was the presidential parade route up there on Main . . ."

I finished the question for him. "How did he get way down here on Elm?"

Frank looked up at me with a slight frown, then looked back at the diagram. He moved his finger back along Main Street to where it reached Houston. "The motorcade turned right on Houston and went down onto Elm," he said.

"Where the motorcade made that sweeping 120-degree left turn you are looking at, which had to slow the President's car down to

about ten miles an hour."

Frank looked up again at the thick line indicating the motorcade route continuing on Main through the center of Dealey Plaza as it headed for the Stemmons Freeway.

"Here on Main street, continuing through the open meadow," he said, "they couldn't have hit him. Are you telling me that at the last moment they just moved the President of the United States off of his scheduled route to here where the Depository is?" He pushed back his chair and stood up. "Hell, I haven't read a damned word about that anywhere. How can they keep something like that a secret for three years?"

I leaned back in my chair. "Now you see why I didn't hear you knock when you came in."

"Where the hell were the Dallas police when they made that last-minute change in the route?" he asked.

"Where indeed?" I asked. "And the Secret Service. And the FBI"

"And the city administration of Dallas," he added. "Don't they have a mayor over there in that damned place?"

"Yes, they do. The mayor when this happened was Earle Cabell."

I buzzed the intercom and my secretary, Sharon Herkes, came in. I asked her to take a cab to the public library and find the latest volume of Who's Who in the Southwest. "I'm sure you'll find Earle Cabell in there. See if his article indicates any connections with Washington."

"With Washington?" Frank asked.

"Of course," I replied. "You can't tell me it's possible to hijack the President—with the whole world watching—unless there's some kind of cooperation between the city administration and the federal government."

Frank grabbed the front page of the Dallas Morning News and pointed to the diagram. "Hell," he said, "was the Warren Commission blind? Didn't they see this?"

"Oh," I said. "Would you like to see the front page that was introduced to the Warren Commission?"

I pulled open my middle desk drawer and took out a copy of the Dallas Morning News front page that had been introduced as a

Commission exhibit. I handed it to Frank and lit my pipe. I had hardly taken the first puff on it when he yelled.

"Those bastards! They just removed the entire motorcade route from the front page."

That was true. On five-sixths of the Dallas Morning News page where the diagram of the motorcade route was supposed to be was nothing but a large square of solid gray. "And this has been printed as an official, exhibit by the Warren Commission?" he asked.

I nodded.

"And just what in the hell are we supposed to call this?" he asked, waving the nearly blank exhibit.

I took a puff or two on my pipe. "This is what you call," I replied, "a coup d'etat."

An hour or so later Sharon walked in the door with a large photostat in her hand. "They, didn't have anything about Mayor Cabell in the Who's Who," she said. "But there's a lot of stuff here about a General Charles Cabell."

I glanced down at the article. Right away it jumped out at me from the page that this Charles Cabell had been the deputy director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Now I found myself looking at that last name with real fascination. It took one phone call to an attorney friend in Dallas to determine that General Charles Cabell was the brother of Earle Cabell, former mayor of Dallas.

Now the eleventh-hour change in the President's motorcade route was even more intriguing to me, and I immediately headed for the public library. Before sunset I had become the leading expert in New Orleans on General Charles Cabell, who, it turned out, had been fired as the CIA's number two man by President Kennedy. General Cabell had been in charge of the Agency's disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion. In the final hours, while Castro's small air force was tearing the landing effort apart, Cabell had managed to get through a call to President Kennedy in an attempt to halt the disaster. Just over the horizon, by something less than happenstance, lay aircraft carriers with fighter planes on their decks, engines warming up. General Cabell informed the President that these fighters could reverse the course of disaster in minutes and secure the success of the invasion. All that was needed was the President's authorization.

On the preceding day Kennedy had assured the assembled

media that if anyone invaded Cuba (and the air had become rife with invasion rumors) there certainly would be no help from the US armed forces. He flatly turned Cabell down. With that the invasion's chances sank, as did the general's intelligence career. President Kennedy asked for Cabell's resignation and the general was subsequently replaced on February 1, 1962, as the CIA's deputy director. General Cabell's subsequent hatred of John Kennedy became an open secret in Washington.

In most countries, a powerful individual who had been in open conflict with a national leader who was later assassinated would receive at least a modicum of attention in the course of the posthumous inquiry. A major espionage organization with a highly sophisticated capability for accomplishing murder might receive even more. Certainly a powerful individual who also held a top position in a major espionage apparatus and had been at odds with the departed leader would be high on the list of suspects.

However, General Cabell, who fit that description perfectly, was never even called as a witness before the Warren Commission. One reason may have been that Allen Dulles, the former CIA director (also fired by President Kennedy), was a member of the Commission and handled all leads relating to the Agency. During the nine years that Dulles had been the CIA's chief, General Charles Cabell had been his deputy.

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 117 - 121)

Former CIA Director, Allen Dulles

Allen Dulles was CIA director during the Eisenhower administration, and Kennedy allowed him to continue serving in that capacity until after the Bay of Pigs invasion, after which Kennedy asked Dulles to resign. According to historian Michael Beschloss, the Kennedy administration "stripped" Dulles of "certain of his CIA retirement privileges" in the spring of 1962, about six months before the Cuban Missile Crisis. The following is an excerpt from *The Crisis Years* by Michael Beschloss:

In March 1962, Nixon's memoir *Six Crises*, charging that Kennedy had subordinated national security to political ambition, caused a public sensation. Nixon wrote that Dulles had told the Democratic nominee that for months the CIA had "not only been supporting and assisting, but actually training Cuban exiles for the eventual purpose of supporting an invasion of Cuba itself."

. . . The President also asked Dulles to issue a statement saying "that the President never knew about it." But Dulles told reporters only that Nixon must be victim of an "honest misunderstanding." Soon thereafter, he was stripped of certain of his CIA retirement privileges.

(Michael Beschloss, *The Crisis Years*, p. 29)

Beschloss also wrote that Dulles began studying President Kennedy's psychological profile while Kennedy was still President-Elect.

Before meeting [with the newly elected President Kennedy, CIA director Allen] Dulles evidently studied an assessment of Kennedy's personality by CIA psychologists using files dating to the 1930s, including material from British surveillance of Joseph Kennedy's London Embassy as well as his son's wartime service in the Navy. Such assessments predicted how the subject would respond when informed of the full range of CIA operations, showing Dulles the most effective method of appeal.

(Michael Beschloss, *The Crisis Years*, pp. 102-103)

Garrison made the following observations of the CIA's study of President-Elect Kennedy:

I do not know precisely when the planning and preparation for the coup began. In a sense, it may have been as early as late 1960 when the CIA prepared a dossier analysis on the President-elect. Such a psychological profile surely would not have contemplated assassination of the President, but its purpose was to help the CIA, or some elements within it, further its goal of manipulating policy.

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 136-138)

Endnotes

1. Nigel Turner documentary, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy: The Patsy*
2. *ibid*
3. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 24 - 25
4. *ibid*, p. 51
5. *ibid*, pp. 55 - 59
6. *ibid*, p. 59
7. *ibid*, p. 64
8. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 278; Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 61
9. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 61
10. *ibid*
11. *ibid*, p. 55

12. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 287; Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, p. 64. Marrs supplied the date of de Mohrenschildt's death, that he was killed by a shotgun blast to the head, and that it occurred at his sister-in-law's home in Manalapan, Florida. Garrison wrote that his death was ruled suicide.
13. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 523
14. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 287; Michael Collins Piper, *Final Judgment*, p. 121
15. Michael Collins Piper, *Final Judgment*, p. 388
16. William Torbitt, *Nomenclature of an Assassination Cabal*, Reference Section II: *J. Edgar Hoover, Ferenc Nagy, Clay Shaw, L.M. Bloomfield, and Perminde*.
17. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, p. 60. The reference to Henry Hurt is from *Reasonable Doubt*, p. 219.
18. *ibid*, pp. 25 - 27
19. *ibid*, pp. 91-93, 198-199. Dean Andrews told the FBI and the Warren Commission that Clay Bertrand had called him to represent Oswald. Later Garrison discovered that Clay Bertrand was in fact an alias used by well-known New Orleans businessman, Clay Shaw. When asked under oath, before a grand jury, if Clay Bertrand and Clay Shaw was the same person, Andrews denied it. The grand jury indicted Andrews for perjury. Subsequently, in August 1967, Andrews was found guilty of perjury by a jury of New Orleans citizens. (pp. 198-199)
20. *ibid*, pp. 292 - 294
21. *ibid*, p. 225
22. *ibid*, pp. 225 - 236, 328 - 329
23. *ibid*, p. 51 (Delgado's testimony is from Warren Commission Hearings, Volume 8, p. 133.)
24. *ibid*, pp. 114 - 115
25. Nigel Turner documentary, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy: The Patsy*
26. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, p. 116. Garrison got the information about the nitrate test from the Warren Commission Report, pp. 560-561. The Commission reported that "Oswald's hands reacted positively to the test. The cast of the right cheek showed no reaction." WCR, p. 560. Due to the problems introduced by the latter finding, the Commission added that "the test is completely unreliable..." WCR, p. 561
27. Nigel Turner documentary, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy: The Patsy*
28. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, p. 86. Garrison quoted Robert Groden's dissent to the House Select Committee on Assassinations, p. 295.
29. *ibid*
30. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, p. 71. Garrison cited John Gilligan, Director of the Agency for International Development during the Carter administration, to corroborate his assertion that AID was a front for the CIA. Gilligan stated the following: "At one time, many AID field offices were infiltrated from top to bottom with CIA people." Garrison found the quote in an article by George Cotter. ["Spies, Strings, and Missionaries," *The Christian Century* (Chicago), March 25, 1981]
31. *ibid*, p. 52
32. *ibid*, p. 51
33. *ibid*, pp. 50 - 62
34. *ibid*, p. 53
35. *ibid*, pp. 83 - 85
36. *ibid*, pp. 84 - 85
37. Warren Report, pp. 278 - 283 (Section is entitled "Contacts With the Cuban and Soviet Embassies in Mexico City and the Soviet Embassy in Washington, DC")
38. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, pp. 73 - 74. Garrison referenced a "murky snapshot" of an older "Oswald" from Henry Hurt's book, *Reasonable Doubt* (p. 263). Garrison cited his source for the CIA ordering the Mexican authorities to arrest Silvia Duran as the House Select Committee Hearings, Chapter 3, pp. 82, 157, 232-233; and Chapter 11, pp. 203-204. Garrison also cited Anthony Summers' book, *Conspiracy*, p. 377, where Duran told Summers, in 1978, that the man who came to the Embassy was about five foot three with blond hair.
39. Warren Report, pp. 33, 174
40. *ibid*, p. 174. Reference section entitled "Prior Attempt to Kill: The Attempt on the Life of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker"
41. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, pp. 255 - 265
42. Warren Report, pp. 175 - 176

43. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 129. Marrs got his information about Marina Oswald from an interview she gave to *Ladies' Home Journal* in 1988. The article, written by Myrna Blyth and Jane Farrell, was entitled "Marina Oswald—Twenty-Five Years Later."
44. *ibid*
45. *ibid*, p. 561. Marrs wrote that Ruby died of "lung cancer," and he "told family [his] family he was injected with cancer cells."

Chapter 7: Proving Conspiracy

Look at the Zapruder Film

In Chapter 5, I mentioned that my curiosity had been aroused by Christian David's description—in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*—of the shots fired at President Kennedy and John Connally. According to David, there were "three guns, four shots, three hits, and one miss." Two shots hit Kennedy, one hit Connally, and one missed the car completely. Furthermore, two shots were fired simultaneously which explains why witnesses heard three shots.

After studying the Zapruder film, I have concluded that David's version is absolutely correct. Not only is it correct, I realized that the Zapruder film alone proves in a legal sense that there was a conspiracy. All one has to do is look at the Zapruder film.

I highly recommend that anyone interested in the Kennedy assassination go to the nearest video store and rent the Zapruder film. Before viewing it, purge your mind of any pre-conceived notions. Forget what the so-called experts have told you and look at it with an open mind. You will see—as I did—two important things rarely discussed by the so-called assassination experts. First of all, it is quite obvious that Kennedy's neck wound was caused by a different bullet than Connally's wounds because there was a four second delay between the time Kennedy grabbed his neck and the time Connally reacted to being hit. The Warren Commission concluded that one bullet hit Kennedy in the neck and caused all of Connally's wounds. This is known as the "Single Bullet Theory." Simply stated, the Warren Commission's Single Bullet Theory is impossible.

Secondly, the Zapruder film shows that there must have been at least two gunmen because there was only a one-second delay between the time Connally reacted to being hit in the back and the time Kennedy was shot in the head. That simply was not enough time for one gunman to fire two shots. The Warren Report stated that a minimum of "2.3 seconds" is "necessary to operate the [Mannlicher-Carcano] rifle" to fire two consecutive shots.¹ Using the government's own logic, there had to have been two gunmen because Kennedy was hit in the head less than 2.3 seconds after Connally was hit. According to the government, this would be impossible for one gunman. Using this logic, the shot that caused Kennedy's head wound could have come from the front or the back, but two gunmen would still have been required because of the one second delay between Connally's shot in the back and Kennedy's shot in the head.

The one-second delay between the second and third shots was corroborated by the eye-witness account of Mary Woodward, a junior reporter on the Dallas Morning News at the time of the assassination. In fact she wrote an article describing the assassination before it was even announced that Kennedy had died. The following is Woodward's description— from an interview years later for *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*—of the shots she observed:

...One thing I am totally positive of in my own mind is how many shots there were. And there were three shots. The second two

shots were immediate. It was almost as if one were an echo of the other, they came so quickly. The sound of one did not cease until the second shot. ...

(The Men Who Killed Kennedy: The Cover-up, N. Turner)

We have an eye-witness account and a film of the assassination; both clearly indicate that the second and third shots were immediate. As Mary Woodward stated, "It was almost as if one were an echo of the other." Again, the Warren Report stated that a minimum of 2.3 seconds delay is required between two consecutive shots from the alleged murder weapon, a Mannlicher-Carcano.

Keep in mind that Woodward's observation that she heard three shots does not refute Christian David's claim that there were actually four shots fired. David also stated that two shots were fired almost simultaneously. Hence, witnesses heard only three shots.

These facts are not complicated. They do not require an expert's analysis. Any reasonable person of average intelligence can understand them. Yet the sponsors of Kennedy's murder have trained the public to rely on expert "interpretation" of these simple facts. After viewing the Zapruder film for yourself, it will become clear that most of the so-called assassination researchers have confused the public for years on the notion of conspiracy. The sponsors of Kennedy's murder have created a general state of public confusion by expressing from all sides so many complex opinions that the public has decided to have no opinion of any kind in matters of conspiracy.

John Connally's Wounds

The nature of John Connally's wounds are another topic of debate among the so-called critics of the Warren Report. The facts I am about to present will show that John Connally generally told the truth about his wounds. It will also become obvious that one bullet struck Connally wounding him in five places. In addition, the individual who shot Connally was standing in the vicinity of the upper floors of the Texas School Book Depository. This does not refute the previously described proof of conspiracy. Remember, the Warren Commission concluded that one bullet hit Kennedy in the neck and also wounded Connally in five places. My position is that one bullet hit Kennedy in the neck, and a separate bullet hit Connally. A third bullet hit Kennedy in the right temple and killed him. Also, the fact that the individual who shot Connally fired from the vicinity of the upper floors of the Texas School Book Depository does not prove that Oswald was the shooter. Here are the facts.

The position in which Connally was sitting when he was struck is critical to understanding the direction the bullet was traveling. I have also discovered that Connally's physical position at the moment he was hit is an area in which disinformation abounds. The nature of Connally's wounds is equally important. The combination of these two things—the physical position he was in when he was hit and

the nature of his wounds—makes it fairly easy to ascertain the general location from which the shot was fired.

I have seen at least one hand-drawn diagram, in a popular assassination book, where Connally is sitting in the wrong position when he was hit. In that diagram, Connally is facing forward, but if you view the Zapruder film, you will see that Connally was actually sitting sideways, facing to his right when he was hit. His torso was twisted to the right because he turned to look behind after hearing gunfire from the back. His legs may have pointed forward, but his torso was definitely twisted to the right. This is a critical point.

All of Connally's wounds were to the left and below the previous wound, but this only makes sense if you understand that his torso was twisted to the right and his legs were facing forward. More specifically, a bullet entered Connally's back at his right armpit, continued in a straight line exiting the right side of his chest (at the right nipple), entering and exiting his right wrist, and hitting his left thigh.² The bullet was obviously traveling downward and to the left in a straight line. This means that the individual who shot Connally had fired from a high position, from behind the Presidential limousine, and to the right of it (from the riders' perspective). In other words, the individual who shot Connally had fired from the vicinity of the upper floors of the Texas School Book Depository.

Transcript of Connally's Interview From The Men Who Killed Kennedy

The facts I have just described match Connally's testimony which states that he turned to look over his right shoulder immediately after hearing the first shot. As he began to turn back around, he was hit. He was not facing forward, as so many of the "false critics" would have us believe. The following is Connally's description of the shots from *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*:

Nellie [Connally's wife] turned to the President and said, "Mr. President, you can't say now that they don't love you here in Dallas.

Within a matter of a few seconds after that, we turned on Elm Street to go down to get on the Stemmons Freeway to go out to the Trade Mart where the luncheon was being held. That's when the shots occurred.

I heard what I thought was a rifle shot. I immediately reacted by turning to look over my right shoulder because that's where the sound came from.

I didn't see anything out of the ordinary and was in the process of turning to look over my left shoulder when I felt a blow in the middle of my back as if someone had hit me with a doubled up

fist, about like that.

[As he was speaking, he hit his hands together hard, three times, one hand balled in a fist hitting the open palm of the other.]

The blow was of such force that it bent me over [leaning forward to indicate it bent him over in the forward direction] and I immediately saw that I was covered with blood – and I knew I'd been hit. And I said, "Oh my God, they're gonna kill us all!"

And I heard another shot that was a loud shot almost like that [a gunshot noise is heard as a picture of the Zapruder film shows Kennedy being shot fatally in the head], and immediately I saw blood and brain tissue all over the back of the limousine. I knew then that the President had been fatally hit because Mrs. Kennedy, then, I heard her say, "My God. I've got his brains in my hand."

(John Connally, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy – The Coup d'état*, N. Turner)

Connally's description of the assassination was consistent with Zapruder film with one exception. I do not believe he said, "Oh my God, they're gonna kill us all." The reason I don't believe it is because he only had one second to get those eight words out before the next shot was fired. There simply was not enough time. Again, look at the Zapruder film. Connally claimed he uttered those words after the second shot hit him in the back. After making the alleged statement he said he heard a third shot, the one that hit Kennedy in the head and killed him. The Zapruder film reveals a one-second delay between those two shots. I don't believe those eight words—or any eight words—can be uttered in just one second. Try it.

For anyone who might argue that the Zapruder film is tainted in some way, recall the eye-witness account of Mary Woodward who made the following observation of the second and third shots: "...there were three shots. The second two shots were immediate. It was almost as if one were an echo of the other, they came so quickly. The sound of one did not cease until the second shot."

We have film footage and an eye-witness account. Both clearly refute Connally's claim that he shouted "Oh my God, they're gonna kill us all!" after being hit.

Connally may have been coached into telling that white lie, or maybe he made the statement in his mind—thought it, but didn't actually say it. In either case, critics had a field day analyzing his alleged remark. It fed the ridiculous notion that he was part of the conspiracy because by stating "they're gonna kill us all," he must have known that there were multiple shooters. I use the word "ridiculous" because I do not believe he, or any rational person, would have put themselves in harm's way to help kill someone. But I could definitely believe he was encouraged to lie about this subtle point for two reasons. First of all, it wasn't the kind of lie that he could easily be convicted of perjury for telling. Secondly, it created a smokescreen by encouraging nonsensical debates amongst critics.

Summary of Shots Fired

Here is my analysis of the shots fired:

1. Four shots were fired.
2. Only three shots hit Kennedy and Connally.
3. One shot missed the car completely, ricocheted off the curb far ahead of the car and a fragment grazed bystander, James Teague, in the cheek.³
4. The first shot was fired from the rear, hitting Kennedy in the neck. We know Kennedy was probably hit in the neck because he was seen clutching his throat in the Zapruder film. Furthermore, we know the shot was likely fired from behind because Connally reacted immediately by turning around. "I immediately reacted," Connally stated, "by turning to look over my right shoulder because that's where the sound came from." His filmed reaction and his testimony are consistent with Kennedy's neck/back wound being caused by someone firing from the rear.
5. Four seconds after Kennedy was hit in the neck, a second bullet hit Connally in the back causing five wounds (right back, right chest, entry and exit wounds on right wrist, and one wound on left thigh). The bullet that hit Connally was obviously fired from the direction of the Texas School Book Depository because each of Connally's wounds was downward and to the left from the previous one.
6. One second after Connally was hit, a third shot was fired fatally hitting Kennedy in the head. The timing alone proves there was a second gunman because, according to the Warren Report, 2.3 seconds are required to fire two consecutive shots from a Mannlicher-Carcano rifle, the type of weapon Oswald was alleged by the government to have used. If there was a second gunman, then by definition there was a conspiracy.
7. The chronology in which the "missed" shot was fired cannot be determined; however, Christian David stated that it was the fourth of four shots fired, that it was fired from the rear, and that two shots were fired almost simultaneously (reference [Chapter 5](#)). Given that the Zapruder film clearly shows Kennedy and Connally reacting to three separate shots, and given that most eye witnesses claim to have heard only three shots, we can conclude that the shot which missed the limousine was fired simultaneously with one of the other three shots that hit Kennedy and Connally and that it was fired from the rear. The sequence in which it was fired is a moot point because conspiracy has already been proved by Point No. 6.

Kennedy's Neck/Back Wound

Much has been made about the direction of the shot to Kennedy's neck. As previously stated, we know that Connally's immediate reaction after hearing the first shot—the one that caused Kennedy to grab his neck—was to look to the rear. My description of Connally's response is corroborated in the Zapruder film and in Connally's testimony.

Hence, we can conclude that the wound to Kennedy's neck/back was caused by someone firing from the rear.

In my opinion, many of the so-called critics who make a fuss about the direction of the bullet that hit Kennedy in the neck are intentionally creating a smokescreen to divert people away from noticing and discussing time delays between shots.

Joseph Milteer Corroborated Jewish Conspiracy

Joseph Milteer was an individual with first-hand knowledge of the conspiracy to kill Kennedy. Thirteen days before the assassination, Milteer told a Miami police informant that Kennedy would be killed with a high-powered rifle from an office building. After the assassination, he told the same informant that a Jewish conspiracy was behind the assassination. An FBI report was subsequently filed on the entire incident.

Joseph Milteer was a wealthy southerner from Quitman,⁴ Georgia with ultra-conservative extremist political leanings. He was an active member of the Constitutional America Party and had acquaintances in the Ku Klux Klan.⁵ His politics were a mixture of right-wing extremism mixed with Evangelical Christianity and the belief in Armageddon. Evangelicals believe Jews are needed to establish a Jewish state so that Jesus will return, gather all Jews in Israel, and build a Temple. The world would then end and practically all the Jews would be killed at Armageddon. The few Jewish survivors would convert to Christianity.⁶

On November 9, 1963, a Miami police informant named William Somersett met with Milteer who outlined the assassination. Somersett was a union organizer with extensive right-wing political ties. President Kennedy was scheduled to come to Miami on November 18, 1963. As a security measure, the local police were monitoring known subversives like Milteer. A tape recorder and microphone was placed in Somersett's apartment where the two men met.⁷

The following is a transcript of the conversation between Milteer and Somersett on November 9, 1963 nearly two weeks before Kennedy was killed:

Somersett:

I think Kennedy is coming here on the 18th, or something like that to make some kind of speech . . .

Milteer:

You can bet your bottom dollar he is going to have a lot to say about the Cubans. There are so many of them here.

Somersett:

Yeah. Well, he will have a thousand bodyguards, don't worry about that.

Milteer:

The more bodyguards he has the easier it is to get him.

Somerset:

Well, how in the hell do you figure would be the best way to get him?

Milteer:

From an office building with a high-powered rifle.

Somerset:

Do you think he knows he's a marked man?

Milteer:

I'm sure he does. I'm sure he does. Yes.

Somerset:

They are really going to try to kill him?

Milteer:

Oh yeah, it's in the working.

Somerset:

Hitting this Kennedy I'll tell you is going to be a hard proposition, I believe. Now you may have it figured out to get him from an office building and all that, but I don't know how the Secret Service—they'd ... cover all them office buildings and anywhere he's going. Do you know whether they'd do that or not?

Milteer:

If they have any suspicions, they will of course. But without suspicions the chances are they wouldn't. You wouldn't have to take a gun up there. They'd take it up in pieces, assemble it and take it out in pieces. All those guns come knocked down and you can take them apart.

Somerset:

Boy, if that Kennedy gets shot, we have to know where we are at. Because you know that will be a real shake if they do that.

Milteer:

They wouldn't leave any stone unturned there, no way. They will pick somebody up within hours afterwards, if anything like that would happen. Just to throw the public off.

(The Men Who Killed Kennedy: The Cover-up, N. Turner⁸)

Miami Detective Everette Kaye was in charge of the surveillance operation on Milteer. Prompted by Milteer's prophecy, security was tightened when Kennedy visited Miami on November 18th. The following is Kaye's recollection of the change in security, from *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*:

... There was no particular city mentioned [by Milteer] nor was there any particular person mentioned that was to do the assassination. ...

The tape was made on November 9th, and President John F. Kennedy was due in Miami on the 18th of November 1963. So the close proximity of the tape being made and his visit made quite a few changes in his security. They changed the motorcade—I believe that he was helicoptered in rather than have a motorcade. Additional men were secured. Everyone was made aware that there may be a problem. So there was a drastic change in the procedures. He wasn't as accessible in this city as he might have been in the past.

(The Men Who Killed Kennedy: The Cover-up, N. Turner)

FBI Report Stated Assassination was a Jewish Conspiracy

After the assassination, Milteer told the same informant, William Somerset, that it was a Jewish conspiracy that sponsored Kennedy's murder. In fact, Milteer referred to the person in charge as "the big Jew." According to an FBI report, Milteer told Somerset that Martin Luther King and Attorney General Kennedy were now unimportant, but the next move would be against "the big Jew." Milteer described the assassination as "a Communist conspiracy by Jews to overthrow the United States government."⁹

This information is extremely important because Milteer was clearly a man with prior knowledge about the assassination. Despite his extremist politics, Milteer was a person to be taken seriously. His comment about Martin Luther King, Robert Kennedy, and "the big Jew" tells us three things. First, his reference to "the big Jew" corroborates my thesis that one Jewish individual—likely Louis Bloomfield—ran the coup against Kennedy. Second, it reveals that right-wing extremists broke ranks with the Jewish-led coup immediately after the assassination. Apparently, Milteer and his associates had made a pact with Bloomfield to support the coup but secretly plotted to kill him—Bloomfield—upon completion of the deed. Third, it suggests that contingency plans were in place in 1963—by the right-wing extremists—to kill Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy.

Further evidence indicates that Milteer personally declared a right-wing war on the Jews. On November 24, just two days after the assassination, Milteer reportedly made a speech before the Constitutional American Party in Columbia, South Carolina. According to an FBI report, he made the following statements:

... to all Christians: The Zionist Jews killed Christ 2000 years ago and on November 22, 1963, they killed President Kennedy. You Jews killed the President. We are going to kill you.¹⁰

The following FBI report, dated November 27, 1963,¹¹ documented Milteer's subsequent conversations with Somersett on November 23th and 24th. Although the report was written in a cryptic manner, it clearly stated that Milteer believed a Jewish conspiracy was behind the assassination of President Kennedy. It also indicated that Milteer's right-wing extremists had declared war on the Jews. Here is the complete text of the FBI report:

11-27-63 - 6 p.m.

Howard Trent, FBI HQ, passed the following information to us per suggestion of Orrin Bartlett:

On Nov. 10 and 11 information came to the FBI from an informant [William Somersett] concerning J.A. Milteer, active in the Constitutional American Party, which information was furnished early the morning of Nov. 11 to Agent Scott Trundle of our Washington Field Office. Plans, he alleged, were being made to kill the President at some future date. He thought it might be done from some place near the White House with a high powered rifle.

Subsequently, Mr. Trent continued, the Secret Service in Miami contacted the informant [Somersett] and interviewed him and had access to a recording of interview with him.

The same informant [Somersett] has just furnished additional

information which in many instances cannot be verified.

In this instance he is speaking of Milteer again. Says he met Milteer in Jacksonville, Florida, November 23, at which time Milteer was jubilant over the assassination and said "everything ran true to form -- I guess you thought I was kidding you when I said he would be killed from a window with a high-powered rifle." Source then asked Milteer whether he was guessing when he gave the original information about the plan. Milteer replied "I don't do any guessing." Then Milteer allegedly said on the 23rd that he had been in Ft. Worth and Dallas, as well as other southern cities, but did not indicate the date he visited these cities. Milteer allegedly had contact with Robert Shelton who is a KKK leader but he thought Shelton could not be depended upon as he opposes violence. Milteer was quoted as saying Martin Luther King and Attorney General Kennedy are now unimportant, but the next move would be against "the big Jew." Milteer alleged [sic] that there is a Communist conspiracy by Jews to overthrow the United States. On Nov. 24 the informant [Somerset] received information from Milteer that Milteer may have made a telephone call which was pertinent and that they do not have to worry about Oswald getting caught because Oswald knew nothing and the right wing was in the clear. Informant indicated Milteer while at Columbia, S.C. Nov. 24 made some notes prior to arrival of members of the Constitutional American Party who were to have a meeting there and captioned the notes "notes to all Christians -- - The Zionist Jews killed Christ 2000 years ago and on Nov. 22, 1963, they killed President Kennedy. You Jews killed the President. We are going to kill you."

FBI Atlanta Office determined that Milteer was, on Nov. 22, at Quitman, Georgia.

FBI is in process of locating Milteer to question him because of his interest in American Constitutional Party Hate organization.

FBI will furnish our office with any further pertinent information developed.

Not possible to evaluate the reliability of the informant; however, he was interviewed by Secret Service Agent in Miami who may have made some comment as to his judgment of the man's veracity.¹²

Milteer's War on Jews

As previously stated, Joseph Milteer belonged to several right-wing extremist groups that mixed politics with Evangelical Christianity. The latter has a history of loyalty to Israel because of its belief in Armageddon.

Evangelical ministers Pat Robertson and Jerry Falwell are both big supporters of Israel. Robertson in particular is a big believer in Armageddon. The bizarre thing about Evangelicals is they do not hesitate to encourage Jewish conversion to Christianity; however, they also feel that Jews are needed in order to fulfill the scriptures.

When Menachem Begin was cautioned that Evangelical aid was provided to Israel only because they believed that a new Jewish state was needed for the second coming of Jesus, and the conversion of Jews to Christianity, he reportedly responded: "I tell you, if the Christian Fundamentalists support us in Congress today, I will support them when the Messiah comes tomorrow."¹³

As previously stated, Milteer and his right-wing associates apparently made a pact with the Jewish forces—namely Louis Bloomfield—who organized the coup against Kennedy. Such an alliance seems highly plausible for several reasons. First of all, Evangelical Christians supported Israel for religious reasons mentioned before. Secondly, Milteer and his right-wing associates were racists and surely detested Kennedy for supporting American "negroes" in the burgeoning civil rights struggle. Thirdly, Milteer and his associates likely gave Louis Bloomfield a green light to step up heroin smuggling into the United States—as payment to the assassins—by Auguste Ricord et al so long as narcotics sales were confined to blacks in the inner cities, thereby making them a permanent underclass. Lastly, Milteer and his associates were ardent anti-communists and felt that Kennedy was getting too friendly with the Soviets.

Apparently Milteer and his associates learned that many of the Jews sponsoring the assassination had leftist leanings even stronger than Kennedy's. Louis Bloomfield and Sam Bronfman, for example, were active members of the leftist Israeli labor union, [Histadrut](#). Whatever the motivation, Milteer clearly indicated—in the cited FBI report—that he was declaring war on the Jews.

Such an action against Jews was not surprising in light of the origins of the Ku Klux Klan. Originally formed in Nashville, Tennessee in 1867 by Confederate cavalry general Nathan Bedford Forrest, the Klan disappeared by 1882 because its original objective—the restoration of white supremacy throughout the South—had largely been achieved during the 1870s. In addition, Forrest had ordered it disbanded in 1869, because of the group's excessive violence.¹⁴

The second wave of Klan activity began when it was reorganized in 1915, not because of strong antiblack sentiment, but because white Protestants in small-town America felt threatened by the Bolshevik revolution in Russia and by the large-scale immigration of the previous decades that had changed the ethnic character of American society.¹⁵

Milteer's call to arms against Jews may have intensified hatred by the Ku Klux Klan against Jews and blacks alike in its opposition to the Civil Rights movement. On June

21, 1964, three civil rights workers—Michael Schwerner, Andrew Goodman and James Earl Chaney—were abducted and killed by the Ku Klux Klan in Mississippi. Two of those men were Jewish; only one was African-American. Their abduction occurred just seven months after Kennedy's assassination.

As soon as the three workers turned up missing, President Johnson and J. Edgar Hoover launched a massive investigation. The fate of the three men was uncertain, but their disappearance provided the final impetus needed for the 1964 Civil Rights Act to pass. The bodies of Goodman, Schwerner and Chaney were found five weeks later, buried in a mud dam. Eventually, 19 men, including the county sheriff and a deputy, were convicted of federal conspiracy charges in connection with the murders.

On the surface, Johnson and Hoover seemed courageous in their fight against right-wing extremists; but more than likely, Johnson, Hoover, and the extremists had been partners in treason.

Milteer and George Wallace

Did Joseph Milteer have enough influence—even within his group right-wing extremist—to instigate a war against Jews? As it turns out, he may have had assistance from at least one prominent politician, namely Alabama Governor George Wallace who was friendly with right-wing General Curtis LeMay, a hawkish adversary of Kennedy's during the Cuban Missile Crisis.¹⁶ Their animosity toward one another has been widely documented.

The Constitutional American Party—the group that Milteer reportedly addressed on November 24, 1963 when he declared war on Jews—later evolved into The American Independent Party, Wallace's party when he ran for president in 1968.¹⁷ General LeMay was his running mate.

Wallace loathed the Kennedy brothers and Martin Luther King because they shamed him in June 1963 during a standoff at the University of Alabama where Wallace stood in the doorway to block enrollment of black students. Under President Kennedy's direction, Bobby Kennedy called out the Alabama National Guard who forced Wallace to step aside. King was in the middle of the conflict as well. In fact, he solicited the aid of the Kennedy brothers to deal with Wallace.

Wallace wanted to be president badly, probably more than Lyndon Johnson. And he would not have a chance until 1985 when the Kennedy dynasty was over (after John, Bobby and Ted had each served two terms).

LeMay was one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the Kennedy administration. He was an ardent cold warrior, and partly for this reason his tenure as chief was neither successful nor happy. LeMay found himself at constant odds with the management policies of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and the "flexible response" military strategy of Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman General Maxwell Taylor.¹⁸

Kennedy's relationship with the military was strained, to say the least.¹⁹ He and Lemay displayed mutual contempt for one another. Kennedy once remarked after one of his many walkouts on the General, "I don't want that man near me again."²⁰

During the Cuban Missile Crisis, LeMay and the other generals wanted to attack Cuba after it was learned that the Soviets had been supplying Cuban leader Fidel Castro with nuclear missiles. Having been ill-advised once before by the Joint Chiefs during the Bay of Pigs Invasion, Kennedy was not willing to make the same mistake twice. He remarked, "Those sons of bitches with all the fruit salad just sat there nodding, saying it would work."²¹

Kennedy feared that a US assault on Cuba would escalate into nuclear war. In fact it is generally accepted among scholars that one of the reasons that the nuclear stalemate ended peacefully is because both superpowers feared the possibility of a military coup against Kennedy if a settlement was not reached.²²

In his four years as chief, LeMay argued vigorously for new air weapons like the B70 bomber and the Skybolt missile, and against the swingwing "fighter" plane, the General Dynamics TFX (later named the F111). He lost all these battles. In addition, LeMay had strong feelings regarding American involvement in Vietnam, arguing against the gradual response advocated by the administration. Once again he was ignored.²³

False Critics and Opposing Propagandists

A powerful tool in covering up crimes is the use of false critics. Two examples are Dr. Cyril Wecht and Oliver Stone. Both are left-wing, both appear interested in the truth, but neither will look in the direction of Israel. Both have consciously deceived the public. In addition, opposing propagandists are employed to overtly promote the Warren Report. The end result is often a form of professional wrestling where both sides pretend to be at odds with each other, but in reality, they report to the same employer.

Robert Groden

On January 2, 2002 assassination researcher and author Robert Groden gave a lecture at a law office, in Severna Park, Maryland, that offers classes on the Constitution. About midway through his slide presentation, Groden mentioned Joseph Milteer (the right-wing extremist). As Groden was talking, he showed the following slide without comment:

Milteer was quoted as saying Martin Luther King and Attorney General Kennedy are now unimportant, but the next move would be against "the big Jew."

Again, Groden did not comment on Milteer's "big Jew" remark. He merely planted a seed of anti-semitism in people's minds. The way he presented the excerpt, Groden gave the distinct impression that Milteer was calling Kennedy a "big Jew." I discussed this with two other people in the audience. Both agreed that they thought Milteer's reference to "the big Jew" was President Kennedy. When I pointed out the Milteer made the statement on November 23, 1963, the day after Kennedy had been killed, they both agreed that Groden was obviously deceiving the audience.

Dr. Cyril Wecht

Dr. Cyril Wecht is one of the world's leading pathologists and a so-called critic of the Warren Report. After closely studying Wecht's statements in a filmed interview, which appeared in *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, I have concluded that Wecht misled the public about the wounds suffered by President Kennedy and Governor John Connally. Wecht gave a convoluted explanation about a "magic bullet" zigzagging in mid-air. Yet the world's leading pathologist neglected to mention the four second delay between the time Kennedy reacted to being hit in the neck (he clutched his throat) and the time Connally reacted to being hit in the back, as displayed in the Zapruder film. Wecht made the following statements in Nigel Turner's documentary:

The infamous magic bullet. We have that bullet exiting from President Kennedy's neck, moving forward, and leftward, and downward. It now stops in mid-air. It turns to the right. It comes back a full eighteen inches, stops again, and then slams into John Connally's back. It continues downward and it goes through his wrist, and somehow, they get that right wrist over to the left thigh. If you look at the Zapruder Film, you'll see in the individual frames, that John Connally's right wrist is not near John Connally's left thigh.

The significance of this, the importance cannot be exaggerated. It is impossible to overstate it. Why? Because the Single Bullet Theory is the [mainstay] of the Warren Commission Report. It's not a matter of how much weight and credibility do you give to it. It's a matter of whether or not you have a Single Bullet Theory that permits you to conclude that there was only one person firing, whether it was Oswald, or anybody else in the world. If you don't have a Single Bullet Theory, then you cannot have a sole assassin. And if you move to that point, then you're into conspiracy by definition. And that's why it had to stop with Oswald as a sole assassin. And that's why they came up with the Single Bullet Theory. There's no question in my mind that that 26 volume set [the Warren Report] should be taken from the shelves of all the libraries where they now rest in the United States, from non-fiction and placed in the fiction shelves along with Tom Sawyer, Huckleberry Fin, and Gulliver's Travels because that's where they belong.

(Dr. Cyril Wecht, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, N. Turner)

Wecht made an issue out of something that is truly irrelevant: the zigzagging of the single bullet in mid-air. As previously stated, he ignored the four second time delay between the time Kennedy clutched his throat and the time Connally was obviously hit.

The most ridiculous statement Wecht made was when he described John Connally's wounds. Here is a repeat of what he said on that topic:

[The Magic Bullet] comes back a full eighteen inches, stops again, and then slams into John Connally's back. It continues downward and it goes through his wrist, and somehow, they get that right wrist over to the left thigh. If you look at the Zapruder Film, you'll see in the individual frames, that John Connally's right wrist is not near John Connally's left thigh.

(Dr. Cyril Wecht, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, N. Turner)

Let's focus on Wecht's last statement: "John Connally's right wrist is not near John Connally's left thigh." That was a subtly deceptive statement. As a pathologist, Wecht is fully aware of the nature of Connally's wounds. As previously stated, Connally was apparently shot by an individual in the vicinity of the upper floors of the Texas School Book Depository. Consequently, it makes perfect sense that the bullet would have entered Connally's left thigh because it was traveling downward and to the left. Remember, his torso was twisted to the right when he was shot. If Connally's right wrist was anywhere within a straight-line path between his right armpit and his thigh, it would have been hit, and it was.

To state that "John Connally's right wrist is not near John Connally's left thigh" was a masterful display of deception by Wecht. If the bullet was traveling on a downward angle, Connally's right wrist would not need to be near his left thigh for them both get hit by the same bullet.

Wecht gave a finale performance that would have made Dr. Irwin Corey proud. Wecht cynically continued to pontificate as a bugle sounded towards the end of his diatribe.

I think it's extremely important for the American people to know that there can be the overthrow of a government, that there can be a coup d'etat in America, that that in fact did happen through the assassination of President Kennedy. In order to prevent that kind of thing from happening again, in order to EXPOSE [emphasis] the forces that were responsible for that kind of murder and the kind of cover-up that has ensued in the following twenty-five years, it's necessary to expose it. Otherwise we can have the same thing repeated again. Therefore in the same fashion that we have EXPOSED [emphasis] problems and

scandals involved with Watergate, problems in Vietnam, problems in Central America, problems in the overthrow of governments elsewhere like . . . Chile, and on, and on, and on; so must we EXPOSE [emphasis] that same kind of political assassination in our country. [A bugle sounds in the background.] As painful as it may be, as disruptive as it might be in a transitory nature, as embarrassing as it might be to certain individuals and organizations in the United States government, that has to be uncovered. If they were able to do it to John F. Kennedy then; they could do it to some other president in the future.

(Dr. Cyril Wecht, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, N. Turner)

Oliver Stone

One has to wonder how a movie like *JFK* was made when the American news and entertainment media is almost completely controlled by friends of Israel. But how honest was Stone's movie, particularly in the area of Israeli/Jewish involvement? Eleven and a half minutes into the movie, the character of Guy Banister (played by Ed Asner) made the following comment as an expression of contempt for Kennedy immediately after hearing of the assassination:

That's what happens when you let the niggers vote. They get together with the Jews and the Catholics and elect an Irish bleeding heart.

Those two sentences played an enormous psychological trick on the audience. It shielded Jewish groups by giving the false impression that Kennedy and Jews were the best of friends. Nothing could have been farther from the truth. Stone's objective was apparently to deceive the public by telling only half the story about who killed Kennedy.

As I stated earlier, Kennedy was more pro-Hitler than many people realize. He praised Hitler in his diary in 1945. Later he was subtly critical of the Nuremberg Trials in his 1957 book, *Profiles in Courage*, when he named Senator Robert Taft as a courageous profile for publicly criticizing the Nuremberg Trials while they were in progress in 1946. I believe Stone intentionally added the line about "niggers" and "Jews," which is pure disinformation, as a means of getting the picture financed by AOL-Time Warner, which is run by Jewish mogul Gerald Levin.^(Footnote 18) By adding that one line early in the film, Stone created a psychological barrier in the audience's collective mind which prevented them from entertaining the possibility that Jewish political interests may have been involved in the assassination.

Furthermore, I noticed that Stone made no mention of Perminex, but did quickly mention the Centro Mondiale Commercial (World Trade Center) in the scene where

New Orleans district attorney Jim Garrison (played by actor Kevin Kosner) summoned Clay Shaw (played by actor Tommy Lee Jones) to his office on Easter Sunday for questioning about his involvement in the Kennedy assassination:

[Garrison holds up an Italian newspaper with the headline "Clay Shaw - ha lavorato a Roma."]

Garrison:

Mr. Shaw, this is an Italian newspaper article saying that you were a member of the board of the Centro Mondiale Commercial in Italy; that this company was a creature of the CIA for the transfer of funds in Italy for illegal political espionage activity. It says that this company was expelled from Italy for those activities.

Shaw:

I'm well aware of that asinine article. I'm thinking very seriously of suing that rag of newspaper.

Garrison:

It also says that this company is linked to the Schlumberger tool company here in Houma, Louisiana which helped provide arms to David Ferrie and his Cubans.

Shaw:

[laughing] Mr. Garrison, you're reaching.

Garrison:

Am I?

Shaw:

I'm an international businessman. The Trade Mart which I founded is America's commercial pipeline to Latin America. I trade everywhere. I am accused as are all businessmen of all things. I somehow go about my business, make money, help society the best I can, and try to promote free trade in this world.

Garrison:

Mr. Shaw, have you ever been a contract agent for the Central Intelligence Agency?

Shaw:

And if I were, Mr. Garrison, do you believe I would be here today talking to somebody like you?

Garrison:

No. People like you don't have to I guess.

Shaw:

May I go?

Garrison:

People like you, they just walk between the raindrops.

Shaw:

[whispering] May I go?

Garrison:

Yes.

[Shaw stands up, turns and walks toward the door, then turns back facing Garrison.]

Shaw:

Regardless of what you may think of me, Mr. Garrison, I am a patriot first and foremost.

Garrison:

I've spent half my life in the United States military serving and defending this great country Mr. Shaw, and you're the first person I ever met who considered it an act of patriotism to murder his own president!

Shaw:

Now just a minute sir, you are way out of line!

[One of Garrison's male assistants steps between Garrison and Shaw apparently to prevent a fist fight from breaking out.]

Assistant:

I'm sorry Mr. Shaw. It's getting late. That's all the questions we have. Thank-you for your honesty and for coming in today.

Shaw:

I enjoyed meeting with you gentlemen. And with you Miss Cox. It was most pleasant.

(Miss Cox was a fictitious female assistant of Garrison's, created by Stone.)

[Shaw walks outside the door of Garrison's office, then turns and changes his demeanor to one of warmth toward his pursuers.]

Shaw:

I wish to extend to each of you, and to each of your families, my best wishes for a happy Easter.

[Shaw leaves and the assistant closes the door.]

Garrison:

'One may smile and smile and still be a villain.' [quoting Hamlet]
God damn it we got one of 'em! Did you see that?

(Transcript from *JFK*, the movie, Oliver Stone)

That was an explosive scene, but slightly inaccurate. The article in the Italian newspaper—*Paesa Sera*—was real, but Garrison never showed it to Shaw or asked him about it because Garrison himself did not find out about the article until well after the trial of Shaw was over. Had Garrison known of the article during the trial, the jury likely would have convicted Shaw of conspiracy to murder President Kennedy. Jurors told researcher and attorney Mark Lane that Garrison had indeed convinced them that there was a CIA conspiracy to assassinate Kennedy, but that Garrison was unable to link Shaw to the CIA. That article might have changed the jurors' minds had they seen it during the trial.

Although it was an error on Stone's part to state that Garrison knew of Shaw's involvement in Centro Mondiale Commercial prior to indicting Shaw for conspiracy to murder President Kennedy, I can forgive Stone here because the mention of Centro Mondiale Commercial was barely detectable by most movie-goers. I saw the movie *JFK* twice in the theater and did not pick up on Garrison's mention of Centro Mondiale Commercial. It likely didn't register with me because Centro Mondiale Commercial is an Italian name which I had never heard of at that time. When I first saw the movie *JFK*, I had not read Garrison's book, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, which explains Centro Mondiale Commercial and its half-brother corporation Permindex in more detail.

It wasn't until after I read Garrison's book, then rented a video cassette of JFK the movie, that I picked up on the dialogue which mentioned Centro Mondiale Commercial only one time. I doubt that one-tenth of one percent of the people who watched JFK the movie recall the mention of Centro Mondiale Commercial.

This poses an interesting question. Why did Stone put it in the movie? It is completely worthless to the plot since it is essentially undetectable?

The topic of Centro Mondiale Commercial is a sensitive area that gets into the uncomfortable area of Jewish political interests involved in the Kennedy assassination. In my opinion, Stone likely mentioned Centro Mondiale Commercial to gain credibility among serious researchers of the Kennedy assassination, but without jeopardizing distribution by Jewish controlled AOL-Time Warner.

Nevertheless, Stone's script accurately described the article in the Italian newspaper, *Paesa Sera*, but no mention was made of Louis Bloomfield from Montreal who was also mentioned in the article as "Major Bloomfield." According to Garrison's book, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, which Stone cited as the basis of the movie—along with Jim Marrs' *Crossfire*, this is what the article in *Paesa Sera* actually stated about Shaw and Bloomfield:

Among its possible involvements ...is that the Center was the creature of the CIA...set up as a cover for the transfer of CIA...funds in Italy for illegal political-espionage activities. It still remains to clear up the presence on the administrative Board of the Center of Clay Shaw and ex-Major Bloomfield.

(Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassin*, p. 103)

Why did Oliver Stone omit the article's mention of Louis Bloomfield, a lawyer for billionaire Jewish Zionist Sam Bronfman? Garrison's book did not mention that Bloomfield was Bronfman's lawyer, but Jim Marrs' book, *Crossfire*, did. Here is what Marrs wrote about Bloomfield and his connection to Sam Bronfman:

The Italian media reported that [Ferenc] Nagy was president of Permindex and the board chairman and major stockholder was Maj. Louis Mortimer Bloomfield, a powerful Montreal lawyer who represented the Bronfman family as well as serving U.S. intelligence services.

(Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 499)

At this point, there is little doubt that Oliver Stone was intentionally directing viewers of the movie *JFK* away from Israel, even though the two books—*On the Trail of the Assassins* and *Crossfire*, which he credits as the basis for the movie—did in fact point to Israel when they mentioned Louis Bloomfield and the Bronfman family.

Noam Chomsky

Noam Chomsky, the prestigious left-wing Jewish intellectual, is not a fake critic of the Warren Report. On the contrary, he endorses it wholeheartedly. Although his field is linguistics, he often strays into political discussions. In 1993, Chomsky wrote a book, *Rethinking Camelot*, which gave a backhanded endorsement to the Warren Commission's conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald alone killed President Kennedy. One of Chomsky's weakest arguments is to belittle conspiracy theories in general. Either Kennedy was killed by a lone assassin or he wasn't. If you believe the former, then you essentially believe the Warren Report. If you believe the latter, then a conspiracy is a likely alternative. One can disbelieve the Warren Report without knowing what really happened or why. The mere fact that a so-called intellectual would engage in bashing all conspiracies reveals a hidden agenda and discredits him as a truth seeker.

The following is an excerpt from Chapter 9, *The Kennedy Revival*, of Chomsky's 1993 book, *Rethinking Camelot*, which gives tacit endorsement of the Warren Report:

The Kennedy revival involves disparate groups. One consists of leading intellectuals of the Kennedy circle. What is interesting in this case is not their rising to Kennedy's defense, but the way they seized upon the idea that Kennedy was planning to withdraw from Vietnam, the timing of this thesis, and the comparison to the version of these events they had provided before the war became unpopular among elites. Among this group, few if any credit the belief that the alleged withdrawal plans, or other planned policy reversals, were a factor in the assassination.

A second category includes segments of the popular movements that in large part grew from opposition to the Vietnam war. Their attitudes toward the man who escalated the war from terror to aggression are perhaps more surprising, though it should be recalled that the picture of Kennedy as the leader who was about to lead us to a bright future of peace and justice was carefully nurtured during the Camelot years, with no little success, and has been regularly revived in the course of the critique of the Warren report and the attempts to construct a different picture, which have reached and influenced a wide audience over the years.

Within both categories, some have taken the position that JFK truly departed from the political norm, and had become (or always was) committed to far-reaching policy changes: not only was he planning to withdraw from Vietnam (the core thesis), but also to break up the CIA and the military-industrial complex, to end the Cold War, and otherwise to pursue directions that would indeed have been highly unpopular in the corridors of power. Others reject these assessments, but argue that Kennedy was perceived as a dangerous reformer by right-wing elements (which is undoubtedly true, as it is true of virtually everyone in public

life). At this point, the speculations interweave with questions and theories about the assassination. Some take the position that Kennedy was assassinated by a high-level conspiracy determined to make sure that their own man, the hawkish LBJ, would take the reins. It is then necessary to assume further that a conspiracy of quite a remarkable character has concealed the awesome crime. There are other variants.

Of all of these theories, the only ones of any general interest are those that assume a massive cover-up, and a high-level conspiracy that required that operation. In that case, the assassination was an event of true political significance, breaking sharply from the normal course of politics and exercise of power. Such ideas make little sense unless coupled with the thesis that JFK was undertaking radical policy changes, or perceived to be by policy insiders.

The scale of the presumed conspiracy should be appreciated. There is not a phrase in the voluminous internal record hinting at any thought of such a notion. It must be, then, that personal discipline was extraordinary among a huge number of people, or that the entire record has been scrupulously sanitized. There has not been a single leak over thirty years, though a high-level conspiracy to assassinate Kennedy and conceal the crime would have to involve not only much of the government and the media, but a good part of the historical, scientific, and medical professions. An achievement so immense would be utterly without precedent or even remote analogue.

The conviction that JFK was assassinated by a high-level conspiracy, and that the crime has since been concealed by a conspiracy awesome in scale, is widely held in the grassroots movements and among left intellectuals. Indeed, it is often presented as established truth, the starting point for further discussion.

Across this broad spectrum, there is a shared belief that history changed course dramatically when Kennedy was assassinated in November 1963. Many believe that the event casts a shadow over all that followed, opening an era of political illegitimacy, with the country in the hands of dark forces.

Given the strong reactions that these issues have raised, perhaps it is worthwhile to make clear just what is and is not under consideration in what follows. This discussion addresses the question of the assassination only at the policy level: is there any reason to believe that JFK broke from the general pattern and intended to withdraw US forces from Vietnam even if that would lead to "impairment of the war effort" and undermine the

"fundamental objective of victory"? Ancillary questions arise concerning the further beliefs about impending policy changes. These questions are addressed below.

The issue of the assassination is only obliquely touched by these considerations. They imply nothing about the thesis that JFK was killed by the Mafia, or by right-wing Cubans, or other such theories. They bear only on the thesis that Kennedy was killed in a high-level conspiracy followed by a cover-up of remarkable dimensions. Serious proponents of such theses have recognized that credible direct evidence is lacking, and have therefore sought indirect evidence, typically holding that JFK's plans for withdrawal from Vietnam (or some of the broader policy claims) provide the motive for the cabal. If serious, the claim must be that the high-level conspirators knew something not publicly available, or had beliefs based on such material; hence the importance of the internal planning record for advocates of such theses. This line of argument has been at the core of the revival of the past few years. Currently available evidence indicates that it is entirely without foundation, indeed in conflict with substantial evidence. Advocates of the thesis will have to look elsewhere, so it appears.

The available facts, as usual, lead us to seek the institutional sources of policy decisions and their stability. Individuals and personal whim doubtless make a difference; one might, for example, speculate that the notorious Kennedy macho streak might have led to dangerous escalation in Indochina, or that he might have leaned towards an enclave strategy of the type advocated by his close adviser General Maxwell Taylor, or a Nixonian modification with intensified bombing and murderous "accelerated pacification" but many fewer US ground combat forces; while at home, he might not have committed himself to "great society" and civil rights issues to the extent LBJ did. Or one might make other guesses. They are baseless, and hold little interest. In the present case, there is a rich record to assist us in understanding the roots of policy and its implementation. People who want to understand and change the world will do well, in my opinion, to pay attention to it, not to engage in groundless speculation as to what one or another leader might have done.

(Noam Chomsky, *Rethinking Camelot*, excerpt from Chapter 9, *The Kennedy Revival*)

I wish to make a few specific points about [Chomsky's anti-conspiracy diatribe](#). Much of his argument against conspiracy theories centers around the inaccurate use of the word "thesis" when referring to Kennedy's plans to withdraw from US military forces South Vietnam. It is not a thesis, an opinion, or a proposition; it is a verifiable fact. The following is a transcript—from a press conference on October 31, 1963—of

Kennedy's announcement to withdraw a thousand men from South Vietnam by the end of 1963:

[REPORTER:] Mr. President, back to the question of troop reductions, are any intended in the far east at the present time – particularly in Korea and is there any speedup in the withdrawal from Vietnam intended?

[PRESIDENT KENNEDY:] Well as you know, when Secretary McNamara and General Taylor came back, they announced that we would expect to withdraw a thousand men from South Vietnam before the end of the year. And there has been some reference to that by General Harkins. If we're able to do that, that will be our schedule. I think the first unit, the first contingent, would be 250 men who are not involved in what might be called front-line operations. It would be our hope to lesson the number of Americans there by a thousand as the training intensifies and is carried on in South Vietnam.

(from JFK's press conference, October 31, 1963)

Although Chomsky avoided stating overtly that he believed the Warren Report, he came pretty close with the following statement: "There is not a phrase in the voluminous internal record hinting at any thought of such a notion [conspiracy]." I assume the phrase "voluminous internal record" means the 26 volumes of the Warren Report. If Chomsky had truly read all 26 volumes, as he suggests he did, he would know that they contain plenty of phrases which do more than merely hint at a conspiracy.

A good example is Volume 11 of the Warren Commission Hearings, pp. 325 - 339, where Dean Andrews was interviewed—on July 21, 1964—by Wesley J. Liebeler, assistant counsel of the Warren Commission (excerpt of transcript is in Chapter 3). Under oath, Andrews identified Clay Bertrand as the man who phoned him requesting legal representation for Lee Harvey Oswald. After a close reading of the cited transcript, it becomes apparent that Andrews realized he was in potential danger after telling the FBI that he received a phone call to defend Oswald. Consequently, he began to have memory lapses about Bertrand's appearance. The cited transcript indicates that Bertrand had shrunk six inches—from six feet two (per Andrews's original description in an FBI report) all the way down to five feet eight inches which is how he described Bertrand to Liebeler. In fact, Liebeler grilled Andrews extensively about the discrepancy between his conflicting descriptions of Bertrand's height.

Later it became known that Clay Bertrand was actually Clay Shaw, who was linked to international espionage activities with Louis Bloomfield, one of Israel's most influential supporters. Although Jim Garrison lost the conspiracy case against Shaw (reference Chapter 3), he proved in a separate proceeding that Clay Bertrand and Clay Shaw were in fact the same individual.²⁴ In subsequent testimony before a grand jury in Louisiana, Andrews denied that Clay Bertrand and Clay Shaw were the same

person. The grand jury responded by convicting Andrews of perjury. Later, in August 1967, Andrews was found guilty of perjury by a jury of New Orleans citizens.²⁵ As a result, Andrews was sentenced to five months in the Parish prison.²⁶ The stated perjury conviction linked Bloomfield directly to Oswald because Shaw was obviously Oswald's handler, and Shaw and Bloomfield were linked to subversive intelligence activity via Permindex and Centro Mondiale Commerciale.

This is just one example of how the "voluminous internal record" indicates that there was a conspiracy, thereby refuting Chomsky's statement to the contrary.

Another example of conspiracy is the Zapruder film which I described in great detail at the beginning of this chapter.

Frankly, the timing of Chomsky's support of the Warren Report was unfortunate for his image as an outspoken intellectual. His book, *Rethinking Camelot*, was published in 1993—around the time that most media outlets stopped endorsing the Warren Report.

Michael Kazin & Maurice Isserman

In 2000, Jewish authors, Michael Kazin and Maurice Isserman wrote a book, *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*. In the fall of that year, Kazin and Isserman gave a joint lecture at a book signing event in Washington, DC to promote their new book. I attended the event which was held at "Politics and Prose," a well-known bookstore in Washington, DC. In their book, I noticed that they aggressively supported the official explanations of the murders of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King; however, they steered clear of making a similar endorsement of the Warren Report. Regarding Robert Kennedy, they inaccurately stated that his assassin, Sirhan Sirhan, was a "psychotic" Palestinian immigrant. During the question and answer session, I asked if they had any evidence that Sirhan Sirhan was psychotic because I had always heard that he was a model prisoner. Kazin admitted that it was an exaggeration. I followed up by asking him why they did not take a similar position regarding President Kennedy's assassination after clearly stating that they accepted the government's explanation for the murders of RFK and MLK. In fact I put a direct question to Kazin: "Do you believe the Warren Report?" He responded: "Yes I do, but I didn't put it in the book because the conventional wisdom these days is not to believe it."

Kazin's oral answer summed up the general position of the news media today regarding the Kennedy assassination. They secretly endorse the Warren Report but won't put it in writing because few people believe it anymore. Hence, they would lose their audience if they supported it directly.

Gerald Posner

Gerald Posner is another Jewish writer whose claim to fame was a book, *Case Closed: Lee Harvey Oswald and the Assassination of JFK* (1994), that openly embraced the Warren Commission's conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald alone killed President Kennedy.

Posner's book is filled with contradictions and half-truths. He does not provide any tangible evidence that Oswald was guilty. Instead he engages in double-talk, inconsistent presentation of facts, and character assassination.

Rather than point out the vast inconsistencies of Posner's conspiracy-bashing book, I would like to list two other books he authored:

- ♦ *Hitler's Children: Sons and Daughters of Leaders of the Third Reich Talk About Their Fathers and Themselves*, 1991
- ♦ *Mengele: The Complete Story*, 2000

It is simply mindboggling that Posner can bash conspiracies on one hand, but write two books that endorse the biggest conspiracy of the Twentieth Century: the Holocaust. Such uneven treatment of two conspiracies is intellectual dishonesty of the highest order

Endnotes

1. Warren Report. Go to the section known by researchers as the "single bullet theory." Unfortunately, a specific page number cannot be referenced because the Warren Report's page numbers vary among its many publications.
2. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins* (1988), pp 281
3. *ibid*, pp. 17-18, 281
4. Nigel Turner's documentary, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy: The Cover-up*, mentioned that Milteer was from Quitman, Georgia. Other cited sources about Milteer simply stated that he was from Georgia.
5. Joseph Milteer's post-assassination remarks to Miami police informant, William Somerset, are in an FBI report in National Archives file number 180-10123-10039. The "originator" is the US Secret Service. The text of the referenced document was obtained from John McAdams' website. (<http://mcadams.posc.mu.edu/somerset.txt>) The cited report states that Milteer "had contact with Robert Shelton who is a KK leader but he thought Shelton could not be depended upon as he opposes violence."
6. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, pp. 203
7. Former Miami Detective Everette Kaye described how the tape was placed in Somerset's apartment. Kaye provided this information in Nigel Turner's documentary, *The Men Who Killed Kennedy: The Cover-up*.
8. The same transcript is available in Anthony Summers' book, *Conspiracy*, p. 404.
9. *ibid*
10. *ibid* (NOTE: Although the cited FBI report does not explicitly state that Milteer made a speech at the Constitutional American Party, it is strongly implied. The report states that, on Nov. 24, 1963, Milteer "made some notes prior to the arrival of members of the Constitutional American Party who were to have a meeting [in Columbia, S.C.] and captioned the notes 'notes to all Christians --- The Zionist Jews killed Christ 2000 years ago and on Nov. 22, 1963, they killed President Kennedy. You Jews killed the President. We are going to kill you'.")
11. Robert Groden's reference to Milteer's "the big Jew" statement was an excerpt from National Archives file number 180-10123-10039. The "originator" is the US Secret Service. The document is from HSCA files. The content of the referenced document is a communiqué—written by a Miami police informant, William Somerset—to the FBI, dated November 27, 1963. The text of the referenced document was obtained from John McAdams' website. (<http://mcadams.posc.mu.edu/somerset.txt>)

12. *ibid*
13. *ibid*
14. Encyclopedia Britannica: Ku Klux Klan
15. *ibid*
16. Ernest May & Philip Zelikow, *The Kennedy Tapes*, pp. 5, 6, 8, 9-10, 12, 26, 32, 43, 177, 178, 182, 185, 186, 205, 247, 263, 265, 306, 565, 683, 699
17. Delmar Davis, *The American [Independent] Party*, (1992), (http://www.visi.com/~contra_m/cm/features/cm04_american.html). Davis wrote that "The American Party grew out of the George Wallace movement of 1968." He also wrote of Christian extremism: "The Christian who does not want the world to be totally Christian is not totally Christian." Clearly an Evangelical group, Davis gave tacit support to Israel in the following statements: "Iran is Islamic. Israel is Jewish. Why do we hesitate to make America Christian?" He essentially endorsed Judaism, something commonly associated with right-extremist groups; however, it is common among Evangelical Christians because of their belief in Armageddon. Davis wrote the following on the topic of Jews: "We also drew fire from the 'far right', as it is sometimes called. Those who claim that all our problems are caused by Jews who are not 'real Jews' could not support our party because we believe that no single group has caused the downfall of America. It is the abandonment of *principles* that has destroyed us. When correct principles - the Word of God - are adhered to, then no group can bring about our downfall. When those principles are ignored, any group can crush us." Also, Davis's 1992 description of the American Party stated that its two groups, The American Party and The Christian Party, were respectively located in Provo, Utah and Epworth, Georgia. Joseph Milteer was also from Georgia.
18. Airpower Journal, The Professional Journal of the United States Airforce: Reference *Curtis E. LeMay*, <http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/cc/lemay.html>
19. Richard Reeves, *President Kennedy: Profile of Power*, p. 306
20. *ibid*. p. 182
21. *ibid*. p. 103
22. Stephen R. Shalom, *Terrorists and Madmen*, March 27, 1999, ZNET, <http://www.zmag.org/sustainers/content/1999-03/mar27shalom.htm>
23. Airpower Journal
24. Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins* (1988), pp. 198-199
25. *ibid*
26. *ibid*

Chapter 8: Power Brokers

Sam Bronfman's 1963 Oil Investments

A significant fact pointing to Israeli involvement in President Kennedy's assassination was Sam Bronfman's mysterious oil investments in 1963. The Bronfman family—based in Montreal, Canada—is one of the most influential behind the scenes power brokers in the world today. Sam Bronfman (1891 - 1971) was the patriarch of the family dynasty, the son of Russian Jews—Mindel and Ekiel Bronfman—who migrated to the Americas seeking refuge from pogroms of Czarist Russia.¹ His son, Edgar Bronfman, has been the president of the World Jewish Congress for years. Edgar's son—Edgar Bronfman, Jr—is head of Universal Studios.

Sam Bronfman—a billionaire—was one of attorney Louis Bloomfield's wealthiest clients. Bronfman made his fortune as a bootlegger during US prohibition. He bought Seagram's and built it into a liquor dynasty. In 1963, former bootlegger Bronfman plunged into an unfamiliar business venture by aggressively purchasing huge oil holdings. He acquired Texas Pacific Oil and its subsidiaries in India, Malaysia, Guatemala, Indonesia, and Italy;² plus Ranger Oil.

Bronfman biographer Michael Marrus summarized Sam Bronfman's sudden interest in oil as follows:

In 1963, when production was about 10,000 barrels a day, Sam made his biggest plunge with the purchase of Texas Pacific, a major producer—"the venerable Texas Pacific Coal and Oil Company, founded in 1888 and possessing one of the oldest of Texas charters," said Sam about the pedigree, speaking as if it were a famous distillery. While it is doubtful that Sam foresaw the energy crisis of subsequent decades as he later claimed, there is no question that his acquisition was a remarkable financial coup—at a time when "leveraged buyouts" were a concept of the future. With a Seagram working capital of \$382 million and earnings of \$34 million a year, Sam borrowed \$75 million from institutional investors, in 25-year promissory notes. He put \$50 million of that as a downpayment on the Texas Pacific purchase price of \$266 million, and undertook to pay the balance out of future revenues—a strategy then facilitated by US tax laws. The key player in these arrangements was Mark Millard, a partner in Loeb, Rhoades and Co. and the man who had recommended the appointment of Carrol Bennett. Millard convinced Sam of the wisdom of the oil payment scheme and nudged him to make a Seagram bid.

By 1975, Texas Pacific had paid off its debt, while in the process its oil and gas reserves expanded phenomenally. A handsome legacy to Seagram, the company proved to be one of Sam's shrewdest moves; bought with only \$50 million in borrowed cash, it was sold in 1980 to the Sun Oil Company for a grand total of

\$2.3 billion. Here too, Mark Millard played a major role. A decade after Sam's death, Seagram used this capital to acquire a 20 percent interest in Dupont, taking the company that Sam had built from being a large wine and spirits company to a major diversified corporation.

(Michael Marrus, *Samuel Bronfman*, pp. 372-373)

Kennedy's Oil Tax

It's interesting Sam Bronfman invested heavily in foreign subsidiaries of Texas Pacific in 1963. Kennedy had placed a heavy tax burden on foreign subsidiaries of US oil companies. Once Kennedy was removed from office, Bronfman's oil investments began to increase. The following is researcher Jim Marrs' description of Kennedy's oil tax:

When John F. Kennedy became President in 1961, the oil industry felt secure. But President Kennedy then began to assault the power of the oil giants directly, first with a law known as the Kennedy Act, and later by attacking the oil depletion allowance. The Kennedy Act, passed on October 16, 1962, removed the distinction between repatriated profits and profits reinvested abroad. Both were now subject to US taxation. The measure also was aimed at preventing taxable income from being hidden away in foreign subsidiaries and other tax havens. While this law applied to industry as a whole, it particularly affected the oil companies, which were greatly diversified with large overseas operations.

By the end of 1962, oilmen estimated their earnings on foreign investment capital would fall to 15 percent, compared with 30 percent in 1955.

One of the most sacred of provisions in the eyes of oilmen was the oil depletion allowance, which permitted oil producers to treat up to 27.5 percent of their income as tax exempt. In theory this was to compensate for the depletion of fixed oil reserves but, in effect, it gave the oil industry a lower tax rate. Under this allowance, an oilman with a good deal of venture capital could become rich with virtually no risk. For example, a speculator could drill ten wells. If nine were dry holes and only the tenth struck oil, he would still make money because of tax breaks and the depletion allowance.

It was estimated that oilmen might lose nearly \$300 million a year

if the depletion allowance was diminished.

Attempts to eliminate or reduce the depletion allowance were rebuffed year after year by congressmen, many of whom were happy recipients of oil-industry contributions.

Speaking of his tax reform act of 1963, President Kennedy pointed the finger at the oil companies, saying: "... no one industry should be permitted to obtain an undue tax advantage over all others."

Included in Kennedy's tax package were provisions for closing a number of corporate tax loopholes, including the depletion allowance. Needless to say, oilmen both in Texas and elsewhere felt threatened by Kennedy and his policies. Kennedy's use of his personal power against the steel manufacturers had shown them that the young President meant to enforce his will in these matters.

(Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, pp. 276-277)

Was Sam Bronfman's acquisition of Texas Pacific Oil truly a "shrewd move" as biographer Michael Marrus described, or was it a perk for participating in President Kennedy's assassination?

'Suicide' of Bronfman Biographer, Terrence Robertson

Other strange events followed the Bronfman family. In 1970, Bronfman biographer Terrence Robertson committed "suicide" after he "found out things they don't want me to write about," as he confided to an associate. Canadian writer Peter Newman wrote of Robertson's death in his 1978 biography of Sam Bronfman, *King of the Castle*. Newman wrote the following:

Terrence Robertson, the only writer known to have previously attempted a Bronfman biography (it was never published), took his own life after completing a rough draft of the manuscript. During a 1977 trial in which the Toronto publishing firm of McClelland and Stewart Ltd sued Mutual Life Assurance Co. to collect the \$100,000 for which Robertson's life had been insured, Roderick Goodman of the Toronto Daily Star's editorial department testified that on January 31, 1970, the author had telephoned him from a New York hotel room to explain that he had been commissioned to write the history of the Bronfman family but that he had "found out things they don't want me to write about." Graham Murray Caney, another Star editor, testified that Robertson had told him his life "had been threatened and we

would know who was doing the threatening but that he would do the job himself." While he was still on the telephone, Caney had the call traced and alerted the New York Police Department. Detectives burst into Terence Robertson's hotel room just minutes before he died of barbiturate poisoning. ...

(Peter Newman, *King of the Castle*, p. ix.)

Israel's History of Terror

Israel's history is filled with terror and murder. In 1948, Jewish terrorists shot and killed UN peace mediator in the Mid-East, Count Folke Bernadotte of Sweden. It is widely accepted that Bernadotte was assassinated by a Jewish terrorist group known as the Stern Gang. Former Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Shamir was a member of the Stern Gang. Shamir's predecessor, Menachem Begin, was the commander of another Jewish terrorist group, Irgun Zvai Leumi (Hebrew: National Military Organization), from 1943 to 1948. On July 22, 1946, the Irgun blew up the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, killing 91 soldiers and civilians (British, Arab, and Jewish). The objective of the bombing was to drive the British from Palestine, thereby setting the stage for Israel to become an independent nation in 1948.³

On April 9, 1947, Irgun commandos assaulted the Arab village of Dayr Yasin, killing all 254 of its inhabitants.⁴ The objective of the Dayr Yasin massacre was to send a message to all Palestinians who had lived in the region for centuries: Get out. Years later, Israel rewarded terrorists Begin and Shamir by making them prime ministers. In my opinion, electing Shamir and Begin as prime ministers of Israel would be like electing Timothy McVeigh as president of the United States. The only difference is that one may legitimately question McVeigh's central role in the Oklahoma City Bombing. With Begin and Shamir, there is no doubt of their leadership roles.

In 1995, Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated because he wanted to give land back to the Palestinians. Ironically, in 1997, John Kennedy, Jr ran a story in *George Magazine* by Guela Amir, mother of Yigal Amir, the man who assassinated Rabin. In that article, Guela Amir charged that her son Yigal was goaded into assassinating Rabin by Avishai Raviv, an agent provocateur working for Shin Bet, one of Israel's intelligence services.

In the editor's note of that same edition of *George Magazine*, the younger Kennedy essentially acknowledged that he did not believe the Warren Report. Referring to representatives of Guela Amir's family's efforts to contact him about running her story in *George Magazine*, he wrote, "They were, no doubt, hoping that my own family history would bring added attention to their story, and they probably were right." In July 1999, John F. Kennedy, Jr was killed when his private plane crashed.

Guela Amir's article, "A Mother's Defense," is presented in [Appendix B](#). It was published in the March 1997 edition of *George Magazine*.

Israel's Political Parties & Prime Ministers

There have been three major political parties in Israel since its founding in 1948. They are as follows:

- ♦ **Mapai Party:** Early political party in Palestine/Israel that in 1930 became the central partner in the Labour Party.⁵
- ♦ **Labour Party:** Political party formed in January 1968 by uniting three socialist-labour parties—Mapai, Labour, and Rafi.⁶
- ♦ **Likud Party:** (Hebrew: Consolidation, or Unity) An ultra-right political party, founded in 1973, with roots in terrorism. Likud is an alliance of several right-wing parties—the major constituent being the Gahal bloc consisting of the Herut party and the Liberal Party. The Herut originated from the Russian Jewish Zionism of the 1920s and '30s, was formally organized in the year of Israel's independence (1948), and was merged with organizations like Irgun Zvai Leumi—a terrorist organization—and the Haganah.⁷

The following is a list of Israel's prime ministers since its founding in 1948:

Term	Name	Party
1948-53	David Ben-Gurion	Mapai
1953-55	Moshe Sharett	Mapai
1955-63	David Ben-Gurion	Mapai
1963-69	Levi Eshkol	Mapai/Labour
1969-74	Golda Meir	Labour
1974-77	Yitzhak Rabin	Labour
1977-83	Menachem Begin	Likud
1983-84	Yitzhak Shamir	Likud
1984-86	Shimon Peres	Labour-Likud coalition government
1986-92	Yitzhak Shamir	Likud
1992-95	Yitzhak Rabin	Labour
1995-96	Shimon Peres	Labour
1996-99	Binyamin Netanyahu	Likud

1999-01	Ehud Barak	Labour
2001-	Ariel Sharon	Likud

In 1977 the Israeli government took a turn to the extreme right with the election of Menachem Begin, head of the radical right-wing Likud party. Begin, a former terrorist, was succeeded by another former terrorist, Yitzhak Shamir. These two men ran the Israel government for 15 years, from 1977 until 1992; however, Shimon Peres was prime minister and head of the Labour party from 1984 until 1986 in a Labour-Likud coalition government with Shamir serving as the number two man, deputy prime minister and foreign minister. In other words, Israel was ruled for fifteen years—from 1977 until 1992—by the same terrorists (i.e., Begin and Shamir) who assassinated Count Folke Bernadotte, blew up the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, and assaulted the Arab village of Dayr Yasin.

In 1992 the fifteen-year Likud reign ended with the election of Yitzhak Rabin as prime minister who began negotiating with the PLO. This infuriated the right, and Rabin was assassinated on November 4, 1995 by Yigal Amir, an Israeli of Yemenite origin. Rabin's assassination was similar to President Kennedy's wherein the official government explanations for both murders were identical. In both instances, the government determined that the victim was murdered by a lone gunman and there was no conspiracy. Like Kennedy's death, many people do not believe the official story regarding Rabin's assassination. In fact evidence has been revealed showing that Rabin's assassin, Yigal Amir, was goaded into killing the prime minister by Avishai Raviv, [\(Footnote 19\)](#) an agent provocateur working for Shin Bet—also known as the General Security Service (GSS)—an Israeli version of the FBI and Secret Service combined.⁸

A Peculiar Offer

An interesting fact pointing to Israeli involvement in President Kennedy's assassination was Israel's proposition to candidate Kennedy, in the 1960 presidential campaign, that he allow Jews to run Middle-Eastern affairs, if elected, in exchange for a huge campaign contribution. The following is an excerpt from Richard Reeves' book about JFK:

The day in New York also gave him a chance to meet for the first time Israel's prime minister, David Ben-Gurion, who was also in New York on a fund-raising trip, meeting American Jews whose generosity was critical to the survival of his twelve-year-old state. They met against a background of suspicion. Jewish Democrats, particularly in New York, did not yet fully trust the son of a man who had been accused of being both anti-Semitic and pro-Nazi. Nor did John Kennedy, comfortably surrounded by Jewish staff members, trust all Jews, particularly New Yorkers. "I had the damnedest meeting in New York last night," he had said to his

friend Charlie Bartlett one day in the early fall of 1960. "I went to this party. It was given by a group of people who were big money contributors and also Zionists and they said to me, 'We know that your campaign is in terrible financial shape!'...The deal they offered me was that they would finance the rest of this campaign if I would agree to let them run the Middle Eastern policy of the United States for the next four years."

Kennedy greeted Ben-Gurion with talk of gut-level politics. It usually worked, politician to politician. This time it didn't. "You know I was elected by the Jews," Kennedy said. "I was elected by the Jews of New York. I have to do something for them. I will do something for you." Ben-Gurion was offended. He was the founder and leader of a nation, not a politician from Brooklyn.

(Richard Reeves, *President Kennedy: Profile of Power*, pp. 143-144)

Apparently every president after Kennedy was given a similar offer that Kennedy received – to let Jews run US Middle Eastern policy in exchange for financing a presidential campaign. For any doubters, ask yourselves this question: How could US Middle Eastern policy have been more pro-Israel, whether Zionists had been running it or not? Israel has no strategic advantage to the United States whatsoever. Yet we support them over the oil-producing Arab nations.

AIPAC's Control of US Politicians

The most influential power broker in the United States—and likely the world—is the powerful Jewish lobby, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). Politicians who oppose Israel, or take fair minded views on Mid-East affairs, must answer to the aggressive lobby group. Former Congressman Paul McCloskey and former senators George McGovern, James Abourezk, John Glenn, Charles Percy, and countless other politicians have felt the wrath of AIPAC for not showing the proper respect to Israel. AIPAC uses two tactics to destroy its perceived political enemies. They openly charge that the target politician is anti-semitic, or they block funding to his/her campaign.⁹ Both tactics are tantamount to blacklisting.

Endnotes

1. Michael Marrus, *Samuel Bronfman*, p. 21
2. Peter Newman, *King of the Castle*, pp 285-292
3. Encyclopedia Britannica: Irgun Zvai Leumi, Yitzhak Shamir, Menachem Begin
4. Encyclopedia Britannica: Irgun Zvai Leumi
5. Encyclopedia Britannica: Mapoi
6. *ibid*, Israel Labour Party
7. *ibid*, Likud
8. Guela Amir, *A Mother's Defense*, published in George Magazine, March 1997 edition (NOTE: Guela Amir is the mother of Yigal Amir, the Israeli man who shot and killed Yitzhak Rabin.)
9. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, pp. 215-225

Chapter 9: Johnson's Hidden Loyalties

Secret Ethnicity

As previously stated, the Johnson administration implemented a dramatic shift in US-Middle East policy. Every president after Johnson has totally capitulated to Israel and ignored the plight of Palestinians. But Johnson marked the turning point. The reason he was so loyal to Israel lies within his own ethnicity. It appears that he and his wife were secretly Jewish. To many, this may seem laughable at first, but in reality Jews were an integral part of Texas history throughout the nineteenth century.¹ Jacob and Phineas De Cordova sold land and developed Waco. Simon Mussina founded Brownsville in 1848. Michael Seeligson was elected mayor of Galveston in 1853. Morris Lasker was elected to the state Senate in 1895.² The list goes on.

The first Jewish settlers of note in Texas were Samuel Issacks (1821) followed by N. Adolphus Sterne (1826).³ By 1838, Jews were living in Galveston, San Antonio, Velasco, Bolivar, Nacogdoches, and Goliad.⁴ In the early part of the twentieth century, a large number of Russian Jews migrated to Texas to escape persecution from the Russian Czar. Between 1900 and 1920, the Jewish population in Texas grew from 15,000 to 30,000. Major cities, Dallas, Houston, Fort Worth, and San Antonio, experienced enormous growth in Jewish populations.⁵ The overall number of Jews in Texas has steadily increased ever since. After World War II, the abundance of Jewish residents grew from an estimated 50,000 in 1945 to 71,000 in the mid-1970s and 92,000 in 1988.⁶

Before 1821, Texas was still a Spanish colony where only Catholics could take up residence. Jews who openly acknowledged their ethnicity could not legally live there.⁷ Originally, Jews migrated to Texas to seek fortune and freedom. The earliest Jews, who arrived with the conquistadors, came from Sephardic (Spanish-North African-Israel) communities.⁸ After the Mexican period, Jewry in Texas was essentially populated by immigrants from Germany, eastern Europe, and the Americas.⁹

Lyndon Johnson's maternal ancestors, the Huffmans, apparently migrated to Frederick, Maryland from Germany sometime in the mid-eighteenth century. Later they moved to Bourbon, Kentucky and eventually settled in Texas in the mid-to-late nineteenth century.¹⁰

According to Jewish law, if a person's mother is Jewish, then that person is automatically Jewish, regardless of the father's ethnicity or religion. The facts indicate that both of Lyndon Johnson's great-grandparents, on the maternal side, were Jewish. These were the grandparents of Lyndon's mother, Rebecca Baines.¹¹ Their names were John S. Huffman and Mary Elizabeth Perrin.¹² John Huffman's mother was Suzanne Ament, a common Jewish name. Perrin is also a common Jewish name.

Huffman and Perrin had a daughter, Ruth Ament Huffman,¹³ who married Joseph Baines¹⁴ and together they had a daughter, Rebekah Baines,¹⁵ Lyndon Johnson's mother. The line of Jewish mothers can be traced back three generations in Lyndon Johnson's family tree. There is little doubt that he was Jewish.

To recap, the following is Lyndon Johnson's maternal family tree:

- ♦ Mother: Rebekah Baines (married Sam Johnson, Lyndon's father)
- ♦ Maternal grandparents: Ruth Ament Huffman and Joseph Baines
- ♦ Maternal great-grandparents (parents of Ruth Huffman): Mary Elizabeth Perrin and John S. Huffman, III
 - Maternal great-great grandparents (parents of Mary Perrin): Dicea Kerby and William Perrin¹⁶ (Footnote 20)
 - Maternal great-great grandparents (parents of John Huffman, III): Suzanne Ament and John S. Huffman, II¹⁷
 - Maternal great-great-great grandparents (parents of John Huffman, II): Cathrine Lyter and John Huffman¹⁸

As previously stated, many Jews migrated to Texas from Germany. A Johnson family friend, Cynthia Crider, observed that Lyndon's mother, Rebekah Baines (Johnson), often boasted of her Baines ancestry, but rarely mentioned the maternal side, the Huffmans. In fact, Crider recalled that Lyndon's father, Sam Johnson, used to tease his wife occasionally about her German heritage. When she would get stubborn about something, Sam would say, "That's your German blood again. German blood! Look at your brother's name. Huffman! Probably was Hoffmann once—in Berlin." Rebekah would respond, "Sam, you know it's Holland Dutch."¹⁹

As far as I can determine, Rebekah's German ancestors, the Huffmans, came to America in the mid-1700s and had a son, John Huffman, in about 1767 in Frederick, Maryland. I cannot find records of John Huffman's parents. They were probably German immigrants. Huffman married Catherine Lyter in 1790 in Frederick, Maryland.²⁰ At some point Huffman and Lyter moved to Bourbon, Kentucky and had a son, John Huffman, II, who married Suzanne Ament. Huffman, II and Ament had a son, John S. Huffman, III, born on May 7, 1824 in Bourbon, Kentucky; and died on June 22, 1865 in Collin, Texas. John Huffman, III was Rebekah's great-grandfather. He married Mary Elizabeth Perrin. Huffman and Perrin had a daughter, Ruth Ament Huffman, who married Joseph Baines. Huffman and Baines were Rebekah's parents, Lyndon's grandparents.

As a young adult, Lyndon Johnson taught school in Cotulla, a poor "Mexican" community south of San Antonio.²¹ Many of his former students marvelled at his spirit, dedication and self-discipline.²² Lyndon strongly encouraged the young Mexicans to learn English in order to get ahead.²³ Possibly he truly had a yearning to help those in need; however, that does not fit most historical accounts of Lyndon Johnson the man. From early adulthood, virtually all of his actions were calculated. Given Lyndon's Huffman, Perrin, Ament family line, it is more likely that he was assisting descendants of Sephardic Jews who migrated to Texas from Spain centuries earlier.

Recently it was disclosed that there are many hispanic Jews living in the San Antonio area. Richard Santos, a hispanic Jew and native of San Antonio, wrote a book entitled *Silent Heritage: The Sephardim and the Colonization of the Spanish North American Frontier, 1492-1600*.²⁴ Santos spoke of his "crypto-Jewish" heritage at the Texas Jewish Historical Society's 22nd conference on May 11, 2001. Crypto-Jews are Sephardic groups of families who secretly retained their religion and culture after the 15th-century Spanish royal decree deemed it punishable by death. Santos has spent

his entire adult life trying to educate the masses about the secret history of his bloodline.²⁵

Stan Hordes, a former New Mexico state historian and professor at the University of New Mexico, described his observations at the same conference.

"One person told me, 'My family just doesn't eat pork—we're allergic to pork,'" Hordes said, explaining the pockets of crypto-Jews who maintain Jewish traditions without even realizing it.²⁶

Among the crypto-Jews that Hordes described, some of the women light menorahs without realizing what they're doing.²⁷

Given this new information about crypto-Jews, plus Johnson's heritage; it is highly plausible that he began his early adult life as a teacher at Cotulla not merely to help disadvantaged hispanics students, but rather to help descendants of Sephardic Jews—crypto-Jews—from Spain who migrated to Mexico and what is now southern Texas. And the reason he felt obliged to help these crypto-Jews was because of his own secret ethnicity.

This information about Sephardic Jews in southern Texas sheds new light on the ethnicity of Lyndon Johnson's wife, Claudia Alta Taylor Johnson (aka, "Lady Bird"). She is apparently a Sephardic Jew of Mexican origin. Although her facial features are consistent with Semitic origin, that alone is not definitive proof. Claudia's mother, Minnie Lee Pattillo, was likely a Sephardic Jew from Mexico. Pattillo is a common Spanish/Mexican name; however, there are no records of Minnie Pattillo's parents so it is entirely possible that they were immigrants. It is quite odd that a first lady—one who lived in the White House less than 40 years ago—has maternal grandparents whose identity is unknown and undocumented.

Minnie Pattillo died in 1918 when Claudia was only five.²⁸ Minnie was born in about 1890 in Karnack, Texas (Harrison County);²⁹ however, she apparently lived in Alabama when Thomas Taylor married her.³⁰ All that is known about Minnie Pattillo is that she had a "spinster" sister, Effie Pattillo (also from Alabama), who helped raise Claudia.³¹

Claudia Taylor's father was Thomas Jefferson Taylor, II, a prosperous businessman and philanthropist.³² He was the son of Thomas Jefferson Taylor and Emma Louisa Bates.³³ Historian Robert Caro wrote that Claudia's father was the "richest man in [Karnack, Texas]."³⁴ Caro also indicated that Johnson's previous two girlfriends—Carol Davis and Kitty Clyde of San Marcos and Johnson City, respectively—were also daughters of the richest men in town.

1931: Johnson Came to Washington as Congressman Kleberg's Assistant

Lyndon Johnson began his career in 1931 as the legislative assistant of Congressman Richard M. Kleberg, a wealthy Jewish politician representing the 14th District of

Texas. Kleberg was not a serious politician, rather an outwardly friendly man who inherited vast wealth. "A sweeter man than Dick Kleberg never lived," a friend said. "But he was a playboy. As for work, he had no interest in that whatsoever."³⁵

Richard Kleberg was one of the wealthiest men in Texas. He inherited twenty percent interest in the King Ranch, the largest ranch in the continental United States;³⁶ a 2,000-square-mile estate with influence extending beyond its borders.³⁷ In fact, Richard Kleberg's father, Robert Kleberg, turned much of South Texas into "Kleberg County."³⁸ Although the ranch dealt in cattle and horses, as well as in sorghum and wheat,³⁹ it also built entire towns, railroads, harbors, colleges, and banks.⁴⁰ In the 1940s, it contracted oil and gas leases to provide additional income. By the mid-1970s, the ranch owned millions of acres of land in such countries as Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, and Morocco; but falling market prices caused them to sell off much of this land in the 1980s.⁴¹

The King Ranch was founded in 1852 by Richard King (Richard Kleberg's grandfather), and was expanded significantly by King's son-in-law, Robert Kleberg (Richard Kleberg's father).⁴² In 1922 Robert Kleberg suffered a stroke and Richard was put in charge of the King Ranch. But Richard's lack of business skills soon caused the King empire to fall into serious financial difficulties. In 1927, the executors of his father's estate removed Richard from authority and put his younger brother in charge of managing the Ranch. Soon the empire was back on its feet. This did not bother Richard because he did not relish the notion of being a businessman.⁴³

Richard Kleberg ran for an open congressional seat merely as a favor to friend, Roy Miller, former "boy mayor of Corpus Christi" and lobbyist for the gigantic Texas Gulf Sulphur Corporation.⁴⁴ Kleberg replaced Harry Wurchbach who died on November 6, 1931. At that time, Wurchbach was the only Republican Congressman from Texas.⁴⁵ With Kleberg's election, the Democrats gained control of the House. The new Speaker of the House of Representative was John Nance Garner^(Footnote 21) of Texas. Miller was a Garner ally, and in Miller's view, the main qualification for the Democratic nominee to replace Wurchbach was electability. And no one was more popular in the 14th District than a member of the Kleberg family.⁴⁶

After easily winning the election, Kleberg gave Miller, the lobbyist, carte blanche permission to use his Capitol Hill office as if it were his own. Often Kleberg never went to the office at all. In essence, Miller was the unelected congressman for the 14th District and Kleberg was merely a figurehead,⁴⁷ however, the work of the Kleberg's constituency was left to his legislative assistant, Lyndon Johnson.⁴⁸

Under Miller's tutelage, Johnson learned to play hardball politics. When Kleberg's bid for re-election was challenged in the 1932 Democratic primary by a more liberal candidate, Carl Wright Johnson; Lyndon Johnson, Roy Miller and another Texas politician, Welly Hopkins, maligned the challenger's character, calling him a "communist," guilty of "radicalism" and "similar filth and slime."⁴⁹ Carl Johnson didn't have a chance in a district so thoroughly controlled by the King Ranch. Newspapers gave him limited coverage.⁵⁰ Needless to say, the challenger lost.⁵¹

Ironically, Kleberg won ten of eleven counties in his district; but the one he lost was Lyndon Johnson's home county of Blanco. Some residents of the county felt that

Kleberg lost in Blanco because many of the voters disliked the congressman's legislative assistant. According to Johnson's aid, Gene Latimer, "He worked hard—he just broke his back—to get those people to like him, but they just didn't."⁵²

Johnson's Mentor, Senator Alvin Jacob Wirtz

Alvin Jacob Wirtz was a lawyer and legislator, first a state senator from Texas, then a United States Senator for the same state. In 1935, Wirtz came to Washington and helped organize the Lower Colorado River Authority. He specialized in oil and water law and was appointed general counsel to the newly established LCRA. Working closely with United States Representative Lyndon Johnson, he helped the river authority secure grants and loans from the Public Works Administration, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Rural Electrification Administration.⁵³

More than any one person, Alvin Wirtz helped pave Lyndon Johnson's early rise to power. Ed Clark, a colleague of Wirtz' for years said of him, "What he wanted was P-O-W-E-R—power over other men. He wanted power, but he didn't want to get it by running for office. He liked to sit quietly, smoke a cigar. He would sit and work in his library, and plan and scheme, and usually he would get somebody out in front of him so that nobody knew it was Alvin Wirtz who was doing it. He would sit and scheme in the dark. He wasn't an outgoing person. But he was the kind of person who didn't want to lose any fights. And he didn't lose many."⁵⁴

As an attorney, Wirtz had a reputation among colleagues for being ruthless. A San Antonio attorney observed that he was "a conniver—a conniver like I never saw before or since. Sharp, cunning." Another attorney commented that "He would gut you if he could. But you would probably never know he did it. I mean, that was a man who would do anything—and he would still be smiling when he slipped you the knife."⁵⁵

In 1917 Wirtz moved his family to Seguin, where he continued his law practice until 1934. From 1922 to 1930 Wirtz served as state senator from Guadalupe County. During his time in the legislature, Wirtz became involved with a group of citizens interested in the development of the Guadalupe River as a source of hydroelectric power.⁵⁶ As someone driven by a need to obtain power over men, Wirtz viewed dams as a means of acquiring it.⁵⁷

In 1934 Wirtz moved to Austin after being run out of Seguin by disgruntled farmers who believed his dam projects had cheated them out of their land. This was result of his dealings with businessman Samuel Insull of Chicago. Insull had retained Wirtz to procure land from farmers along the Guadalupe River for the purpose of building six small dams for irrigation. The farmers were unwilling to sell, but through legal maneuvering, Wirtz got the government to purchase the farmers' land at low prices. On February 26, 1934, Tom Hollamon, Sr—a sixty-seven-year-old farmer and former Texas Ranger—walked into Wirtz's office, where he was meeting with Insull representatives, and began shooting. Before being disarmed, one Chicago financier was dead. Hollamon was arrested for murder, but Wirtz was quickly run out of town by the locals.⁵⁸

In Austin Wirtz organized the law firm of Powell, Wirtz, Rauhut, and Gideon. Things seemed bleak for awhile, but Roosevelt's New Deal gave him a chance to revive his dream of becoming a power mogul. During Roosevelt's "Hundred Days" portion of the New Deal, \$3.3 billion of federal money was slowly released into the economy for public works which included dams. Eventually a \$10,000,000 dam project, the Marshall Ford Dam, became the vehicle by which Wirtz could acquire the power he sought. The contract was awarded to one of Wirtz' clients, Brown & Root.⁵⁹

Brown & Root: Johnson's Primary Financial Supporter

Throughout Lyndon Johnson's career, Brown & Root was his biggest financial supporter. Today the company is a huge defense contractor. It was founded by Herman Brown in the 1920s. The son of a Belton, Texas shopkeeper, Herman's career had a humble beginning. But Alvin Wirtz and Lyndon Johnson helped Brown & Root acquire huge defense contracts from President Roosevelt in the late 1930s. The company prospered a great deal after America's entry into World War II. Brown & Root returned the favor by giving Johnson virtually any financial help he requested.

Brown & Root continued to grow as the primary contractor for building military bases. When Johnson got America into the Vietnam War, Brown & Root made a fortune constructing military bases in Southeast Asia. They built the Tan Son Nhut Air Base and reportedly built many of the infamous tiger cages used to brutalize and torture suspected enemies of the Saigon regime.⁶⁰ Tiger Cages were cells constructed below ground with just enough room to fit one person. Prisoners were put in these as punishment for various infractions of the rules.

As of this writing (2002) Brown & Root is owned by the Halliburton Company, a prestigious defense contractor based in Dallas, Texas. Until July 25, 2000, Vice-President Dick Cheney was CEO and chairman of the board of the Halliburton Company. The following is a profile of the Halliburton Company from Yahoo.com stock quotes:

BUSINESS SUMMARY

Halliburton Company provides services and equipment to energy, industrial and governmental customers. The Company operates in two business segments: Energy Services Group and Engineering and Construction Group. The Energy Services Group provides a range of discrete services and products to customers for the exploration, development and production of oil and gas. The segment serves independent, integrated and national oil companies. The Engineering and Construction Group segment, consisting of Kellogg Brown & Root and Brown & Root Services, provides a range of services to energy and industrial customers and government entities worldwide. Halliburton operates in 120 countries.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Halliburton Company provides a variety of services, equipment, maintenance, and engineering and construction to energy, industrial and governmental customers. For the nine months ended 9/30/01, revenues rose 13% to \$9.87 billion. Net income from continuing operations before account. Change increased 96% to \$410 million. Revenues reflect higher rig counts and increased prices. Earnings also reflect increased utilization of equipment and personnel.

(Yahoo, ticker: HAL, profile, December 2001)

The Rags to Riches Story of Brown & Root

At the age of sixteen (1909), Herman Brown got a job earning two dollars a day carrying a rod to assist surveyors. For ten years, he lived in a crowded tent for members of the construction crew. In fact, when he got married in 1917, he and his wife, Margaret Root, spent their wedding night in a tent, and a tent was their first home.⁶¹

At the age of twenty-one, Herman became a contractor. At that time, successful contractors had to know how to handle mules and men. Herman quickly gained a reputation for getting the maximum amount of work from men working on construction contracts. Later, he took on two partners. As a favor to his wife, Margaret Root, Herman made her brother, Dan Root, a partner; along with Herman's brother George. When Dan Root died, the firm's name remained unchanged out of affection to Herman's wife.⁶²

After the success of the Marshall Ford Dam, Herman Brown was looking for even bigger projects for his construction company. Something big was about to happen. In 1938, Congress, at President Roosevelt's request, had authorized the expenditure of a billion dollars on a "two-ocean" Navy. By early 1939 it had become clear that a substantial portion of that billion would be spent on the construction of naval bases and training stations for a greatly expanded Navy Air Force. On April 26, 1939, Roosevelt had signed into law a bill authorizing the expenditure of \$66,800,000 for the first of such bases. Brown's attention was already focused on the Navy because Lyndon Johnson was a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. He decided to bid on one of the bases—in San Juan, Puerto Rico—authorized in the April bill. Unfortunately, Johnson did not have enough influence within the White House, and Brown was not awarded the San Juan contract.⁶³

An important political dynamic had developed between President Roosevelt and his Texan Vice-President John Garner. In 1937 the conservative Garner broke with liberal Roosevelt over the latter's plan to enlarge the Supreme Court. In 1940 Garner challenged Roosevelt for the Democratic presidential nomination but lost.⁶⁴

Meanwhile, there was talk of another naval air base for Texas, on the Gulf of Corpus Christi. Obviously Brown wanted that contract, but he had been a Garner supporter for years. So had Corpus Christi's Congressman, Richard Kleberg. In fact, Kleberg's primary handler, Roy Miller, was Garner's campaign manager. Lyndon Johnson too, had long supported Garner. All parties knew that in order to get the Corpus Christi contract, they would have to unilaterally endorse Roosevelt over Garner. The Texans chose to drop Garner by sending a subtle political signal to Roosevelt rather than overtly pledging their support to him.⁶⁵

In the midst of this turmoil, George Brown wrote a letter to Johnson pledging his support:

In the past I have not been very timid about asking you to do favors for me and hope you will not get any timidity if you have anything at all that you think I can or should do. Remember that I am for you, right or wrong, and it makes no difference if I think you are right or wrong. If you want it, I am for it 100%.⁶⁶

In Houston, where Brown & Root's headquarters were located, Herman Brown's political influence was growing, and the city's Congressman, Albert Thomas, a junior Representative with negligible clout in Washington, was known to take Herman's orders unquestionably. In August, Congressman Thomas had said, "Of course every member of the Texas delegation is for Vice President Garner." In December 1939, Thomas made another statement. He was not for Garner after all, he said. He was for Roosevelt.⁶⁷ This was a signal to Roosevelt, sent by Johnson et al, that they had dumped their longtime political ally, John Garner.

Roosevelt responded positively with two reciprocal signals. First, on January 2, 1940, he appointed Alvin J. Wirtz as Under Secretary of the Interior. Wirtz was the attorney for Brown & Root and had been recommended by Lyndon Johnson. Wirtz would be second in command only to Harold Ickes. Second, the White House went out of its way to cite Representative Lyndon Johnson as the person who "presented Wirtz's name." Presidential Secretary Stephen Early stated that "neither Texas Senator was consulted," nor was Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn or Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones. To readers of political signals, it was clear that Lyndon Johnson had become a key White House ally.⁶⁸

In addition, the Navy Department was quietly informed by the White House that Lyndon Johnson was to be consulted—and advice taken—on the awarding of Navy contracts in Texas.⁶⁹

Consequently, Brown & Root began obtaining coveted Navy Department contracts. The Corpus Christi Naval Air Station was awarded to Brown & Root without competitive bidding. Instead it was awarded on a "negotiated basis." Because the contract was so big, Brown & Root was directed by the Roosevelt administration to share the profits with another contractor, Kaiser.⁷⁰

Friendship With J. Edgar Hoover

It has been well documented that Hoover and Johnson had been friends since 1945 when a young Senator Johnson and his family moved onto the same block of Washington's Thirtieth Place where Hoover lived.⁷¹

John Edgar Hoover (1895 - 1972) was born in Washington, DC—the youngest of four children—and rarely left the city his entire life. He lived with his mother at 413 Seward Square until her death in 1938. Afterward he continued living there with his companion and associate director at the FBI, Clyde Tolson.⁷² It is common knowledge that the two were [homosexual lovers](#).

In 1917, Hoover entered the Department of Justice as a file reviewer. Within two years he became special assistant to Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer in the Woodrow Wilson administration. In that position, he oversaw the mass roundups and deportations of suspected Bolsheviks (Communists) after World War I. In May of 1924, he was named acting director of the Bureau of Investigation (as it was then called) and confirmed as director seven months later. Finding the Bureau in disarray because of the scandals of the Harding administration, he reorganized and rebuilt it, establishing a fingerprint file, which became the world's largest; a scientific crime-detection laboratory; and the FBI National Academy, to which selected law enforcement officers from all parts of the country were sent for special training.⁷³

By the early 1930s, the Bureau was involved in the pursuit of Bonnie and Clyde and the Ma Barker Gang, the shooting and killing of notorious bank robber John Dillinger, investigating the kidnapping of Charles Lindbergh's infant son, and countless other sensational stories.⁷⁴

In the summer of 1936, Hoover began to have secret meetings with President Roosevelt where the FBI was granted executive authority to expand into intelligence gathering—particularly in areas of subversive activities in America, including Communism and fascism. With Roosevelt's support, the FBI grew from 391 agents in 1933 to nearly 5,000 by the end of World War II.⁷⁵

After war, the Hoover exploited anticommunist hysteria of the Cold War to intensify the FBI's intelligence activities. It is widely known that Hoover leaked derogatory material on Martin Luther King in the 1960s as part of his secret counterintelligence (COINTELPRO) program. Former assistant FBI Director William Sullivan commented on Hoover's surveillance of Kennedy and King in a book, *The Bureau*, published posthumously in 1979.^(Footnote 22) The following is an excerpt from that book:

Hoover was always gathering damaging material on Jack Kennedy, which the President, with his active social life, seemed more than willing to provide. We never put any technical surveillance on JFK, but whatever came up was automatically funneled directly to Hoover. I was sure he was saving everything he had on Kennedy, and on Martin Luther King, Jr., too, until he could unload it all and destroy them both. He kept this kind of explosive material in his personal files, which filled four rooms on

the fifth floor of headquarters.

(William Sullivan, *The Bureau*, p. 50⁷⁶)

Hoover's view of organized crime was astonishing, to say the least. As late as January 1962, Hoover denied its existence in the United States. He stated that "No single individual or coalition of racketeers dominates organized crime across the nation." It was not until gangster Joe Valachi was brought to Washington by Attorney General Robert Kennedy's Justice Department to testify before the Senate that Hoover was forced to admit that his opinion about organized crime in American needed some serious re-thinking.⁷⁷

In January 1964, shortly after Hoover's 69th birthday (Jan. 1st) and less than two months after Kennedy's assassination, President Johnson signed an Executive Order exempting Hoover from retiring on his 70th birthday, which was mandatory at that time. It should be noted that Johnson was also gearing up the Warren Commission to investigate Kennedy's death in that timeframe. Consequently, it is not implausible to think that Johnson's Executive Order may have been an incentive to Hoover not to conduct a serious investigation of the assassination. It might have been a reward as well, since many of the FBI's cover-up activities had already been accomplished by January.⁷⁸

Sullivan also observed that the relationship between Johnson and Hoover changed after Johnson assumed the presidency. The following is an excerpt from Sullivan's posthumous book, *The Bureau*:

They remained close when Johnson served as Vice President, but there was a change in their relationship when Johnson became President. The Director was over 65 by that time, past retirement age for federal employees, and he stayed in office only because of a special waiver which required the President's signature each year. That waiver put Hoover right in Johnson's pocket. With that leverage, Johnson began to take advantage of Hoover, using the Bureau as his personal investigative arm. His never-ending requests were usually political, and sometimes illegal... And Hoover hot-footed it to Johnson's demands... he found himself very much in the back seat, almost a captive of the President ...

(William Sullivan, *The Bureau*, pp. 60 - 61⁷⁹)

Endnotes

1. Rabbi James L. Kessler, *Handbook of Texas* (online), <http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/view/JJ/pxj1.html>
2. *ibid*
3. *ibid*
4. *ibid*
5. *ibid*
6. *ibid*

7. *ibid*
8. *ibid*
9. *ibid*
10. Internet, familysearch.org (geneology website for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints)
11. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 50
12. Internet, familysearch.org (geneology website for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints) NOTE: I did a search on the parents of Ruth Ament Huffman, wife of Joseph Baines. The website search indicated that Ruth Ament Huffman's parents were Mary Elizabeth Perrin and John S. Huffman.
13. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 850 (Index: Ruth Ament Huffman, "LBJ's grandmother," is listed under "Baines.")
14. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 850 (Index: Joseph Wilson Baines, "LBJ's grandfather," is listed under "Baines.")
15. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 50
16. Internet, familysearch.org (geneology website for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints) NOTE: I did a search on the parents of Mary Perrin, wife of John Huffman. The website search indicated that Mary Perrin's parents were Dicea Kerby and William Perrin.
17. Internet, familysearch.org (geneology website for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints) NOTE: I did a search on the parents of John S. Huffman, husband of Mary Elizabeth Perrin. The website search indicated that John S. Huffman's parents were Suzanne Ament and John S. Huffman.
18. *ibid*
19. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 61
20. Internet, familysearch.org (geneology website for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints)
21. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 166-169
22. *ibid*
23. *ibid*
24. David Garza, *The Secret History*, May 11, 2001, *The Austin Chronicle: Books*, http://www.austinchronicle.com/issues/dispatch/2001-05-11/books_feature.html
25. *ibid*
26. *ibid*
27. *ibid*
28. *ibid*
29. *ibid*
30. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 295
31. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 296
32. Mark Odintz, *Handbook of Texas* (online), <http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/view/TT/fta26.html>
33. Internet, familysearch.org (geneology website for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints)
34. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 294
35. *ibid*, *Path to Power*, p 219
36. Encyclopedia Britannica: King Ranch
37. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 219
38. *ibid*
39. Encyclopedia Britannica: King Ranch
40. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 219
41. Encyclopedia Britannica: King Ranch
42. *ibid*
43. *ibid*
44. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 220
45. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 218
46. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 220
47. *ibid*
48. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 221
49. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 272
50. *ibid*
51. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p 293

52. *ibid*
53. Michael L. Gillette, *Handbook of Texas* (online), <http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/view/WW/fwi70.html>
54. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 373
55. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 376
56. Michael L. Gillette, *Handbook of Texas* (online), <http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/view/WW/fwi70.html>
57. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 376
58. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 376-377
59. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 378-379
60. Reliable source within the intelligence community (deceased)
61. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 369-371
62. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, p. 371
63. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 581-582
64. Encyclopedia Britannica: John Garner
65. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 582-583
66. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 583
67. *ibid*
68. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 583-584
69. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 584
70. Robert Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 584-585
71. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 223
72. *ibid*, p. 214
73. Encyclopedia Britannica: J. Edgar Hoover
74. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 218; Encyclopedia Britannica: John Dillinger
75. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 220
76. The quotation from William Sullivan, regarding Hoover's surveillance of JFK and MLK, was obtained from Jim Marrs's book, *Crossfire*, pp. 221 - 222. Marrs cited William Sullivan's posthumous book, *The Bureau*, p. 50.
77. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, pp. 216 - 217
78. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, pp. 223 - 224. Marrs cited Executive Order 11154 as the tool used by Johnson to exempt Hoover from mandatory retirement at age 70.
79. The quotation from William Sullivan, regarding Johnson and Hoover's relation, was obtained from Jim Marrs's book, *Crossfire*, p. 224. Marrs cited William Sullivan's posthumous book, *The Bureau*, pp. 60 - 61.

Chapter 10: LBJ's "Passionate Attachment" to Israel

Background

As some readers may know, the term "passionate attachment" was used by George Washington in his farewell address in 1796. Washington advised citizens of the new republic to renounce any "passionate attachment"^(Footnote 23) with another nation, and also to repudiate "inveterate hatred" toward another country. In the Twentieth Century, the United States failed to heed Washington's warnings on both counts. Shortly after World War II, we developed an "inveterate hatred" of the Soviet Union and formed a "passionate attachment" to Israel, although the latter accelerated dramatically under the Johnson Administration.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower was the last American president in the Twentieth Century to successfully stand up to the pressures and unyielding annoyances of the Israeli government and its American supporters. Although President Kennedy shared his predecessor's views intellectually, he entered the White House after an extremely close election. Consequently, he had to assume a more cautious approach.

The Eisenhower administration's Middle East policy is important for two reasons. First of all, it demonstrated that a strong American president can stand up to Israel. Secondly, it reveals that Lyndon Johnson—then Senate Majority Leader—was Eisenhower's most influential political adversary regarding Israel.

Two major incidents occurred on Eisenhower's watch where Israel acted as an aggressor toward its neighbors and toward Palestinians living in the region. The first incident occurred in 1953 and involved Israel's effort to secretly divert waters of the Jordan. The second incident occurred in 1957 when Israel conspired with France and Britain to attack Egypt and overthrow that country's leader, President Gamal Abdel Nasser, after he nationalized the Suez Canal in defiance of Israel and the Western powers. In the latter incident, Lyndon Johnson used all of his political muscle as Senate Majority Leader to prevent the UN from imposing sanctions on Israel—the sanctions were fully supported by the Eisenhower administration—for its flagrant disregard for international law. In both instances, Eisenhower forced Israel to behave by temporarily cutting off American aid.

1953: The Jordan River Diversion

Israel secretly planned to use the Palestinian village of Banat Ya'qub for a major water diversion project that would move waters of the Jordan Valley to central Israel and the North Negev. The UN, the US, and the Palestinians who lived in that area were unaware of Israel's plans. Earlier, the Eisenhower administration had offered to implement an American-sponsored regional water-usage plan, and Israel had promised to cooperate in that effort. But in reality, Israel secretly wanted complete control of the flow of water in the region, despite its commitments to the Americans. Consequently, a dispute ensued over the control of Palestinian territory near Banat Ya'qub.

Unaware of Israel's hidden agenda, UN Representative, Dr. Ralph Bunche, worked out a truce agreement where disputed lands would be evacuated by Syrian forces. The agreement stipulated that Israel must allow Arab inhabitants to continue farming there. Israel also agreed that it would not occupy the disputed area, but would allow it to be a neutral zone.

Immediately after the Syrian troops withdrew, the Israelis broke their promise and drove the Palestinian farmers from the land. The Syrian troops responded by opening fire to drive out the settlers. Israel responded by complaining that the Syrians had violated the truce and asserted a right to occupy the areas. UN Truce Observers immediately cited Israel as the instigator and essentially stated that the Syrian troops were justified in retaliating against Israel for violating the truce agreement.

The Israelis took the strategy that if they completed the water diversion project at Banat Ya'qub, then the UN would back down because the work simply could not be undone. So the Israelis began working aggressively on the project. They worked non-stop, twenty-four hours a day using searchlights at night to hasten completion. But secrecy was still key. They omitted appropriations for the project from their published budget. In addition, they did not mention it to Americans working with them on other water projects; however, US intelligence soon detected their activity.

President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles realized that Israel had openly deceived them and had no intention of keeping its earlier promise to cooperate in the American-sponsored regional water-usage plan. To show its displeasure, the Eisenhower administration withheld \$26 million under the Mutual Security Act and suspended economic aid until Israel agreed to cooperate with UN observers. In addition, President Eisenhower directed the Treasury to prepare an Executive Order removing tax-deductible status from contributions by Jewish Americans to such Zionist organizations as the United Jewish Appeal (UJA). Eisenhower did not make these actions public because he did not want to humiliate the Israelis; however, the Israelis interpreted his magnanimous gesture as a sign of weakness. As a result, they continued work on the project—convinced that the Americans would back down.

Israel's strategy might have worked had Israel not launched a bloody raid on the village of Kibya on the night of October 14, 1953. In that attack, twenty-five-year-old Ariel Sharon and his three hundred Israeli commandos, known as Force 101, massacred fifty-three Palestinian civilians. According to a UN report, Sharon's forces drove the villagers into their homes then blew them up.

The Eisenhower administration condemned the raid and, for the first time, publicly revealed that it had already suspended construction funds for Israel's water supply. There was a huge backlash against Eisenhower. The US government was denounced by Hadassah, a Jewish charitable organization. An attaché at the Israeli Embassy attempted to divert attention from the water controversy by claiming—in a widely publicized speech—that the Kibya raid was in response to Jordanian aggression. Pro-Israeli congressmen and David Ben-Gurion accused Eisenhower and his advisers of anti-Semitism.

But Eisenhower stood firm and continued to withhold funds from Israel. Fearing a financial burden, Israeli representatives informed President Eisenhower—on October 19—that work had ceased on the water diversion project and that Israel would cooperate with the Security Council's efforts to solve the Jordan River Development problem. Within twenty-four hours, America restored aid to Israel.

Eisenhower demonstrated that Israel responded faster to cutting off the money flow than anything else; however, the Israelis interpreted America's quick restoration of aid as proof that they could manipulate the superpower by applying adequate pressure. Ultimately, Israel completed the project in a slightly altered manner.¹

Nov. 1956: The Suez Crisis

The stage was set for the Suez Crisis in 1955 when the Eisenhower administration began pressuring Israel to demonstrate its commitment to peace in the Middle East.

On February 28, 1955, President Gamal Abdel Nasser made a speech full of warnings against Israeli atrocities. He emphasized a bloody raid on the Gaza Strip by the Israelis, allegedly a retaliation for raids made from Gaza. Nasser was also upset with the United States for denying his request for arms a few months earlier. In his speech he repeated the request for Egypt to buy arms but was ignored.

On September 4, 1955, Egypt announced that it had received a proposal from the Soviet Union for an arms sale. The Eisenhower administration treated this as an idle threat which angered Nasser. As a result, he brokered a cotton-for-arms barter agreement with Czechoslovakia on September 27 in which Egypt received \$200 million worth of arms—tanks, MiG planes, artillery, submarines, and small arms.

Israel immediately renewed its joint arms agreement with the United States, France, and Britain. In addition, Israel requested a treaty guaranteeing its security, but it was denied by the Western powers because they knew that Israel's military strength was vastly superior to the neighboring Arab nations.

On August 26, 1955, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles made a speech before the Council of Foreign Relations in New York in which he outlined terms for peace in the Middle East. He stated that the problem of Palestinian refugees could be solved, but Israel should not be expected to assume the full cost. He proposed that Congress approve an international loan to finance the resettlement or repatriating of Palestinian refugees. The loan would also help develop irrigation projects to assist refugees in cultivating their land for growing crops.

The Israelis were somewhat agitated by Dulles's speech because he mentioned a possible boundary revision. Dulles promptly responded to clarify the American position. He stated in no uncertain terms that if Sharett and Ben-Gurion (Israeli leaders) wanted American diplomatic, political, and military aid, they would have to demonstrate their peaceful intentions by helping resolve the sensitive problems of Palestinian refugees and boundary disputes. On November 9, President Eisenhower—

who was in a Denver hospital convalescing from a heart attack—confirmed Dulles's position in a formal statement made from his hospital bed.²

At that point, it became clear that the United States could no longer be counted on to support Israel's continuing efforts to expand its borders. Consequently, Israel turned to the European powers for support. Over the next year, trouble began to arise over the Suez Canal.

The Suez Canal is a sea-level waterway running north-south across the Isthmus of Suez in Egypt to connect the Mediterranean and the Red seas. The canal separates the African continent from Asia, and it provides the shortest seagoing route between Europe and the lands lying around the Indian and western Pacific oceans. It is one of the world's most heavily used shipping lanes.³

On July 26, 1956, Egyptian President Nasser angered Israel and the European powers when he nationalized the Suez Canal. He took this bold action because he felt that friends of Israel in America had cheated him out of US aid for the Aswan Dam that Egypt needed for irrigation and power. The dam cost \$1.3 billion and Nasser had been given the impression by the Eisenhower administration that US aid would be forthcoming; however, friends of Israel in America pressured the Senate Appropriations Committee into blocking funding for the dam. On July 16, 1956, funding was officially denied—much to the chagrin of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. To make matters worse, the State Department issued a statement, on July 19, critically appraising Egypt's international credit. Nasser felt that this was a ruse created by friends of Israel in America, and he responded by seizing control of the canal and nationalizing the Suez Canal Company in order to obtain funds for the dam.⁴

On October 29, 1956, Israel attacked Egypt and advanced toward the Suez Canal. On November 1, British and French forces also invaded Egypt and began occupation of the canal zone, but growing opposition from President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles, UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld, and Soviet threats of intervention put an immediate stop to British and French support, but Israeli troops still occupied the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza Strip in defiance of a UN resolution.⁵ Eisenhower was so angered by European involvement in the attack that he telephoned British Prime Minister Anthony Eden and gave him such a tongue-lashing that the Prime Minister was reduced to tears.⁶ (Footnote 24)

Eisenhower told Dulles: "Foster, you tell 'em, goddamn it, we're going to apply sanctions, we're going to the United Nations, we're going to do everything that there is to stop this thing." He later explained, "We just told the Israelis it was absolutely indefensible and that if they expect our support in the Middle East and in maintaining their position, they had better behave... We went to town right away to give them hell."

UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld shared Eisenhower's view that Israel needed to learn to behave. Consequently, Hammarskjöld and Ben-Gurion engaged in some heated exchanges after the UN Secretary General publicly condemned Israel for its retaliatory actions against Palestinians. In 1956 Ben-Gurion complained that

Hammar skjöld's remarks had encouraged assaults on Israel by Egypt and Jordan. Hammar skjöld replied as follows:

You are convinced that the threat of retaliation has a deterrent effect. I am convinced that it is more of an incitement to individual members of the Arab forces than even what has been said by their own governments. You are convinced that acts of retaliation will stop further incidents. I am convinced that they will lead to further incidents.... You believe that this way of creating respect for Israel will pave the way for sound coexistence with the Arab people. I believe that the policy may postpone indefinitely the time for such coexistence.... I think the discussion of this question can be considered closed since you, in spite of previous discouraging experiences, have taken the responsibility of large-scale tests of the correctness of your belief.⁷

On February 2, 1957, the UN General Assembly passed a resolution demanding Israel's withdrawal from the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza Strip, but Ben-Gurion refused. Fed up with Israel's treachery, Eisenhower wrote a strong letter to Ben-Gurion demanding Israel's withdrawal. Still Ben-Gurion refused.⁸

Feb. 1957: LBJ Rescued Israel From UN Sanctions

It had been rumored that UN Secretary-General Dag Hammar skjöld of Sweden was quietly pushing for sanctions—with the full support of the Eisenhower administration—against Israel if it continued to maintain troops in the Gulf of Aqaba and Gaza in defiance of US and UN demands for immediate withdrawal. In response, Lyndon Johnson—then Senate Majority Leader—wrote a letter to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles urging the Eisenhower Administration not to support UN sanctions against Israel. Johnson's letter to Dulles appeared in the *New York Times* on February 20, 1957. The Senate Majority Leader's argument was that it was an unfair double-standard to punish a small country like Israel when large countries like the Soviet Union were allowed to openly defy UN resolutions without being punished.⁹

In addition, Johnson rallied Senate Democrats to oppose Israel sanctions.^(Footnote 25) He used partisan politics to pressure Eisenhower into retreating from principle, but Eisenhower stood his ground and kept applying pressure to Israel by cutting off or delaying financial assistance. When Israel began to run out of money, in March 1957, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion finally agreed to withdraw troops from the occupied territories. President Eisenhower triumphed, but Johnson had protected Israel from the humiliation of UN sanctions. Sadly, Eisenhower was the last US president to stand up to the Israeli government and its American supporters. At least he proved it could be done.¹⁰

Ironically, one of the best accounts of Lyndon Johnson's involvement in the Suez Crisis was written by Louis Bloomfield in his 1957 book entitled *Egypt, Israel and the Gulf of Aqaba*. In the ensuing years, Johnson's involvement in that conflict has

been erased from history. Although his pro-Israel stance appeared on the front page of the New York Times on February 20, 1957, his name is not mentioned in Western history books about the Suez Crisis (none that I have found anyway, except Bloomfield's). The power elite within the book publishing industry have apparently been concealing Johnson's loyalty to Israel as a means of preventing inquiries by historians, researchers, and investigators about a possible Jewish conspiracy behind the assassination of President Kennedy years later.

This is how Bloomfield described Johnson's pro-Israel stance during the Suez/Gulf of Aqaba Crisis:

On February 11th, 1957, Mr. John Foster Dulles, United States Secretary of State, submitted certain Proposals to the Israeli Government which were, in effect, that:

"Israel should withdraw her troops from the Gulf of Aqaba region and the Gaza Strip, in accordance with the recommendations of the United Nations General Assembly.

The United States should use all its influence to establish the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba as an international waterway for the innocent passage of all nations, including Israel.

Meanwhile the United States should do everything it could to see that United Nations troops replaced the Israeli troops in the Gaza Strip and that that area should become a kind of de facto United Nations trusteeship where United Nations officials would watch and if possible stop any fighting between Israel and Egypt."

Subsequent discussion between the United States Secretary of State and Mr. Abba Eban did not bring about the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from these two areas and rumours began to circulate in the American press that the Afro-Asian bloc would introduce resolutions calling for economic and military sanctions to force Israel to comply with the withdrawal resolutions.

On February 19th, 1957, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, the Senate Majority Leader, wrote to Mr. John Foster Dulles urging that the United States oppose imposing of economic sanctions against Israel by the United Nations. The letter was endorsed by the Senate Democratic Policy Committee.

(Louis Bloomfield, *Egypt, Israel, and the Gulf of Aqaba*, p. 152)

Jul. 2, 1957: Senator Kennedy Made a Controversial Speech About Algeria

On July 2, 1957, John F. Kennedy—then a US Senator—made a speech, "Facing Facts on Algeria," which denounced France's colonial occupation of Algeria and the brutality of the French-Algerian War. The speech also demonstrated an understanding of Indochina that would likely have prevented him from escalating US military involvement in Vietnam had he not been killed.

Historian Richard Mahoney summarized the speech and events that preceded and followed it:

Early in 1957, Kennedy decided to make a major critique of the [Eisenhower] administration's position on France's colonial war in Algeria. By 1957, the French had committed over 500,000 troops to the effort to suppress the nationalist rebellion. Torture, atrocity, and terror on both sides had turned the pride of France's empire into a chamber of horrors. ...the Eisenhower administration had been maintaining a policy of strict silence in Algeria – at least until Kennedy's attack, which The New York Times called "the most comprehensive and outspoken arraignment of Western policy toward Algeria yet presented by an American in public office."

On July 2, 1957, Kennedy accused the Eisenhower administration of courting disaster in Algeria. He charged that Eisenhower's policy of non-involvement in Africa and Asia was really made up of "tepid encouragement and moralizations to both sides, cautious neutrality on all the real issues, and a restatement of our obvious dependence upon our European friends, and our obvious dedication nevertheless to the principles of self-determination, and our obvious desire not to become involved." The result, Kennedy said, was that, "We have deceived ourselves into believing that we have thus pleased both sides and displeased no one ... when, in truth, we have earned the suspicion of all."

The previous decade had proven that the tide of nationalism in the Third World – from Indochina to India to Indonesia – was "irresistible," Kennedy declared. It was time for France to face the fact that Algeria had to be freed. When would the West learn, he asked, that colonies "are like fruit that cling to the tree only till they ripen?" Didn't the French debacle in Indochina, which ended at Dien Bien Phu, serve as a warning of what lay ahead for France in Algeria if something were not done?

[Referring to lessons that should have been learned from France's Indochina debacle, Kennedy stated,]

"Did that tragic episode not teach us whether France likes it or not, admits it or not, or has our support or not, that their overseas territories are sooner or later, one by one, going to break free and

look with suspicion on the Western nations who impeded their steps to independence? ... Nationalism in Africa cannot be evaluated purely in terms of the historical and legal niceties argued by the French and thus far accepted by the State Department. National self-identification frequently takes place by quick combustion which the rain of repression simply cannot extinguish."

In the United States, a storm of protest greeted Kennedy's address on "Facing Facts on Algeria." President Eisenhower complained about "young men getting up and shouting about things." Secretary [of State John Foster] Dulles commented acidly that if the senator wanted to tilt against colonialism, perhaps he might concentrate on the communist variety. Most prominent Democrats were equally scornful. Adlai Stevenson dismissed Kennedy's speech as "terrible." Dean Acheson described the speech as "foolish words that wound ... a dispirited ally."

In France, the speech provoked an even more furious outcry. Paris's largest daily, "Le Figaro," remarked: "It is shameful that our business is so badly directed that we are forced to endure such idiocies." U.S. News and World Report noted that "An American has unified France – against himself!" Responding to Kennedy's speech, French President Rene Coty told the French Senate that France would "never negotiate with cutthroats since independence would give the 1,200,000 Europeans living in Algeria one alternative – leaving their homeland or living at the mercy of fanaticism." French Defense Minister Andre Morice publicly wondered whether Kennedy was "having nightmares." Talk of independence, Morice said, "will cost many more innocent lives," Harvard historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. reported to Kennedy from Paris that summer that "Algeria is beginning to poison France."

In Algeria itself, feeling among the European colonists against the speech ran so high that French authorities warned American newsmen and residents to stay off the streets to avoid reprisals. Two days after the speech a bomb exploded outside the American consulate in Algiers. The French Resident Minister in Algiers, Robert Lacoste, called the bomb "a Communist joke" and challenged Kennedy to come to Algeria. The senator declined.

...Practically no one in the American foreign-policy establishment regarded the Algeria speech as anything more than a partisan political blast designed to attract attention. But foreign correspondents such as Alistair Cooke of the Manchester Guardian and Henri Pierre of Le Monde recognized what their American counterparts had not – that Kennedy knew what he

was talking about on Third World issues. In a letter to the editor of The New York Times, Pierre wrote: "Strangely enough, as a Frenchman I feel that on the whole Mr. Kennedy is more to be commended than blamed for his forthright, frank and provocative speech."

Although Le Monde opposed Kennedy's call for Algerian independence, it identified the senator as one of the few serious students of history in American politics: "The most striking point of the speech of Mr. Kennedy is the important documentation it revealed and his thorough knowledge of the French milieu."

(Richard Mahoney, *JFK: Ordeal in Africa*, pp. 19-22)

Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Algeria

In his 1957 speech about Algeria, "Senator" Kennedy was highly critical of the Eisenhower administration; however, the political dynamic involved must be considered. Kennedy's views about Israel and the Middle East in general were closer to Eisenhower's than Johnson's. Having stated that, it is significant to understand that Kennedy's public endorsement of an independent Algeria was a subtle criticism of Israel. It is widely known that Israel opposed Algeria's independence because it (Israel) wanted to oppress or dominate all Muslim/Arab states. Although Eisenhower had not publicly supported Algerian independence, it seems plausible that he may have agreed with Kennedy but lacked the political courage to denounce France as the young Senator had boldly done in his speech. Upon reflection, Eisenhower may have secretly admired Kennedy for publicly denouncing America's World War II ally. After all, France had recently betrayed Eisenhower by secretly conniving with Israel and Britain to attack Egypt after President Nasser had nationalized the Suez Canal. [\(Footnote 26\)](#)

Kennedy surely understood how much he and Eisenhower agreed on Middle Eastern issues, but Eisenhower belonged to the opposing political party; and Kennedy and Johnson both had their eyes on the White House in the upcoming 1960 presidential campaign. Consequently, one of Kennedy's objectives when making the Algerian speech was likely to differentiate himself from the sitting Republican President and his Democratic adversary, Johnson. Although Kennedy and Johnson held opposing views about Israel, they could not openly criticize each other because they were both Democrats. But since Eisenhower was a Republican, it made sense politically for a Democratic Senator to criticize him for not supporting Algerian independence. The speech also sent a message to informed political observers that unlike Johnson, Kennedy would not be a minion for Israel if elected president.

Even more important, Kennedy's Algerian speech made the front page of the New York Times which put him in the same league as Senate Majority Leader Johnson. Recall that Johnson had made the front page of the New York Times five months

earlier (Feb. 1957) for opposing Eisenhower's efforts to place UN sanctions on Israel in the wake of that country's failed attempt to seize land from Egypt and overthrow Nasser in the Suez Crisis of 1956 and 57.

Jun. 5, 1967: The Six Day War

Ten years after the Suez Crisis, Israel attacked Egypt again; but this time with success. The event is known as the Six Day War which began on June 5, 1967. Things had changed a great deal over the ten years leading up to the Six Day War. Israel's most influential adversaries had either died or left public office. Eisenhower had retired years earlier and was in failing health. John Foster Dulles had died of cancer in 1959. Dag Hammarskjöld had been killed in a mysterious plane crash in the Congolese province of Katanga in 1961. President Kennedy of course had been assassinated in Dallas in 1963. And Israel's old ally, Lyndon Johnson, had become Commander-in-Chief of the United States. In July of 1965, President Johnson had appointed Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg as US ambassador to the UN. Goldberg—a Jew and ardent supporter of Israel—replaced Adlai Stevenson as US delegate to the UN after Stevenson died suddenly of a heart attack on July 14, 1965.^(Footnote 27) The Yemen War had been eroding Arab unity since the conflict began in 1962.^(Footnote 28) By 1967, Egyptian forces had suffered heavy losses and were weakened after five years of military involvement in the Yemen War.

Whether these events were random or planned is anyone's guess, but they were definitely advantageous to Israel by the time the Six Day War occurred in 1967.

The Six Day War was a watershed event that transformed Israel from a small nation into a colonial empire. Although Israel became a nation in 1948, it expanded dramatically after the Six Day War. Israel took from the Arabs—through military force—the Old City of Jerusalem, the Sinai and the Gaza Strip, the Jordanian territory west of the Jordan River known as the West Bank, and the Golan Heights, on the Israeli-Syrian border.¹¹ In addition to acquiring new land, Israel gained control of an additional 900,000 Arabs who became the discontented subjects of the new Israeli empire. Since 1967, the number of Arabs under Israel's military control has grown to over 1.75 million.¹²

Amnesty International has documented Israel's inhumane treatment of its Palestinian subjects citing arbitrary arrests, torturing detainees, destroying or sealing the homes of Arab suspects and their relatives, confiscating land, destroying crops, and diverting precious water from thirsty Palestinians in the desert to fill the swimming pools and water the lawns of Israeli settlers.¹³ This conduct is condoned, embraced, and encouraged by the United States through its steadfast financial and military support of Israel. Today, US tax payers spend approximately \$3 billion annually to subsidize, support, and arm Israel. Although Israel is a wealthy country by western standards, it receives the highest amount of American foreign aid money, 28 percent.¹⁴

Jewish scholars Michael Kazin and Maurice Isserman described in their book, *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*, the passion ignited within American Jews by the Six Day War. They wrote the following:

The swift, complete victory was followed by a long and wrenching occupation of Palestinian lands. For many American Jews, the 1967 conflict awakened and inspired passions that did much to transform the meaning of their identity. No longer was Israel just a reason for Jewish pride, a desert miracle of orange groves and thriving kibbutzes, whose creation was romanticized in *Exodus*—a popular novel and film of the late '50s and early '60s. Israel was now the homeland of fellow Jews who had fought alone for their survival and were resigned to living in perpetual danger. The threat came not just from Arab militants but from communist powers, their Third World allies, and a good many American leftists who were eager to prove their "anti-imperialist" credentials. In the face of extinction, Israel became "the ultimate reality in the life of every Jew living today," as a young professor at Brandeis University put it, "In dealing with those who oppose Israel, we are not reasonable and we are not rational. Nor should we be."¹⁵

Those are troubling words, but they reflect the true agenda of those who support the Jewish state of Israel.

Background on the Six Day War

Understanding the Six Day War requires some background regarding the politics of the Middle East in 1967. The following men were heads of state for the countries involved in the Six Day War:

Nation	Head of State
Egypt	President Gamal Abdel Nasser
Syria	General Salah al-Jadid
Jordan	King Hussein [ibn Talal]
Israel	Prime Minister Levi Eshkol
US	President Lyndon Baines Johnson
USSR	Chairman Aleksey Nikolayevich Kosygin
UN	Secretary General U Thant (of Burma, now Myanmar)

Egyptian President Nasser was a key figure in Middle Eastern affairs for seventeen years. In 1954 he became prime minister of Egypt, and in 1956 he became that country's president—remaining in that position until his sudden death in 1970.¹⁶ Nasser had been Israel's primary enemy because he was a charismatic Muslim leader who advocated Arab unity (also known as *pan-Arabism*).

Egypt has no oil of any consequence, but it has a more advanced culture than the other oil-producing Arab nations. It was the home of one of the principal civilizations of the ancient Middle East. It is also one of the earliest urban and literate societies.¹⁷ Consequently, the other Arab nations have historically looked to Egypt for leadership.

The original antagonist of Israel in the Six Day War was Syria, led by General Salah al-Jadid, head of the Ba‘th regime.¹⁸ Although Syria—under the Ba‘th regime—was an aggressive enemy of Israel, Syria’s erratic behavior toward other Arab nations actually helped Israel. In fact, Israel used Syrian raids along the its border as a pretext for attacking Egypt and starting the Six Day War.

In March 1963 Ba‘thist supporters seized power from the "secessionist" regime in a military coup. With the Ba‘th in power, Nasser had three Arab nations against him. Those nations were Saudi Arabia and Jordan (because they supported the ousted Imam in the Yemen war) and Syria.

In April 1967 Syrian bombardments of Israeli villages had been intensified. When the Israeli Air Force shot down six Syrian MiG planes in reprisal, Egypt mobilized its forces near the Sinai border.¹⁹ Egypt had a mutual defense agreement with the Syrians, who now felt themselves in danger. As an advocate of pan-Arabism, Nasser felt obliged to help Syria. He ordered part of the Egyptian Army to move into Sinai. He thought that the presence of Egyptian forces would discourage the Israelis from attacking Syria. It was a purely defensive move designed to draw off Israeli forces from Syria. If Israel had attacked Syria, then the Egyptian Army would have carried out operations in support of the Syrians. But no offensive operations against Israel were consider.²⁰

A standoff between Egypt and Israel ensued, and tensions mounted between the superpowers. The Soviet Union supported Egypt and the United States supported Israel. This raced the stakes considerably because it introduced the possibility of nuclear war.²¹

Historians now know that Israel secretly launched an attack against Egypt, but lied about it claiming that Nasser had launched the attack first. In fact Israeli Prime Minister Menachem

Begin made this admission in a speech on August 8, 1982 before the National Defense College in Jerusalem. He stated that the Six Day War was not a "war of necessity" but rather a "war of choice... Nasser did not attack us. We decided to attack him."²² This was a major admission by Begin.

On June 3, 1967, just two days before the Israelis attacked, the United States sent the aircraft carrier Intrepid through the Suez Canal with all its planes lined up on deck. Nasser thought this was an unnecessary show of force. The Egyptian people became furious. They lined the bank of the Canal and threw old shoes at the carrier. At the same time the Sixth Fleet flexed its muscles and prepared for a war situation. It was an excessive show of force by the United States.²³

After Israel’s victory, Nasser was disgusted with Johnson. He felt that Johnson was dishonest and had colluded with Israel to strike first and blame it on Egypt. He was

suspicious of America's UN ambassador Arthur Goldberg, an ardent Zionist. Goldberg had immediately backed Israel in the UN when it claimed that Egypt "fired the first shot." Nasser accused Johnson of collusion, broke off diplomatic relations with the United States, and ordered all Americans out of Egypt. Several other Arab states did the same. Soon Johnson, already angered by the charge of collusion, had to watch the humiliating spectacle of twenty-four thousand American men, women, and children being thrown out of the Middle East. Johnson never forgot and never forgave.²⁴

After Egypt's humiliating defeat in the Six Day War, Nasser attempted to resign, but massive street demonstrations and a vote of confidence by the National Assembly induced him to remain in office. The Soviet Union immediately began replacing all the destroyed war equipment and installed surface-to-air missiles along the Suez as a cover for Egypt's artillery installations.²⁵

An important footnote to the Six Day War is an incident that occurred in Yemen months earlier. In early 1967, fighting in Yemen still continued. One day there was shooting in Taiz (in Yemen). Direction finders indicated that two bazooka shots came from the headquarters of the United States Point Four Aid Program—which was the CIA's cover organization. Yemeni government forces attacked the building and arrested the four people inside. The safes were opened and an enormous number of documents were found and subsequently photographed by Egyptian intelligence experts.^(Footnote 29) The United States was furious at the attack on the building and demanded the documents. They were returned three weeks later, but by that time their secrets were known. Many people within the United States military became extremely hostile toward Nasser because of this event. Some believe the Six Day War was a form of retribution.²⁶

UN Resolution 242

Within six months after the Six Day War, the UN Security Council issued Resolution 242 which called for "withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict." In theory the UN should enforce the resolution itself, but unfortunately, reality is much different. The sad truth is the UN is unable to enforce much of anything without the support of the United States, and the United States has maintained a "passionate attachment" to Israel ever since President Johnson was in office.

Ironically, Resolution 242 was issued on the fourth anniversary of President Kennedy's death, November 22, 1967.²⁷ It is an extremely important document because virtually all disputes between Israel and the Palestinians and neighboring Arab states could be resolved by its enforcement.

In addition, the Israelis managed to secure ambiguous, legalistic wording for Resolution 242 which makes even more difficult to enforce,²⁸ however, the resolution remains a highly sensitive area for American presidents and politicians to roam. The following is the entire text of the resolution:

The Security Council,

Expressing its continuing concern with the grave situation in the Middle East,

Emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security,

Emphasizing further that all Member States in their acceptance of the Charter of the United Nations have undertaken a commitment to act in accordance with Article 2 of the Charter,

1. Affirms that the fulfillment of Charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which should include the application of both the following principles:

(i) Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;

(ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

2. Affirms further the necessity

(a) For guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area;

(b) For achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem;

(c) For guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area, through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to designate a Special Representative to proceed to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the progress of the efforts of the Special Representative as soon as possible.

(UN Security Council Resolution 242 of November 22, 1967)

Jun. 8, 1967: Israel Attacked the USS Liberty

In the midst of the Six Day War, Israel attacked the [USS Liberty](#) spy vessel killing 34 American sailors and wounding 75.

George Ball wrote a riveting account of Israel's attack on the [USS Liberty](#) on June 8, 1967. Ball's comments are significant because he was undersecretary of state in the Johnson and Kennedy administrations. The following text is an excerpt from Ball's book, *The Passionate Attachment: America's Involvement With Israel, 1947 to the Present*:

During the [Six Day] War, Israel attacked the [USS Liberty](#). The Liberty was an American intelligence-gathering vessel, then cruising in international waters near Egypt and reading the radio transmissions on both sides. It flew the American flag and was painted in US Navy colors, complete with number and name.

On the fourth day of the war [June 8, 1967], with both Jordan and Egypt routed, the Israelis turned their attention to Syria, the original cause of all this trouble. Guns mounted on the Golan Heights had subjected Galilee to sporadic bombardment for years and the Israelis had every intention of capturing those Heights before hostilities were over. Meanwhile, the United Nations had adopted a cease-fire resolution and they feared there might not be enough time to accomplish this objective without, as it were, going into overnight.

The [Liberty's](#) presence and function were known to Israeli leaders. They presumably thought it vital that the Liberty be prevented from informing Washington of their intentions to violate any cease-fire before they had completed their occupation of the Golan. Their solution was brutal and direct.

Israel aircraft determined the exact location of the ship and undertook a combined air-naval attack. Apprised of Israel's plans from various sources, the US Navy Department faced a delicate problem. Due regard for the lives of America's naval personnel should have impelled the Navy to urge the State Department to warn off Israel in no uncertain terms; meanwhile, the Navy have alerted the [Liberty](#) to its danger and dispatched ships or planes for its protection. But none of these actions was taken in time.

There has, for years, been a continuing argument about the tragic lapse. Some say that a warning to Israel might have

exposed U.S. sources of secret intelligence. Whatever the motive, the President or one of his aides took the decision to risk the ship and its crew, and merely ordered them, without explanation, to steam west at top speed. Unhappily, that notice was too little and taken too late. Israeli ships and planes attacked, killing 34 American sailors, wounding 75, and leaving 821 rocket and machine-gun holes in the [Liberty](#). It was only when the Israelis were preparing to board the ship that American planes belatedly appeared from the west and forced them to retire.

The sequel was unedifying. The [Johnson] administration tried vigorously to downplay the whole matter. Although it silenced the crew, casualties to the sailors and damage to the ship could not possibly be concealed. Thus, an elaborate charade was performed. The United States complained pro forma to Israel, which reacted by blaming the victims. The ship, they rejoined, had not been clearly marked but looked like an Arab ship—which was definitely untrue. Nor did the Israelis even pretend that they had queried the American Embassy in Tel Aviv regarding the status of the well-marked ship. In the end, the Israelis tendered a reluctant and graceless apology; indemnities for the victims and damaged ship were both parsimonious and slow in coming. The sordid affair has still not been erased from the history books; an organization of devoted survivors has kept the cause alive over the years by publishing a newsletter and holding well-advertised meetings.

Yet the ultimate lesson of the [Liberty attack](#) had far more effect on policy in Israel than America. Israel's leaders concluded that nothing they might do would offend the Americans to the point of reprisal. If America's leaders did not have the courage to punish Israel for the blatant murder of American citizens, it seemed that their American friends would let them get away with almost anything.

(George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, pp. 57 - 58)

Arthur Goldberg, UN Point Man

As previously stated, Adlai Stevenson died suddenly of a heart attack on July 14, 1965.²⁹ Until his untimely death, Stevenson had represented the United States in the UN. Arthur Goldberg was a Supreme Court Justice appointed by Kennedy to a traditionally Jewish slot in the high court.^(Footnote 30) At President Johnson's request, Goldberg resigned from his position as Supreme Court justice to take the lower position of US ambassador to the UN.³⁰ This was an extraordinary move.

Goldberg was an interesting figure. In addition to serving on the Supreme Court and as a UN diplomat, he had an impressive background in the world of espionage. During World War II, he worked with Haganah and OSS in Palestine.

After the events of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, President Roosevelt created the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), a military spy agency and precursor to the CIA.³¹ New York attorney William Donovan was appointed to run the newly formed agency. With Donovan in charge of the OSS, Roosevelt had created the first civilian-run spy organization in modern US history. Donovan immediately recruited another New York attorney, Allen Dulles, to help establish the organization. Goldberg was given the rank of major and he assisted Donovan and Dulles establish an OSS field office in New York. Shortly thereafter, Goldberg became—for all intents and purposes—an international spy working for the OSS. He was assigned various spy missions in Sweden, Germany, Spain, and Morocco.³²

With the experience he acquired in espionage, he returned to Washington, DC and created an intelligence gathering operation. After that, he was sent on a secret mission in Palestine where he met with leaders of the illegal army of Jewish settlers, Haganah. This operation meant a great deal to Goldberg personally because he had become a Zionist rather late in life. The Haganah worked with him to coordinate a joint OSS-Haganah parachute mission into Italy to gather critical intelligence information. After the Palestine encounter, Goldberg was sent to London to recruit anti-Nazi Germans, who had been captured as spies when the allies invaded France.³³

Endnotes

1. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, pp. 43 - 45
2. *ibid*, pp. 45 - 46
3. Encyclopedia Britannica: Suez Canal
4. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 46
5. Encyclopedia Britannica: Suez Crisis
6. Richard D. Mahoney, *JFK: Ordeal in Africa*, Chapter 1
7. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 251. Eisenhower's instructions to Dulles were on p. 47 of Ball's book. The Hammarskjöld quote regarding Ben-Gurion and Israel was on p. 251. Ball cited Brian Urquhart's biography of Dag Hammarskjöld: *Hammarskjöld*, p. 157.
8. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 47
9. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, pp. 46 - 49; multiple articles about Senate Majority Leader Johnson's support for Israel in the New York Times on February 20, 1957
10. *ibid*
11. Encyclopedia Britannica: Six Day War
12. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 58
13. *ibid*, p. 179
14. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 256
15. Kazin and Isserman, *America Divided*, p. 253
16. Encyclopedia Britannica: Gamal Abdel Nasser
17. Encyclopedia Britannica: Egypt
18. Encyclopedia Britannica: Six Day War; Salah al-Jadid; George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, pp. 53-56; Mohamed Heikal, *The Cairo Documents*, Chapter VII: *Johnson and Violence*, pp. 225 - 249
19. Encyclopedia Britannica: Six Day War
20. Mohamed Heikal, *The Cairo Documents*, Chapter VII: *Johnson and Violence*, pp. 225 - 249
21. *ibid*
22. Ball, p 56
23. Heikal
24. *ibid*

25. Encyclopedia Britannica: Gamal Abdel Nasser
26. Heikal
27. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 62
28. *ibid*, pp. 62-63
29. Encyclopedia Britannica: Adlai Stevenson
30. *ibid*, Arthur Goldberg
31. Edward B. Shils, Ph.D, *Monthly Labor Review* (January 1997), pp. 59 - 60 (excerpt from *Arthur Goldberg: proof of the American dream*)
32. *ibid*
33. *ibid*

Chapter 11: Vietnam, Johnson's Opium War

American Heroin Trafficking was Introduced by Jewish Gangsters

In the 1920s, heroin smuggling and prostitution were introduced and run primarily by Jewish gangsters. Alfred McCoy made the following observation in his book, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*:

At first the American Mafia ignored this new business opportunity [heroin trafficking]. Steeped in the traditions of the Sicilian "honored society," which absolutely forbade involvement in either narcotics or prostitution, the Mafia left the heroin business to the powerful Jewish gangsters—such as "Legs" Diamond, ["Dutch" Schultz, and Meyer Lansky](#)—who dominated organized crime in the 1920s. The Mafia contented itself with the substantial profits to be gained from controlling the bootleg liquor industry.¹

However, in 1930-1931, only seven years after heroin was legally banned, a war erupted in the Mafia ranks. Out of the violence that left more than sixty gangsters dead came a new generation of leaders with little respect for the traditional code of honor.²

The leader of this mafioso youth movement was the legendary Salvatore C. Luciana, known to the world as Charles "Lucky" Luciano. Charming and strikingly handsome, Luciano must rank as one of the most brilliant criminal executives of the modern age.^(Footnote 31) For, at a series of meetings shortly following the last of the bloodbaths that completely eliminated the old guard, Luciano outlined his plans for a modern, nationwide crime cartel. His modernization scheme quickly won total support from the leaders of America's twenty-four Mafia "families," and within a few months the National Commission was functioning smoothly. This was an event of historic proportions: almost single-handedly, Luciano built the Mafia into the most powerful criminal syndicate in the United States and pioneered organizational techniques that are still the basis of organized crime today. Luciano also forged an alliance between the Mafia and Meyer Lansky's Jewish gangs that has survived for almost 40 years and even today is the dominant characteristic of organized crime in the United States.

(Alfred McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, pp. 17 - 18)

Lucky Luciano died on January 26, 1962. Therefore he was not directly involved in President Kennedy's assassination. A more likely candidate is Meyer Lansky. As previously stated, in 1979, the House Select Committee on Assassinations linked Jack Ruby to Meyer Lansky.³ This supports my overall thesis that President Kennedy's assassination was ultimately a Jewish conspiracy into which various underworld elements were lured by the promise of opium smuggling from Southeast Asia for heroin production in Marseilles, France and Hong Kong.

China's Vietnam Strategy in 1965

On June 23, 1965, Chinese Premier Chou En-lai dined with Egyptian President Nasser in Alexandria, Egypt. The two men reportedly enjoyed each other's company. According to Arab scholar Mohamed Heikal, ^(Footnote 32) Chou made the following comments to Nasser about American involvement in Vietnam:

"We are afraid some American militarists may press for a nuclear attack on China and we think that the American involvement in Indochina is an insurance policy against such an attack because we will have a lot of their flesh close to our nails.

"So the more troops they send to Vietnam, the happier we will be, for we feel that we will have them in our power, we can have their blood. So if you want to help the Vietnamese, you should encourage the Americans to throw more and more soldiers into Vietnam.

"We want them there. They will be close to China. And they will be in our grasp. They will be so close to us, they will be our hostages. ...

"Some of them are trying opium. And we are helping them. We are planting the best kinds of opium especially for the American soldiers in Vietnam. Do you remember when the West imposed opium on us? They fought us with opium. And we are going to fight them with their own weapons. We are going to use their own methods against them. We want them to have a big army in Vietnam which will be hostage to us and we want to demoralize them. The effect this demoralization is going to have on the United States will be far greater than anyone realizes.

(Mohamed Heikal, *The Cairo Documents*, pp. 306 - 307)

Premier Chou's comments are highly significant because they indicate that the Chinese had a keen interest, in 1965, in the Golden Triangle and the opium produced there. In my observation, Chou's thinking was flawed regarding his belief that the presence of American soldiers in Vietnam would protect China from nuclear attack. Also, his strategy of "helping" the American soldiers get hooked on opium/heroin as means of weakening the resolve of the American military was somewhat naïve. My research has convinced me that the last thing the leaders of the American military cared about during the Vietnam was the personal welfare of its soldiers, particularly during the Johnson administration. This mindset, however, changed a great deal when President Nixon came into office.

History of Opium Wars

The opium that Premier Chou planned to supply to American soldiers in Vietnam was grown in the Golden Triangle, a mountainous area of northeastern Burma, northern Thailand, and northern Laos regarded as one of the world's most important sources of illicit opium, morphine, and heroin. Chou also made references to two Opium Wars of the Nineteenth Century. The first opium war (1839-42) was between Britain and China. The second (1856-60) involved Britain and France against China. Both wars originated from China's efforts to limit opium trade.

Early in the 19th century, British merchants began smuggling opium into China which resulted in social and economic turmoil in the country due to widespread addiction. In 1839, China began enforcing its prohibitions on the importation of opium. At one point, the Chinese government confiscated and destroyed a large quantity of opium warehoused by British merchants at Guangzhou (Canton). Britain responded by sending gunboats to attack several Chinese coastal cities. The two countries were at war for about three years. Eventually China was defeated and forced to sign the Treaty of Nanjing (1842) and the British Supplementary Treaty of the Bogue (1843). These provided that the ports of Guangzhou, Jinmen, Fuzhou, Ningbo, and Shanghai should be open to British trade and residence. The agreements also gave Hong Kong to the British. Within a few years other Western powers signed similar treaties with China and received commercial and residential privileges, and the Western domination of China's treaty ports began.

In 1856 a second opium war broke out following a Chinese search of a British-registered ship, the *Arrow*, in Guangzhou. British and French troops took Guangzhou and Tianjin and forced the Chinese to accept the treaties of Tianjin (1858), to which France, Russia, and the United States were also participants. China begrudgingly agreed to open eleven more ports, permit foreign legations in Beijing, sanction Christian missionary activity, and legalize the import of opium.

There was a brief peace, but China continued to resist British efforts to import opium. In 1859, hostilities were renewed when China attempted to block the entry of diplomats into Beijing. This time the British and French occupied Beijing and burned the imperial summer palace (Yuan ming yuan). The Beijing conventions of 1860, by which China was forced to reaffirm the terms of the Treaty of Tianjin and make additional concessions, marked the end of the second Opium War.⁴

The Golden Triangle

As previously stated, the Golden Triangle is a mountainous area of northeastern Burma, northern Thailand, and northern Laos. Alfred McCoy described—in his book, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*—how most of the world's illicit opium was grown in that region of the world in 1972:

Almost all of the world's illicit opium [in 1972] is grown in a narrow band of mountains that stretches along the southern rim of the

great Asian land mass, from Turkey's and Anatolian plateau, through the northern reaches of the Indian subcontinent, all the way to the rugged mountains of northern Laos. Within this 4,500-mile stretch of mountain landscape, peasants and tribesmen of eight different nations harvest some fourteen hundred tons a year of raw opium, which eventually reaches the world's heroin and opium addicts." A small percentage of this fourteen hundred tons is diverted from legitimate pharmaceutical production in Turkey, Iran, and India, but most of it is grown expressly for the international narcotics traffic in South and Southeast Asia. Although Turkey was the major source of American narcotics through the 1960s, the hundred tons of raw opium its licensed peasant farmers diverted from legitimate production never accounted for more than 7 percent of the world's illicit supply.⁵ About 24 percent is harvested by poppy farmers in South Asia (Afghanistan, Pakistan, and India). However, most of this is consumed by local opium addicts, and only insignificant quantities find their way to Europe or the United States.⁶ It is Southeast Asia that has become the world's most important source of illicit opium. Every year the hill tribe farmers of Southeast Asia's Golden Triangle region-northeastern Burma, northern Thailand, and northern Laos-harvest approximately one thousand tons of raw opium, or about 70 percent of the world's illicit supply.⁷

(Alfred McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, p. 9)

McCoy's description of the region where most opium was grown is intriguing. He portrayed it in geographic and visual terms, rather than merely a division of man-made nation states. Again, this is how he described it: "4,500-mile stretch of mountain landscape...in a narrow band of mountains that stretches along the southern rim of the great Asian land mass, from Turkey's and Anatolian plateau, through the northern reaches of the Indian subcontinent, all the way to the rugged mountains of northern Laos." From that description, it becomes obvious why the Western powers were so interested in dominating that area of the world.

McCoy also implied that market forces were causing "peasants and tribesmen of eight different nations to harvest some fourteen hundred tons a year of raw opium" which was ultimately sold to heroin and opium addicts across the world.

Given that the world's opium supply was grown in a central geographic region over which several nations ruled, it becomes significant that by the mid-1960s, the countries of Southeast Asia were the only ones left where opium production was still legal. In 1955, the Iranian government announced the complete abolition of opium growing.⁸ In 1967, the Turkish government announced plans to follow suit.⁹

It apparently became known within the worldwide heroin cartel that Turkey and Iran would eventually abolish opium production. Consequently, the CIA began supporting opium and heroin production in Southeast Asia in the 1950s and 60s. Alfred McCoy

described—in his book, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*—how Cold War politics influenced heroin trafficking from World War II through the Vietnam era.

The cold war was waged in many parts of the world, but Europe was the most important battleground in the 1940s and 1950s. Determined to restrict Soviet influence in western Europe, American clandestine operatives intervened in the internal politics of Germany, Italy, and France. In Sicily, the forerunner of the CIA, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), formed an alliance with the Sicilian Mafia to limit the political gains of the Italian Communist party on this impoverished island. In France the Mediterranean port city of Marseille became a major battleground between the CIA and the French Communist party during the late 1940s. To tip the balance of power in its favor, the CIA recruited Corsican gangsters to battle Communist strikers and backed leading figures in the city's Corsican underworld who were at odds with the local Communists. Ironically, both the Sicilian Mafia and the Corsican underworld played a key role in the growth of Europe's postwar heroin traffic and were to provide most of the heroin smuggled into the United States for the next two decades.

However, the mid-1960s marked the peak of the European heroin industry, and shortly thereafter it went into a sudden decline. In the early 1960s the Italian government launched a crackdown on the Sicilian Mafia, and in 1967 the Turkish government announced that it would begin phasing out cultivation of opium poppies on the Anatolian plateau in order to deprive Marseille's illicit heroin laboratories of their most important source of raw material. Unwilling to abandon their profitable narcotics racket, the American Mafia and Corsican syndicates shifted their sources of supply to Southeast Asia, where surplus opium production and systematic government corruption created an ideal climate for large-scale heroin production.

And once again American foreign policy played a role in creating these favorable conditions. During the early 1950s the CIA had backed the formation of a Nationalist Chinese guerrilla army in Burma, which still controls almost a third of the world's illicit opium supply, and in Laos the CIA created a Meo mercenary army whose commander manufactured heroin for sale to Americans GIs in South Vietnam. The State Department provided unconditional support for corrupt governments openly engaged in the drug traffic. In late 1969 new heroin laboratories sprang up in the tri-border area where Burma, Thailand, and Laos converge, and unprecedented quantities of heroin started flooding into the United States. Fueled by these seemingly limitless supplies of heroin, America's total number of addicts skyrocketed.

(Alfred McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, pp. 7-8)

It should be noted that the group of Americans hit hardest by heroin addiction was poor blacks living in the inner cities. Given that right-wing extremists like Joseph Milteer apparently joined the coup against Kennedy (reference Chapter 7), the targeting of black communities for illicit heroin sales was likely no accident.

Origins of the Vietnam War

The Vietnam War began in 1955 and ended in 1975. During the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, American involvement in Vietnam was limited to clandestine espionage and training the South Vietnamese army. Kennedy increased the number of "military advisors" from about 800 to 16,000; however, this was done primarily as a show of strength to the Soviet Union during the height of the Cold War. As tensions eased between the two superpowers in the spring, summer, and fall of 1963, Kennedy announced plans to withdraw forces from South Vietnam, starting with a thousand men by the end of 1963. Immediately after Kennedy's death, President Johnson rescinded the withdrawal plan and began sending more troops to that country.

On August 2, 1964, North Vietnamese patrol boats fired on the U.S. destroyer Maddox in the Gulf of Tonkin, and, after President Johnson asserted that there had been a second attack on August 4—a claim later shown to be false—the U.S. Congress almost unanimously endorsed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution authorizing the president to take "all necessary measures to repel attacks . . . and prevent further aggression." The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in effect gave the president carte blanche to wage war in Southeast Asia without Congressional approval. This marked the beginning of full-scale American involvement in the Vietnam War. When Johnson left office in January 1969, there were about 540,000¹⁰ American soldiers—mostly draftees—in Vietnam in sharp contrast to the 16,000 military advisers—non-draftees—present when Kennedy was killed in 1963.

Reasons for the War

There are three popular explanations for the Vietnam War. Western diplomats, politicians, and historians state that it was an unsuccessful effort by South Vietnam and the United States to prevent the communists of North Vietnam from uniting South Vietnam with North Vietnam under their leadership. The Vietnamese government would have us believe it was merely a civil war that occurred after Vietnam declared its independence from Japan^(Footnote 33) at the end of World War II. But in Alfred McCoy's book, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, he suggested that the war was as much about the illicit export of opium as anything else. My research indicates that it was a combination of all three, but was intensified by the assassination of President Kennedy.

Furthermore, historical evidence indicates that the Vietnam War was a continuation of the two Opium Wars of the Nineteenth Century in which the Western powers forced China to import opium. As governments learned more about the dangers of opium and

heroin, it became unacceptable—purely for public relations reasons—for the Western powers to overtly export narcotics to China and other countries. Over time, drug trafficking continued but its management shifted to international espionage services and organized crime which were secretly sanctioned by the Western governments. Eventually drug smuggling began to drive the foreign policies of the Western powers, and vice-versa. This entanglement, in my view, became the impetus behind Western involvement in the Vietnam War. It also appears that this situation was exploited by friends of Israel as a means of setting up the assassination of President Kennedy.

As previously stated, it was Jewish gangsters—such as "Legs" Diamond, "Dutch" Schultz, and Meyer Lansky—who introduced the heroin business to the American Mafia in the 1920s. In addition, the American Mafia—which was primarily of Sicilian origin in the 1920s—forbade involvement of either narcotics or prostitution. Such activity was left to the Jewish gangsters.¹¹ This is a critical fact that further supports my conclusion that a Jewish conspiracy as the ultimate sponsor of the Kennedy assassination.

Vietnam History, From 1941 to 1963

In 1941, the League for the Independence of Vietnam—generally known as the Viet Minh—was organized as a nationalistic party seeking Vietnamese independence from France.

On September 2, 1945, less than a month after the Japanese surrendered in World War II, Ho Chi Minh, leader of the Viet Minh, formally declared Vietnam's independence. The Viet Minh had a strong base of popular support in northern Vietnam. The French wanted to reassert control in Indochina, however, and would recognize Vietnam only as a free state within the French Union.

In the mid-1950s, Vietnam became openly communist. In 1946, fighting between the French and the Viet Minh broke out—and continued until 1954—when the French were badly defeated in the Battle of Dien Bien Phu. An international conference in Geneva in 1954 negotiated a cease-fire. To separate the warring forces, the conferees decided that the French and the Vietnamese fighting under French command would move south of the 17th parallel and the Viet Minh would go north of the 17th parallel, which was established as a military demarcation line surrounded by a demilitarized zone (DMZ). Thousands of people accordingly moved north or south away from their homes, and the French began their final departure from Vietnam. The agreement left the communist-led Viet Minh in control of the northern half of Vietnam, which came to be known as North Vietnam, while the noncommunist southern half became South Vietnam. Ngo Dinh Diem became South Vietnam's prime minister during the armistice negotiations.

The Geneva Accords stipulated that free elections be held throughout Vietnam in 1956 under the supervision of an International Control Committee with the aim of reunifying North and South Vietnam under a single popularly elected government. North Vietnam expected to win this election thanks to the broad political organization

that it had built up in both parts of Vietnam. But Diem, who had solidified his control over South Vietnam, refused in 1956 to hold the scheduled elections. The United States supported his position. In response, the North Vietnamese decided to unify South with North Vietnam through military force rather than by political means.

U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, fearing the spread of communism in Asia, persuaded the U.S. government to provide economic and military assistance to the Diem regime, which became increasingly unpopular with the people of South Vietnam. Diem replaced the traditionally elected village councils with Saigon-appointed administrators. He also aroused the ire of the Buddhists by selecting his fellow Roman Catholics (most of whom had moved to South Vietnam from the North) for top government positions. Diem's government began mistreating the Buddhists to the point that there were riots in the streets; Buddhists monks publicly committed suicide by setting themselves on fire.

Guerrilla warfare spread as Viet Minh soldiers who were trained and armed in the North—the Viet Cong—returned to their homes in the South to assassinate, ambush, sabotage, and proselytize. The Diem government asked for and received more American military advisers and equipment to build up the Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN) and the police force, but it could not halt the growing presence of the South Vietnamese communist forces, or Viet Cong.¹²

From 1962 until 1963, President Kennedy increased the number noncombat military advisers from 800 to 16,000.¹³

Vietnam was a Divisive Issue Within JFK's Government

The Vietnam War was obviously a divisive issue during the Johnson and Nixon years, but few people realize how divisive it was while Kennedy was still president. Historian Michael Beschloss wrote that Vietnam was tearing Kennedy's government apart in the summer of 1963:

Kennedy later told Charles Bartlett, "My God, my government's coming apart!" Robert Kennedy recalled that week [end of August 1963] as "the only time, really, in three years that the government was broken in two in a disturbing way." He later said, "Diem was corrupt and a bad leader... but we inherited him." He thought it bad policy to "replace somebody we didn't like with somebody we do because it would just make every other country nervous as can be that we were running coups in and out."

(Michael Beschloss, *The Crisis Years*, p. 653)

Oct. 31, 1963: Kennedy Announced Withdrawal From Vietnam

On October 31, 1963 in a press conference, Kennedy publicly announced his intention to withdraw a thousand men from South Vietnam by the end of 1963. A reporter asked him about troop reductions in the far east. Here is the entire question and Kennedy's response:

[REPORTER:] Mr. President, back to the question of troop reductions, are any intended in the far east at the present time – particularly in Korea and is there any speedup in the withdrawal from Vietnam intended?

[PRESIDENT KENNEDY:] Well as you know, when Secretary McNamara and General Taylor came back, they announced that we would expect to withdraw a thousand men from South Vietnam before the end of the year. And there has been some reference to that by General Harkins. If we're able to do that, that will be our schedule. I think the first unit, the first contingent, would be 250 men who are not involved in what might be called front-line operations. It would be our hope to lesson the number of Americans there by a thousand as the training intensifies and is carried on in South Vietnam.

(from JFK's press conference, October 31, 1963)

[An audio cassette tape recording of the referenced press conference was provided by the John F. Kennedy Library, audio-visual department, Columbia Point, Boston, MA 02125.]

Nov. 1, 1963: Diem Assassinated in CIA Backed Coup

The very next day, on Nov. 1, 1963, South Vietnamese President Ngo Dinh Diem was killed in a CIA backed coup. As previously stated, Diem—a Roman Catholic—had upset the Buddhists by selecting fellow Roman Catholics (most of whom had moved to South Vietnam from the North) for top government positions. There was a public backlash—riots in the streets; Buddhists monks publicly committed suicide by setting themselves on fire. Diem became an embarrassment to the United States and was encouraged to resign, but he refused.

Diem's assassination pulled the US deeper into the Vietnam conflict, a conflict Kennedy was trying to pull away from. There is a question as to whether Kennedy had approved the coup. Some historians claim that he knew of it; however, he was extremely upset at hearing of Diem's murder. Here are some cites:

The news of Diem's death outraged Kennedy. General [Maxwell] Taylor wrote that he "leaped to his feet and rushed from the room with a look of shock and dismay on his face which I had never seen before." George Smathers remembered that Jack Kennedy

blamed the CIA, saying "I've got to do something about those bastards;" they should be stripped of their exorbitant power. Mike Forrestal called Kennedy's reaction "both personal and religious," and especially troubled by the implication that a Catholic President had participated in a plot to assassinate a coreligionist. Every account of Kennedy's response is in complete agreement. Until the very end he had hoped Diem's life could be spared.

(Herbert Parmet, *JFK: the Presidency of John F. Kennedy*, p. 335.)

I saw the President soon after he heard that Diem and Nhu were dead. He was somber and shaken. I had not seen him so depressed since the Bay of Pigs.

(Arthur Schlesinger, *A Thousand Days*, p. 997]

In the Situation Room, Kennedy was monitoring the coup when told of the murders. He rushed out of the room. Forrestal felt that the assassination "shook him personally" and "bothered him as a moral and religious matter. It shook his confidence, I think, in the kind of advice he was getting about South Vietnam."

(Michael Beschloss, *The Crisis Years*, p. 657)

Over the next year, countless CIA backed governments rose and fell in South Vietnam.¹⁴

Nov. 24, 1963: Johnson Rescinded Kennedy's Withdrawal Order

On November 24, 1963, two days after Kennedy's assassination, President Johnson quietly rescinded Kennedy's order to withdraw a thousand men from Vietnam by the end of the year.

On Sunday afternoon, November 24, [1963], Lyndon Johnson kept the dead President's appointment with [U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot] Lodge and told him that he was not willing to 'lose Vietnam.': 'Tell those generals in Saigon that Lyndon Johnson intends to stand by our word.'

(Michael Beschloss, *The Crisis Years*, p. 680)

Aug. 2, 1964: Gulf of Tonkin Incident Occurred. The Vietnam War Began.

On August 2, 1964, the Gulf of Tonkin incident occurred and the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was subsequently ratified by Congress. This was the beginning of large-scale military involvement in Vietnam. Here is a summary of the Gulf of Tonkin incident:

[On August 2, 1964,] three North Vietnamese boats fired torpedoes at [U.S. destroyer Maddox]. Maddox gunners and jets from the nearby Ticonderoga fired back, crippling two of the vessels and sinking the third.

President Johnson rejected further reprisals. Using the hot line to Moscow for the first time, he cabled Khrushchev that he did not wish to widen the conflict but hoped that North Vietnam would not attack other American vessels in international waters.

The Maddox and another destroyer, the C. Turner Joy, were ordered to sail eight miles off the North Vietnamese coast, four miles off the offshore islands. The commandos from the South resumed their operations. On Sunday evening, intercepted radio messages gave the Maddox commander, Captain John Herrick, the 'impression' that Communist patrol boats were about to attack. With air support from the Ticonderoga, the Maddox and Turner Joy began firing.

Maddox officers reported twenty-two enemy torpedoes, none of which scored a hit, and two or three enemy vessels sunk. But when the firing stopped, Herrick warned his superiors that the 'entire action leaves many doubts'; no sailor on the destroyer had seen or heard enemy gunfire. An 'overeager' young sonar operator who had counted torpedoes may have been misled by 'freak weather effects.'

Nevertheless the President ordered bombing of North Vietnam for the first time and unveiled the document now christened the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Language was broadened to authorize Johnson to 'take all necessary measures' to protect American forces and 'prevent further aggression.' The Senate passed it [on August 7, 1964] with only two dissenters.

(Michael Beschloss, *The Crisis Years*, p. 694)

Johnson also made a false claim—supported by the news media—that on August 4, 1964, the North Vietnamese attacked US destroyers a second time.¹⁵

Here is a transcript of President Johnson describing the Gulf of Tonkin Incident to Robert Anderson, former Secretary of Treasury in the Eisenhower administration, the day after the attack.

[MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 1964:]

There have been some covert operations in that area that we have been carrying on – blowing up some bridges and things of that kind, roads and so forth. So I imagine they wanted to put a stop to it. So they ...fired and we respond immediately with five-inch [artillery shells] from the destroyer and with planes overhead. And we ... knock one of 'em out and cripple the other two. Then we go right back where we were with that destroyer and with another one, plus plenty of planes standing by...

(Transcript of LBJ per Michael Beschloss, *Taking Charge*, pp. 493-494.)

Four days later on August 7, 1964, the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution passed unanimously in the House of Representatives and 88-to-2 in the Senate. Here is a transcript of a telephone conversation, after the vote, between President Johnson and Speaker of the House, John McCormack:

[FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 1964:]

LBJ: That was a good vote you had today.

McCormack: Yes, it was very good. Four hundred fourteen to nothing. One present. What'd the Senate do?

LBJ: Eighty-eight to 2 – [Wayne] Morse and [Ernest] Gruening.

McCormack: Can't understand Gruening.

LBJ: Oh, he's no good. He's worse than Morse. He's just no good. I've spent millions on him up in Alaska [Gruening's home state] ... And Morse is just undependable and erratic as he can be.

McCormack: A radical.

LBJ: I just wanted to point out this little shit-ass [Edgar] Foreman today got up and said that we acted impulsively by announcing [in a Tuesday night televised statement] that we had an answer on the way before the planes dropped their bombs ... It's just a pure lie and smoke screen. [\(Footnote 34\)](#)

(Michael Beschloss, *Taking Charge*, p. 508)

Aug. 25, 1964: Johnson got Cold Feet and Wanted to Resign.

A few weeks later on August 25, 1964, Johnson began to lose his nerve and planned to announce that he would withdraw his name as Democratic presidential candidate. Here is a transcript of a telephone conversation with Press Secretary George Reedy where Johnson was clearly shaken over a walk-out by Southern delegations, on the previous day, at the Democratic Convention in Atlantic City:

[TUESDAY, AUGUST 25, 1964:]

Reedy:

I'm set to brief.

LBJ:

Good.

Reedy:

What should I tell 'em about this morning?

LBJ:

I don't know, George. There's really not much to tell 'em... I'm just writing out a little statement that I think I'm gonna make either at a press conference or go up to Atlantic City this afternoon to make. But I don't think we can tell 'em about it now. Here's what I'm gonna say to 'em. [reading from a handwritten statement:]

"[Forty-four months ago] I was selected to be the Democratic Vice President ... On that fateful November day last year, I accepted the responsibility of the President, asking God's guidance and the help of all our people. For nine months, I've carried on as effectively as I could. Our country faces grave dangers. These dangers must be faced and met by a united people under a leader they do not doubt. After thirty-three years in political life, most men acquire enemies as ships accumulate barnacles. The times require leadership about which there is no doubt and a voice that men of all parties and sections and color can follow. I've learned, after trying very hard, that I am not that voice or that leader. Therefore... I suggest that the representatives from all states of the Union selected for the purpose of selecting a Democratic nominee for President and Vice President proceed to do their duty. And that no consideration be given to me because I am absolutely unavailable."

[LBJ then vents:]

Then they can just pick the two they want for the two places. We'll ... do the best we can to help till January. Then, if he's elected ... they can have a new and fresh fellow without any of the old scars. And I don't want this power of the Bomb. I just don't want these decisions I'm required to make. I don't want the conniving that's required. I don't want the disloyalty that's around. I don't want the bungling and the inefficiencies of our people. ...

Reedy:

This will throw the nation into quite an uproar, sir.

LBJ:

Yeah, I think so. And I think that now is the time, though. I don't know any better time ... I am absolutely positive that I cannot lead the South and the North ... And I don't want to lead the nation without my own state and without my own section. I am very convinced that the Negroes will not listen to me. They're not going to follow a white Southerner. And the stakes are too big to try to compromise. ... [He complains about various newspaper articles.]

Reedy:

I think it's too late, sir. I know it's your decision, because you're the man that has to bear the brunt. But right now I think this just gives the country to Goldwater.

LBJ:

That's all right. I don't care. I'm just willing to --- I don't think that. I don't agree with that a-tall. But I think he could do better than I can because ---

Reedy:

He can't, sir. He's just a child. And look at our side. We don't have anybody. The only man around I'd trust to be President would be McNamara, and he wouldn't stand a chance.

LBJ:

No, but we didn't trust any of the rest of 'em. You know, we didn't trust Eisenhower or Jack Kennedy. That's a matter for them [the delegates]. Anyway they've been running their business for a couple hundred years, and I'll leave it up to them. ...

[A few minutes later, Johnson was on the phone with Walter

Jenkins and expressed frustration over the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, suggesting that he did not have a mandate to wage war in Southeast Asia.]

LBJ:

I don't believe there'll be many attacks on the orders I issue on Tonkin Gulf if I'm not a candidate. And then I think the people will give the man that they want ... a mandate. And he might continue the work we've done. ...

(Michael Beschloss, *Taking Charge*, pp. 529-531)

As we know, Johnson changed his mind, was re-elected in 1964, and served four more years as president. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that Johnson got cold feet just 18 days after Congress ratified the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution which was basically a declaration of war against North Vietnam after we had clearly provoked them into attacking us (or not attacking us as some believe). While Johnson complained mostly about racial problems and not being able to deal with Southern whites or Negroes in general, he also mentioned Tonkin Gulf. Clearly it was on his mind.

Oct. 14, 1964: Khrushchev Toppled

It is interesting that Khrushchev was toppled from power on October 14, 1964, less than a year after Kennedy was killed. Equally interesting, Khrushchev's political demise occurred less than two and a half months after the Gulf of Tonkin incident and the subsequent ratification of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution by Congress (August 2-7, 1964).

Another point of interest is that the term "Cold War" was coined by Bernard Baruch,¹⁶ an influential Wall Street financier, top advisor to President Roosevelt, and ardent Zionist.

I am intrigued that two other world leaders mentioned by Kennedy in the American University speech left their positions as heads of state within a close proximity in time to Kennedy's assassination.

... Chairman Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, and I have agreed that high-level discussions will shortly begin in Moscow looking toward early agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty. Our hopes must be tempered with the caution of history—but with our hopes go the hopes of all mankind. ...

(JFK, American University, June 10, 1963)

As previously stated, Khrushchev was toppled from power in a coup on October 14, 1964, less than a year after Kennedy was killed. British Prime Minister Macmillan resigned—ostensibly for health reasons—on October 18, 1963, about one month before Kennedy was killed. Health problems notwithstanding, Macmillan lived another twenty-three years. He died on December 29, 1986. It seems most intriguing that three heads of state who framed the nuclear test ban treaty stepped down or were removed from power within a year.

Johnson Escalated the War

After 1965 U.S. involvement in the war escalated rapidly. On the night of Feb. 7, 1965, the Viet Cong attacked the U.S. base at Pleiku, killing 8 soldiers and wounding 126 more. Johnson in response ordered another reprisal bombing of North Vietnam. Three days later the Viet Cong raided another U.S. military installation at Qui Nhon, and Johnson ordered more aerial attacks against Hanoi. On March 6, two battalions of Marines landed on the beaches near Da Nang to relieve that beleaguered city. By June 50,000 U.S. troops had arrived to fight with the ARVN. Small contingents of the North Vietnamese army began fighting with the Viet Cong in South Vietnam, which they reached via the Ho Chi Minh Trail west of the Cambodian border.

The government in Saigon was now headed by Air Vice-Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, but he was unable to check the rapidly deteriorating military situation. NLF forces were gaining control of more and more areas of the countryside, and a communist victory seemed imminent. President Johnson's response was to pledge the United States to defend South Vietnam and to send more troops. By the end of 1965, 180,000 Americans were serving in South Vietnam under the command of General William C. Westmoreland.

After mid-1966 the United States and the ARVN initiated a series of new tactics in their intensifying counterinsurgency effort, but their efforts to drive the Viet Cong from the countryside and separate them from their civilian supporters were only partly successful. The U.S. troops depended heavily on superior firepower and on helicopters for rapid deployment into targeted rural areas. The Viet Cong depended on stealth, concealment, and surprise attacks and ambushes.

U.S. troop strength in South Vietnam rose to 389,000 men in 1967, but, despite their sophisticated weapons, the Americans could not eradicate the skillful and determined insurgents. More North Vietnamese troops arrived to bolster the NLF forces in the South. A presidential election, in which all candidates who favored negotiating with the NLF were banned, was held in South Vietnam in September, and General Nguyen Van Thieu became president, with Ky as vice president.

On January 30, 1968, the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong launched a massive surprise offensive during the Tet (lunar new year) Vietnamese festival. They attacked 36 major South Vietnamese cities and towns. The fighting at this time was especially fierce in Saigon and in the city of Hue, which the NLF held for several weeks. The NLF suffered heavy losses (33,000 killed) in the Tet Offensive, and the ranks of the Viet Cong were so decimated by the fighting that, from 1968 on, the majority of the

insurgents in South Vietnam were actually North Vietnamese soldiers who had infiltrated into the South. Although the general uprising that the NLF had expected in support had not materialized, the offensive had an important strategic effect, because it convinced a number of Americans that, contrary to their government's claims, the insurgency in South Vietnam could not be crushed and the war would continue for years to come.

In the United States, sentiment against U.S. participation in the war mounted steadily from 1967 on and expressed itself in peace marches, demonstrations, and acts of civil disobedience. Growing numbers of politicians and ordinary citizens began to question whether the U.S. war effort could succeed and even whether it was morally justifiable in a conflict that some interpreted as a Vietnamese civil war.

General Westmoreland requested more troops in order to widen the war after the Tet Offensive, but the shifting balance of American public opinion now favored "de-escalation" of the conflict. On March 31, 1968, President Johnson announced in a television address that bombing north of the 20th parallel would be stopped and that he would not seek reelection to the presidency in the fall. Hanoi responded to the decreased bombing by de-escalating its insurgency efforts, and in October Johnson ordered a total bombing halt. During the interim the United States and Hanoi had agreed to begin preliminary peace talks in Paris, and General Creighton Abrams became the new commander of U.S. forces in South Vietnam.¹⁷

When Johnson stepped down from the presidency in January 1969, there were about 540,000¹⁸ U.S. military personnel in South Vietnam.

The Assassinations of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King

Martin Luther King and Robert F. Kennedy were likely killed because the latter was about to assume the presidency and former was endorsing him. Both wanted to end US involvement in the Vietnam War, but several interests would prevail over their wishes. First, the right-wing extremists hated both men because of they—along with President Kennedy—had embarrassed George Wallace in June 1963 when the Alabama National Guard forced him to allow black students to enroll at the University of Alabama. Second, Israel absolutely did not want the son of Joseph Kennedy to become president. None of the Kennedys were considered friends of Israel. Consequently, the Irish-American family could not be counted on to support Israel's annexation program of expanding its borders into neighboring Arab territories. Third, American and French-Corsican-Latino crime families wanted the Vietnam War to continue because they were reaping huge profits from the Golden Triangle from its production of opium. Those profits were apparently being shared with senior military personnel as well.

In March of 1967 Senator Robert Kennedy announced a peace plan for Vietnam and soon became an outspoken antiwar advocate.¹⁹ Martin Luther King quickly followed the senator's lead. On April 4, 1967, at Riverside Church in New York City and again on the 15th at a mammoth peace rally in that city, King committed himself irrevocably to opposing US involvement in the Vietnam War. Once before, in early

January 1966, he had condemned the war, but official outrage from Washington and strenuous opposition within the black community itself had caused him to acquiesce.²⁰

On Jan. 30, 1968, the Tet Offensive began. It marked a new beginning of anti-war sentiment amongst many Americans. Gene McCarthy had been campaigning for the presidency on the Democratic ticket. On March 16, 1968, Robert Kennedy announced his candidacy for the presidency,²¹ Martin Luther King immediately endorsed him. On March 31, 1968, President Johnson startled television viewers with a national address that included three announcements: (1) he had just ordered major reductions in the bombing of North Vietnam, (2) he was requesting peace talks, and (3) he would neither seek nor accept his party's renomination for the presidency.²² On April 4 King was killed by a sniper's bullet while standing on the balcony of a motel in Memphis, Tennessee where he and his associates were staying. On March 10, 1969, the accused assassin, James Earl Ray, pleaded guilty to the murder and was sentenced to 99 years in prison.²³ Ray later recanted his confession.

By June 4, 1968 Robert Kennedy had won five out of six presidential primaries, including one that day in California. Shortly after midnight on June 5^(Footnote 35) he spoke to his followers in Los Angeles' Ambassador Hotel. As he left through a kitchen hallway he was fatally wounded by a Palestinian immigrant, Sirhan Bishara Sirhan; at least that's the official story. Robert Kennedy died the next day on June 6, 1968.²⁴

1968: LBJ Attempted to Appoint Abe Fortas as Chief Justice

One of the last things President Johnson attempted while in the White House was to nominate a Jewish American, Abe Fortas, as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. In 1965, President Johnson appointed Fortas—a longtime political crony—to the Jewish slot in the Supreme Court, replacing Arthur Goldberg. As previously stated, Goldberg had resigned from the high court—at Johnson's request—to serve as US delegate to the UN following the death of the Adlai Stevenson who held that post until his untimely demise. Stevenson had died unexpectedly of a heart attack on July 14, 1965.

Three years later, in 1968, Johnson nominated Fortas to replace retiring Chief Justice Earl Warren. When the nomination came to the Senate floor, a filibuster ensued. On October 1, 1968, the Senate failed to vote because of the filibuster and Johnson then withdrew the nomination. With that, Fortas became the first nominee for that post since 1795 to fail to receive Senate approval.^{25 (Footnote 36)}

After sending 540,000²⁶ U.S. military personnel to South Vietnam, then declining to run for a second term, one of the last things the lame duck President Johnson attempted was to appoint Abe Fortas—a Jewish crony—as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. This incident, combined with his long-standing passionate attachment to Israel (Chapter 10), further supports my earlier assertion that the 36th President of the United States, and his wife, were both secretly Jewish (Chapter 9).

Endnotes

1. Alfred McCoy, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, pp. 17 - 18. McCoy cited the following source: US Congress, Senate Committee on Government Operations, Organized Crime and Illicit Traffic in Narcotics, 88 Cong. 1st and 2nd sess., 1964, pt. 4, p. 913
2. Alfred McCoy, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, pp. 17 - 18. McCoy cited the following source: Nicholas Gage, "Mafioso's Memoirs Support Valachi's Testimony About Crime Syndicate," in *The New York Times*, April 11, 1971.
3. Encyclopedia Britannica: Meyer Lansky
4. Encyclopedia Britannica: Opium Wars
5. Alfred McCoy, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, p. 9. McCoy cited the following source: U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, "The World Opium Situation," October 1970, p. 10
6. Alfred McCoy, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, p. 9. McCoy cited the following sources and made comments as indicated: In 1969 Iran resumed legal pharmaceutical production of opium after thirteen years of prohibition. It is not yet known how much of Iran's legitimate production is being diverted to illicit channels. However, her strict narcotics laws (execution by firing squad for convicted traffickers) have discouraged the illicit opium traffic and prevented any of Iran's production from entering the international market. (John Hughes, *The Junk Merchants* [Boston: The Christian Science Publishing Company, 1971] pp. 17-20; U.S. Congress, House Committee on Foreign Relations, *International Aspects of the Narcotics Problem*, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., 1971, p. 74.)
7. Alfred McCoy, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, p. 9. McCoy cited the following sources and made comments as indicated: Report of the United Nations Survey Team on the Economic and Social Needs of the Opium Producing Areas in Thailand (Bangkok: Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 59, 64, 68; The New York Times, September 17, 1968, p. 45; *ibid.*, June 6, 1971, p. 2. Estimates for illicit opium production made by the U.N. and the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics vary widely and fluctuate from year to year as conditions in the opium-producing nations change and statistical data improve. In general, U.S. Bureau of Narcotics estimates have tended to underestimate the scope of illicit production in Southeast Asia, while the U.N. has tended to minimize production in South Asia, The statistics used above are compiled from both U.N. and U.S. Bureau of Narcotics figures in an attempt to correct both imbalances. However, even if we accept the Bureau's maximum figures for 1968 and 1971, the differences are not that substantial: India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan (South Asia) have a combined illicit production of 525 tons, or 29 percent of the world's total illicit supply; Burma (1,000 tons), Thailand (150 tons), and Laos (35 tons) have a combined production of 1,185 tons, or roughly 66 percent of the world's illicit supply; and Turkey accounts for 100 illicit tons, or about 5 percent of the world supply. (U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, "The World Opium Situation," p. 10; U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1972, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., 1971, pp. 578-584.
8. Alfred McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, p. 89
9. *ibid.*, pp. 53 - 54
10. Encyclopedia Britannica: Vietnam War
11. Alfred McCoy, et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, pp. 17 - 18
12. Encyclopedia Britannica: Vietnam War
13. Military advisers in Vietnam during the Kennedy administration, 800 to 16,000 per John Pilger's website, 3/11/02, <http://pilger.carlton.com/vietnam/chronology2>. The final number, 16,000, is corroborated per Think Quest website, <http://library.thinkquest.org/10826/vietnam.htm>. 16,000 is corroborated again by Motts Military Museum, <http://www.mottsmilitarymuseum.org/vietnam.html>.
14. Encyclopedia Britannica: Vietnam War
15. *ibid.*; corroborated in an article by Jeff Cohen and Norman Solomon entitled "30-Year Anniversary: Tonkin Gulf Lie Launched Vietnam War" (July 27, 1994), published in Media Beat, <http://www.fair.org/media-beat/940727.html>
16. Encyclopedia Britannica: Cold War
17. Encyclopedia Britannica: Vietnam War
18. *ibid.*
19. Michael Jay Friedman, *Congress, the President, and the Battle of Ideas: Vietnam Policy, 1965-1969*, (1999), <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/journals/EH/EH41/Friedman41.html>
20. Encyclopedia Britannica: Martin Luther King, Jr.
21. Encyclopedia Britannica: Robert F. Kennedy

22. Encyclopedia Britannica: Lyndon Johnson
23. Encyclopedia Britannica: Martin Luther King, Jr.
24. Encyclopedia Britannica: Robert F. Kennedy
25. Encyclopedia Britannica: Abe Fortas. The date, October 1, 1968, was provided in an article about the Fortas filibuster on the Senate Learning Website. The article was entitled, "October 1, 1968 Filibuster Derails Supreme Court Appointment."
(http://www.senate.gov/learning/min_6hHHh.html)
26. Encyclopedia Britannica: Vietnam War

Chapter 12: The Nixon Administration (1969-74)

The Secret Bombing of Cambodia

One of the biggest criticisms of the Nixon administration is the "secret" bombing campaign of Cambodia, a neutral and defenseless country in Southeast Asia. Nixon later disputed its labeling as "secret." In a speech before the Veterans of Foreign Wars in New Orleans on August 20, 1973, he explained that the decision was made only two months after he became president. He further stated that the decision was made in a meeting attended by Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird; National Security Advisor, Henry Kissinger; Secretary of State, William Rogers; and head of the CIA. He also stated that the bombing plan was "disclosed to appropriate Government leaders" and the "appropriate Congressional leaders, those in the Military Affairs Committee like Eddie Hebert."^(Footnote 37) He added that "there was no secrecy as far as Government leaders were concerned, who had any right to know or need to know."

Nixon had apparently been led to believe by his advisors that the lives of American soldiers were at risk because the North Vietnamese were setting up sanctuaries and staging areas in Cambodia.

"If American soldiers in the field today were similarly threatened by an enemy," he explained, "and if the price of protecting those soldiers was to order air strikes to save American lives, I would make the same decision today that I made in February of 1969." He admitted that the military action was kept secret from the American public, but only because "the bombing would have had to stop"¹ if the public had been informed.

Nixon's description of the decision to bomb Cambodia—which he made as a new president—was surprisingly similar to Kennedy's indoctrination as a new president when faced with the Bay of Pigs ordeal in April of 1961. To fully appreciate Nixon's plight, it is important to remember that President Johnson had escalated the number of American soldiers in South Vietnam from 16,000^(Footnote 38) when Kennedy was killed to 540,000 when Johnson left office in January of 1969. Johnson had abdicated his leadership—by announcing in March of 1968 that he would not seek re-election—thereby leaving his successor with the nightmare of Vietnam, a foreign policy disaster in a colossal state of senseless confusion and discontinuity. Unfortunately, this is what Nixon's critics selectively forget when denouncing him for the so-called "secret" bombing campaign in Cambodia. Nixon's critics tend to forget that he stepped into the presidency with half a million soldiers—mostly eighteen year-old boys—placed in harm's way on foreign soil.

Nixon was obviously concerned for the safety of those half-million soldiers, and as the new president, was probably pressured by his advisers to make a bad decision as Kennedy was pressured eight years earlier regarding the Bay of Pigs. Both made the wrong decision, but neither did so in a vacuum. Both kept the decision secret from the American public, but not a secret from the appropriate people within government.

I would venture to state that most "informed" Americans today have been led to believe that Nixon's "secret" bombing campaign in Cambodia was literally a "secret" in every sense of the word. Most people believe Nixon somehow managed to initiate a

military campaign against a foreign country without informing anyone in government because this is the spin that has been pushed by propagandists within the news media and the bookpublishing industry for years. But Nixon's explanation seems perfectly believable. Thinking rationally, how would he have kept such a program a secret within the United States government? Did he personally fly a plane to Cambodia and drop the bombs himself? Obviously this is absurd. He made a command decision in the middle of a war with the full knowledge of his advisors and the appropriate leaders in Congress. The reason he made the decision was to save the lives of half a million American soldiers put in harm's way by his predecessor.

Nixon's Eight Point Strategy to end the Vietnam War

When Nixon campaigned for the presidency in 1968, he pledged repeatedly that he had a "secret plan" to end the Vietnam War. As the years passed, people forgot about his pledge. But it begs a question now as it in 1968. Why did the plan have to be secret? He was president, why couldn't he just withdraw? The Vietnam War was a major liability for him politically. Few Americans would have objected, not even supporters of the war. What prevented Nixon from using his constitutional power as Command-in-Chief of the military to withdraw forces as he saw fit? In Oliver Stone's movie, *Nixon*, it was suggested that the 37th president did not have authority to make such a dramatic decision. There was a scene in the movie where Nixon agreed with a young female protester who described the governmental forces keeping American troops in Vietnam as a "wild animal." Upon reflection, her description seems accurate. Nixon's plan apparently needed to remain secret in order to tame the wild animal.

If one accepts the premise that the Vietnam War was merely a continuation of the two opium wars of the Nineteenth Century (Chapter 11), then logic would dictate that it was not within a sitting US president's power to merely withdraw military forces from South Vietnam by issuing an executive order. Also, Nixon may have known who killed the Kennedys and Martin Luther and why. No one knows for certain if Nixon's foreign policy was part of a well-conceived strategy to end the Vietnam War, or if it was a series of random decisions made without a grand purpose. Nevertheless, he performed the following eight tasks which ultimately achieved peace—albeit a short-lived one—in Southeast Asia.

1. He dramatically increased aid to Israel.
2. He reduced American forces in South Vietnam from 540,000 (June 1969) to 160,000 (Dec. 1971) through a program called "Vietnamization."
3. He established diplomatic relations with China.
4. He used his new friendship with China as leverage to establish détente between the United States and the Soviet Union.
5. He broke up Auguste Joseph Ricord's heroin cartel. ([Footnote 39](#))
6. He intensified US bombing of North Vietnam in order to get that government to participate in the Paris peace talks.
7. He withdrew American forces from Vietnam.
8. He ended the draft.

The first point was to dramatically increase American aid to Israel. In a word Nixon bought them off. By doing so he created division among friends of Israel. He gave Israel about \$1.61 billion from 1971 through 1973. That was a huge increase—approximately the same amount the United States had given Israel over its entire 22 year history (from 1948 through 1970).² If Nixon believed that US involvement in the Vietnam War and President Kennedy's assassination were the results of a Jewish conspiracy, then his colossal increase of foreign aid to Israel was completely understandable. He was dividing his enemies.

The second point was to initiate a program called "Vietnamization" which reduced American forces in South Vietnam from 540,000 in January 1969 to 335,000 by late 1970, then to 160,000 by late 1971, and finally a complete withdrawal by the end of 1973. In addition, Vietnamization gradually made the South Vietnamese army assume all military responsibilities for their defense while being abundantly supplied with US arms, equipment, air support, and economic aid. US commanders in the field were instructed to keep casualties to "an absolute minimum," and losses decreased appreciably.

The third point was to establish diplomatic relations with China. Nixon personally visited China in February 1972 after a 21-year estrangement with the United States. This was a bold diplomatic move for an American president. But his new friendship with China gave him leverage to negotiate with the Soviet Union which would lead to an era of détente between the two superpowers.³

The fourth point was to establish détente with the Soviet Union. In May of 1972 Nixon paid a state visit to Moscow to sign 10 formal agreements, the most important of which were the nuclear-arms limitation treaties known as SALT I (based on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks conducted between the United States and the Soviet Union beginning in 1969) and a memorandum, the Basic Principles of U.S.-Soviet Relations, summarizing the new relationship between the two countries in the new era of détente.⁴ Although the Soviet Union continued to exist for 19 more years,^(Footnote 40) Nixon ended the Cold War—for all intents and purposes—in May of 1972 when he and Soviet Premier Leonid Brezhnev signed the SALT I agreements. It is significant that the Watergate burglary occurred just one month later, on June 17, 1972.

The fifth point was to break up Auguste Joseph Ricord's heroin cartel. Nixon's war on drugs reached a zenith with the extradition of Ricord from Paraguay which occurred around the same time of his trip to China followed by his meeting with Brezhnev in Moscow in the spring of 1972.^(Footnote 41) By going after Ricord, Nixon was assaulting the top underworld figure responsible for smuggling heroin into the United States at that time. The profits from Ricord's heroin smuggling efforts were apparently divided among international crime syndicates and various espionage organizations which funneled the illicit drug money to the power elite in Israel and the Western Powers (i.e., United States, Britain and France). Nixon was indeed tangling with a "wild animal" when he went after Ricord.

The sixth point was to intensify US bombing of North Vietnam in order to get that government to participate in the Paris peace talks. By doing this Nixon created division within the military, many of whom actually wanted to win the war and had no interest in drug smuggling.

The seventh point was to withdraw American forces from Vietnam. By the time Nixon did this, he had done several other things—the first six points—to set the stage for the seventh point.

The eighth point was to abolish the draft completely. This made it extremely difficult for succeeding presidents to get involved in another Vietnam War. Before starting another full-scale war, the next president would first have to reinstate the draft—something the American public would resist. Ending the draft was perhaps Nixon's greatest contribution to world peace.

The Conclusion of the Vietnam War

In March 1972 the North Vietnamese invaded the demilitarized zone (DMZ)^(Footnote 42) and captured Quang Tri province. President Nixon responded by ordering the mining of Haiphong and other North Vietnamese ports and an intense bombing of the North. Peace talks resumed in July, but the talks broke down in mid-December with each side accusing the other of bargaining in bad faith. Nixon responded by subjecting Hanoi and other North Vietnamese cities to 11 days of intensive U.S. bombing (later called the "Christmas bombing.")

The relentless Christmas bombing forced the North Vietnamese back to the Paris peace talks which resulted in a cease-fire agreement on Jan. 27, 1973. A cease-fire would go into effect the following morning throughout North and South Vietnam, all U.S. forces would be withdrawn and all its bases dismantled, all prisoners of war would be released, an international force would keep the peace, the South Vietnamese would have the right to determine their own future, and North Vietnamese troops could remain in the South but would not be reinforced. The 17th parallel would remain the dividing line until the country could be reunited by "peaceful means." This pact was augmented by a second 14-point accord signed in June. In August the U.S. Congress proscribed any further U.S. military activity in Indochina. By the end of 1973 there were few U.S. military personnel left in South Vietnam.

But the fighting continued in spite of the cease-fire agreements, and North and South Vietnam each denounced the other for numerous violations of the truce. Casualties, both military and civilian, were as high as they had ever been.

The year 1974 was characterized by a series of small offensives as each side sought to seize land and people from the other. The North Vietnamese began preparing for a major offensive to be launched in either 1975 or 1976, while the South Vietnamese tried to hold all of the areas under their control, although they lacked the strength to do so. South Vietnam's difficulties were compounded when the United States drastically cut its military aid in August 1974.^(Footnote 43) The morale and combat effectiveness of South Vietnam's army—aka, the Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN)—plummeted as a result.

In December 1974 the North Vietnamese attacked Phuoc Binh, a provincial capital about 60 miles (100 km) north of Saigon. Their capture of this city in early January 1975 convinced the North Vietnamese that a full-scale invasion of the South was now

practicable. Accordingly, in early March, North Vietnamese forces began a large-scale offensive in the central highlands. When President Thieu ordered a withdrawal of all ARVN forces not only from the central highlands but from the northernmost two provinces of the country as well, general panic ensued, and the South Vietnamese military machine began to come apart. The withdrawals rapidly became routs as large ARVN units disintegrated into columns of refugees. One by one the coastal cities were abandoned, and by early April the ARVN had abandoned the northern half of their country to the North Vietnamese forces. The troops of the ARVN began to melt away, and the remaining Americans escaped by air and sealifts with Vietnamese friends and coworkers. On April 21, President Thieu resigned and flew to Taiwan. On April 30 what remained of the South Vietnamese government surrendered unconditionally, and North Vietnamese tank columns occupied Saigon without a struggle. A military government was instituted, and on July 2, 1976, the country was officially united as the Socialist Republic of Vietnam with its capital in Hanoi. Saigon was renamed Ho Chi Minh City.

The Watergate Burglary (June 17, 1972)

Near the end of President Nixon's first term, on June 17, 1972, five men were arrested breaking into the Democratic national headquarters in the Watergate office-apartment building in Washington, DC. It was quickly learned that the arrested burglars had been hired by the Committee to Re-Elect the President (CRP). Immediately, attorney general John Mitchell resigned as director of the CRP. Clearly, this was an embarrassment for President Nixon, but the incident did not impact the ensuing fall elections which Nixon won by a landslide. The Democrats retained majorities in the House and Senate.

A few days after the break-in, charges of burglary and wiretapping were brought against the five men arrested at the scene, plus two additional officials within the Nixon administration. They were E. Howard Hunt, Jr., a former White House aide, and G. Gordon Liddy, general counsel for the Committee for the Re-Election of the President.

Investigation into the scandal continued for the next two years and culminated with the resignation of President Nixon on August 9, 1974.⁶

As previously mentioned, the Watergate burglary occurred a month after the SALT I agreements were signed by Nixon and Brezhnev. SALT I and accompanying agreements marked a new era of détente between the two superpowers.

Division Between Nixon and the Military

As it turns out, Watergate was not the only cover-up in the Nixon White House. Joan Hoff, a research professor of history at Montana State University, recently wrote an article asserting that on December 21, 1971—six months before the Watergate burglary occurred—Nixon approved the first major cover-up of his administration;

however, he was not covering up his own misdeeds. He was covering up the Navy's. Nixon had learned that Admiral Thomas Moorer, head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had authorized his subordinates to spy on the White House's National Security Counsel. For thirteen months, from 1970 to late 1971, Navy Yeoman Charles E. Radford systematically stole and copied NSC documents from Alexander Haig, Henry Kissinger, and their staff. When Nixon learned of this, he ordered it hushed up; but he let the military know he was aware of the spying. Apparently Nixon and his aides thought that approach would give them more leverage with a hostile defense establishment.⁷

Bob Woodward and Naval Intelligence

The news media slowly began to cover the Watergate burglary. Several major newspapers investigated the possible involvement of the White House in the break-in. Leading the pack was *The Washington Post* and its two young reporters, Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward, whose stories were based largely on information from an unnamed source called "Deep Throat"; the mysterious identity of Deep Throat became a news story in its own right and continues to be speculated on to this day.

The journalistic integrity of Yale graduate Bob Woodward became tainted and comprised years later when it was revealed, by authors Len Colodny and Robert Gettlin, that prior to working at the Washington Post, Woodward had worked at the Pentagon for the Office of Naval Intelligence as a Naval Lieutenant. *Silent Coup*—a 1991 book by Colodny and Gettlin—reveals that in 1969, the twenty-six-year-old Lieutenant was the briefing officer for Admiral Moorer, head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who had authorized his subordinates to spy on the White House's National Security Counsel. A briefing officer sees, hears, reads, and assimilates information from one of several sources and passes it on to more senior officers. This is a coveted position for young officers seeking career advancement. The work is often Top Secret.

Colodny and Gettlin asserted that Admiral Moorer sent Lieutenant Woodward to the basement of the White House to act as a briefer for Alexander Haig.⁸ The ramifications of this information are staggering.

Nixon's War on Drugs

On June 17, 1971 Nixon declared that heroin addiction was "Public Enemy No. 1,"⁹ and he targeted Auguste Joseph Ricord for extradition from Paraguay and prosecution in the US for managing large-scale heroin smuggling into America.⁹ This may have been the straw that broke the camel's back. Nixon had become too bold, too independent. His war on drugs even led to the demise of Lucien Sarti—the French-Corsican assassin who fatally shot President Kennedy in the right temple with an exploding bullet—when Mexican agents shot and killed him in Mexico City on April 27, 1972.¹⁰

In his first three and a half years as president, Nixon got Congress to increase the Bureau of Narcotics' annual budget from \$14 million to \$74 million and expanded its agent force from 600 to 1,600. The Bureau of Customs—the agency that monitored drug-trafficking into the United States from other countries—grew from 9,000 to 15,000.¹¹

The Nixon administration determined that the primary smuggler of heroin into the United States was Auguste Ricord. Consequently, in March 1971 the United States government attempted to extradite Auguste Ricord from Paraguay, but there was a breakdown in protocols and it did not happen,¹² although Ricord remained in jail in Paraguay. Over the next year and a half, Nixon turned up the heat on Paraguay to release Ricord to the United States. On June 14, 1971 Nixon met with ambassadors to all countries that grew opium poppies or converted opium gum to morphine and morphine to heroin. He had called them home to impress upon them the seriousness of the situation and to order each of them to make heroin a daily, personal, and official concern. Nixon advised the team of ambassadors in the "problem countries" to influence, even exert pressure on, the heads of state to help break up the international heroin cartel.¹³

In effect, the US ambassadors became Nixon's foot soldiers on his war against heroin.¹⁴ Under his leadership, US Customs and narcotics agents were encouraged to "exploit" investigative techniques of Latin and European countries that were legally unacceptable in the United States. Such practices included unauthorized wiretaps, bugging, even torture. In other words, the US agents did not use these techniques themselves, but they would not discourage other countries from acquiring information by whatever means was acceptable. This approach allowed US agents to be somewhat aggressive in building a case against Ricord as a citizen of Paraguay, but without violating his rights in the United States after he was arrested, extradited, and prosecuted.¹⁵

In September 1971, a newly created Cabinet Committee on International Narcotics Control held its first formal meeting in the White House. It was chaired by Attorney General John Mitchell, the secretaries of Defense, Treasury, and Agriculture; and the Director of the CIA. The committee fought the war on heroin through diplomatic channels. Their objective was to convince heads of state—through pressure from US ambassadors—that President Nixon was serious about stopping the flow of heroin into the United States.¹⁶

On July 4, 1972 the American Embassy in Asuncion, Paraguay did not hold an Independence Day party for the Paraguayan officials. This had been an annual tradition for 111 years. Nixon's message was loud and clear: Send us Ricord.¹⁷

Around this time the Cabinet Committee on International Narcotics Control held another meeting to discuss the Ricord case, the continuing difficulties with drug smuggling from Panama, and similar problems in Thailand, Burma.¹⁸ It is significant that the Committee was discussing two countries that make up the Golden Triangle.

In September 1972 the government of Paraguay announced they would extradite Ricord to the United States to face prosecution for heroin trafficking.¹⁹

On December 16, 1972 Auguste Ricord was convicted of conspiring to smuggle narcotics into the United States.²⁰ On January 29, 1973 Ricord was sentenced to 20 years in prison and fined \$25,000.²¹

On July 1, 1973, President Richard Nixon created the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) by merging its predecessor agency, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD) with various law enforcement and intelligence gathering agencies. DEA has been charged with the responsibility of enforcing the nation's federal drug laws and works closely with local, state, federal and international law enforcement organizations to identify, target and bring to justice the most significant drug traffickers in the world.²²

Dealing With Israel

When President Nixon took office in January 1969, Levi Eshkol was prime minister of Israel and was head of the Labour party.^(Footnote 45) Eshkol had been prime minister since June 16, 1963 after David Ben-Gurion stepped down from that position. Consequently, Eshkol was Israel's prime minister when President Kennedy was assassinated. He was also prime minister during the Six Day War, during Johnson's escalation of the Vietnam War and during the assassinations of Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King. On February 26, 1969, Eshkol died in office. He was replaced by Golda Meir, foreign minister to Eshkol and Ben-Gurion. Meir had also been a member [Histadrut](#)^(Footnote 46) since she and her husband migrated to Palestine from Milwaukee, Wisconsin in 1921. Her real name was Goldie Mabovitch, later Goldie Myerson, finally changed (Hebraized) to Golda Meir.²³ As Prime Minister, Meir headed the Labour party.

During Nixon's first term, he was not indebted to Israel or its allies in America for winning the election. Most of the American Jewish community had supported Democratic candidate Hubert Humphrey in the 1968 presidential race.²⁴ According to Henry Kissinger, Nixon often boasted to colleagues that the "Jewish lobby" had no power over him.²⁵

Initially, Nixon felt that National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger's Jewish background disqualified him from deep involvement in Middle Eastern affairs. Consequently, Nixon gave those responsibilities to his first Secretary of State William Rogers. Around the time of the Watergate burglary, June of 1972, a power struggle developed between Kissinger and Rogers.^(Footnote 47) Ultimately Kissinger won and replaced Rogers as secretary of state in the fall of 1973. Kissinger was completely pro-Israel whereas Rogers had been even-handed and was liked by the Arabs but disliked by Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir.²⁶

Nixon was distrustful of Jewish political influences within American politics. He made the following observations in his memoirs:

One of the main problems I faced...was the unyielding and shortsighted pro-Israel attitude in large and influential segments

of the American Jewish community, Congress, the media and in intellectual and cultural circles. In the quarter century since the end of World War II this attitude had become so deeply ingrained that many saw the corollary of not being pro-Israel as being anti-Israeli, or even anti-Semitic. I tried unsuccessfully to convince them that this was not the case.²⁷

In addition, both Nixon and Kissinger made the mistake of approaching Middle East issues within the framework of the Cold War. Nixon might have been more effective had he viewed Arab-Israeli problems as an ongoing regional conflict which ultimately entangled both America and the Soviet Union.²⁸

The War of Attrition (1969-70)

The years 1969 through 1970 was a period in which the Egyptians tried unsuccessfully to pressure Israel and the United States into implementing UN Resolution 242²⁹ (reference Chapter 10 for text of the Resolution). The high point of this period was marked by a direct clash between Soviet personnel and the Israeli Defense Forces. This conflict was the result of Egypt's humiliating defeat in the Six Day War combined with Israel's flaunting of its military might at the Egyptians.³⁰

In late 1968, Egypt began shelling IDF troops regularly. Israel responded by firing back, plus it built a fortified defense across the east bank of the Suez Canal. To minimize casualties from Egyptian fire, Israel launched massive bombing raids that extended to deep penetrations of Egyptian air space. At the end of the year, Defense Minister Moshe Dayan boasted that Israel had destroyed twenty-four missile sites, an estimated one third of Egypt's front-line combat planes. Rubbing salt in the wound, Israel's pilots flagrantly displayed their air superiority by creating sonic booms to shatter windows in Cairo.³¹

Nasser requested military aid from the Soviet Union, and in January 1970, the Soviets furnished him with a powerful air defense system. By March 17, 1970, Soviet troops in Egypt were armed with an assortment of impressive weapons, including SA-2s. On the same day, it was announced that 1,500 Soviet technicians and a stockpile of SAM-3 missiles—weapons not even supplied to North Vietnam by the Soviets—had arrived in Egypt. By April 24th, a month later, 10,000 Soviet technicians were in Egypt and Egyptian planes were being flown into combat by Soviet pilots. The Nixon administration was soon under political pressure to counter the Soviets by supplying Israel with 125 additional fighter planes; however, diplomatic avenues were explored instead.³²

UN Resolution 242 was discussed again but no genuine effort was made to enforce it. In August 1970, a flawed cease-fire agreement between Egypt and Israel went into effect. But five Israeli Phantoms were soon shot down over Egypt by Soviet missiles. Israel complained, but the reality was the cease-fire agreement had been violated by both sides. Neither the Soviets or the Egyptians were supposed to shoot at Israeli

planes, but the Israeli Phantoms had no business being in Egypt's airspace in the first place.³³

In a sense, Israel had been paid back for flaunting its military might over Egypt; however, the Israelis used the truce violations as a pretext for avoiding discussions that might force them to return land acquired in the Six Day War.³⁴

The Jordanian Crisis (June to September 1970)

The PLO had built a large private army for raids on Israel and was involved in attempts to assassinate King Hussein. On September 5, 1970, an extremist group known as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) hijacked three airliners (American, Swiss, and British) and landed them in a small airfield in Amman, Jordan. Over three hundred passengers were held hostage before the planes were destroyed. King Hussein wanted to crush the terrorists, but feared such an action might draw Iraq and Syria into the conflict, thereby escalating the overall situation. At America's encouragement, Israel launched air strikes against Syria while Jordanian forces crushed the PFLP guerrillas.³⁵

Nixon increased American aid to Israel in 1971. Some believe he was rewarding Israel for its assistance with the PFLP hijackers, but he may have used that incident as a pretext to buy off Israel (reference the first point of Nixon's eight point plan to end the Vietnam War.) As previously stated, he gave Israel about \$1.61 billion from 1971 through 1973. That was a huge increase—approximately the same amount the United States had given Israel over its entire 22 year history (from 1948 through 1970).³⁶ In retrospect, however, Israel did not really deserve such a huge reward because it acted primarily out of self interest. Syria was one of Israel's most dangerous enemies, and it was to Israel's interest to eliminate a Syrian-dominated radical regime in Amman, Jordan. Surely Nixon understood that.^(Footnote 48)

The Death of Nasser—Replaced by Sadat (1970)

On September 28, 1970, President Nasser died suddenly and unexpectedly.^(Footnote 49) His successor, General Anwar el-Sadat was not widely known outside his own country. The political experts did not expect him to do much right away, but he surprised them by suddenly trying to switch backers; preferring the United States over Russia. Sadat was under heavy political pressure internally to recover land from Israel or risk being overthrown. For some reason, Henry Kissinger ignored Sadat's efforts to switch sides.³⁷

Assisted by American representatives in Cairo, Sadat drafted a peace proposal and submitted it to the Nixon administration. He had been led to believe that it would meet America's approval. At this point, the Nixon government was under heavy Israeli influence, and Sadat's proposal was promptly rejected at Israel's direction. In May 1971 Sadat was left with no alternative but to maintain his friendship with the Soviets. Consequently, he signed a friendship agreement with them.³⁸

Nevertheless, Sadat was not happy with the Soviet Union. He wanted more arms in order to take back his land, but the Soviets did not want to fight Israel and they wanted to avoid a confrontation with the United States. In May 1972, at the Moscow Conference, Sadat concluded that the Soviet Union had completely reneged on its promises to recover Egypt's seized territories. Consequently, he expelled his Soviet advisers, and in February 1973 sent a private emissary to Kissinger to discuss a United States-brokered deal. Sadat's efforts were less than fruitful because Nixon was pre-occupied with the Watergate scandal at that time.³⁹

After Nixon's re-election in 1972, his Middle Eastern policy was in effect—though not stated—to continue nurturing Israel's military so that prime minister Golda Meir could continue her expansion agenda. Israel continued using its powerful political influence in America to pressure Congress. By March 1, 1973, Nixon agreed to supply new airplanes and even authorized plans for co-manufacturing of aircraft in Israel.⁴⁰

The Yom Kippur War (Oct. 6, 1973)

On October 6, 1973 (Yom Kippur), Egypt launched a massive attack on Israel. Egyptian forces swiftly crossed the Suez Canal and occupied the entire east bank. Within two days, the Israelis lost fifty aircraft and hundreds of tanks. The United States and Israel were caught completely off guard. On October 9th, Israel launched a counterattack and halted the Egyptian onslaught.⁴¹

In the years immediately following the Six Day War, the Soviets had helped Egypt assemble one of the most substantial missile walls in the world. Also, to avert an air offensive from the Israel Air Force deep within Egypt, the Soviets furnished Egypt with SCUD surface-to-surface missiles with a 180-mile range. With the delivery of the first SCUD in April 1973, Sadat decided to launch the attack. He was assisted by President Assad of Syria who simultaneously attacked Israel's northern border.⁴²

Sadat organized the attack because he was under heavy political pressure to provide even a small military success to compensate for the humiliating defeat of the Six Day War in 1967. In fact, he managed to thwart a coup d'état supported by the Soviets. In planning the attack, Sadat's primary objective was not merely to recover lost territories, but to burst the bubble of leaders in Washington and Jerusalem who believed Israel could continue its annexation program with impunity. To a large degree, the Yom Kippur War achieved that goal.⁴³

The emotional impact of the Yom Kippur War was considerable. Israel's casualties were extensive; its vision of an boundless enlargement of kingdom had been given an abrupt shock. The discovery that Arabs could in fact fight with courage and efficiency was most unsettling.⁴⁴

UN Cease-Fire (Oct. 22, 1973)

A UN cease-fire order was issued on October 22, 1973; however, Israel quickly ignored it. They attempted to surround the Egyptian Third Army and starve it into surrender. The United States demanded that all parties abide by the UN cease-fire, otherwise America would intervene and provide food to the Egyptian troops.

During the cease-fire negotiations, the Israelis demanded more military support and threatened a negative publicity campaign toward the US government for joining the Soviet Union in imposing peace conditions to Israel. The United States mildly subdued its displeasure and tried to appease Israel by providing the extra planes and tanks requested.⁴⁵

The Geneva Conference (1973)

In September 1973 President Nixon appointed Henry Kissinger as Secretary of State,⁴⁶ thereby replacing William Rogers. To resolve the Yom Kippur War, the UN passed Resolution 338 which called for a cease-fire between Israel and Egypt, prescribed implementation of UN Resolution 242, and urged additional peace talks at Geneva. The following is the complete text of UN Resolution 338:

The Security Council

1. Calls upon all parties to the present fighting to cease all firing and terminate all military activity immediately, no later than 12 hours after the moment of the adoption of this decision, in the positions they now occupy;
2. Calls upon the parties concerned to start immediately after the ceasefire the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all of its parts;
3. Decides that, immediately and concurrently with the ceasefire, negotiations start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

(UN Security Council Resolution 338, October 22, 1973)

The United States had lukewarm support for Resolution 338^(Footnote 50) and its call for a Geneva Conference, although Kissinger was obliged—as secretary of state—to give observers the impression that he was trying to adhere to it.⁴⁷

President Hafez Assad, head of Syria since 1970 and head of the Ba'ath Socialist Party, had no interest in the Geneva Conference unless Kissinger agreed to answer the following three questions:

1. Did the United States agree with Syria that Syria should not give up any of its territory?

2. Did the United States agree that there could be no solution unless the Palestinian problem was solved?
3. Was the United States going to Geneva with an objective consonant with those points, or only to engage in the usual obfuscations before breaking up the conference without having achieved anything?⁴⁸

Syria's three questions put Kissinger in an awkward position. If he agreed with the first point, that Syria should not give up any territory; this would upset Israel. If he agreed with the second point, that the Palestinian problem should be solved before peace talks with Israel could begin; Israel would definitely be displeased. On the other hand, if Kissinger supported Israel's efforts to annex the Golan and refused to include the Palestinians, the Arabs would walk away from the peace talks. Kissinger more or less evaded the issue and merely gave President Assad unspecific support.⁴⁹

Gold Meir made Kissinger's job even more difficult by insisting that the Palestinians not be mentioned at all in Geneva and that the United Nations participation would be limited exclusively to facilitating the conference, and nothing more.⁵⁰

Kissinger managed to negotiate a preliminary agreement between Egypt and Israel,⁵¹ however, the Arabs were dissatisfied with his attitude toward Syria's three points. This created solidarity among the oil-producing Arab nations. Consequently, they imposed an oil embargo on the United States through the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC). This had a dramatic effect on the American culture and economy.⁵²

Arab Oil Embargo (1973)

OAPEC was created in January 1968. The Chairmanship rotates annually. Member countries include Algeria, Bahrain, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and United Arab Emirates.⁵³ As previously stated, the Arab oil embargo was the result of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's efforts—in the wake of the Yom Kippur War (1973)—to resolve Arab-Israeli conflicts at a peace conference in Geneva per UN Resolution 338. The OAPEC countries imposed the embargo which led to a quadrupling of oil prices. The aftershock produced runaway inflation and a recession.⁵⁴

Few politicians had the courage to publicly criticize America's support of Israel as the root cause of the Arab oil embargo. Instead our leaders took a more convenient route of blaming Arabs and engaging in racism toward Muslims at large.

The OAPEC nations refused to end the embargo until the United States worked out a peace agreement between Israel and Syria. Kissinger's job was made more difficult by Israel's demand that Syria free its jailed Israeli prisoners. To neutralize that demand, Kissinger suggested that both countries—Syria and Israel—provide the other

with a list jailed prisoners to be released. Once both sides agreed on the lists of names, the peace negotiations would begin.⁵⁵

Israel and Syria provided the requested list of names, but peace negotiations quickly deteriorated because Israel was simply unwilling to give up any land to Syria. A squabble developed over the former provincial capital of the Golan Heights, Quneitra, an uninhabited market town with a population once estimated at between 20,000 and 50,000 people. Syria had evacuated the town at the end of the Six Day War. In the final hours of the truce, Israeli forces drove out the remaining civilian population and destroyed the town, leaving it uninhabitable; however, this fact was not known to the Syrians during the 1973 negotiations between Israel and Syria. Consequently, Israel stalled and complained about the negotiations because they did not want to acknowledge destroying the town of Quneitra in 1967.⁵⁶

As a diversion, Israel launched a raid into Lebanon which prompted a Palestinian guerrilla attack on the Israeli town of Ma'at. Hostages were seized. In the end, sixteen schoolchildren and three guerrillas were killed. The possibility of genuine peace evaporated with that tragic event; however, both Syria and Israel signed a peace plan on May 18, 1974 to end the fighting. This also diffused the Arab oil embargo.

Rethinking Nixon

It appears that President Nixon may have been more courageous than many realize. Although he resigned in disgrace over the Watergate scandal, he did some things that the public seldom reads or hears about, at least not in full context. The following is a list of major accomplishments:

- ♦ He established détente, in May 1972, between the United States and the Soviet Union with the signing of the SALT I agreements. For all intents and purposes, this marked the end of the Cold War.
- ♦ He opened diplomatic relations with China.
- ♦ He withdrew American forces from South Vietnam and ended the draft. Half a million American soldiers were abandoned on foreign soil by President Johnson when he abdicated his leadership in March 1968. Nixon brought them home.
- ♦ He greatly curtailed the flow of heroin into US borders by crushing Auguste Ricord's heroin cartel.
- ♦ He encouraged the public execution of Lucien Sarti—the French-Corsican assassin who reportedly killed President Kennedy by shooting him in the right temple with an exploding bullet—by Mexican police in Mexico City on April 27, 1972 (about six weeks before the Watergate burglary).

In light of these things, a different image of Nixon unfolds, and Watergate has new dimensions—likely a bloodless coup. To evaluate Nixon fairly, one must consider the times in which he served as President. He took office just six years after President Kennedy was assassinated. And Kennedy's successor, Lyndon Johnson, had quickly escalated US involvement in the Vietnam War. Within four years, Johnson had escalated the number of military personnel in South Vietnam from 16,000 to 540,000.

After turning a small conflict into a major war, Johnson abdicated his leadership in March of 1968. Within days, Martin Luther King was assassinated. On June 5, 1968, Robert Kennedy was assassinated. Both men were advocating a quick withdrawal of troops from Vietnam.

The Nixon Administration is still most heavily criticized for its "secret" bombing campaign in Cambodia. But as he explained in a speech before the VFW in New Orleans on August 20, 1973, the action was not a secret within the government as his critics had charged. Nixon explained that the plan was "disclosed to appropriate Government leaders" and the "appropriate Congressional leaders." He added that "there was no secrecy as far as Government leaders were concerned, who had any right to know or need to know." It is also important to realize that Nixon had only been President for less than two months when that decision was made. Upon reflection, it appears that the so-called "secret" bombing campaign in Cambodia was actually Nixon's Bay of Pigs. Eventually his enemies used that decision—which many of them participated in—as one of several reasons why he should be driven from office.

Within this context, many of Nixon's actions regarding China, the Soviet Union, Vietnam, and the war on heroin were indeed bold and courageous.

Endnotes

1. Nixon's remarks to the Veterans of Foreign Wars in New Orleans on August 20, 1973 were quoted in an ACLU pamphlet entitled "The First Pamphlet Proposing the Creation of Committees of Correspondence to Redeem the Constitution of the United States by Causing the Impeachment of Richard M. Nixon," October 24, 1973.
<http://www.aclu.org/library/1stpamphlet.html>
2. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 281
3. Encyclopedia Britannica: Richard Milhous Nixon
4. Encyclopedia Britannica: Nixon, China and the Soviet Union (Note the author's comments about Auguste Ricord were not in the cited Britannica article.)
5. Endnote omitted.
6. Encyclopedia Britannica: Richard Milhous Nixon, Watergate Scandal
7. Joan Hoff, *The Nixon Story You Never Heard* (article). Collusion between Admiral Moorer, Yeoman Radford, and others within the US military is also discussed at great length in *Silent Coup* by Len Colodny and Robert Gettlin.
8. Len Colodny and Robert Gettlin, *Silent Coup*, pp. 69 - 71. The authors cited the following sources for the Woodward-Haig connection: The National Personnel Records Center provided basic information about Woodward's military career, including duty stations, assignments, date of rank, decorations, and dates of induction and discharge; *Playboy* interview of Woodward by J. Anthony Lukas (February 1989); NROTC guide obtained from Naval Military Personnel Command; Woodward himself provided the authors with a copy of his 1969 resignation letter and of NAVOP order, also known as an ALLNAV; An excerpt from Haig's 1962 master's thesis was published in the *Washington Post* on January 18, 1981.
9. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, pp. 181 - 182
10. *ibid*, pp. 215 - 216
11. *ibid*, p. 206
12. *ibid*, pp. 3 - 22
13. *ibid*, p. 182
14. *ibid*
15. *ibid*, p. 214
16. *ibid*, p. 183
17. *ibid*, p. 206
18. *ibid*
19. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, p. 212

20. *ibid*, p. 230
21. *ibid*, pp. 230 - 231
22. DEA Museum and Visitors Center, "An Introduction to DEA,"
<http://www.usdoj.gov/dea/deamuseum/deaintro.html>
23. Encyclopedia Britannica: Golda Meir
24. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 67
25. *ibid*
26. *ibid*, p. 69
27. Nixon, *Memoirs*, p. 481; also cited by George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 68
28. *ibid*
29. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, pp. 68 - 71
30. *ibid*, p. 68 - 70
31. *ibid*, p. 69
32. *ibid*, pp. 70 - 71
33. *ibid*, p. 71
34. *ibid*
35. *ibid*, p. 72
36. *ibid*, p. 281
37. *ibid*, pp. 73 - 74
38. *ibid*
39. *ibid*
40. *ibid*
41. *ibid*, pp. 74 - 75
42. *ibid*
43. *ibid*
44. *ibid*, p. 76
45. *ibid*, p. 75
46. Encyclopedia Britannica: Henry Kissinger
47. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 76
48. *ibid*, p. 77
49. *ibid*, p. 77
50. *ibid*
51. *ibid*, p. 78
52. *ibid*, pp. 78 - 79
53. Encyclopedia Britannica: Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC)
54. *ibid*, United States, History, Since 1946, The 1970s, The Gerald R. Ford Administration
55. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 78 - 79
56. *ibid*, p. 79 - 80

Chapter 13: Religion and Politics

Talmud vs. Bible

The historic persecution of Jews by Christians is well-documented, but few people understand the motivation. In this chapter, I will set aside religious beliefs and focus on the ancient conflict between Jews and Christians by first analyzing passages from the Bible and the Talmud, then exploring the historical and political implications. It is not my intention to claim that Christianity is better than Judaism. To the contrary, I will show that many aspects of Christianity have strayed dramatically from the teachings of Jesus through the misguided interpretation of the self-appointed Apostle Paul, a Pharisee. Although Jesus preached to love our enemies, he made it abundantly clear that the Pharisees were in fact his enemies.

The Pharisaic sect of Judaism no longer exists per se, but its teachings have become the mainstay of modern Judaism through Pharisaic teachings documented in the Talmud. In AD 200, the teachings of the Pharisees on Jewish law were incorporated in the Mishna which became the first volume of the Talmud.¹ The Talmud—a set of 63 books written by ancient rabbis—contains the legal code which is the basis of Judaism and Jewish law. It was edited centuries after the birth of Jesus and is the textbook used to train rabbis.²

Persecution of Jews

Jews were expelled from virtually every country in Western Europe from 1290 through 1551. During this time the Catholic Church instituted the Inquisition to combat heresy throughout Europe. In 1478 Pope Sixtus IV authorized the well-known Spanish Inquisition which resulted in the burning of about 2,000 people at the stake and the expulsion of Jews from Spain in 1492.³ In general, Jews were accused of the following offenses:

- ◆ Continual lying and treacherous behavior
- ◆ Practicing witchcraft
- ◆ Blasphemous ridicule of Jesus

Much to my surprise, after studying the Talmud and various historical sources, I have concluded that the stated offenses are promoted under Talmudic law.

The first offense—continual lying and treacherous behavior—is encouraged through the annual recitation of an ancient Jewish prayer, the Kol Nidre, which frees Jews from fulfilling vows taken throughout the ensuing year. The Kol Nidre is widely known among Jews because it is recited—sung to a melody—on the eve of Yom Kippur. Typically the song is sung as part of the temple’s service and Jews respond by making the following declaration which is written in the Talmud book of Nedarim:

Every vow which I may make in the future shall be null.

(Talmud, Nedarim, 23a)

The Kol Nidre is good for a year. Therefore it must be restated annually on the eve of Yom Kippur. Apologists for the Kol Nidre abound. The popular explanation is that it applies only to vows made to God. The rationale is that in the Middle Ages, Jews were forced to take Christian vows. The Kol Nidre was intended—we are told—to give oppressed Jews a way of voiding such vows made to God under duress. This explanation sounds good, but it does not match the Talmud's rationale. The following is a full description of the Kol Nidre prayer as written in the Talmud book of Nedarim:

He who desires his friend to eat with him, and after urging him, imposes a vow upon him, it is 'a vow of incitement' and hence invalid. And he who desires that none of his vows made during the year shall be valid, let him stand at the beginning of the year and declare, "Every vow which I may make in the future shall be null." HIS VOWS ARE THEN INVALID, PROVIDING THAT HE REMEMBERS THIS AT THE TIME OF THE VOW. (Caps in original.)

(Talmud, Nedarim, 23a)

Clearly, the practice of breaking vows is intended for vows made to humans, not to God. The Talmud specifically states that "He who desires his friend to eat with him, and after urging him, imposes a vow upon him, it is 'a vow of incitement' and hence invalid." In other words, if two businessmen have lunch together—one is a Jew, one is a Christian—and the Christian gets the Jew to agree to a specific business deal (which is a vow), then the Jew is not bound to honor the terms of the business deal because it is a "vow of incitement" and therefore invalid. This explains why Jewish leaders in Israel rarely honor the terms of Arab-Israeli peace treaties, cease-fire truces, or border agreements.

The late Benjamin Freedman^(Footnote 51) described the Kol Nidre in a speech he delivered in Washington, DC in 1961. The following text is an excerpt from that speech:

Do you know what Jews do on the Day of Atonement, that you think is so sacred to them? I was one of them. This is not hearsay. I'm not here to be a rabble-rouser. I'm here to give you facts. When, on the Day of Atonement, you walk into a synagogue, you stand up for the very first prayer that you recite. It is the only prayer for which you stand. You repeat three times a short prayer called the Kol Nidre. In that prayer, you enter into an agreement with God Almighty that any oath, vow, or pledge that you may make during the next twelve months shall be null and void. The oath shall not be an oath; the vow shall not be a vow; the pledge shall not be a pledge. They shall have no force or effect. And further, the Talmud teaches that whenever you take an oath, vow, or pledge, you are to remember the Kol Nidre

prayer that you recited on the Day of Atonement, and you are exempted from fulfilling them. How much can you depend on their loyalty? ...

(Benjamin Freedman, excerpt from a speech at the Willard Hotel in Washington, DC, 1961)

For Gentile readers interested in hearing the Kol Nidre's melody, go to a video store and rent *The Jazz Singer*^(Footnote 52) starring Al Jolson. In the movie, Jolson gave a stirring rendition of Mammy and the Kol Nidre.

The second offense—practicing witchcraft—receives tacit endorsement in the Talmud. The following passage clearly states that some forms of sorcery are entirely permitted, while others are exempt from punishment, yet forbidden, and others are punished by death. The following text is from the Talmud book of Sanhedrin:

Abaye said: The laws of sorcerers are like those of the Sabbath: certain actions are punished by stoning, some are exempt from punishment, yet forbidden, whilst others are entirely permitted. Thus: if one actually performs magic, he is stoned; if he merely creates an illusion, he is exempt, yet it is forbidden; whilst what is entirely permitted? — Such as was performed by R. Hanina and R. Oshaia, who spent every Sabbath eve in studying the Laws of Creation, by means of which they created a third-grown calf and ate it.

(Talmud, Sanhedrin 67b)

The Talmud further reveals a specific instance where an ancient Rabbi—in around AD 200^(Footnote 53)—tried and executed other Jews in Palestine for practicing witchcraft just as the Catholic Church did centuries later in Europe during the Inquisition. The Rabbi's name was "Simeon B. Shetah." He hanged 80 women in the city of Askelon, located on the Mediterranean Coast of Palestine, for practicing witchcraft at an "alarming rate." Ironically, Rabbis later commented in the Talmud that the executions were illegal—not because they were inhumane or cruel, but because two defendants must not be tried on the same day. The following text is from the Talmud book of Sanhedrin:

MISHNAH. ALL WHO ARE STONED ARE [AFTERWARDS] HANGED: THIS IS R. ELIEZER'S VIEW, THE SAGES SAY: ONLY THE BLASPHEMER AND THE IDOLATER ARE HANGED. A MAN IS HANGED WITH HIS FACE TOWARDS THE SPECTATORS, BUT A WOMAN WITH HER FACE TOWARDS THE GALLOWS: THIS IS THE VIEW OF R. ELIEZER. BUT THE SAGES SAY: A MAN IS HANGED, BUT NOT A WOMAN. WHEREUPON R. ELIEZER SAID TO THEM: BUT DID NOT SIMEON B. SHETAH HANG WOMEN AT ASHKELON? THEY RETORTED: [ON THAT OCCASION] HE

HANGED EIGHTY WOMEN, NOTWITHSTANDING THAT TWO [MALEFACTORS] MUST NOT BE TRIED ON THE SAME DAY.⁴⁴

[Footnote]

(44) Hence this occurrence cannot be brought forward as a valid precedent, owing to its extraordinary nature. Witchcraft amongst Jewish women prevailed at that time to an alarming extent, and in order to prevent a combined effort on the part of their relations to rescue the culprits, he had to execute all of them at once. He hanged them, then, to prevent such practices and to avoid rescue, but his action is no precedent, and in itself was actually illegal, as the Sages pointed out.

(Talmud, Sanhedrin 45b)

The third offense—blasphemous ridicule of Jesus—appears to be quite valid. The Talmud makes about sixty references to an apparent alias for Jesus: "Balaam." Most references to Balaam are extremely hateful and often vulgar. The Talmud itself discloses that some people believe Balaam is an alias for Jesus, and Phinehas the Robber is an alias for Pontius Pilate. The following text is from the Talmud book of Sanhedrin:

(6) According to the view that all the Balaam passages are anti-Christian in tendency, Balaam being used as an alias for Jesus, Phinehas the Robber is thus taken to represent Pontius Pilatus, and the Chronicle of Balaam probably to denote a Gospel (v. Herford op. cit. 72ff.). This view is however disputed by Bacher and others: cf. Ginzberg, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLI, 121.

(Talmud, Sanhedrin 106b)

The Talmud further discloses that Balaam was thirty years old when Phinehas the Robber killed him:

A certain min^(Footnote 54) said to R. Hanina: Hast thou heard how old Balaam was? — He replied: It is not actually stated, but since it is written, Bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days, [it follows that] he was thirty-three or thirty-four years old. He rejoined: Thou hast said correctly; I personally have seen Balaam's Chronicle,^(Footnote 55) in which it is stated, 'Balaam the lame was thirty years old when Phinehas the Robber killed him.' Mar, the son of Rabina, said to his sons: In the case of all [those mentioned as having no portion in the future world] you should not take [the Biblical passages dealing with them] to expound them [to their discredit], excepting in the case of the wicked Balaam: whatever you find [written] about him, lecture upon it [to

his disadvantage].

(Talmud, Sanhedrin 106b)

The last sentence, "lecture upon it to his advantage," appears to be an instruction to Rabbis to actively teach in opposition of Jesus and Christianity.

When the Mishna (the first of the 63 books of the Talmud) was compiled in around AD 200, it incorporated the teachings of the Pharisees on Jewish law. This is what the Mishna states about Balaam:

MISHNAH 19. WHOEVER POSSESSES THESE THREE THINGS, HE IS OF THE DISCIPLES OF ABRAHAM, OUR FATHER; AND [WHOEVER POSSESSES] THREE OTHER THINGS, HE IS OF THE DISCIPLES OF BALAAM, THE WICKED. THE DISCIPLES OF ABRAHAM, OUR FATHER, [POSSESS] A GOOD EYE, AN HUMBLE SPIRIT AND A LOWLY SOUL. THE DISCIPLES OF BALAAM, THE WICKED, [POSSESS] AN EVIL EYE, A HAUGHTY SPIRIT AND AN OVER-AMBITIOUS SOUL. WHAT IS [THE DIFFERENCE] BETWEEN THE DISCIPLES OF ABRAHAM, OUR FATHER, AND THE DISCIPLES OF BALAAM, THE WICKED. THE DISCIPLES OF ABRAHAM, OUR FATHER, ENJOY [THEIR SHARE] IN THIS WORLD, AND INHERIT THE WORLD TO COME, AS IT IS SAID: THAT I MAY CAUSE THOSE THAT LOVE ME TO INHERIT SUBSTANCE AND THAT I MAY FILL THEIR TREASURIES, BUT THE DISCIPLES OF BALAAM, THE WICKED, INHERIT GEHINNOM, AND DESCEND INTO THE NETHERMOST PIT, AS IT IS SAID: BUT THOU, O GOD, WILT BRING THEM DOWN TO THE NETHERMOST PIT; MEN OF BLOOD AND DECEIT SHALL NOT LIVE OUT HALF THEIR DAYS; BUT AS FOR ME, I WILL TRUST IN THEE.

(Mishna, Avoth Chapter 5)

Reference [Appendix C](#) for a summarized listing of anti-Christian passages from the uncensored version of the Talmud.

An additional offense—blood libel (the ritualistic sacrifice of children)—is obviously the most controversial, but it appears to have a historical basis. On November 16, 1491, five men were executed at Avila for the ritualistic murder of a four-year-old Christian boy (later known as the "Holy Child of La Guardia"). Two of the men were Jews, the other three were "conversos"—Sephardic Jews who converted to Christianity. The boy's heart was reportedly cut out and used with two stolen consecrated hosts in a ritual of black magic against the Christians.

For centuries the case was tainted because the five executed men had been tortured prior to confessing. But in 1931, historian William Thomas Walsh offered persuasive

evidence in his book, *Isabella of Spain*, that the charge of blood libel was in fact true. Walsh found the testimony of a Jew who stated that he witnessed the crime, and had not been subjected to torture. Although the Spanish Inquisition was already underway, it was ritualistic murder of the young boy that resulted in expulsion of Jews from Spain in 1492. It was the last straw.

Before the executions, two independent judicial panels had reviewed and confirmed the Inquisition's findings.⁴ On November 24, 1805, the murdered boy was canonized as St. Christopher on the authority of Pope Pius VII.

Jesus Warned Against Pharisaic Rule

The Talmud teaches Rabbis to oppose and discredit the teachings of Jesus because he criticized the Pharisees. As previously stated, Pharisaic law is reflected in the Talmud, particularly in the book of Mishna—the original book of the Talmud.

Here are a few examples of Jesus's words of contempt towards the Pharisees from the book of Matthew, Chapter 23 (King James edition):

(26) Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. (27) Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye are like unto whited sepulchres [burial vaults], which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and all uncleanness. (28) Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. (29) Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! Because ye build tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous. (30) And say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. (31) Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. (32) Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. (33) Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?

(34) Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: (35) That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. (36) Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation. (37) O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! (38) Behold, your house is left unto you

desolate.

(The words of Jesus: King James Bible, Matthew, Chapter 23)

Even the well-known "render unto Caesar" passage was instigated by the Pharisees. Here is a reminder:

(15) Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. (16) And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, Master we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither, carest thou for any man: for thou regardest not the person of men. (17) Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not? (18) But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, 'Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites?' (19) 'Show me the tribute money.' And they brought unto him a penny. (20) And he saith unto them, 'Whose is this image and superscription?' (21) They say unto him, Caesar's. Then saith he unto them, 'Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's.' (22) When they had heard of these words, they marvelled, and left him and went their way.

(King James Bible, Matthew, Chapter 22)

Balaam: References in Bible and Talmud

As previously stated, the Talmud apparently uses "Balaam" as an alias for Jesus. It is also worth noting that Bible mentions Balaam several times as well, particularly in the Old Testament book of Numbers, Chapters 22 - 24. In fact, there is an interesting story about Balaam in the Bible (Numbers 22:20 - 22:35) that is remarkably similar to a reference of Balaam in the Talmud (Sanhedrin 105a, 105b).

The two passages must have originated from the same source because the sentence structures and word choices in the two sections are too similar to be coincidence; however, two different stories are told. The Biblical reference depicts Balaam as a protector of the Israelites, whereas, the Talmudic reference depicts him as one who commits bestiality.

It makes no sense for the Talmud to view Balaam with contempt, often referring to him as the "wicked Balaam." Such contempt for a man who protected the Israelites further supports the belief that Balaam is in fact a Talmudic alias for Jesus.

In the Biblical reference, Balaam's donkey spoke to him as he traveled to the city of Moab to meet with its King, Balak. The king had solicited Balaam to put a curse on the Israelites camped ominously on the plains of Moab. While en route to Moab, an angel appeared but only Balaam's donkey could see it. The donkey stopped, and

Balaam struck the animal to get it to continue. After three blows, the Lord spoke to Balaam through the donkey's mouth. The beast warned Balaam that he should not put a curse on the Jews for King Balak. Balaam took heed of the advice and hence became a protector of the Israelites.

The Talmudic reference to Balaam's talking donkey makes a vulgar assertion that Balaam committed bestiality with the animal—a sin punishable by death under Talmudic law.

Here is the Biblical reference to the words spoken by Balaam's donkey:

[30] And the ass said unto Balaam, Am not I thine ass, upon which thou hast ridden ever since I was thine unto this day? Was I ever wont to do so unto thee?

(King James Bible, Numbers 22:30)

Here is the Talmudic reference to the words spoken by Balaam's donkey:

But the ass said to [Balaam], 'Am I not thine ass?' — 'Merely for carrying loads', [he replied]. 'Upon which thou hast ridden.' — 'That was only by chance.' 'Ever since I was thine until this day,' [she added]. 'Moreover, I serve thee as a companion by night.'

(Talmud, Sanhedrin 105a, 105b)

The Talmudic reference to the talking donkey appears to be a distortion of the Biblical account. Both accounts state that the donkey made the following statement: "Ever since I was thine until this day." But the Talmud added the following reference to bestiality: "Moreover, I serve thee as a companion by night."

Here is the Talmudic reference in full context where it clearly states that Balaam committed bestiality:

R. Johanan said: Balaam limped on one foot, as it is written, And he walked haltingly. Samson was lame in both feet, as it is written, [Dan shall be a serpent by the way,] an adder in the path that biteth the horse's heels. Balaam was blind in one eye, as it is said, [and the man] whose eye is open . . . He practised enchantment by means of his membrum.^(Footnote 56) For here it is written, falling, but having his eyes open; whilst elsewhere is written, And Haman was fallen on the bed whereon Esther was.

It was stated, Mar Zutra said: He practised enchantment by means of his membrum. Mar the son of Rabina said: He committed bestiality with his ass. The view that he practised enchantment by means of his membrum is as was stated. The view that he committed bestiality with his ass [is because] here it

is written, He bowed, he lay down as a lion and as a great lion; whilst elsewhere it is written, At her feet he bowed, he fell.

And knoweth the mind of the most High. Now, seeing that he did not even know the mind of his ass, could he know the mind of the most High! What [is this about] the mind of his ass? — For they [the elders] said to him, 'Why didst thou not ride upon thy horse?' He replied. 'I have put it [to graze] in the dewy pastures. But the ass said to him, 'Am I not thine ass?' — 'Merely for carrying loads', [he replied]. 'Upon which thou hast ridden.' — 'That was only by chance.' 'Ever since I was thine until this day,' [she added]. 'Moreover, I serve thee as a companion by night.'

(Talmud, Sanhedrin 105a, 105b)

Here are the Old Testament references to Balaam:

- ♦ Numbers 22; verses 5, 7-10, 12-14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27-31, 34-41
- ♦ Numbers 23; verses 1-5, 11, 16, 25-30
- ♦ Numbers 24; 1-3, 10, 12, 15, 25
- ♦ Numbers 31; 8, 16
- ♦ Deuteronomy 23; 4, 5
- ♦ Joshua 24; 9, 10
- ♦ Nehemiah 13:2
- ♦ Micah 6:05

Here are the New Testament passages to Balaam:

- ♦ 2 Peter (the Second Epistle of Peter); 2:15 (Chapter 2, Verse 15)
- ♦ Jude 1:11
- ♦ Revelation 2:14

The Plot to Kill Jesus

As previously stated, Jesus was extremely critical of the Pharisees which obviously upset them a great deal. In addition, he performed miracles which was viewed by the Pharisees as magic—a form of sorcery punishable by death under Jewish law. When the Pharisees learned that Jesus had reportedly raised Lazarus from the dead, the Sanhedrin^(Footnote 57) decided to take action. They plotted to kill him.

The high priest of the Sanhedrin at that time was Joseph Caiaphas. He was the man who ordered the death of Jesus, although the deed was officially carried out by Roman Governor Pontius Pilate.^(Footnote 58) Caiaphas was the last priest to interrogate Jesus before delivering him to Pilate for a formal inquisition and subsequent crucifixion. Assisting Caiaphas in the interrogation of Jesus was his father-in-law, Ananus, who also had served as the previous high-priest of the Sanhedrin.

According to the ancient Jewish historian Flavius Josephus (AD 37/38 - 100), Caiaphas was appointed high-priest and official head of the Sanhedrin by Roman Governor Valerius Gratus around AD 18. Caiaphas held that position for about 18 years until he was replaced in AD 36. Governor Gratus was the predecessor of Pontius Pilate.⁵ Pilate was appointed Governor around AD 26, stayed for ten years, then was ordered back to Rome by Vitellius in AD 36 to appear before the Emperor Tiberius regarding complaints made against him by the Jews; however, Tiberius died before Pilate reached Rome.⁶ Shortly thereafter (AD 36), Vitellius took over as Governor and immediately removed Caiaphas as high-priest. Caiaphas was replaced by Jonathan, the son of Ananus.⁷ Ananus was the first member of the Sanhedrin to interrogate Jesus after his arrest by the Sanhedrin guards.⁸

According to the Gospels, Pilate did not want to kill Jesus and was somewhat intimidated by him. Pilate's wife, Claudia Procula, begged him to leave Jesus alone because she had a bad dream [\(Footnote 59\)](#) about the "just man."⁹ But Caiaphas, Ananus and their colleagues at the Sanhedrin had already spread malicious rumors about Jesus to the crowds that surrounded the Governor's palace. When Pilate asked the crowd what to do with Jesus, they shouted "Crucify him!"¹⁰

Pilate tried to calm the crowd because he did not want to kill Jesus. But Caiaphas, Ananus and their colleagues had whipped the crowd into such a frenzy that a riot nearly occurred. At that point, Pilate gave in and ordered Jesus to be crucified. Before issuing the order, he publicly washed his hands before the crowd and said, "I am innocent of the blood of this just person."

They replied, "His blood is on us and on our children."¹¹

Ironically, according to Josephus, Caiaphas and Pilate were both replaced in their respective positions of authority within five years after Jesus was crucified.¹²

The Bible is quite clear about who bears responsibility for Christ's execution. It was not Pilate. In fact, several Christian churches have canonized Pilate's wife, Claudia Procula, and in some instances even Pilate himself, for their defense of Christ against the Jewish priests. In my research, I have found two days, June 25th and October 27th, designated by various Christian churches (Greek Orthodox, Abyssinian, Coptic) to recognize either St. Pilate, or St. [Claudia] Procula, or both.

Josephus—a non-Christian source—described Jesus in his book, *Antiquities of the Jews* (AD 93), in a manner remarkably similar to the Gospels. The following is an excerpt about Jesus:

Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was [the] Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again the third day; as the divine prophets

had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day.

(Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 18, Chapter 3, p. 3)

Notice that, according to Josephus, Pilate condemned Jesus to the cross "at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us." Those men were Joseph Caiaphas, head of the Sanhedrin, and his predecessor and father-in-law, Ananus.

The Apostle Paul, a Pharisee, Distorted Jesus's Message

I believe the Apostle Paul was a false prophet working for the Pharisees. In fact, he openly boasted of being a Pharisee (Philippians 3:5).¹³ As previously stated, Jesus was highly critical of the Pharisees. Paul's mission was apparently to water down the teachings of Jesus; however, it should be remembered that Jesus warned of false prophets in the following passage:

- [15] Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.
- [16] Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?
- [17] Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.
- [18] A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.
- [19] Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.
- [20] Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.
- [21] Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.
- [22] Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? And in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?
- [23] And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

(The words of Jesus: King James Bible, Matthew 7:15 - 7:23)

The Apostle Paul's original name was Saul of Tarsus. Initially, Paul was a bitter enemy of Christianity—a Pharisee—then converted and did more than anyone to promote the burgeoning religion. Paul's message, however, differs substantially from the Gospels. If one examines the letters of Paul, it becomes clear that he paid little attention to the teachings of Jesus. Instead, Paul focused almost entirely on the

theological aspect of Jesus as the son of God, the crucifixion, the resurrection, and the concept of predestination.

Paul was not given any sort of authority by Jesus or any of his Twelve Apostles to spread the Gospel. This plus the fact that Paul the Apostle was a Pharisee should not be taken lightly. Furthermore, Paul's view of Jews is somewhat confusing, while Jesus was quite clear and consistent on that topic. Jesus viewed Pharisaic Jews as evil and corrupt. At one point he accused their father of being the devil, to which the Pharisaic Jews responded by casting stones at him,¹⁴ but he hid to escape their wrath.¹⁵ Throughout the Gospels, there is a constant conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees. Paul, however, is inconsistent on this issue. In some of his writings, he addressed Jews in a loving sense, but in others he addressed them in a hateful, scornful way.

For example, Paul wrote poetically of Jews in Galatians:

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free,
there is neither male nor female: for you are all one in Christ
Jesus.

(King James Bible, Galatians 3:28)

In Thessalonians, Paul was not so poetic when he accused the Jews of killing Jesus:

[14] For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God
which in Judaea are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like
things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews:
[15] Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and
have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary
to all men:
[16] Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be
saved, to fill up their sins always: for the wrath is come upon
them to the uttermost.

(King James Bible, Thessalonians 2:14 through 16)

Clearly Paul was a skilled writer, but much of his rhetoric makes no sense. Most of the confusing dogma associated with Christianity can be attributed to Paul. Here are some examples of Paul's poetic, but muddled rhetoric about Jesus:

For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how
that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;

(King James Bible, 1st Corinthians 15:3)

For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life
through Jesus Christ our Lord.

(King James Bible, Romans 6:23)

Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God.

(King James Bible, Romans 15:7)

For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect.

(King James Bible, 1st Corinthians 1:17)

Notice that Paul created many of the popular phrases used by Christians today. They include the following: "Christ died for our sins"... "the wages of sin"... "Christ also received us to the glory of God"... "the cross of Christ"... and so on.

In the Gospels, the death and resurrection of Jesus was additional proof that he was in fact the son of God. In my view, the words of Jesus alone are powerful and courageous. Whether we choose to believe that he was the son of God is a matter of individual faith. Nevertheless, Jesus was a wise man in his own right. But Paul ignored his powerful teachings and focused almost exclusively on his death and resurrection. Paul took the crucifixion to a completely new level which, in my view, weakened the original message substantially.

The Ancient Kingdom of Khazaria

The notion that Jews are God's chosen people is not only untrue, but ridiculous. It is a myth that most Jews have an ethnic relationship to Israel. In reality, most Jews have a stronger kinship to the ancient Kingdom of Khazaria than to modern or ancient Palestine/Israel. ^(Footnote 60) Khazaria was a country in eastern Europe that flourished as an independent state from about 650 to 1016. In about 740, the king of Khazaria issued a decree whereby the national religion became Judaism. Prior to that, the main religion was Shamanism, a type of paganism from which Wicca later evolved. Wicca is a religion of sorts, but is really a euphemism for witchcraft. In fact, Wiccans openly refer to themselves as witches. In addition, Wiccans openly acknowledge Shamanism as a "mother religion."

Benjamin Freedman described the Khazars in a speech he delivered in Washington, DC in 1961. The following is an excerpt from that speech:

What are the facts about the Jews? (I call them Jews to you, because they are known as Jews. I don't call them Jews myself. I refer to them as so-called Jews, because I know what they are.) The eastern European Jews, who form 92 per cent of the world's population of those people who call themselves Jews, were

originally Khazars. They were a warlike tribe who lived deep in the heart of Asia. And they were so warlike that even the Asiatics drove them out of Asia into eastern Europe. They set up a large Khazar kingdom of 800,000 square miles. At the time, Russia did not exist, nor did many other European countries. The Khazar kingdom was the biggest country in all Europe -- so big and so powerful that when the other monarchs wanted to go to war, the Khazars would lend them 40,000 soldiers. That's how big and powerful they were.

They were phallic worshippers, [\(Footnote 61\)](#) which is filthy and I do not want to go into the details of that now. But that was their religion, as it was also the religion of many other pagans and barbarians elsewhere in the world. The Khazar king became so disgusted with the degeneracy of his kingdom that he decided to adopt a so-called monotheistic faith -- either Christianity, Islam, or what is known today as Judaism, which is really Talmudism. By spinning a top, and calling out "eeny, meeny, miney, moe," he picked out so-called Judaism. And that became the state religion. He sent down to the Talmudic schools of Pumbedita and Sura and brought up thousands of rabbis, and opened up synagogues and schools, and his people became what we call Jews.

There wasn't one of them who had an ancestor who ever put a toe in the Holy Land. Not only in Old Testament history, but back to the beginning of time. Not one of them! And yet they come to the Christians and ask us to support their armed insurrections in Palestine by saying, "You want to help repatriate God's Chosen People to their Promised Land, their ancestral home, don't you? It's your Christian duty. We gave you one of our boys as your Lord and Savior. You now go to church on Sunday, and you kneel and you worship a Jew, and we're Jews." But they are pagan Khazars who were converted just the same as the Irish were converted. It is as ridiculous to call them "people of the Holy Land," as it would be to call the 54 million Chinese Moslems "Arabs." Mohammed only died in 620 A.D., and since then 54 million Chinese have accepted Islam as their religious belief. Now imagine, in China, 2,000 miles away from Arabia, from Mecca and Mohammed's birthplace. Imagine if the 54 million Chinese decided to call themselves "Arabs." You would say they were lunatics. Anyone who believes that those 54 million Chinese are Arabs must be crazy. All they did was adopt as a religious faith a belief that had its origin in Mecca, in Arabia. The same as the Irish. When the Irish became Christians, nobody dumped them in the ocean and imported to the Holy Land a new crop of inhabitants. They hadn't become a different people. They were the same people, but they had accepted Christianity as a religious faith.

These Khazars, these pagans, these Asiatics, these Turko-Finns, were a Mongoloid race who were forced out of Asia into eastern Europe. Because their king took the Talmudic faith, they had no choice in the matter. Just the same as in Spain: If the king was Catholic, everybody had to be a Catholic. If not, you had to get out of Spain. So the Khazars became what we call today Jews. Now imagine how silly it was for the great Christian countries of the world to say, "We're going to use our power and prestige to repatriate God's Chosen People to their ancestral homeland, their Promised Land." Could there be a bigger lie than that? Because they control the newspapers, the magazines, the radio, the television, the book publishing business, and because they have the ministers in the pulpit and the politicians on the soapboxes talking the same language, it is not too surprising that you believe that lie. You'd believe black is white if you heard it often enough. You wouldn't call black black anymore -- you'd start to call black white. And nobody could blame you.

That is one of the great lies of history. It is the foundation of all the misery that has befallen the world.

(Benjamin Freedman: excerpt from a speech at the Willard Hotel in Washington, DC, 1961)

Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion (Fraud or Real?)

In the early 20th Century, Czar Nicholas Romanov disseminated *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* which he claimed was a seditious document used by Jews to dominate the world. Consequently, Czar Nicholas began persecuting and expelling Jews from Russia. Some say he merely used the *Protocols* as a pretext and rationale for anti-Semitism.

In 1921, Philip Graves of *The Times* (London), explained that the *Protocols* bore a resemblance to a satire by the French lawyer Maurice Joly on Napoleon III published in 1864 and entitled *Dialogue aux Enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu* ("Dialogue in Hell between Machiavelli and Montesquieu").¹⁶

Regardless of the document's origin, many of the *Protocols* bear a striking resemblance to reality. And quite frankly, the general tone of the *Protocols* is similar to that of the Talmud. To demonstrate my point, I will discuss a few example protocols from the entire suite. The following three specific protocols appear to be part of a working ideology:

- ◆ Protocol XII, *Control of the Press*
- ◆ Protocol V, *Despotism and Modern Progress* (how to control public opinion)
- ◆ Protocol VII, *Worldwide Wars*

The first example—Protocol XII, *Control of the Press*—clearly reflects reality in modern America. The US news media is almost completely dominated by Jewish individuals at the executive and ownership levels (reference Introduction: Media Moguls). The following text is an excerpt from Protocol XII:

... WE CONTROL THE PRESS

[4.] NOT A SINGLE ANNOUNCEMENT WILL REACH THE PUBLIC WITHOUT OUR CONTROL. Even now this is already being attained by us inasmuch as all news items are received by a few agencies, in whose offices they are focused from all parts of the world. These agencies will then be already entirely ours and will give publicity only to what we dictate to them.

[5.] If already now we have contrived to possess ourselves of the minds of the GOY communities to such an extent the they all come near looking upon the events of the world through the colored glasses of those spectacles we are setting astride their noses; if already now there is not a single State where there exist for us any barriers to admittance into what GOY stupidity calls State secrets: what will our positions be then, when we shall be acknowledged supreme lords of the world in the person of our king of all the world

[6.] Let us turn again to the FUTURE OF THE PRINTING PRESS. Every one desirous of being a publisher, librarian, or printer, will be obliged to provide himself with the diploma instituted therefore, which, in case of any fault, will be immediately impounded. With such measures THE INSTRUMENT OF THOUGHT WILL BECOME AN EDUCATIVE MEANS ON THE HANDS OF OUR GOVERNMENT, WHICH WILL NO LONGER ALLOW THE MASS OF THE NATION TO BE LED ASTRAY IN BY-WAYS AND FANTASIES ABOUT THE BLESSINGS OF PROGRESS. Is there any one of us who does not know that these phantom blessings are the direct roads to foolish imaginings which give birth to anarchical relations of men among themselves and towards authority, because progress, or rather the idea of progress, has introduced the conception of every kind of emancipation, but has failed to establish its limits All the so-called liberals are anarchists, if not in fact, at any rate in thought. Every one of them in hunting after phantoms of freedom, and falling exclusively into license, that is, into the anarchy of protest for the sake of protest

FREE PRESS DESTROYED

[7.] We turn to the periodical press. We shall impose on it, as on all printed matter, stamp taxes per sheet and deposits of caution-money, and books of less than 30 sheets will pay double. We

shall reckon them as pamphlets in order, on the one hand, to reduce the number of magazines, which are the worst form of printed poison, and, on the other, in order that this measure may force writers into such lengthy productions that they will be little read, especially as they will be costly. At the same time what we shall publish ourselves to influence mental development in the direction laid down for our profit will be cheap and will be read voraciously. The tax will bring vapid literary ambitions within bounds and the liability to penalties will make literary men dependent upon us. And if there should be any found who are desirous of writing against us, they will not find any person eager to print their productions in print the publisher or printer will have to apply to the authorities for permission to do so. Thus we shall know beforehand of all tricks preparing against us and shall nullify them by getting ahead with explanations on the subject treated of.

[8.] Literature and journalism are two of the most important educative forces, and therefore our government will become proprietor of the majority of the journals. This will neutralize the injurious influence of the privately-owned press and will put us in possession of a tremendous influence upon the public mind If we give permits for ten journals, we shall ourselves found thirty, and so on in the same proportion. This, however, must in no wise be suspected by the public. For which reason all journals published by us will be of the most opposite, in appearance, tendencies and opinions, thereby creating confidence in us and bringing over to us quite unsuspecting opponents, who will thus fall into our trap and be rendered harmless.

[9.] In the front rank will stand organs of an official character. They will always stand guard over our interests, and therefore their influence will be comparatively insignificant.

[10.] In the second rank will be the semi-official organs, whose part it will be to attack the tepid and indifferent.

[11.] In the third rank we shall set up our own, to all appearance, off position, which, in at least one of its organs, will present what looks like the very antipodes to us. Our real opponents at heart will accept this simulated opposition as their own and will show us their cards.

[12.] All our newspapers will be of all possible complexions - aristocratic, republican, revolutionary, even anarchical - for so long, of course, as the constitution exists Like the Indian idol "Vishnu" they will have a hundred hands, and every one of them will have a finger on any one of the public opinions as required. When a pulse quickens these hands will lead opinion in the

direction of our aims, for an excited patient loses all power of judgment and easily yields to suggestion. Those fools who will think they are repeating the opinion of a newspaper of their own camp will be repeating our opinion or any opinion that seems desirable for us. In the vain belief that they are following the organ of their party they will, in fact, follow the flag which we hang out for them.

[13.] In order to direct our newspaper militia in this sense we must take special and minute care in organizing this matter. Under the title of central department of the press we shall institute literary gatherings at which our agents will without attracting attention issue the orders and watchwords of the day. By discussing and controverting, but always superficially, without touching the essence of the matter, our organs will carry on a sham fight fusillade with the official newspapers solely for the purpose of giving occasion for us to express ourselves more fully than could well be done from the outset in official announcements, whenever, of course, that is to our advantage.

[14.] THESE ATTACKS UPON US WILL ALSO SERVE ANOTHER PURPOSE, NAMELY, THAT OUR SUBJECTS WILL BE CONVINCED TO THE EXISTENCE OF FULL FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND SO GIVE OUR AGENTS AN OCCASION TO AFFIRM THAT ALL ORGANS WHICH OPPOSE US ARE EMPTY BABBLERS, since they are incapable of finding any substantial objections to our orders.

ONLY LIES PRINTED

(Excerpt from the *Protocols of Zion: Protocol XII, Control of the Press*)

Anyone who analyzes the American news media knows that Protocol XII is a real strategy because the media is dominated by Jewish executives, owners, reporters, and writers (reference Introduction: Media Moguls). As previously stated, six media conglomerates in America are controlled by six Jewish men. Gerald Levin, Michael Eisner, Edgar Bronfman, Jr, Sumner Redstone, Dennis Dammerman, and Peter Chernin—all Jews—collectively control AOL Time Warner, [\(Footnote 62\)](#) Walt Disney Company, Universal Studios, Viacom, Inc, General Electric, and News Corporation Limited. These six media conglomerates own or control ABC, NBC, CBS, the Turner Broadcasting System, CNN, MTV, Universal Studios, MCA Records, Geffen Records, DGC Records, GRP Records, Rising Tide Records, Curb/Universal Records, and Interscope Records.

And Si Newhouse owns two dozen daily newspapers from Staten Island to Oregon, plus the Sunday supplement Parade; the Conde Nast collection of magazines, including Vogue, The New Yorker, Vanity Fair, Allure, GQ, and Self; the publishing firms of Random House, Knopf, Crown, and Ballantine, among other imprints; and cable franchises with over one million subscribers.

David Sarnoff and William Paley—both Jews—ran NBC and CBS television when President Kennedy was assassinated in 1963. Walter Lippmann—an ardent Zionist—was an influential newspaper commentators during Kennedy’s Presidency. In 1917, Lippmann served briefly as an assistant to Secretary of War Newton D. Baker. In 1919, President Woodrow Wilson sent Lippmann to France to take part in the negotiations for the Treaty of Versailles. Martin Agronsky—a Jew—was an influential television news correspondent for NBC when Kennedy was killed. Agronsky used his position to aggressively promote Lyndon Johnson as a qualified successor to the slain president (reference Chapter 1).

Jewish political forces control and influence every facet of American media outlets. This includes the electronic news media, newspapers/journals, and the entertainment industry: movies, music, and book publishing industries. Anyone who claims that Protocol XII, *Control of the Press*, is untrue is simply not paying attention.

The second example—Protocol V, *Despotism and Modern*—is used to control public opinion regarding controversial topics. The following text is an excerpt from Protocol V:

[9.] We shall assume to ourselves the liberal physiognomy of all parties, of all directions, and we shall give that physiognomy a VOICE IN ORATORS WHO WILL SPEAK SO MUCH THAT THEY WILL EXHAUST THE PATIENCE OF THEIR HEARERS AND PRODUCE AN ABHORRENCE OF ORATORY.

[10.] IN ORDER TO PUT PUBLIC OPINION INTO OUR HANDS WE MUST BRING IT INTO A STATE OF BEWILDERMENT BY GIVING EXPRESSION FROM ALL SIDES TO SO MANY CONTRADICTORY OPINIONS AND FOR SUCH LENGTH OF TIME AS WILL SUFFICE TO MAKE THE "GOYIM" LOSE THEIR HEADS IN THE LABYRINTH AND COME TO SEE THAT THE BEST THING IS TO HAVE NO OPINION OF ANY KIND IN MATTERS POLITICAL, which it is not given to the public to understand, because they are understood only by him who guides the public. ...

(Excerpt from the *Protocols of Zion: Protocol V, Despotism and Modern Progress*)

The stated approach of "exhausting the patience of the [listeners]" was used extensively to cover-up the facts about the Kennedy assassination. The American public has been besieged about this crime for thirty-seven years (as of 2002). Many people are still interested in the topic, but they simply don’t know what to think because they’ve been inundated with so much nonsense. A close analysis of both the critics and advocates of the Warren Report reveals that Protocol V was used extensively by the conspirators. No one demonstrates Protocol V better than Dr. Cyril Wecht who pontificated ad nauseam on *The Men Who Killed Kennedy* (1988) about the Single Bullet Theory (reference Chapter 7). His comments about John Connally’s

wounds were completely misleading. And he totally ignored the fact that there was a four second delay between the time Kennedy grabbed his neck and the time Connally reacted to being hit—thereby missing a chance to publicly refute the Single Bullet Theory in the simplest terms possible. [\(Footnote 63\)](#) Given that he is an illustrious and eminent pathologist, he cannot claim ignorance as an excuse.

Other examples of false critics are Robert Groden and Oliver Stone (reference Chapter 7). Both made a concerted effort to direct the public away from Jewish involvement in the Kennedy assassination. Prominent defenders of the Warren Report are Noam Chomsky, Michael Kazin, Maurice Isserman, Gerald Posner, David Belin, and Arlen Specter (reference Introduction for the latter two names). Chomsky in particular confused the public because he is a prominent opinion leader among intellectuals. Protocol V, is not only an effective technique for controlling public opinion on controversial topics, it is probably the most widespread propaganda tool employed today. [\(Footnote 64\)](#)

The third example—Protocol VII, *Worldwide Wars*—is extremely troubling because it advocates war. A serious observer of the Middle East cannot deny that Israel is one of the most war-mongering nations in history. The following text is an excerpt from Protocol VII:

UNIVERSAL WAR

[3.] We must be in a position to respond to every act of opposition by war with the neighbors of that country which dares to oppose us: but if these neighbors should also venture to stand collectively together against us, then we must offer resistance by a universal war.

[4.] The principal factor of success in the political is the secrecy of its undertakings: the word should not agree with the deeds of the diplomat.

[5.] We must compel the governments of the GOYIM to take action in the direction favored by our widely conceived plan, already approaching the desired consummation, by what we shall represent as public opinion, secretly promoted by us through the means of that so-called "Great Power" - THE PRESS, WHICH, WITH A FEW EXCEPTIONS THAT MAY BE DISREGARDED, IS ALREADY ENTIRELY IN OUR HANDS.

(Excerpt from the *Protocols of Zion: Protocol VII, Worldwide Wars*)

Protocol VII certainly explains the actions of President Johnson regarding the Six Day War and the Vietnam War. It also explains the blood-thirsty Likud-party prime ministers of Israel—Begin, Shamir, and Sharon—not to mention other aggressive leaders like David Ben Gurion.

Revised History of the Twentieth Century

The formation of the Jewish state in Palestine played a dominant role in world history throughout the Twentieth Century—particularly regarding World War I and II—although Western historians have largely ignored its significance. Over the years, many "alternative" historians have attempted to set the record straight, but their writings have been suppressed or their careers destroyed by Jewish political forces. In general, the new breed of historians take exception to the "official" explanations regarding the following historical events:

- ◆ US entry into World War I
- ◆ Anti-Jewish sentiment in Germany after World War I
- ◆ Hitler's conflict with Jewish political forces
- ◆ *The Night of Broken Glass* (aka, *Kristallnacht* and *November Pogroms*)
- ◆ The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor
- ◆ Details about Hitler's persecution of Jews

The first exception to conventional history—US entry into World War I—is similar to the Gulf of Tonkin incident which led to large-scale involvement in the Vietnam War by the United States military. When the World War I began in 1914, the conflict pitted Britain, France, and Russia on one side against Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey on the other. In 1917, the United States entered the war but for reasons that are somewhat ambiguous. The official explanation given was because a German submarine sank a French passenger ship, the SS *Sussex*. Some Americans were killed because they were passengers on the French vessel, but Germany did not intentionally attack an American target. That begs the question: Why would America declare war on Germany for sinking a French ship, especially when Germany was already at war with France? Most modern historians agree that the reasons for America's entrance into World War I are ambiguous, but they have little interest in exploring it farther. Benjamin Freedman gave a different explanation in a speech he delivered in Washington, DC in 1961. According to Freedman, the United States entered World War I for reasons far more complex than the sinking of a French vessel by a German submarine. The following text is an excerpt from Freedman's speech:

World War I broke out in the summer of 1914. There are few people here my age who remember that. Now that war was waged on one side by Great Britain, France, and Russia; and on the other side by Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey.

Within two years Germany had won that war: not only won it nominally, but won it actually. The German submarines, which were a surprise to the world, had swept all the convoys from the Atlantic Ocean. Great Britain stood there without ammunition for her soldiers, with one week's food supply -- and after that, starvation. At that time, the French army had mutinied. They had lost 600,000 of the flower of French youth in the defense of Verdun on the Somme. The Russian army was defecting, they were picking up their toys and going home, they didn't want to play war anymore, they didn't like the Czar. And the Italian army

had collapsed.

Not a shot had been fired on German soil. Not one enemy soldier had crossed the border into Germany. And yet, Germany was offering England peace terms. They offered England a negotiated peace on what the lawyers call a status quo ante basis. That means: "Let's call the war off, and let everything be as it was before the war started." England, in the summer of 1916 was considering that -- seriously. They had no choice. It was either accepting this negotiated peace that Germany was magnanimously offering them, or going on with the war and being totally defeated.

While that was going on, the Zionists in Germany, who represented the Zionists from Eastern Europe, went to the British War Cabinet and -- I am going to be brief because it's a long story, but I have all the documents to prove any statement that I make -- they said: "Look here. You can yet win this war. You don't have to give up. You don't have to accept the negotiated peace offered to you now by Germany. You can win this war if the United States will come in as your ally." The United States was not in the war at that time. We were fresh; we were young; we were rich; we were powerful.

They told England: "We will guarantee to bring the United States into the war as your ally, to fight with you on your side, if you will promise us Palestine after you win the war." In other words, they made this deal: "We will get the United States into this war as your ally. The price you must pay is Palestine after you have won the war and defeated Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey." Now England had as much right to promise Palestine to anybody, as the United States would have to promise Japan to Ireland for any reason whatsoever.

It's absolutely absurd that Great Britain, that never had any connection or any interest or any right in what is known as Palestine should offer it as coin of the realm to pay the Zionists for bringing the United States into the war. However, they did make that promise, in October of 1916. And shortly after that -- I don't know how many here remember it - - the United States, which was almost totally pro-German, entered the war as Britain's ally.

I say that the United States was almost totally pro-German because the newspapers here were controlled by Jews, the bankers were Jews, all the media of mass communications in this country were controlled by Jews; and they, the Jews, were pro-German. They were pro-German because many of them had come from Germany, and also they wanted to see Germany lick

the Czar. The Jews didn't like the Czar, and they didn't want Russia to win this war. These German-Jew bankers, like Kuhn Loeb and the other big banking firms in the United States refused to finance France or England to the extent of one dollar. They stood aside and they said: "As long as France and England are tied up with Russia, not one cent!" But they poured money into Germany, they fought beside Germany against Russia, trying to lick the Czarist regime.

Now those same Jews, when they saw the possibility of getting Palestine, went to England and they made this deal. At that time, everything changed, like a traffic light that changes from red to green. Where the newspapers had been all pro-German, where they'd been telling the people of the difficulties that Germany was having fighting Great Britain commercially and in other respects, all of a sudden the Germans were no good. They were villains. They were Huns. They were shooting Red Cross nurses. They were cutting off babies' hands. They were no good. Shortly after that, Mr. Wilson declared war on Germany.

The Zionists in London had sent cables to the United States, to Justice Brandeis, saying "Go to work on President Wilson. We're getting from England what we want. Now you go to work on President Wilson and get the United States into the war."^(Footnote 65) That's how the United States got into the war. We had no more interest in it; we had no more right to be in it than we have to be on the moon tonight instead of in this room. There was absolutely no reason for World War I to be our war. We were railroaded into—if I can be vulgar, we were suckered into—that war merely so that the Zionists of the world could obtain Palestine. That is something that the people of the United States have never been told. They never knew why we went into World War I.

After we got into the war, the Zionists went to Great Britain and they said: "Well, we performed our part of the agreement. Let's have something in writing that shows that you are going to keep your bargain and give us Palestine after you win the war." They didn't know whether the war would last another year or another ten years. So they started to work out a receipt. The receipt took the form of a letter, which was worded in very cryptic language so that the world at large wouldn't know what it was all about. And that was called the Balfour Declaration.

The Balfour Declaration was merely Great Britain's promise to pay the Zionists what they had agreed upon as a consideration for getting the United States into the war. So this great Balfour Declaration, that you hear so much about, is just as phony as a three dollar bill. I don't think I could make it more emphatic than that. ...

(Benjamin Freedman, excerpt from a speech at the Willard Hotel in Washington, DC, 1961)

The Balfour Declaration was a brief official communiqué reportedly written by Sir Arthur James Balfour,^(Footnote 66) British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and sent to Lord Lionel Walter Rothschild of the English Zionist Federation on November 2, 1917. The Balfour Declaration stated the following:

His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

(Balfour Declaration, November 2, 1917)

The second exception to conventional history—anti-Jewish sentiment in Germany after World War I—has never been adequately addressed by Western historians. Freedman gave the following explanation in his 1961 address:

.... The United States got in the war. The United States crushed Germany. You know what happened. When the war ended, and the Germans went to Paris for the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 there were 117 Jews there, as a delegation representing the Jews, headed by Bernard Baruch.^(Footnote 67) I was there: I ought to know. Now what happened? The Jews at that peace conference, when they were cutting up Germany and parceling out Europe to all these nations who claimed a right to a certain part of European territory, said, "How about Palestine for us?" And they produced, for the first time to the knowledge of the Germans, this Balfour Declaration. So the Germans, for the first time realized, "Oh, so that was the game! That's why the United States came into the war." The Germans for the first time realized that they were defeated, they suffered the terrific reparations that were slapped onto them, because the Zionists wanted Palestine and were determined to get it at any cost.

That brings us to another very interesting point. When the Germans realized this, they naturally resented it. Up to that time, the Jews had never been better off in any country in the world than they had been in Germany. You had Mr. Rathenau there, who was maybe 100 times as important in industry and finance as is Bernard Baruch in this country. You had Mr. Balin, who owned the two big steamship lines, the North German Lloyd's and the Hamburg-American Lines. You had Mr. Bleichroder, who was the banker for the Hohenzollern family. You had the

Warburgs in Hamburg, who were the big merchant bankers—the biggest in the world. The Jews were doing very well in Germany. No question about that. The Germans felt: "Well, that was quite a sellout."

It was a sellout that might be compared to this hypothetical situation: Suppose the United States was at war with the Soviet Union. And we were winning. And we told the Soviet Union: "Well, let's quit. We offer you peace terms. Let's forget the whole thing." And all of a sudden Red China came into the war as an ally of the Soviet Union. And throwing them into the war brought about our defeat. A crushing defeat, with reparations the likes of which man's imagination cannot encompass. Imagine, then, after that defeat, if we found out that it was the Chinese in this country, our Chinese citizens, who all the time we had thought were loyal citizens working with us, were selling us out to the Soviet Union and that it was through them that Red China was brought into the war against us. How would we feel, then, in the United States against Chinese? I don't think that one of them would dare show his face on any street. There wouldn't be enough convenient lampposts to take care of them. Imagine how we would feel.

Well, that's how the Germans felt towards these Jews. They'd been so nice to them: from 1905 on, when the first Communist revolution in Russia failed, and the Jews had to scramble out of Russia, they all went to Germany. And Germany gave them refuge. And they were treated very nicely. And here they had sold Germany down the river for no reason at all other than the fact that they wanted Palestine as a so-called "Jewish commonwealth."

Now Nahum Sokolow, and all the great leaders and great names that you read about in connection with Zionism today, in 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, and 1923 wrote in all their papers—and the press was filled with their statements—that the feeling against the Jews in Germany is due to the fact that they realized that this great defeat was brought about by Jewish intercession in bringing the United States into the war. The Jews themselves admitted that. It wasn't that the Germans in 1919 discovered that a glass of Jewish blood tasted better than Coca-Cola or Muenschner Beer. There was no religious feeling. There was no sentiment against those people merely on account of their religious belief. It was all political. It was economic. It was anything but religious. Nobody cared in Germany whether a Jew went home and pulled down the shades and said "Shema' Yisroel" or "Our Father." Nobody cared in Germany any more than they do in the United States. Now this feeling that developed later in Germany was due to one thing: the Germans held the Jews responsible for their crushing defeat.

(Benjamin Freedman, excerpt from a speech at the Willard Hotel in Washington, DC, 1961)

There is another reason why post-World War I Germans detested Jews. Popularly known as the "stab in the back theory," it was because the German Social Democratic Party (a Jewish-led communist regime) demobilized Germany's military at the end of World War I.¹⁷

A few months prior to the end of World War I, Russian Czar Nicholas Romanov abdicated the throne at the end of the Russian Revolution. In July 1918, the Bolsheviks executed the Czar at Yekaterinburg along with his immediate family.¹⁸

By autumn of 1918, German/Prussian Kaiser William II realized Germany would soon be defeated. On November 9, 1918, he fled to Holland because he feared the Bolshevik Communists would take over Germany as they did Russia and he would meet a similar fate as Czar Nicholas and his family. In the interim, the German government was taken over by the Jewish dominated Social Democratic Party. Fearful of being overthrown by more radical communists led by Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht (both Jewish), the Social Democratic Party demobilized the German armies.¹⁹ This put Germany in an extremely weak negotiating position with the Allied forces after the initial Armistice agreement on November 11, 1918. The original agreement did not require demobilization of German armies, only that all German armies withdraw to pre-war boundaries.²⁰ A fully armed Germany expected Wilson's Fourteen Points²¹ which he had formulated as the basis for a just peace. After the disarmament of its military, Germany got the Versailles Treaty which was extremely harsh. Again, this is what many people call the "stab in the back theory."

It appears that Germany actually got stabbed in the back twice by two different Jewish groups. Bernard Baruch et al inserted the first dagger by getting America into World War I in exchange for the promise of Palestine by Britain as specified in the Balfour Declaration. Later, Jewish Communists inserted the second dagger by demobilizing Germany's military before the Armistice agreement was finalized. As a result, Germany got the short end of the stick at Versailles.

The third exception to conventional history—Hitler's conflict with Jewish political forces—is quite a bit different than Western historians portray. Hitler became Chancellor of Germany in 1933. On that point, everyone agrees. But thereafter, things get muddy. Freedman summarized Hitler's problems with Jews as follows:

... After the Communist threat in Germany was quashed, the Jews were still working, trying to get back into their former status, and the Germans fought them in every way they could without hurting a single hair on anyone's head. They fought them the same way that, in this country, the Prohibitionists fought anyone who was interested in liquor. They didn't fight one another with pistols. Well, that's the way they were fighting the Jews in Germany. And at that time, mind you, there were 80 to 90 million Germans, and there were only 460,000 Jews. About one half of one per cent of the population of Germany were Jews. And yet

they controlled all the press, and they controlled most of the economy because they had come in with cheap money when the mark was devalued and bought up practically everything.

The Jews tried to keep a lid on this fact. They didn't want the world to really understand that they had sold out Germany, and that the Germans resented that.

The Germans took appropriate action against the Jews. They, shall I say, discriminated against them wherever they could. They shunned them. The same way that we would shun the Chinese, or the Negroes, or the Catholics, or anyone in this country who had sold us out to an enemy and brought about our defeat.

After a while, the Jews of the world called a meeting in Amsterdam. Jews from every country in the world attended this meeting in July 1933. And they said to Germany: "You fire Hitler, and you put every Jew back into his former position, whether he was a Communist or no matter what he was. You can't treat us that way. And we, the Jews of the world, are serving an ultimatum upon you." You can imagine what the Germans told them. So what did the Jews do?

In 1933, when Germany refused to surrender to the world conference of Jews in Amsterdam, the conference broke up, and Mr. Samuel Untermyer, who was the head of the American delegation and the president of the whole conference, came to the United States and went from the steamer to the studios of the Columbia Broadcasting System and made a radio broadcast throughout the United States in which he in effect said, "The Jews of the world now declare a Holy War against Germany. We are now engaged in a sacred conflict against the Germans. And we are going to starve them into surrender. We are going to use a world-wide boycott against them. That will destroy them because they are dependent upon their export business."

And it is a fact that two thirds of Germany's food supply had to be imported, and it could only be imported with the proceeds of what they exported. So if Germany could not export, two thirds of Germany's population would have to starve. There was just not enough food for more than one third of the population. Now in this declaration, which I have here, and which was printed in the New York Times on August 7, 1933, Mr. Samuel Untermyer boldly stated that "this economic boycott is our means of self-defense. President Roosevelt has advocated its use in the National Recovery Administration," which some of you may remember, where everybody was to be boycotted unless he followed the rules laid down by the New Deal, and which was

declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of that time.

Nevertheless, the Jews of the world declared a boycott against Germany, and it was so effective that you couldn't find one thing in any store anywhere in the world with the words "made in Germany" on it. In fact, an executive of the Woolworth Company told me that they had to dump millions of dollars worth of crockery and dishes into the river; that their stores were boycotted if anyone came in and found a dish marked "made in Germany," they were picketed with signs saying "Hitler," "murderer," and so forth, something like these sit-ins that are taking place in the South.

At a store belonging to the R. H. Macy chain, which was controlled by a family called Strauss who also happen to be Jews, a woman found stockings there which came from Chemnitz, marked "made in Germany." Well, they were cotton stockings and they may have been there 20 years, since I've been observing women's legs for many years and it's been a long time since I've seen any cotton stockings on them. I saw Macy's boycotted, with hundreds of people walking around with signs saying "murderers," "Hitlerites," and so forth. Now up to that time, not one hair on the head of any Jew had been hurt in Germany. There was no suffering, there was no starvation, there was no murder, there was nothing.

Naturally, the Germans said, "Who are these people to declare a boycott against us and throw all our people out of work, and make our industries come to a standstill? Who are they to do that to us?" They naturally resented it. Certainly they painted swastikas on stores owned by Jews. Why should a German go in and give his money to a storekeeper who was part of a boycott that was going to starve Germany into surrendering to the Jews of the world, who were going to dictate who their premier or chancellor was to be? Well, it was ridiculous. ...

(Benjamin Freedman, excerpt from a speech at the Willard Hotel in Washington, DC, 1961)

Ironically, the American Jewish Archives corroborated Freedman's description of Samuel Untermyer as a Zionist Jew who organized a boycott against German goods. The following is an excerpt from a biographical sketch on Untermyer (1858 - 1940) found in the Archives:

... After the advent of Hitlerism, Untermyer became president of the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League to Champion Human Rights, to counter Nazi propaganda and lead in the boycott of German goods. Other activity in the Jewish community included serving

as vice-president of the American Jewish Congress until 1926 and president of the Palestine Foundation Fund for several years. ...

(American Jewish Archives, March 2002²²)

The fourth exception to conventional history—*The Night of Broken Glass*—is presented by Western historians as a night, on November 9-10, 1938, when the Nazis brutally attacked Jews at Hitler's order because of their religion. The name, *Night of Broken Glass*, refers ironically to the litter of broken glass left in the streets after the night of rioting. It is also referred to as *Kristallnacht*, a German word meaning "crystal night." The following is Freedman's description of events:

.... The [international Jewish] boycott [against Germany] continued for some time, but it wasn't until [November 7] 1938, when a young Jew [Herschel Grynszpan] from Poland walked into the German embassy in Paris and shot a German [diplomat, Ernst vom Rath], that the Germans really started to get rough with the Jews in Germany. And you found them then breaking windows and having street fights and so forth.

(Benjamin Freedman, excerpt from a speech at the Willard Hotel in Washington, DC, 1961)

Western historians have traditionally underplayed the murder of vom Rath by Grynszpan. In fact, *The Night of Broken Glass* is often referred to as the *November Pogroms*. For example, Encyclopedia Britannica described vom Rath's murder as follows: "The pretext for the pogroms was the shooting in Paris on November 7 of the German diplomat Ernst vom Rath by a Polish-Jewish student, Herschel Grynszpan."²³ Historian David Irving,^(Footnote 68) however, found a memo sent by Hitler's deputy, Rudolf Hess, dated November 10, 1938. The Hess memo reveals that Hitler tried to protect Jews from arson attacks during the night of rioting. The following text is an English translation of the memo:

To all Gauleiter HQs for Immediate Action! Directive No. 174/38. Repeating Telex of November 10, 1938. On express orders from the very highest level arson attacks on Jewish businesses and such are not to occur under any circumstances or conditions whatever...²⁴

The Night of Broken Glass remains highly controversial amongst historians. Jewish political forces would have us believe that the Nazis terrorized innocent Jews without cause. Western historians acknowledge that a young Jew did in fact shoot and kill a German diplomat in Paris, but the incident is surprisingly viewed as unrelated.

According to Freedman, *The Night of Broken Glass* was not an official implementation of "pogroms" against Jews, but rather the culmination of tensions between German Gentiles toward Jews after a five-year Jewish boycott—instigated by

Samuel Untermyer—which hurt the German economy badly. In addition, German citizens felt betrayed by Jews over their defeat in World War I. When Herschel Grynszpan murdered German diplomat Ernst vom Rath, that was the last straw. Violent insurrections against Jews followed. Vom Rath's cold blooded murder by a young Jew had set off anti-Jewish furor that was difficult to contain. Emotions came pouring out—so much so that Hitler told Hess to issue a directive telling Nazi officials not to commit "arson attacks on Jewish businesses....under any circumstances or conditions whatever."

The fifth exception to conventional history—the Japanese attack of Pearl Harbor (Dec. 7, 1941)—has been shown by historians to be a ruse perpetrated by President Roosevelt to get America into the European war against Nazi Germany. Author Robert B. Stinnett^(Footnote 69) built a powerful case in his book, *Day of Deceit*, that Roosevelt had prior knowledge of the attack—which killed 2,400 military persons and wounded 1,100 more—and allowed it to happen, even encouraged it. Given that Roosevelt's top adviser, Bernard Baruch, was an ardent Zionist, Stinnett's explanation seems highly plausible.

In 1999, the US Senate voted to exonerate Hawaii commanders Admiral Husband E. Kimmel and Lieutenant General Walter Short for lack of preparedness after the Pentagon declared that blame should be "broadly shared."²⁵ Prior to Stinnett's work, researchers concluded that the US Government did not crack Japanese military codes before December 7, 1941; however, Stinnett provided numerous cables of decryptations to refute that claim. He also proved that a Japanese spy in Hawaii had transmitted information—including a map of the bombing target—beginning on August 21, 1941, and that American intelligence knew about it. In a word, Stinnett proved how Roosevelt allowed the attack to occur. The only part missing from his book, *Day of Deceit*, is Why. But Benjamin Freedman answered that question long ago when he delivered his speech in Washington, DC in 1961. Not only did he explain World Wars I and II, but he essentially predicted the Six Day War, the Vietnam War, The Persian Gulf War, and the present war with Afghanistan (in 2002). The following text is an excerpt from that speech:

... What do we face now [in 1961]? If we trigger a world war that may develop into a nuclear war, humanity is finished. Why might such a war take place? It will take place as the curtain goes up on Act 3: Act 1 was World War I, Act 2 was World War II, Act 3 is going to be World War III. The Jews of the world, the Zionists and their co-religionists everywhere, are determined that they are going to again use the United States to help them permanently retain Palestine as their foothold for their world government. That is just as true as I am standing here. Not alone have I read it, but many here have also read it, and it is known all over the world.

What are we going to do? The life you save may be your son's. Your boys may be on their way to that war tonight; and you don't know it any more than you knew that in 1916 in London the Zionists made a deal with the British War Cabinet to send your sons to war in Europe. Did you know it at that time? Not a person

in the United States knew it. You weren't permitted to know it. Who knew it? President Wilson knew it. Colonel House knew it. Other insiders knew it.

Did I know it? I had a pretty good idea of what was going on: I was liaison to Henry Morgenthau, Sr., in the 1912 campaign when President Wilson was elected, and there was talk around the office there. I was "confidential man" to Henry Morgenthau, Sr., who was chairman of the finance committee, and I was liaison between him and Rollo Wells, the treasurer. So I sat in these meetings with President Wilson at the head of the table, and all the others, and I heard them drum into President Wilson's brain the graduated income tax and what has become the Federal Reserve, and I heard them indoctrinate him with the Zionist movement. Justice Brandeis and President Wilson were just as close as the two fingers on this hand. President Woodrow Wilson was just as incompetent when it came to determining what was going on as a newborn baby. That is how they got us into World War I, while we all slept. They sent our boys over there to be slaughtered. For what? So the Jews can have Palestine as their "commonwealth." They've fooled you so much that you don't know whether you're coming or going.

(Benjamin Freedman, excerpt from a speech at the Willard Hotel in Washington, DC, 1961)

Prior to the Japanese attack of Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt was under heavy political pressure not to get the United States involved in military action against Germany. In 1940 and 1941, the America First Committee—led by Senator Gerald P. Nye—conducted Senate hearings which openly questioned the Zionist movement. Members of the Committee even accused Jewish movie moguls in Hollywood of stirring up war fever in various movie productions. Though failing in its campaigns to block the Lend-Lease Act, the use of the U.S. Navy for convoys, and the repeal of the Neutrality Act, its public pressure undoubtedly discouraged greater direct military aid to a Great Britain besieged by Nazi Germany. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor (Dec. 7, 1941), the committee dissolved and urged its members to support the war effort.²⁶

The sixth exception to conventional history—details about Hitler's persecution of Jews—is probably the most important of all. Actually, the politically correct word to use in this discussion is *Holocaust*. The word was introduced in 1978 in the TV mini-series, *The Holocaust*, directed by Marvin Chomsky and starred Meryl Streep and James Woods. Before 1978, the term Holocaust was not associated with Nazi Germany and Jews. In 1976, William Stevenson wrote a book, *A Man Called Intrepid*, which discussed the deaths of six million Jews during World War II a great deal, but Stevenson never used the term Holocaust because that term had not been introduced to the public in 1976.

It is difficult to discuss Hitler and the Holocaust openly because so many opinions are based on raw emotion, not intellect. One of the most controversial topics discussed today among intellectuals is the total number of Jews that died in Nazi Germany. The official number is six million. But there appears to be a double-standard among historians as to how they tallied the number of dead in the Holocaust versus the numbers killed in other atrocities.

It is amazing to me that historians are unable to agree on the number of German and Japanese civilians murdered by the allied forces in the fire-bombing of Dresden or the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Yet virtually all mainstream historians agree with great certainty that six million Jews died in Nazi Germany over a seven year period (1938-45) under the most clandestine circumstances. Dresden, Hiroshima and Nagasaki were there one day, gone the next. Determining the number dead in those three cities should be relatively uncomplicated, but for some reason, historians cannot agree. For a complex atrocity, everyone agrees; for simpler ones, everyone argues. This double-standard should raise red flags regarding the credibility of historians on this most controversial topic. Are historians being pressured to lie about the Holocaust? If so, why?

British historian David Irving has publicly stated his belief that the number of Jews who died in the Holocaust was intentionally inflated for political reasons. According to Irving, if the number of Jewish dead in the Holocaust was only a million, then Hitler was no more of a war criminal than Churchill, Roosevelt, Truman, or Stalin. In order to villainize Hitler for political purposes, the number of Jewish dead had to be exaggerated significantly. That is why the number six million is so important.

Endnotes

1. Encyclopedia Britannica: Pharisee
2. Benjamin Freedman, *Facts are Facts*, Part II, p. 1. Freedman cited an article by Rabbi Morris N. Kertzer (official spokesman for The American Jewish Committee) as his source. The article was "What is a Jew," *Look Magazine*, June 17, 1952. "The Talmud consists of 63 books of legal, ethical and historical writings of the ancient rabbis. It was edited centuries after the birth of Jesus. It is a compendium of law and lore. IT IS THE LEGAL CODE WHICH FORMS THE BASIS OF JEWISH RELIGIOUS LAW AND IT IS THE TEXTBOOK USED IN THE TRAINING OF RABBIS:" (emphasis supplied).
3. Encyclopedia Britannica: Inquisition
4. Holy Child of La Guardia: The complete record of testimony of the trial of one of the accused has been available since it was published in 1887 in the *Bulletin of the Royal Academy at Madrid* (Vol. XI, pp. 7-160), from the original manuscript.
5. Josephus, *Antiquities*, Book 18, Chapter 2, p. 2. (Caiaphas was appointed head of the Sanhedrin by Roman Governor Gratus in around AD 18.)
6. Josephus, *Antiquities*, Book 18, Chapter 4, p. 2. (Pilate served for ten years, then returned to Rome in AD 36 to meet with Emperor Tiberius regarding complaints made against him by Jews. Tiberius died before Pilate reached Rome.)
7. Josephus, *Antiquities*, Book 18, Chapter 4, p. 3. (Caiaphas was removed as head of the Sanhedrin by Roman Governor Vitellius in AD 36, and replaced by Jonathan, son of Ananus.)
8. King James Bible, John, 18:12 - 18:24
9. King James Bible, Matthew, 27:19
10. King James Bible, Matthew, 27:1 - 27:26
11. *ibid*
12. Josephus, *Antiquities*, Book 18, Chapter 4, p. 3. (Caiaphas and Pilate were relieved of their respective positions of authority in AD 36, about two or the years after Jesus was crucified.)

13. Philippians 3:5. The Apostle Paul boasted of being a Pharisee. Speaking of himself, Paul wrote: "Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee;"
14. John 8:59, King James Version
15. John 8:44, King James Version
16. Encyclopedia Britannica: Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion
17. Frank L. Britton, *Behind Communism* (1952), reference *Rosa Luxemburg's Revolution*, p 29
18. Encyclopedia Britannica: Romanov Dynasty
19. Frank L. Britton, *Behind Communism* (1952), reference *Rosa Luxemburg's Revolution*, p 29
20. *ibid*
21. Encyclopedia Britannica: *Treaty of Versailles*
22. American Jewish Archive: Excerpt from biographical sketch of Samuel Untermyer.
<http://www.huc.edu/aja/untermyer.htm>
23. Encyclopedia Britannica: Kristallnacht
24. Rudolf Hess's memo was obtained from David Irving's website. Irving stated that the memo was found in the Berlin Document Center: Ordner 240/1.
(<http://www.fpp.co.uk/Auschwitz/docs/Hess101138a.html>)
25. Robert Stinnett, *Day of Deceit*, written on book jacket; also corroborated in article by Jerrold Smith entitled *Pearl Harbor, and the Role of the Military in Our Society*.
http://www.acorn.net/jfkplace/09/fp.back_issues/33rd_Issue/pearl.html
26. Encyclopedia Britannica: America First Committee

Chapter 14: Conclusion

Camelot's Taboo Secret

There's an open secret about President Kennedy and his father that is widely known but rarely discussed thoroughly. They admired Adolf Hitler and were sympathetic to the goals of the German Nationalist Social Party. After reading Benjamin Freedman's version of World Wars I and II (reference Chapter 13) it's easy to understand why. And quite frankly, their opinions were probably more defensible than most people would care to admit. In his time, Hitler was extremely popular. He was Germany's new protector after their humiliating defeat in World War I and the ensuing Treaty of Versailles. It could be argued that he was also a colonialist and was merely doing to Britain, France and the Soviet Union what they had been doing to others for years. Consequently, it is quite understandable why a young John Kennedy wrote in his diary in 1945 that "he had in him the stuff of which legends are made."

But Kennedy's praise of this hated man only makes sense if you take exception to several historical events of the Twentieth Century (reference Chapter 13). It makes sense if you accept that US entry into World War I had more to do with the Balfour Declaration than the sinking of a French passenger ship—SS *Sussex*—by a German submarine. It makes sense if you accept that anti-Jewish sentiment in Germany after World War I was because the German people learned that Jewish moguls—Samuel Untermyer, Louis Brandeis, and Lionel Rothschild—lured America into the war against Germany in exchange for Palestine. It makes sense if you accept that Hitler's conflict with Jewish political forces intensified when Samuel Untermyer initiated a worldwide boycott of German goods which lasted five years (1933 - 1938) and badly hurt the German economy. It makes sense if you accept that *The Night of Broken Glass* was a German backlash after enduring Untermyer's five-year boycott which culminated with a Jewish student shooting and killing a German diplomat at the German embassy in Paris. It makes sense if you accept that the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was encouraged by President Roosevelt to get America into a second war against Germany. It makes sense if you accept that a great deal of hype has been added to Hitler's persecution of Jews.

If you accept these facts, then it is understandable why, in 1940, Kennedy wrote a book, entitled *Why England Slept*, which presented a fair-minded analysis of Neville Chamberlain's appeasement of Nazi Germany. It is also quite understandable why, in 1956, Kennedy—then a US Senator—indirectly criticized the Nuremberg Trials by naming Senator Robert Taft as a courageous profile in the acclaimed book, *Profiles in Courage*. Kennedy cited Taft for the "courageous act" of criticizing the Nuremberg Trials while they were in progress in 1946.

It is equally understandable why friends of Israel could not tolerate a Kennedy dynasty in the White House. "Goddamn the Kennedys," Clyde Tolson remarked to J. Edgar Hoover. "First there was Jack, now there's Bobby, and then Teddy. We'll have them on our necks until the year 2000." The director reportedly nodded in agreement.¹

Fallout From JFK's Assassination

One outcome of President Kennedy's assassination was nine years of heavy US military involvement in Vietnam. The effects of the long conflict were harsh for all involved. More than 47,000 Americans were killed in action, nearly 11,000 died of other causes, and more than 303,000 were wounded in the war. Casualty figures for the Vietnamese are far less certain. Estimates of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam's (ARVN) casualties range from 185,000 to 225,000 killed and 500,000 to 570,000 wounded. The North Vietnamese and Viet Cong suffered about 900,000 troops killed and an unknown, but huge, number of wounded. In addition, more than 1,000,000 North and South Vietnamese civilians were killed during the war. Parts of the countryside were scarred by bombs and defoliation, and some cities and towns were heavily damaged. By the war's end much of the population of South Vietnam had become refugees seeking an escape from the fighting. Agriculture, business, and industry had been disrupted. In the United States, Johnson's economic program for a "Great Society" had been largely halted by the economic and military demands of an unpopular war. The cost of the war has been estimated to have totaled about \$200 billion. With the communist victory in South Vietnam and communist takeovers in neighboring Cambodia and Laos, the new Vietnam emerged as an important Southeast Asian power.²

A second outcome of President Kennedy's assassination was a dramatic increase in heroin trafficking in the ensuing years. By 1971, it had reached epidemic proportions. In 1965 there were only 57,000 known heroin addicts in America. By 1969 the number had grown to 315,000. And by late 1971 the estimated total had jumped to 560,000—nearly ten times the amount in 1965. Army medical doctors were convinced, in 1971, that 10 to 15 percent of the GIs in Vietnam were heroin users.³ On June 17, 1971 Nixon declared that heroin addiction was "Public Enemy No. 1,"^(Footnote 70) and he targeted Auguste Joseph Ricord for extradition from Paraguay and subsequent prosecution in the US for large-scale heroin smuggling.⁴

A third outcome of President Kennedy's assassination was the Six Day War, a watershed event that transformed Israel from a small nation into a colonial empire. Although Israel became a nation in 1948, it expanded dramatically after the Six Day War. Israel took from the Arabs—through military force—the Old City of Jerusalem, the Sinai and the Gaza Strip, the Jordanian territory west of the Jordan River known as the West Bank, and the Golan Heights, on the Israeli-Syrian border.⁵ In addition to acquiring new land, Israel gained control of an additional 900,000 Arabs who became the discontented subjects of the new Israeli empire. Since 1967, the number of Arabs under Israel's military control has grown to over 1.75 million.⁶

Amnesty International has documented Israel's inhumane treatment of its Palestinian subjects citing arbitrary arrests, torturing detainees, destroying or sealing the homes of Arab suspects and their relatives, confiscating land, destroying crops, and diverting precious water from thirsty Palestinians in the desert to fill the swimming pools and water the lawns of Israeli settlers.⁷ This conduct is condoned, embraced, and encouraged by the United States through its steadfast financial and military support of Israel. Today, US tax payers spend approximately \$3 billion annually to subsidize, support, and arm Israel. Although Israel is a wealthy country by western standards, it receives more American foreign aid money, 28 percent, than any other country.⁸

Points of Discussion

There are several points that I believe are relevant to the assassination but need further clarification. First of all, I believe I have shown a strong Mafia presence in the assassination; however, there was not a vendetta against President Kennedy because he had "double-crossed" them. The Mafia's role was purely mercenary. A new source of opium was needed for heroin production and Kennedy's death allowed American and French-Corsican crime syndicates to utilize Southeast Asia for this purpose once Kennedy was replaced by Johnson who quickly escalated the war. I have further demonstrated that Meyer Lansky was the primary American mobster involved in the assassination, but he was also Jewish which links him to the Jewish conspiracy. Santo Trafficante may have had prior knowledge of the assassination, but only because he was Lansky's top lieutenant. In addition, Jack Ruby apparently worked directly for Lansky. It is also highly significant that Lansky and other Jewish gangsters were the first of the American Mafia to deal in heroin back in the 1920s. The Sicilians had a code of honor that forbade narcotics trafficking and prostitution (reference Introduction). Given Lansky's vast experience with narcotics trafficking, it may have been his idea to use heroin as the "glue" to hold the rivaling factions of the conspiracy together. But there is little doubt that the forces behind the coup were much bigger than he was.

Second point: Many "left-wing historians" tend to lump Alan Dulles and John Foster Dulles together as symbols of right-wing ideology. Although they were both Cold Warriors, their views about Israel were quite different. Alan was a Zionist but John Foster had little use for Israel. While running the OSS during World War II, Alan Dulles worked extensively with American Jews who later acquired a great deal of stature. Examples include Arthur Goldberg, future Supreme Court Justice, and William Paley, future president of CBS. On the other hand, John Foster Dulles fully supported President Eisenhower's efforts to contain Israel's expansion. In Chapter 10 I described how Eisenhower and J. F. Dulles were particularly harsh with Israel when Ben-Gurion conspired with France and Britain to attack Egypt during the Suez Crisis (1956-57). Both John Foster Dulles and President Eisenhower held views about Israel that were identical to those held by President Kennedy and his father. If anything, Dulles and Eisenhower were more open about their disdain for the Jewish state than were the Kennedys.

Third point: President Nixon acquired vast insight about Israel during his vice-presidency with Eisenhower. As I pointed out in Chapter 10, Eisenhower was perhaps the strongest president in the 20th Century regarding Israel. No other president in the last fifty years has forced Israel to behave the way Eisenhower did during the Suez Crisis. Nixon obviously learned a great deal from that episode.

Fourth point: The Suez Crisis of 1956-57 and the Six Day War of 1967 were both Israel's efforts to seize Arab land by force. In Chapter 10, I pointed out that the primary difference between the two assaults was the outcome. In 1956-57, Israel lost militarily and was humiliated by negative worldwide condemnation. Ten years later, they were successful. In both instances, they attacked Egypt and tried to overthrow President Nasser. He was hated by the Israelis because he was a unifying force among Arab nations, plus he demonstrated time and time again that he could not be bought off by the West. In 1956-57, President Eisenhower, Secretary of State John Foster

Dulles, and UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld were united in their efforts to contain Israel and force it to abide by international law.

Had it not been for Lyndon Johnson—then Senate Majority Leader—the UN would have imposed economic sanctions on Israel in 1957 for not withdrawing its forces from the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza Strip in the wake of the failed attack on Egypt. Johnson rallied support for Israel in the Senate, plus he wrote a letter to Secretary of State Dulles on Israel's behalf. The letter was published in the *New York Times* on February 20, 1957. A few months later, John Kennedy—then a US Senator—gave a signal to the Eisenhower Administration and Israel that he would not bow to the whims of the Jewish State if elected president. On July 2, 1957, Kennedy delivered a speech on the floor of the Senate condemning France for its colonial occupation of Algeria and for waging a brutal war against that nation. Israel did not support independence for Algeria because that meant the rise of another Arab state. Kennedy's support for Algerian independence was also a message to Israel: Behave!

By 1967, things had changed a great deal over the ten years leading up to the Six Day War. Israel's most influential adversaries had either died or left public office. Eisenhower had retired years earlier and was in failing health. John Foster Dulles had died of cancer in 1959. Dag Hammarskjöld had been killed in a mysterious plane crash in the Congolese province of Katanga in 1961. President Kennedy of course had been assassinated in Dallas in 1963. And Israel's old ally, Lyndon Johnson, had become Commander-in-Chief of the United States. In July of 1965, President Johnson had appointed Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg as US ambassador to the UN. Goldberg—a Jew and ardent supporter of Israel—replaced Adlai Stevenson as US delegate to the UN after Stevenson died suddenly of a heart attack on July 14, 1965. The Yemen War had been eroding Arab unity since the conflict began in 1962 (reference Chapter 10). By 1967, Egyptian forces had suffered heavy losses and were weakened after five years of military involvement in the Yemen War. Whether these events were random or planned is anyone's guess, but they were definitely advantageous to Israel by the time the Six Day War occurred in 1967.

Fifth point: Lyndon Johnson's damage control in the wake of the Suez Crisis has been erased from the history books. This more than anything else points to collusion among Johnson, Israel, the American news media and book-publishing industry. This more than anything else indicates that Johnson was a point man for Israel in the US Senate. This more than anything else makes Johnson a prime suspect as a co-conspirator in the assassination of President Kennedy. I have read numerous accounts of the Suez Crisis and have never seen anything about Johnson's letter to Secretary of State Dulles which was printed in the *New York Times* on February 20, 1957. Ironically, the only place where I read anything about Johnson's 1957 damage control for Israel—other than in the *New York Times* itself—was from the pen of Louis Bloomfield in his 1957 book, *Egypt, Israel and the Gulf of Aqaba*, p. 152. As I pointed out before, Bloomfield was likely the man who masterminded the assassination of the President Kennedy (reference Introduction, and Chapters 3, 4, & 5).

Sixth point: One of the reasons for Nixon's diplomatic success with China in 1972 was his personal rapport with Chinese Premier Chou En-lai. It has been widely documented that Chou En-lai liked Nixon on a personal level, but few people

understand why. If we recall the Opium Wars of the 19th Century (reference Chapter 11), then it becomes quite obvious why Chou En-lai liked Nixon. The Chinese leader realized the Nixon was making a serious effort to stop Western opium smuggling, something that was used as a weapon against the Chinese until the Communists took over in 1949 and banned all narcotics. Nixon's pursuit of August Ricord demonstrated that he was changing the Anglo-French-American exploitation of Asia through opium and heroin smuggling. In Chapter 11, I pointed out that Chou En-lai reportedly told Nasser, in 1965, that he was going to use opium as a weapon against American soldiers in Vietnam the same way the West has used it against China. Nixon had demonstrated through his actions that he believed the practice of smuggling narcotics was wrong. Apparently this made quite an impression on Chou En-lai.

Seventh point: Many historians have incorrectly labeled Joseph Kennedy Sr as someone who cared only about money. It is certainly true that he acquired a vast fortune, but that alone does not prove that attaining financial success was his primary interest. It is quite obvious that the elder Kennedy believed Zionist expansion was a threat to the United States and he did everything he could to stop it. This would have been an unwise position to take if he only cared about money. Furthermore, he supported British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's appeasement of Hitler. And he continued to hold that belief after World War II. I also believe he knowingly encouraged his sons to risk their lives in this endeavor. It has been well-documented that he believed President Roosevelt had his eldest son, Joe Jr, killed in a top secret bombing mission in order to prevent him from becoming president. Nevertheless, he still encouraged his younger son, John, to continue the same fight. These were not the actions of a man who was driven purely by money.

Eighth point: Historians should point out that David Ben-Gurion, the so-called "Father of Israel," renounced Zionism before he died. In his later years, Ben-Gurion stated the following: "I'm no longer a Zionist, I'm no longer a Socialist, I don't belong to [Histadrut](#), I resigned from the Knesset."⁹ I believe Ben-Gurion was demoralized by President Kennedy's assassination. He resigned as prime minister on June 16, 1963, six days after Kennedy's eloquent American University speech which expressed the hope for world peace. It is my suspicion, however, that Nahum Goldmann (president of the World Jewish Congress) issued the order to kill Kennedy immediately after the American University speech. I further suspect that Ben-Gurion was personally moved by Kennedy's eloquent words and refused to participate in the plot to kill him. That is probably the real reason for his resignation. Ben-Gurion may have had an epiphany of sorts after hearing or reading Kennedy's speech and was apparently overcome with shame at the thought of plotting to kill such a wise man. Michael Collins Piper suggested in his book, *Final Judgment*, that Ben-Gurion resigned in order to go underground and set up Kennedy's assassination. In my view, Piper's contention that Ben-Gurion was the mastermind is thoroughly refuted by Ben-Gurion's later rejection of Zionism.

Ninth point: Martin Luther King made a mistake by supporting the Black-Jewish Alliance. This coalition was doomed for a couple of reasons. In the 20th Century, the Ku Klux Klan had more of a vendetta against Jews than blacks. White supremacy had been a big issue for the Klan immediately after the Civil War, but they disbanded in 1869 once their goals were achieved. The Klan was revived again in the early part of the 20th Century primarily to fight Jewish immigration from Czarist Russia. Secondly,

Martin Luther King was a Christian and the Talmud is secretly anti-Christian (reference [Appendix C](#)).

Fifteen-Year Reign of Terrorist Likud Party

In 1973, Menachem Begin—former terrorist—formed the ultra-right political party by merging his former terrorist organization, Irgun Zvai Leumi, with several other political groups including the Haganah (reference Chapter 8). In 1977, Begin was elected Prime Minister of Israel and the Likud Party ruled with an iron fist over Israel for the next fifteen years. During that period, Begin was prime minister for six years and Shamir for seven.^(Footnote 71) It was during this period that Israel constantly fought with Lebanon which culminated with the Israeli massacres at Sabra and Shatilla. The Jonathan Pollard spy incident also occurred during that period.

Bush and Clinton Attempted to Make Peace in the Middle East

Presidents George H. W. Bush and William J. Clinton made serious attempts to establish a genuine peace between Israel and the PLO. In October 1991, the Bush Administration initiated the Madrid Conference which was an attempt to enforce UN Resolutions 242 and 338.^(Footnote 72) Bush was evidently using his high approval ratings—a direct result of the Persian Gulf War—as leverage to enforce the stated Resolutions. Although Bush was apparently sincere, the chances for an Israeli commitment to peace were slim given that Yitzhak Shamir—harder-liner and former terrorist—was Prime Minister of Israel and head of the ultra-right Likud Party.^(Footnote 73) But in June 1992, the Likud Party's fifteen-year reign ended with the election of Yitzhak Rabin, head of the Labour Party. This was a major shift in Israeli politics. It seemed as though peace might finally prevail between the PLO and Israel.

The negotiations at the Madrid Conference were delayed because of a change in leadership in America. Bush's popularity plummeted which led to his subsequent defeat in the fall elections of 1992 by Bill Clinton.^(Footnote 74) Shortly after Clinton took office in January 1993, Norway intervened as mediator in the peace process. The end result was the Oslo Accords which were announced in the fall. On September 13, 1993 President Clinton hosted a signing ceremony at the White House for the Oslo Accords. The ceremony was attended by all interested parties including Yasser Arafat, until then persona non grata in the United States.¹⁰ Per the accords, Israel recognized the PLO and agreed to gradually implement limited self-rule for Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.¹¹ The Accords specifically stated that UN Resolutions 242 and 338 would finally be implemented. The future seemed bright, but hopes of peace slowly evaporated as events unfolded.

The driving force behind the Oslo Accords was Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Johan Joergen Holst. The Norwegian statesman initiated eleven secret negotiations between the PLO and Israel from April to August 1993. In fact, he hosted the first several secret meetings at his country home in Smestad, with others at the Borregaard estate mansion east of Oslo and the Oslo Plaza Hotel.¹²

On January 13, 1994, four months after the signing of the Oslo Accords, Johan Joergen Holst died unexpectedly in Norway of a heart attack at the age of 56.¹³

On November 4, 1995, Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated by Yigal Amir, an Israeli of Yemenite origin. (Reference [Appendix B](#) for an article—*A Mother's Defense*—written by the assassin's mother, Guela Amir, and published in the March 1997 edition of *George Magazine*,^(Footnote 73) p. 138.)

The Death of Vince Foster

Deputy White House Counsel Vincent W. Foster's body was found in Fort Marcy Park, Fairfax County, Virginia, on July 20, 1993. His death was perhaps one of the most damaging scandals in the administration of President Clinton. Foster died of a gunshot wound, and his death was immediately ruled suicide by the United States Park Police. There is little doubt, however, that Foster was [murdered](#) and it is quite obvious that there was a cover-up—two topics I will address shortly. But for now, let us focus on the motive.

Rumors circulated that Foster was spying for Israel, that he was the victim of a Mossad hit squad, the CIA, the Mafia, and so on. No one, however, has connected his death with the Oslo Accords. I believe it is quite possible that Foster attended the secret meetings in Norway, held by the late Johan Joergen Holst, that led to the Oslo Accords. Certainly a representative from the Clinton Administration was present. He was likely working on behalf of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton who later emerged as an advocate for a Palestinian State. I further believe that Foster's death was probably a signal sent to Hillary by Likud radicals warning her to stay out of Middle Eastern affairs. The message was clear: No Palestinian state. The following facts support this assertion.

First of all, Foster's death occurred during the time-frame of the secret negotiations. As previously stated, Foster died on July 20, 1993. The secret negotiations between the PLO and Israel occurred from April to August 1993 in Norway.

Secondly, Foster's death was followed by the deaths of Johan Joergen Holst and Yitzhak Rabin, both key players in the Oslo Accords. This is highly suspicious. Holst died on January 13, 1994, just six months after Foster. As Rabin began to implement the Oslo Accords, he was shot and killed on November 4, 1995, by Yigal Amir, an Israeli of Yemenite origin. His mother, Guela Amir, claims that he was goaded into assassinating Rabin by an agent provocateur working for Israeli Intelligence.

(Reference [Appendix B](#) for Guela Amir's article in *George Magazine*, March 1997, p. 138.)

Thirdly, Foster and Hillary had a symbiotic relationship. Clinton's former bodyguard, Arkansas State Trooper Larry Douglass Brown, stated in several interviews that he was aware of a serious and longstanding affair between Foster and Hillary—then partners at the famed Rose law firm—dating back to the mid-1980s. In addition to being one of Clinton's preferred bodyguards, Brown's wife-to-be, Becky McCoy, was

Chelsea's nanny.¹⁴ According to Brown, Foster and Hillary were clearly in love, but it was an affair of the mind more than anything else. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard wrote in his book, *The Secret Life of Bill Clinton*: "Foster was devoted. He would do anything for her. And she took advantage of that. There was no one else in the world that she could trust more than Vince Foster."¹⁵ Roger Morris described the complexities of Foster's relation with Hillary in his book, *Partners in Power*:

There would be several sources—including a former US attorney, sometimes aides, a number of lawyers, social friends, and many of the same troopers who testified about the governor's illicit acts—who described the First Lady's affair, dating to the mid-1980s, with Rose partner Vince Foster. A relationship evident in the semiprivate kisses and furtive squeezes at parties and dinners described by the security guards, it was also an intimate professional bond between two attorneys who worked together on some of their firm's most sensitive cases. Along with Webster Hubbell, they staged a veritable coup d'état to wrest control of the Rose firm in 1988. Many thought that the governor was well aware of the affair and ultimately accepted it as one more implicit bargain in their marriage. Clinton continued to treat Vince Foster as the close friend he had been since childhood in Hope, even entrusting him with some of the most crucial secrets of the 1992 campaign. "Bill knew, of course he knew," said a lawyer close to Foster who was familiar with them all. "But what the hell was *he* supposed to say to anybody about being faithful?"

To some, Hillary's relationship with Vince Foster, a tall, handsome, courtly figure who was widely respected in the Little Rock legal and business community, was an understandable and natural response to her husband's behavior. Foster was known to treat her with dignity, respect, and abiding love she was missing in her marriage. "He adored her," said a fellow lawyer. Under other circumstances, it might have been one of those relationships that remained private and without any political relevance to the Clinton presidency. What set it apart was that, once in the White House, the Clintons would install the First Lady's confidant in one of the nation's most sensitive positions as deputy counsel to the president, where he would handle controversial matters stemming from their Arkansas past as well as highly classified presidential affairs.¹⁶

Fourthly, Foster kept tabs on President Clinton for Hillary. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard wrote that Foster had solicited the services of security executive Jerry Parks, in 1989, to perform discreet surveillance on Clinton—then Governor of Arkansas. When Parks asked why he needed this done, Foster said he needed it for Hillary. She was apparently gauging his vulnerability to charges of philandering if he decided to launch a bid for the presidency.¹⁷ Parks was murdered on September 26, 1993—just two months after Foster's death. A professional assassin shot him several times in Little Rock in front of several astonished witnesses.¹⁸ According to his widow, Jane Parks,

her husband had carried out sensitive assignments for the Clinton circle for almost a decade, and the person who gave him his instructions was Vince Foster.¹⁹

Media Cover Story: Foster Was Depressed

The role of Jewish journalists in covering up important facts about Foster's death cannot be understated. The following Jewish journalists and authors flooded the printed media with articles supporting the cover story that Foster was depressed, something that is completely unsubstantiated:

- ♦ **Michael Isikoff** – Washington Post reporter who first revealed the existence of a suicide note containing names of psychiatrists; however, the story changed without explanation. Isikoff also wrote that police were turned away from the Foster house, a lie.
- ♦ **Walter Pincus** – Washington Post CIA beat reporter. Pincus acknowledged knowing Foster personally and was the first to write that he had noticed Foster out of sorts emotionally, without actually saying "depressed." This gave the public the clear impression that Foster was depressed.
- ♦ **Sidney Blumenthal** – Wrote a New Yorker article making the case of Foster's depression. The New Yorker was the first national magazine to aggressively claim that Foster suffered from depression. Blumenthal was the first to write that Foster had lost 15 pounds, though he gave no source for that information. In reality, Foster had actually gained weight since arriving in Washington.
- ♦ **Frank Rich** – New York Times columnist who was the first to lay out the psychological theory of *excessive perfectionism* as cause of suicide.²⁰

Other Jewish journalists propagated misleading information about the Foster case. An example is Chris Ruddy, a former writer for the New York Post. Although he has never admitted it, Ruddy is almost certainly Jewish. He attended Hebrew University and has been heavily praised by Rabbi Morton Pomerantz. "The Jewish people have survived because we believe in truth and courage and we respect tenacity. David is our hero, not Goliath. [Chris] Ruddy has lived up to that ideal," (Rabbi Morton Pomerantz, from *Journalist Who Dealt With Holocaust Survivors Takes on Vincent Foster and Mike Wallace; The Jewish Voice and Opinion*, Vol. 9, No. 4, December 1995). Ruddy pretends to be a critic of Clinton White House and the official version of the Foster case, but his criticism is fumbling and half-hearted.

A second example is Mike Wallace who interviewed Ruddy on *60 Minutes* (CBS) on October 8, 1995 about the Foster case. Wallace created the impression that Ruddy's investigation of the Foster case was shoddy. By tainting Ruddy's credibility, Wallace suggested that the notion of murder was out of the question.

Other prominent Jews were entangled in the Foster case as well. They included the following:

- ♦ **Nathan Landow** – Foster spent the last weekend of his life meeting with Webb Hubbell and Landow on latter's estate. Landow was Al Gore's leading financial backer when he first ran for president. Landow is a major political contributor and has been linked to both the Gambino family and the Meyer Lansky organization through joint casino investments.
- ♦ **William Styron** – Prominent novelist who wrote a cover article in Newsweek concluding that Foster killed himself from depression. His novel, *Sophie's Choice*, is about the Holocaust.
- ♦ **Bernard Nussbaum** – Foster's boss as Chief White House Counsel. Claimed to have emptied out briefcase where a subordinate later turned up the torn-up "suicide" note.
- ♦ **Susan Thomases** – New York lawyer and Clinton political adviser who told writer James Stewart that Foster confided to her he was having marital problems.²¹

Other Mysterious Deaths

Scores of people associated with the Kennedy assassination have died violently. But two in particular stand out because of the victims' high social status. They were George de Mohrenschildt and William Sullivan. Both were prominent men—the latter had served as deputy director at the FBI—and were scheduled to meet with the House Select Committee on Assassinations when they were killed.

On March 29, 1977, George de Mohrenschildt was found dead of a gunshot blast to the head at his sister-in-law's fashionable home in Manalapan, Florida. De Mohrenschildt had been Oswald's handler in Dallas (reference Chapter 6). His death was ruled suicide.²² He died three hours after arranging to meet investigator, Gaeton Fonzi,^(Footnote 76) from the House Select Committee on Assassinations.²³ Earlier that day, de Mohrenschildt had met with writer Edward Jay Epstein.²⁴

Epstein is a highly suspicious individual. In 1969, he wrote *Counterplot* which attacked Garrison and his prosecution of Clay Shaw. Epstein wrote another propagandistic book, *Legend* (1978), which pushed the cover story that the Soviet KGB sponsored the Kennedy assassination, and that Oswald was working for them. In 1966, Epstein wrote *Inquest*, a mild critique of the Warren Report which was hailed by the media—a telling indictment of his virtue.

On November 9, 1977, William Sullivan—number two man at the FBI when Kennedy was shot and killed with a high-powered rifle near his home in New Hampshire. Sullivan had just completed a preliminary meeting with investigators for the House Select Committee on Assassinations. The man who shot him was the son of a state policeman and claimed to have mistaken Sullivan for a deer. He was arrested, charged with a misdemeanor—"shooting a human being by accident"—and released into the custody of his father. No further investigation was ever done.²⁵ In addition, Sullivan was finishing an exposé on Hoover's FBI, with journalist Bill Brown, when he was killed. Two years later, Brown published Sullivan's book entitled, *The Bureau: My Thirty Years in Hoover's FBI*. It was a major indictment of J. Edgar Hoover and Lyndon Johnson.

Deaths of Rock Stars

The untimely deaths of rock stars have troubled me for years. The first name that comes to mind is [John Lennon](#) who was assassinated by Mark Chapman in front of his home in New York City on December 8, 1980. He was 40. In recent years, his younger son—Sean Lennon—made the following comments about his father's death:^(Footnote 77)

[He] was a counterrevolutionary and was very dangerous to the government. If he had said 'Bomb the White House tomorrow,' there would have been 10,000 people who would have done it. The pacifist revolutionaries are historically killed by the government, and anybody who thinks Mark Chapman was just some crazy guy who killed my dad for his own personal interest is insane or very naive. It was in the best interest of the United States to have my dad killed. And you know, that worked against them, because once he died, his power grew. So I mean, fuck them! They didn't get what they wanted.²⁶

In addition to being a counterrevolutionary, John Lennon was certainly not a friend of Jews. Although he had many Jewish business associates, he clearly held certain Jews in low esteem and did not hesitate to express his views publicly. In the latter days of the Beatles, John nearly agreed to allow John Eastman—Paul McCartney's Jewish brother-in-law and attorney—^(Footnote 78) to manage the quartet. But after meeting Eastman, Lennon withdrew his support because of Eastman's abrasive demeanor. Lennon sarcastically labeled Eastman's communication skills during their first meeting as an "epileptic fit."²⁷ Lennon made the following remarks about Eastman's ethnicity in a 1970 interview with *Rolling Stone*:

They're fucking bastards, they're—Eastman's a WASP Jew, man! And that's the worst kind of Jew on earth, that's the worst kind of WASP too—he's a WASP Jew, can you imagine it!²⁸

Ironically, all of Lennon's managers were Jewish. The Beatles original manager, Brian Epstein, was Jewish. So was Alan Klein who became Epstein's replacement, much to the chagrin of McCartney and his brother-in-law. Based on his comments about Eastman, it appears that Lennon viewed all Jews with a degree of contempt, but apparently wanted one to handle his business affairs because—as I pointed out in the Introduction—the entertainment industry in America is run almost exclusively by Jews. Lennon apparently understood this.

In addition to Lennon, three prominent rock stars—who were headline acts at the celebrated Woodstock rock festival—died about a year after the legendary event. They were Jimi Hendrix, Janis Joplin, and Al Wilson. The latter is less known than Hendrix or Joplin, but Wilson was one of the founding members of *Canned Heat*, one

of the hottest blues bands of the era. All three died from heroin-related causes. [\(Footnote 79\)](#)

The Woodstock Festival—August 15–17, 1969—brought about the harmonious gathering of about 400,000 young rock-music devotees and marked what is considered the high point of the American youth counterculture of the 1960s. It was also viewed by many as a powerful political statement against US involvement in the Vietnam War at a time when American forces were at an all-time high: 540,000 soldiers. Jimi Hendrix played a dramatic virtuoso rendition of *The Star Spangled Banner* on a screeching electric guitar that simulated the sounds of bombs dropping, explosions blasting, and machine guns firing, combined with the melody line of America's national anthem presented as an avante-garde work of musical art before the huge gathering of spellbound American youths.

Al Wilson, guitarist for Canned Heat, was the first to meet his premature demise. He died on September 3, 1970 at the age of 27. A shroud of mystery surrounds his death. Some suggest it was a heroin overdose, others say suicide. His band, *Canned Heat*, was reportedly the third highest paid act at Woodstock. In addition, they were one of the few bands at the concert who could draw huge crowds in their own right. [29](#)

Jimi Hendrix was the second casualty. On September 18, 1970, just two weeks after Wilson's death, Hendrix was found dead in London, England from a drug overdose. He was also 27.

Janis Joplin was next. On October 4, 1970, two weeks after Hendrix's death, Joplin was also found dead from a drug overdose in Los Angeles, California. She too was 27. Like Hendrix, she was an incredibly charismatic, high-energy performer.

Within a year, two other legendary rock stars died: Jim Morrison (July 3, 1971, heart attack, [\(Footnote 80\)](#) age 27), Duane Allman [\(Footnote 81\)](#) (October 29, 1971 motorcycle accident, age 24).

A week before Woodstock began, the "Charles Manson Family" committed the ritualistic murders of actress Sharon Tate and several friends at her home in California on August 9, 1969. The bizarre hippie Family also murdered Leno LaBianca and his wife Rosemary around the same time. Manson had the look of a charismatic rock star [\(Footnote 82\)](#)—shoulder-length hair, beard and mustache, and a sullen stare—and his followers were mostly young "hippie" women in their late teens or early twenties. By appearances, they would have fit in perfectly with the young female groupies at Woodstock.

Manson—who was in his mid-thirties in 1969—used LSD as a form of mind-control over his followers, although he rarely used it himself. This technique has been well-documented as a procedure used by the CIA in various mind-control experiments. In addition, state prosecutors built a case against Manson claiming that he was inspired by the lyrics from the Beatles *White Album*. Vincent Bugliosi, the LA District Attorney who prosecuted Manson, wrote a book, *Helter Skelter*, named after one of the Beatle songs that allegedly caused the Manson Family to commit mass-murder.

On December 6, 1969, just four months after Woodstock, the Rolling Stones gave a nightmarish concert at the Altamont Motor Speedway outside of San Francisco. The Stones were the headliners and someone convinced them that using Hell's Angels as security would be useful. While performing *Sympathy for the Devil* several of the Angels murdered a concert-goer—all in view of the performers. Three other people were murdered by the Angels. Other bands at the concert included the Grateful Dead, the Jefferson Airplane, [Footnote 83](#) and Ike and Tina Turner. In 1970, Albert and David Maysles released a film documentary of the tragic event entitled *Gimme Shelter*.

The impact of these events on rock music was devastating. The Manson Family's ritualistic murders tainted the carefree image of flower children. In addition, District Attorney Vincent Bugliosi attempted to tarnish the music of the Beatles by building his entire case against Manson on *Helter Skelter*, a Beatle song from their White Album. The violent murders of four people at the Rolling Stones concert at Altamont created the illusion that only thugs attended rock concerts. The deaths of five major rock stars—mostly from drug overdoses—within 14 months of Woodstock dramatically slowed the momentum of the rock music phenomenon as a vehicle for artistic and political expression. It also fed the stereotype that all rock musicians were drug addicts. These events had a chilling effect that seriously weakened the youth counterculture movement which expressed itself through rock music. It has never recovered.

As previously stated, the Woodstock rock festival was not merely a large musical gathering. It was also 400,000 young Americans thumbing their noses at Uncle Sam and his war in Vietnam. Woodstock occurred just seven months after Lyndon Johnson abdicated his leadership, thereby leaving 540,000 American soldiers—mostly draftees—in Southeast Asia. Anyone who thinks that Uncle Sam was not intimidated by the solidarity demonstrated by America's youth at Woodstock—well, to quote Sean Lennon, they're either "insane or very naïve."

Ironically, America's youth tended to associate President Nixon with the problems in Vietnam. But as I pointed out in Chapter 12, his view of the war was apparently little different from theirs.

Waco

After the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, the mission of US intelligence agencies shifted from fighting the spread of communism to fighting terrorism. Ironically the war on terrorism began a few years after the FBI's brutal attack on the Branch Davidians in Waco, Texas, on April 19, 1993, in which approximately eighty civilians were killed. Independent investigator Carol Valentine has brought to [public attention](#) several aspects about the incident that are deeply disturbing—human carnage notwithstanding.

First of all, the American public does not realize that Davidian leader David Koresh taught that Israel was not necessary to fulfil the prophecies. Koresh's religious teachings were an amalgam of Islam and Christianity. In fact, Koresh was the family name of Muhammad, the founder of Islam. As Koresh's popularity grew, he became a

target of the US government because of his religious teachings. As I pointed out before, America has been under siege by Zionist forces throughout most of the Twentieth Century. For all intents and purposes the US government was overthrown with the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963 who was replaced by mega-Zionist Lyndon Johnson. Consequently, people like Koresh became enemies of the state. His teachings of Islam and Christianity as a unified religion—one that had no use for Israel—was viewed as a threat by influential elements within the US government. To contain the situation, the Branch Davidians' compound—Mount Carmel, near Waco, Texas—was placed under aerial surveillance several years prior to the 1993 assault by the BATF.³⁰

Secondly, the American public was led to believe that the BATF botched the initial raid, on February 28, 1993, which led to the FBI assault on April 19, 1993. The facts, however, indicate that Koresh and his followers had been targeted long before. In addition, the government's initial explanation of the two assaults did not make sense. The American public was told repeatedly by spokespeople for the BATF that the February 28th raid was launched because the government feared the Davidian "cult" was on the verge of committing mass suicide similar to the mass suicide of "cult group leader" Jim Jones and his followers years earlier in Jonestown, Guyana on November 18, 1978. Nearly a thousand people died at Jonestown. After the FBI's April 19th assault on Mount Carmel, Attorney General Janet Reno told a completely different story, claiming she had no idea the Davidians were suicidal. This shift in rationale clearly did not pass the smell test.³¹

Thirdly, the government's position was that the Branch Davidians committed mass suicide. Later, the crime was blamed on a few Davidians who set Mount Carmel on fire, thereby murdering their friends—men, women, and children—for no apparent reason. There is, however, strong evidence that Koresh's successor, Clive Doyle, may have been a government provocateur who set the fire. Senator John Danforth issued a report on the Waco incident which revealed that Doyle told Texas Rangers that the Davidians had started the fire. The report also stated that Doyle's jacket contained flammable liquids on both sleeves, and his hands were burned in a manner consistent with a flashback from a liquid fire. Clive Doyle has never been charged with murder.

And lastly, Waco was a military operation, not a police action. And it was headed by General Wayne Downing, the same general who now heads the war on terrorism in the Middle East. General Downing is a former commander of the Special Operations Command, which was made a separate command within the US military prior to the 1993 assaults on Mount Carmel by the BATF and FBI.³²

The Oklahoma City Bombing

On April 19, 1995, the world was stunned by the "terrorist" bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, killing 168 people. Timothy McVeigh was tried, found guilty, and subsequently executed for the crime. Ironically the late prime minister of Israel, Menachem Begin, did essentially the same thing when his terrorist group, Irgun Zvai Leumi, blew up the King David Hotel in Jerusalem on July 22, 1946, killing 91 soldiers and civilians. It is interesting that in one country, the so-

called terrorist was sentenced to death, while in another country, the person responsible became prime minister.

Seismograms Offered Insight Into Oklahoma City Bombing

Two seismographs near the Murrah building^(Footnote 85) each recorded two low-frequency wave trains indicating the possibility of two separate explosions. The Oklahoma Geological Survey noted in an April 26, 1995 press release that "the location and source of the second surface wave recording was unknown. Detailed investigation at the building site may offer an explanation of the cause and origin of the second event."

This advice was never heeded. In fact, the opposite was done. On May 23, 1995, the Murrah Building was demolished with explosives, thereby destroying any traces of evidence pointing to a second bomb. On October 8, 1996, the American Geophysical Union published an article about the seismograms in their scientific journal, *Eos*. The article, entitled *Seismograms Offer Insight Into Oklahoma City Bombing*, refuted the possibility of a second explosion. It was the equivalent of the Warren Report. One report claimed that a lone gunman killed a president, even though persuasive evidence indicated the opposite. The other report claimed that a lone bomber killed 168 people, even though two seismograms indicated otherwise. Equally interesting, the group of scientists who wrote the *Eos* article had names that appeared to be quite Jewish. The main author was Thomas L. Holzer, assisted by Trond Ryberg, Gary S. Fuis, Christopher M. Dietel, Thomas M. Brocher, and Joe B. Fletcher. They reached the following conclusion in their article: "We conclude that the two wave trains recorded during the bombing are consistent with a single impulsive source." That conclusion is suspiciously similar to the Warren Commission's conclusion that Oswald alone killed President Kennedy.

Even more troubling, Jewish Senator Arlen Specter chaired the Senate Intelligence Committee when the Murrah Building was bombed. This takes us full circle back to the Kennedy assassination when, as a young lawyer serving as legal counsel to the Warren Commission, the same Arlen Specter wrote the "Single Bullet Theory." The essence of the Single Bullet Theory is that one bullet hit President Kennedy in the neck and caused five wounds to John Connally, something that is absolutely untrue. As I stated earlier, the Zapruder film clearly shows a four second delay from the time Kennedy grabbed his neck until Connally reacted to being shot. Arlen Specter's Single Bullet Theory was the primary lie that supported the Warren Commission's conclusion that Oswald acted alone. Years later, this known conspirator in President Kennedy's assassination, Arlen Specter, headed Senatorial oversight of the intelligence community when the Oklahoma City bombing occurred.

September 11, 2001 Terrorist Attack on America

Independent investigator Carol Valentine^(Footnote 86) has written several persuasive [articles](#) concluding that the suicide plane crashes on September 11, 2001 were

sponsored by Israel with assistance from the US military. Her premise—as I interpret it—is based on two key points. First of all, the airspace over New York City and Washington, DC was intentionally left unprotected by the military agency tasked to protect it. That group is the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD). Secondly, the suicide jets were controlled by "advanced robotics and remote-control technology, not hijackers." NORAD has had this capability since 1959.

Valentine wrote in great detail how NORAD has the capability to track planes in distress and take appropriate actions to defend US airspace from foreign aircraft or from aircraft within the US. ^(Footnote 87) In fact, NORAD had at its disposal a number of US Air Force General Dynamics F-106 Delta Dart fighter aircraft configured to be remotely flown into combat as early as 1959 under the auspices of a program known as SAGE.

Another example of remote control technology is a jet, made by Northrop Grumman, called the *Global Hawk*. This jet has a wingspan of a Boeing 737 and has flown unmanned across the Pacific Ocean. ³³ Valentine further observed that President Bush and Robert Ayling—a former official with British Airways—both claimed that such a technology was a thing of the future. The two men made carefully prepared public statements which envisioned remote-control capabilities as a lofty goal to be achieved in years to come. In fact, President Bush was quoted in the *New York Times* offering to give grants to airlines to pay for "new technology, probably far in the future, allowing air traffic controllers to land distressed planes by remote control." ³⁴ Both men were obviously deceiving the public.

Valentine compared NORAD's lack of reaction on September 11th to its rapid response to the LearJet carrying golfer Payne Stewart and several companions on October 25, 1999. With Stewart's ill-fated flight—which was en route from Orlando to Dallas, NORAD's reaction was fast. One or more US Air Force fighter jets were launched to control the situation shortly after air traffic controllers knew something was wrong. On September 11th, NORAD apparently did nothing because no jets were launched—at least no evidence has been presented indicating that NORAD jets were launched. Based on prior emergencies, there was more than enough time for NORAD to send jets to control the situation.

But how could Israel coerce the US military into committing such an act of treason? One word: OPIUM! History repeats itself. This is what was done when President Kennedy was assassinated. In exchange for helping the Jews kill Kennedy, the military and organized crime were given a war in Southeast Asia in an area where growing opium poppies was big business. Afghanistan and Pakistan are two major producers of opium today. A pact was apparently made between Israeli planners, US generals, and elements of organized crime stipulating that America would wage a war against Afghanistan in retaliation for the self-inflicted September 11th attacks. Osama bin Laden would be blamed, his Al-Queda group would be labeled terrorists, and America would wage war against Afghanistan for harboring these terrorists. ^(Footnote 88) US forces would drive out the Taliban, who successfully banned the growing of opium poppies in Afghanistan, ³⁵ and replace them with the Northern Alliance who would legalize opium production. ³⁶ Windfall profits would be shared by the participants from the illicit sale of opium and its derivative narcotics (namely heroin). The wealthy interests of the Western nations would also share in the illicit drug

money as they have done for over a century. It's the same technique used in the Kennedy assassination.

Everyone would benefit except the American people and the victims and their families. Israel would use the "terrorist" attacks as a pretext to intensify the war against Palestinians. Clearly a cover story was written and distributed to the Western news media prior to the attack. [\(Footnote 89\)](#) To achieve such a vast conspiracy, the plan must have been announced by the president of the World Jewish Congress. That individual is presently Edgar Bronfman, son of the late Sam Bronfman (reference Chapter 8). The junior Bronfman followed the path of Joseph Caiaphas, high priest of the Sanhedrin who sanctioned the plot to kill Jesus. Bronfman also followed the path of Nahum Goldmann, who apparently sanctioned the plot to kill President Kennedy.

Osama bin Laden was made the patsy like Lee Harvey Oswald was years earlier in the Kennedy assassination. The US government provided a video of bin Laden taking credit for the attacks in a secret meetings. While that may seem authentic, we should remember that the US government produced phony pictures of Oswald holding the alleged murder weapon (Mannlicher-Carcano rifle) in the backyard of his Dallas apartment in 1963 (Chapter 6). We also know that the CIA provided the Warren Commission with a fake photograph of Oswald at the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City. The photograph supported the false claim that Oswald had applied for a visa to Cuba. The Warren Commission used the alleged trip to Mexico City as further proof that Oswald was a communist (Chapter 6). This is the same old story, but most of the actors changed.

If I Were a Jew

Over the past three years I have studied Judaism as a political force and Jewish law as described in the Talmud (Chapter 13). Based on my research, I have developed a degree of mistrust and apprehension toward people of that ethnicity. But recently I asked myself, what would I be like if I had been born a Jew? Would I feel superior to Gentiles because of my Jewishness? Upon reflection, I thought of the words of President Kennedy when he spoke at American University on June 10, 1963:

So, let us not be blind to our differences--but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal.

President Kennedy was right. We should be hopeful, but not naïve. We should never be blind to the differences among peoples and their diverse cultures. There are so many differences between Jews and Gentiles (Chapter 13). But we should always remember that we are all mortal. Gentiles and Jews should interact on a personal level. Both should enlighten the other about their cultures. It is fair for Jews to enlighten

Gentiles on the negative historical and religious points of their respective non-Jewish religions. But equally, Gentiles should have the right to criticize Judaism and to encourage Jews to challenge Jewish authority as Christ did so many years ago when he blasted the Jewish Pharisees for their evil practices. Here are a few examples of Jesus's words from the book of Matthew, Chapter 23 (revised standard version):

27 - Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs, which outwardly appear beautiful, but within they are full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness.

28 - So you also outwardly appear righteous to men, but within you are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

31 - ... You are the sons of those who murdered the prophets.

33 - You serpents, you brood of vipers, how are you to escape being sentenced to hell?

I don't believe Christ meant that all Jews will burn in Hell. He was speaking specifically of those who implemented Jewish law as practiced by the Pharisees. As a Jew, Christ was quite familiar with Jewish law and believed it was evil. The Pharisees believed in oral interpretation of the teachings of Moses. More specifically, they believed they were a master race and consequently interpreted the Ten Commandments in a way that made them apply to Gentiles only, but not to Jews. It could be argued that this is the essence of Jewish law. According to the Pharisees, it was acceptable for Jews to lie, cheat, steal, even murder, so long as the victims were Gentiles. The practices of the Pharisees in Jesus's time were the beginnings of what later became written Jewish law known as the Talmud.

One of the most unethical practices in the Talmud is called the Kol Nidre which frees Jews from fulfilling their vows throughout the year because apparently taking vows is a sin for Jews. The text below is directly from the Talmud. It provides insight as to why Christ was so angry with the Jewish Pharisees. Read on and become enlightened.

"And he who desires that none of his vows made during the year shall be valid, let him stand at the beginning of the year and declare, 'Every vow which I may make in the future shall be null.'
HIS VOWS ARE THEN INVALID, PROVIDING THAT HE REMEMBERS THIS AT THE TIME OF THE VOW." (Caps in original.)

(Nedarim, 23a)

The American Heritage dictionary defines Kol Nidre as "The opening prayer recited on the eve of Yom Kippur. ..." It means "all the vows." The Kol Nidre is sung to an ancient melody. This song is sung by Jews in synagogues across the world on the eve of Yom Kippur, a major Jewish holiday. In other words, all practicing Jews know of the Kol Nidre.

For more information on this topic, I invite all inquisitive people to do a search on Kol Nidre on google.com (a search engine used by many journalists).

I looked up Kol Nidre in the Encyclopedia Britannica and it provided some extremely interesting information:

....According to some historians, forced Jewish converts to Christianity in 7th-century Spain recited the Kol Nidre to annul oaths forcibly extracted from them by their persecutors. All that is known with certainty, however, is that the prayer was used as early as the 8th century. Rabid anti-Semites in the European Middle Ages, brushing aside the repeated Jewish assertion that the absolution referred only to matters between God and man, used the prayer as a pretext to question the trustworthiness of all oaths taken by Jews in Christian courts. Fears of misunderstanding led to the elimination of the Kol Nidre from the Reform Jewish liturgy in the 19th century, but revised form was reintroduced in 1945.

One has to ask, Why was the Kol Nidre reintroduced into Reform Jewish liturgy in 1945 after being eliminated in the previous century? 1945 marked the end of World War II and the end of the Holocaust. Could it be that Jewish historians have written a pack of lies about the Holocaust, a pack of lies sanctified and encouraged by Jewish law, specifically the Kol Nidre? Could it be that Hitler's war crimes against Jews were greatly exaggerated by Zionist Jews in an effort to get Jews to migrate to Israel, which was established in 1948 (just three years after the Kol Nidre was reintroduced)? Could it be that six million Jews did not die in the Holocaust and that gas chambers were not used? Could it be that between 500,000 and a million Jews died from disease and starvation in Nazi prison camps, not by Nazi extermination in gas chambers?

Most of what we have been taught about the Holocaust appears to be directly linked to Jewish law and the practice of evil, not by Hitler alone, but by organized Jewry itself. But just because Jewish law is evil, does that mean that all Jews are evil? In my opinion, No. But I also believe that any devout Jew should not be trusted because Jewish law teaches devout Jews that they are superior to Gentiles, that Jews are a master race. In fact, everything that Jewish historians have told us about Hitler and the Nazis is also a description of devout Jews who practice Jewish law. Completely intolerant, superior, a master race. But still, is it reasonable to assume that someone is automatically evil just because he/she was born into an ethnic group that encourages the practice of evil? I don't think so.

Some argue that basic religious teachings are the building blocks of an individual's value system of an individual's personal sense of ethics. I agree that religion plays a role, but not necessarily a complete role. The United States is a secular society and its people are influenced by many things above and beyond religion. One of the most positive secular influences in the U.S. is its Constitution. If someone was born a Jew, had minimal training in Jewish law, but had a strong and sincere belief in the principles of the U.S. Constitution, then that person would probably be a decent human being, in my opinion. And lots of Jews admire Martin Luther King, Jr.,

President Kennedy, his brother Bobby, John Lennon, Mohandas Gandhi. The list goes on. These are all positive role models admired by people of all faiths and ethnic backgrounds. Such powerful role models force us all to develop our own sense of ethics that transcend our collective religious heritage.

After all, we cannot choose our parents, our race, our ethnic heritage or the religion we were born into. These things are all forced upon us. But God gave us minds to recognize the difference between good and evil. YES, Jewish law is evil. Christ recognized it, and was likely crucified for stating it so plainly and so openly.

It is up to us—Jews and Gentiles—to use our minds to overcome the backward teachings of any ethnic groups or religions.

If I were a Jew, what would I be like? I think I would be the same. I would search for the truth. I would be proud of the positive aspects of my heritage, and truthful about the negative ones. Like Jesus, I would probably criticize Jewish law, and would likely become the enemy of many powerful forces. Like Yitzhak Rabin, I would be willing to give my life for the cause of peace between Arabs and Jews.

If I were a Jew, I would call upon the US Government to crack down on those who practice Talmudic law (Chapter 13), recognizing that it is no different from Nazi law or Ku Klux Klan law. Talmudic law encourages hatred against non-Jews, racial superiority and ethnic purity. If I were a Jew, I would call upon the U.S. Justice Department to break up the Jewish monopoly of the electronic news media, the printed news media, the Hollywood movie industry, the musical recording industry and CD distributors, the major book publishers and distributors, and the banking industry. I would recognize that those Jewish forces who control those interests are malevolent forces. I would recognize that these Jewish forces are well versed in Talmudic law. I would recognize that those Jewish forces believe it is acceptable to lie to Gentiles, cheat Gentiles, steal from Gentiles and even murder Gentiles. I would recognize that those forces are like "serpents," and "brood of vipers," unable "to escape being sentenced to hell!"

If I were a Jew, I would believe in the US Constitution and in the separation of church of state. As a result, I would not support the Jewish State of Israel, for it does not adhere to that principle. And I would petition the United States government to declare Israel an enemy nation rather than subsidizing it. I would further encourage the United States government to arrest anyone who openly supports an enemy nation and try that person for treason. This would include journalists, bankers, politicians, lobbyists, media moguls, and Hollywood movie producers. The First Amendment could no longer be used as a shield for those who do the bidding of Israel. And speaking of shields, if I were a Jew, I would not use the Holocaust—fact or fiction—as a shield against public criticism toward powerful Jewish interests or the Jewish State of Israel. If I were a Jew, I would visit ghettos of the inner cities and assist poor black youths break the cycle of poverty, ignorance, drugs and crime. I would also visit American Indian tribes for the same reason. But I would not stop there. If I were a Jew, I would visit the Japanese cities of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and the German city of Dresden. In so doing, I would naturally be reminded that "victims" come in all ethnicities. And suffering is not measured solely by a body count.

If I were a Jew, I would encourage public debate of all topics, especially dialogue among diverse cultures. I would remember the words of President Kennedy: "We are all mortal."

Above all, I would remind myself that I am an individual. And it is up to individuals to make the world a better place to live. I would also recall something else President Kennedy said in his inaugural address: "Here on earth, God's work must truly be our own."

May God smile upon all enlightened people, Jews and Gentiles alike.

Reasons to be Hopeful

Although I am obviously quite skeptical of today's world leaders, I am also hopeful of the future. One reason I am interested in the assassination of President Kennedy is because I truly believe his was a message of hope for mankind. Killing him only silenced the messenger, not the message itself. Although there is much evil in the world, I also believe there are many positive aspects to the modern age in which we live.

Unlike any other period of history, mankind today is unable to wage total war because of the advent of atomic and nuclear weapons. The only alternative is peace. In a sense, God has given us a great gift. In the nuclear age, He has given us two choices: total peace or total annihilation. Although Israel and other Zionist forces possess unconscionable international power and influence through their control of information flow and monetary systems, I do not believe such a tyranny will last forever. September 11, 2001 only reinforces my belief that they are quickly losing power. It was an act of desperation.

Unlike any other period of history, mankind today can communicate instantaneously across the globe via the Internet. Unlike any other period of history, mankind today can travel to all corners of the globe in a matter of hours. Unlike any other period of history, mankind today is merging the economies of the world.

President Kennedy was equally hopeful for the future. The following text is the last three paragraphs from a speech he intended to deliver on November 22, 1963 at a luncheon at the Dallas Trade Mart. Unfortunately, he never got the opportunity to make that speech. His eloquent words become even more poignant when you recall that Joseph Milteer told an informant, prior to the assassination, that he believed Kennedy knew he was a marked man (Chapter 7):

... My dear friends and fellow citizens, I cite these facts and figures to make it clear that America today is stronger than ever before. Our adversaries have not abandoned their ambitions. Our dangers have not diminished. Our vigilance cannot be relaxed. But now we have the military, the scientific, and the economic strength to do whatever must be done for the preservation and

promotion of freedom.

That strength will never be used in pursuit of aggressive ambitions. It will always be used in pursuit of peace. It will never be used to promote provocations. It will always be used to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes. We in this country, in this generation are by destiny rather than choice, the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask therefore that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility, that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint, and that we may achieve in our time, and for all time, the ancient vision of "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

That must always be our goal, and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For as was written long ago, "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." [Psalms 127:1]³⁷

Perhaps the world might fulfill the prophesy of President Kennedy's final speech. At his funeral, Jacqueline Kennedy reportedly gave a brief but insightful message to Soviet Diplomat Anastas Mikoyan who was sent by Premier Nikita Khrushchev. Mikoyan later recalled that Mrs. Kennedy said the following words as she greeted him at the reception line: "My husband is dead. Now peace is up to you."³⁸

Indeed, peace is up to all of us.

Endnotes

1. William Sullivan & Bill Brown, *The Bureau*, p. 48
2. Encyclopedia Britannica: Vietnam War
3. Alfred McCoy et al, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, p. 1. McCoy cited the following sources: US Treasury Department, Bureau of Narcotics, *Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs for the Year Ending December 31, 1965* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 45; statement from John E. Ingersoll, Director, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, before the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, New York City, February 24, 1972, p. 5. McCoy's statement that Army medical doctors believed 10 to 15 percent of GIs were heroin addicts came from *The New York Times*, May 16, 1971, p. 1.
4. Evert Clark & Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, pp. 181 - 182
5. Encyclopedia Britannica: Six Day War
6. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 58
7. *ibid*, p. 179
8. George Ball, *The Passionate Attachment*, p. 256
9. Ben-Gurion's statements are from *Herzl, Hess, and Histadrut*, by Nahum Guttman, p. 18.
10. Michael Fischbach, *The Oslo Accords*,
<http://www.palestinecenter.org/palestine/osloaccords.html>
11. Encyclopedia Britannica: Yitzhak Rabin
12. Information about Johan Joergen Holst and the secret negotiations was obtained from the Carter Center website. Reference an article entitled *A SPECIAL PRIZE of THE CARTER-MENIL HUMAN RIGHTS FOUNDATION: Honoring the People of Norway for Their Contribution to Peace, May 18, 1994, Oslo, Norway*, (<http://www.cartercenter.org/CCNEWS/CCN-S94/menilnwy.html>). Other sources were: *Norwaves* Volume 1, Number 27, September 7, 1993 [archive, produced by NORINFORM, Norwegian Information Service, P.O. Box 241 Sentrum, N-0103 Oslo, Norway Tel (47) 22 11

- 46 85, Fax (47) 22 42 48 87 Editors: Ragnvald Berggrav, Helge Loland, http://www.norwaves.com/norwaves/Volume1_1993/v1nw27.html]
13. Reuters, *Oslo peace brokers urge Israel to make concessions*, March 5, 1998; death date and age from *Daily Almanacs*, Jan. 13, 1994 (<http://www.dailyalmanacs.com/almanac2/january/0113.html>)
 14. Roger Morris, *Partners in Power*, p. 404. Morris cited the following sources for L. D. Brown's account: deposition of L. D. Brown in *Reed v. Young*, July 25, 1995; plaintiff's response to defendant's *Motion in Limine*, December 14, 1995; *Nation*, September 25, 1995; *American Spectator*, August 1995; and confidential interviews.
 15. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, *The Secret Life of Bill Clinton*, p. 333. Evans-Pritchard cited an interview with L. D. Brown, December 1985, as the source for his description of Hillary's relationship with Foster.
 16. Roger Morris, *Partners in Power*, p. 444. Morris cited the following sources for his description of the relationships President and First Lady Clinton had with Vince Foster: *American Spectator*, January 1994, and April-May 1994; *American Lawyer*, July-August 1992; *Sunday Telegraph* (London), February 6, 1994; *Washington Post National Weekly Edition*, August 23-29, 1993; *New Yorker*, August 9, 1993; *Esquire*, November 1993; *National Enquirer*, August 10, 1993; *Village Voice*, August 3, 1993; *Economist*, February 12, 1994; *Hope Star* (Arkansas), July 20, 1993; *In These Times*, September 6, 1993; *New York Times*, August 13, 1993; *US News and World Report*, August 23, 1993; and confidential interviews.
 17. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, *The Secret Life of Bill Clinton*, p. 246. Evans-Pritchard interviewed Jane Parks, widow of Jerry Parks, in April 1994. In the interview she revealed that Foster had asked her late husband to keep tabs on Governor Clinton at Hillary's behest.
 18. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, *The Secret Life of Bill Clinton*, p. 233. Evans-Pritchard cited the police report, family interviews, and witness observations as his source for details of the shooting.
 19. *Ibid.* p. 245. Evans-Pritchard interviewed Jane Parks in April 1994.
 20. The list of journalists came from David Martin's paper, *America's Dreyfus Affair: The Case of the Death of Vince Foster*. (<http://www.thebird.org/host/dcdave/>) The journalists wrote erroneous stories indicating that Foster was depressed when there was no evidence offered to substantiate the charge.
 21. *ibid*
 22. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 287; Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, p. 64. Marrs supplied the date of de Mohrenschildt's death, that he was killed by a shotgun blast to the head, and that it occurred at his sister-in-law's home in Manalapan, Florida. Garrison wrote that his death was ruled suicide.
 23. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 523
 24. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 287; Michael Collins Piper, *Final Judgment*, p. 121
 25. Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 564
 26. Geoffrey Giuliano, *Lennon in America*, p. 222
 27. 1970 *Rolling Stone* interviews conducted and transcribed by Jann Wenner, *Lennon Remembers*, p. 123
 28. *ibid*, p. 125
 29. Canned Heat biography on Ruf Records website. (<http://www.rufrecords.de/bios/canned.html>)
 30. Carol Valentine, *David Koresh and the Cuckoo's Egg*, April 19, 2001, http://www.public-action.com/SkyWriter/WacoMuseum/burial/page/b_kce.html
 31. Carol Valentine, *Waco Holocaust Electronic Museum: War*
 32. Carol Valentine, *Waco Paradigm and the Church of the Nativity*, April 2002, <http://www.public-action.com/zoa/downing.html>
 33. "Robot plane flies Pacific unmanned" (article), *International Television News*, April 24, 2001
 34. "Bush to Increase Federal Role in Security at Airports," *New York Times*, September 28, 2001
 35. Tim Golden, "Taliban opium-growing ban may be unraveling," *New York Times*, October 22, 2001
 36. Barry Meier, "Most Afghan Opium Grown in Rebel-Controlled Areas," *New York Times*, October 5, 2001
 37. President Kennedy's final speech which he never delivered, transcribed from *As it Happened*, NBC-TV coverage of JFK assassination. The words were read by NBC anchorman Bill Ryan, on live television, on November 22, 1963.
 38. Michael Beschloss, *The Crisis Years*, pp. 681 - 682

APPENDIX A: JFK's Letter to Eshkol About Dimona

Dear Mr. Prime Minister [Eshkol]:

It gives me great personal pleasure to extend congratulations as you assume your responsibilities as Prime Minister of Israel. You have our friendship and best wishes in your new tasks. It is on one of these that I am writing you at this time.

You are aware, I am sure, of the exchange which I had with Prime Minister Ben-Gurion concerning American visits to Israel's nuclear facility at Dimona. Most recently, the Prime Minister wrote to me on May 27. His words reflected a most intense personal consideration of a problem that I know is not easy for your Government, as it is not for mine. We welcomed the former Prime Minister's strong reaffirmation that Dimona will be devoted exclusively to peaceful purposes and the reaffirmation also of Israel's willingness to permit periodic visits to Dimona.

I regret having to add to your burdens so soon after your assumption of office, but I feel the crucial importance of this problem necessitates my taking up with you at this early date certain further considerations, arising out of Mr. Ben-Gurion's May 27 letter, as to the nature and scheduling of such visits.

I am sure you will agree that these visits should be as nearly as possible in accord with international standards, thereby resolving all doubts as to the peaceful intent of the Dimona project. As I wrote Mr. Ben-Gurion, this Government's commitment to and support of Israel could be seriously jeopardized if it should be thought that we were unable to obtain reliable information on a subject as vital to the peace as the question of Israel's effort in the nuclear field.

Therefore, I asked our scientists to review the alternative schedules of visits we and you had proposed. If Israel's purposes are to be clear beyond reasonable doubt, I believe that the schedule which would best serve our common purposes would be a visit early this summer, another visit in June 1964, and thereafter at intervals of six months. I am sure that such a schedule should not cause you any more difficulty than that which Mr. Ben-Gurion proposed in his May 27 letter. It would be essential, and I understand that Mr. Ben-Gurion's letter was in accord with this, that our scientist have access to all areas of the Dimona site and to any related part of the complex, such as fuel

fabrication facilities or plutonium separation plant, and that sufficient time to be allotted for a thorough examination.

Knowing that you fully appreciate the truly vital significance of this matter to the future well-being of Israel, to the United States, and internationally, I am sure our carefully considered request will have your most sympathetic attention.

Sincerely,

John F. Kennedy

(July 5, 1963)

(Israel State Archive, Jerusalem. For more information, reference Israel and the Bomb, by Avner Cohen, pages 153-162)

APPENDIX B: George Magazine Article About Yitzhak Rabin's Murder

Background

In March 1997, President Kennedy's son, John, Jr., ran a controversial article in his magazine, *George*. The article was written by Guela Amir, mother of Yigal Amir, the man who assassinated Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Rabin in 1995. In the article, Ms. Amir made it quite clear that her son did not act alone. She provided compelling evidence that Rabin's assassination was sponsored by the Israeli government, and that her son had been goaded into shooting the prime minister by an agent provocateur working for Shin Bet, Israel's equivalent of the FBI and Secret Service combined into one agency. The motive for the killing was because Rabin was going to give land back to the Palestinians as specified in the Oslo Accords. The following is Ms. Amir's article in its entirety:

A Mother's Defense, by Guela Amir

(Published in *George Magazine*, March 1997 edition, p. 138)

Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Rabin looked exhilarated as he made his way down the podium stairs that chilly autumn night. The pro-peace rally that Rabin had just addressed was an unqualified success. Some 100,000 supporters attended, and public attention was briefly deflected from the mounting criticism of his administration.

Rabin's carefree, buoyant demeanor that night seemed to put his bodyguards at ease, and the half dozen or so agents who accompanied him to his limousine in the parking lot behind the stage encircled him only loosely. None of the Shin Bet (General Security Service) agents in the entourage seemed to notice the slight young man leaning casually against one of the government cars.

As Rabin walked past, the young man drew a pistol, slipped into the crowd of towering security agents, and fired three rounds at the prime minister. Two of them hit Rabin's exposed back, and one shot wounded his bodyguard. As the shots rang out, someone at the scene shouted, "Blanks! Blanks!" as if to reassure the others that the bullets were not real. But the shots were not blanks. Rabin, mortally wounded, was rushed to nearby Ichilov Hospital. Curiously, as Leah Rabin was whisked away by car to Shin Bet headquarters, one of the agents assured the prime minister's wife that the gunman had actually used "a toy gun" and that her husband was fine. The reality was that Rabin lay dying in an emergency room.

The gunman was my son Yigal. The shooting seemed to be an open-and-shut case of assassination. An amateur videotape of the event clearly showed Yigal walking up to

the prime minister and shooting him. So how could anyone at the scene have thought that Yigal was shooting blanks? Why was another guard so certain that the gun wasn't real? And how is it that minutes after the shooting, even before the details of the incident were broadcast, Israeli TV received a phone call from a man who claimed to represent a right-wing Jewish organization. He confidently declared, "This time we missed. Next time we won't." Other journalists simultaneously received messages on their pagers with the same statement.

Throughout the tense and painful period since the assassination, the answers to these troubling questions have begun to emerge, and they depict what I believe is an unsavory intrigue at the highest levels of government. This is the story of my search for the truth about the Rabin assassination.

I was visiting a friend's home when the first news bulletin about the assassination was broadcast. The report said that a law student "of Yemenite origin" from Bar-Ilan University had shot the prime minister during a peace rally in Tel Aviv. I had heard about the rally but had no reason to think that my son Yigal would be there. Nervously, I ran to my car and drove the short distance home to Herzliyya, a northern suburb of Tel Aviv, my hands shaking with fear all the way. When I pulled up in front of our house I could hear my husband, Shlomo, shouting. He is a religious scribe with a particularly gentle personality. In our more than 30 years of marriage, I have almost never heard him raise his voice. If he was shouting, something was terribly wrong.

My husband grabbed my hand and we stood together, eyes fixed stonily on the television. Within minutes, our other seven children joined us. Relatives and neighbors streamed into our home. Somebody insisted that it couldn't be Yigal, that "Gali" (his nickname) was visiting a friend. But then a broadcast showed a clear image of my son in the custody of the police. There was no mistake: That was my Yigal. As we sat, dazed, in front of the television, a swarm of Shin Bet agents burst into the living room, charged upstairs to Yigal's room, and took it apart from floor to ceiling.

In the streets outside, hundreds of neighbors gathered at the edge of our yard. Reporters and television crews soon joined them. My youngest children were crying uncontrollably. The phone rang off the hook that night, and it has not stopped since.

Daybreak brought the peculiar combination of unreality and routine that is painfully familiar to anyone who has experienced a family tragedy. For years I have managed a nursery school in our home for neighborhood children. Forty preschoolers had enrolled that autumn. At 8 A.M. parents began to arrive with their toddlers; all but a few came that day.

Later, the Shin Bet returned to raid the house. Concealed in the rafters, in a backyard shed, and in an underground cache they found weapons and ammunition. The agents seemed to revel in our shock at each new discovery. At one point I asked one of them why he was spending so much time examining several bars of soap found in the house. He showed me the explosives that were hidden inside. And then they arrested my firstborn son, Hagai, on suspicion of being an accomplice in the assassination of Rabin. Several of Yigal's and Hagai's friends and schoolmates were also hauled in for questioning.

I had lived through four wars and the terrifying Iraqi Scud missiles that struck Israel—just miles from our home—during the Persian Gulf War. But the fear I now felt was something entirely different. In wartime we had been part of a brave and unified community; now I felt that it was my family's own battle—that our family stood alone. Politicians and newspaper columnists branded us a family of "religious fanatics" and "extremists," never pausing to distinguish between us and Yigal. Leading the attacks against us was Rabin's former chief of staff Eitan Haber, who showed up at one of the early court hearings for Yigal and announced that he wouldn't leave the "Amir family in peace until the end of [his] days." Haber's pledge helped inspire a new round of telephone harassment against us, and our home was attacked by vandals.

When the news leaked out that my oldest daughter, Vardit, would soon be married, Haber was on her trail. Needless to say, we were in no mood for celebrations, but according to Jewish religious tradition, once a wedding date has been set it cannot be postponed; Vardit's wedding date had been decided on six months earlier. Haber called for protesters to show up by the thousands.

To our amazement, Haber's plan backfired. There was a spontaneous outpouring of sympathy for our family. Gifts began to arrive from anonymous well-wishers. People we did not know called to offer us help. A stranger lent the young couple a new car for their honeymoon. Nearly every one of our invited guests showed up.

In Jewish tradition the righteous are rewarded with a place in the world to come, and those who are sinful are punished until their souls have been cleansed. When I was a little girl, my grandfather, a revered rabbinical sage, would tell me stories about rare individuals whose sins were so grievous that they could not even enter purgatory. Such a soul, termed a dybbuk in Hebrew, is sent back to the earthly realm to repair the spiritual damage it has wreaked. The dybbuk's only hope is to infiltrate and possess the body of a living person and cling tightly to this purer soul in the hope of securing enough credit, through that person's meritorious deeds, to be forgiven for his own misdeeds. In the spring of 1992, a baneful dybbuk took possession of Israel's radical right-wing political movements and almost succeeded in driving them to ruin. This dybbuk's name was Avishai Raviv.

Raviv was a part of Yigal's other world-his world away from home-and I didn't realize what a central role he played in my son's life until his name began cropping up again and again as the Israeli press probed deeper into the Rabin assassination.

Avishai Raviv was born in 1967 in Holon, a backwater development town just south of Tel Aviv. He is remembered in Holon as a youngster who made up for his shyness and stuttering by playing practical jokes on his classmates. Raviv's family was not religious and tended to vote Labor. His life changed suddenly and dramatically when, at the age of 16, he attended a lecture by Rabbi Meir Kahane, the fiery leader of the Israeli nationalist Kach movement. Raviv became active in the movement and, under Rabbi Kahane's influence, seemed to undergo a religious awakening that resulted in his embracing traditional Judaism. While on leave from service in the Israeli army's elite Givati Brigade, Raviv began attending demonstrations and other Kach activities.

Subsequent Israeli and foreign media reports alleged that at some time during or immediately following his military service, Raviv was recruited as an informer for the Shin Bet. Raviv, however, was no ordinary snitch. It was reported that for five years he initiated, organized, and led dozens of extremist right-wing activities.

After the November 1990 assassination of Rabbi Kahane, the Kach movement split into two factions. Raviv managed to remain active in both. He consistently appeared at each group's events and soon became an infamous fixture on the nightly news. When scuffles broke out with the police or hostile passersby, Raviv was often in the center of the trouble and was arrested dozens of times (although he was rarely charged and never imprisoned).

While he was active in the various Kach splinters, Raviv joined the Temple Mount Faithful, a group that protests for Jewish rights on the Temple Mount, the Jewish holy site in Jerusalem upon which Muslims built the Al Aqsa mosque and the Dome of the Rock shrine. Israelis must get permission from the police before they can pray on the mount for fear of violence between Arabs and Jews, and the Temple Mount Faithful has responded with protests. Raviv's attempt to wrest control from the founder of the group would lead to his expulsion.

Raviv's agitation led to a particularly ugly episode in August 1991 during a protest outside the Tel Aviv office of Israel's Communist party. As Tamar Gozansky, a Communist member of the Knesset (the Israeli parliament), left the building, Raviv charged at her with a large metal flagpole. Gozansky's aide blocked the assault, and a brawl ensued. Photos of a bloodied Raviv limping away from the rally enhanced his stature among the Kahane activists. Raviv was arrested, but it took nearly four years for the case to go to court. He was let off with a mere nine months' probation and a small fine. The decision by Israeli prosecutors to request probation rather than imprisonment seemed curious.

In the meantime, Raviv had enrolled at Tel Aviv University and was busy making trouble on campus. When a Druse student was elected head of the student union (the largely Jewish student body had chosen a Muslim), Raviv publicly accused him of being disloyal to Israel. The university administration brought disciplinary charges against Raviv for racism. Eventually Raviv was expelled from the university-but not before he asked the Office of the Prime Minister to intervene on his behalf. Tel Aviv University officials, however, had had enough of his provocations and his appeal was rejected.

Raviv then founded an organization with settlement activist David Hazan, called Eyal (the Jewish Fighting Organization). It was a religious-nationalist youth movement with barely two dozen members at the start. But Raviv devoted all of his energy to recruiting new members. He soon built himself a small but loyal following, made up primarily of religious teenagers. Raviv lured these youngsters with the enticement of violence and rebellion. According to one girl's later testimony, the charismatic Raviv would arrange Sabbath weekend retreats for Eyal members in various Jewish settlements. I believe the cost of these weekends was usually footed by Raviv.

Before long, Raviv was quarreling with Hazan over the group's direction. Hazan thought Raviv went too far at times, and, reportedly, when Raviv started to openly

discuss assassinating a prominent Israeli, Hazan resigned. Raviv took over and shaped Eyal into his vision of the militant vanguard of the Israeli Right. His former roommate, Eran Ojalbo, claimed that Raviv was obsessed with obtaining publicity for himself and his small band of followers and developed a real flair for media stunts. On one occasion, Raviv invited a television crew to watch Eyal members training with weapons. On another, he launched a well-publicized leafleting campaign against mixed Jewish-Arab classes in public schools. He and several Eyal teenagers were brought in for police questioning. Leaflets of this sort are illegal in Israel because they're considered racist, and those who are responsible for creating them are often prosecuted. With Raviv, no charges were pressed.

In September 1993, the Rabin government signed the Oslo accords with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). The accords, and the series of terror bombings that followed their implementation, brought thousands of previously apolitical Israelis into the streets and onto the barricades in embittered protest. These neophyte activists poured into the pre-existing right-wing groups and placed themselves at the disposal of experienced organizers such as Avishai Raviv. One of these new activists was my son Yigal.

The election of Labor party leader Yitzhak Rabin as prime minister in 1992 was the climax of an extraordinary political comeback. After four straight national election losses and more than 15 years in the political wilderness, Rabin led the center-left Labor party to triumph.

Like many Israelis, my husband and I were saddened by Rabin's election, but we sought consolation in the platform upon which he ran: no negotiations with the PLO, no establishment of a PLO state, and no surrender of the strategically vital Golan Heights. If Rabin adhered to his party's declared principles, Israel's basic security needs would be protected.

In utter disregard of Rabin's platform and in defiance of the Israeli law prohibiting contact with the PLO, Labor party emissaries initiated negotiations with the terrorist group. In September 1993, Rabin announced to a stunned nation that he was going to sign an agreement with PLO chairman Yasir Arafat, giving the PLO partial control over Judea, Samaria, and Gaza. He also planned to release jailed terrorists in exchange for a PLO peace pledge.

In Israel, we hoped desperately that peace would emerge. As a wife and a mother, I know the pain and fear of having watched my sons go off to serve the mandatory three years in the Israeli army. I yearn for the day when we can beat our swords into plowshares.

Sadly, the Oslo process did not produce the peace we expected. Within weeks of the White House handshake, the horror began. A Palestinian terrorist drove a car filled with explosives into a bus near the community of Beit-El, wounding 30 people. Next, a Palestinian driving a car filled with explosives pulled up alongside a bus in the northern Israeli city of Afula. The explosion killed eight people and wounded dozens more. On Remembrance Day, a Palestinian suicide bomber boarded a bus in nearby Hadera and blew himself up, killing five and wounding 25. Public support for Rabin and the Oslo process plummeted. Labor had insisted that the agreement would bring

Israel untold benefits. But such dreams were shattered by the rude reality of the old Middle East.

At the same time, a dangerous schism was emerging in Israeli society between those who continued to support the peace process and those who opposed it. Faced with widespread public rejection of the Oslo process, an increasingly defensive Rabin and his cabinet ministers responded by forging ahead with policies that did not have the support of the public majority.

The terror continued. On October 19, 1994, in the heart of Tel Aviv, a Hamas bomber blew up a bus, killing 22 passengers and wounding 48. Three weeks later a terrorist riding a bicycle and carrying a knapsack filled with explosives pedaled up to an army checkpoint in Gaza and killed three soldiers. Each week brought more death, violence, and disillusionment. Around our Sabbath dinner table, the one time each week when all of our children were together, there was a growing sense of despair. Yigal once said, almost in tears, "Who cares if you can now take a vacation trip to Jordan if the street outside is running with Jewish blood?" We didn't know how to answer him. But we did not quite understand just how deeply he felt the pain of the massacred victims. We could not imagine that these terrible events were pushing him past the point of no return.

In the summer of 1995, as Rabin entered the fourth and final year of his term, his popularity was rapidly declining and his coalition government had to count on the support of five Arab members in the Knesset for its survival, though he could not be assured of these crucial votes indefinitely. And there was turmoil inside the Labor party itself Rabin had indicated his willingness to surrender most or all of the Golan Heights region to the Syrians, and a handful of Labor members of the Knesset, led by the 1973 war hero Avigdor Kahalani, balked. Recalling how the Syrians had used the Golan from 1949 to 1967 to shell northern Israel, the Kahalani faction announced that it would vote against the government if it sought to surrender the Golan.

Throughout the spring and summer of 1995, Likud leader Benjamin Netanyahu began to rise in the polls. By late summer of 1995, the polls showed that if elections were held at that time, Netanyahu would be elected prime minister. The polls found that a majority of the nation no longer supported new territorial surrender.

With elections less than a year away, Rabin's career appeared to be on the verge of ruin, and it's my belief that the Labor leadership quietly turned to the security services to help stave off a defeat at the polls.

The dybbuk in our story will now be joined by an authentic spook. Karmi Gillon came from one of Israel's prominent families. His grandfather, Gad Frumkin, had served as a Supreme Court justice during the pre-state years under the British Mandate. Gillon's father, Colin, was Israel's state attorney during the 1950s, and his mother, Saada, was a deputy attorney general. Gillon's brother, Alon, is a judge who serves as the registrar of Israel's Supreme Court. Karmi Gillon forsook the family profession for a career in the Shin Bet. Created shortly after Israel's birth, the Shin Bet is, in effect, the Israeli FBI and Secret Service combined; it is charged with the tasks of gathering domestic intelligence, counterespionage, and protecting diplomats and VIPs. Control of the Shin Bet is in the hands of the office of the prime minister.

The Shin Bet like the FBI, has had no small share of controversy over the years. During the time that Gillon was rising in its ranks, the Shin Bet was implicated in a series of scandals. The Landau Commission, established in 1987 to investigate the methods of the Shin Bet, found a pattern of perjury spanning almost two decades. It released an 88 page report sharply censured the Shin Bet leadership for having "failed by not understanding that no security operation, however vital, can put its operatives above the law." The commission characterized the Shin Bet's lawlessness as a danger to democratic society.

Karmi Gillon had a unique field of expertise. While most of his fellow agents spent their time combating the threat of Arab terrorism, Gillon was the Shin Bet's resident expert on Jewish extremist groups; he even wrote his master's thesis at Haifa University on the topic in 1990. He was an advocate of cracking down on Jewish nationalist movements and made no secret of his antipathy to the right-wing outlook.

A few months prior to Gillon's appointment as chief of the Shin Bet in February 1995, Avishai Raviv pulled off an extraordinary stunt. Raviv, accompanied by a band of former Kach activists, attempted to stage a demonstration outside Gillon's Jerusalem home to demand his resignation from the Shin Bet. Raviv and two other people were briefly detained as they approached Gillon's house. Raviv told reporters at the scene—I believe he tipped off the press—that the planned-demonstration was "to protest that the head of the Shin Bet is being used as a political tool against the right wing."

To some, Raviv's threatening behavior was just further "evidence" that the Jewish Right was a menace that had to be combatted. In fact, Raviv, as it was later alleged, was already serving as an informer for the Shin Bet, and I find it hard to believe that his stunt hadn't been cleared by Gillon himself. Even before Gillon assumed control of the service, Raviv's provocations had become completely unrestrained. According to the Jerusalem Post, a few days after the machine-gunning of 29 Palestinians by Dr. Baruch Goldstein in March 1994 at Hebron's Cave of the Patriarchs, Raviv rented an apartment—directly above the one where Goldstein had lived—in Kiryat Arba. While Kiryat Arba's leaders were denouncing Goldstein, Raviv was boasting about his admiration for him. According to the Post, one of Raviv's splinter groups, DOV [Suppression of Traitors], vandalized a car belonging to the Kiryat Arba council head, Zvi Katzover, and the next day, Eyal took credit for assaulting Katzover's son so seriously that the boy had to be hospitalized. Again, Raviv was not prosecuted.

Raviv was then accepted by Bar-Ilan University, an Orthodox Jewish institution located in Ramat Gan, not far from Tel Aviv. Raviv registered for several history and philosophy courses and also enrolled in the school's Institute for Advanced Torah Studies. It was there, in the spring of 1994, that he met my son Yigal.

By the time summer rolled around, Raviv was sponsoring a paramilitary Eyal summer camp for militant youngsters. Reporters were invited to watch as Raviv ordered his young recruits, armed with automatic weapons, pistols, and knives, to engage in paramilitary drills and martial-arts training.

Throughout 1994, my husband and I were aware that Yigal was becoming increasingly involved in political activities. But as long as his actions were within the law (and to my knowledge, they were) and he kept up his grades (and he did), we saw

no reason to object. If Yigal felt that the Oslo process was endangering Israel—and many, many Israelis felt that way—it was his right, even his obligation, to protest.

What we did not know was that Yigal was being drawn into Raviv's netherworld. Raviv was blanketing the campus with extremist posters. He clashed with campus security when some of the more militant notices were taken down by guards. This resulted in a hearing before an academic disciplinary committee that issued a warning: He would be expelled if he caused any more trouble.

In the summer of 1995, Raviv was once more summoned to a disciplinary committee for his activities. Raviv was again let off with a mere warning by the university administration. Acquaintances from that period later told me that he had behaved as if he had *protectzia*, the Hebrew slang for pull, or influence in high places. The rabbis at the Institute for Advanced Torah Studies, however, had seen enough of Raviv's antics. He was expelled from the institute.

In Hebrew, Yigal means "he will redeem." My second son was born during those first heady years after the Six Day War, when Israel, on the brink of annihilation by the Arab armies, miraculously beat back the enemy and liberated sacred territories that are so central to Judaism and Jewish history: Judea, Samaria, Gaza, the Golan Heights, and, of course, Jerusalem. God had redeemed his nation, and we named our second child Yigal as an affirmation of that miracle. Even as a young child, Yigal displayed an energy and drive that set him apart from other children. Whatever Yigal wanted, he found a way to get.

Yigal had never given us a day of trouble in his life. After graduating at the top of his high school class, he began his military service. His fierce patriotism compelled him to volunteer for an elite combat unit. As a mother, I dreaded his decision to serve in the unit that is called into battle first when war breaks out. But how could we stand in the way of our son's desire to defend his country?

When Yigal finished his three mandatory years of service, I detected a new seriousness in him. He was hired as a government emissary to Latvia, where he taught Hebrew to potential Jewish immigrants to Israel. He subsequently told me that this is where he was trained by the Shin Bet.

Upon his return, Yigal gained admission to law school at Bar-Ilan. For a young man of Yemenite background, this was quite an accomplishment: Jews from Yemen and other Arab countries start out at the bottom of Israel's socioeconomic ladder, and it has taken decades to break into professions dominated by those of European origin. Yigal enrolled not only in the Bar-Ilan University law school but simultaneously in its computer classes and the university's religious-studies program.

Like many of his fellow students, Yigal was drawn to political activism by the Oslo accords. He attended a number of mass demonstrations in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem and helped organize a number of campus rallies, but he soon despaired of their impact because there was no chance of changing Rabin's mind.

Yigal found himself overwhelmed by a sense of frustration, and this helped to pave the way for his association with Raviv. He was now spending a good deal of his time

organizing Sabbath weekend retreats for student activists in various Israeli towns and in the settlements. As Yigal's friends told me subsequently, he and Raviv worked together, publicizing the retreats, preparing literature for the discussion groups and seminars, and arranging for guest lecturers.

We hardly saw Yigal during the summer and early autumn of 1995. I couldn't imagine how he mustered the energy for such outings after his grueling schedule of classes. But if he was using his day and a half off from school (Israel's weekends last only from Friday afternoon until Saturday night) for educational purposes, we considered it worthwhile.

According to Yigal's friends and others who have since testified in court, Raviv seemed to be obsessed with one topic: killing Rabin. He and Yigal frequently engaged in discussions about the feasibility of assassination.

On September 16, Israeli television broadcast what was purported to be a secret late-night swearing-in ceremony organized by Eyal. At the ceremony, which was later revealed to have been staged for the television cameras, Raviv assembled what he claimed were a group of new Eyal recruits at the graves of pre-state Jewish underground fighters, according to the Jerusalem Post.

Raviv scored his biggest media triumph on October 5, 1995, when the opposition political parties organized a mass rally in downtown Jerusalem to protest the mounting Arab terror and the government's weak response. Although I rarely attended demonstrations, Yigal and I went to, this one together. The main speaker that Saturday night was Likud leader Benjamin Netanyahu. Circulating among the huge crowd was Avishai Raviv and his band of Eyal hotheads. According to the Jerusalem Post, Raviv had given them handouts depicting Prime Minister Rabin dressed up in an SS uniform. When demonstrators urged the Eyal sign holders to remove the offensive placards, they refused. Eyal's founder, David Hazan, passed by and tore up one of the posters. A gang of Eyal toughs promptly pummeled him.

The Post reported that an Israeli television reporter, Nitzan Chen, later revealed that Raviv had approached him and urged him to broadcast the sign on the nightly news report, and that he had even called later to be sure that it had been included.

In the Knesset the next morning, the Labor party made good use of the poster. Netanyahu was accused of having failed to condemn them. It helped reinforce the notion that the Likud was extremist and irresponsible. In a radio interview shortly afterward, Rabin told the public that "the Likud provides extremists with inspiration. It cannot wash its hands of this and claim it has nothing to do with it."

Netanyahu's request to meet with Rabin to attempt to ease the mounting political tensions was ignored. Rabin's refusal to even meet with the Likud leader again strengthened the idea that Netanyahu was beyond the pale. It also helped deflect public attention away from Arab terrorism. Finally, so it seemed, Rabin had found an effective campaign strategy.

On November 4, 1995, Yigal exited a bus and made his way toward Malchei Yisrael Square, where thousands of supporters had already assembled. The large floodlights

placed outside the Tel Aviv city hall illuminated the area for many blocks, and security was stepped up around the demonstration. On hand were more than 700 police and border-patrol officers, dozens of undercover police, and agents of the Shin Bet who had been assigned the job of guarding the featured political leaders.

The gathering, whose theme was "Yes to peace, no to violence," had been heavily advertised for weeks. Labor party-dominated municipalities and unions pulled out all stops in their drive to generate a large turnout for the rally. Some of the biggest names in Israeli entertainment were recruited to perform. In addition to Prime Minister Rabin and Foreign Minister Peres, other top Labor leaders were present. It was meant to be an impressive show of strength for the party and proof positive that large segments of the country still supported the peace process.

Yigal strode quickly through the crowd. The police had erected special metal railings to keep the crowd away from the rostrum, but people were simply walking around the barriers. When Yigal arrived near the stage he circled around the police line and descended the stairway that led to the cordoned parking area, where the limousines of the prime minister and other government officials were parked.

After a while, a Shin Bet agent approached and asked Yigal who he was. He reportedly replied that he was one of the drivers. The agent apparently accepted the answer and walked away. At no point did anyone ask Yigal to produce identification or seriously challenge his presence near the cars. Much criticism was later leveled against the police and the Shin Bet for failing to create a "sterile" area near the stage, a standard security precaution.

Yigal struck up a conversation with some of the drivers and police officers who were mingling in the parking lot. Later they would admit that they had assumed he was either an undercover policeman or one of the entertainers' drivers. From his position in the parking lot, Yigal could clearly hear the singing of the performers.

As the speeches and performances continued on the stage above him, Yigal bided his time. He did not check his watch, nor did he display any anxiety, he told me. He said that if the police had stopped him or seriously questioned him at this stage, he would have taken it as a sign from above and abandoned the plan to kill Rabin. But on this evening there were no such actions by the police or Shin Bet agents. And so Yigal was content to peacefully wait for the rally to end and the prime minister to be escorted to his car.

In the chaotic aftermath of the assassination, rival Israeli law-enforcement officials engaged in a frenzy of finger-pointing and recriminations. In the newspapers and on the airwaves, the Police Ministry and the Shin Bet hurled accusations at one another, each attempting to blame the other for the lax security. Shin Bet head Karmi Gillon, whose name was then a state secret, announced that the security services would conduct an internal investigation. The police announced their own internal probe. Astonishingly, within 48 hours—on November 7—the Shin Bet report was concluded and leaked to the press. The document, which was authored by three former branch heads of the Shin Bet, found that the entire protection system assigned to the prime minister had collapsed. The report lambasted the inability of the Shin Bet to gather intelligence on extreme right-wing groups. After the report's release, the head of the

protection department, identified as "D," was forced to resign. The Shin Bet insisted that D's negligence was the sole reason for the procedural breaches on the night of the killing.

On Tuesday, November 7, Raviv was arrested by the police, on charges that he was involved in the assassination. The Jerusalem Post asserted that his group, Eyal, was being investigated in connection with a conspiracy to kill the prime minister. As the handcuffed Raviv was brought to court under heavy police guard, he yelled to reporters, "This is a political investigation and a false arrest! This is a dictatorship!"

The next day, the government announced the formation of a commission of inquiry into the assassination, to be headed by former Supreme Court justice Meir Shamgar. And from the outset, the Shamgar Commission was plagued by conflicts of interest and questions of impartiality. Shamgar himself had served for many years as Judge Advocate General of the Israeli army and maintained ties to the military establishment. He was also a close personal friend of the Rabin family. Shamgar was joined on the panel by a former head of the Mossad, Zvi Zamir, and Professor Ariel Rosen-Zvi, dean of Tel Aviv University law school. Professor Rosen-Zvi was in the advanced stages of cancer at the time and would be dead within weeks of the commission's final report.

In a strange twist, Judge Alon Gillon, the older brother of Shin Bet head Karmi Gillon, was named secretary of the commission. Sitting in on the commission's proceedings was the brother of the government official who was most likely to be blamed if the commission concluded that the Shin Bet had failed to safeguard Rabin. The possible conflict of interest apparently escaped the notice of the commissioners—Karmi Gillon would testify before the commission at length. Unfortunately, neither the public nor the news media were allowed to attend many of the commission's hearings.

Equally troubling was the presence of Attorney General Michael Ben-Yair. Since the commission was investigating, among other issues, whether the attorney general's office was granting some Shin Bet informants—one of which was later alleged to be Raviv—immunity from prosecution, the presence of the attorney general at the hearings was surprising indeed. If the government's intent was to definitively ascertain what led to Rabin's assassination, then even the perception of impropriety should not have been tolerated.

During the days following the assassination, Attorney General Ben-Yair had ordered a crackdown on individuals who were suspected of engaging in "inflammatory speech." Curiously, the crackdown continued for several weeks, then stopped suddenly. Ben-Yair announced—in a stunning reversal—that mere words could not cause an individual to engage in criminal acts, and they had not caused Yigal's act. "The person who killed the prime minister did not do so under the influence of incitement.... He acted due to a complete worldview, which he had developed.... It wasn't because of a poster here or there." Ben-Yair was not the only one to engage in a sudden, unexplained about-face. Police Minister Moshe Shahal, who had previously declared, "We believe that a group of people carefully prepared the ground to conspire to murder carefully chosen targets," now asserted that Yigal was a lone gunman who had organized the assassination on his own.

But the "inciting rhetoric" and "organized conspiracy" theories had served their purpose they had inflamed public opinion against the Israeli Right. Now, I believe they needed to be discarded lest they open an even bigger can of worms about incitement and conspiracy.

On the weekend before the Shamgar Commission was to hear its first witness, Karmi Gillon, there was a stunning revelation: Israeli television and radio both reported that Raviv was, indeed, an undercover agent for the Shin Bet. According to the reports, Raviv, codenamed "Champagne" by his Shin Bet handlers, had been on the government's payroll for at least two years as a top infiltrator of the far Right. But according to an investigation by the Jerusalem Post, Raviv's task involved much more than infiltration: His orders were to attract individuals to Eyal, incite them to illegal activities, and then inform on them to the Shin Bet.

One of the sources of this information was Rabbi Benny Elon, the dean of Yeshivat Beit Orot, a religious college, and son of a retired Supreme Court justice. Elon would later become a Knesset member in 1996. This prominent Jewish-settlement activist and leader of the right-wing group Moledet held a press conference and charged that Raviv had effectively manufactured the wild far Right. He was, in Elon's words, an "agent provocateur," carrying out a mission by the government to discredit the right-wing opposition, including, by association, the Likud. "I would venture to say," Elon added, "that the whole organization [Eyal] and its activities, including the poster depicting Rabin in an SS uniform, were all paid for by the Shin Bet." (The Shin Bet later denied the charge.) Elon went on to say, "There is a reasonable suspicion that [Raviv's activity] was okayed by the legal authority."

Elon, who had met Raviv and other Eyal activists on a number of occasions at demonstrations and elsewhere, said that Raviv had been Yigal's constant companion in the months prior to the killing. How could Raviv have been so close to Yigal and not known, as Raviv later claimed in court, of the assassination plan? And how could a Shin Bet informer have been so closely involved in all of these activities without the knowledge of the Shin Bet, which is supervised by the Office of the Prime Minister?

The two weeks after the assassination were the most horrible period of my life. Now, suddenly, came the revelation of a Shin Bet connection to Yigal's "pal" Raviv.

The Likud, which had been on the defensive since the assassination, came to life in the wake of the Raviv-Shin Bet accusations. At a meeting of the Likud executive bureau, Netanyahu called for "a full, thorough, and exhaustive investigation into the Raviv affair. There must be no coverup. Even if only a fraction of the provocative activities attributed to Raviv are true, they constitute a grave danger to democracy. There must be an investigation, and it must come now, with no delays and no excuses."

And then there were more revelations. Israel's leading daily, Yediot Achronot, reported that in testimony before a closed session of the Shamgar Commission, several young women at a religious seminary said that they had recognized Yigal and Raviv from a Sabbath retreat at Ma'aleh Yisrael the previous summer. The girls told their teacher, Sarah Eliash, that Raviv had denounced several Rabin government officials as "traitors." During several marathon ideological discussions that weekend, Raviv had

attempted to goad Yigal into killing Rabin, ridiculing his "cowardice" for not being willing to assassinate a "traitor." In court, Raviv said he had heard Yigal talk about the "need to kill Rabin" but claimed he hadn't taken him seriously.

The girls testified: "We used to see Raviv and Amir on Saturdays during last summer. These gatherings were arranged by Yigal. We would sit out on a hilltop there. There were no demonstrations or any violence. They were basically study groups. We met, like, several times.... Raviv was real macho. He kept saying to Yigal, 'You keep talking about killing Rabin. Why don't you do it? Are you frightened? You say you want to do it. Show us that you're a man! Show us what you are made of'" The girls testified that Yigal didn't react at all to Raviv's pressure and just changed the subject of discussion.

Suddenly, information about Raviv was spilling forth. Raviv's former roommate in Kiryat Arba, and former member of Eyal, Eran Ojalbo, testified as a witness for the defense at Yigal's trial. He revealed that Raviv had said that Rabin was a *rodef*—the Hebrew term for someone who endangers others and therefore should be killed. At a weekend retreat organized by Yigal in the settlement of Ma'alch Yisrael, press reports say, Raviv had marked several different government leaders for death.

Ojalbo also testified that ten minutes after news of the assassination had been announced, Raviv called him and asked how he was and if he knew who had shot Rabin. Ojalbo responded that in television reports he had seen that it was "a short Yemenite guy." Raviv asked if it was Yigal. "I looked again," Ojalbo testified, "and said that it was Yigal."

Ojalbo also maintained that Raviv had verbally pressured Yigal to attempt an assassination of Rabin. "Raviv told Yigal and others, time and time again, that there was a *din-rodef* [judgment] on Yitzhak Rabin. He said, 'Rabin should die,' and whoever killed him was a righteous person.... Raviv had a powerful influence on Yigal. He continuously emphasized to him and other students that whoever implemented the *din-rodef* against Rabin was carrying out a holy mission."

Israel television's Chen appeared before the Shamgar Commission and related the details of Raviv's involvement with the SS handouts. Raviv's job was to discredit the Right, Chen said, and what could be more effective than giving the public the idea that the entire opposition considered Rabin to be a Nazi?

The next Raviv revelation came from the Jerusalem Post investigative reporter Steve Rodan. He reported that "Israel Broadcasting Authority spokesman [Ayala Cohen] said the first report of the Rabin shooting was broadcast at 9:48 P.M. Channel 1 began broadcasting live at 10:15, and 15 minutes later, the alleged assassin was identified as a 25-year-old student from Herzliyya."

But Rodan also wrote that Raviv had arrived at the Tel Aviv rally 15 minutes before Rabin's murder. When the first rumors of the shooting swept through the crowd, at 9:50 P.M., Rodan reported, "Immediately Raviv pulled out his mobile telephone and spoke to an unidentified person. 'He called somebody,' one of the witnesses said. 'He asked whether they shot Rabin.' Then Raviv asked, 'Was he hurt?'.... When he finished [the conversation] he shouted, 'It was Yigal. Don't you know Yigal? He was

at the Orient House demonstrations [Eyal's protests at PLO headquarters in Jerusalem]. Raviv then made his way toward nearby Ichilov Hospital and then disappeared."

"Those around him could not understand how Raviv knew the identity of the assassin before anyone else," Rodan reported.

As the accusations about Raviv mounted, the opposition Tsomet party petitioned the High Court of Justice to prevent Attorney General Ben-Yair from attending further Shamgar Commission hearings. The petition asked that, at a minimum, Ben-Yair be prohibited from questioning witnesses, including Shin Bet agents and confidential informants, whose activities he might have authorized. The petition also argued that since Ben-Yair might himself be called to testify, it was improper for him to become familiar with others' testimony.

Instead of ruling on the merits of the petition, the High Court offered a compromise proposal under which Tsomet would withdraw its petition in exchange for a promise that Ben-Yair would absent himself if a conflict of interest arose. But it was a disappointing action by the Court, and it did little to restore the image of the commission. The growing public perception was that Ben-Yair was sitting in on the commission hearings to conduct damage control for the government in the wake of the Raviv-Shin Bet revelations.

On December 14, Raviv himself appeared before the Shamgar Commission. After completing his secret testimony, he was whisked away in a government car and vanished from public view.

Following Raviv's testimony, the commission issued warning letters to six Shin Bet officials, including Karmi Gillon. The letters cautioned the officials that they might face criminal liability as a result of their involvement with the events surrounding Raviv and the Rabin murder. Gillon and several other Shin Bet agents were called back for additional testimony, in light of Raviv's statements to the commission.

On January 8, 1996, Karmi Gillon resigned. The Israeli media concluded that had he not stepped down voluntarily, the Shamgar Commission would have insisted on his removal. The man who had been championed as an expert on Jewish extremism had failed to examine and follow up on information that he had received regarding a possible attack on the prime minister by Jewish extremists. But what was widely perceived as Gillon's negligence explained only a fraction of the events that led to the assassination. Why hadn't the Shin Bet ordered Raviv to cease his provocations? Why had it not detained or at least questioned Yigal before he acted? Why the strange restraint in the face of a threat to the prime minister?

The Jerusalem Post reported: "Yigal told investigators that he acted alone, did not belong to an extremist organization, and had 'received instructions from God to kill Prime Minister Rabin.'" Yigal also reiterated in court that he acted alone. I believe he did so in order not to implicate others.

On March 28, 1996, the Shamgar Commission released its report. Of the 332 pages, 118 were declared classified. The unclassified parts blamed Gillon for the failures of

the Shin Bet on the night of the murder but did not find him or any other agents criminally negligent. According to the Jerusalem Post, the unclassified sections contained only a few scattered references to the relationship between the running of agents and the Shin Bet. The report depicted the assassination as a failure by the agents protecting Rabin to organize themselves effectively. In one of its least believable conclusions, the Shamgar report claimed that Gillon—the expert on right-wing Jewish extremism—“did not conduct even one substantive, relevant, thorough, and comprehensive discussion with all the security and intelligence-gathering bodies to review methods.” This was after two senior Shin Bet officers told the commission that they had gathered intelligence reports that right-wing groups could be a threat to both Jews and Arabs.

Equally bizarre was the commission's assertion that in order to “safeguard” the Shin Bet's operational methods, testimony by or about Raviv and his role had to be placed in a classified appendix to the report. In Chapter 5 of the commission's report is a section entitled “The Avishai Raviv Episode.” The page is blank except for the cryptic note that “the details of this subject will be discussed in the secret appendix.”

A section entitled “The Operation of Agents” states: “The body that operates an informer must keep tight control of him and not allow him to initiate actions at his will ... and to prevent the carrying out of provocations that in the end might have a boomerang effect.” Could they have been referring to Raviv?

The official investigation of Raviv's relationship with Yigal remains shrouded in secrecy. Labor, of course, wanted no further probing into a potentially explosive scandal. Ironically, Likud, having forced national elections in two months, preferred to put the issue to rest.

The idea of using an agent provocateur was not originated by the Shin Bet. The secret police in czarist Russia created fake anarchist cells in order to attract genuine anarchist militants whom they would arrest and execute. When the Soviets came to power, they employed the same tactic against their political enemies. In the United States, the FBI created COINTELPRO (the counterintelligence program) to recruit potential lawbreakers, help incite them to break the law, then arrest them. By the late 1970s, the use of such unscrupulous tactics had been exposed and widely condemned as improper interference with citizens' rights. In Israel, unfortunately, dirty tricks are still commonly used.

Neither the Shin Bet nor the political echelon that controls it, the Office of the Prime Minister, seems to have appreciated the difference between a legitimate informant and an agent provocateur.

I believe Raviv enjoyed the full backing and protection of the Shin Bet. He assaulted a member of the Knesset and did not serve a day in jail. The Office of the Prime Minister was contacted to help intervene in an attempt to prevent his expulsion from Tel Aviv University. He emerged scot-free from distributing racist literature, publicly praising Baruch Goldstein, holding illegal summer militia camps, and allegedly distributing the Rabin-SS poster. On many occasions, he allegedly urged the assassination of Rabin and other Labor government officials and was never

prosecuted. Raviv's lawlessness had to have sent the message to potential extremists that violence could be employed with impunity.

As I see it, Karmi Gillon and Avishai Raviv were the perfect match: Gillon, the Shin Bet chief obsessed with the belief that right-wing Jewish terrorist groups were on the loose; and Raviv, the alleged Shin Bet informer actively ensuring that Gillon's dark prophecies came true. If Raviv was an informer, did he alert Shin Bet agents that Yigal was now a potential assassin? I find it inconceivable that he would have kept such information to himself. Yet Yigal was never arrested. Never questioned. Never had his gun license revoked. Never had his gun confiscated. Did Gillon know from Raviv about Yigal's activities? If so, why didn't he order his agents to undertake any action against Yigal? What were they waiting for?

Just minutes after Yigal had shot the prime minister, somebody called reporters, identified himself as a spokesman for a right-wing organization, and claimed, "This time we missed. Next time we won't." It seems astonishing to me that the caller could have known that the shots were fired by a right-wing Jew rather than an Arab. Why did he think that the attack had failed?

Could the caller have been Raviv? I think he spent months inciting Yigal to make the attempt. He may have suspected that it would take place that night. I also think that he positioned himself at the rally, close enough to the scene of the crime to know that the shots had been fired, enabling him to make the immediate calls to the reporters. (One wonders what might emerge from an investigation of the itemized bill of Raviv's cellular phone.)

Yet, for some reason, Raviv was sure that the attempt would fail. Why? Perhaps somebody—either Raviv or someone else—was surreptitiously supposed to have disabled Yigal's gun, either by removing the firing pin or by replacing the bullets with blanks, before the shooting. It has been claimed in court that it was Yigal who shouted, "Blanks! Blanks!" But Shin Bet agents are trained to shout out "Blanks! Blanks!" in security drills. And I believe that that cry, combined with the fact that an agent assured Mrs. Rabin that the gun was not real, might mean that the Shin Bet were expecting an unsuccessful assassination attempt.

The Shin Bet could have arrested Yigal at any time in the weeks before the rally and charged him with plotting to kill Rabin. But the impact on the public would be so much more dramatic if Shin Bet agents heroically foiled an attempt on the prime minister's life. But something went terribly wrong. The bullets were not blanks; the gun was not a toy.

My belief has some basis in past events. Foiling attempted crimes at the last second is a well-established Shin Bet method. In April 1984, in a Shin Bet operation, agents were tracking a group of settlement leaders who were engaged in retaliatory attacks against Arab terrorists. They followed the suspects as they planted explosives on several Arab buses in East Jerusalem. After this, the suspects were allowed to travel back to their residences. Only then did the Shin Bet raid their houses and conduct arrests. At the time, it was reported that the Shin Bet delayed taking suspects into custody until after the bombs were planted in order to sensationalize their own heroic efforts. Faced with the shocking news story, then prime minister Yitzhak Shamir had

no choice but to let the security services arrest dozens of other suspects and crack down on the settlement organizations.

More recently, there is the disturbing case of the Kahalani brothers, Eitan and Yehoyada, from Kiryat Arba. The two men were convicted of plotting to shoot an Arab in retaliation for the murder of a Jewish settler. The pair had taken their loaded rifles to a road near the village of Kafr Batir, where they spotted an Arab man on a bicycle. As the Arab approached their truck, Eitan raised his rifle to fire, but the gun malfunctioned and Shin Bet agents waiting in ambush rushed to arrest the two brothers. The charge sheet is revealing. It contends that the murder was dramatically foiled "as a result of the removal of the firing pin by GSS [Shin Bet] without prior knowledge of the accused, [hence] no shot was fired."

The Kahalanis' attorney argued that a third individual involved in planning the attack was a Shin Bet plant who had disabled the guns. The alleged informant was arrested and then quickly released despite the charge that he was involved in the conspiracy. Why did the Shin Bet wait until after Eitan Kahalani had pulled the trigger to move in and make the arrest?

What Israel needs now is to heal the terrible wounds that the nation has suffered as a result of the assassination and its aftermath. To ease the malaise that is eating away at our society. To restore the public's confidence in our government. And, above all, to preserve the principles that are the basis of our democratic way of life.

My concern for the lives and the freedom of my two sons ensures that I will not rest until the truth—about Avishai Raviv, the Shin Bet and my son Yigal—is fully revealed.

(Guela Amir, *A Mother's Defense*, published in *George Magazine*, March 1997, p. 138)

APPENDIX C: TALMUD PASSAGES

The following are summarized references to Christians and Christianity from the uncensored books of the Talmud: [\(Footnote 90\)](#)

Abhodah Zarah (22a) Don't associate with gentiles, they shed blood
 Iore Dea (153, 2). Must not associate with Christians, shed blood
 Abhodah Zarah (25b). Beware of Christians when walking with them.
 Orach Chaiim (20, 2). Christians disguise themselves to kill Jews.
 Abhodah Zarah (15b) Christians have sex relations with animals.
 Abhodah Zarah (22a) Suspect Christians of intercourse with animals.
 Schabbath (145b) Christians unclean because they eat accordingly
 Abhodah Zarah (22b) Christians unclean because not at Mount Sinai.
 Iore Dea (198, 48). Clean female Jews contaminated by Christians.
 Kerithuth (6b p. 78) Jews called men, Christians not called men.
 Makkoth (7b) Innocent of murder if intent to kill Christian.
 Orach Chaiim (225, 10) Christians and animals grouped.
 Midrasch Talpioth 225 Christians created to minister to Jews.
 Orach Chaiim 57, 6a Christians to be pitied more than sick pigs.
 Zohar II (64b) Christian idolaters likened to cows and asses.
 Kethuboth (110b). Psalmist compares Christians to unclean beasts.
 Sanhedrin (74b). Tos. Sexual intercourse of Christian like beast.
 Kethuboth (3b) The seed of Christian is valued as seed of beast.
 Kidduschim (68a) Christians like the people of an ass.
 Eben Haezar (44,8) Marriages between Christian and Jews null.
 Zohar (II, 64b) Christian birth rate to be diminished materially.
 Zohar (I, 28b) Christian idolaters children of Eve's serpent.
 Zohar (I, 131a) Idolatrous people (Christians) befoul the world.
 Emek Haschanach (17a) Non-Jews' souls come from death and its shadow.
 Zohar (I, 46b, 47a) Souls of gentiles have unclean divine origins.
 Rosch Haschanach (17a) Non-Jews souls go down to hell.
 Iore Dea (337, 1). Replace dead Christians like lost cow or ass.
 Iebhammoth (61a) Jews called men, but not Christians called men.
 Abhodah Zarah (14b) T. Not to sell religious works to Christians.
 Abhodah Zarah (78) Christian churches are places of idolatry.
 Iore Dea (142, 10) Must keep far away physically from churches.
 Iore Dea (142, 15) Do not listen to church music or look at idols.
 Iore Dea (143, 1) Must not rebuild homes destroyed near churches.
 Hilkoth Abh. Zar. (10b) Jews must nor resell broken chalices to Christians.
 Schabbath (116a) Tos. Gospels called volumes of iniquity, heretical books.
 Schabbath (116a). Talmudists agree that books of Christians to be burned.
 Abhodah Zarah (2a). Festivals of Christians called days of calamity.
 Abhodah Zarah (78c). Christian feast days despicable, vain and evil.
 Abhodah Zarah (6a). Forbidden to observe Christian Christmas day.
 Hikoth Akum (ch.IX). Forbidden to celebrate Easter and Christmas.
 Chullin (91b) Jews possess dignity even angels cannot share.
 Sanhedrin, 58b To strike Israelite like slapping face of God.
 Chagigah, 15b A Jew considered good in spite of sins he commits.
 Gittin (62a) Jew stay away from Christian homes on holidays.

Choschen Ham. (26,1) Jew not sue before a Christian judge or laws.
 Choschen Ham (34,19) Christian or servant cannot become witnesses.
 Iore Dea (112, 1). Eating with Christians, breeds familiarity.
 Abhodah Zarah (35b) Not drink milk from cow milked by Christian.
 Iore Dea (178, 1) Not imitate Christian customs, even hair-comb.
 Abhodah Zarah (72b) Discard wine touched by Christians.
 Iore Dea (120, 1) Bought-dishes from Christians to be well-washed.
 Abhodah Zarah (2a) Avoid all, for 3 days before Christian festivals.
 Abhodah Zarah (78c) Christian festivals regarded as idolatry.
 Iore Dea (139, 1) Avoid things used in Christian worship.
 Abhodah Zarah (14b) Don't sell Christians articles for worship.
 Iore Dea (151, 1) H. Don't sell water to Christians for baptisms.
 Abhodah Zarah (2a, 1) No trade with Christians on feast days.
 Abhodah Zarah (1, 2) Now such trade permitted.
 Abhodah Zarah (2aT) Trade because they have money to pay.
 Iore Dea (148, 5) If Christian not devout, send him gifts.
 Hilkoth Akum (IX, 2) Send gifts to Christians only if irreligious.
 Iore Dea (81, 7 Ha) Christian wet-nurses dangerous.
 Iore Dea (153, 1 H) Christian nurse will lead children to heresy.
 Iore Dea (155, 1). Avoid unknown Christian doctors.
 Peaschim (25a) Avoid medical help from idolaters (Christians).
 Iore Dea (156, 1) Avoid Christian barbers unless escorted by Jews.
 Abhodah Zarah (26a). Christian midwives dangerous when alone.
 Zohar (1, 25b) Those good to Christians never rise when dead.
 Hilkoth Akum (X, 6) Help needy Christians if it will promote peace.
 Iore Dea (148, 12H) Hide hatred for Christians at celebrations.
 Abhodah Zarah (20a) Never praise Christians lest it be believed.
 Iore Dea (151, 14) Don't praise Christians to add to glory.
 Hilkoth Akum (V, 12) Quote Scriptures to stop mention of their god
 Iore Dea (146, 15) Christian religious articles contemptible.
 Iore Dea (147, 5) Deride Christian religious articles.
 Hilkoth Akum (X, 5) No gifts to Christians, gifts to converts.
 Iore Dea (151, 11) No gifts to Christians, encourages friendship.
 Iore Dea (335, 43) Exile for that Jew who sells farm to Christian.
 Iore Dea (154, 2) Forbidden to teach a trade to a Christian.
 Babha Bathra (54b) Christian property belongs to first claimant.
 Choschen Ham (183, 7) Keep what Christian overpays in error.
 Choschen Ham (226, 1) Jew may keep lost property of Christian.
 Babha Kama (113b) It is permitted to deceive Christians.
 Choschen Ham (183, 7) Jews divide what they overcharge Christians.
 Choschen Ham (156, 5) Must not take Christian customers from Jews.
 Iore Dea (157, 2) H May deceive all who believe Christian tenets.
 Abhodah Zarah (54a) Usury practiced on Christians or apostates.
 Iore Dea (159, 1) Usury permitted now for any reason to Christians.
 Babha Kama (113a) Jew may lie and perjure to condemn a Christian.
 Babha Kama (113b) Name of God unprofaned when lying to Christians.
 Kallah (1b, p.18) Jew may perjure himself with a clear conscience.
 Schabbouth Hag. (6d). Jews may swear falsely by use of subterfuge.
 Zohar (1, 160a). Jews must always try to deceive Christians.
 Iore Dea (158, 1) Do not cure Christians unless it makes enemies.

Orach Cahiim (330, 2) Not assist Christian's childbirth on Saturday
 Choschen Ham.(425, 5) Unless Torah believer, don't prevent death.
 Iore Dea (158, 1) Christians not enemies must not be saved either.
 Hilkkoth Akum (X, 1) Do not save Christians in danger of death.
 Choschen Ham (386, 10) A spy may be killed even before he confesses.
 Abhodah Zarah (26b) Apostates to be cast into well, not rescued.
 Choschen Ham (388,15) Kill all who give Jews' money to Christians.
 Sanhedrin (59a) "Prying into Jews' "Law" to get death penalty.
 Hilkkoth Akum (X, 2) Baptized Jews are to be put to death.
 Iore Dea (158, 2) Hag. Kill renegades who turn to Christian rituals.
 Choschen Ham (425, 5) Those who do not believe in Torah to be killed
 Hilkkoth tesch.III, 8 Christians deny the "Law" of the Torah.
 Zohar (I, 25a) Christians to be destroyed as idolaters.
 Zohar (II, 19a) Captivity of Jews end when Christian princes die.
 Zohar (I, 219b) Princes of Christians are idolaters, must die.
 Obadiah When Rome is destroyed, Israel will be redeemed.
 Abhodah Zarah (26b) T. Even the best of the Goim should be killed.
 Sepher Or Israel 177b If Jew kills Christian commits no sin.
 Ialkut Simoni (245c) Shedding blood of impious sacrifice to God.
 Zohar (II,43a). Extermination of Christian necessary sacrifice.
 Zohar (L, 28b, 39a) High place in heaven for all who kill idolaters.
 Hilkkoth Akum (X, 1) Make no agreement, show no mercy to Christians
 Hilkkoth Akum (X, 1) Turn them away from their idols or kill.
 Hilkkoth Akum (X, 7). Allow no idolaters to remain where Jews are strong.
 Choschen Ham (388,16) All contribute to cost of killing traitor.
 Pesachim (49b) No need of prayers while beheading on Sabbath.
 Schabbath (118a). Prayers save from punishment of coming Messiah.

Bibliography

Adams, Leonard P., II (see McCoy, Alfred W.)

Ball, Douglas (see Ball, George)

Ball, George & Douglas Ball, *The Passionate Attachment: America's Involvement With Israel, 1947 to the Present*, Copyright 1992 by authors, published by W.W. Norton & Company, ISBN 0-393-02933-6

Beschloss, Michael, *Taking Charge: The Johnson White House Tapes, 1963-1964*, edited and commentary, published by Simon & Schuster, Copyright 1997 by author, ISBN 0-684-80407-7

Beschloss, Michael, *The Crisis Years: Kennedy and Khrushchev, 1960-1963*, Copyright 1991 by author, published by Edward Burlingame Books, an imprint of HarperCollins Publishers, ISBN 0-06-016454-9

Bloomfield, Bernard M., *Israel Diary*, Crown Publishers, Copyright 1950 by publisher

Bloomfield, Louis M. and Gerald F. FitzGerald, *Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons: Prevention and Punishment – An Analysis of the UN Convention*, Praeger Publishers, New York, NY, Copyright 1975 by publisher, ISBN 0-275-05350-4

Bloomfield, Louis M., *Egypt, Israel and the Gulf of Aqaba*, published by The Carswell Company, Limited; Toronto, Canada; Copyright 1957 by author

Brown, Bill (see Sullivan, William)

Bugliosi, Vincent and Curt Gentry, *Helter Skelter*, published by Bantem Books, Copyright 1994 by Bugliosi

Caro, Robert A., *The Path to Power*, published by Vintage Books, Copyright 1981, 1982 by author, ISBN 0-679-72945-3

Clark, Evert and Nicholas Horrock, *Contrabandista!*, Praeger Publishers, New York, Copyright 1973 by author, LOCN 72-87296

Clarke, Thurston, *By Blood and Fire: The Attack on the King David Hotel*, copyright 1981 by author, published by G.P. Putnam's Sons, ISBN 0-399-12605-8

Cleveland, William L., *A History of the Modern Middle East*, published by Westview Press, Inc., Copyright - 1994 by publisher, ISBNs 0-8133-0562-4 (history) & 0-8133-0563-2 (20th Century)

Cole, Wayne S., *Senator Gerald P. Nye and American Foreign Relations*, Copyright 1962 by the University of Minnesota, Printed in the United States at the North Central Publishing Company, St. Paul; Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 62-21813

Colodny, Len and Robert Gettlin, *Silent Coup: The Removal of a President*, published by St. Martin's Press, Copyright 1991 by authors, ISBN 0-312-05156-5

Crenshaw, Dr. Charles A., M.D.; Jens Hansen, J.Gary Shaw, *JFK: Conspiracy of Silence*, published by SIGNET - Penguin Group, Copyright - 1992 by authors, Forward Copyright - 1992, John H. Davis, ISBN 0-451-40346-0)

Evans-Pritchard, Ambrose, *The Secret Life of Bill Clinton: the Unreported Stories*, published by Regnery Publishing, Inc., Copyright 1997 by author, ISBN 0-89526-408-0

FitzGerald, Gerald F. (see Bloomfield, Louis M.)

Freedman, Benjamin H., *Facts are Facts: The Truth About Khazars*, Copyright 1954, CPA Books; ISBN: 0944379222

Garrison, Jim, *On the Trail of the Assassins*, published by Warner Books, Inc., copyright 1988 by author

Gentry, Curt (see Bugliosi, Vincent)

Gettlin, Robert (see Colodny, Len)

Giuliano, Geoffrey, *Lennon in America: 1971 - 1980, Based in part on the Lost Lennon Diaries*, published by Cooper Square Press, Copyright 2000 by The Lennon Project, ISBN 0-8154-1073-5

Hansen, Jens (see Crenshaw, Dr. Charles A., M.D.)

Heikal, Mohamad Hassanein, *The Cairo Documents*, Copyright 1971, 1972, 1973 by author and the Sunday Telegraph, published by The New York Times Company, ISBN 0-385-06447-0

Horrock, Nicholas (see Clark, Evert)

Irving, David, *Hitler's War*, published by Macmillan Company, Copyright 1977 by author, ISBN 0-670-37412-1

Isserman, Maurice (see Kazin, Michael)

Josephus, Flavius (AD 37/38 - 100), *Antiquities of the Jews*

Kazin, Michael and Maurice Isserman, *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*, published by Oxford University Press, Copyright 2000 by publisher, ISBN 0-19-509190-6

Kennedy, John F., *Profiles in Courage*, published by Harper & Brothers, Copyright 1955 & 1956 by author (commemorative edition published by HarperPerennial, a division of HarperCollins Publishers), ISBN: 0-06-080698-2

Kennedy, John F., *Why England Slept*, published by Wilfred Funk, Inc., Copyright 1940 & 1961 by publisher, LOCN 40-14799

Krüger, Henrik, *The Great Heroin Coup: Drugs, Intelligence, & International Fascism*, Copyright 1976, published by South End Press, ISBN 0-89608-032-3

Lipstadt, Deborah, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*, Copyright 1993 by the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism, published by the Free Press, ISBN 0-02-919235-8

Mahoney, Richard D., *JFK: Ordeal in Africa*, published by Oxford University Press, Copyright - 1983 by publisher, ISBN 0-19-503341-8

Marrs, Jim, *Crossfire: The Plot That Killed Kennedy*, published by Carroll & Graff Publishers, Inc., Copyright 1989 by author

Marrus, Michael, *Samuel Bronfman: The Life and Times of Seagram's Mr. Sam*, published by Penguin Books Canada, Ltd., Copyright 1991 by author

May, Ernest R. & Philip D. Zelikow, *The Kennedy Tapes: Inside the White House During the Cuban Missile Crisis*, Copyright 1997 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College, published by the Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, ISBN 0-674-17926-9

McCoy, Alfred W. with Cathleen B. Read and Leonard P. Adams II, *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia*, Copyright 1972, published by Harper, Standard Book Number 06-012901-8

Miller, Merle, *Plain Speaking: An Oral Auto-Biography of Harry S. Truman*, published by Berkeley Books, Copyright 1974

Morris, Roger, *Partners in Power: The Clintons and Their America*, published by Henry Holt and Company, copyright 1996 by author, ISBN 0-8050-2804-8

Newman, Peter C., *King of the Castle*, published by Atheneum, manufactured by American Book-Stratford Press, Saddle Brook, NJ, Copyright 1978 & 1979 by author, ISBN 0-689-10963-6

Parnet, Herbert S., *Jack: the Struggles of John F. Kennedy*, published by The Dial Press, Copyright 1980

Parnet, Herbert S., *JFK, the Presidency of John F. Kennedy*, published by The Dial Press, Copyright 1983 by author, ISBN 0-385-27419-X

Piper, Michael Collins, *Final Judgment*, published by the Liberty Lobby, Copyright 1998 (fourth edition), ISBN 0-935036-51-0

Read, Cathleen B. (see McCoy, Alfred W.)

Reeves, Richard, *President Kennedy, Profile of Power*, published by NY: Simon & Schuster, Copyright 1993

Santos, Richard, *Silent Heritage: The Sephardim and the Colonization of the Spanish North American Frontier, 1492-1600*, published by Shofar, Copyright 1997

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., *A Thousand Days, John F. Kennedy in the White House*, published by Houghton Mifflin Company, Copyright - 1965 by author, Library of Congress Catalog Card No.: 65-20218

Shaw, J.Gary (Crenshaw, Dr. Charles A., M.D.)

Shawcross, William, *Sideshow: Kissinger, Nixon and the Destruction of Cambodia*, Copyright 1979 by author, published by Simon and Schuster, ISBN: 0-671-23070-0

Stinnett, Robert B., *Day of Deceit: The Truth About FDR and Pearl Harbor*, Copyright 2000 by author, published by The Free Press, ISBN: 0-684-85339-6

Sullivan, William and Bill Brown, *The Bureau: My Thirty Years in Hoover's FBI*, Copyright 1979, W.W. Norton & Company; ISBN: 0393012360

Urquhart, Brian, *Hammarskjöld*, published by New York: Harper Colophon Books, Copyright 1972

Warren Commission, *Report of the Warren Commission: The Assassination of President Kennedy*, Copyright 1963, 1964, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 64-24803

Wenner, Jann S., *Lennon Remembers (Rolling Stone interviews from 1970)*, published by Verso, Copyright 1971 by Jann S. Wenner, Copyright 2000 by Rolling Stone Press, ISBN 1-85984-600-9

Zelikow, Philip D. (see May, Ernest)

Movies

As it Happened, NBC-TV coverage of JFK assassination

JFK – by Oliver Stone, Warner Brothers, a Time Warner Company; Copyright 1991

The Men Who Killed Kennedy – by Nigel Turner, Program Copyright 1988 Central Independent Television plc, video distributed by Time/Warner, ISBN 1-56068-849-1)

Audio Tapes

JFK press conference, dated October 31, 1963 – provided by the John F. Kennedy Library, audio-visual department, Columbia Point, Boston, MA 02125

Strategy of Peace (American University Speech) – provided by the John F. Kennedy Library, gift shop, Columbia Point, Boston, MA 02125

Internet

American Federation of Scientists (FAS), <http://www.fas.org>

America's Dreyfus Affair: The Case of the Death of Vince Foster, David Martin, (<http://www.thebird.org/host/dcdave/>)

Benjamin Freedman's Speech – 1961, Willard Hotel in Washington, D.C., transcript available available through many sources including National Vanguard Books and Islamzin (<http://www.islamzine.com>)

Charles Orde Wingate, General (brief biography) – Source: The Pedagogic Center, The Department for Jewish Zionist Education, The Jewish Agency for Israel, (c) 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, Director: Dr. Motti Friedman, Webmaster: Esther Carciente

Congress, the President, and the Battle of Ideas: Vietnam Policy, 1965-1969 – by Michael Jay Friedman (1999), published by the Corcoran Department of History at the University of Virginia, <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/journals/EH/EH41/Friedman41.html>

Count Bernadotte Assassination by Zionist Gangs: 17 September 1948 –

by Ghada Sharqawy, 1998, Palestinian Information Center, <http://www.palestine-info.net>

LEXPERT—Canadian Legal Directory—Goodman Phillips & Vineberg

<http://www.lexpert.ca/firms/goodmanphil.html>

Nomenclature of an Assassination Cabal, by William Torbitt, Reference Section I: *Permindex and its Five Subsidiaries* (written around 1969)

<http://www.newsmakingnews.com/torbitt.htm#I>

Prelude To Leadership - The European Diary of John F. Kennedy, Summer 1945 – by John F. Kennedy, Regnery Publishing, Inc., Washington DC

Terrorists and Madmen - by Stephen R. Shalom, March 27, 1999, ZNET, <http://www.zmag.org/sustainers/content/1999-03/mar27shalom.htm>

The Histadrut Crime Family – 1996, Dr. Steven Plaut, senior lecturer in economics and business, University of Haifa

The Histadrut – The Jewish Agency for Israel The World Zionist Organization

The Protocols of Zion – Radio Islam-(at <http://www.abbc.com>)

References Books

Encyclopedia Americana, 1988 edition

Encyclopedia Britannica, Year 2002 edition

Martindale-Hubbel International Law Directory, Volume II, North America, The Caribbean, Central America, South America; 1998 edition, page NA391B (Goodman, Phillips and Vineberg profile)

Talmud on CD (Judaic Classics Library by Davka Corporation): The Soncino Talmud, Copyright 1973 by Judaica Press, Inc; Copyright 1965, 67, 77, 83, 84, 87, 88 & 90 by Soncino Press, Ltd.

Magazines

George Magazine – March 1997; *A Mother's Defense*, Guela Amir

Monthly Labor Review – January 1997 excerpt from article: *Arthur Goldberg: proof of the American dream*, Edward B. Shils, Ph.D, pages 59 - 60

Other Documents

Histadrut Award: Bloomfield to be Honored (1967), Montreal Newspaper article, declassified document (Sep. 1, 1982), FOI Case No. 8201020, United States Department of State

Report of the Independent Counsel in Re Vincent W. Foster, Jr., Robert B. Fiske, Jr., Independent Counsel; June 30, 1994

Valentine, Carol, *Did NORAD Send the "Suicide" Jets?* (Feb. 12, 2002), <http://www.Public-Action.com/SkyWriter/>

Valentine, Carol, *Operation 911: No Suicide Pilots* (Oct. 6, 2001), <http://www.Public-Action.com/SkyWriter/>

