

EIR Books

Why the JFK assassination case should be reopened

by W. Allen Salisbury

Best Evidence: Disguise and Deception in the Assassination of John F. Kennedy, 2nd edition

by David S. Lifton
Carroll & Graf, New York, 1988
763 pages, paperbound, \$13.95

Crossfire: The Plot that Killed Kennedy

by Jim Marrs
Carroll & Graf, New York, 1990
620 pages, paperbound, \$13.95

The following article first appeared as a feature in the "American Almanac" section of the weekly newspaper New Federalist (Vol. IV, No. 32, 1990). Allen Salisbury died on Sept. 14, 1992 after waging a courageous battle for a year and a half with cancer. His last words were "Keep fighting." His investigation into the Kennedy assassination testifies not only to his fighting spirit, but also, as one of his friends said in his eulogy, to the deep understanding of the principle of poetry that allowed him to delve into an investigation and come up with a devastatingly correct analysis.

I was sitting in my ninth-grade biology class, behind Perryetta Williams. I was just about to pull her ponytail, which back in those days was just another way of flirting. Mr. Rosenberg, my biology teacher, stopped my arm in mid-stretch, as he passed my desk and walked to the front of the room.

He turned and announced to the class very solemnly, "President Kennedy has just been shot." I started to snicker, along with a few others in the class, but in the next instant I knew that he was not talking about the two gerbils that the class had affectionately named Jack and Jackie.

Mr. Rosenberg had a rich baritone voice and for the first time it cracked falsetto as he tried to wipe the tears that were streaming down his cheeks.

As Mr. Rosenberg strained to relate the tragedy in Dallas, a thousand thoughts raced through my mind. I thought about how silly I had been, when, back in the sixth grade, I had taken the side of Nixon in the mock debates that were held in that election year. Of course, Nixon was a Republican like Lincoln, I had reasoned then, and Lincoln had freed the slaves.

In the ensuing three years, I had developed a somewhat richer idea of what freedom meant. After Kennedy's announcement of the space program, there was a sense in the country that there was not one problem that man could not solve, be it disease, poverty, famine, or conquering outer space. I had also met Dr. Martin Luther King and I had heard Malcolm X. The prospects for the success of the civil rights movement meant that my people would be full participants in the great achievements our country was destined for. The future had been full of hope.

Mr. Rosenberg dismissed the class. No one moved. Tears were streaming down everyone's cheeks. A frightful numbness engulfed us all. Had all hope been assassinated along with our beloved President? And who had murdered the future?

Today, no sane person believes that Lee Harvey Oswald, acting alone, killed President Kennedy. Indeed, it is quite probable that Oswald was telling the truth when, in his last appearance before the television cameras, he blurted out that he was just a patsy.

One of two recently published books, *Best Evidence* by David Lifton, has been the basis for a new attempt to reopen the investigation into the JFK assassination. The evidence presented by Mr. Lifton has the quality of what one could call new courtroom evidence. Mr. Lifton proves conclusively that the President's wounds were altered between Parkland Memorial Hospital in Dallas, where the President was taken immediately after being shot, and Bethesda Naval Hospital in Washington, D.C., where the official autopsy was done.

In addition, Mr. Lifton has appeared on the television news show "Hard Copy," where he presented as additional evidence the first publicly released photographs of the official autopsy. These photographs differ substantially from the reports of doctors in Dallas, and the autopsy report as well.

Mr. Lifton's work establishes that many cover stories—"The Russians did it," "the Cubans did it," "the Mafia did it"—have to fall by the wayside. Kennedy's body was, after all, in the custody of a team of Secret Service agents the entire time. This does not rule out the participation of any of the above agencies in the assassination of President Kennedy, or others. It merely establishes that, as Mr. Lifton argues, agencies of the United States government acted to alter the body of the President to fit a "lone assassin" scenario. At the very least, those who were in charge of the body committed the crime of obstruction of justice.

Mr. Lifton's evidence consists of the following:

1) President Kennedy's body was placed in a ceremonial casket at Parkland. But when the body reached Bethesda for the autopsy, it was in a shipping casket. And, it had arrived 20 minutes or so before the arrival of Mrs. Kennedy and the presidential party with the ceremonial casket.

2) The body at Parkland was laid inside the ceremonial casket, on a plastic hospital sheet. At Bethesda, the body was in a body bag, the kind used for shipping air crash victims and dead soldiers.

3) In the FBI report on the autopsy of President Kennedy's body, the two FBI agents in attendance noted at the beginning of the autopsy that surgery had been performed in the head area. Most would automatically assume that the doctors at Parkland Memorial in Dallas had performed some type of surgery in a desperate attempt to save the President's life; however, no such surgery was done by any of the doctors at Parkland Memorial.

Much of the autopsy report is concerned with doctors' comments on the damage done to the brain of President Kennedy by the assault. The report also indicates other damage to the brain, conforming to that which would have been accomplished by a craniotomy on the President—in other words, a surgical procedure that entails the complete removal of the brain from a corpse.

Mr. Lifton's evidence would be sufficient in any court of law to reopen an ordinary murder case. It should be more than sufficient to reopen the case of an assassination of a President.

As many researchers in the Kennedy assassination point

out, the death of John F. Kennedy resulted in a virtual coup d'état, which has affected the politics and policies of this country for over the past quarter-century. Indeed, in many respects, the country has survived so far as a scientific and industrial nation only on the basis of Kennedy's crash-basis Moon landing program, his investment tax credit policy, and the other credit and monetary policies he implemented to ensure industrial and scientific growth. Since then, there has been not one significant programmatic commitment to foster the nation's scientific and technological growth.

Considering the decline in American industry, and the plummeting numbers of scientists and engineers produced in our colleges over the last quarter of a century, the miracle is that we still somehow exist. The country's commitment to science and industrial growth and the financial policies that make both possible were buried in Arlington National Cemetery, along with President Kennedy.

Instead, the ruling Anglo-American establishment opted for creating a cultural paradigm shift away from science and technology and toward what is now called the New Age movement or radical environmentalism.

How Kennedy challenged the establishment

When considering how JFK challenged the establishment, the first policy shift that comes up in the minds of most assassination researchers concerns Southeast Asia. They all point to the fact that Kennedy had issued the orders to start withdrawing American troops from Vietnam, and immediately after his death, President Johnson rescinded the order and the buildup that led us to the quagmire in Vietnam was on.

"Hmmm," our researchers will say to themselves, "it must have been the right-wing military that was behind the assassination." The other popular targets are the Mafia and the oil companies of the right-wing varieties of H.L. Hunt.

Many people who have emphasized Hunt's enmity toward Kennedy over the President's attack on the oil-depletion allowance somehow ignore the fact that that same change in the tax laws would have hurt the Seven Sisters as well, an interest far more powerful than the Texas yahoos, and an interest which was deeply intertwined with the Anglo-American banking establishment characterized by Morgan Bank. Indeed, Kennedy's major move on the multinational oil cartels was in proposing legislation that would have prevented them from claiming royalty payments made to various sheikhs as capital tax deductions.

This policy of breaking up the Seven Sisters was the continuation of Truman's attempts to curb the power of the oil cartels just before he left office. All attempts at reining in oil multinationals ceased, under the guise of national security considerations, when Eisenhower took office.

Kennedy and the Federal Reserve

A book published in 1989, *Crossfire* by Jim Marrs, contains another bombshell. On page 275, in a section on who

had a motive to have Kennedy assassinated, Marris details Kennedy's fight with the Federal Reserve Board over U.S. monetary policy. Here, Marris has discovered a bombshell: the powerful economic and financial motive the Anglo-American establishment had for violently removing John F. Kennedy from office. And, it would not be the first time a U.S. President had been assassinated for that reason.

It appears that Kennedy was moving to end the Federal Reserve's 50-year control over U.S. monetary and credit policy, as the leading edge of his attack on entrenched finance capital interests in the United States.

According to Marris, and confirmed by this author, Kennedy—facing a \$3 billion budget deficit—refused to continue the practice of paying the Federal Reserve banks interest on the money they printed for the United States. Instead, Kennedy issued an Executive Order instructing the U.S. Treasury to print over \$4 billion in U.S. currency. That money was, in its smaller denominations, to be backed by gold. The currency (U.S. Treasury notes instead of Federal Reserve notes) was indeed printed and issued, but was quietly withdrawn from circulation after Kennedy's death. The Executive Order under which it was printed, E.O. 11,110, still remains in force to this day, although no U.S. President since Kennedy has dared to use it. With today's tremendous budget deficits, we still pay interest on the money printed by the Federal Reserve banks.

There was a second aspect to Kennedy's war with the Anglo-American banking establishment (the bankers known as "economic royalists" in FDR's era). In order to get credit where it was needed in the country, Kennedy's Comptroller of the Currency, John Saxon, insisted that local banks outside of the Federal Reserve system be given the power to underwrite state and city bonds, a power which until then had been the exclusive right of Federal Reserve banks. Like Kennedy's decision to print Treasury notes, this had the effect of taking away a big chunk of power from the banking establishment led by the Morgans.

The purpose of spreading out that lending authority was twofold: to make credit available for capital projects and to build a political power base around an elected President capable of resisting, and of defeating, if necessary, the political forces represented by commercial and international banking interests led by powerful financial houses such as the Morgans. A case in point, some of you may remember, is Kennedy's mobilizing of public opinion to force U.S. Steel to roll back its price increases. The largest chunk of U.S. Steel stock was controlled by Morgan Bank.

Kennedy's determination that the credit and monetary policies of the nation should be controlled by elected officials was not lost on the scribblers at the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. In the 1964 edition of its *Year in Review*, *Britannica's* editors hysterically, though correctly, state that the Kennedy administration was attempting to set up an alternative banking system which would have had the potential to end Anglo-

American control of U.S. credit and monetary policy.

Kennedy's policies were intended to encourage reinvestment in industry and capital improvements in the United States. That he was in a serious adversary relationship with the Morgan banking interests is indicated by the fact that, in 1960, Morgan Bank and Morgan Grenfell investment house launched that notorious ripoff called the Eurodollar market, which was causing a flight of dollars and gold overseas. It has also been reported to this author by insiders in the Kennedy administration that, after Kennedy vetoed Morgan's attempt to set up the country's largest consumer bank, Bobby Kennedy was determined to prosecute Morgan and other giant banks under the anti-trust acts.

As President Kennedy's chief aides, Kenneth P. O'Donnell and David Powers have pointed out, Kennedy's tax cut and investment tax credit policy were geared to "increase the productive power of our industrial society." As it has been reported by many Kennedy intimates, the President was concerned with finding ways to get the country out of the Eisenhower recession.

Kennedy looked at the massive industrial expansion under way in Europe and Japan and to the immediate history of the United States under Roosevelt during the war years, in an attempt to emulate those approaches to economic and industrial development. He was particularly concerned with how to help small- to medium-sized industrial firms modernize their plant and equipment, which was still of World War II vintage.

It was still the case in the early 1960s that in order to build a political machine you had to give people something of value. In the early sixties, this still expressed itself in the promise that one's offspring would lead a better and more productive life than was afforded the generation preceding them. Under President Kennedy's economic policies, there remained the potential that the federal government could respond to the needs of our population. Today, after nearly 30 years of post-industrial policies, that promise has gone the way of once popular truisms "as good as gold" and "sound as the dollar."

Reagan's tax cut vs. Kennedy's tax cut

During his campaign for the presidency in 1980, Ronald Reagan invoked the name of John F. Kennedy when he promised the American people a cut in their income taxes, and proceeded to proclaim for the next eight years that the country was in a recovery. Now I think even the most rock-ribbed Reagan supporter knows that the whole thing was a hoax, and instead the country was entering its deepest depression ever.

Instead of taking on the Fed and chopping Paul Volcker's usurious interest rates—which were destroying the nation's farming and manufacturing base as well as the savings and loan and other local banking institutions—Reagan watched as farmer after farmer went bankrupt and plant after plant shut down.

Instead of directing credit into agriculture, infrastructure, and modernization of plant and equipment, the nation piled up gargantuan debts as a result of the Eurodollar offshore banking shenanigans, junk bonds, leveraged buyouts which saddled fundamentally sound companies with huge unpayable debts, and the largest speculative real estate bubble this nation has ever seen.

The only bright spot in the entire 1980s was what might have been, had Ronald Reagan followed the advice of Lyndon LaRouche on the SDI program. It was basically at the urging of LaRouche that circles around the President convinced him to announce the program. The SDI, conceived by LaRouche as a crash program of basic scientific research and development, would have paid back dividends far exceeding the ten-to-one payback of the crash program to put a man on the Moon.

Since the Kennedy assassination, any politician who has gotten anywhere near to being able to establish an independent political force in the country, to demand economic progress and development, has either been assassinated, as were Robert Kennedy, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, and George Wallace (attempted), or vilified by the national news media as a prelude to assassination or imprisonment, as in the case of Lyndon LaRouche.

How did they get away with it?

The assassinations of both Kennedys and of Martin Luther King were sloppy jobs, and over 80% of the American people rightly believe to this day that some sort of conspiracy was involved. If that is true—and it is—why weren't millions of people in the streets, tearing down the Capitol, until the murderers were put in jail?

The answer to that question lies neither in the cleverness nor the power of the establishment, though both are considerable. The answer lies in a basic defect of the American character: the desire not to make waves, to go along, and get along.

I'm reminded of a late-1950s propaganda film done in the style of the TV program "Leave It to Beaver." In the film, a family is sitting around the dinner table and the male child rather dejectedly announces that he's not very popular in school. The father, in the style of Mr. Cleaver, looks thoughtfully for a few seconds, then advises his son to watch what the most popular kids are doing and ape in their activities. "Pretty soon, you'll be popular, too." To get along you have to go along.

And you, the American public, just went along. You were bombarded by press reports that Lee Harvey Oswald was the guilty party, acting alone, and even though you didn't believe it, you went along.

When New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison attempted to bring to justice some of those involved in the assassination, the press, led by NBC, derided him as a crazy conspiracy theorist. Even though most of you thought Garrison was on to something, you still went along. After all, you had to get along.

It is not a coincidence that the network of spooks and media outlets that went after Judge Garrison overlaps with the network that has been running the smear campaign against Lyndon LaRouche and his followers. For example, as word leaked of Garrison's investigation of the Schlumberger Corporation's role in running guns and explosives to the anti-Castro Cuban networks which President Kennedy had ordered shut down, a CIA agent by the name of Gordon Novel, who was suspected among other things of impersonating Lee Harvey Oswald, sent the warning out that Garrison was on to the illegal weapons traffic and the CIA's role in it. The Schlumberger Corporation, whose U.S. operation was bankrolled by the Morgan Bank, had been one of the major funders of the Secret Army Organization (OAS) terrorists who tried three times to assassinate President Charles de Gaulle of France.

Walter Sheridan, a former Office of Naval Intelligence agent working at the Justice Department, took a temporary leave of absence to spearhead the NBC team that was out to smear Garrison. Under Sheridan's direction, NBC then proceeded to intimidate witnesses and generally obstruct the Garrison investigation. The network then aired a barrage of attacks against Garrison, accusing him of being tied to the mob and of "brainwashing potential witnesses."

The whole time, Gordon Novel was in Ohio, from where the governor refused all attempts to extradite him to Louisiana.

This same cast of characters, Gordon Novel, Walter Sheridan, and NBC, were among those spearheading the campaign to get LaRouche. In 1984, Gordon Novel appeared on the now-defunct NBC news magazine show "First Camera," accusing LaRouche of, among other things, plotting the assassinations of Jimmy Carter and Henry Kissinger. Meanwhile, a task force headed from the Justice Department by Walter Sheridan's crony Buck Revell headed up a public-private Get LaRouche Task Force, in cooperation with the Anti-Defamation League.

The media support for this operation was led by NBC. For example, in February of 1986, NBC News charged that a member of LaRouche's political organization in Sweden was suspected of assassinating Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme.* Subsequent events have demonstrated that NBC itself and that section of the intelligence community involved in the Iran-Contra affair were the most likely perpetrators of the Palme assassination.

Today, as a result of not enough of us acting over a quarter of a century ago, we have endured economic and cultural policies which have brought this country to the brink of ruin. At the very least you can demand the kind of policies which the Kennedy presidency represented. Or, will you just go along and lynch whatever scapegoat the press feeds you in order to get along?

* For recent revelations on the origins of this slander, see *EIR*, Sept. 11, 1992, "Stasi Agents: 'We Spread Lie that LaRouche Killed Palme'"—Ed.