



YOUR KINDLE NOTES FOR:

The Kennedy Assassination Cover-Up

Donald Gibson

Last accessed on Friday, March 25, 2022

62 Highlights | 0 Notes

Yellow highlight | Location: 392

Curry and Wade did most of the talking, in press interviews and press conferences; Fritz was directly involved in the investigation. The Warren Commission criticized Fritz for publicly convicting Oswald on November 23, thereby jeopardizing Oswald's rights.[43] As we will see, the Commission should have criticized elements of the media and the FBI more than local officials in Dallas. On the 24th, Fritz did this again in a press interview. He was less definitive about the possibility that others were involved. Fritz was asked if there "was anyone else connected with Oswald in the matter?" Fritz said, "Well, now, not that I know of." [44] Chief Curry spoke frequently with the press; he did so at least once on each of those first three days. On the 22nd, he said that they probably had "sufficient evidence" to convict Oswald. He also said "There are still many things that we need to work on." Asked about the possibility of a conspiracy, Curry said "We...there's no one else but him." [45] His comments on the 23rd were more uncertain. Curry said that he thought they had "the right man," but he also said "we don't have positive proof." Asked if Oswald was the only suspect, Curry said "Yes." [46] Later in the same interview Curry was asked if there was "any evidence that there was anybody else involved in this?" Curry responded: "No, sir, not that we know of." Asked again shortly thereafter about the "possibility of accomplices," Curry said, "We don't believe so at this time." [47]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 407

During the evening of the 23rd, Curry appeared again for press interviews. During one of these, he was asked again if there was any evidence of accomplices. Curry stated that: At this time, we don't believe so. We are talking to a man that works in the same building that we have in our subversive files and we are talking to him but he denies any knowledge of it. [48] Obviously, on the 23rd, the Dallas police were actively interested in the possibility of accomplices. In a different interview that evening, Curry also indicated that there was an ongoing investigation, saying: I think our case [against Oswald] was in good shape this morning and it is much stronger tonight. We will continue to work on every possible shred of evidence that comes to our attention. [49] On the 22nd there was no one else. By the evening of the 23rd, they were looking into a possible accomplice and were continuing the investigation.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 437

It is true that Curry talks about this in the most cautious of terms, never suggesting that he suspects a conspiracy in the assassination. He, however, did not close the door on this possibility in his public statements. Later, in a book published in 1969 entitled JFK Assassination File, Curry did two things. He pointed out that the role of the Dallas police in providing security for the President was very limited and that their role in the investigation was also limited. Second, he clearly indicated that he thought there was a conspiracy.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 450

Less than twelve hours after the assassination, Curry transferred the evidence to the FBI, trusting them to do a good job and to return the evidence. They did neither. The Secret Service had already seized the body.[54] Curry says that in the days after the assassination Dallas investigators waited for the release of a detailed autopsy report, complete with photographic evidence.[55] It never came and Curry says that he suspected that some of the material was destroyed. Curry saw signs of a conspiracy in other aspects of the case as well. For example, Curry points to numerous facts and reports which indicated that the President was hit from the front.[56] He also notes that a picture of the Book Depository shows a man who looks like Oswald standing in front at the time the President was killed. That picture, referred to in Chapter One, is reproduced and discussed in Harold Weisberg's Whitewash II: The FBI-Secret Service Cover-up.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 532

Information about Oswald, that he had been in Russia and was pro-Communist, appeared very quickly. J. Edgar Hoover allegedly gave such information to Attorney General Robert Kennedy by about 2:30 P.M., CST.[75] Hoover may have received this information from the FBI files in Washington or from the Dallas FBI office; Dallas police did not have a file on Oswald.[76] The 112th Military Intelligence Group, Fort Sam Houston, also had a file on Oswald and had learned immediately of his arrest.[77] Lt. Col. Robert Jones of the 112th had provided information to the FBI's Gordon Shanklin, [78] apparently sometime between 2:00 and 2:30 P.M.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 585

Air Force One arrived at Washington at 5:00 P.M., CST, 6:00 P.M., EST. Oswald was a suspect by this time, but where would a conclusion that there was no conspiracy have come from? Journalist and author Theodore White says that within an hour of the assassination, President Kennedy's military aide, Major General Chester V. Clifton, had established "contact with the national command center in Washington to find out whether this was indeed coup or conspiracy." By "national command center" White, or his source, seems to mean the White House and the Pentagon.[86] The reference could be to the Situation Room in the White House, a facility under the control of national security advisor McGeorge Bundy.[87]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 592

Why anyone would think that authorities located in Washington would know within a few hours whether or not there was a conspiracy related to an assassination in Dallas is certainly not clear. Apparently, the relevant conversations are either unintelligible on the tapes held by the LBJ Library or those parts of the tape were erased.[88] People aboard a plane returning to Washington from Hawaii, including much of the President's cabinet, also heard stories about Oswald and his past which were understood to imply that Oswald was the assassin. Although one account vaguely implies that the information was coming from the White House Situation Room,[89] another specifically identifies the source as the wire service machine[90] Those conversations are also apparently missing from the tapes at the LBJ Library. In the hours following these events, and still only ten to fifteen hours after the assassination, Oswald became more than just the focus of attention and more than just a suspect. He was convicted as a lone assassin and was quickly declared to be a nut. While Dallas officials were tending in the direction of looking for accomplices, important elements of the media were closing the case.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 653

Captain Fritz is quoted as saying that "the case is cinched" and D.A. Wade saying that they had "enough evidence to convict him now." As was noted earlier, there was this rush to judgment about Oswald's guilt. The tendency by Dallas officials to become more open to the possibility of accomplices during the first three days is not discussed in these reports. Even a hint of this would seem to be newsworthy.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 740

The Wall Street Journal, like the Herald Tribune and people at the Times, was impressive in its ability to judge the facts and reach a conclusion. From afar, they sized up the events and within three days they knew that Oswald acted alone, Oswald's killer

Jack Ruby acted alone, neither had any connection to any political group ("red or white"), and both were mentally unbalanced. Oswald and Ruby were hysterics, and idiots to boot. A week or so later all of the country's three main news magazines did similar things. None of them reported the doubts voiced in Dallas. All three contributed to the then widely repeated rendition, although not always in a consistent way. In its coverage, U.S. News and World Report indicated at least three separate times that only one person was involved.[108] They even implied that Lincoln was killed by an assassin acting as an isolated individual. Time did U.S. News one better. They simply stated that Lincoln was killed by a "lonely psychopath." This was meant to help us understand Lee Harvey Oswald against whom, asserted Time, the evidence was "overwhelming".[109] Newsweek, a little less certain of Oswald's guilt, was sure that there was only one assassin and sure of the reason. The assassin, apparently Oswald, had "cancer of the psyche." [110]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 760

There was no good or understandable reason for people at the wire services, the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, or Wall Street Journal to jump to these conclusions. No one looked to them to solve the crime. They felt none of the pressures probably felt by officials in Dallas. They conceivably could have been victims of the rumors and the assurances from the FBI that the evidence against Oswald was solid. What is not explainable is their apparent ability to see that Oswald acted alone, that Ruby acted alone, and that Oswald acted because of mental or emotional instability and that alone. This is clear evidence of a desire to dispense with this case as quickly as possible. Some high officials of the FBI were not far behind them. Belmont

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 802

Even though Belmont had served in Chicago, no one asked him if he had any knowledge of Jack Ruby, who was in Chicago around the time that Belmont was there. McCloy did go out of his way to solicit from Belmont an opinion that Oswald was the lone assassin and that there was "no evidence" to suggest a conspiracy.[116] There is not much of interest in this testimony beyond what was not discussed. There is one exception. Belmont clearly indicates that from the time of the assassination, it was he, not Hoover, who was directing things. Belmont's statements in this regard are supported by the available documentary evidence. J. Edgar Hoover, unquestionably complicit in the cover-up, played second fiddle in this orchestra. He was not the first fiddle, nor the conductor, nor the owner of the orchestra.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 882

At 10:01 A.M. on the 23rd, Hoover called President Johnson and provided something of a briefing on the events.[126] In his report to the President, Hoover mistakenly told LBJ that: - a gun used by Oswald had been shipped to a Dallas P.O. box belonging to a woman named A. Heidel; - officials were in possession of a bullet that fell out of the President when his heart was being massaged; - that there were latent fingerprints on the gun; - Oswald lived with his mother; - the rifle had been wrapped in a blanket in his mother's home; - shots were fired from a fifth floor; - Oswald engaged in a gun battle with police at the theater. All of this was wrong. Hoover also referred, in bizarre fashion, to the assassination as "this incident."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 893

Hoover twice indicates to LBJ that there was not yet enough evidence against Oswald. Hoover first said that the evidence against Oswald "at the present time is not very, very strong" and later said that "The case as it stands now isn't strong enough to be able to get a conviction." [127] Although these remarks understate the problems in the case against Oswald, they do show that almost 24 hours after the assassination, Hoover is not the leader of the Oswald-did-it-alone school of thought. James Reston and John Hay Whitney's Herald Tribune were way out in front of Hoover. Less

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 956

Belmont was on the 24th and 25th burying all questions and doubts, doubts that should have been greatly intensified by the murder of Oswald on the 24th. A week later, Belmont stated in a memo to Tolson that he was rejecting a request to have an FBI representative at the first executive session of the Warren Commission. Belmont reported that he had told Katzenbach that "there is nothing that we can contribute at this time." [132] This makes no sense. How can Belmont be certain on November 24 and 25 that Oswald alone killed JFK and that the murder of Oswald held no significance and then have "nothing" to contribute ten days later? Belmont ends this memo recounting information received from Katzenbach concerning Commission Chairman Earl Warren's intention to select Warren Olney to be chief counsel for the Commission. Belmont stated that Katzenbach was opposed to Olney and that he, Belmont, had told Katzenbach he was also opposed to Olney. As we will see later, John J. McCloy, Belmont's partner in dust control, would lead a successful effort to block the appointment of Olney.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,087

An internal FBI memo from Alan Belmont to Associate Director Clyde Tolson suggested that the FBI would be able to show that Oswald is an "avowed Marxist, a former

defector to the Soviet Union and an active member of the FPCC, which has been financed by Castro" and that "Oswald is the man who killed the President." [148] On the face of it, this is a very strange reaction from the FBI. On one hand they are ready to brand Oswald a communist and to convict him within two days of the assassination. On the other hand, they will display no interest in the possibility of a conspiracy even though Oswald is being associated with a variety of left-wing groups. This means that they are passing up an opportunity to investigate and pursue the very sort of people that Hoover and others had been obsessed with for four decades.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,379

Alsop recommended that LBJ get out in front of the Washington Post and have Moyers discuss things with Friendly or Kay [Katherine Meyer Graham]. For the fourth time, Acheson is mentioned as Alsop again pressures LBJ to talk to him. LBJ says that he will do so. Alsop ended by saying that LBJ's decisions were 200 percent correct, but that LBJ still needed to change his mind on the commission. LBJ seemed unconvinced, but no longer as certain about his own judgment. Alsop has been partially successful. Within three days, LBJ will have reversed himself, becoming a supporter of a commission and, legally speaking, its creator. Douglas Brinkley, an Acheson biographer, says that Johnson phoned Acheson "a few days after assuming the Presidency" and discussed the commission idea. LBJ also apparently sent Abe Fortas to talk to Acheson about this. In Brinkley's account, Acheson was recommending a group of state judges as members of a commission. [174] In Alsop's statements Acheson was represented as an important figure in the emergence of a commission proposal. Acheson's role has been obscured in an edited version of Alsop's call to LBJ which is presented in a 1997 book, *Taking Charge*, edited by Michael R. Beschloss. The Alsop call itself is misrepresented as an effort by President Johnson to get Alsop to pressure colleagues at the Washington Post to oppose the creation of the commission. Also, Rostow's call is excluded entirely from this collection of White House tape transcripts.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,422

The rest of the memo can be read in at least two ways. On one hand, Katzenbach does say twice that all of the facts must be presented. On the other hand, before any investigation has been completed, he has indicted and convicted Oswald as a lone assassin. He mentions some facts, or alleged facts, concerning Oswald's life which could suggest or be used to suggest a Communist conspiracy, but for some reason Katzenbach has already concluded that there was no conspiracy, Communist or otherwise. Hoover, the great pursuer of communists, also passed up these appetizing morsels within hours or days of the assassination. Between November 25th and the 28th LBJ was transformed from opponent of to promoter of a commission. It is clear

that a number of people acted to bring about this change. Eugene Rostow brought up the idea initially, to both Bill Moyers and Katzenbach. Rostow discussed this with at least one unidentified person in the minutes immediately following Oswald's death. Joseph Alsop applied pressure to LBJ less than 24 hours later. If Alsop is to be believed, and there is no reason to doubt this, Dean Acheson was also involved in developing and promoting the idea. Other immediate supporters appear to include both Alfred Friendly and Katherine Graham, and, as noted before, particularly Russell Wiggins.

During

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,943

A somewhat recent account of these events presented by Kai Bird in his biography of McCloy is misleading. Bird says that McCloy was the Commission member most inclined "to look for the threads of a conspiracy", but that McCloy, feeling pressured to quickly complete the investigation, early on muttered something "about how the Commission was established "to lay the dust." [244] Bird is wrong. McCloy never pressed or initiated any area of investigation; he frequently acted to prevent the discovery of the truth. Also, McCloy did not just "mutter something" about laying the dust. He stated twice in a clear manner that that was, in his view, the Commission's purpose. While McCloy was emphasizing the goal of laying the dust, Dulles was offering a conclusion for the Commission's investigation before it had even started. The conclusion was that Oswald did it, did it alone, and did it because he was a nut. Warren had raised the psychiatric issue first, but he was citing what was in the press and he did not dwell on this. [245] It was Dulles who attempted to impose the lone-nut idea on the Commission as a virtual premise for its investigation.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,974

The book that Dulles was pushing was *The Assassins* by Robert J. Donovan. Although Dulles did not identify it, Donovan's book was published in the year mentioned by Dulles as the publication year and Donovan's book contains a statement that is almost identical to something said

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,976

by Dulles. In response to a comment from McCloy that there was a plot in the Lincoln assassination, Dulles noted that that was true "but one man was so dominant that it almost wasn't a plot." In his book, Donovan, who was in 1963 the New York Herald Tribune's Washington bureau chief, argued that in the U.S., assassinations are the work of individuals and he went on to say: This was true even in the Lincoln assassination in which, though other conspirators were involved, Booth was the moving spirit and

dominated his accomplices to such an extent that the plot was the product of one man's will.[252]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,998

Donovan uses about eight different terms to suggest that Oswald was a lone nut. The official line that developed during the hours immediately following the assassination had not changed, it was restated with even greater emphasis by Donovan. Commission member Gerald Ford offered what was but a slight variation on the lone-nut theory in his 1965 book *Portrait of the Assassin*. Ford explained the assassination in psychological terms. Oswald was described as a man who had "deep-rooted resentment of all authority" and as a man with a capacity for violence and desire for a place in history. Ford claimed that Oswald was unable to form meaningful relationships and that Oswald had an "addled head." Ford deviated to a degree from the lone-nut theory by asserting that Oswald was committed to Marxism and communism. This idea did not lead Ford to any examination of Oswald's politics or connections. Ford noted Oswald's politics only to suggest that they alienated Oswald from U.S. society.[255] Ford's performance is entirely consistent with what happened immediately following the assassination. Oswald's unusual history and his apparent political interests were ignored by people in the media and at the FBI in the rush to conclude that he acted alone. Ford's references to Oswald's alleged communist sympathies are similar to those made by J. Edgar Hoover. These references in both cases led directly to conclusions about Oswald's character, mental status, and guilt rather than to any questions about the assassination or Oswald's relationships to other people.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,011

In the hours, days, and weeks following the assassination, there were three specific assertions made: Oswald did it; he did it alone; he was a nut. During the first few days after the assassination, the Dallas police and the District attorney consistently and emphatically supported only the first assertion, and they did this in part because of what the Belmont supervised FBI investigators were telling them. They never declared Oswald a nut and an opposing view of him was given several times. The only other discernible tendency on the part of most Dallas officials was to become more open to the idea that others may have been involved in some way. The Oswald did-it-alone conclusion was reached immediately in the media and was put in writing by Alan Belmont on November 25, just hours after Oswald was murdered. That murder should have raised new questions but, instead, it allowed a premature conclusion.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,458

McCloy was related by marriage to Lewis Douglas, an heir to Phelps Dodge money, who was president of Mutual Life Insurance Co. and a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation and to John S. Zinsser, a long-time director of J. P. Morgan & Company.[313] Within the Establishment, McCloy was one of the Establishment's most versatile, experienced, sophisticated, and trusted agents.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,530

McCloy was probably even closer than Dulles to Acheson. McCloy was for thirty years one of Acheson's closest friends and someone with whom he frequently worked.[344] Like Dulles, McCloy worked with Acheson during the 1940s in the effort to promote assistance to Great Britain.[345] McCloy supported Acheson when he came to the defense of accused traitor Alger Hiss.[346] Acheson recommended McCloy as one of the high commissioners in Germany after World War Two and he recommended McCloy to JFK as Secretary of State.[347] When Acheson's daughter married William Bundy, brother of national security advisor McGeorge Bundy, the wedding breakfast was held at McCloy's home.[348] William Bundy worked under Allen Dulles at the CIA in the 1950s. McCloy

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,568

James Reston, one of the first and most important people in the media to label Oswald the lone assassin and to imply that he was insane just hours after the assassination, was close to Dean Acheson.[364] In fact, according to Acheson biographer James Chace, Reston was someone with whom Acheson could plant stories.[365] Reston was also close to McCloy. McCloy lived across the street from Reston in the 1940s and became an unidentified source for some of Reston's stories.[366]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,573

Joe Alsop briefly worked for John Hay ("Jock") Whitney, owner of the Herald Tribune, and the two were well acquainted.[367] Whitney was a millionaire publisher with all the right credentials. His education included Exeter, Yale, and Oxford. Whitney's father and grandfather were members of Yale's secret and elitist society Skull and Bones.[368] Commenting on George Bush's association with Skull and Bones, James Reston referred to the "noble tradition of Skull and Bones." [369] As noted in chapter two, Whitney was a knight of St. John of Jerusalem and honorary commander of the Order of the British Empire. He was a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Business Council. [370]

Note:

Like Butler, Ochsner at times identified himself with views that could be thought of as anti-Establishment (e.g., he praised the ostensibly anti-Establishment Birch Society book, *None Dare Call It Treason*[496]). But as with Butler, any image of Ochsner as a red-neck, anti-Establishment, right-wing, populist would be very misleading. He was racist, anti-union, and anti-welfare, but he was associated with and committed to upper-class conservatism.[497] Ochsner was part of the local aristocracy and he was thoroughly plugged into the national power structure, particularly the "internationalist" parts of it. Any right-wing yahoo looking to Ochsner for leadership would have been shocked to learn that Ochsner was thoroughly connected to the very same old, big moneyed interests that non-upper-class right wingers love to hate, or love to pretend to hate. Ochsner was a leader in the 1960s of both the International House (IH) and the International Trade Mart (ITM), where he worked with Clay Shaw. He was a member of the exclusive Boston Club and was a guest in 1965 at the Bohemian Grove in California, a place where big East Coast money mingles with the wealth of the West and South. Ochsner served as a director of National Airlines and of Florida National Banks of Florida, Inc., the latter position achieved through a friendship with Edward W. Ball of the DuPont interests.[498] The DuPonts had investments in a number of Latin American countries, giving them an interest in common with Ochsner.[499] Everything considered, Ochsner's social world had little in common with small-business and middle-class right wingers. Ochsner was comfortable with a more sophisticated type of conservative. At Tulane University, where he became Chairman of the medical school's surgery department, Ochsner was involved in efforts to orient the school's programs toward support for the growing U.S. upper class involvement in Latin America. Ochsner had become a supporter of the Somoza regime in Nicaragua. Due in part to the efforts of Ochsner, Tulane became a major center for Latin American study. The University was aided by grants from the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation, where C. D. Jackson, another expert on right-wing propaganda and the man who acquired the Zapruder film for Time, Inc., was a trustee. Two of Huey Long's United Fruit enemies, Samuel Zemurray and Joseph Montgomery, were trustees of Tulane at that time. Ochsner became president in 1956 of the Cordell Hull Foundation which was established to promote "free enterprise" by providing scholarships to Latin American students for study in the U.S.[500] In this context "free enterprise" means that neither the U.S. government nor the host country's government will interfere with the operations of organized, powerful, private interests. The U.S. government can be called upon to back up those private interests with military power or other government resources.

Note:

Ochsner was personally close to the leaders of the New Orleans elite and he was directly connected to many in the national power structure. Among the New Orleans

associates was Theodore Brent, who also was personally close to Clay Shaw. Brent was president of the Mississippi Shipping Company and a director of the Hibernia National Bank. He was a founding trustee of the Alton Ochsner Medical Foundation and he helped to finance the Ochsner Foundation Hospital, opened in 1954.[501] Brent was also a director of the ITM affiliated International House.[502] IH was a New Orleans based but nationally connected promoter of "free trade" with Latin America. Brent's Mississippi Shipping apparently subsidized the Latin American Report, published in the 1940s and 1950s by William G. Gaudet.[503] Gaudet, who also received support from Ochsner and was associated with Edward Bernays of United Fruit,[504] claimed that he worked for the Central Intelligence Agency. Whatever his true employer, Gaudet turned up as the man who accompanied Lee Oswald (or an Oswald imposter) on the famous trip to Mexico.[505]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,176

When Ochsner and Butler created the Information Council of the Americas (INCA) a month after the Bay of Pigs failure, they acted not as local right wingers, but as Establishment right wingers. When Butler formed INCA in May of 1961 he was forming his second right-wing group in a year. He had created Free Voice of Latin America in 1960; it was headquartered at the ITM. According to historian Arthur Carpenter, INCA developed from three sources: Edward Butler, Alton Ochsner, and elite anti-communism. In Carpenter's view, the organization was intended to stimulate anti-Communist fears and then to exploit those fears to discredit opponents of the elite and to justify elite policies. Butler had longstanding interests in these kinds of psychological warfare efforts.[522]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,182

A few months after he and Ochsner created INCA, Butler was bragging about his relationship with CIA Deputy Director Charles P. Cabell,[523] who would soon be fired by President Kennedy. As noted earlier, his brother, Dallas Mayor Earle Cabell, would be the first public figure to offer the lone assassin theory, a view also promoted by INCA. The newly formed INCA had interesting members and supporters.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,194

Clay Shaw served for many years as managing director of ITM. He was in 1961 and 1962 managing director of IH. In that capacity, Shaw was linked to Ochsner and to the many interests which were hostile to Kennedy and, earlier, to Long. That would include Morgan interests, Rockefellers, and the Boston-United Fruit group.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,216

Clay Shaw, Alton Ochsner, and Edward Butler were thoroughly entrenched in this Establishment network connected to ITM and IH. That network included people associated with the Freeport Sulphur Company.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,219

his 1975 book, *The Rockefeller Syndrome*, Ferdinand Lundberg observed that Freeport Sulphur was under the control of the Rockefeller, Stillman-Rockefeller, and Whitney families.[537] On the board of directors of Freeport was Augustus Long who was chairman of the giant Texaco oil company and a director of the Rockefeller controlled Chemical Bank. A second director was Jean Mauze who was the third husband of Abby Rockefeller, granddaughter of John D.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,223

Rockefeller. Freeport director Godfrey Rockefeller was the brother of James Stillman Rockefeller. Director Benno C. Schmidt was an original partner at J. H. Whitney & Co. and he owned a ranch in Australia jointly with David Rockefeller. John Hay Whitney himself had been board chairman of Freeport Sulphur from 1949 to 1956 and he was a major stockholder in the 1960s. Director Chauncey Devereux Stillman was a descendent of the William Rockefeller and James Stillman wing of the family. Stillman had been an advisor to the Department of Defense in 1947 and he worked for the National Security Council from 1948 to 1951.[538] This upper-class environmentalist would team up in the late-1960s with J. Lee Rankin, then counsel for New York City, to stop construction of a pumped-storage plant on the Hudson River. The plant was intended to provide power for New York...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,232

One of the other significant Establishment figures on the Freeport board was Robert Abercrombie Lovett. Robert's father, Robert S. Lovett, married into the Abercrombie family, part of Texas aristocracy, and he rose to be E. H. Harriman's successor as chairman of the Union Pacific Railroad. Robert A., born in 1895, attended Yale, was a member of the secret society Skull and Bones, and married Adele Brown of the Brown Brothers banking family in 1919. Roland and Averill Harriman, Prescott Bush (father of President George Bush), and Knight Wood, all of the Harriman firm, were all Bonesmen as were several partners at Brown Brothers.[540] In 1926, Robert, only about 31 years

of age, became a partner at Brown Brothers and a director of the Union Pacific.[541] In 1930 the Harriman and Brown Brothers firms were merged to form Brown Brothers Harriman and Lovett took over the...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,242

Among his closest friends was Henry Luce, a major force at the anti-JFK Time-Life-Fortune empire.[544] One of Lovett's longest (over 60 years) and closest friendships was with Warren Commissioner and Morgan-Rockefeller lawyer John J. McCloy.[545] Lovett and McCloy, known as the "Heavenly Twins" at the World War Two War Department, were among Dean Acheson's oldest and closest friends.[546] Lovett was frequently called in by Acheson and Averill Harriman to provide advice to President Harry Truman.[547] Truman went public in 1960 in an effort to prevent JFK from getting the Democratic nomination. Lovett and McCloy, at the request of Dean Rusk, offered "outsider" advice to LBJ on Vietnam in 1965. They, along with Dean Acheson, recommended escalation.[548] Lovett, Acheson, and McCloy all recommended Dean Rusk to JFK as Secretary of State.[549]...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,253

Freeport Sulphur's Robert Lovett was then extremely close to one of the men who instigated the creation of the so-called Warren Commission, Dean Acheson, and to one of the overseers of that Commission, John J. McCloy. Freeport's Chairman and longtime Whitney associate Langbourne Williams, Freeport Vice-Chairman Charles A. Wight, President Robert Hills, Vice-President Peter Black and Chauncey Stillman were all members of the Council on Foreign Relations. Clay Shaw almost certainly knew a few or more of these men. At least two individuals provided information to Jim Garrison indicating that Clay Shaw was...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,260

We return first to suspected Clay Shaw associate, Charles A. Wight. After 17 years with Bankers Trust, including about four years in its London office, Wight moved to Freeport Sulphur as its executive committee chairman and as a board member. Wight also served as a director of two Freeport affiliates, the National Potash Company and the Sulphur Export Corporation. Bankers Trust was controlled by or at least closely affiliated with the Morgan interests from the beginning of the century to, at least, the 1970s. In fact, the bank was created by two men who became major figures at J. P. Morgan & Co. - Thomas W. Lamont and Harry P. Davison.[552] This suggests that the Morgan interests played some important role at Freeport Sulphur. There is more. Freeport Sulphur shared ownership of the Sulphur Export Corporation, created in 1958,

with Texas Gulf Sulphur. Thomas S. Lamont, the son of Bankers Trust founder and J. P. Morgan partner Thomas W. Lamont, was on the board of Texas Gulf as early as 1927 and was still one of its directors in 1963. E. R. Stettinius, a Morgan partner, helped to reorganize Texas Gulf in the 1920s.[553] The Morgan bank reportedly controlled Texas Gulf Sulphur from the 1930s into the 1960s.[554] Thomas S. Lamont, following the path of his father, rose to be Vice- Chairman of Morgan Guaranty Trust. As noted above, Lamont, also a director of Phelps Dodge, was in 1964 a leader of the National Independent Committee for President Johnson. Two other leaders, John L. Loeb and Edgar Kaiser, turned up four years later as leaders of the stop RFK-movement. Lamont's father, Thomas W., had been a leading figure in 1932 in the stop-Roosevelt movement. Morgan interests played a significant role in the creation in 1934 of the anti-Roosevelt American Liberty Lobby.[555] According to Jules Archer's 1973 book, *The Plot to Seize the White House*, this Morgan activity, perhaps led by Grayson Mallet-Prevost Murphy, included a possible overthrow of the Roosevelt administration. Allen Dulles's uncle married into the Mallet-Prevost family. Thomas S. Lamont's brother, Corliss Lamont, turned up in a most curious way in the activities of Oswald. In August, 1963, Oswald handed out a pamphlet in front of Clay Shaw's International Trade Mart. The pamphlet, entitled "The Crime Against Cuba," was written by Corliss Lamont. That pamphlet, like other of Oswald's handouts, was...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,381

Michael Paine, husband of Ruth Paine, Oswald's hostess in Dallas, was related to both the Forbes and Cabot families. One of Michael's cousins, Thomas Dudley Cabot, served as president of United Fruit. Michael's grandmother was Elise Cabot Forbes. Michael's mother, Ruth Forbes Paine Young, had a friendship with Allen Dulles' lover, Mary Bancroft.[581] Even though she and Michael were separated at the time, Ruth Paine remained personally close to the Forbes family. Marina Oswald lived with Ruth and Ruth helped Lee Oswald to get the job at the Book Depository.[582] The organizers of the 1954 coup against Jacobo Arbenz Guzman included United Fruit stockholder Allen Dulles, C. D. Jackson, Tracy Barnes, and David Atlee Philips.[583] The Guatemalan intervention had been recommended in 1953 by one of John J. McCloy's Council on Foreign Relations study groups.[584] The Dulles's law firm, Sullivan and Cromwell, represented United Fruit.[585] Dulles, with McCloy, would steer the Warren Commission and C. D. Jackson would be involved in the Time-Life decision to acquire and then suppress the Zapruder film. McCloy was a director of United Fruit.[586] Tracy Barnes, a close friend of Dulles,[587] was involved with a far-right group known as the Cuban Revolutionary Council. The Council had links to INCA and it had headquarters at Bannister's 544 Camp Street. David Ferrie knew Council leader Sergio Aracha-Smith. [588] Harold Weisberg noted the possible significance of Butler's INCA and the Council in his 1967 book *Oswald in New Orleans*. [589] Weisberg also noted that two of the men involved in what looked like an attempt to frame Oswald by having an

impersonator display hostility toward JFK were arrested less than a month later on a dangerous drug charge.[590] David Atlee Philips would be identified by Gaeton Fonzi as Oswald's handler "Maurice Bishop."[591] As noted earlier, William Gaudet, a United Fruit propaganda man,[592] accompanied Oswald or an Oswald impersonator to Mexico. One

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,037

In Russell's view, man's "collective passions are mainly evil" and when combined with the power of science those passions are a threat to "our civilization." Russell suggested, in 1924, that the "only solid hope seems to lie in the possibility of world-wide domination by one group, say the United States, leading to the gradual formation of an orderly economic and political world government."[741]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,041

According to Russell, economic internationalism will have to develop first if political internationalism is to be successful.[742] Even then, the establishment of the new order will require violence. Russell said that if a single group becomes dominant in this increasingly integrated world, they will have to prove their dominance against resistant

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,044

groups in the world, but, after suppressing "the first half-dozen revolts" most people will give up and submit to the "victors in the great world-trust."[743] Russell was about 52 years old when he wrote that. Writing almost thirty years later, Russell said that if either of the major powers becomes dominant, the U.S. or Russia, it can "establish a single Authority over the whole world, and thus make future wars impossible. At first this Authority will, in certain regions, be based on force, but if the Western nations are in control, force will soon as possible give way to consent."[744] This is the man who somehow acquired the reputation of being one of the world's leading advocates for peace. Russell's

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,051

ambivalence toward science and technology is readily apparent in his 1953 book *The Impact of Science on Society*. Therein, he frequently acknowledges the positive potential of science,[745] but he also associates science and technology with a variety of evils (war, tyranny, dehumanization) and he indicates his preference for a kind of

aristocrat's science, a science geared more to satisfying idle curiosities and less to production or the solution of practical problems.[746]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,062

This led Russell to charge that Kennedy and Harold Macmillan "are much more wicked than Hitler." He also referred to JFK and Macmillan as "murderers" who were among "the wickedest people that ever lived in the history of man." [747] Russell, of course, never referred to someone like Corliss Lamont's father or brother in this way. Thomas W. Lamont actually was affiliated with people who did support Hitler.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,066

Russell's profound sense of superiority is reflected in a racial remark he once made. While visiting the United States Russell wrote in a letter his impressions of servants. He wrote: I find the coloured people friendly and nice - they seem to have something of a dog's liking for the white man - the same kind of trust and ungrudging sense of inferiority. I don't feel any racial recoil from them.[748] This remark was not made by an eighteen year old rich kid still influenced by aristocratic parents and peers. Russell was a sophisticated, world-traveled 38-year-old when he wrote that. Russell made many equally horrible comments about other matters. Unlike Kennedy, Russell never argued for economic development as a way to painlessly slow down population growth. Instead, he offered a choice between a Malthusian solution of wars, pestilences, and famines on one hand and a world government which would impose controls on population growth on the other.[749] Noting that past wars had not been very successful in slowing population growth, Russell looked hopefully to the potential of bacteriological war saying that: ...perhaps bacteriological war may prove more

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,078

effective. If a Black Death could be spread throughout the world once in every generation survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full. There would be nothing in this to offend the consciences of the devout or to restrain the ambitions of nationalists [as would be the case with Russell's world government solution]. The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of that? Really high-minded people are indifferent to happiness, especially other people's.[750]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,082

Aldous Huxley, a co-founder with Russell in the 1930s of the Peace Pledge Union, expressed similar enthusiasm in 1959 for the possibility that a virus might appear that eliminated large numbers of people.[751] These kinds of comments reveal the real Bertie, and Aldous.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,085

Russell wrote that he grew up assuming that the British Empire and British naval superiority would last forever. Therefore, he said, "it is difficult to feel at home in a world of atomic bombs, communism, and American supremacy." [752] World government would put control over those bombs in the hands of never identified Western leaders and reduce or eliminate the power that America, communism, and nations had acquired. Russell never did focus on the question of who would run this world government. He most certainly had in mind men such as himself. Russell

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,108

In short, Russell is promoting a view which leads people to have vague suspicions about government bureaucracies while overlooking powerful private interests that we know played definite and critical roles in the cover-up.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,114

As Fletcher Prouty, Dallas Police Chief Jesse Curry,[756] and others have pointed out, there were real breakdowns in the security arrangements. Maybe Russell knowingly used the word "ordered" rather than "implemented" in this statement. The "right-wing fanatics" that orchestrated this assassination and cover-up clearly did not have pickup trucks and Texas accents, as is claimed by Russell. Virtually all the evidence available now clearly points to fanatics with Yale and Harvard diplomas and slightly British accents. Even in 1969, Russell, who had written a book on social and political power, had to have known he was misrepresenting the Commission and ignoring the important role played in the cover-up by the Establishment media. This was conscious misdirection.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,127

Also on the Committee was Hugh Redwald Trevor-Roper, long-time Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford. In his book, *Mask of Treachery*, John Costello indicates that Trevor-Roper was for a time a member of MI5, England's rough equivalent to the FBI. [758] At any rate, Trevor-Roper was acquainted with some of the famous or infamous

people of the intelligence world. He was pretty close to the infamous Kim Philby and he knew Anthony Blunt[759] (both operating in the netherworld of double and triple agents, or something).

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,133

Trevor-Roper was a speaker at the first meeting, in 1950, of the CIA backed Congress for Cultural Freedom. This was part of an effort to organize and control an anti-Soviet left, an effort backed by Kennedy opponent and Warren Commission leader John J. McCloy.[760] Also, the CIA and McCloy, who served as a High Commissioner for Germany after the war, supported a magazine published in Germany, entitled *Der Monat*, which featured anti-Soviet leftists, including Bertrand Russell.[761] Anthony Blunt was not only acquainted with Trevor-Roper, he also knew Lord Russell.[762] This indicates an indirect connection between Russell and Clay Shaw. Peter Montgomery was Anthony Blunt's lover and Montgomery's name was in Clay Shaw's address book. In addition, Sir Michael Duff, who also appeared in Shaw's address book and with whom Shaw reportedly had a sexual relationship, knew Peter Montgomery. Finally, Sir Steven Runciman, an old friend of Montgomery, was also in the Shaw address book. Sir Steven's father worked closely in the 1930s with the Earl of Halifax, a close friend of Dean Acheson, co-creator of the Warren Commission.[763] When

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,150

Given the background we have reviewed on Russell, it should not be surprising that the man who gave the Russell Lectures at Trinity College, Cambridge, the year after Russell's death also wrote one of the most vitriolic attacks on President Kennedy - that is Noam Chomsky. Chomsky published those lectures as a book entitled *Problems of Knowledge and Freedom: The Russell Lectures* in the same year, 1971.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,155

Noam Chomsky's *Rethinking Camelot: JFK, the Vietnam War, and US Political Culture* (1993) discredits and attacks Kennedy while protecting the private interests that promoted the Vietnam involvement long before Kennedy was President and continued to do so after Kennedy was assassinated. Like Lamont and Russell, Chomsky studiously avoids any mention of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) even though the CFR's leadership began planning for U.S. intervention in Southeast Asia in the early-1940s. [764] He never refers to high level figures at the CFR who were active promoters of the Vietnam War. Among the leaders of that group were John J. McCloy, Allen Dulles, David Rockefeller, and Henry M. Wriston.[765] Since they were part of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, CFR members McGeorge Bundy and Dean Rusk are

mentioned, Bundy about ten times.[766] Their affiliations outside of government, including their CFR memberships, are never discussed, leaving the impression that the most important indicator of who they were is their position in Kennedy's government. Similarly, Averill Harriman, George Ball, and Michael Forrestal are all mentioned as government officials.[767] Chomsky does not point out that they were all CFR members and, as with Bundy and Rusk, he says nothing about their backgrounds or other private affiliations.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,167

Throughout this book, in a pattern that is virtually identical to Lamont's writing on Cuba and Vietnam, Chomsky is totally silent on Wall Street, the Establishment, the upper class, and the CFR. Vietnam is Kennedy's war, and then it is LBJ's and Nixon's war. In at least three places the war is referred to simply as "Kennedy's war." [768] Those who created the policy are "Kennedy planners", "Kennedy and his circle," and "JFK and his advisors." [769] U.S. bombing missions in 1962 are "Kennedy's aggression" and the U.S. implemented "Kennedy's brutal strategic hamlet program." [770] Chomsky correctly notes that LBJ was a somewhat reluctant warrior in 1964, but he goes on to say that those who pressed for more aggressive action included "JFK's doves." [771] In fact, most of the people putting pressure on LBJ to expand the Vietnam intervention had had only a brief association with Kennedy and the important people pressuring LBJ were CFR, Establishment luminaries such as Rusk and Bundy.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,182

Some of Chomsky's so-called evidence on what Kennedy intended to do is second hand, coming from sources that most informed people would find suspect. Proof of what Kennedy's intentions were is based on what Dean Rusk and Averill Harriman said Kennedy would do. [773] Rusk and Harriman, two upper level Establishment agents, are to be trusted, but Senator Mike Mansfield and long-time JFK advisor Kenneth O'Donnell are not. [774] Mansfield and O'Donnell, of course, said that Kennedy was deciding to severely limit or end our involvement in Vietnam. In the November 22, 1963, issue of Life, the editors of Time-Life-Fortune indicated that they shared O'Donnell's and Mansfield's perception that Kennedy was going to disengage from Vietnam, the difference being that they were against that decision.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,198

There are unsubstantiated, and probably incorrect, accusations against Kennedy and there are instances where evidence cited by Chomsky does not support the point being made. Trying to prove that Kennedy's policy led to escalation, Chomsky quotes JFK's

remarks from September 12, 1963, to show this. In fact, the remarks do not show this and quite likely imply something different. Kennedy said that "What helps to win the war we support; what interferes with the war effort, we oppose." He followed this with: "But we have a very simple policy in that area...we want the war to be won, the Communists to be contained, and the Americans to go home." Chomsky quotes these statements to demonstrate Kennedy's embrace of "extremist doctrines." [775] Kennedy's choice of words clearly suggests that Kennedy did not intend a full or major U.S. commitment. He didn't say we will win the war but that "we want the war to be won" and we will "support" "What helps to win the war." Taken at face value, these are hardly comments that represent what would have been extremist doctrine at the time. They are instead the kinds of comments that would lead the well informed editors of Time-Life-Fortune to warn the President against any plan of withdrawal. Vietnam

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,219

Chomsky refers to the Kennedy Administration's Alliance for Progress as "a statistical success and social catastrophe", except for foreign investors and domestic elites. [779] This comment is fundamentally bizarre on two counts. First, The Alliance was changed very soon after Kennedy's death. David Rockefeller pointed this out in his April, 1966, Foreign Affairs article. Rockefeller was almost gloating over the change. Second, the program under Kennedy only existed for a couple of years. With something on this scale, it is silly to evaluate it based on such a short period of time. If this were not a serious topic, we would have to suspect Chomsky of attempting to be humorous.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,401

As we have seen, it was "Yankees" who carried out the cover-up, including Allen Dulles. As I briefly indicated in Chapter One and as I have shown elsewhere, [795] including in the final chapter of this book, Kennedy was at war with those "Yankees," including David Rockefeller. Kennedy was definitely, unmistakably at war with the same forces Oglesby claims that JFK represented. This may be simply a very big misunderstanding; it may be a big lie. There is no evidence that Texans organized the assassination. There is some evidence that the idea of a Yankee-Cowboy conflict is mostly or wholly a fiction. For example, according to Ferdinand Lundberg, Yankees were deeply involved in and owned much of the wealth of Texas [796] and, according to G. William Domhoff, the upper class of Texas intermingled with that of New York. [797] Oglesby has misrepresented everything he

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,409

discusses. Others have simply dumped various wealthy and/or conservative groups into the mix with no real evidence. Often this ends up being something like a laundry list of plausible or conceivable suspects (minus the New York-Boston upper-class Establishment). For example, Groden and Livingstone[798] blame CIA-controlled Cuban exiles, organized crime, the "Ultra Right Wing" and "some politically well-connected wealthy men." Mentioning "wealthy men" enhances the credibility of the list but it is too vague to lead anywhere. Sometimes

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,424

Livingstone[800] implicates the military, Texas oil people, the FBI, an unidentified "wealthy Establishment," the corporations Bell Helicopter and General Dynamics, the government, the Office of Naval Intelligence, and, by name, H. L. Hunt, Lyndon Johnson, Clint Murchison, General Charles Cabal, Mayor Earl Cabal, the CIA's David Atlee Phillips, Richard Nixon, and Dallas Chief of Police Jesse Curry. This is an assassination acid trip. There is no evidence at all for the smears against Johnson and Nixon, and Jesse Curry was one of a few officials to indicate that there had been a conspiracy. Curry wrote one of the few useful books about the assassination. Much of the rest of it is so vague and general that it could be neither proven nor disproven. Livingstone[801] also suggests that "New York banks and their owners" may have played some role because Kennedy was a fiscal conservative and the bankers hated this. In fact, bankers and parts of the media criticized Kennedy for almost the opposite reasons and government policies became decidedly more conservative shortly after Kennedy's death.[802]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,458

Peter Dale Scott has tried to give this kind of laundry list of bogeymen an aura of mystery by referring to them as the "deep political system." [806] This "system" includes "Texas oilmen, organized crime, the Dallas police, and army intelligence." Other than the Ruby connection to organized crime and the role of one or two high-level military officers in influencing the autopsy, there is no evidence at all for this. We know that it is worse than absurd to overlook Establishment media and implicate the Dallas police. The Dallas police performance was stellar when compared to the New York Times and Wall Street Journal. There is no significant evidence against "army intelligence" or "Texas oilmen." In earlier work Scott implicated Clint Murchison and Richard Nixon. [807] Nixon may be guilty of saying nothing about his suspicions but there is no real evidence for this or anything else. While I find it interesting that Murchison was host to John J. McCloy during the summer of 1963,[808] something not discussed by Scott, there is no evidence linking Murchison to the assassination.

Note:
