

JFK

2 November 2017



A reader asks (numbers added to match responses from The Committee):

If the U.S Government promised to release 3,000+ unsealed documents in relation to the JFK assassination due to the movie "JFK" created by Oliver Stone in 1992, followed by a highly publicized 3-hour court case, 1. why did the Intelligence Agencies request that the President only release 2,800?

2. Will they follow through with the promise to release the remaining files in 6 months? (3. More importantly, will our President remember, or even care to sign them at that point?)

It has been said that only 52 files of the 2,800 count have never been seen before. With this being proven, 4. does this signify that the CIA has something to hide about the JFK assassination? Also, 5. was it true as a file implied that Oswald could have been a CIA agent? 6. Did George H.W Bush (future Vice President from 1981 to 1989 then 41st President of the United States, from '89 to '93) have any involvement, as Head of the CIA at the time?

7. Will the American public ever know the truth about the JFK assassination (at the very least, from our own government)?

Apologies for the long (and many) list of questions. It is a subject I hold dear. They have had over 50 years to tell us what they know of what happened to John F. Kennedy, and in those 50 years they have deflected and ignored us. No longer should they be able to.

Just in case, for anybody unfamiliar (not too many I don't think) J, F & K are the initials of the 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in office from January, 1961 until he was assassinated by rifle fire while riding in a roofless car in Dallas, Texas on November 22, 1963. The letters CIA stand for Central Intelligence Agency.

To the remark asking for apologies, none needed. I appreciate reader questions.

Says The Committee:

1. To prevent public knowledge of the information contained in the still concealed files. If revealed, these would compromise current investigative methods and techniques.

2. Yes, however the files will be, as you might say, redacted. Specific information will be omitted; the reasons which might be given are as we said in response to question one. This decision has not yet been made.

3. Yes and maybe, this decision has not yet been made.

4. Of course, but not only within the Central Intelligence Agency. This department, as many of you know, is principally involved with the gathering of information related to activity outside the United States, however there are nearly always elements of overlap into the United States where an event, organization, nation, group or issue of interest to the agency originates primarily outside of the USA. This assassination violated a state law at the time, not a federal one, so the principal investigation responsibility was of the city where the killing happened. Given the target, the implications were worldwide and involved several agencies, not all of which were or have been revealed. This leads to the need to continue concealment of additional information, as was and is still seen necessary. A significant number of leads and details at the time of the investigation pointed to pressing other nations for their involvement also, considered to difficult to achieve, with too high a diplomatic cost if insisted upon by the USA. This concern is still held.

5. Yes, and Oswald did work as one but not in the way an observer might typically believe to be the role of an agent, a more or less permanent member of the organization, where certain ongoing commitments are implied or expressed in both directions, such as employment. You would more likely call this relationship one of a contractor or informant.

6. In the investigation, yes. In the events, no.

7. Yes but no. The complete truth will not be able to be known, the final involvement of all concerned parties cannot be uncovered. This information is no longer available in the human way. Both participants and observers with knowledge of the participants have died.

"We speak to the event generally and wish to say, the reasons the complete story has not been revealed are because it is not known to that extent, and the methods and techniques are considered still too sensitive to reveal. There are current and future perpetrators who would use such information to increase their ability to evade detection and revelation of their current activity, if certain information about the investigation then, were made public today.

The assassination is no longer relevant. The concerns and motivations which brought about its occurrence are no longer held. Bear in mind, assassinations occur because of the illusion of time; what need is there to uncover and address what has already occurred, but for the future which might be changed because of that information?

The motivations concerned fear that continued decisions by the President of the USA would harm certain interests connected to and in several ways, a part of the central authority, or government of the United States.

Your concern that what was uncovered during the investigations became a lie at the time and has continued to be one, as an ongoing deception, is valid. The truth to the extent it can be revealed, can be extracted. Simply insist upon this during an elective cycle; make it a priority of winning

elective office, to any candidate for the post, that what has not been told so far must be revealed, once the winning candidate assumes power.

If this insistence successfully influences voters' sentiments, immediately steps will be taken to create new modified information which some would deem false, for eventual disclosure to be ordered by the prevailing candidate upon assumption of office.

There are components of government activity which benefit the operation of the central authority, which remain outside control of the established hierarchy and structure of what the USA's citizenry understands government to be. These elements, parts, pieces, components and sections have two motivations; to remain in operation and to continue to safeguard the interests of the United States, as these shadowy bits of activity see the proper role they should fill, to provide such protection.

The many of you might disagree, and in this lie both the challenge and our observation of mankind. Knowledge is seen as power, because in the human existence, it is always somewhat incomplete. The human holders of information which might provide a more complete picture, if not entirely accurate accounting, see personal strength and perpetuity of position as a valuable thing they would lose. This is reluctantly given up, and more often actively resisted. Giving away secrets makes the holder unnecessary.

To the issue of John Kennedy's assassination, we will say, Oswald did not assassinate Kennedy. He was intentionally assassinated himself to silence one possible point through which doubts would leak, then grow. His assassin, Mr. Ruby, was fooled, tricked or duped as it could be described, as part of the plan. From the outset Mr. Oswald was recruited into the process with no knowledge of what would happen and he was forthright, truthful and honest when telling the press he was not involved, shortly before he was killed. Mr. Oswald would never have agreed to play a part in any such scheme, not by love or hate of the victim Mr. Kennedy but for the implications and effects. He believed until the moment he himself was assassinated, that he was an unfortunate nearby witness, one of many, and nothing more. He was confident he would be exonerated because of the role he had been engaged to fill, and believed sincerely and completely that his arrest was simply an error made in the eager effort to detain someone responsible, as soon as possible. The public outcry would have only grown louder and more fierce, as time passed and no responsible individuals were located. Oswald knew anyone on planet Earth would have to disappear into thin air to avoid prosecution if identified as a suspect, and he understood that USA's pressure to detain then hand over a responsible party would have been impossible to resist by any sovereign nation which might be able to do so. He also knew US authorities would make any parallel effort necessary, legal or otherwise, to gain control over and take into custody, any responsible parties no matter where on Earth such persons might be found.

Oswald was certain his prior role could have nothing to do with such an event, just as would be the case for any other person in or near the city of Dallas, Texas on the days before and the day during which the assassination took place.

To the inquiring reader who has read this explanation so far, the obvious question becomes who, if not Oswald? We will prepare that answer by first addressing several obvious points about the story offered and held forth as the official explanation from the time of the event until today, well into the second decade of mankind's numbered twenty first century of 'time'.

Oswald, through former military service, would never have used the rifle he was alleged to have employed. He knew of and was quite proficient in the use of more effective ammunition, again from his military service. He understood well that one shot would have quickly ended the life of the target. He would not ever have chosen the moment he is said to have fired, he would have chosen a far easier shot when the victim was moving towards him, thus nearly stationary from the view of a shooter. He would not have bothered with a sighting device using lenses of magnification, called a scope. He could have easily made a fatal shot through utterly reliable fixed sights and he would have used a semi-automatic rifle and avoided the need to operate a bolt to make subsequent shots. His military training made him proficient with this type of rifle. Given the planning required, all of these basic elements of such a shot would have occurred to him immediately when planning such an event, even if done the same day. Absent the proper tools, he would have postponed the attempt until he had the required rifle, ammunition and place from which to shoot.

None of things came into play, because Oswald was never aware of the plan and never for a second of his human life contemplated killing the President of the USA.

Kennedy was likewise also not killed by foreign interests, who understood implicitly what would happen to their nations and their regimes, if by some remote chance such foreign nation's involvement had been uncovered. The process to employ actors sufficiently far from and thus detached enough to avoid detection of a foreign leader's involvement would also create too risky a loss of control for such leader. The USA's responses to Imperial Japan's attack on the United States and to Nazi Germany's aggression in Europe approximately twenty years earlier were still fresh in the minds of world leaders, all of them. These leaders knew any US President's assassination linked to them would result in the destruction of their regime, a fall from power and likely arrests and executions of themselves and anyone involved, in the USA. Nazi Germany's greatest foe, The Soviet Union and the Russian people, who themselves resisted a great invasion and onslaught by Nazi Germany to take over their nation, held great respect for and fear of the USA's resolve, based on the several years' campaigns in both Europe and Asia to crush Germany and Japan and knew this would happen to them. None of this came to the mind of a foreign leader or government, because all knew such attempt would be suicide, individually and collectively and moreover, would provide no benefit. No increase in trade, wealth, political advantage or any other gain would come to any foreign power or leader.

Kennedy was eliminated by elements not inside and not outside the halls of power in the United States government. These interests saw his re-election and presence in office through the year 1968 as supremely dangerous to their interests, especially because they saw his brother, Attorney General at the time of Kennedy's killing, as a likely candidate with good chances to be elected and remain in office until at least 1972, if not 1976. When Robert Kennedy announced his plans to run for office, he was also assassinated by the same interests which perceived a similar threat from the younger Kennedy's entrance into office. The youngest of the Kennedy brothers, a senator, escaped this fate when announcing a run because he was seen as a flawed candidate who could secure neither the party's nomination or the office of chief executive. The youngest Kennedy's attempt flamed out early, as expected.

We will not ever reveal the more specific details. Aside from irrelevance today, such information could likely become a distorting influence which would provide no good benefit to mankind or

the people of the USA. Besides being deemed unbelievable thus written off as theory without proof, the details if believed, would become a temporary distraction undermining the many things mankind had before itself on its current dinner plate, things both self generated by humanity and also occurring in a greater way mankind cannot control, but to which it is very much subject.

Be well one and all. Goodwill we wish to all. Do return.