

# Cover-Up Continues After Newly Released JFK Files | Harry Berger & Aaron Good

Trump released 20,000 previously classified files related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in 1963. For more than 60 years, the CIA has concealed all sorts of evidence - which our guest today Aaron Good shows - points to a conspiracy involving the CIA to have the President killed. Why were these files classified and what do they reveal? Aaron Good joins independent journalist Harrison Berger to unpack the latest JFK files release.

## #M3

Congress held hearings this week over recently declassified JFK assassination files, 20,000 pages of material that the CIA had withheld from the American public for more than 60 years. Predictably, corporate media, as well as Democrats in Congress, rallied to declare definitively that these new documents absolve the CIA of any wrongdoing in the plot to kill the president. To help us understand what really happened, we speak with Aaron Good, a political scientist and historian known for his critical examinations of U.S. foreign policy. He joins me today to break down the latest file releases as well as the reactions to them. So, Aaron, thank you so much for being here. I really appreciate it.

## #M2

Thanks, great to be here.

## #M3

I want to start with the New York Times' Julian Barnes, because he's apparently set a world record for speed reading, having read 20,000 newly released JFK files in a matter of days. He must have, because he's determined definitively that the CIA did not kill JFK.

## #M3

Thousands and thousands of pages of these super-secret documents related to the JFK assassination. So, given that history, what was your first impression when you finally had a chance to really make sense of them? Well, not to spoil the episode, but the CIA did not kill JFK.

## #M3

Case closed. And if you watched the congressional hearings on Tuesday, you'd hear similar refrains from congressional Democrats.

### **#M3**

But you have said, I think, just to correct what you said, you have said, though, that there is no direct evidence as of today that the CIA committed the assassination. Is that correct? I would say that the fact pattern that has emerged in the last month shows culpability or complicity in the president's death. But no direct evidence, is that correct, sir? We have very direct evidence of the CIA's surveillance of Oswald. No, I'm not asking about that. I agree with you, sir. I mean, direct evidence that the CIA is connected to the assassination. All of these events connect the CIA to the assassination. I understand that, sir. I'm just telling you my interpretation of what's been presented is that I have not seen direct evidence.

### **#F1**

Previously classified JFK assassination files are now public and show no evidence of a CIA conspiracy. So instead of giving a platform to conspiracy theories—and let me be clear, there are holes. I don't want y'all to think that I don't think there are holes. But when we're looking back, we need to look back so that we can look forward and hopefully do better.

### **#M3**

And ABC News echoed congressional Democrats, reporting that the hearings were an attempt to revive unfounded conspiracy theories. Now, there's no way that any of them have read the 20,000 new files released only a couple of weeks ago. So, Aaron, what do you make of both establishment media and Democrats in Congress reflexively dismissing the notion of a CIA plot to kill President Kennedy?

### **#M2**

Well, they are remaining true to form because since the assassination, in the decades since the assassination in 1963, the main elements in the U.S. which did not believe there was a plot behind the assassination were the media, the establishment media, the mainstream media, and the public pronouncements of politicians. But once you get beyond that, the politicians privately believed that there was a plot behind the assassination. I'm referring to LBJ himself, who came to suspect the CIA, and Richard Nixon, who believed that the people behind Watergate were essentially the same people that got rid of John Kennedy.

Robert Kennedy himself sent a messenger to Moscow a week after the assassination to tell the Soviets, "We know you didn't kill John Kennedy, the President. It was a domestic right-wing

conspiracy." But JFK's policies, you know, ending the Cold War, moving for peace, these were going to have to wait because LBJ was too close to big business. So they were going to have to wait until RFK got to the White House to resume these plans. But of course, RFK gets killed before he can get to the White House under very dubious circumstances.

Even Gerald Ford himself told a French president or prime minister, I can't remember which, a guy named Debré, I think, I'm probably mangling his name, but he told him that they believed there was a plot, but that they just couldn't figure out who did it. And of course, he was one of the people on the Warren Commission, and he helped to cover up the location of one of the wounds of the magic bullet, supposedly one of the seven wounds caused by this one bullet. He moved the entrance wound from the back to the neck, which didn't make any sense at all according to the death certificate or if you look at the clothes. Charles de Gaulle didn't believe that. Indira Gandhi didn't believe this.

Kwame Nkrumah, Sukarno, pretty much no one who was around the circles of power then believed it, but they all said that publicly. Even Earl Warren—it's pretty easy to surmise that he knew there was a conspiracy, but that his job, as he understood it, was to keep this from being exposed because he was told by LBJ, essentially, that it would lead to nuclear war because there was a Soviet hand in it. And when you consider that he was told this, and he was reduced to tears by the President, the Chief Justice of the United States, you can kind of understand why, even if he believed that Jack Ruby must have been some kind of underworld figure who killed Oswald, he could have believed that he was put up to it by national security people who were trying to avoid nuclear war by silencing Oswald. Who knows what he really believed he was doing there, but it seems that he thought he was stopping a nuclear war.

Even the Warren Commission members themselves were not really unanimous. There were three dissenters: Richard Russell, Hale Boggs, and John Cooper. They spoke about this and even tried to get it included in the proceedings, in the report. Senator Russell was basically tricked into giving a whole presentation about how he didn't believe the magic bullet theory and had some other questions. There was a stenographer there apparently taking notes, but it was, I think, a fake stenographer or something because there's no record of it. He was basically tricked into going along with this. So really, nobody believed it at the time. Many people didn't believe it at the time, and more and more evidence has mounted over the years. So the New York Times is just doing what the New York Times does, which is acting as the publicity arm for the U.S. empire.

**#M3**

Now, you and others have talked about a small faction within the CIA, almost like a government within the CIA, which is its own clique that could have perpetrated this assassination. Can you explain that theory and how these new files shed light on those connections?

**#M3**

Well, in particular, James Angleton emerges as a very sinister figure in the assassination.

## **#M2**

And if you watched the hearings yesterday, Jeff Morley focused a lot on the handling of the Oswald file. Richard Helms, who was eventually the director, but at the time was the director of plans under Kennedy, which is like the head of the clandestine service, was in charge of the dirty tricks. There are three officials that Morley has identified as lying about Oswald. One is George Joannides, who handled one of these Cuban exile groups during the Kennedy administration. Later, he was used as the liaison for Congress's investigation into the assassination, and he stonewalled them at every turn. It wasn't known until many years later that he was someone who really should have been a witness.

He was a material witness that they should have been deposing about the CIA's potential involvement in the assassination. Instead, he was the liaison there to supposedly help them get documents. But in reality, he was there to keep them from getting documents. So this is very scandalous. So this guy, Joannides, had deceived U.S. officials about his role. And so had Richard Helms and James Angleton, who lied about how much they had been surveilling Oswald and what the agency knew about Oswald. As Jeff Morley documents, they had a big file on Oswald, and they had been reading his mail for a long time. So there's that aspect of it. They had him under surveillance.

They were using him in different ways. It appears, Peter Dale Scott argues, and Jeff Morley does as well, that Oswald was being used by Angleton. They didn't emphasize this much yesterday, by the way, but they've written about this in the past, that there's much evidence to suggest that Oswald was being used by Angleton, ostensibly as part of a mole hunt. You say, oh, there's so much penetration that we need to have these kinds of, I think they call it a barium meal or something like you eat before you get imaging if you have cancer, and it's supposed to show the path through your body, and it might show vascular damage or it might show this or that, right?

Well, that Oswald himself, because he was a defector to the Soviet Union, was a person of interest, and Angleton had all the files that would come up on him routed to him. Some of the information out there would have different names, spellings, and different errors, and if you looked at those, Angleton might somehow figure out who the mole was. If they were reporting this information that was erroneous in a particular way, they could figure out who was the mole. But in reality, what I would suggest they were doing was making sure that they would have a monopoly on what the government knew about Oswald in this way. So Angleton's a very deceptive individual, and I believe that this is part of what he was doing. They were reading his mail, they were keeping tabs on him. And on the surface, it seems, well, he defected to the Soviet Union.

He might be a communist. But in reality, his background is so strange, and his activities make no sense at all until you think, is he an intelligence operative? And then suddenly they make perfect sense. For example, he's in this public dust-up in New Orleans, where he eventually goes on the radio and debates these guys about the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. And he gets exposed as a former defector to the Soviet Union, and it kind of discredits the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which we know now the CIA was doing illegally, running operations trying to discredit the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

And when Oswald was in New Orleans doing these things, passing out these flyers, he was working out of the office of an ex-FBI right-winger who also used that office to work with Cuban exile groups to plan Operation Mongoose—kind of guerrilla operations, paramilitary operations, and so on. At one point, an outfit associated with this person, Guy Bannister, tried to purchase trucks in the name of Lee Oswald when Lee Oswald was in the Soviet Union. So somebody was impersonating him there. So Oswald seems pretty clearly to have been an agent provocateur of some kind working for the government. And that's never been explained in any way. So there's so much.

And evidence, people say, direct evidence and indirect, you know, prove or don't prove. These are different. There are different standards of legal proof and so on. So, you know, what really constitutes—there is no file that says "Operation Kill JFK" and explains it in a one-page memo. There never would be something like that for an operation of this magnitude. But there's an enormous amount of evidence linking the CIA and these actors to Oswald. And that's one part of it. So there's the Oswald aspect, which I think there's a lot of evidence pointing to Angleton, especially manipulating that. Angleton and others are a part of this story. David Phillips in Mexico City is a big part of it.

### **#M3**

Let me ask about that quickly, because it's very strange. Just thinking back to how we started this, we were talking about these congressional Democrats, and they're saying definitively, oh, there's no evidence of CIA involvement, no CIA plot. But as you mentioned, there are all these strange CIA connections to Lee Harvey Oswald, and not only that... They were surveilling him, and they stopped surveilling him. Very bizarrely, as you mentioned, after he was arrested in New Orleans and after he went to Mexico City and allegedly met with someone involved with the KGB, that would be reason to increase surveillance if you're in counterterrorism like James Angleton or all these people who were receiving these files on Lee Harvey Oswald at the time. But they did the exact opposite of that. They stopped looking at Lee Harvey Oswald. So it's very strange. As you say, whatever you want to call it, direct evidence, indirect evidence, it raises a lot of questions, and there's clearly a lot that's unresolved.

### **#M2**

Right. Well, they have lied about this for a long time, which is significant, and about their connections with Oswald, their surveillance of Oswald, and operational interest in Oswald. And they have also made it difficult for—I mean, what Angleton was doing was basically making it very hard for anyone. Every time Oswald would come up, it got routed to him personally, so it's very difficult. He had control of the way that this information was created and distributed, so this is notable. There was also a case where, as you say, they began to surveil him less.

In a sense, they took a flash warning off of Oswald, which was, I believe, done by an FBI agent named Marvin Gheesling. It's spelled G-H-E-E-S-L-I-N-G. And he was FBI, but he took this flash notice off of Oswald, which, my understanding is, if it had been left on there, it would have entailed the Secret Service paying attention to Oswald specifically around the time of the president's visit. So really, he should have been paid a visit and monitored by security officials before the president ever went there. And he wasn't. And it wasn't that they forgot to do something; they actively intervened to take Oswald off this list.

And my understanding is that Gheesling, the official who did this, who wasn't a very high-ranking person, was initially reprimanded, but then later this gets cleared from his performance record, and he wasn't punished for this. So why wasn't he punished? This is important. Why aren't the guys who were watching Epstein punished, for example? This, to me, is a red flag and seems like a kind of circumstantial evidence for a plot from the clandestine state or an operation from the clandestine state when you have these kinds of failures that are not treated as failures by the administrative state.

## **#M3**

There's one character we haven't talked about yet, which is Jack Ruby, who, according to the official narrative, just kind of got upset about the assassination and walked out with a gun and shot Lee Harvey Oswald before he could say anything or give testimony in court about anything that had happened or if there were any other co-conspirators. What really explains why he killed Lee Harvey Oswald?

## **#M2**

Well, Ruby is a fascinating character and probably the Rosetta Stone for trying to understand certain aspects of the assassination. Just to reiterate what you said about Ruby silencing Oswald, it's notable that one of the things that the no-conspiracy crowd will say is that, well, somebody would have talked. But in this case, you have two principal figures who are involved in some way without a doubt, which are Lee Oswald and Jack Ruby. Lee Oswald was perhaps the first conspiracy theorist in the JFK assassination because he said himself, I'm a patsy. I'm being set up here. I didn't shoot anybody. I'm just a patsy. And he tries to call a military intelligence officer named, I think, William Hurt or John Hurt. John Hurt, maybe. One of them is the actor. William Hurt's the actor. I think it's John Hurt.

But anyway, he tries to call a military intelligence officer who's stationed, I think, in North Carolina. And they don't let the call go through, and they don't take any notes on what he says. When he's being interrogated, they don't record anything. They don't take any notes. So he himself posited a conspiracy. And Jack Ruby himself later said, people in powerful positions put me in the position that I'm in, and they'll never let the truth come above board because they have too much to lose. So both of the principals, who are lone nuts, we're told, pointed to a conspiracy. And yet, they weren't allowed to do anything about it. Jack Ruby himself told Earl Warren, my life's in danger here. Take me to Washington, and I can tell you what happened. Because there's a new form of government that's going to take over, and it's going to be horrible. And nobody can stop it.

Now, when he had spoken to Warren, he had just been declared insane by a psychiatrist named Jolly West, who we now know was involved with the MK-Ultra CIA program. He helped to run the CIA's mind control program and conducted all these experiments using LSD, much of it on unwitting test subjects. He even killed an elephant by dosing it with so much LSD at one point. And he was the person sent in to evaluate Jack Ruby's insanity. He said Ruby had a psychotic break because right when Jolly West came to evaluate Ruby, Ruby started hallucinating and saying that people were out to get him, etc., etc. His episode basically corresponded to an acid trip, probably a really bad acid trip.

So it's only emerged over time how much the CIA or people around the CIA and around MK-Ultra were involved in Ruby's legal defense. His lawyers were either connected to the syndicate or they were connected to this milieu of people using psychology and psychiatry for legal means, like as a means of legal defense to argue someone was insane and so not guilty for this or that reason. They initially tried to do this with Ruby. They were going to say, well, he's insane, because if you say he's insane, then that means you can discount anything that he might say. But I think that Ruby himself was used sort of the way that they used Oswald in Mexico City. Oswald in Mexico City, they say, visits this fellow named Kostikov, who is a KGB coordinator of assassinations.

And so this is used to tell Earl Warren, well, if you investigate this, it could lead to nuclear war. We can't have that. So you have to deal with any conspiracy that way. That's the head of the Warren Commission. And then Ruby, on the other hand, if you look into his background, he is in a very sensitive or unique spot in the crime syndicate and especially in the syndicate's takeover of Dallas, more or less. So he is connected. He goes back further. Even in 1939, he was in the room when the president of a local junk handlers union gets assassinated, gets murdered. And eventually, this union is taken over by a guy named Dorfman, a right-hand man, in a sense, of Jimmy Hoffa.

And this leads to the mob takeover of Teamster pension funds, which is a big part of the story of organized crime in the '50s and '60s and so on. So, Ruby was arrested for this and not charged. He later was involved in this with a guy named Paul Roland Jones, who was arrested on big drug charges, and Ruby should have been involved in one of those drug cases because he spoke to Jones around this time. But for some reason, Ruby was not. There are a lot of indications he was an

informant, and he even had evaluations as an informant. So he was an informant, I believe, for the FBI, and they evaluated him as a decent informant. And what his role was apparently there was to be the syndicate's person handling the drug traffic as a part of it because he comes up in these areas.

And there's one, I believe it's the wife of a mobster, who says that, yeah, when my husband needed to make a drug deal or set up an arrangement that went through Dallas, he had to get it okayed by Jack Ruby. So he seems to have been a syndicate lieutenant there. And, you know, he's also this guy, Paul Roland Jones, that Ruby was associated with for drugs and trying to move into Dallas. Jones and his people around him, like, I think, Dave and Sam Yaris, who are brothers, they're involved in this high-profile murder of a guy named James Reagan, who in 1946 controlled the wire service, which was a gambling service that would give you the results of the race all around the country. And if you wanted to control organized crime gambling in an area, you wanted to have control of this wire service, but it was controlled nationally.

And this was a major sort of infrastructure for organized crime to get into big cities all around the country. Because you get people to take little bribes for the wire service and a little bit of gambling, then you kind of have them for everything else. Once they're corrupted, they can be bought off to overlook drugs, policing, and so on and so forth. So this is a foothold for organized crime, only it's on a national level. So Ruby was involved in two of those episodes tangentially: the Teamster murder that led to the Teamster pension fund being taken over by the syndicate, and then the murder of James Reagan, which led to the wire service being controlled by the syndicate.

And James Reagan went and talked to a national reporter, and the reporter, Drew Pearson, encouraged him to go to the FBI. He said that Hoover told this reporter that, well, the wire service king, he's being chased by these guys or pursued by these people, but they're important people that have changed their ways and they're good. Two of the guys, Annenberg and Crown, are very notable as Zionists. I mean, super Zionist figures, as I understand it. Annenberg's father later went to jail and was a Lansky associate. Annenberg himself is the guy whose family owned TV Guide and the Philly Inquirer. I mean, they're extremely wealthy people.

And Crown, Henry Crown, his son or grandson was one of the people that was in that mega group with Wexner. I believe Adelson may have been a part of that. That was a pro-Israel lobbying group in the '90s that's connected to people connected to Epstein in different ways. So there's this organized crime element intertwined with Mossad. And Ruby was a part of this national crime syndicate. And I think it goes to the heart of our problem, or it gets close to it, to think that we never really resolved any of these issues with the National Crime Syndicate. They kind of just created a cover story about, oh, this Italian mob is really the Cosa Nostra and so on. And then that's that. It seems to be like a mythology for the way that organized crime really operates.

And the key to it is that it is so intertwined with the national security state, especially because during the Cold War, the idea was that you had to defeat communism. So if you had to ally with drug



dealers, and if those are the only capitalists in the place in Southeast Asia, if the only real capitalism is opium dealers, then I guess you have to work with them because you must defeat communism. But it needs to be noted that people are making money off this all the time. I mean, the narcotics trade is one of the biggest commercial operations in the world if you look at it as a whole. It's right up there with oil and weapons trafficking as the top three generators of economic activity internationally.

### **#M3**

So you mentioned James Angleton a bunch, and I think it's important for us to focus on him because he seems like a main perpetrator of the plot. A lot of evidence points to that, including the fact that he was receiving all these reports on his desk about the main perpetrator of the assassination, Lee Harvey Oswald. So you have this new piece out. It's called "James Angleton, Mossad, the Syndicate, and the CIA's Cuban Business." And those are a lot of characters. So do you mind just first breaking down what their significance is in this assassination plot?

### **#M3**

Sure. So this comes from Angleton's testimony to the Church Committee in 1975, and he had just been fired from the CIA.

### **#M2**

And it was difficult to get him out of there. It really took kind of an operation in and of itself to get rid of him. Apparently, what happened was William Colby became the director of the CIA, but initially, he was working under James Schlesinger, who became the director once Nixon fired Richard Helms. And this is bad for Watergate. It helps to set off Watergate in a sense. But James Schlesinger was called in because he looked at Watergate and saw the CIA connections to the Watergate burglars. He thought this was very worrisome. He wanted to know everything that the CIA had done to go against its charter and break laws and so on.

And he wanted it all put in one file. And he assigns William Colby to do this. Well, eventually, William Colby becomes the CIA director a little bit later, and he decides that Angleton needs to go. And the way that he does this, in part, is by leaking stories to the press about a lot of Angleton's crimes. And he uses Sy Hersh to do this. So Angleton was kind of defensive about his little fiefdom that he had been running because he was in charge of counterintelligence at the CIA, which meant that he was the guardian of the security of the CIA, in a sense, making sure they weren't penetrated by Soviet agents and dealing with spies that would potentially go astray or become security risks.

And we don't know everything that was under his purview, but there were a lot of things the CIA did during this time, like assassinating one of its own officials named Frank Olson, who was dosed with acid at one point and then apparently tossed out of a window on the 10th floor in Manhattan, and he

dies. Sy Hersh eventually, through a source at the CIA, found that, yeah, there was a mechanism in place for dealing with security risks, and that was used against Olson. The real details have never been fully admitted by the government. The guy who was in charge of this little operation was James McCord, who later helps to take down Nixon with Watergate, and who was also involved with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee operations on U.S. soil. He was a guy that worked for Angleton, by and large.

So this is suspicious, and it all points to Angleton having this fiefdom there at the CIA, doing things sort of off the books without the directors knowing. And he's testifying about this to the Church Committee in 1975. One of the things they ask him about is the Israel account that he runs. He not only ran counterintelligence and even coordinated things like, you know, the elimination of agents, apparently, like potentially Frank Olson—we assume he was actually doing this. He was the person in charge of these sorts of operations. But he also ran the Israeli account because he had relations with high-level Zionists that predate the creation of Israel. He was working with Teddy Kollek, who later became the mayor of Jerusalem and was a founding Zionist sort of figure. And he had all these connections to Mossad, and he ran the Mossad desk. He was the liaison to Mossad.

And this was brought to bear in Cuba, and this was not known for a long time. What happens is this is what he tells the Church Committee. He says, well, the Bay of Pigs was exposed too early and all these other operations, and the CIA basically has no operational security at all. So this is a real problem. If we wanted this Cuban business, you know, the operations in Cuba after the Bay of Pigs especially had failed, and they wanted to do Operation Mongoose and these other efforts to subvert Cuba's government and assassinate Castro. If we want this Cuban business to remain secret, and it's so sensitive because we're doing all these serious things, well, the CIA is compromised, says Angleton. So I had to use someone else to be basically overseeing all these operations and reporting to CIA officer Bill Harvey, who was under Angleton.

So he says that he had really no choice but to let this Israeli intelligence officer handle the Cuban business, be the intermediary with the Cuban business that William Harvey was running, with Angleton overseeing this, apparently. Harvey was nominally in charge, but Angleton seems to have been working right with him, and he controlled the conduit of information, which was a Mossad agent. This Cuban business included relations with the mob. William Harvey himself was the person who had worked with Johnny Roselli, the mobster, to do those infamous Castro assassination plots. Another part of this Cuban business was ZR Rifle, which was an assassination program set up by the CIA. It was very secret.

And I found another document saying that documents about ZR Rifle should all be routed to Helms and another chief that's unnamed, but it could have been Angleton. So Angleton's creating all of these flows of documents and control of classified material such that Israel was going to be the go-between on the Cuban business, and the rest of the CIA would be shut out of that. The Oswald information was also, as part of a mole hunt, controlled by Angleton. So all the information on Oswald was sort of controlled by Angleton, both on Oswald and on Cuba. It's interesting because in

the Oswald case of reading his mail, you also have a person who wasn't known to be a Mossad agent, but he later, I believe, retired to Israel.

And he wrote these articles in the Israeli press about the history of Jewish spies, you know, in antiquity and so on. So, he was a Zionist, and he wrote about spy things. He worked for Angleton, who had all these troubling Israeli connections. Was Angleton having the guy surveil Oswald? Was he potentially someone who was a double agent of some kind? Because later, he did go and live in Israel and write about the history of Jewish spies for Israeli outlets. So this is one aspect of it, but in both cases, he's handling Oswald, and only he really understands Oswald, partly because he's using him in this mole hunt. All the Soviets are penetrating everything, so it must be so secret and use figures like Oswald to potentially find out who the mole is.

Right. So I got to control this information. And then on the other side, with this assassination program in the Cuban business, he's also controlling all of that information. And again, the excuse is, well, I have to use this Israeli account because the rest of the CIA is compromised with moles, and the Soviets will find out. So I just have to do this. But in reality, it gave him pretty much almost sole control and an understanding of what this apparatus, this assassination apparatus and mobbed-up program that he was running down there was. So if you're saying, like, did the CIA kill Kennedy? Well, that's a difficult thing to argue, but Angleton seems to have been involved in a couple of these aspects in very suspicious ways.

And he used the excuse of the Soviet Union and anti-communism to create protocols that made it so only he and a tiny number of officials would have any knowledge of what was going on. So he is a very suspicious figure, and his connections to both Israel and the mob are notable. This is a dark quadrant of what the CIA was doing. It's like you could call it a CIA within the CIA or a private version of the CIA, but it's a dark force in US politics. Angleton's political views were essentially like a neoconservative before there was a thing called neoconservatism. He made common cause with the ultra-Zionists because those are the people that kind of form the basis of what we think of as neoconservatism in the '70s. This begins.

So Angleton probably found other people who thought like he did or worked with them in the government. And there was a consensus, I think, among a lot of the oligarchs and national security people that Kennedy had to go. Angleton seems to be a big part of it. He used Mossad in some way and used mob assets as well. The relationship between the mob, the syndicate, the national crime syndicate, and Mossad or Israel or Zionism is a very radioactive thing to even look at. But a lot of people like Peter Dale Scott and Alan Block and, I think, a biographer of Lansky himself have written that Lansky seems to be the person really running the syndicate in the bigger sense and handling all these money laundering operations.

And the Italian mafia thing kind of covered up a lot of this as a sort of cover story. For example, when Lansky helped to provide weapons to Israel for its founding, Nixon goes after the syndicate in a sort of controlled way, but still damages them in some way and starts to investigate Lansky.

Lansky goes to Israel and stays there until 1973. By 1973, Nixon's really in hot water because of Watergate. What's interesting is that of all the people in this milieu of intelligence, mob, Kennedy assassination, you know, figures like Jimmy Hoffa, Sam Giancana, Johnny Rosselli, John Martino, Meyer Lansky—the only guy who doesn't die in an untimely way is Lansky.

### **#M3**

Well, you mentioned Peter Dale Scott, and I have looked at "The American Deep State." I think that's a very interesting book because he kind of draws some continuity between all of these, what he calls, deep events. Peter makes these connections between the JFK assassination, Watergate, Iran-Contra, and 9/11. He draws these parallels. Can you just kind of explain that continuity of how these kinds of shocking events are used and seized upon by the ruling classes in the United States to expand their powers even more?

### **#M2**

Right, so when JFK is killed, they say, well, he's a lone nut, and he did it for no real reason, because he's a lone nut. But then the response after it is to increase surveillance of groups that are potentially violent. Okay, so... If Oswald, for example, was a lone nut, then why? What's the point of dealing with groups? How do you protect yourself from lone nuts by surveilling groups like that? It doesn't exactly make any sense. And, you know, after Watergate, when you end up having the Church Committee do these investigations into the activities of the CIA and the FBI, the one result of it is that instead of it leading to an end of this sort of activity, they sort of go further off the books.

Like they create overseas operations, such as the Safari Club, involving ex-CIA officials who might have been fired because they were a little too extreme and they were trying to clean up the CIA. It also used Egyptian, Saudi, and Iranian intelligence to basically run the CIA when the CIA was too busy or under investigation. So these efforts to try to crack down on some of the clandestine criminality of these entities or to deal with deep events like the Kennedy assassination end up just making the problem worse. And this has happened repeatedly.

And another element that Peter Dale Scott sees connecting a lot of these deep events like Watergate or the JFK assassination and 9/11 is the continuity of government networks or the doomsday network. And this is, I think, why I don't just say, oh, the CIA killed JFK. Because, you know, what I was talking about earlier with Angleton hiding this Cuban business, you know, and using Mossad to do it. I don't know that I got to the key part of that, which was that in the testimony that Angleton gave, still today, if you want that testimony, you'll see it'll say the status is complete with deletions or something like that.

It's like they got rid of the redactions, but there's a deletion. But I actually found the page. Maybe there's more than one page, but there was one page I found that was deleted in an older version of this document. I think one that came out in the '90s that was otherwise very incomplete and kind of

useless. But when you put this one page together that was present, then subsequently deleted, what you see is that Angleton did not tell the director of the CIA that he was using an Israeli asset to handle the most sensitive, potentially explosive operations in the agency's history.

And the CIA director wasn't briefed about the assassination parts. The CIA director, whom JFK put in there, wasn't briefed about the assassination component that was being run here. Angleton admits that he didn't tell them about the Israeli asset who was acting as the liaison there. He sort of lies about it. He says the situation is so dire, the Soviets are going to penetrate it, so I have to use this Israeli agent. Then somebody asks him, "Well, if it's really so risky and dangerous, why wouldn't you tell McCone about this?" and he says, "Oh, he wouldn't have been interested." So, in that way, you can see how Angleton creates, without even oversight of the CIA director, this sort of mechanism involving the mob, Israel, and assassinations right out of Cuba.

But alternatively, on the other hand, you have this militarized part of it, which we could call the doomsday network or continuity of government planning or institutions. This was created to deal with a nuclear attack, especially, or some kind of national emergency that would decapitate the American leadership. So it might kill the president and the vice president or something like that. How would the military be able to come in and basically have martial law and all this overriding power? Communications networks are set up to enable this, and different protocols and emergency measures that you can take.

Well, those elements are involved in different aspects of the JFK assassination, of Watergate, and Iran-Contra. And on 9/11, there's a phone call or phone calls made by Dick Cheney, apparently using continuity of government communications networks. And we've never had access to those. And it should alarm us that back in the '90s, it was Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld who were doing a lot of the planning for these operations. So there are levels of secrecy that they, just as with Angleton saying, if I don't use this Israeli agent, the Soviets will know and then we're doomed. The Cold War will lose to the Soviets because of our bad security.

And meanwhile, he's the person in charge of this security, which makes it more comical. And then there's the doomsday network on the military side that also has super secret networks and protocols and overriding authority to protect in the event of a national emergency. And so the result is we don't know what those elements were really doing in so many cases. This is anti-democratic, ultra-secretive, despotic, authoritarian—whatever word you want to use. But this is not something that makes sense by any liberal democratic understanding of how government is supposed to function. This is really a top-down, kind of disguised, fascistic form of bureaucracy, if you really want to look at the core of it.

## **#M3**

It's very interesting, the connection that you're making, and I guess Peter Dale Scott was making as well, showing this continuity between these kinds of deep events when something very tragic and

shocking happens. And we don't really know why. The official narratives that we're told don't make much sense. And if you want to look into it or have questions about it, you're instantly labeled a conspiracy theorist. Even though conspiracies are real, they do exist. Like the Powell memo, for instance, is a conspiracy that everybody knows about. Allen Dulles, who I've heard you talk about before, wrote these memos for the Council on Foreign Relations back in the 1940s and '50s, talking about why we need global hegemony in order to protect U.S. capitalists and business interests by expanding our empire abroad, and just with this very naked language. And if you look at it, you would say, oh, these are like ruling elites conspiring against the masses. But if you point that out, you're called a conspiracy theorist.

## **#M1**

Right.

## **#M2**

The term "conspiracy theory" is so nonsensical that, in many ways, it's kind of a synecdoche for the counter-enlightenment that we have lived through. The term "conspiracy" is just something bad planned in secret by two or more people and then carried out, or, you know, not—you could have a conspiracy plan without actually doing it. But it's just a plot that is kept secret or a bad plan that is kept secret involving two or more people. In theory, it's just an explanation of something. So there are bad conspiracy theories, and there are bad theories that are not conspiratorial. Like if you try to say 9/11 was not the result of a conspiracy and you have a theory of 9/11 that isn't a conspiracy theory, that would be stupid because everyone agrees that 9/11 was a conspiracy.

And so any explanation or theory of what happened on 9/11 is going to be a conspiracy, right? So that doesn't make any sense. Furthermore, the operations arm of the CIA, its entire job is to conspire, to carry out plans which are more often than not illegal, either by U.S. domestic law or the laws of the countries they're operating in, and to create cover stories so that they can make up lies to explain what happened and so that they don't have to admit something was a CIA operation. So they conspire all the time. And they lie about it all the time. And they've been caught lying about it so many times. And yet still, when the government officials say, oh yeah, this was a democratic uprising, the press takes it seriously.

When, if they were to pay attention to history at all, they would recount that in similar situations, the government has lied about these things for years and years and will always lie about them until they are forced to admit them, right? But they don't do that. We're not given that context. We're just expected to believe known liars who have conspired and then had their conspiracies exposed innumerable times over the decades since World War II. And yet there's a social stigma that the establishment attempts to place on anyone who suggests that the regime, the clandestine service, is doing what they always do, which is to conspire. You're not to say that they are doing what they are doing.

So this is as ridiculous as saying that, like, oh, I don't believe in... If you say you don't believe in state conspiracies, it's like saying you don't believe in the Department of Motor Vehicles or something. It's idiotic. But yet, this is what liberals and a lot of so-called leftists think. They think it's like a sign of sophistication to not believe the government is capable of secretive and sinister intrigues. It makes no sense at all, and it's kind of stupefied us politically because we can't address things like the assassination of the most popular head of state, at least since Franklin Roosevelt, in 1963. We still can't be told about the truth of that.

### **#M3**

I mean, is there any group of people that spreads conspiracy theories more than the U.S. government, though? We're told that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, that they were collaborating with and conspiring with al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden. That wasn't true. We were told at the same time that they perpetrated the anthrax attacks when it turns out that that came from Fort Detrick in Maryland. Oh, we were told that the Hunter Biden laptop was Russian disinformation. Really, the list goes on. And these are very consequential conspiracy theories. It's really good to talk to you. It's very important to get these facts through to people so that they know what happened in the past, because this is not just the past. These things obviously continue. If you think that the CIA stopped doing assassinations and stopped meddling in domestic and international affairs in all sorts of unsavory ways, then I'm sorry, but you're naive.

### **#M1**

I would just like to add, to piggyback on what you're saying, it's not just that the U.S. government puts out some bogus conspiracy theories. It's that since the end of World War II, pretty much the whole of the U.S.

### **#M2**

Foreign policy has been organized around conspiracy theories, and often very contrived ones, like the global communist conspiracy. That was the phrase used by J. Edgar Hoover. You had to have that as the conspiracy, as the ruling cosmology of the day, because that way you could justify such aggressive policies overseas, overthrowing governments and bolstering dictatorships, and so on. But then, when the Cold War ends, you have a brief time where the conspirators are international drug traffickers and maybe this or that terrorist group. But especially after 9/11, the new terror, the new conspiracy, is the so-called Islamo-fascist conspiracy, or whatever they would call it at the time, to talk about global Islamism as this conspiracy to impose Sharia law and create the caliphate, and so on. They have to create a conspiracy theory there, right? Russiagate was a bogus conspiracy theory.

I mean, the most irresponsible conspiracy theorists, and the ones whose irresponsible conspiracy theories have the most grave and often deadly consequences, would be the U.S. regime. So that

aspect is just... Once you grasp the duplicity here, it will make you very much opposed to the regime that we live under and the cosmology that they impose on us through the media, academia, politicians, and so on. It's a system that I think is crumbling, and the global majority is going to overcome it. And I think the U.S. will first lose power overseas as a result. That's part of what we're seeing.

And then it will make this regime seem very weak and kind of pathetic as it tries to control things domestically because politically we can't do anything against them. It seems to date there's no workers' party or no group of people to stand against this system of imperial capitalism, we could call it, and global hegemonism, as the Chinese sometimes call it. They've so divided us and scrambled our brains in different ways to make us politically neutral that I think it's going to take the rest of the world's job to somehow stop this. And I would hope that somehow it'll become clear how we in the West might do something about it. But honestly, we're mostly spectators here because we're so befuddled and neutered by our own political regime and the sense-making systems that we have around us that we can't do much of anything.

### **#M3**

Well, it's not a really optimistic note to end on, but I think it's accurate. And I really, again, appreciate you coming today. If people want to read and watch your work, where should they go?

### **#M1**

The American Exception podcast is on Patreon, so just look up American Exception Patreon, and you should be able to find it. We're also on YouTube; there's an American Exception channel. And on Substack, where I occasionally publish, you can find American Exception there as well.

### **#M2**

The book is "American Exception: Empire in the Deep State," and there's an audiobook version of that. There's also a documentary film coming out before too long that deals with the book and related topics that I have studied. So I've put out a lot of material, especially the podcast. Even though I have a grim assessment of the U.S. political system, I'm actually more optimistic in the long run because the fate of empires is to fall, and the U.S. empire is the biggest, richest empire in human history, and it is going to fall also. Once it does, the illusions and the mystique should change, and it should change everything. So I'm actually optimistic on the whole, even as I am very pessimistic or grim about the U.S. system. I don't mean to be a downer exactly. The rest of the world sees the U.S. and the West for what it is. The West is not yet there, but I think it's going to become harder and harder to deny reality, and Trump is accelerating things in a sense.