

'JFK' film is indictment of America's 'secret government'

by Anno Hellenbroich

"President Kennedy has been shot!" That terrifying report, broadcast around the world on Nov. 22, 1963, still rings in the ears of many today. Young and old of all countries sat in front of their radios and television sets in a state of shock and bewilderment. What had happened? Why had it happened? It had only been in June of that fateful year, that John F. Kennedy had visited Berlin, to deliver his now-famous declaration, two years after the building of the Berlin Wall, in order to guarantee the security of the divided city: "Ich bin ein Berliner!"

Recently a new film on Kennedy's assassination, and the massive coverup of its background, began to unleash a huge controversy even before it started showing in movie theaters. The basic thesis of its director, Oliver Stone, is that Kennedy's assassination was a coup d'état by the CIA/FBI and parts of the military-industrial complex, and that the coverup perpetrated by the Warren Commission was merely one more step in the formation of a "parallel government" in Washington and a turning of the United States toward fascism. This thesis has struck a raw nerve in the U.S. population and within the establishment. Why, for example, has an incumbent U.S. President—George Bush—felt the need to appear on a talk show in order to emphatically reject demands for the release of the documentation of the investigation of the assassination—documents which the government will not release until the year 2029? Why does an ex-President and former member of the first investigatory commission under Chief Justice Earl Warren—Gerald Ford—set out to "rip up" the film? Why do the *London Times*, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and other pillars of the establishment rail so at Stone's allegedly miserable, monstrous "conspiracy mongering," and accuse him of confuting "fact and fiction"

to such an extent that *Newsweek* advised potential viewers against going to see the film, since it might "confuse" them?

As a German who viewed the film in a theater in a small U.S. midwestern town just before Christmas, I was struck by the exciting impact of this more than three-hour-long film epic on the viewers. After a long exposition by New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison (played by Kevin Costner), many sequences were played of the original footage filmed by the amateur photographer Abraham Zapruder, who captured the moments of the shooting. One lives through those anguished moments, as a series of four shots, lasting five to six seconds, ends with the final shot which hurls the President's head backward with tremendous force. The audience in the movie theater groans aloud; but at the same time, the question is raised again in everyone's mind, that Lee Harvey Oswald could not possibly have been the sole gunman, since the final shot must have come from an entirely different direction. After the film is over, viewers of all ages leave the theater silently in inner turmoil.

The significance of this absorbing film is based on the fact that it highlights cinematically, and with great intensity, the contradictions which have emerged in the various investigations of the Kennedy assassination. What is of interest here, however, is not the specific conclusions which Stone extracts from these contradictions, but rather the fact that he dramatically raises once again the fundamental questions about what actually led to the killing of Kennedy, the attempts to sabotage the investigation, and the subsequent killings of Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Malcolm X. The fact that Stone attempts to present a one-sided answer to those questions, is one of the film's greatest weaknesses.

The filmscript is largely based on a book by Garrison—

now a judge—which he published in 1988 under the title *On the Trail of the Assassin*. Supporting material also came from the 600-page study by Jim Marrs, *Crossfire: The Plot That Killed Kennedy* (1989), in which the author presents all of the most significant theories about the assassination. The chapter titled “The Garrison Investigation,” which is key to the film, is in fact substantially based on a book-length study issued in 1978 at the behest of Lyndon LaRouche, entitled *Dope, Inc.*, which is acknowledged in Marrs’s footnotes. EIR News Service also issued large portions of the same material in 1981 under the title “Permindex: Britain’s International Assassination Bureau.” (In a commentary in the London *Times*, the reviewer Bremner could not resist connecting his gloss of the film with a cutting reference to LaRouche. Was this belated revenge, or a case of bad conscience?)

The reason that this film is being reviled so much by U.S. government officials, must lie in the fact that the people who have become fed up with the collapse of the United States following Kennedy’s assassination, the daily violence in the cities, the deluge of drugs, and the economic collapse, are now focusing their rage against the growing arrogance and autocratic rule of the current Bush administration and the establishment in general. The administration and its official scribblers are meanwhile becoming increasingly shrill in their attempts to legitimize all the dirty machinations, the Iran-Contra scandal, the Panama invasion, and the Iraq war. To be sure, official hearings were held on all these dirty dealings, but highly placed officials who had clearly been involved in illegal secret activities, have not been brought to justice; some have been promoted, as in the case of the new CIA director, Robert Gates. Documentary evidence and witnesses who could say things about the dirty drugs-for-arms business in North’s Irangate, suddenly disappear, are killed, or conveniently die “just in time.” The list of dead witnesses in connection with Irangate is just as shockingly long as the list of witnesses in the Kennedy case who were “silenced.”

Why Kennedy was killed

What were the great issues for whose sake Kennedy had to be gotten out of the picture, to be followed later by Martin Luther King, and still later, by Lyndon LaRouche, whose opposition wing within the Democratic Party won 30% and more in the 1986 primaries, after which LaRouche was thrown into jail in an outrageous railroad trial?

In John F. Kennedy’s Inaugural Address on Jan. 20, 1961, the newly elected—Catholic—President of the United States gives a foretaste of the political transformation which, in 1963, when Kennedy wanted to put these words more energetically into action, made him into the deadly enemy of the oligarchical establishment. Kennedy spoke of his desire for peaceful cooperation with the Soviet Union, of the yearning for scientific progress and the development of the underdeveloped world:

“Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.

“Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms, and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

“Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

“Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah to ‘undo the heavy burdens . . . [and] let the oppressed go free.’ ”

This is the spirit of the “New Frontier,” a spirit which, once again today, amid the brutality of the depression, is being reawakened through recalling the Kennedy assassination of November 1963. Admittedly, Kennedy’s policies were quite contradictory—and in his private life, as is generally known, he was not exactly a model statesman. But he gave expression to a perspective for the development of the world, a perspective which was shared by leading political, business, and church people. It was shared, for example, by the Italian industrial leader Enrico Mattei, who laid the groundwork for Italy’s modern industry, especially in the energy production sector, until he was murdered in 1964.

These were also the years of the great reconciliation between France and Germany, when de Gaulle spoke of his great vision of a “Europe of the Fatherlands” (and a turning away from Anglo-American domination), thus making himself a target of the same assassination circles who felled Kennedy—as the Garrison investigation demonstrated. De Gaulle at the time expelled from France the local agents of the firm Permindex (which worked with Clay Shaw, M. Bloomfield, and G. Bannister of the FBI’s Division 5). Unfortunately, this aspect is omitted from the film.

De Gaulle exhibited this same way of thinking when he gave words of encouragement to young Germans during his 1962 visit: “I wish you well, young Germans, you children of a great people. Yes, of a great people, which now and then, in the course of history, has made great mistakes. But a people which has also sent throughout the world fruitful intellectual, scientific, artistic, and philosophical waves, and has enriched the world with countless products of its imagination, its technology, and its labor.”

It was the year in which Paul VI was chosen as the new pope during the Vatican Council—a pope who later in 1967 dedicated the encyclical *Populorum Progressio* to humanity’s great task of the development of all peoples and the eradication of hunger and poverty.

The year 1963 was also the time when Martin Luther King gave his famous “I have a dream” speech before over 200,000 civil rights demonstrators, and demanded justice for America’s oppressed Afro-Americans. In this political climate, Kennedy, as President of the most powerful nation on

Earth, was on the verge of shattering the old structures of the oligarchical world order. The oligarchical forces demanded that he be killed. Networks within the drug and intelligence apparatus arranged the death of the world's best-protected man. Stone's film is impressive on this aspect.

Kennedy's enemies are LaRouche's

In 1982-83, LaRouche—with the full knowledge of the Reagan White House—launched an initiative for peace and joint economic development with the Soviet Union. At the same time, concrete agreements were being arrived at with the President of Mexico on “defusing the debt bomb.” In 1984 LaRouche published a draft for an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States which, although much more comprehensive than what Kennedy had formulated in his inaugural speech, similarly aimed at world economic development. LaRouche wrote in Article I: “The most crucial feature of present implementation of such a policy of durable peace is a profound change in the monetary, economic, and political relations between the dominant powers and those relatively subordinated nations often classed as ‘developing nations.’ Unless the inequities lingering in the aftermath of modern colonialism are progressively remedied, there can be no durable peace on this planet.”

That was the core concept of the policy against which LaRouche's enemies, including Kissinger and company, launched a witchhunt which led to LaRouche's incarceration in 1989.

Oliver Stone's film, with its frontal attack against the “secret, shadow government” which was responsible for the murder of Kennedy, thus serves as a searchlight for revealing today's “secret government.” Even though the film does not report on the great issues confronting the world at that time—with the exception of the Vietnam War, the role of the “military-industrial complex,” and the evil machinations of the CIA/FBI apparatus—something profound has been awakened by “JFK.” This is particularly the case for younger people, especially those allied with the democratic movements in Europe, Asia, and the Americas who are up in arms against this “apparatus.” The process will doubtless be accelerated by the electoral campaign of the LaRouche wings of the Democratic Party and of the U.S. civil rights movement.

The enemies of progress then are the same as the enemies of progress today. Already in 1990, LaRouche issued a warning against the same judicial fascism decried by Stone: “The people in the U.S. establishment . . . repeatedly say to us of my imprisonment: ‘Of course, he violated the political rules by being outspoken, and therefore he's stuck in prison, and they'll keep him in prison until he learns his lesson and doesn't say these things anymore.’ That's the general nature of their charge: I did not play by the rules of the consensus. . . . I opposed policies which the majority of the establishment had come to agree upon. I did not accept the democratic

centralism of the liberal Anglo-American establishment. . . . The establishment is engaged presently in the effort to exterminate to the last vestige the political association and entire political movement associated with me. . . . What does that say of the United States?

“It says the United States has become a form of an *administrative fascist* state. That is what the insiders have consented to. That's what they rationalize: ‘That's the system.’ ”

LaRouche concludes his statement: “I have been consistently right in these matters, and that is what I am condemned to prison for doing: warning the establishment of those changes in its policy which it must make in order to survive. I am imprisoned for trying to save the establishment from its own folly. As long as I remain imprisoned, the destruction of George Bush's administration and the establishment, and who knows what else besides, is absolutely assured. Let us put to one side all this nonsense about my breaking the rules. Those who put me in prison broke God's rules; God will punish them unless they desist. If I'm free they might survive.”

The demand for justice, for clearing up the traumatic question of why the majority of Americans were deliberately deceived following Kennedy's assassination, makes “JFK” a potential catalyst for dramatic cultural shifts in the United States.

Books Received

Nicholas of Cusa, *The Catholic Concordance*, edited and translated by Paul E. Sigmund, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1991, 326 pages, hardbound, \$69.95.

Law and Justice in the Reagan Administration, by William French Smith, Hoover Institution Press, Stanford, Calif., 1991, 260 pages, hardbound, \$34.94; paperbound, \$18.95.

Peru's Path to Recovery: A Plan for Economic Stabilization and Growth, edited by Carlos E. Parades, Jeffrey D. Sachs, and Stanley N. Wellborn, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1991, 336 pages, hardbound, \$39.95; paperbound, \$19.95.

Virtual Reality, by Howard Rheingold, Summit Books, New York, 1991, 415 pages, hardbound, \$22.95.

The Collapse of Communism, by Bernard Gwertzman and Michael Kaufman, Random House, New York, 1991, 600 pages, paperbound, \$13.