

Some Observations Regarding the JFK Assassination

By Wm. Thomas Sherman

Last updated: 29 May 2017

The following are a series of casual commentaries carried on at my website <http://www.gunjones.com>, originally posted in 2008 and 2009, and which pertain to the assassination of Pres. John F. Kennedy. At my website, the subject of the scientifically verifiable existence of spirit people; such as what we normally think of as ghosts, demons, angels, etc., is a common theme and subject; so that my remarks and analysis of the JFK murder to some extent are tied in with that. While I certainly don't expect that someone just being introduced to my work to readily or out of hand accept my hypothesis and claim regarding "spirit people," let it at least be said here that I explore that same topic at greater length and depth at my website, and to which I would refer you for further explanation of where I am coming from.¹ This said, my comments regarding Nov. 22, 1963 can, to a significant extent, can be assessed on their own merit without any reference or association to my asseverations with respect to spirit people; so that in this document before you are extracts from those website postings that focus exclusively on the Kennedy case.

These observations of mine are fairly random, desultory, and as I said casual (including some occasionally humorous in purpose and character), and I don't claim to be deeply informed expert on the JFK assassination but rather an amateur. However, using what facts and reasoning I do have available to me, I do think that some who are more informed on the subject will, nevertheless, perhaps find *some* value in them; hence, my gathering them together in one document for their and others' possible use and benefit.

I need to state that for a very long time now I have had my e-mail, phone and other communications interfered with; so that if you try to contact me it may not be possible for you to reach me to ask questions and or give a response. I welcome visitors to my home and residence if they are so disposed and that is feasible for them, but that is about as much as I can suggest as an alternative to get around this long standing problem.

Last, I am the author of a number of online books including *Calendar and Record of the Revolutionary War in the South: 1780-1781* and the *Mabel Normand Source Book*, to name two of my more prominent and scholarly titles I have authored, and which are available as .pdf downloads at my website.

Wm. Thomas Sherman
1604 NW 70th St.
Seattle, Washington 98117
206-784-1132
wts@gunjones.com
Secondary email addresses:
gunjones1@yahoo.com
williamthomassherman@gmail.com



¹ Also and for further regarding my writings on spirit people, see: <https://archive.org/details/ANewTreatiseOnHell> and <https://archive.org/details/WilliamThomasShermanNarrative>

Since I had just brought up Pres. Kennedy, I thought some might find it helpful and informative to express my views on what might be the connection between spirit people (such as I discuss) and his assassination. Shortly after the event, Gov. Connally, while still recovering from his own wound in the hospital, described the assassination shooting as a manifestation of extremism and lawlessness in society. And this explanation I think is very apt on a number of levels. One of the great confusions that have understandably arisen is people's attempting to get at what was or might have been the motive for the crime. If criminal spirit people were behind it, they would not need to have such a motive merely or solely such as "get rid of Kennedy." With people like this the motive would be more one of causing trouble to many, while hopefully also causing many to become guilty in the process. To put it one way, what is sought is a kind of glorification and empowerment of evil, which and at the same time doing they get a thrill or high from -- and as likely as not some sort of material pay also for some of them. For in the midst of anarchy, people are not untypically forced to turn to someone as authority, and if legitimate authority is absent or otherwise in question many people will look to powerful criminals as authority in their place, and which thereby increases the sway, rule, and influence of such spirit people. These, needless to add, then are turned to their profit.

The various cover-ups and conspiracies that have been suggested are such as would be promoted, encouraged, devised and or orchestrated -- even if not strictly necessary for committing and getting away with the crime -- because doing so gets more people guilty. The more guilty people are the easier it becomes to threaten and blackmail them, and then in turn control them; with again, the idea being to expand the criminal spirit people's power and influence. A sorcerer is a kind of magician, and so much of the disinformation, evidence tampering, and distorting of facts adds to the confusion and assists his illusion. Meantime, the magician (whoever he might be) loves to ply his trade and gets real enjoyment (accompanied by a spiteful and sadistic relish) at playing various kinds of tricks, yet which tricks simultaneously serve to engender the chaos that compromises and undermines legitimate authority -- which the criminal spirit people can then try to supplant.

With respect to Lee Harvey Oswald, the evidence is overwhelming to me that he was in fact set up, such as:

- * What an extraordinary coincidence that he should have a job at the Book Depository and which happened to be right along the route of the motorcade.²
- * His statements after being taken into custody at the police station seem sincere and genuine.
- * The time it would have taken him to have committed both the presidential assassination and the shooting of police officer Tippit in the time frame given seems little short of incredible.
- * His strange history as a supposed communist activist sounds very much like he was being made a fool of and being led on by someone else.
- * The discrepancy between the caliber of the spent shells and the caliber of the rifle found in the Depository is extremely strange, and is hard to account for using the Oswald theory. It is much better I think explained by our "magician" brazenly presenting inexplicable and obviously conflicting evidence to the police for purposes of bewildering and of mocking their efforts to figure out what actually happened -- thus further proving the latter's weakness in the face of the threat posed.

For further regarding the identification of the sniper's rifle found in the book depository, see:

- * <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-WQr4y1j4Gw>

[“The depository revisited - Alyea#2” – A Dallas Deputy Sheriff Roger D. Craig gives his version of the rifle found in the book depository on the day of the shooting; insisting that it was a Mauser.]

- * <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e4l9Sczs9aI>

² This was a "too good to be true" sort of coincidence. No less so with the building being both right on the parade route, and that it was possible for Oswald, as employee, to plant himself almost anywhere he cared to in the building -- which most employees working as large downtown office buildings will know is not very usual. And what further are we then to think prompted Oswald to kill? The opportunity the parade route afforded?

["JFK Assassination Seymour Weitzman claims he was wrong to identify the rifle as a Mauser" -- Dan Rather interviewing Dallas Deputy Sheriff Weitzman]

~~~~~\*~~~~~

Although I did not originally intend to spend too much time on the subject, the JFK assassination upon closer examination proved such an intriguing mystery that I could not help myself in trying to seek a solution. The more then I have looked over or listened to various material, analyses, testimony and commentary the more convinced I am that there were multiple culprits involved in committing the crime, and these were ultimately actuated and their actions directed by a spirit person of some kind, presumably a ghost sorcerer (or at least such at this juncture would be as good a guess as any.) In support of this, we have the following:

\* The open mike dictabelt recording of the Dallas Police Department motorcycle officer seem to leave little doubt that there were two shooters; since the last two of the four shots recorded come so near to each other in time that they could not possibly have been fired by the same person unless he was firing an automatic rifle (which the book depository gunman ostensibly was not.) [*Later Note*. This conclusion of mine assumes a trustworthiness to and or interpretation of the dictabelt recording which perhaps upon closer inspection (some would argue) is not so readily warranted. Upon reflection then, this possible weakness to my reasoning I, for the time being, concede.]

\* That there were two head wounds to the President also confirms there being two gunman, and this case is well presented and made, and to which I would refer you, at: <http://jfkhistory.com/>

\* As we pointed out earlier, it is too absurd a coincidence to believe that Oswald *just happened* to be working at a tall building -- and which he could freely move about in without arousing suspicion -- located right along the route of the motorcade.

\* The lapses in Secret Service security for the president are too numerous to be credited were not such clearly and undeniably established by the accepted record and evidence. And if those in charge of the Secret Service in Dallas in Nov. 1963 did not act with criminal intent at the very least they displayed mind-boggling incompetence.

\* It is a bit strange that when Pres. Kennedy was first hit that he did not cry out or make a sound. Although I would not go so far as to advocate this interpretation myself, one theory to account for this is that he was paralyzed by a dart fired by the "Umbrella Man." Here I will let others attempt to make the case, and which you can find at: <http://www.ratical.org/ratville/JFK/TUM.html> I would, however, just remark that the nicety of silencing Kennedy before killing him would be perfect modus operandi *if* the crime actually were in some way witchcraft person related. On the other hand, even if no flechette was fired, the umbrella man is certainly a strange and distracting presence -- and, once again, the creating that sort of confusion is arguably symptomatic and in keeping with the sort of sophistication a ghost magician characteristically manifests in a performance.

\* Among the most important questions that needs to be asked in order to understand the tragic event is what effect did JFK's death (and also subsequently MLK's and RFK's) end up having?

One immediate and later impact for many is that they were (and are) compelled to choose between faith and fear. In light of the President's death, should we continue to hope or should we rather fear more? For many obviously the answer was and is to fear more, and to perhaps even come around to seeing that Kennedy's idealism -- as proven by his own instantaneous death -- was a useless pipe dream. To further bolster this pessimistic view, in the wake of the crime and its investigation more and more people became disillusioned with the government; either because the latter was acting with duplicity and or gross ineptitude in not preventing *or* solving the crime. Who then might we asked have sought these as ends? Hardly the purportedly mad loner Oswald -- presumably he would have been too mentally incapacitated to

have calculated in advance such things. And while war profiteers might have desired wealth from escalating events in Vietnam, surely they would not have also deliberately sought to attack the government and the integrity of the government itself. No, the only one who would have such a grand motive as that would be one of these big-shot criminal spirit people I write about, and who would have the subtle expertise and comprehensive wherewithal to have weaved the actions of many separate and unassociated individuals into the perpetration of one joining and linking event. It would be a spirit person, in my opinion, who would have the hindsight to have the event take place and then so prompt and pose to people the frightening question – “What, in light of this terrible occurrence, will you believe? Fear or idealism?” Indeed, who else would have it in them to be both so expertly knowledgeable as to have coordinated conspirators while also intentionally precipitating such a broad, grandiose -- and cosmic -- referendum?

~~~~~\*~~~~~

I noticed in continuing to look into and examine the JFK slaying case that there are what appear to be some hoax documentaries, such as “The Men Who Killed Kennedy, *The Final Chapter*” [or “TMWKK;” not to be confused with the original and sober -- if less than perfect given the complex character of the topic addressed -- History Channel presentation, “The Men Who Killed Kennedy.”] If then you are in the habit of viewing and following such programs [and if you don’t know already] be prepared for the possibility of fraud, put-ons, and “warcraft” while endeavoring -- as always -- to arrive at your own conclusions with care -- which is to say rationally, skeptically and impartially. No less absurd than the above “secret speech” of Pres. Bush [a spoof video on YouTube], by the way, are claims that Pres. Johnson sought to have Pres. Kennedy gunned down -- made just as laughable as the YouTube piece when juxtaposed with actual and historical footage of John F. Kennedy during the 1960 presidential campaign expressing his affection and admiration for Johnson before huge crowds.

Later Note. This a video version of the Judyth Vary Baker story and her purported association with Oswald, and that I frankly find blatantly preposterous; not least of which owing to the suggestion of someone’s *grass roots* involvement in international biological warfare. Moreover, I personally think Oswald had better taste in women than that.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

One of the difficulties I noticed that frequently arises with those who attempt to identify and, in effect, accuse certain individuals of being behind a given conspiratorial plot is that it is difficult to get at what is supposed to be that individual’s primary motive for their actions. For example, there is an interesting (if at times childish irrelevant given the subject matter) documentary on Google video titled “JFK II” that pursues the hypothesis that George Bush, senior was at the nexus of a group of persons tied in with the slaying of Pres. Kennedy. Now even if we grant, for the sake of argument, the theory being essentially correct, it would not necessarily follow that Bush acted with significant (as opposed to petty or misdemeanor) *mens rea*. It is possible that such a person being positioned as he is alleged to have been could assist the main body of criminals merely through his being deceived into doing the wrong thing. What an orchestrator of sophisticated criminals plots does is arrange his players to act their separate roles -- without their necessarily even knowing what they are a part of, or what parts others are playing, or even that there is any centralized plot at all. This can be achieved without requiring that the subject have serious criminal intent in order to fulfill and carry out their assigned role. Indeed, some persons can be got to do something very wrong because they think they are doing something very right. Others will excuse doing wrong saying it is forced necessity, and they otherwise would not think of doing it was not such extreme and highly unusual pressure placed upon them.

A true higher up in a grand conspiracy then plans in advance how to tailor each potential participant (whether knowing, unknowing, or partly knowing) in the role he wants them to play; concerning himself with different (and mutual) motives and or weaknesses of whose involved, and which then can be manipulated and directed according to the higher end or purpose sought. He then factors in how much it will cost to get that person to play that role, and so in this manner budgets his resources accordingly.

A cover-up therefore, say in the case of the Warren Commission Report, was not then necessarily prompted by government investigators seeking to conceal Kennedy's assassins. All that might be necessary (and to give just one conjectured instance) might be to get them to believe that the President's killers (due to such and such circumstances) are beyond being apprehended by the law. Yet if the real criminals (albeit unintentionally otherwise) are not covered up for, these others who do mean well and who only became involved through pardonable incompetence should not have their personal lives and careers ruined by implicating them unfairly with something they were only connected to due to an in and of itself small, but even so ultimately devastating in its effect, error and mistake. And, needless to add, many and other scenarios, combinations, and explanations are possible; where historians and scholars are potentially led astray by red herrings, decoys, scapegoats, and second and third banana characters -- as intended.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

"Hey guys! It's Jack! It's me!" ~ *Ruby immediately upon being tackled to the ground after shooting Oswald; as reported by Dallas Officer R. C. Nelson.*³

Some comments on Jack Ruby and his assassination of Lee Harvey Oswald, I think, need to be added to some related historical remarks of mine I posted here earlier. In short, that Ruby was driven and incited by a spirit person to act as he did seems to be so far the most plausible explanation for his behavior. For consider the logic of this.

That Ruby shot Oswald based solely on his own thought and initiative as he originally testified in both his court trial and before the Warren Commission seems palpably false and hard to believe; because we know from his later statements and testimony that he was, in his way, a subtle thinker who calculated in advance the effects of his words or his acts. You see this in some of his careful replies to commission questioning. To think he would have killed Oswald merely as an excited act of patriotism strikes one then as absurd. Not because he could not have felt patriotic, but that he could be so rash as to so carelessly ignore the effects of his actions. How, for example, could he just thoughtlessly brush aside questions like -- how can we be sure Oswald's really guilty? -- what effect will killing Oswald have on my own life? Yet somehow we are supposed to believe his strong feelings overruled such obvious and important advance considerations.

Yet I think there is good reason to conclude Ruby meant what he said when he asserted he was very emotionally upset by Pres. Kennedy's death. Only what I would point out is that a spirit person, through psychological manipulation at which some are skilled, could heightened and amplify such feelings dramatically and turn them into a overflowing mania -- the kind of mania necessary to have caused Ruby to have lost all reason as he did.

Ruby himself later admitted by implication that his original testimony was less than the whole story; thus leaving open the possibility that he did not conceive the crime in pure isolation. If then he was not alone in bringing about what transpired -- who then would have power of persuasion so great and proficient as to convince Ruby he was acting idealistically -- and at the same time should also do so suicidally? A mobster? A religious friend from the synagogue? Someone tied in with Lyndon Johnson? Those answers do not make any sense. A spirit person at the same time could keep Ruby informed, guide him, and fill his head with all kinds of nonsense (such as his later suggestion that Johnson was a major factor behind Kennedy's assassination.) Ruby, for all his flaws, was in my opinion then basically a good person in intention, and who did what he did thinking he was doing the right thing. But it is nothing short of completely incredible to me that he could have acted as he did alone, or further that an "earthly" person *both* so moved and commanded him to do what took place.

Later Note. "Let's put it this way. This would not have happened if Adlai Stevenson had been Vice President" (or words to this effect.) This statement, as supplement to the above comments, is strong evidence to me personally that Ruby was listening to a spirit person; because the reasoning used is perfectly

³ See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w5f-9MaZFrk>
["Retired Dallas Police Officer R C Nelson Recalls His Partner JD Tippit's Murder By Lee Harvey Oswald"]

in sync with the way such spirit persons will think and coach others. In other words, it is necessary for someone (in this case the assassins) to do evil -- indeed they are forced to it -- because the do-gooders (or would be do-gooders) are either having it too good and or else are infringing on Hell's domain. If would-be virtuous people want to be spared Hell's wrath then they must not do anything to upset Hell -- and if they do upset Hell they (not Hell) are to blame for what happens. Johnson with Kennedy, it could be argued, would represent a wider demographic and overall base of the population than Stevenson-Kennedy -- and this when Kennedy was already strong and influential in many and other ways as it was. The imbalance caused by this was unacceptable to Hell; since again, good people must not be too strong in this world -- and if they are then this only compels Hell to step in and take charge of the situation. Very possibly, if not presumably, Ruby thought Johnson himself acted with some criminal intent or at least was in some measure an accomplice or accessory. Yet even if he did see it this way, Johnson's actions did not arise from Johnson himself (who was really only a pawn), but rather Hell which uses (if not orders) Johnson to set in motion what *it* wants -- and that is to see that the forces for good are neither too rich or too powerful *in this world*. Now in saying this, I don't mean to insinuate that this was Hell's all or only pretext for acting as they did; rather, I would bring some attention to the kind of fallacious argument and sophistry that is and can be used to persuade Ruby or someone else who listens to spirit people that sinister evil can be justified on religious grounds.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

*"While we were standing there someone brought the word that the President was dead...There wasn't a sound...I then looked over between someone's feet and there lay a carton of books broken open with the lid flapped back. Inside the carton was a paperback book, and on the cover was Christ Leads the Way with a picture of Jesus..."*

~Dallas Officer Luke Mooney, quoted in *No More Silence* by Larry A. Sneed pg. 224, and who was the first policeman to arrive at the 6th floor of the Book Depository on 22 Nov. 1963.

Out of curiosity, I spent some additional time going through much online available material on the Kennedy Assassination, and the following are some observations and conclusions that occurred to me.

One theory poses that CIA connections with the mob resulted in Kennedy originating plans to assassinate Castro being used against the Kennedys themselves-- i.e., because the Kennedys (John and Robert) were causing loss in mob profits. (Here note, though I don't want to get into it at the moment, mob profits does not seem to me a strong enough incentive for the mob to have wanted to actually kill Kennedy -- that would have been madness. But if a very important *spirit person* was taking exception to Kennedy *that* would be a motive and incentive of far more plausible a magnitude to have excused, indeed perhaps demanded, the deed.)

This seems a somewhat strange hypothesis, yet even if incorrect it does raise some useful questions and issues. One thing wrong with it is that Bobby Kennedy spoke loudly and courageously for going after the mob -- why therefore would he fail to see the immorality of assassination? Because according to this proposed view, Robert Kennedy was against the mob yet at the same time he saw assassination as an acceptable means to pursue political policy. In all the speeches he or his brother ever gave, was there ever any hint of the latter? I myself don't know. But let's assume that they didn't actually believe or endorse such a method. One possibility is that the whole thing is a hoax; that the Kennedys never had such a policy. Yet by inventing or else being deceived by others with it, it would lead one to believe Kennedy was somehow responsible for his own death.

What may rather have been the case is that the Kennedys' idea of attacking the mob instigated a mob reaction and expansion of infiltration of the CIA. A secret agency like the CIA in peace time has never to me made a whole lot of sense to begin with, and covert methods obviously lend themselves to spirit and witchcraft people. There is obviously a degree to where if one goes off the deep end in darkness and secrecy they will sure enough find that darkness and secrecy -- and the poison and disease that come with them.


Regarding my own supposition of the very important spirit person, the geometrically religious exchange of fire at Dealey Plaza suggests a potentially wonderful symbolism -- and to that extent a more refined and exquisite form of torture. Two of the most persuasive forensics explanations as yet are that the shots that killed Pres. Kennedy came from *above* (the Depository or else another adjacent high building) and from *below* (from the flood drain.) [The flash/smoke from the knoll being possibly the/a magician?] Perhaps the meaning to be read into this is that the President was being denied Heaven's protection for being self-righteous (i.e., his being less than perfect); while Hell wanted to get at him for reasons of jealousy ("he has it too good.") This may sound silly to some, yet it is exactly using the carrot and stick of Heaven and Hell that works wonders on some people's minds -- even if Heaven and Hell are actually, and unbeknownst to them, the same person.

Speaking of torture, remember spirit people can attack, including torture, an individual in at least three main ways: physical, mental, and spiritual (including morally and rationally in their soul.) If you are or happened to be so attacked, it is important to define to yourself exactly what they are doing of the one, some or all of these as a necessary way of forming and creating a defense for yourself; for they have arts and techniques that extend to assailing all three aspects of your person, and by rationally and specifically realizing exactly what it is they are doing you are that much better able to deal with whatever it is.

(Oh, and you, of course, don't want to forget your ["Man from UNCLE"](#) theme music by Jerry Goldsmith [via amazon.com downloads.]

*Later Note.* If you are relatively new to studies on the JFK assassination, one documentary you might try and which I especially found helpful and interesting is "The Men Who Killed Kennedy."

~~~~~\*~~~~~



"The iron-guts guys who kill for medals... dames... or just to stay alive!"
~ Tagline for "War is Hell" (1963), the film Oswald was watching at the time of his arrest. (Anyone know where one can get a copy of this film? I myself can't seem to find it available anywhere.)

Later Note. In fairness to Candy Barr (which stage name, you have to admit, is one of the tackiest you might ever hear), she was actually an accomplished poet, as witnessed by these thoughtful and well composed lines of hers:

*"Hate the world that strikes you down,
A warped lesson quickly learned.
Rebellion, a universal sound,
Nobody cares, no one's concerned.*

*"Fatigued by unyielding strife,
Self-pity consoles the abused,*

*And the bludgeoning of daily life,
Leaves a gentle mind...confused."*

Unfortunately, much like "War is Hell," a copy of her 1967 anthology, *A Gentle Mind...Confused*, it seems is just about nowhere to be had, except one copy at bookfinder.com going for \$1,253.00.

~~~~~\*~~~~~



[For the original picture, i.e., the famous Mary Moorman photograph, from which the above detail comes, see: <http://www.gunjones.com/moorman.jpg>]<sup>4</sup>

Before proceeding on the remarks I am going to make, I want to be emphatic in stressing that I have no compelling reason to assume the image in question is anything more than an optical illusion or some happenstance of lighting. This having been explicitly conceded, what does the above picture look like to you? Well, to me offhand it appears to be someone's eye. Now if you click on the picture, you will see where and what it is an enlargement from; the above image is located in the small red circle I've drawn left of center, and if you close in to and enlarge you will see it more clearly.

Now even though we assume the mysterious eye is simply a by coincidence, optical illusion, nevertheless the image is a bit frightening if you took it to be what it seems it might be. My main point in bringing this up then is to give you an example of how a spirit person can scare you with something, and were the purported eye something other than a photographic illusion how would you react to seeing such a thing if it were or actually appeared real? Well, of course, for some their hair would stand on end and they would beg for mercy. And this is why it is easy to get some to go along with these spirit people I write about -- you simply scare the former to death, and they will do whatever the spirit people (or their cohorts) tell them to. But if you are intelligent, what you ought to do (when dealing with bullying and con artist spirit people) instead is mock them or whatever it is they're doing, and or attempt to engage them in a dialogue, while keeping in mind and embracing with all your heart that inestimable dictum "perfect love casts out fear" -- indeed, say this to them as if you would instruct *them*. (Nor neglect to avail yourself of other great sayings we've posted or alluded to here before, such as "pray for peace...and mind your own business," and "it's a bad doctrine as well as a poor teaching," and "believe in truth, but not falsehood," etc.)

~~~~~\*~~~~~



⁴ Alternatively, see end of this document for the full view of the Moorman photo in which the "eye" is seen.

Once more I recollected something I had written some years previous at this site among my posts, and in searching through my “Oracles” files could not find it. This may be a fault of my search program, but in any case let me repeat what I basically related at that time about 2 or 3 years ago. What I said was that I had seen this “eye in the triangle” person, shown on the U.S. one dollar bill, by way of a spirit person showing it to me as an animated and vivid image in my head, and then sarcastically asked you my readers the question -- are you impressed then to know that there is such a thing? I would also add now that part of what I was and am trying to impart by mentioning this is that if there is such a thing you have no reason to necessarily take it very seriously, let alone deistically; even though it is on the dollar, and even though some will unthinkingly take for granted that it bespeaks something divine. As likely as not, it is really nothing more than some sorcerer’s or powerful spirit person’s jest to make us look stupid, and or else a guise they put on to arouse awe and terror.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

Not that I thought it so very important to point out, but in the interest of clarity I would make mention of one explanation for the “eye on the knoll” phenomena brought up earlier here. Assuming, for the sake of argument, the image *is* something more than just a lighting or photographic anomaly; it may be that it became manifest as a tell tale sign of our speculated magician. That is, he was taking things too far, and as a result traces of his otherwise invisible presence were left as a kind of penalty for and or exorcism of his transgression. And, of course, there are or might be other and like explanations to account for it as well.

~~~~~\*~~~~~



More Notes from Our J.F.K. File

If it was Oswald who attempted to kill Gen. Walker then presumably he was motivated by his Communist leanings to do this -- and yet later post-assassination scholarship has strong evidence to show that Oswald not only was no such left wing zealot but actually, and to some degree, of the opposite camp.⁵

It was interesting again being able to now re-watch some of these “Man from Uncle” shows circa 1964, and that in them often times the villain, whether spoken of or a specific character in the episode, is some self-serving military general or else a group of extremists out to overthrow some South American political leader. It is further of interest that these two types should be played up as villains because they are among the possible candidates that have in one form or other been suggested as the ones behind the purported conspiracy to assassinate the president. Yet we can safely reason that if the one who took a shot at Gen. Walker was in some way connected to the later presidential assassination, he was clearly not a right wing militarist and very probably not an anti-Castro fanatic. Who then was he? Based on some simple logic, we could reasonably say he was anti-military but not a left extremist (that is not Oswald and assuming a conspiracy.) And, of course and needless to say, an anti-Castro person going after Walker’s life makes no

⁵ Marina Oswald, in a television interview with David Lifton, asserts (1) that Lee admitted to have shot at Walker, and (2) that the backyard photos of him with a rifle were taken by her. If what she says is true, then this is seems hard evidence against Lee Oswald; unless we posit that photos were taken as part of a scheme to set (the unwitting) Oswald up. But if, on the other hand, what Marina states is not true, it *might* be explained as a result of her not telling the truth because she had reason to fear for the safety of herself and or her family if she did not do otherwise. Either way, these statements of hers are naturally significant.

sense. If there were a connection between the two separate life attempts rather than what it seems we would be in a position to infer is that those responsible were anti-military (shooting a general), and probably more or less indifferent to either communism as such or anti-Castroism; since these political view points were used as decoys or patsys for the real culprits. Or so very plausibly the case seems to me. Bear in mind also that from the very beginning it has almost always been a minority of public opinion that assumed Oswald acted alone. Therefore, it was understood by the (alleged) conspirators as necessary to come up with explanations as to who might have been behind a conspiracy such as many people presumed there was, and such as would be used to lead those people off the scent from themselves.

Vilification of the Dallas Police Dept. (as, say, per Melvin Belli [*Later Note*. Specifically, Belli spoke derogatorily of the City of Dallas, and I presume this effectively includes the DPD. For more see <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oxmzb2jP8uU> (“The City Of Dallas – 1963”)], incidentally, also seems another case of leading people astray. What seems to have happened with the DPD is that they were engulfed with something too big for themselves to handle. They meant well at first, but were understandably made to be baffled, and over time influenced, manipulated and effectively taken over by persons connected to the alleged conspiracy -- with the result that they too came to be seen as actual accomplices -- and therefore also red herrings -- to whom the crime might in some way and measure be attributed.

Later Note. Ordinarily, I avoid passing on putative assertions of fact communicated to me by spirit people on the ground that a) I do not want to encourage them, and b) that as a general rule it is better not to trust what they say. However, last night sometime after writing the above, a spirit person told me something that I thought I would make an exception for. What he said was that the “two” people who shot Pres. Kennedy were persons who were frightened and coerced into doing so, and themselves did not have malicious intent. Later and following the crime, they felt extreme, indeed the pits of, remorse -- for obvious and understandable reasons. While again we have no way of validating the veracity of such a claim as this spirit person made to me, it is at least useful in helping to give us an otherwise unexpected and possibly true explanation of why that shooter or shooters did what they did -- hence, my permitting myself to make an exception to my normal policy of not sharing such purported “inside” information.

~~~~~\*~~~~~



*31 October 1963*

While there is of course no need (though prompted we might be) to necessarily read any cryptic significance into the above photograph (and what it depicts); it does strike one as at least slightly peculiar that such very high profile children as Caroline and John Jr. would be costumed as witches for Halloween. Why such a choice I wonder? Is it possible that someone (perhaps the mother) was paying tribute -- as you know many people routinely and commonly do -- to placate and thereby ward off el diablo by such a gesture? Well *if* so -- and remember I am only saying “if” -- it obviously didn’t much help (as I will and do always remind people with respect to and when it comes to appeasement.)

*Later Note.* It occurs to me that possibly the idea was one of ridicule -- there is, after all and plausibly, a suggestive reference to the magician (i.e., the witch) and “Speelburg/Brukhymer” (the ?) of that day -- in the costumes.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

A couple months ago, I saw on YouTube a relatively recently made interview with the late Walter Cronkite; in which the CBS anchorman told an anecdote concerning the 1960 Presidential election. What he in effect said in it (as I can't quote from memory word for word) was that John Kennedy, off mike and off camera, threatened to go after or somehow retaliate against Cronkite and the people at CBS; after Cronkite (during the Wisconsin Democratic primary) had publicly asked Kennedy about the effect Kennedy's Catholicism would have on voters. The gist or implication of the story as presented was that Kennedy had a vengeful, big boss type, mean streak and would attempt to silence and censor his opponents if they didn't cooperate. The whole thing was so laughable when I watched it, I put it on the back-burner for purposes of posting it one day at this website as something funny for you to see. Well, just today I remembered and went to look for -- but it is now gone from YouTube. I then went and tried to find it via Google without success. I did, nonetheless, locate an interview with Cronkite in which he tells the same story quite differently, and which you can see at <http://www.emmytvlegends.org/interviews/people/walter-cronkite> (do a FIND search under “catholic” or else look for the second item in Chapter Six in the “Shows” tab.) Here, John Kennedy is hardly present at what happened, and instead it is Bobby who scolds Cronkite, and in a more plausible and polite manner; till the interviewer pointedly asks when Cronkite is done “it did not have a lasting impact, did it?” To which Cronkite answers “no, no, no;” with the interviewer then moving to the next topic -- as if this second interview was an apology or else to make up for the aforementioned, now lost from YouTube, televised interview in which Cronkite was somehow and clearly encouraged in some way to make John Kennedy look like a bully. All of which goes to show you how someone as respected, well thought of, and esteemed as Walter Cronkite can be made to talk nonsense and distort what happened if the pressure put on him is considerable enough. That at least is my interpretation of what occurred.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

Here's another thought provoking interview that was just posted on YouTube within the last two months; which some of you then may not yet have had the chance to see. Is it possible some of the Warren Commission members, *with all sincere and good intention*, were susceptible to pressure as Cronkite himself apparently (or purportedly) was in the interview spoken of in my last post?

See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FeSug5GVCg8> [“LBJ questions JFK Warren Report-CBS”]

~~~~~\*~~~~~



Now You See It.



Now You Don't.

In passing, and since the subject came up -- The above are details from Philip Willis' Dealey Plaza photographs [5](#) and [6](#). The first shows what has been labeled as the "black dog." What, if anything, is to be made of the strange object or figure, I don't know and could only guess. But that it does curiously depict something (aside from a photographically created aberration) seems to be plausibly evident.

Later Note. Just after posting the above last night, I joked to someone concerning the "figure" seen in the first picture, and, assuming it was a spirit person, said "that person didn't know *what* he was doing!" And, indeed, if we posit it or he was a spirit person, it is not impossible that he didn't (i.e., know what he was doing.) I remember when I had spirit people "visiting" (uninvited) my house very frequently in 2000, they at first use to come from my bedroom and then into my living room where I sat; with the ghoulish magician acting as "MC" to all this. Then one day they significantly reduced the number of entrances from my bedroom, and instead came in by way of the kitchen (which also enters into my living room.) The explanation for this, as I inferred at the time and based on some remarks of the magician, was that a passerby pedestrian outside, or else neighbor, had seen one of the spirit people through my window, and therefore it was necessary to have the spirit persons enter my living room by way of the kitchen (mostly); so that it was less easy to see them from without (i.e., through the window.) In other words, the spirit people were at first a bit careless about being seen, but when they realized they were or had been viewed by someone (aside from myself), they accordingly changed their path of entrance to avoid or lessen the risk of this happening further.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

"My God, I'm hit!" -- JFK as quoted by Secret Service agent Roy Kellerman (though no one else present testified to the same exclamation.)

"This fellow Kellerman is about as low a man as you can find, but he was about as dumb as an ox." -- LBJ.

*Note.* Although the above are historically accurate, my purpose is strictly one of humor (and nothing more, i.e., no offense or accusations intended or implied here toward anyone.)

*Later Note.* BTW, I learned of the Kellerman testimony from a 1966 "Firing Line" interview by William F. Buckley with attorney Mark Lane; which you can see at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7YkOLMxGrgs> ["MARK LANE IS INTERVIEWED BY WILLIAM BUCKLEY (12/1/66)(PART 1)"]. It is actually quite fascinating, on different levels, and among others

things disproves and discredits the scoring, of such as Noam Chomsky, that Buckley (leaving your politics aside) wasn't actually witty (except by reputation.)

~~~~~\*~~~~~

Some More Briefly

JFK shooting investigator Mark Lane, and whom we mentioned recently, did, as some of you already know, a film documentary (1967) that accompanied his book "Rush to Judgment" and which remains to this day one of the most useful and very best, possibly *the* best, of its kind. Notwithstanding, it suffers at certain points from what I feel is a certain (albeit at the time the film was made perhaps understandable) unfairness and bias against the Dallas Police (i.e., the latter taken as a general whole.) Specifically in what on YouTube is part 8 of the 90+ minute film, at points 3:40 and 8:35, with the respective interviews with Nancy Hamilton and Joseph W. Johnson, both former Carousel Club employees, and both of whom also I personally would suspect of being somehow under the influence at the time, and in error in their testimony. They (and apparently others also) claim Ruby knew half of the 1200 men on the Dallas Police force; with Police Chief Jesse Curry in response saying only 4 men of the dept. were known to have any off duty contact with Ruby and his club -- quite a divergence from the Hamilton and Johnson assertion.

Let's say, at least *for the sake of argument*, that Hamilton and Johnson's versions were the less than correct of the two varying accounts; what might we deduce as the cause of their error? The following is a list of possible explanations:

- 1) They were prompted to lie or distort the facts by "someone" but for what they believed was a "good" purpose in doing so.
- 2) Men masquerading as DPD officers frequented the club (this fact being known or unknown to Ruby himself.)

My point then is to suggest how someone might not fully or at all be telling the truth yet in their own mind feel justified that they were actually doing good by acting so; while bringing out the other possibility that they are telling the truth as they know it but were purposely deceived by some other. In any case and as ever, you can judge for yourself.

See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SzhIZFn4pLs> ["INTERVIEWS WITH DALLAS POLICE CHIEF JESSE CURRY (NOVEMBER 22-23, 1963)"]

Although, in fairness to Lane's early account, Curry looked very bad at the time of Oswald's arrest and seemed like one of those ready to join the lynch mob; another view of him, years later, is seen in this clip in which he sounds a good deal more credible.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WT4Gy6_rt_o ["Dallas Police Chief Jesse Curry JFK assassination-Kennedy Detail- Clint Hill"]

Last, just in passing and on a separate but related note and in case you missed it, I came across this clip of Connally's doctor at Parkland saying that the bullet had not yet been removed from the Governor's leg. If this statement is correct then presumably the bullet found on the stretcher is not what the Warren Commission believed it to be.

See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aQ8NJwq58Fg>

["JFK assassination AMAZING medical evidence news- Kennedy Detail Vince Palamara"]

~~~~~\*~~~~~

See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yvsH8pLtDXM>

[“Allen Dulles interview – 1966”]

There are so many videos to choose from on YouTube pertaining to the JFK assassination, one has to do some sifting to find something good and that isn't frivolous, redundant, or else scurrilous. Yesterday, I came across a joint interview done in 1989 with authors Gary Shaw and John Stockwell, and that definitely qualifies as one of the better such videos, and for those interested in reviewing the case, it is much worth recommending. You can catch the same, “The JFK Assassination Conspiracy - Two Different Points of View,” at:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9qgrXpD8uNw>

So often does the devil come up in human affairs, it is wonder relatively little is and has been done to identify himself and his methods, that is, in the various guises these take on, scientifically and empirically. Too frequently people are too hasty in ascribing motives to serious and less serious felons without taking into account or distinguishing between real criminals and deluded and misguided people. Here, for instance, quoting from *The True and Genuine Account of the Life and Actions of the Late Jonathan Wild* (1725) and believed by some to have been penned by Daniel Defoe, is a *real* devil:

“[Wild soon became an ensnarer of] poor, wretched Creatures, like himself; who he having first led them on in the Road of Crime for several Years, as long as they would be subservient to him, and put all their Purchase into his Hands, abandon'd as soon as they offer'd to set up for themselves, and leaving them to the mercy of the Government [i.e., he arranged to have them turned into the authorities], made himself the instrument of their Destruction.”

On the other hand, there are those who can be implicated in something, and yet rationalize their behavior as justifiable. Guilt doesn't always imply maliciousness or a desire to commit murder or spiteful injury for its own sake. Sometimes people can act badly because they don't know what they are doing, but genuinely mean well. Just as when a soldier in war kills someone; to them it is doing their duty and furthering good. In other instances, the person doesn't even know he is killing someone; because he's been misinformed. So while it is or at least can be a legitimate exercise to impute guilt or blame (say in a matter like the JFK assassination), it is necessary to be cautious and careful when it comes to ascertaining motive or state of mind of the accused.

This is all the more important when we realize a true devil can masquerade as any side and make himself at home in any camp of thought, belief, or ideology; and is ready to jettison, and if need be betray, the same as it suits him; leaving those behind to take the wrap. This, again, is one of the differences, between a true criminal and a dupe, and those who would prosecute wrong doers and offenders without being aware of this kind of distinction in culprits risk making themselves instruments of the very injustice they seek to do away with and rid society of.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

As a last, for the moment, footnote on the JFK assassination, I learned from the edifying research of Zapruder expert Jack White about a strange figure caught in frames 405-417 of the Zapruder film that seems to defy explanation. Now exactly what it shows or is, I don't claim to know. I *will* say it doesn't look like any spirit person I have ever seen, but then I haven't seen all spirit people. In any case, certainly as a phenomenon of itself and whatever it is, it arouses one's curiosity. To see these same frames enlarged, go to <http://www.assassinationresearch.com/zfilm/>

See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cqrXIOlq0zU>

["Stickman" in the Zapruder film - JFK assassination"]

Later Note. In examining the one version of the Bell film and that has what seems to be the same figure as "Stickman" running at high speed, notice the entirely different strides of the two. They hardly match. Similarly try replicating "Stickman's" movements on your own, and see if you don't end up looking like John Cleese.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

Even if we assume a CIA and or FBI tie to Oswald, we must, I think, be extremely careful as to exactly who or what that CIA and or FBI contact constituted or implied. Needless to say, it makes a HUGE difference if the contact was someone formally acting on behalf of the given agency (which suggestion conspiracist Jim Garrison himself vehemently believed implausible) or was acting independently with others; these perhaps not exclusively attached to the government. With this in mind, that Oswald had CIA and or FBI contacts diminishes immensely the likelihood that he was acting (assuming his involvement) for purposes of gaining notoriety or making himself a big man in the eyes of the world. And yet this latter interpretation is standard coin of those who take for granted that Oswald was THE (if not merely "one of the") gunman.

See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Xawnd59GBU>

["David Atlee Philips - CIA Agent who framed LHO"]

~~~~~\*~~~~~

It has got to be a bit of side hobby in my spare hours to examine and reflect of the JFK assassination; not so much or necessarily because I somehow feel an urgent need to solve the mystery of it myself, but because I guess I like to play armchair detective, and there is a certain satisfaction I get attempting to solve puzzles of this sort. This by no means to make light of the importance of getting at the truth of what happened in 1963; only under the circumstances I am not situated otherwise to take the task up in due and proper earnest.

This said, I got to thinking about my own experience of how the magician one day appeared, back in the year 2000 (and recounted in my "Narrative"), as it were out of nowhere and led me to go on a wild car ride, and which resulted in my ultimately finding myself in a car wreck. The memory made me wonder if perhaps Oswald hadn't had something somewhat similar done to him on the day of the shootings; so that if we grant the premise, he had a spirit person, perhaps appearing as it were out of no where, telling him what to do. Let me first emphasize that I am in no position to say any such thing actually occurred, yet if -- for the sake of discussion -- we posit such, it would explain much that happened that so far will have struck one as altogether inexplicable.

Let's therefore try this theory -- and let us be emphatic that that is all it is -- on for size and see how well it *might* fit the facts. For simplicity, let's assume further that Oswald was not the assassin of the President.

* Oswald leaves the book depository right after the shooting of the President; reportedly because he believed there would be no more work that day. A reasonable surmise, and yet why didn't he check in with anyone before leaving?

* In taking a cab on his way to the boarding house, the cab driver (who at that time did not know of the assassination) mentioned all the sirens and police cars; stating aloud that he wondered what *that* was all about? Oswald, very strangely, said nothing to him; even though presumably he did know the reason for the commotion. Why should he keep silent on something so important? Here perhaps we have an indication of the spirit person, whom we can call the "magician," as in my own story, telling him to keep silent and not respond.

* Oswald did not have the cab driver drop him off at his boarding house, but rather up the street a ways. What possible reason could there have been for this? Fear that his landlady should see him arrive home in a cab? On the other hand, this odd decision seems possibly to me a case of the magician advising him to do this.

* After being dropped off, Oswald walks back down the street to the boarding house. He is there for a few minutes, again evidently says nothing to anyone about what he knows has happened respecting the President, and then proceeds out of the house with a revolver. Why on earth should he leave the house with a revolver? If he was guilty as the assassin it would have been the height of folly to walk about so armed. While if he was innocent, what should he need a gun for? The answer may be the magician told him to take it with him. Presumably, Oswald was frightened or at least distressed by what had happened, irregardless of his guilt or innocence, and therefore all the more impressionable to such an otherwise highly absurd and extremely dangerous suggestion. Perhaps as well his ties with others who were or might have been involved in the assassination made him apprehensive; even though he himself was (for sake of our analysis) blameless of any direct or conscious involvement in such a plot.

* Where was Oswald going? We don't have the foggiest. However, if we posit the magician, it was perhaps the latter telling him to go and where to go.

* The magician leads Oswald in the direction of Tippit, and somehow perhaps the latter is led in the direction of Oswald. A confrontation transpires, and Oswald, being systematically and emotionally worked up by this time by the magician, is provoked into shooting Tippit. Likewise, it is again possible Tippit was being set up before hand for the encounter as well. Why did Oswald shoot Tippit? Perhaps because the magician told him that it was in the interest of his own safety to do so. Oswald was led to believe he was in danger, and he must act to defend himself. Of course, such a response rightly seems madness to us, but if such as the magician was leading him on he might be able to get terrified Oswald to believe sheer nonsense; just as he had advised Oswald to take a gun with him; which again, whether Oswald was guilty or not, was an extraordinarily preposterous thing to do to begin with.

* Still trusting in the magician's advisement, Oswald makes his way to the Texas Theater, and where, of course, he is set up to be caught and is. Again, how completely crazy he should try to physically fight off the police officers. What possible chance did he have of overpowering and escaping from them at that point? Yet, once more, if such as the magician was advising him, Oswald presumably thought he was safe by continuing to trust the spirit person's commands.

* Once Oswald is arrested, the spirit person disappears and Oswald is left to fend for himself.

Is this or something like it what happened? I myself have no idea except to point out that *if* true, it would go a long way towards accounting for Oswald's inexplicably self-endangering, impractical, unrealistic, and irrational behavior following the President's assassination of which latter, to my mind, he more than likely was innocent.⁶

~~~~~\*~~~~~

After reviewing and ruminating on the above attempt at a hypothetical explanation of Oswald's movement's immediately after the Kennedy assassination, some additional thoughts have since occurred respecting it that I thought I would jot down as a supplement.

For starters, there is perhaps something of significance in Oswald's leaving his wedding ring and some money with Marina just prior to his last seeing her. It has been the interpretation of some, including as I understand Marina herself, that this gesture betokened Oswald disillusionment with their relationship and or else Oswald's implied statement he was going to be engaged in something suicidal. The latter possibility

---

<sup>6</sup> Last and just in passing, one other explanation might be to say Tippit's murderer was an (deliberate) Oswald look-alike.



does not, on the face of it, by any means strike me as a strictly necessary interpretation. Oswald's brother has made a statement in an interview that Lee, in going abroad, was desirous of sowing his wild oats. If there is truth to this, then perhaps part of what Oswald was seeking in Russia was a wife -- not unlike how even today one will come across ads offering American males brides to be had in Russia. And he got himself a quite pretty one. But did she really care for him so much? Or rather, was she substantially using him to get to America, and or was she someone's else's plant as bait to be used on Oswald? These last seem not implausible explanations. In any event, if such was the case, and Marina's own attachment was based on ulterior motives, this would account for Oswald's dissatisfaction with their relationship. And, of course, such dissatisfaction would be all the more egregiously compounded if someone else was using Marina to get at Oswald, and he then suspected or came to know of it. Now in positing these two possibilities, it isn't necessary to presume Marina's motive's were antagonistic; and I personally don't think they were; only that she possibly was and had been using him.

Granting such a scenario, it would be rather absurd to then conclude Oswald then went off to shoot Kennedy because he came to believe Marina has been using him and, even worse, someone else in turn using her to manipulate him. And yet it does provide us with a scenario that would help explain his being distraught at the time. In addition, it is one more illustration of Oswald possibly being set up by someone; which if he was, casts further doubt on the idea of his being a supposed "loner" being responsible for what ended up taking place. It is to my mind nothing short of astounding that a loner should have his picture taken so frequently; not least of which in his being *televised* handing out of "Fair Play" leaflets and the tv and radio interviews. I mean, after all, how easy is it for a person off the street and out of nowhere to be able to secure such potent publicity? He was supposed to be the treasurer for "Fair Play" in New Orleans. And though he was the only New Orleans member of the group, he somehow had enough money to secure himself an office for the group (at least an address for one) *and* money for the printing of leaflets *and* relatively high profile media coverage of his cause. If then he was loner, then he must after all have been a most extraordinary individual to have done or accomplished all these things by himself. And yet the trailer to the upcoming tv movie "Killing Kennedy" no little amusingly has the character portraying him saying "Nobody listens to me" (or words to this effect.)

~~~~~\*~~~~~

I heard author Joseph McBride this morning on Osanic saying the CIA had infiltrated the major mass media.

This is very good, but what about a possible distinction, that is, someone(s) infiltrating the CIA and then using the CIA to infiltrate the major media? This sort of thing one routinely encounters, e.g., the Mary Pinchot Meyers biographer and similarly, and must be careful about. Namely, was it the government agency itself to blame or, more specifically, outside infiltrators using it? Either way, it is well to consider that perhaps an intensely classified and secretly run government entity like the CIA and FBI, by their very hidden natures, all the more open themselves up to such furtive incursions; since, given that same clandestine, insulated, and compartmentalized character, there are that fewer watch-dogs (including fewer insufficiently empowered and or competent watch-dogs) to guard against and stand off its potential usurpation.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

## *A License to Kill*



Even to this hour, as we approach the JFK assassination 50th anniversary, we continue to be told how it was, after all, LBJ who was behind doing in the President in 1963. This I find most odd, not only because we hear this from historical experts who should know better, but also because it is the same pet theory espoused by Jack Ruby himself.

Well, if people are going to continue to be that ridiculous, let me enter an additional and as or more likely a candidate and suspect -- namely Hollywood and the film business. How strange that within two years of Nov. 22, 1963 that the same bunch who were putting out a high profile film like "Seven Days in May" (1964) -- in which upper echelon US military are portrayed as behind an attempted takeover of the government -- had the utter cheek (in partnership with toy manufacturers) to issue sniper rifle/assassin sets as popular children's toys. (I for my part, and to my delight back then, received the James Bond attaché case package for Christmas in 1965.)

But then, and again, it's the realistic, no nonsense likes of Jack Ruby and James Bond, et al., that get all the girls -- or so, at any rate, *some* would seem to have believed.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

One of the positive and worthwhile results of the ongoing controversy and debate between the so called conspiracists versus lone gunman believers in the ongoing JFK assassination story is that it is both compelling and encouraging people to be more closely rational. And one reason emerging that reveals why some are so childishly mocking and vehemently against the conspiracist point of view is that the more intelligent and serious among the latter are continually insisting that everyone think logically and scientifically -- and many people don't want to think logically, scientifically, and in the process face reality. Like the proverbial vampire who cannot bear the rays of the sun (in this case of truth), or else Mr. Gumby in Monty Python their is response is as much to say "my brain hurts" by all this active cogitating and analysis; and so they get very upset, not because the Warren Commission is so dear to them or that they so hate Oswald, but because they are forced into being reminded there is such a thing as reality.

I will be frank in confessing that my own living circumstances of late often find me with much idle, spare time on my hands (at least after the morning has passed); much of which then I frequently spend going through some of the JFK assassination historical related footage, recordings, interviews, and documentaries on YouTube. Two particularly good programs I've encountered recently, if not exactly perfect, are author David Lifton's lectures on the purported Zapruder film Hoax; and a you-are-there recounting of the JFK assassination and its subsequent history called "JFK: 3 SHOTS THAT CHANGED AMERICA" -- though

the last program leaves unexplained which three shots the title is referring to (“3” as with regard to such fired in Dallas Nov. 22, 1963, or “3” as in JFK, MLK, RFK -- or what?) Again, both programs could have been better; the first, although in some 9 installments, is somewhat rushed, and part 2 of the second is more choppy and inchoate than its part 1. Even so, both the lecture and unnarrated documentary are all in all extremely fascinating and indubitably worth the watch.

See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DVrxtiA98hc>

[“JFK Zapruder Hoax - David Lifton Part 1” -- symposium held at the University of Minnesota, May 2003]

See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dcXqgzJkV0g>

[“JFK: 3 SHOTS THAT CHANGED AMERICA” (PART 1)]

(Successive video installments you’ll have to navigate to once you are on YouTube.)

~~~~~\*~~~~~

This Friday the 22nd, as many of you know, will be the long awaited 50th anniversary of the murder of President John F. Kennedy. To mark the same here at our humble website, I thought I would post the assassination sequence from the 1973 film “Executive Action,” and that I happened to have seen when it first came out at the theaters. You may or may not agree to the idea of there being more than one gunman in the assassination, but it is interesting in watching this how (allowing for it being only a movie) a scenario with multiple snipers might have taken place. (The main sequence I wanted to show runs to about 3:50, and beyond that there isn’t as much to see unless you intend to watch the entire film.)

See: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DzlkNOQ\\_-KY](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DzlkNOQ_-KY)

[“JFK - executive action part8/9”]

~~~~~\*~~~~~

“The Hooligan Group,” *or* Exactly What It Is That Makes Conspiracies *Really* Work

See: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PdCWl2_Lh9s

[“Lee Bowers JFK Assassination Witness Some Claim That He Was earwitnesses”]

See: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SCI_-ecZtuw

[“JFK Assassination The Death Of Navy Medical Technician Lieutenant”]

~~~~~\*~~~~~

A number of years back, on one of those many occasions when the magician (along with concomitant brain radio banter) was chatting away at me, reference was made about how in the past such as the magician and the then “Speelburg” used to make fools out of traveling door to door salesmen. Although he didn’t specifically state so, the gist of it as I gathered was that what they would do was get certain men to take up careers as door to door salesmen, and then create all kinds of pressures and pranks for the salesmen to go through. It was one of those kinds of things where the magician and his underlings could have fun while simultaneously tormenting someone, and used to be (if not still currently so) a way of causing trouble that was relatively easy to do. It just so happened the other day that someone on Face Book posted this human interest story that I would bet \$100 dollars was an instance of one such plaguing an individual. But to make the joke even more glorious, have it seem like the poor fellow was engaged in a noble enterprise; while up

their sleeves making fools of yet others who praise him. This, at any rate, is my guess, but you can judge for yourself.

See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L8LnvfpeQDA>

[“Mr.Bill Potter.wmv” -- “20/20” segment with Hugh Downs]

And here’s another. There is a certain Roderick Mackenzie who within the past few years has come out with a bombshell and nigh full explanation of who killed JFK (a topic, as you know, we have talked about here a number of times previously.) When I first listened to these interviews with him, I will admit I was impressed with what seemed a credible story. However, the more I reflected on what he said, the more I became convinced it was more than likely a witchcraft based hoax; intended to make fools out of people who would believe it; particularly serious minded conspiracy theorists. As I have posted in my comment on YouTube on several of these interviews -- “Possibly some parts are based on a true story, but otherwise a total hoax designed to mock and discredit conspiracy-minded theories. It is astounding the range of connections MacKenzie claims to have had, and no less so how serendipitous that Mac Wallace should divulge such extensive and exact implicating details regarding the assassination -- simply because he was drunk! As if the whole plot was thought up in the course of a few nights as little more than a lark by some individuals; who supposedly ‘all’ hated Kennedy. Highly toxic stuff -- beware!”<sup>7</sup>

For one such of these interviews, see:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Aim90PkYMIk>

[“In depth interview with a JFK assassination inside witness.”]

Really, if you knew the truth, there has been an avalanche in recent years of all kinds of hoaxes, counterfeits, and put-ons (many, as to be expected, religion related) on various subjects; some of them very clever and believable -- certainly to the unwary. And it is well therefore and naturally to be all the more on your guard; lest, you too, find yourself too easily being made a dummy.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

Some Quick YouTube Reviews

“Vincent Bugliosi 2013 Debunks JFK Assassination Conspiracy Theories & Oswald Being Innocent”

For which, see: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jYiyKtx9Y68>

Sheer, unobjective rhetoric; using assumptions which he claims are true because they are verified and confirmed by the government and police; which government and police his opponents claim are crooked or incompetent. How does Bugliosi explain the Mauser? How does he explain Oswald’s good luck finding a job on the parade route? What was supposed to be his motive(s)? Pro-segregationism of some of the Dallas leadership (as recently posited by such as Dan Rather as one possible and likely motive?) How does he explain the multiple bullets, such as the one that ricocheting nicked James Tague? The problems with the autopsy photos? The absurdities in the Zapruder film (e.g., bystanders who don’t seem to notice JFK riding right past and in front of them?) The countless murder, reported suicides, or suspicious deaths of witnesses (Lee Bowers, e.g.?) Etc.? There are other explanations then for what happened than what Bugliosi is adamant and fanatically upon.

⁷ The James Files story, incidentally and which MacKenzie’s contradicts, would seem to be a sophisticated fabrication of a similar sort.

“JFK Assassination Documentary With Professor John McAdams Josiah Thompson & Others” [Nova program from 2013 “JFK: Cold Case”]

For which, see: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WFP7ZQvHH3c>

John McAdams: “Here’s a nothing person.” And we heard this sort of thing from William Manchester -- both of whom are supposedly “somebodies;” whom by their very use of language make themselves sound like killers.⁸ (Just the violent way of speaking, pertaining to a homicide investigation no less, that doubtless JFK himself would have used.) Even if we grant a single shooter, we still haven’t proved it was necessarily Oswald who did the shooting. Meanwhile, discounting of two shooters and even if we assume Oswald guilty does not ipso facto eliminate the possibility of a conspiracy; as simple matter of fact common sense and logic would tell you -- with innumerable questions still unanswered; such as how did Oswald just happen to have job at the depository? Why is no mention made in this documentary of the testimony of pathologists and doctors at Parkland? How are the countless murders, suicides, and strange deaths of witnesses accounted for? Is evidence tampering absolutely not a serious issue or concern in any of this? And, rest assured, much more.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

In a BBC radio report of Nov. 24, 1963, Alistair Cooke aired a scintillating and scathing analysis of and on the meaning of JFK’s death. He effectually states and implies that the assassination was an act of raw evil; the evident intent and or result of which was to destroy hope in people’s hearts and minds, and to break up, what was in effect, greater America’s family solidarity and unity. If what he says is true, then “Oswald’s” ambitions were very grand indeed.

See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qc3c9gtwiwc>

[“COMMENTARY BY ALISTAIR COOKE ON 11/24/63 (BBC RADIO)”]

~~~~~\*~~~~~

There are so many uploads on YouTube regarding the JFK assassination that it is not always easy to sort out the good from the indifferent from the junk, and for me it has been a while since I came across anything very interesting. That is until just a couple days ago; when this turned up: a History Channel program “Infamous Murders: Somebody Killed the President: The Assassination of JFK.” Of particular interest is its profiling of Oswald, and which is one of the best documentary presentations I have ever yet seen on him: not exactly perfect, but relatively and very well done otherwise. Whether by detractors or exonerators, Oswald was then and now often and understandably portrayed as nut. Yet in his attempting to sort out the bad and sort in the good from both communism and capitalism, Oswald not only manifested intelligence but even a kind of genius. At the same time, not the least puzzling thing about him is how someone so articulate and impassioned in his purpose could have been just faking it (say as a covert operative.) In this lies the great conundrum of Oswald. For while there is convincing evidence he was acting as agent for someone, how could he also come across as somebody so sincere, and many of his political ideas often so cogent and persuasive? If Oswald was merely an undercover operator, what did he believe in contrast to the ideas he rather and at times eloquently expounded? Are we to say that he was really a right winger pretending to be a Marxist? This doesn’t seem to me to really make much sense; since he expresses his brand of Marxism all *too* effectively.

The only explanation I can think of then to explain this paradox is to support the idea that much of what was attributed to Oswald was actually a double impersonating him. Simultaneously and meanwhile, the real Oswald was being used, duped, and manipulated for purposes of setting him up. Granted it is easier to

⁸ Similarly Eric Sevareid at 1:19:45, and Jim Newton, pro-WC author, at 1:20:25 in:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pLhEeyXhFe4&t=19s>

[“The Assassination of President Kennedy 2013” - CNN documentary]

Such ad hominem, merciless vitriol ostensibly from morally minded, educated persons! Why not have settled for simply calling Oswald a sick lunatic? Not a very Christian attitude certainly.

assert this in general terms, as opposed to identifying the real versus alleged “fake” Oswald by the details, nevertheless, I am as yet utterly at a loss as to how else his person and story can best be accounted for.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rq3VqUrEhr4>

[““Jack Ruby” The Case of JFK Assassination’s Missing Echelon” -- History Channel program “Infamous Murders: Somebody Killed the President: The Assassination of JFK”]

~~~~~\*~~~~~

6 hour+ presentation by author and researcher Douglas P. Horne; one of the most intelligent and detailed attempts to get at a large body of evidence pertaining too the JFK assassination.

See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=svDEw3Jgkw8>

[“Finally hearing the TRUTH about the JFK cover-up.” - filmed by the Future of Freedom Foundation]

For what amounts to an abbreviated version of this same presentation (at 46+ mins.), see:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fSV0FyWJa0c>

[“News from Doug Horne concerning JFK's autopsy..”- MrChrillermannen channel]

~~~~~\*~~~~~

Anita Langley and Len Osanic interview journalist Gaeton Fonzi.

See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2lxN2x6gWEE>

[“Anita Langley and Len Osanic with Gaeton Fonzi”]

~~~~~\*~~~~~

Whenever you point the finger at someone, be sure to be right because if you aren’t two things happen: the innocent (or else mostly innocent) are blamed and the guilty go free. Jim Marrs has some very good and interesting things to say, but he too often seems trigger happy at pointing the finger and a bit hasty at assuming conclusions. When people do the wrong thing it is not always because they intend wrong doing or a bad result, or that they themselves wish the crime or bad act to take place. Some people do wrong because others force them to; for example because of black mail. While Johnson, then and for instance, did or may have aided a cover up, it may be he did so because he was blackmailed, or because he thought it was better for the country not to pursue conspirators, and any number and more possible motives. And yet when you hear talks like this, not infrequently someone likes to jump to the conclusion simply that Johnson wanted to have Kennedy removed to start the Vietnam War and help Wall Street bankers and magnates. Perhaps. But are there not at least a dozen other possible motives? Why be so sure and quick to assume that one; including the assumption that Johnson acted with criminal mens rea at all? Another reason people do wrong, in addition to their own willful intent or else criminal coercion by the others (e.g., blackmail), is that they may be deceived and tricked into doing the wrong thing. If this is true, say and using the example of Johnson again, and that Johnson was tricked, what sense does it make to blame him for anything but being mistaken and or stupid? Be careful then folks in taking in as true all that you hear from people whom we have every good reason to believe mean well.

See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OsItiPfnzLI>

[“Lee Harvey Oswald’s Phone Call Before Assassination” -- should read “after the assassination”]

~~~~~\*~~~~~

[10 April 2017]

This past week, and on my time off from my regular work and studies, I went through a number of JFK assassination related videos on YouTube, taking notes and considering and re-consideration different points in the case, and thought I would write up a little summary and review of my thoughts pertaining to that controversy. In the opinions I express that follow, I may admittedly in a given instance be mistaken or need to modify my position, but if so I hope you understand that I am at least willing to hear counter arguments and try to be fair and impartial in my doing so. This said, below are some thoughts and conclusions I adopt on the JFK assassination at present.

In my approach to the case I believe very strong in the principle of innocent until proven guilty, and that we should in general lean toward giving people accused the benefit of the doubt; not least of which when it comes to questions of motive. If I have learned anything in life, it is that more often than not people do wrong while in their own minds thinking themselves benevolent and meaning well; no matter how blameworthy the action is otherwise.

First, I am inclined to think Oswald was not the assassin, or at least evidence claiming he was is no fully convincing, and that almost certainly he was set up by others to take the rap. This is not to say he may have been guilty of something, perhaps he was (say, resisting arrest at the Texas theater.) But as far as his killing either Kennedy or Tippit, I am as yet unpersuaded.

Although I don't have the time to go into them in any detail here, the following points (in no particular order) raised by others (or myself) seem to me to show that the Warren Commission's findings at minimum deserve reconsideration if not outright rejection. Of course, this does not pretend by any means to be a complete list, but only some of the arguments that to me and off-hand appear to be among the most compelling.

1. Murder of Oswald by Ruby; with implications that the former was possibly being silenced; and including how Ruby could make his way into the police garage (described by reporters on the scene as "an armed camp") without being either recognized or inspected.
2. That Oswald should "just happened" to have job at a location along the motorcade route seems too good to be true.
3. The tampering and disappearance of medical and other evidence (including Zapruder film), as for instance brought out in the work of David Lifton and Douglas P. Horne, strikes me as both confirmed and wholly inexcusable. (I would, however, like a better and more clear explanation, by Lifton and or Horne, as to how the body switch was made on the plane, and how the real body was moved unseen to Bethesda before the fake casket.)
4. The discrepancy between the Mauser found and the alleged Mannlicher Carcano.
5. The extraordinarily bizarre character of Tippit shooting appears extremely suspicious and inexplicable; so much so that I would even be willing to consider a theory that Tippit wasn't actually killed at all, and that perhaps his death was even faked and a put on.
6. As Mark Lane brought to our attention, paraffin test on Oswald by Dallas police show he did not fire a gun.
7. The too man to name witnesses and investigators, like Roger Craig or Dorothy Kilgallen, who were shortly after murdered or suffered an untimely death clearly suggests a possible cover up.⁹
8. Bullet found on stretcher at Parkland Hospital seems little short of ridiculous.
9. Early reports, including by doctors at Parkland, that JFK was shot in the right temple.

Other points that argue in favor of the cover-up or conspiracy view are brought out in the following discussions, and which I highly recommend for any examining the case:

⁹ List of some of the persons connected to JFK assassination who died mysterious or suspicious deaths (though oddly does not list Roger Craig, Dallas PD), see: <https://www.jfk-assassination.com/articles/deaths.php?>

1. Regarding possible Oswald double theory:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LMAc7WKMP2c>
[“Who impersonated Lee Harvey Oswald?.”]
2. The Girl on the Stairs story.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H26auGV_1Z4
[“Barry Ernest: The Girl on the Stairs”]
3. Oswald phone call to N.C. after arrest in Dallas.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OsItiPfnzLI>
[“Lee Harvey Oswald’s Phone Call Before Assassination” -- should read “after the assassination”]
4. Not on YouTube, but which I saw on tv years back but now can’t find it on DVD or anywhere:
“JFK Last Days” (2004), President John F. Kennedy’s last days in office; from series “Time and Again” with Jane Pauley.

Two videos I watched this weekend and that I found very interesting were interviews with persons who believe the Warren report:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4RKIu2VAZ7Q>
[“Kennedy Assassination ~ Malcolm Kilduff Interview” - done at Sixth Floor Museum]

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6xZwHAy60WE>
[“Q&A: Gerald Blaine & Clint Hill” - interview of C-SPAN]; see also Vince Palamara’s response to this on his channel.

As much as I over all disagree with the pro-Warren report people, in such interviews as this they come across as likeable and personable individuals. It is almost comical how Vince Palamara at times has vilified Clint Hill, when even if Hill is misguided or mistaken, he comes across otherwise as being a credible and good person. And yet it is not hard to see certain regrettable tendencies that perhaps might explain their attitudes, and which they could be faulted as follows; while asking do they take the position they do simply not to prevent themselves from being ostracized?

1. They resort to straw man arguments, citing, for instance, ridiculous conspiracy claims like Bill Greer was the gunman, while ignoring sound ones.
2. They make little or no effort to be actually impartial and objective. After all how can they be so sure the conspiracy theorists are on every point absolutely and incontrovertibly wrong?
3. Not Killduff, Blaine or Hill, but some pro Warren people at length bring up allegations, whether true or false, of Kennedy being a womanizer or a drug taker (the “Dr. Feelgood story) risking the safety of the nation. Now really, what possible relevance does this have to proving Oswald’s guilt?

The following I don’t believe:

1. Badge Man -- I just don’t see it.
2. Beverly Oliver -- she *could* be the Babushka lady, and she seems sincere, but I frankly can’t help but be suspicious of her claims.
3. Joseph McBride’s take on the Tippit case to me is suspect. Again I may be wrong, but I find his version rather too broad brush with Tippit’s character, evincing a certain unwarranted presumption and unfairness. Also how solid is his proof that he actually interviewed Tippit’s father, and that what he recorded was what was actually said?
4. Oliver Stone’s “JFK” is in large measure as absurd as the pro-Warren Commission people say it is; but he does deserve credit for bringing attention to the work of Jim Garrison.

~~~~~\*~~~~~

More related YouTube videos worth recommending...



<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SFBehXGP-bM>

[“Mark Lane Talks On The “ Reliable “ Witness Mrs Helen Markham Recorded In 1964”]

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f\\_Jnoesk2KE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f_Jnoesk2KE)

[“Harold Weisberg interview” - 50:06 in length from Denis Morisette YT channel]

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gOk8esut5EQ>

[“John F Kennedy - The Autopsy” - includes interview segments with Cyril Wecht and Harold Weisberg, 10:15 in length from jakoxn YT channel]

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UtFoPCKVp-8>

[“Bullet holes in the limousine and extra bullets in Dealey Plaza (Extended English Version)”]

[23 May 2017]

We must further add:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XTdKgH1HN5M>

[“James Angleton & Lee Oswald.” - Lisa Pease on James Angleton, counterintelligence chief.]

Watching this led me further indirectly to the book *Reclaiming Parkland: Tom Hanks, Vincent Bugliosi, and the JFK Assassination in the New Hollywood* (2016 version!) by James Di Eugenio, and that is quite superb and to be highly recommended.

[28 May 2017]

At last (for me anyway) -- something like the REAL story of how the United States became so heavily involved in Vietnam (an absolute must for JFK assn. researchers; who if they are not already familiar with what is covered here, risk making serious fools of themselves.) Though two hours long, this C-SPAN broadcast is worth watching to the very end.

<https://www.c-span.org/video/?316196-1/vietnam-1963>

[“November 8, 2013: Vietnam 1963 Four Vietnam War historians talked about the events of 1963, a year many consider pivotal to the conflict. They discussed the political atmosphere in South Vietnam, the country’s changing relationship with the United States, and the uncertain future of the conflict during that year, which culminated in a military coup and the assassination of President Diem in November 1963. The panel “Vietnam 1963: Revision and Reassessment” was hosted by the New York Military Affairs Symposium.”]

See also:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sqoiCjONUu0>

[“Madame Nhu - Trần Lệ Xuân Trả Lời Phỏng Vấn 1982” – 1982 WGBH interview with former South Vietnam First Lady]


<https://www.c-span.org/video/?425801-2/us-diplomacy-counterinsurgency-policy-vietnam>

[“March 28, 2017: U.S. Diplomacy and Counterinsurgency Policy in Vietnam Steve Young, a former adviser who helped coordinate civilian and military programs during the Vietnam War, talked about how the conflict in Southeast Asia evolved over time and the role that President Lyndon Johnson played in the

decision-making process. Mr. Young also contrasted President Johnson's policies with those of his successor, Richard Nixon."]

---

Moorman photo from which detail of "eye" mentioned earlier was taken.<sup>10</sup>



---

<sup>10</sup> The website from which this originally came -- <http://jfkmurderphotos.bravehost.com> -- is no longer up. All other versions of the Moorman photo I now come across have the specific area in question pretty much blacked out. Consequently, here it is as I have it.