

Tom Hanks, Gary Goetzman, and Bugliosi's Bungle: A Comprehensive Review of *Reclaiming History*

Part VIII:

Bugliosi Hearts the Warren Commission: or How the author learned to like Allen Dulles, Gerald Ford and John McCloy

James DiEugenio

VIII.1

"The best evidence that Oswald could fire as fast as he did and hit the target is the fact that he did so."

—Warren Commission Counsel Wesley Liebeler

The reader should observe why I structured the last three chapters as I did. In sequential order, it shows how the Kennedy case was investigated. First was the Dallas Police; second, the FBI; and finally, the Warren Commission. By taking this approach we pose an important, perhaps crucial, question: What was the state of the evidence when it arrived at the Warren Commission? It appears that the Dallas Police Department (DPD) may have dabbled with CE 543, the shell not sent to FBI headquarters the evening of the assassination, and which experimentation shows could not have been fired that day. Because it was exculpatory of Oswald, Hoover covered up the actual results of his continued gunshot residue testing. The Dallas police appear to have intimidated Wesley Frazier and then retrieved a "package" from the Texas School Book Depository that does not correspond to the one in evidence today. The Commission was presented with an autopsy report that was first burned and then rewritten after Oswald was killed. They were confronted with a print on the rifle that was not initially reported in Dallas, not found by the FBI in Washington, but then appeared when the rifle was returned to Dallas days later.

The above is, of course, only a partial list. I have not enumerated the cover-up around Oswald's activities in New Orleans and Mexico City, or the spectacular security breakdown by the Dallas Police in the basement of City Hall. The point is that the Warren Commission was confronted with an evidentiary trail that contained tell-tale signs of manipulation and concealment. Yet, both the DPD and FBI had declared to all that Oswald was guilty—but now Oswald was dead. In light of this dubious collection of evidence, any fair or judicious legal body would be concerned with granting the murdered Oswald his posthumous day in court; after all, he had been killed in the arms of people who were supposed to be protecting him, before he even had a lawyer; and because of that, the Commission would be sure that Oswald's defense would be a vigorous one. At the very least, one expected the Commission to uphold the tradition of the Ameri-

can legal system: Oswald would be presumed innocent and be given a vigorous defense. That defense team would view and study all the evidence concerning their client. They would then be able to use this knowledge to both call and cross-examine witnesses. And they would also be able to present their own experts in certain refined fields. For instance, illustrious New York City medical examiner Milton Halpern would be allowed to study the autopsy evidence and records. Based on that, he would participate in the examination of the pathologists about why they did what they during Kennedy's autopsy.

And, of course, all these official proceedings would be conducted in the open so that Americans would know their government had nothing to hide about President Kennedy's murder.

As we know, in a complete reversal of standard jurisprudence, nothing even like the above happened. In each category, the opposite occurred. Oswald was provided with no defense team. He was presumed guilty by the Commission in January, before the first witness was called. Many important documents and pieces of evidence were never presented to the Commission. Important witnesses were not called. Crucial areas of evidence, like the autopsy and ballistics, were never questioned—even though they could have easily been challenged. One of the most surprising twists in *Reclaiming History* is this: lawyer Bugliosi finds nothing wrong with any of this.

What made the rush to judgment all the worse was the incessant pounding home by the press that Oswald was clearly the only gunman involved. During the months of November and December, the media carried deliberately leaked stories. They drummed into the public mind the “overwhelming guilt” of the dead Oswald. As I wrote in Part VII, the day after Oswald was killed, J. Edgar Hoover was the source for an Associated Press story declaring Oswald's posthumous guilt. On December 1, 1963, the *Washington Post* did a long article that told its readers that “all the police agencies with a hand in the investigation . . . insist that the case against Oswald is an unshakable one.” *TIME* magazine assured its readers that the FBI report “will indicate that Oswald, acting in his own lunatic loneliness, was indeed the President's assassin” (December 13, 1963, p. 26). *Newsweek* echoed this verdict by stating that “the report holds to the central conclusion that Federal and local probes had long reached: that Oswald was the assassin” (December 16, 1963, p. 26). The *New York Times* also served as a bullhorn for FBI Director Hoover. On December 10, 1963, it ran a front-page story, titled, “Oswald Assassin Beyond a Doubt, FBI Concludes.”

What makes this publicity barrage even worse is that it seems to have been orchestrated by officers in the government who were responsible for finding out who actually killed President Kennedy—that is, both J. Edgar Hoover, and Acting Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach. Since the shabby FBI report was classified, and the Commission worked in secret, there was no one to show that the Emperor was wearing no clothes—that is, that the “unshakable” case against Oswald was anything but airtight. These irresponsible officials were bamboozling an all-too-gullible media. The Commission itself criticized the FBI report at an Executive Session of December 16, 1963: Representative Hale Boggs said, “There's nothing in there about Governor Connally.” To which Sena-

tor John S. Cooper replied, "And whether or not they found any bullets in him." Commissioner John McCloy added, "This bullet business leaves me confused." Chief Counsel J. Lee Rankin then summed it all up with, "It's totally inconclusive." What is important to remember about this conversation is that the Commission at this time had done almost nothing: materials and reports had begun to accumulate, but very little of it had been digested. That is because the Commission itself was a part-time body; the vast majority of its work was done by its legal staff—which had not been appointed at this time, and would not be until early January.

Now, the way that Bugliosi deals with the above questions by the Warren Commission is notable: he describes their questioning of the FBI report as constituting a "very investigative mood" for the Commission (p. 331). What he doesn't say is that the "mood" didn't last very long—or go very far.

For, by January 11, 1964, the December 16 "investigative mood" had been muzzled. The Commission was in firm agreement with the FBI and Dallas Police: Oswald did it by himself. We know this from their own records: in a document dated that day, and titled "Progress Report", Rankin prepared a work outline to assist in the organization and evaluation of the materials received by the Commission. (He had been assigned to do this by Warren at the December 16 Executive Session meeting.) The second sub-head was titled, "Lee Harvey Oswald as the Assassin of President Kennedy". The third sub-head was "Lee Harvey Oswald: Background and Possible Motives". In other words, the verdict had been decided upon, in spite of the Commission's previously expressed doubts—and three weeks before the first witness had been called. Bugliosi does not tell the reader that at this same December 16 meeting, Warren stated that he wanted a birth-to-death biography of Oswald, and a similar one on Ruby—which clearly influenced Rankin's outline.

What happened between December 16, 1963 and January 11, 1964? Formally, nothing was done. The December 16 meeting was the last Executive Session before Rankin prepared his fateful outline—from which there would be no turning back. Placing the question in a broader context, the Commission was announced on November 29, 1963. The first witness was called on February 2, 1964. To paraphrase Walt Brown: What did they do for the first sixty-six days? (*The Warren Omission*, p. 59)

They had four Executive Session hearings, and they hired their support staff. This staff started to sift through the assembled reports of the FBI, the Secret Service, and the CIA. But in the roughly nine months left of their existence, they would not budge from Rankin's outline. Why? Because at the very first meeting on December 5, 1963, during Chairman Earl Warren's first speech, he said that the function of the Commission should be to evaluate evidence, not to gather evidence. And that the Commission could rely upon the reports of "the FBI and Secret Service and others that I may not know about the present time." He sealed the deal by saying something that would discredit both him and the Commission: "I believe that the development of the evidence in this way should not call for a staff of investigators." In other words, the Commission would accept the work of the Dallas Police, the FBI, and the Secret Service, and not in-

investigate or search for new evidence or witnesses with detectives of their own. With what we know today about the work of the bodies the Commission relied upon, this was an error of judgment similar to General Custer at the Little Big Horn.

Just how emasculated was Chief Justice Earl Warren on the Kennedy case? From this point, he went on to say that the hearings should not be held in public; he thought that their report would carry more influence done secretly than if it were done in the open. Incredibly, he even wanted the Commission to hear no witnesses, nor even have the power to subpoena them! He added that this would “retard rather than help our investigation”. At this first meeting, Warren was clearly carrying water for President Johnson, for he added that one function of the Commission was to head off legislative committees from holding hearings, which was LBJ's goal. Further, Warren invited Acting Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach to the first meeting. Mr. Katzenbach told the Commission a real whopper: he said that the upcoming FBI report on the case “will have no conclusions in it”. As I noted in the previous installment, this was completely false. The fact that the report was absolutely conclusive shocked some of the Commissioners. The FBI report was so poor that the Commission decided at its second meeting that they could not rely on it. What they needed was the raw data it was based upon, as well as the interview reports of the other agencies involved. Senator John S. Cooper added, “I think we ought to have a list of people we want to interrogate.” Therefore subpoena power was necessary.

One of the most amazing things about *Reclaiming History* is this: Bugliosi has no serious problems with any of the above. Oswald not having representation is not a real problem for him. The Commission not hiring its own investigators and relying on Hoover is not really objectionable to the prosecutor. The Commission not having all the evidence from agencies like the CIA is also OK. To have the bizarre autopsy practices not reviewed by a professional is not objectionable. The proceedings being closed to the press and public: that's not a big deal. Bugliosi doesn't bat an eyelash at Earl Warren not subpoenaing important witnesses like David Ferrie and Sylvia Duran. In fact, the former practicing attorney who found the Supreme Court procedures and actions so outrageous in both the Paula Jones case, and the *Bush v. Gore* decision, doesn't wince at any of the oddities and irregularities noted here.

As a result, he can't bring himself to admit a rather troublesome truth about this whole sorry state of affairs. As Chris Sharrett noted, the Nazis at Nuremberg were furnished more of a defense than Oswald was. Of course, if he did admit that, Bugliosi would have a lot to explain. (One thing would be: How could you as an attorney condone such a thing, Mr. Bugliosi?) This would have created a rather large problem for him, since today we have more data about the inner workings of the Commission than we had before; we also have more information on the commissioners themselves; and this helps explain why people like Hess, Streicher, and Goering got more justice than Oswald.

VIII.2

"The Commission had been set up to lay the dust ... not only in the USA, but all over the world."

—John McCloy, Warren Commissioner

In over 1,600 pages of text, Bugliosi could not find room for the above quote, even though the book I found it in—Kai Bird's biography of McCloy, *The Chairman*—is in his bibliography. There is an episode about McCloy's dealings inside the Commission that vividly dramatizes this quote: it puts McCloy's sentiments into action, via a power play—but Bugliosi only skims it.

Bugliosi mentions the fact that Commission Chairman Earl Warren wished to appoint his friend and colleague Warren Olney as Chief Counsel; but he glosses over what happened to Warren when he tried to do this. In fact, he actually tries to blame Olney's rejection on Senator Richard Russell (*Reclaiming History*, p. 327)—which, in light of what actually happened, is nonsense. Gerald McKnight was much more forthcoming in *Breach of Trust*. After describing how close Warren was with Olney, McKnight then described the origin of the opposition to him: Hoover hated Olney's guts (McKnight, p. 41). How did Hoover find out about Warren's preference so quickly? Through Nicholas Katzenbach, and perhaps Gerald Ford (*ibid.*, pp. 42–3). As we now know, Ford was an informant for FBI official Cartha DeLoach on the Commission. This began closely after his appointment in late November 1963. But like most informants, Ford insisted that his role should remain secret. He then lied about it after it was exposed. His snitching included panel disputes over the hiring of staff (Associated Press story of August 11, 2008). In turn, DeLoach served as a conduit to Ford for what Hoover thought of those panel disputes—and Ford acted in accordance with the wishes of his long-time friend, Hoover (*ibid.*).

But it wasn't just Hoover who wanted the independent Olney out. Katzenbach did also. He had also jumped on the "Oswald as lone gunman" bandwagon, and he did not want to risk the Commission upsetting that contraption. So Katzenbach installed his man at the Justice Department, Howard Willens, on the Commission to guard against the train jumping off track (McKnight, p. 42). How important was Willens in this regard? As Bugliosi notes without comment, one of Willens's functions was to recruit the staff (Bugliosi, p. 331). With what Katzenbach had written in his famous November 25, 1963 memo—"The public must be satisfied that Oswald was the assassin"—we can imagine what Willens was looking for as qualifications. When the FBI was informed about Warren's preference for Olney, a lobbying campaign was arranged by Hoover, Katzenbach, and DeLoach to thwart said appointment. According to McKnight, there was a lot to fear; for, as the author states in his book, "Had Olney served as Chief Counsel it is very likely that the Warren Commission Report would have been an entirely different historical document." (*ibid.*, p. 44)

When Warren tried to appoint Olney, it was Ford and McCloy who joined forces to block him. McCloy just happened to have a list of substitutes on hand, one of which was J. Lee Rankin. A rump committee was formed, which included McCloy, Ford, Allen Dulles, and Warren. As McKnight tells it, in just a matter of

hours, Rankin now became the consensus choice. Warren was outmaneuvered since Ford and Dulles threatened to resign if Olney was appointed (*ibid.*, p. 45). Rankin was a longtime friend of McCloy's, but he was also a working colleague of Hoover, whom the Director felt he could get along with. Regrettably, Hoover was right in that regard.

In *Breach of Trust*, McKnight spends about four pages on this key episode. Bugliosi deals with it in three paragraphs (pp. 327–8). In his discussion of it, he leaves out the role of Ford as the FBI informant; he leaves out the work of Hoover and De Loach in lobbying the Commission; and, most importantly, he ignores the maneuvering of McCloy, Dulles, and Ford to veto Olney, and enlist Rankin, the more palatable FBI candidate.

There may be a reason why Bugliosi blurs and discounts the above: it betrays what the real balance of power was on the Commission. Contrary to Bugliosi's insinuation, Richard Russell and John Cooper made no real objection to Warren's appointment of his own counsel; coming from the Senate, they understood the chair's privilege in that regard (McKnight, p. 45). It was McCloy, Ford, and Dulles who cooperated with the off stage actors—Hoover, Katzenbach, and DeLoach—to make sure that Olney was not appointed. When broken down and analyzed, this episode provides a window into what the Commission was really about, and how it would proceed. What does the window reveal?

1. For all practical purposes, Chief Justice Earl Warren had been made into a figurehead. Bugliosi mentions how LBJ scared Warren into taking the job, by suggesting images of mushroom clouds and tens of millions of burnt corpses. But, incredibly, the author makes no comment on how this fear-mongering could have impacted Warren in his fiduciary function (p. 324). Yet from the way that Warren reacted to it—tearfully—and the way he then spoke at the first meeting of the Commission, one would think he clearly got the message: the Kennedy case was not to be dug into or exposed to the public; if it was, nuclear apocalypse was at hand. As others have written, the giveaway as to how compromised LBJ made Warren was the Chief Justice's famous reply to a question about just when the public would see all the documents the Commission had seen. Warren was rather indeterminate: he responded with, "Yes, there will come a time. But it might not be in your lifetime." (Anthony Summers, *Conspiracy*, p. 101) The reader should note the use of the word "might". One wonders just how many lifetimes Warren was talking about.
2. The real nexus of power within the Commission was made up of John McCloy, Allen Dulles, and Gerald Ford. To anyone who studies American history, this would have been a predictable grouping. Why it is predictable is a key point, that is drastically underplayed by Bugliosi. But before we get to that, let us use some facts to demonstrate that this power center actually existed and acted. In his micro-study of the Commission hearings entitled *The Warren Omission*, Walt Brown broke down the proceedings by attendance and questions posed. The Commission member who was in attendance at the most number of full hearings was Allen Dulles; and the member who posed the most questions was also Dulles

(pp. 83–5). He outdistanced the second place finisher in both categories by no insignificant margin. In fact, Brown's charting of these statistics demonstrates that Dulles, Ford, and McCloy asked nearly 70% of the questions—a startling figure, especially since this troika formed a minority of the Commission. Another way to demonstrate their dominance is by tallying up the number of full hearings each member attended. The grand total for all members was 260. The Dulles–McCloy–Ford troika tallied 145 of those—more than half, even though they formed a minority. The Troika clearly dominated the proceedings.

3. Since averages are a zero sum game, the reader can guess my next point. The three members left out in the cold were Representative Hale Boggs, and Senators John S. Cooper and Richard Russell. These three attended only 63 full hearings, which is less than 25% of the total (*ibid.*). They also asked less than 25% of the questions posed by the Commission members. One could conclude that the southern wing of the Commission was being both left out and left behind by the Washington–Wall Street Troika.

In light of these facts, one should note that Brown's book was published over a decade before *Reclaiming History* appeared; Bugliosi lists it in his bibliography. There may be a reason why the author does not then inform us of these illuminating figures. See, once the early critics of the Warren Report began to expose the Commission's subterfuges, it was Russell, Boggs, and Cooper who first voiced doubts about the work they had done (James DiEugenio, *Destiny Betrayed*, pp. 348, 353). In light of the above numbers, this makes perfect sense, because the figures indicate that those three—the figurative Southern Wing—were not really a part of the Commission's work in any integral way.

The case of Richard Russell epitomizes what actually happened. Back in 1967, estimable critic Sylvia Meagher first pointed out the poor attendance record of Senator Russell (*Accessories After the Fact*, p. xxx). Many writers, both pro- and anti-Warren Commission, have used this to score him as “shirking his responsibilities”; and, predictably, Bugliosi goes after him on this account (see p. 455). With what we know about both the Commission and Russell today, the senator could have easily pleaded what Corazon Aquino did when she challenged Ferdinand Marcos for the highest office in the Philippines. Her critics charged that she was inexperienced. She replied that the charge was accurate—for she had no experience in graft, kickbacks, blackmail, criminal cover-ups, and bribery. Today, one can make the same case for Russell: after he saw how the neutered Warren was going to conduct the Commission, and after he read the wholly inadequate FBI report of December 9, 1963, he decided the proceeding was going to be a stage-managed dog-and-pony show—which it was. In fact, even assistant counsel Burt Griffin testified that Russell wanted to do an investigation, as opposed to an evaluation: one that would be a countercheck on the Commission, to be sure no stone was left unturned (HSCA, Vol. XI, p. 274). This is something that Bugliosi has to resist—or he has no book. So, as I mentioned in Part VII, he actually labels the FBI investigation in one place as “excellent” (End Notes, p. 115)—yet he himself says that with the submission of the December 9, 1963 report, the FBI “had failed its first test, badly” (p. 331). How does the author explain the dichotomy of his two comments? Right after this, he implies

that the rest of the Bureau's work was good because the Commission directed it—which, as I demonstrated in Part VII, is not so.

Russell saw the writing on the wall. At the December 16, 1963 meeting, Russell had warned the Commission that the FBI report needed to be scoured for weaknesses and contradictions; if not, five or six years later it would come back to haunt them. He then saw that the Commission's disagreements with the FBI report were not one of content, but of form: Hoover had not camouflaged his negligent and biased tracks well enough—either in length or in obfuscation. The Commission's cover-up would be longer, and more elaborate: 888 pages of it. Realizing what was ahead, Russell did something that no other Commissioner did: using people on his own staff—like Alfreda Scobey—and others—like retired Army Intelligence officer Philip Corso—he conducted his own inquiry. Corso found out that the Mannlicher Carcano rifle allegedly used in the assassination could not perform as the official story leads us to believe. Corso also came to believe that there was a Second Oswald, and that Oswald had gone to Russia as part of a fake defector program run by Naval Intelligence. He also came to the conclusion that the assassination was a project of rogue CIA agents working with anti-Castro Cubans. Russell tended to agree with Corso, but he said he could never get the other members of the panel to believe it (Dick Russell, *On the Trail of the JFK Assassins*, pp. 126–7).

His legal assistant, Scobey, had severe doubts about the testimony of Marina Oswald; in fact, in a memo she wrote to him, she all but called Marina a liar (Scobey Memo to Russell, June 29, 1964); and she added that there were many parts of her testimony that could be challenged. In fact, in 1965, Scobey wrote an essay for a legal journal pointing out that much of the Warren Commission's case against Lee Oswald rested on Marina's testimony—yet, if Oswald had stood trial, Texas law prohibited her from testifying against him (*American Bar Association Journal*, January 1965, pp. 39–43).

This all serves as fitting background to an interesting excursion taken by the Commission—or part of it. On September 6, 1964, Russell led a small expedition to a US Naval Air Station in Dallas. The only three Commissioners were the Southern Wing: Russell presided, with Boggs and Cooper in attendance. Rankin was there, along with two interpreters (Warren Commission, Vol. V, p. 589).

From the beginning of his examination of Marina Oswald, Russell makes two things clear. First, he has thoroughly digested the past record of her interrogations. This includes her relationship with Ruth Paine, whom he once called Marina's alter ego, and “one of the most charitable people we have” (December 16, 1963 Commission meeting, p. 41). Second, unlike Bugliosi and the Troika, he has real doubts about Marina's testimony concerning her husband, and about Oswald's real reasons for going to Russia. For instance, he asked the following: if Lee had told Marina that Russia was such an outstanding communist country to live in, and that is why he moved there, then why did he decline citizenship in Russia (*ibid.*)? Some of Marina's answers make little sense. She actually says that Oswald was unhappy with his living quarters and his wages (*ibid.*, p. 590), yet most observers know that Oswald was granted a very nice domicile at low rent and was given a fairly good job. Clearly, as far as living standards went,

this is as good as it got for Oswald once he left the service. Russell then went on to address the possible Cuban connection with Oswald: he asked if Oswald knew any Cubans while in Russia, New Orleans, or Texas (*ibid.*). He asked her about his joining a gun club in Minsk, and got her to admit that he only went hunting there once (*ibid.*, p. 591).

Russell then probed for any connections between Marina and the KGB or the Soviet military. The CIA had written a memo in March 1964 that stated, "In practice, permission for a Soviet wife to accompany her foreign national husband abroad is rarely given. In almost every case available for our review, the foreign national was obliged to depart the USSR alone and either return to escort his wife out or arrange for her exit while he was still abroad. In some cases, the wife was never granted permission to leave." Following this proven record, Russell asked Marina who she saw in the military to get her exit visa out of Russia. He then asks another pointed question: did she know any other Russian citizen who left Russia with a foreign national (*ibid.*, p. 592)? Clearly, Russell is skeptical about why she was allowed to leave Russia at the height of the Cold War. In fact, this line of questioning got Marina so on the defensive that she actually volunteered that she was never given any assignment by the Soviets or the Americans (*ibid.*, p. 604)—even though she was never asked that specific question! Russell also uncovered the fact that Marina, with Priscilla Johnson's help, found a ticket stub to Mexico in the middle of a television program guide (*ibid.*, p. 602). Conveniently, right after this discovery, Wesley Liebler happened to call her with questions about Oswald in Mexico—and she told him about this ticket stub that she and Priscilla had miraculously discovered nine months after the police first searched the Paine residence (*ibid.*, p. 602). Russell also discovered that Marina was planning on publishing her memoirs at the end of 1964 (*ibid.*, p. 600). She didn't. So the timely appearance of the eventual co-writer Ms. Johnson helped delay her plans for about thirteen years. Senator Cooper also pressed the ease with which she gained an exit visa from the Soviets (*ibid.*, p. 604). And it is here that Marina denied any "assignment" for the Soviets or Americans. Cooper also probed her relationship with Ruth Paine (*ibid.*, p. 607). In trying to discern a motive, Boggs asked her questions about how Oswald felt about Kennedy (*ibid.*, p. 606). He was so persistent in this line that he got her to admit that she was thoroughly rehearsed on this point in her previous Commission appearance (p. 607). The questions also focused on Marina's facility with the English language: Russell seemed to doubt her need for an interpreter (*ibid.*, p. 600).

Early in the game, this is the closest anyone came to suggesting Marina was a KGB agent who was planted on another agent, namely, Oswald; then, when left on her own, she fell into the arms of another government agent, Priscilla Johnson, who conveniently helped her "discover evidence", and then delayed her book for well over a decade. All in all, left to their own devices, the Southern Wing did OK.

Few people know that the day after this interview, Russell visited Dealey Plaza with Boggs and Cooper. He took an unloaded rifle up to the sixth floor, and simulated firing at JFK. In light of what Corso had told him, he commented rather wryly that "Oswald must have been an expert shot"—which, of course, he

knew he wasn't (*Flagpole Magazine*, November 19, 2003, "Sen. Richard Russell and the Great American Murder Mystery"). What even fewer people know is that Russell actually composed a letter of resignation from the Commission. Dated February 24, 1964, it was never sent to President Johnson. In it, he complains that the Commission "has been scheduling, holding, and canceling meetings without notifying him" (*ibid.*). If one adds in the Southern Wing's performance with Marina to their hesitance in signing onto the Single Bullet Theory at the September 18, 1964 Executive Session hearing (see Part IV, Section IV.1), it's easy to understand why the Troika didn't want him. Russell disagreed with the Single Bullet Theory based on two strong pieces of evidence: (1) the testimony of John Connally as to hearing the first shot, and turning before he was hit; and (2) the Zapruder film (*Flagpole Magazine*, *op. cit.*) As I previously noted, Rankin tricked Russell into thinking that his objections would be noted at this meeting. There was a woman there who Russell thought was from the stenographic firm. She wasn't; there is no stenographic record of this meeting (McKnight, p. 295). Harold Weisberg later informed Russell of Rankin's deception (*ibid.*, p. 296).

To me, the emerging record of Russell as the first dissenter—perhaps the first critic—of the Commission is one of the most important developments in the scholarship on the Warren Commission to appear of late. Russell did not criticize the Commission in public until November 20, 1966, in *The Atlanta Constitution*. There he said that he harbored a lingering dissatisfaction with the Commission's work, and that he disagreed with the Single Bullet Theory. In 1968, he went further and told Weisberg that the Commission had been deceived by the CIA and FBI in two key areas: (1) Oswald's background; and (2) the ballistics evidence (*op. cit.*, Dick Russell).

Russell left the records of his work from the Commission at the University of Georgia Library; many people other than Dick Russell have used them, and there have been several unpublished scholarly papers based upon those records, by students like Gary Diamond and Dani E. Biancolli. (The last is supposed to be the best discussion of this subject yet to appear.) In 21 years, Bugliosi apparently never consulted those archives or read those research papers. This tells us much about what he was up to in *Reclaiming History*.

VIII.3

"He is more or less inclined to be a Fascist."

—Harold Ickes on John McCloy

As critical as Russell was about the Warren Commission, he was never as vituperative or as specific as Hale Boggs. Boggs famously said that "Hoover lied his eyes out to the Commission—on Oswald, on Ruby, on their friends, the bullets, the gun, you name it" (*Texas Observer*, November 1998). The congressman's regrets about his service on the Commission were well known to his family. In the 1970s, his widow Lindy Boggs took over his seat in Congress. In keeping with his wishes, she became one of the early backers of the bill to authorize a new inquiry into the JFK case, which became the House Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA). Senator Cooper once expressed concerns over contradictions

between the testimony given by witnesses before the Commission, versus the interviews of those very same witnesses to the media. (Jim Marrs, *Crossfire*, p. 477).

Senator Cooper also did not buy into the single bullet theory. In an interview he did in 1978 for a British documentary, he stated, "Yes there were disagreements. I think the most serious one ... was whether the first shot went through President Kennedy and Governor Connally, who was sitting in the jump seat in front of him. I heard Connally testify he was not struck by the same bullet. I could not convince myself the same bullet struck both of them." At this point, realizing the import of what Cooper had said, the interviewer jumped in and asked, "You mean you yourself were not convinced by the single bullet theory?" To which Cooper simply replied, "No, I was not." By this, he was saying that there was a second gunman, and, by necessity, a conspiracy (DVD, *The Assassination of President Kennedy*). Cooper's 1978 testimony means that Russell did not stand alone in his dissent from the Troika.

One way to look at why the Troika and Warren did what they did is this: it was the easy way out. By January 11, 1964, it had become clear that Hoover, the White House, the Dallas Police, and the press all wanted a verdict of "no conspiracy", with Oswald and Ruby as disturbed killers. Furthermore, all the above power centers were alive and kicking; Oswald was dead and gone. The path of least resistance was quite obvious.

But something else was at work here: the clearly incredible power of the Establishment and the mainstream media pulling everything in one direction. But in a very real sense, the Troika was the Establishment and the mainstream. This is a significant point that Bugliosi simply does not confront. Beneath the surface of *Reclaiming History* lurks a rather disturbing fact: on one of the most controversial issues of the era, the author is siding with four of the most repellent characters in post-war American history: J. Edgar Hoover, John McCloy, Allen Dulles, and Gerald Ford. In Part VII I took some time to inform the reader about much of the rather unappetizing character and practices of Mr. Hoover; and you will find much more there about what a despicable ogre Hoover was than you will find in *Reclaiming History*. But as curtailed as his writing on Hoover is, I exaggerate only slightly when I say that, in comparison with his discussion of the Troika, it looks comprehensive. Yet it is hard to understand what the Commission did if one leaves out who McCloy, Dulles, and Ford really were, and what they represented. It is also necessary in understanding how the Southern Wing was marginalized, and, at the last meeting, duped into thinking that their objections would be recorded. The Troika was in control; and, from vast experience, they knew how to manipulate both people and events. In that regard, Cooper, Boggs, and Russell were provincial, almost amateurish. Dulles, McCloy, and to a lesser extent Ford, were masters at pushing levers behind the scenes: both of power and the press. Whether they knew it or not, the Southern Wing was being taken to school in how the Eastern Establishment controlled the national agenda. But to understand that, you need to know something about the unsavory background and acts of these three men. Bugliosi doesn't give it to you, so I will.

John McCloy's widowed mother made a middle-class living by being a hairdresser for the upper class wives of Philadelphia. As a youth, he first met the Rockefeller clan at a vacation resort in Maine (James Chace, "The Proconsul", *New York Review of Books*, October 8, 1992). His mother saved the money to send him to Amherst, and then Harvard Law School. At Harvard he concentrated on corporate and commercial law. Upon graduation he was advised by a Philadelphia lawyer to go to New York to make his fortune. He did. He eventually worked for three famous Wall Street firms, ending up at Milbank, Tweed, Hadley, and McCloy. That firm did a great deal of work for the Rockefeller family, especially in their banking and oil holdings. One of McCloy's early specialties was driving individual corporations into bankruptcy at the expense of holders of common stock—a skill that he exercised in takeovers of railroads during the 1920s. This, of course, would benefit families like the Harrimans—whom he also represented—since they owned the preferred stock, which could now be purchased by an allied family like the Warburgs, whom McCloy also represented. In other words, it was a socialist scam for the ultra-rich. But it allowed McCloy to become wealthy enough to marry into the class he served. He wed an heiress to the Phelps-Dodge copper fortune (see Chace, and also Jacob Heilbrunn, "The Real McCloy", *The New Republic*, May 11, 1992).

McCloy really made his name in the higher circles by winning the famous Black Tom Terminal case in international court against Germany. Employed by Bethlehem Steel, he reversed a judgment on appeal and showed that an explosion in New York Harbor in 1916 was a product of German espionage. In light of our subject, something else about his life at this time cannot be left out. In 1930, when working on this case for Cravath, Henderson, and de Gersdoff, McCloy became friends with Allen Dulles. Dulles headed up the Paris office of another powerful Wall Street firm, Sullivan and Cromwell. So when the two joined forces on the Warren Commission, they had known each other for over three decades (Kai Bird, *The Chairman*, pp. 76–7). War Secretary Henry Stimson noticed the Black Tom case, and McCloy became Stimson's assistant in 1940. It was that case, plus this appointment, that seems to have enamored McCloy of his two later preoccupations: national security and espionage (McCloy was one of the very few who had access to the famous MAGIC intercepts prior to 1942).

While at work for Stimson, McCloy was involved in two very questionable decisions. The first was the infamous Japanese internment on the West Coast. He played a key role in implementing this disgraceful episode. There was a dispute between the Justice Department and the military over whether Japanese-American citizens should be rounded up, many of their belongings forfeited, their lives disrupted, and then detained in isolated camps. McCloy came down on the side of the military. How unsupportable was McCloy's decision? Even *Hoover* recommended against it (Bird, p. 149). Some argued that it was unconstitutional: since most were American citizens, they deserved due process. McCloy shot back with one of the most ill-advised quotes in memory: "If it is a question of the safety of the country or the Constitution of the United States, why the Constitution is just a scrap of paper to me." (Heilbrunn, p. 42) It was this kind of attitude towards the law which made other Roosevelt advisers like Harold Ickes say things such as the quote above (Bird, p. 161). But that wasn't all. Once the over 100,000 American citizens were in detention, McCloy

manipulated evidence during legal proceedings to be sure they stayed there. A legal claim in their appeal was that they had been singled out because of their identifiable race. The Army had more or less admitted that this was a reason for their incarceration. McCloy had this point deleted from the Army report admitted into evidence at two legal hearings seeking their release (*ibid.*, Heilbrunn).

But there is little doubt that race was part of McCloy's reasoning. He later wrote a friend, "We would be missing a very big opportunity if we failed to study the Japanese in these Camps ... before they were dispersed ... These people ... afford a means of sampling opinion and studying their customs and habits in a way we have never before had possible. ... I am aware that such a suggestion may provoke a charge that we have no right to treat these people as "guinea pigs", but I would rather treat them as guinea pigs and learn something useful than merely to treat them ... as they have been in the past with such unsuccessful results." (Bird, pp. 165–6). These sentiments remind one of the attitudes of the eugenics "doctors" toward the Jews incarcerated in Eastern Europe at the time.

In light of that, one would not be surprised to know that McCloy also argued against ameliorating the Holocaust. Reports had filtered into America as early as 1941 that Hitler was slaughtering the Jews he had captured in the East. Many Jewish groups appealed to the White House to help those in the camps to escape. In 1944 FDR set up an agency to consider such action. McCloy actively opposed efforts to bomb Auschwitz, or the rail lines leading to the camp itself (Bird, p. 205; Heilbrunn, p. 43). He even lied about the possibility of doing so: he said it would detract from the war effort—yet American bombers, in attacking trivial targets near Auschwitz, had accidentally bombed an outlying division of the complex (Bird, pp. 213–4). In August 1944, McCloy responded to a similar plea by the World Jewish Congress with another one of his infamous dictums: the bombing raids, "even if practicable, might provoke even more vindictive action by the Germans" (Heilbrunn, p. 43). The real reason for McCloy's obstinacy was that the Joint Chiefs thought any such rescue operations "might create a precedent which would lead to other demands and an influx of additional refugees" (Bird, p. 204)—which they did not want to deal with before Germany was defeated. McCloy was pimping for the military again; but, as in the Japanese internment case, there is much anecdotal evidence to show McCloy was also anti-Semitic (*ibid.*, p. 207).

After the war, McCloy was appointed High Commissioner for Germany. Some, like George Kennan and Walter Lippmann, favored German reunification. McCloy's overall aim was to join the fledgling republic of West Germany into the western alliance. German chancellor Konrad Adenauer wished to leave the de-Nazification era behind, and make Hitler a more distant memory. Therefore, McCloy agreed to a review of the cases against surviving Nazis convicted at Nuremberg, even though many had already been reviewed by McCloy's predecessor, Lucius Clay, just before he left office (Bird, p. 331). The problem for McCloy and Adenauer was that Clay had not been comprehensive or lenient enough. McCloy's new clemency board worked with remarkable speed: in just six weeks, they reviewed over ninety cases, three thousand pages of judgments, and considered written and oral briefs from fifty defense lawyers. But there were two un-

usual factors that revealed McCloy's actual objective: his board did not review the actual evidence used at the trials, nor did they hear from the prosecution (*ibid.*, p. 336). The board predictably recommended reductions in seventy-seven of the ninety-three cases, including the commutation of seven of the fifteen remaining death sentences. McCloy approved over half of those decisions, including twenty out of twenty-five former SS officers who had served in Einsatzgruppen, the early mechanized Jewish firing squads (Heilbrunn, p. 44).

Afterwards, Eleanor Roosevelt asked McCloy why he was in such a hurry to free so many convicted Nazis. Telford Taylor, a member of the prosecution team at Nuremberg, showed that McCloy misrepresented salient facts in his reply to her (see Chace). As some later commented, McCloy's lack of sympathy for the Jews trapped at Auschwitz contrasted interestingly with his solicitude for some of their killers.

But that wasn't all. McCloy helped conceal the escape of the notorious Butcher of Lyons, former Gestapo chief Klaus Barbie. Barbie liked to torture his victims before killing them. One of his favorite methods was stringing them upside-down from hooks (Bird, p. 346). Another job of Barbie's was to ensure the deportation of French Jews eastward to the death camps. Some believe he overdid it when he emptied an orphanage containing forty-one Jewish children, aged three to thirteen, and shipped them to their deaths (*ibid.*). After the war, the French demanded that Barbie be extradited from Germany to stand trial. McCloy helped cover up his true location until he was transported secretly to Bolivia in 1951 (*ibid.*, p. 352). There he became a drug lord and arms dealer. Why would McCloy do such a thing for such a person? Military intelligence felt Barbie was a valuable asset in the Cold War against the French communists (*ibid.*, pp. 351–2). Nazi hunter Beate Klarsfeld finally discovered Barbie. His subsequent trial was popularized by documentary filmmaker Marcel Ophuls. Therein, McCloy was interviewed by several people about his past actions concerning the Butcher. He repeatedly said he had no memory of either Barbie or the French attempt to extradite him (*ibid.*).

In 1952, after resigning his post in Germany, McCloy went to work for his old benefactor, David Rockefeller, as president of Chase Manhattan Bank. He also became counsel for the Seven Sisters, the name given to the largest American oil companies at the time—which means he ran oil diplomacy into the 1960s and 1970s. He later also helped run the Council on Foreign Relations and the Ford Foundation. At the latter, due to the urging of his friend Allen Dulles, he allowed the CIA to use the Foundation as a channel to run Agency projects throughout the world (*ibid.*, p. 427). One of the things that Dulles arranged though McCloy was secret funding for the Congress of Cultural Freedom. This was a liberal front group that financed various publications in Europe, in order to strengthen the anti-Communist left (*ibid.*, p. 428). Dulles and McCloy arranged for this clandestine Ford funding to be known to only four people at the Foundation.

McCloy's swansong for the Eastern Establishment was as part of a three-man lobbying effort codenamed Project Alpha. His two partners in Alpha were David Rockefeller and Henry Kissinger. McCloy's firm was paid handsomely for his ul-

timately disastrous efforts. The objective was to get the Shah of Iran into the USA for medical treatment after the Iranian Revolution of 1979. Nixon and Kissinger had tried to make Iran into a regional power, a surrogate for American interests in the Middle East, so Kissinger considered the Shah both a personal and national friend. President Carter resisted the overtures, but McCloy was indefatigable. He wrote letters, made phone calls, held lunches; he even arranged for the publication of a book to answer the Shah's critics (*ibid.*, p. 644). The campaign went on for nine months. Carter resisted mightily. But, one by one, McCloy and his cohorts converted his closest advisers: Walter Mondale, Cyrus Vance, and Zbig Brzezinski. Finally, cornered and alone, Carter relented—but not before asking prophetically: “What are you guys going to advise me to do if they overrun our embassy and take our people hostage?” (*ibid.*, p. 652)—which, as we know, is exactly what happened. McCloy didn't care; he had achieved what Rockefeller paid him to achieve. In so doing, he helped Ronald Reagan gain the White House. Thus, McCloy ushered in the Radical Republican Revolution, which culminated in the catastrophe of George Bush, Jr.

McCloy died unrepentant over any of his reprehensible acts. For example, decades later, when called to testify about his role in the Japanese internment, he appeared guiltless about what he had done. He said that any financial award to those deprived of due process would be “utterly unconscionable” (Heilbrunn, p. 43). This from a man who made millions pimping for banks, oil companies, and David Rockefeller. After reviewing his career, Heilbrunn writes that, in sum, McCloy was a thoroughly despicable character (*ibid.*, p. 41).

Yet the reader of *Reclaiming History* would not know how the real McCloy. Why? Because there isn't a single detailed paragraph describing his deplorable acts in Bugliosi's giant book. Somehow, while writing 2,600 pages, he never thought that McCloy's access to MAGIC, and role in the internment, was important to understanding him. Yet, he fails to mention that while also serving on the Commission, McCloy had a role in Brother Sam, the 1964 CIA coup operation against President Goulart of Brazil (Bird, pp. 550–3). In the world of *Reclaiming History*, backing the single bullet theory forgives a multitude of sins—even those the magnitude of John McCloy's.

VIII.4

“That Kennedy, he really thought he was president.”

—Allen Dulles

As mentioned previously, Walt Brown did a valuable service in breaking down the proceedings of the Warren Commission to see who were the most active and influential members. On pages 83–87 of *The Warren Omission*, he presented the information he had ferreted out, in different ways, via different charts and matrices. He came to the conclusion that many of the questions asked by Warren were mere formalities, like, “Will you rise and be sworn?” Or he would ask if each commissioner was present (Brown, p. 87). Allowing for that, Brown came to the conclusion that “of Commission members, Allen Dulles was the Grand inquisitor”. Brown constructed a formula in which he gave credit for full witness

session attendance, partial session attendance, and if the Commissioner asked questions of the witness. He then combined this with the total number of questions asked. After tallying up the totals, he came to the conclusion that the Commission was actually misnamed: if one looks at the sheer level of activity during the proceedings, it should be called the Dulles Commission (*ibid.*, p. 87). Let's quote Brown in this regard: "... the key Commissioner, above and beyond all others, in the process of sifting through the evidence in the murder of President John F. Kennedy, was the former head of the Central Intelligence Agency—and a man who seethed at his removal from that post—by *the late* John F. Kennedy" (*ibid.*). Bugliosi does not inform you about this fact: as with McCloy, he tells you very little about Dulles the man. Because he was so influential on the Commission, let us fill in what Bugliosi leaves out.

Allen Dulles was directly related to three Secretaries of State. His grandfather on his mother's side was John Watson Foster, Secretary of State under President Harrison. His uncle, Robert Lansing, served in that office under President Wilson. His brother, John Foster, eventually served under President Eisenhower. His Uncle Robert and his brother John formed a powerful influence on his life.

Lansing was an Anglophile who favored England in the World War I disputes over freedom of the seas. He so much admired the British that he took elocution lessons to mimic a British accent (Leonard Mosley, *Dulles*, pp. 35, 38). Lansing was so in cahoots with the British, he actually worked with English undercover agents in covering their tracks in the breaking of neutrality laws (*ibid.*, p. 37). He brought one of them home, and he regaled young Allen with espionage stories for hours. So Allen developed three proclivities that determined his future: an admiration of England; the ambition to be, like Lansing, an international lawyer; and his love of the spy world.

After Dulles graduated from Princeton, Lansing got him a job in the State Department. He ended up in Berne, Switzerland. It was in Berne, during World War I, that he first entered the world of intelligence (*ibid.*, p. 39). He met dissident leaders of East Europe like Jan Masaryk and Edouard Benes, and "he began running networks of Czechs and Yugoslavs out of the U.S. Embassy" (Jacob Heilbrunn, "The Old Boy at War," *The New Republic*, March 27, 1995, p. 33). He also met the family of Herbert Field, including his controversial son Noel, who, many suspect, the Dulles brothers used as a double agent later in the Cold War (Mosley, p. 49). In fact, it was as early as 1918, with the collapse of the Hapsburg Empire, that Dulles first formulated the idea of an intelligence network to thwart the expansion of Bolshevism (*op. cit.*, Heilbrunn).

After the war, John Foster Dulles—through his employment at the powerful New York law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell—met Wall Street financier Bernard Baruch. Baruch helped the brothers gain entry to the Treaty of Versailles. With their Uncle Robert, they worked at redrawing the maps of Europe and the Middle East, and figuring the reparations owed by Germany. During the conference, Thomas Lamont of the Morgan empire made sure that the brothers would be in on the beginning of the American version of the British Round Table Groups, which ended up being called the Council on Foreign Relations (Laurence Shoup

and William Minter, *Imperial Brain Trust*, pp. 5, 26). At the age of 27, Allen Dulles was now where he wanted to be: he was working with the political leaders of the world, and, through his brother, with the world's plutocracy of wealth. Until President Kennedy fired him, this is where he would stay.

From 1919–22, Allen worked for the State Department, and was stationed in Berlin, Vienna, and then Turkey (Mosley, p. 71). While at the last post, he helped cover-up the Turkish genocide of the Armenians. He wrote to his superior, "Our task would be simple if the reports of the atrocities could be declared untrue or even exaggerated, but the evidence, alas, is irrefutable ... I've been busy trying to ward off congressional resolutions of sympathy for these groups." (Christopher Simpson, *Splendid Blond Beast*, p. 34). From 1922–6 he was head of the Near East Department at State. This is where, after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, Dulles developed his interest in the nascent new Arab world—and, one should add, also with the controversial nation of Palestine: there is evidence that Dulles, like his friend T. E. Lawrence, was really an early Arabist (Mosley, p. 71).

There was a problem for Allen in working at State: he didn't make enough money. But he now had a law degree, and his brother was senior partner at Sullivan and Cromwell, making over \$300,000 a year in the Great Depression—equivalent to over \$10,000,000 a year in today's money (Nancy Lisagor and Frank Lipsius, *A Law Unto Itself*, p. viii). So John brought Allen into the firm, and in four years he made partner. Allen's value was in his services derived from overseas connections to top clients like United Fruit and DuPont (Mosley, p. 77). For example, in 1932 he saved a rich oil and mineral field for the Mellon family when he rigged the Colombian presidential elections by bribing one of the candidates (Lisagor and Lipsius, p. 129). It is these types of clients that Allen would stay loyal to when he became CIA Director by arranging things like the Guatemala coup in 1954 for United Fruit.

It was with Sullivan and Cromwell that Allen Dulles now began his clouded, controversial, and hotly disputed association with the upper classes in Germany: those who would eventually bring Hitler to power. Sullivan and Cromwell represented "several provincial governments, some large industrial combines, and a number of big American companies" which would eventually do extensive business with the Third Reich (Mosley, p. 88). Allen was a friend of the infamous industrialist Fritz Thyssen (*ibid.*). Thyssen introduced him to Hitler and Goebbels. The latter's sincerity and frankness impressed Allen (Heilbrunn, p. 34). Thyssen was one of Der Fuehrer's earliest and most important financial backers—to the tune of 100 million marks. Another of Sullivan and Cromwell's clients who did business with the Third Reich was Standard Oil (Mosley, p. 88)—which is one way that the Dulles brothers became well acquainted with the Rockefeller clan.

As both economics minister and Reichsbank president, Hjalmar Schacht was the fiscal wizard who helped finance the Third Reich. The Dulles brothers had been personal friends and/or business partners of Schacht since at least 1930 (Lisagor and Lipsius, p. 122). Through Schacht, "Sullivan and Cromwell thrived on its cartels and collusion with the new Nazi regime." One of the cartels was

the infamous I. G. Farben chemical company (*ibid.*, pp. 125–7). This Dulles client was another huge early contributor to the Nazis. When Sullivan and Cromwell helped construct Farben's American alliances, and its subsidiaries, Farben insisted on secret German control (*ibid.*, p. 136). Through its industrial might and scope, Farben became a crucial contributor to the war effort. For instance, in 1943, Farben was responsible for the entire Wehrmacht supply of synthetic rubber, methanol, and lubricating oil, plus 95% of its poison gas, 84% of German explosives, and 70% of German gunpowder (*New York Times*, October 21, 1945). As Senator Homer Boone said during a Senate hearing on military affairs on June 4, 1943, "Farben was Hitler and Hitler was Farben." Allen Dulles was important to Sullivan and Cromwell in this regard: since he helped draft parts of the Versailles Treaty, he could advise Farben on how to bypass them, and illegally rearm Germany (Heilbrunn, p. 34). Allen also served as general counsel for J. Henry Schroder, New York, whose Hamburg banking branch was a chief backer of Heinrich Himmler, commander of the SS (*ibid.*). Allen tried to fuzz up all this hobnobbing with the Nazis as he socialized with the English upper classes by saying that the U.S. had no interest in "fights over oppressed races and lost causes" (*ibid.*).

In 1940, William Donovan hired Allen to serve in the Office of Coordinator of Information (COI), which would later turn into the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). Stationed in Berne again, Dulles ran agents all across Europe. He had a habit of playing both sides. For instance, in France he ran money to "DeGaulle's Free French guerillas but also to the anti-Gaullist factions of his arch-rival, General Giraud" (Mosley, p. 144). In Germany, he worked with both Nazis and anti-Nazis. It is here again where some of Dulles's most controversial acts occurred. The first was the attempted working out of a sort of "separate peace" with the SS in northern Italy through General Karl Wolff. This was initiated without any knowledge by his superiors, and continued like that for weeks. When Dulles finally reported it, Stalin was enraged: he accused Dulles of trying to arrange a private accommodation with Germany, based, in part, on anti-Bolshevism. For this reason, the Joint Chiefs told Dulles to terminate the contacts (*ibid.*, p. 184).

There may be some truth to Stalin's accusation. When the war ended, Dulles became OSS chief in Germany. There he got to know two men who would figure prominently in his efforts to construct the future Central Intelligence Agency: Richard Helms and Frank Wisner (*ibid.*, p. 226). Wisner told Dulles, "Forget the Nazis and get in there and find what the Commies are up to instead." (*ibid.*, p. 229) In this regard, Dulles proposed a scheme by which a group of anti-Nazi students would stage a coup in Berlin, take over the city, and then have a force of Anglo-American paratroopers occupy the capital and make it pro-Western—all before the Russian troops arrived. It was wisely rejected by General Eisenhower: it may have started World War III; for when the Russians got wind of it, they planned on drenching any American occupying force "by accident" with an artillery bombardment (*ibid.*, p. 230).

With this dropped, Dulles found a new way to find out what the Soviets were up to. He heard that General Reinhard Gehlen was hiding in Bavaria. Gehlen was the commander of the Nazi intelligence apparatus for Eastern Europe; he spe-

cialized in military information about the Russian army (*ibid.*). He was ready to help the Allies against the Communists. So when he surrendered, he expected to be greeted with open arms. Instead he was arrested as just another ex-Nazi.

Dulles had put out word to be on the lookout for him, so information about Gehlen's arrest soon reached him (*ibid.*, p. 233). Gehlen and his former staffers were now freed and given an office in Wiesbaden. Gehlen was given an army platoon to go to the secret hiding place where he had hidden his files. When one steel case was unearthed, he patted it, and said, "Here are the secrets of the Kremlin. If you use them properly, Stalin is doomed." (*ibid.*, p. 234) As Gehlen knew, this is what Dulles wanted to hear. Eisenhower was against signing up Gehlen, since he thought it would endanger his alliance with Marshall Zhukov, the Soviet Commander in Germany (*ibid.*, p. 235). He was right. Zhukov was actually hunting Gehlen down. Gehlen surrendered to the Allies, knowing that Zhukov would probably have him summarily executed. He played his cards right: in September 1945, Donovan and Dulles had Wisner fly Gehlen out of Germany to Washington. From there, the Gehlen organization was incorporated into the American military intelligence network, pretty much "on Gehlen's terms. It remained intact and under his control, justified under the rubric of mutual defense against the communist menace." (DiEugenio, p. 6) In 1949, Gehlen signed a contract for five million dollars a year to work for the CIA (Bird, p. 353). In 1950, John McCloy appointed Gehlen as an adviser to Adenauer on intelligence matters (*ibid.*, p. 354). Via Dulles and McCloy, a man who should have been in the dock at Nuremburg was now allowed to start, and then exacerbate, the Cold War; for, as many commentators have written, not only did Gehlen exaggerate the Soviet threat, his network was riddled with double agents (Bird, p. 354; DiEugenio, p. 386). Furthermore, the network was a safe haven for former SS officers, including members of the notorious Einsatzgruppen (Bird, p. 354).

Their association with Gehlen tells us much about Dulles and McCloy. Yet in all of *Reclaiming History* you will find just one reference to the Nazi: a footnote at the bottom of page 1194. Contrary to the appraisal of many other commentators, Bugliosi actually calls Gehlen's network "helpful" to the U.S. This is explainable because the author bases his unusual opinion in part on Richard Helms. In accordance with this soft-pedaling, I could find no reference to Gehlen's war crimes in the entire book (Christopher Simpson, *Blowback*, p. 44). Also absent is Gehlen's help in providing a hiding place for former SS officers. And, of course, I could find no reference to the associations of Dulles and McCloy with the former Nazi who was so useful to them in launching and preserving the Cold War.

VIII.5

"If they've found another assassin, let them name names."

—Allen Dulles, addressing the Warren Commission critics

After the War, Allen Dulles returned to Sullivan and Cromwell. He and Donovan were instrumental in getting the National Security act of 1947 passed (Mosley,

p. 239), which allowed for the creation of the Central Intelligence Agency. But in 1948, the CIA had no real covert action arm or experience. So, from the offices of Sullivan and Cromwell, Dulles oversaw a CIA team headed by Frank Wisner, James Angleton, and Bill Colby. They used millions on a “crash program of propaganda, sabotage, and secret funding” to stop the Italian Communists from gaining significant power (Simpson, *Blowback*, p. 90). Dulles also participated in his brother's efforts to elect Thomas Dewey as president; and if Dewey had won in 1948, Allen would have been CIA Director (Mosley, p. 245). In 1948, Dulles helped write the Jackson–Dulles–Correa report to expand the CIA's efforts into covert action areas (*ibid.*, p. 246). Dulles was also part of the group that founded the propaganda channel Radio Free Europe, before it was sold to the government (Lisagor and Lipsius, pp. 163–4). He was also instrumental in negotiations among competing intelligence agencies to make the Director of the CIA the head of all US intelligence (*ibid.*).

Lisagor and Lipsius make clear an important point about the Dulles brothers' service at Sullivan and Cromwell: they note that the anti-communism of Joe McCarthy gave them a means to undercut the bipartisanship from which the GOP had benefited from when out of power (p. 165). The brothers also used a young Richard Nixon, whom Allen had met in 1947—perhaps even earlier, in 1945—for similar reasons (Mosley, p. 243). Besides McCarthy, perhaps no one attacked Harry Truman for harboring communists more than Nixon. The Dulles brothers used the exaggerated rhetoric of these men to rebuild West Germany, while protecting their German clients from Justice Department investigations. As with their friend McCloy, anti-communism superseded de-Nazification. From their long experience on Wall Street, the Dulles brothers firmly believed that the national interest was equated with the interests of private enterprise. Their “virulent anti-communism reflected a fear of losing markets for American exports, a shrinking of the realm in which American business could operate.” (Lisagor and Lipsius, p. 165)

All these ideas came to fruition when Dulles came to power in the CIA. That ascension was a two-stage process. First, the CIA's second Director, Walter B. Smith, read the Jackson–Dulles–Correa report in 1950. Impressed, he invited Dulles to become his Deputy Director, in order to reorganize the Agency along that report's lines (Mosley, p. 268). In 1952, the Dulles brothers' effort to paint the Democratic Party as soft on communism helped the GOP win the presidential election. The following year, Allen Dulles fulfilled his ambition to become Director of the CIA.

To put it simply: Dulles revolutionized the Agency. The two previous Directors, Roscoe Hillenkoeter and Smith, were military men; they generally believed that intelligence should be used to supplement military action. But Dulles's long experience in the State Department, the OSS, and at Sullivan and Cromwell gave him a much wider and more sophisticated view of what the CIA could be and do. Plus one other thing: in service to the upper classes at Sullivan and Cromwell, Dulles worshipped at the altar of ruthless corporate Realpolitik. With Dulles, the acronym CIA came to stand for Corporate Interests of America. No method was discarded in his pursuit of their ends.

It was Dulles who began the Agency's specialty of engineering the overthrow of governments who wanted to keep their natural resources for themselves, i.e., Iraq in 1953, Guatemala in 1954. It was under Dulles that the CIA began its program of "executive action" against nationalist heads of state in the resource rich Third World, e.g., plotting the murder of Patrice Lumumba in the Congo. It was under Dulles that the concept of preparing death lists of those after a coup became established doctrine (see consortiumnews.com/archive/story37.html). And it was under Dulles that men willing to do this kind of dirty work now rose in the Agency, e.g., David Phillips and Howard Hunt. Dulles originated the CIA's use of religious groups as cover organizations. Dulles began the systematic process of using the media to disguise these lethal actions, and keep them from the public: that particular project was called Operation Mockingbird. As Director, Dulles's worst traits had free rein because his brother was Secretary of State, and Foster had strong influence over President Eisenhower.

What is extraordinary about what Dulles did with the CIA is that it was too much for even certain elements of the Eastern Establishment, i.e., the very people whom Dulles worked with and for. In 1956, David Bruce and Robert Lovett composed the Bruce-Lovett Report on the CIA for President Eisenhower. That report is almost nowhere to be found today. But Seamus Coogan pointed out to me that Arthur Schlesinger saw it among Robert Kennedy's papers and used it for his biography, *Robert Kennedy and His Times* (pp. 474-8). RFK had access to it during his service on the board of inquiry into the Bay of Pigs debacle. Bruce and Lovett had served on the forerunner of what came to be known as the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board: a group of private citizens meant to monitor American intelligence activities abroad. Eisenhower appointed this board in 1956. When they got a look at what Dulles had done with the CIA, they were shocked. I stress the following point: these two were scions of the Eastern Establishment; Bruce was a friend of Dulles's, who married into the Mellon family in 1926, served in the OSS, and was ambassador to France prior to writing this report; Lovett was Skull and Bones at Yale, became a lifelong partner at Brown Brothers Harriman, served with McCloy under Henry Stimson in the War Department, was Under Secretary of State under George Marshall, and became Defense Secretary in 1950. They were not leftist critics of American foreign policy reading William Appleman Williams at night. And what they wrote demolishes writers like Max Holland who maintain that the CIA was under executive control.

Lovett told the Cuban board of inquiry that "Bruce was very much disturbed" by the CIA's actions. "He approached it from the standpoint of 'what right have we to go barging into other countries, buying newspapers and handing money to opposition parties or supporting a candidate for this, that or the other office.' He felt this was an outrageous interference with friendly countries ..." (*ibid.*, pp. 474-5). The report perfectly captures Dulles's cavalier, unfeeling attitude about sending young men of privilege abroad to engage in adventures with a blank check in hand. Bruce went as far as to deride Dulles's actions as irresponsible "King Making", all the while ignoring what the CIA was really supposed to do: collect, collate, and evaluate the best intelligence possible (*ibid.*, p. 475). They further scored the system Dulles installed, which rewarded success and ignored failure, with no system of justification or control. As long as a covert ac-

tion was deemed as frustrating the Russians or keeping a country pro-western, it was given the go-ahead. Approval was almost always a “pro-forma” matter, done over lunch by a small inner group. The result was that “no one, other than those in the CIA immediately concerned with their day to day operation, has any detailed knowledge of what is going on.” This meant that the CIA’s covert action arm exerted unilateral influences on American foreign policy—and, at times, not even the US ambassador in country knew about it beforehand (*ibid.*). The writers believed that what had happened “could not possibly have [been] foreseen” in the legislation of 1947 and 1948. And they blamed lack of oversight as being “responsible in a great measure for stirring up the turmoil and raising the doubts about us that exist in many countries of the world today.” (*ibid.*)

The report also pointed out that the way that Dulles organized the CIA allowed covert action programs to consume 80% of the budget (*ibid.*, p. 476). Furthermore, the National Security Council (NSC) exercised little or no control over covert action. The CIA’s Directorate of Plans “is operating for the most part on an autonomous and free-wheeling basis in highly critical areas.” (*ibid.*) At times, this was truly lamentable, since “the operations being carried out by the Deputy Director of Plans are sometimes in direct conflict with the normal operations being carried out by the Department of State.” (*ibid.*) Schlesinger adds that a perfect example of this was the CIA coup attempt against Sukarno in Indonesia the year after the report. John Allison, the ambassador, opposed the coup attempt—so Allen had his brother at State remove Allison. The new ambassador was kept largely in the dark about the CIA plans. The coup failed, greatly alienating Sukarno from the U.S. Lovett and Bruce—and Joseph Kennedy, who was also on the advisory board—continued to press their case against Dulles until they left. In their last report, they wrote that “the CIA’s concentration on political, psychological, and related covert action activities have tended to detract substantially from the execution of [a] primary intelligence-gathering mission. We suggest, accordingly, that there should be a total reassessment of our covert action policies.” (*ibid.*, p. 477)

Lovett told the Cuban board, “I have never felt that the Congress of the United States ever intended to give the United States Intelligence Agency authority to conduct operations all over the earth.” (*ibid.*) Lovett’s report and testimony held great sway with the Kennedys; in fact, Joseph Kennedy was so impressed by working with Lovett that he urged JFK to offer him a top job in his Cabinet. After his Bay of Pigs testimony, President Kennedy called Lovett in for a private meeting. He told the president that the CIA was “badly organized, dangerously amateurish and excessively costly”. It had to be re-organized, which wasn’t possible with Eisenhower as President and Dulles as Director (*ibid.*, p. 478).

There can be little doubt that Lovett’s testimony and his relationship with Kennedy’s father helped convince JFK to fire Allen Dulles. How important was it? Lovett’s influence was so profound that after JFK fired Dulles, Robert Kennedy was determined to find out if any other relative of Dulles was still at the State Department. When he found out that Allen’s sister Eleanor worked there, he ordered Dean Rusk to fire her, because “he didn’t want any more of the Dulles family around” (Mosley, p. 473).

So this is the man that LBJ appointed to the Warren Commission. As shown above, he became the most active member of that cover-up—and it started almost immediately: at the Commission's second meeting, he urged the Commissioners to read a book by Robert Donovan that depicted “a pattern running through” American assassinations “that I think we'll find in this present case”—namely, they are the work of one man (December 16, 1963 transcript, p. 52). Dulles also backed the idea of the Commission not having independent investigators (DiEugenio, p. 90).

It later turned out that Dulles had nothing but scorn for both the evidence and the critical arguments against the Oswald-did-it hypothesis. In 1965, at UCLA, David Lifton questioned Dulles about the Zapruder film and Harold Feldman's essay entitled “51 Witnesses” about many witnesses hearing a shot from the grassy knoll. Dulles not only denied that evidence, he moreover ridiculed Lifton for even bringing it up. He said bizarre things like, “There is not a single iota of evidence indicating a conspiracy.” When Lifton pointed out testimony, and even pictures, of smoke arising on the grassy knoll, Dulles derisively replied with, “Now what are you saying, someone was smoking up there?” When Lifton brought up Feldman's essay, Dulles—even though he knew full well about it—asked him where it was published. When Lifton answered, Dulles replied, with ridicule: “The *Nation!* Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha.” When Lifton showed him frames from the Zapruder film arranged in sequential order to show Kennedy's head going back toward the seat—the opposite direction of a shot from the Texas School Book Depository—Dulles said: “You have *nothing!* Absolutely nothing! ... I can't see a blasted thing here. You can't say the head goes back. I can't see it going back. It does not go back. You can't say that.” Dulles then tried to neutralize this Zapruder film argument by tendentiously saying he had never heard it before (*Best Evidence*, pp. 34–36)—when, of course, the Commission had seen the film dozens of times; they just did not feel that powerful evidence, like Kennedy's violent reaction backwards, merited mention in the *Warren Report*.

Although Dulles was married, he had multiple affairs throughout his life. One of his lengthier dalliances was with Mary Bancroft. He met her in Switzerland and brought her into the OSS (Mosley, pp. 170–1). Mary Bancroft admitted that she was friends from an early age with Ruth Forbes Paine (George Michael Evica, *A Certain Arrogance*, p. 234). In fact, Mary Bancroft and Ruth Forbes remained friends for a very long time. So when she divorced her first husband, Ruth and her new husband Arthur Young were still friendly with Bancroft (*ibid.*). Ruth Forbes was the mother of Michael Paine, and mother-in-law to Ruth Paine. This was the Quaker couple who befriended the Oswalds in 1963 and separated Marina from Lee after their return to Dallas from New Orleans. After Oswald's arrest, that separation enabled Ruth to have much control over Oswald's possessions, which were left in the Paine garage. Some of this turned into dubious yet incriminating evidence against him, e.g., the infamous backyard photographs.

In light of the Bancroft–Paine relationship, I have always found the following quote by and about Dulles to be interesting and provocative: “Dulles joked in private that the [JFK] conspiracy buffs would have had a field day if they had known ... he had actually been in Dallas three weeks before the murder ... that

one of Mary Bancroft's childhood friends had turned out to be a landlady for Marina Oswald ... and that the landlady was a well-known leftist with distant ties to the family of Alger Hiss." (Evica, p. 230) Dulles had a weird sense of humor: to some, those facts are no laughing matter.

In addition to his being in Dallas three weeks before the assassination, Lisa Pease has discovered another curious location for Dulles on the actual day of the assassination. According to notes written on his calendar, Dulles happened to be at "the Farm". You have to know something about CIA shorthand to understand what that means. As Jim Hougan discovered, it can actually refer to two places: the CIA training facility in Camp Peary, Virginia, or Mitch Werbell's sixty-acre weapons development laboratory in Georgia (Hougan, *Spooks*, p. 29). As Hougan notes, the confusion in the names is deliberate, for Werbell was a wizard in creating lethal weapons to be used in counter-insurgency warfare and assassinations, neither of which the CIA wanted to be openly involved with. In discussing a silencer created by Werbell, Hougan noted the following: that the sound pattern created in Dealey Plaza—with shots heard in two directions—could well have been created by two teams using Werbell's partial directional silencers (*ibid.*, p. 36). It would be interesting to hear Dulles explain why he was at either place on that day.

VIII.6

"I think it has become necessary to take another look at the purpose and operations of our CIA."

—Harry Truman, December 22, 1963

Let me conclude this section on Dulles with a famous newspaper column written by President Truman and published in the *Washington Post*. Truman wrote that he had become "disturbed by the way CIA has been diverted from its original assignment. It has become an operational and at times a policy-making arm of the government." Truman said that he never dreamed that such a thing would happen when he signed the National Security Act: he thought that it would be used for intelligence analysis, not "peacetime cloak and dagger operations". He continued that the CIA had now become "so removed from its intended role that it is being interpreted as a symbol of sinister and mysterious foreign intrigue—and a subject for Cold War enemy propaganda". He went as far as suggesting that its operational arm be eliminated. He concluded with the warning that Americans have grown up learning respect for "our free institutions and for our ability to maintain a free and open society. There is something about the way the CIA has been functioning that is casting a shadow over our historic position and I feel that we need to correct it." This column was published on December 22, 1963, one month to the day after Kennedy was killed. Ray Marcus first brought this editorial to relevance in his self-published monograph entitled *Addendum B*. He called it the "least known important public policy statement by a president or former president in the 20th century". There was even more to the story than anyone thought; and Marcus, through the Truman Library, has filled it in.

Through the acquiring of Truman's notes, it turns out that the first draft of this editorial was completed on December 11, 1963—but the rough draft was started on December 1—which brings the provenance of the piece to about a week after Kennedy's murder. On December 27, Admiral Sidney Souers congratulated Truman on the editorial by calling it a "splendid statement". Souers had been part of Naval Intelligence, and Truman picked him to head the Central Intelligence Group in 1946. From 1947–50 he served on the NSC, and later was a consultant to the White House on military and foreign affairs. Souers wrote to Truman that Allen Dulles "caused the CIA to wander far from the original goal established by you, and it is certainly a different animal that I tried to set up for you."

But someone else saw the column and had a different reaction. In April 1964, while serving on the Warren Commission, Allen Dulles arranged to meet Truman at his home. After exchanging formalities, Dulles had arranged for his assistants to leave the room. Dulles then did two things: (1) he tried to soften Truman up by telling him how much he admired him for setting down the Truman Doctrine after World War II; and (2) he tried to say that what he covertly did as CIA Director was only a natural evolution of the Truman Doctrine. In short: guilt by association. Dulles then pulled out the real reason for being there: he took out the December 22 editorial and said that, consequently, Truman's editorial "seemed to be a misrepresentation of his position". In Dulles's April 21, 1964 memo to CIA counsel Lawrence Houston, he says that Truman then studied his essay, and seemed "quite astounded at it. In fact, he said that this was all wrong. He then said that he felt it had made a very unfortunate impression. He asked me if he could keep the article." Dulles then continues, "At no time did Mr. Truman express other than complete agreement with the viewpoint I expressed and several times said he would see what he could do about it, to leave it in his hands. He obviously was highly disturbed at the *Washington Post* article."

As the meeting ended, and his associates rejoined the two men, Dulles explicitly praised John McCone, the man JFK picked to succeed to his office after Kennedy fired him. But, as of yet, there had been no explicit mention of President Kennedy himself. Dulles now did so, and in a startling way: as he was leaving, he mentioned the "false attacks" on the CIA in relation to Vietnam, and how Kennedy had repudiated those attacks.

Dulles concludes the memo by saying he was not sure "what will come of all this. It is even possible, maybe probable, that he will do nothing when he thinks it over." He then suggests that Houston get the President's old pal Clark Clifford to contact Truman, and perhaps even McCone should do so himself. He then tells Houston to show the memo to Richard Helms and Cord Meyer, suggesting that perhaps they could do something with the Director.

The clear implication is that Dulles wanted Truman to either take back or soften his December editorial; and if he didn't succeed, he wanted a phalanx of people to intervene: Clifford, Helms, Cord Meyer, even John McCone if necessary. I moreover doubt his description of Truman's reaction: does anyone think that Truman actually asked for a copy of a column he already wrote? Further-

more, Truman worked on the piece for at least ten days; according to a memo he wrote on December 1, he called Souers for his input; so how could he later be “quite astounded” at his own column’s contents?

We now come to an utterly fascinating parting shot: Dulles bringing up the recent “false attacks” on the CIA in relation to Vietnam. He’s probably referring to the now-famous columns published in October and December 1963. The October columns were penned by Arthur Krock and Richard Starnes for the *New York Times* and the *Washington Daily News*. The December ones were by Starnes for the *New York World-Telegram*. Krock’s piece mentioned a source in Vietnam who likened the CIA’s growth “to a malignancy” which even the White House could not control. His source added that if the U.S. ever experienced a coup, it would come from the CIA, and not the Pentagon. Starnes’ source said the same: “If the United States ever experiences a *Seven Days in May* it will come from the CIA, and not from the Pentagon.” In a column dated December 11, 1963, Starnes explained how Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia was worried about certain CIA elements trying to overthrow him. Starnes later added that an Agency source told him he was appalled at what was going on in Southeast Asia, and questioned whether President Kennedy had had any “effective control over this monstrous bureaucracy”. In a December 3, 1963 column, Starnes questioned that with Dulles on the Commission, how could the truth about Oswald in the Soviet Union ever be known? Of course, Kennedy could not have repudiated the December columns, but I know of no place where he repudiated the October columns. In all probability, Dulles was trying to dupe Truman into issuing a retraction. But his actions are even more suggestive if he was referring to those columns—especially when one adds in the fact that he specifically mentioned Kennedy to Truman in regards to them: because if one looks at the first generation of Kennedy assassination books, no one connected those dots—Vietnam, those columns, JFK’s death—that early. Was Dulles trying to prevent anyone from doing so in the near future?

Any objective person would admit that this material on Dulles is relevant in evaluating the make-up of the Warren Commission—especially since he became its most active member. Yet although you will find Schlesinger’s book in his bibliography, you will not find Robert Lovett’s name in Bugliosi’s book. Comedian Lenny Bruce’s name is in the index, but not David Bruce’s—so the influence of their report in the firing of Dulles is absent. I could also find no reference to Mary Bancroft—so the possible relationship that Dulles joked about is gone. And since the quote by Dulles referring to Bancroft is not included, the reader doesn’t know that Dulles was in Dallas three weeks before the assassination—or that he was at the Farm the day of the assassination. (Werbell’s name is not in Bugliosi’s index.) Bugliosi *does* quote from Truman’s article, but what he does with it is notable: after a long quote, like the Warren Commission, he just drops it and goes to a new subject—almost like he didn’t want to be accused of not mentioning it (Bugliosi, p. 1195). Ray Marcus received the supplementary material used here early in 2006, a year before *Reclaiming History* was published—and not a page of it is in Bugliosi’s massive tome, so the reader never learns when Truman began the essay, his dialogue with Souers, or, most of all, about the visit by Dulles. Thus, with all this missing, the reader cannot pose the obvious question: Why did LBJ ask this guy to be on the Commission? To

put it another way: If you were Oswald's defense lawyer, would Dulles be on the jury?

VIII.7

"The monumental record of the President's Commission will stand like a Gibraltar of factual literature through the ages to come."

—Commissioner Gerald Ford

Representative Gerald Ford was the junior partner in the Troika—in more ways than one: he was only 51 at the time; Dulles was 71, and McCloy was 69. And while they had been players in the Wall Street – Washington power alleys since the 1920s, Ford had been a Congressman from Grand Rapids, Michigan only since 1949. Yet according to the indices in Walt Brown's book, Ford was a solid second to Dulles in overall participation in the Commission's proceedings (*The Warren Omission*, pp. 83–7). What makes this attendance record remarkable is that, although Dulles did not have a full-time job, Ford was supposed to be representing the people of his congressional district—yet, looking at Brown's statistics, in some ways Ford even surpasses Dulles in his participation at the hearings (see p. 83). We must look a bit closer at Ford to understand why.

As Gerald McKnight notes in *Breach of Trust*, the association between J. Edgar Hoover and Ford went back to the 1940s (p. 42). McKnight writes that Hoover so much wanted Ford in Washington that he secretly aided him in his first congressional campaign. (ibid) Appreciative of the help, "Ford reciprocated in his maiden speech by asking Congress to increase Hoover's salary." (ibid) From there, Ford developed a close relationship with the Bureau. FBI official Cartha DeLoach once noted that "relations were excellent" between the Bureau and Congressman Ford and that Ford had been "in touch with my office on numerous occasions." Hoover and Ford were so close that the Director even sent Ford an autographed copy of his ghost-written *A Study of Communism*, realizing the conservative views expressed therein would echo with Ford. (ibid, p. 43)

This early cultivation paid off in spades when Ford was appointed to the Commission. (Jim Marrs writes that this was done on the recommendation of Richard Nixon: *Crossfire*, p. 466.) A week after the first Commission meeting, Ford was in DeLoach's office complaining about Warren's "general ineptitude and attempt to force Olney on the Commission as chief counsel" (ibid.). DeLoach noted in a memo that "Ford indicated he would keep me thoroughly advised as to the activities of the Commission ... He also asked if he could call me from time to time and straighten out questions in his mind concerning our investigation. I told him by all means he should do this." (Marrs, *op. cit.*) Five days later, the two met again, and Ford told DeLoach that so far there had been no criticism of the FBI. Over Christmas 1963, the FBI loaned Ford a briefcase with a security lock so that he could read the FBI report while on a skiing vacation (McKnight, p. 43). While the Commission was still in session, DeLoach arranged a dinner at his home for the Fords and the Director. Hoover followed up on this by writing Ford that his door was always open "any time our help is needed or when we can be of service". In response to this, McKnight notes that it was probably Ford

who passed to DeLoach an early draft of the Warren Report in July 1964. The FBI added a note to this copy: "There will be a fourth and final draft made available through a source by July 23, 1964, which will contain the final conclusions and recommendations of the Commission." (*ibid.*, p. 44) As I noted in Part VII of this review, the FBI's atrocious performance in the Kennedy case centered almost instantly on convicting Oswald at any price. Ford quickly joined in that monomaniacal effort.

The year after the *Warren Report* was issued, Ford published his own book called *Portrait of the Assassin*. Ford arranged for John Stiles, his first campaign manager and Nixon's campaign field director, to be his assistant while on the Commission. Their book was essentially a rehash of the Commission's view of Oswald. It made for dull reading. Consequently, the publisher told them to spice it up; so they added a section about the report from Texas of Oswald being an FBI informant (see this review, Part VII, Section 6). The problem was that at the time the book was published, the records of the Warren Commission executive sessions were classified. Evidently, Ford had little concern about violating the law in order to smear Oswald and make a little money in the process. But in 1973, Nixon chose Ford to replace Spiro Agnew as his Vice-President. Ford was now questioned about his use of classified material. He lied under oath about what he had done: he said he only used material in the Warren Commission volumes for that book—which he clearly had not. When later exposed, Ford apologized for his misdeed (Marrs, p. 467). Six months after he became President, Ford declassified the material in question (*ibid.*).

While a congressman, Ford developed a reputation for being one of the CIA's best friends (*ibid.*, p. 466). In 1974, when Nixon resigned under the pressure of the Watergate scandal, President Ford immediately began to prove his reputation. Many people on the Watergate Committee, like Senator Howard Baker, suspected that the CIA had played a role in that affair, and that Richard Helms had manipulated the FBI inquiry (Daniel Schorr, *Clearing the Air*, p. 139). Consequently, there was a movement to investigate the crimes of the CIA and FBI. Ford gave a speech at the time in which he defended the Agency against the rumors that they had overthrown Salvador Allende in Chile the year before—which turned out to be true. When asked if this action was not in violation of international law, the new President replied, "I am not going to pass judgment on whether it is permitted or authorized under international law. It is a recognized fact that historically as well as presently, such actions are taken in the best interest of the countries involved." (*Time*, September 30, 1974). In other words: Uncle Sam Knows Best. *Time* commented: "Ford's words seemed to represent an anachronistic, cold-war view of national security reminiscent of the 1950s. Complained Democratic Senator Frank Church of Idaho: 'It's tantamount to saying that we respect no law save the law of the jungle.'" (*ibid.*)

In late 1974, even more friction came between President Ford and Senator Church. James Angleton had badly divided the CIA over the Yuri Nosenko affair. In order to force him to resign as counter-intelligence chief, Director Bill Colby had given a story to the CIA-friendly Sy Hersh. This story uncovered some of the illegal surveillance operations that Angleton had run out of his shop. When exposed at Christmas time in the pages of the *New York Times*, the story

created a sensation. Angleton resigned. Ford called Colby for a briefing. Realizing that this would give Frank Church the opening he needed for a full-scale inquiry into the intelligence community, Ford tried to divert that by appointing his Vice-President, Nelson Rockefeller, to run his own inquest (Schorr, p. 143). Called the Rockefeller Commission, this was seen as something of a whitewash. The report contained an annex on the JFK assassination. But since Ford brought back Warren Commission assistant counsel David Belin as Executive Director, this was viewed as something of a joke: two original cover-up men, re-doing the cover-up. In fact, the report deliberately distorted the testimony of Dr. Cyril Wecht (see Gary Shaw and Larry Harris, *Cover-Up*, p. 29). It was also the first official JFK inquiry to use the goofy "neuromuscular reaction" as a way to explain Kennedy's violent rearward action at the time of the head shot (*ibid.*).

The appointment of Belin indicated Ford's stance during the entire 18 months of what one author has called "the season of inquiry". This refers to the two investigative committees set up in Congress: the Pike Committee in the House, and the Church Committee in the Senate, which ended up replacing the Rockefeller Commission. This is as close as the United States has ever come to explaining to the public just what the CIA and FBI have done in the name of national security. Who knows what they would have achieved if Ford had not fought them? Why did he resist an open-ended inquiry? It might be that he understood that his work on the Commission could have been exposed for the sham that it was. Why do I say that? *Because Ford did.* On January 16, 1975, he held a White House luncheon for the editors of the *New York Times*. Someone asked why Ford had picked such a conservative and defense-minded panel to make up the Rockefeller Commission (e.g., Ronald Reagan was a member). The President said that he needed people who would not stray from the straight and narrow: because if they did, they could stumble upon matters that might hurt the national interest. The editor asked, "Like what?" Ford replied, "Like assassinations!" (Schorr, p. 144) Ford added that this was off the record. But reporter Daniel Schorr deduced that since the Rockefeller Commission was investigating domestic matters, Ford must have meant American assassinations (*ibid.*). Later, CIA Director William Colby effectively spun Ford's comment: he told Schorr that the CIA had run assassination plots abroad, but not in America (*ibid.*). This deftly neutralized Ford's slip: the committees would now look at CIA assassination plots against foreign leaders. With regard to the JFK case, the Church Committee would only investigate the performance of the intelligence agencies in *investigating* Kennedy's murder.

But even Colby was too much for Ford: he was deemed too open with Congress. After all, when mobster Sam Giancana was murdered before testifying, Colby went out of his way to say that the CIA had nothing to do with it (*ibid.*, p. 155). Colby was later fired for being too forthcoming. Ford picked George Bush to replace him. And as further signal of his new "get tough" policy, Ford made a young Dick Cheney his Chief of Staff, and moved Donald Rumsfeld into the Pentagon.

With all these elements in place, Ford decided to use the 1975 murder of a CIA officer as a way to squelch and smear any further investigation. Richard Welch was the CIA station chief in Athens. The CIA and Ford blamed his death on the

fact that his name had been exposed by an American journal called *Counterspy*. In fact, the leftist rebel group who killed him had issued a communiqué beforehand that revealed that they knew his name then (Schorr, p. 191). In a classic case of political propaganda, Ford and the CIA pulled out all the stops in using Welch's funeral as psychological warfare against the committees. Welch's body was flown into Andrews Air Force Base—but the plane circled the base for fifteen minutes, to time the landing for the morning news shows (*ibid.*). Ford attended the chapel service—but the press was barred, in order to suggest that they were to blame for Welch's murder. Colby issued a statement saying that Welch's death was the result of a "paranoiac attack on ... Americans serving their country". David Phillips was interviewed by CBS and said, "American agents are in less danger today from the KGB than from the 'moral primitives' who 'condemn my label'." (*ibid.*) Welch's body was buried at Arlington with full military honors; his coffin was carried on the same horse-drawn caisson that carried President Kennedy's. Colby gave the flag draped over it to Welch's widow. As Schorr wrote, "This is the CIA's first secret agent to become a public national hero." (*ibid.*)

It worked. Henry Kissinger jumped on the committees: "I think they have used classified information in a reckless way" (*ibid.*, p. 194) Both committees closed up shop shortly after. Ford and the CIA held veto power over what could be published. When Otis Pike defied that agreement, Congress bottled up his report. A copy was smuggled to Daniel Schorr. As he was arranging to have it released, his boss, Bill Paley, lunched with Bush (*ibid.*, p. 201). The Pike Report was published in a special issue of *The Village Voice*. Forgetting his own use of classified material for his Oswald book, Ford now proposed an FBI investigation to find out who gave the report to Schorr (*ibid.*, p. 208). After Paley's meeting with Director Bush, Schorr was taken off the air by CBS. After a two-hour impromptu interrogation—during which he was not represented by counsel—Schorr was fired by the network. He was later investigated by the House, but refused to reveal his source for the report.

Ford's performance with the Pike and Church Committees reveal his character *in extremis*. When it came to the intelligence community and their role in covert operations—including coups and assassinations—Ford joined whole-heartedly in the cover-up. This sheds retrospective light on his performance for the Warren Commission. But you would never know that from reading *Reclaiming History*, because you will find not one reference there to either Daniel Schorr or Richard Welch; therefore, you are not informed of how Ford engaged in warfare with the Pike and Church Committees. The Pike Committee is mentioned four times in the book, but only as a source: Bugliosi never chronicles what happened to it at the hands of Ford and the CIA. The influence of Colby's leak about Angleton to Hersh, and Ford's creation of the Rockefeller Commission, is dealt with in a footnote (p. 1236). In the references to Ford in the book, I could find no mention of the lunch with the *New York Times* and his blurting out the word "assassination" as the reason why he picked who he did for the Rockefeller Commission.

Yet, Bugliosi often uses Ford as a witness to just what a fine investigation the Warren Commission really was. Well, if you eliminate just about everything I detailed above, you can do that.

Bugliosi had more than enough space in his book to give us long and full biographies of the Troika. But what he holds back on them, plus what he chose not to reveal about Hoover, is, in my view, critical to understanding his work; since, once one understands them, one could fairly conclude that they were four of the worst people to hold high office in America for any length of time in the twentieth century: they were all involved—in some ways they helped create—the cult of the national security state, which often means that Americans should not be privy to the ugly things that America does in their name. Well, if I was involved in some of the things that these men were, I wouldn't want anyone to know either. Would you want people to know that you helped Klaus Barbie escape from Europe? Or that your coup in Guatemala led to a series of rightwing fascist leaders—like General Rios Montt—who eventually killed, raped, or maimed about 100,000 citizens? Or, in Ford's case—something I left out—that you approved Suharto's 1975 invasion of East Timor, which resulted in the deaths of at least 60,000 people? (Try and find that in Bugliosi's discussion of Ford in *Reclaiming History*.) Or that, as FBI Director, you ordered the systematic liquidation of the Black Panthers? In large part, this is what "national security" meant to these four.

Now that we are outside the realm of *Reclaiming History* and know the full story of Ford, McCloy, Dulles, and Hoover, the question arises: If President Kennedy was killed by a high- or even mid-level conspiracy, how could these men be trusted to reveal that to the public? The answer is that they couldn't have. Not in a thousand years.