

More Disinformation About the Kennedy Assassination II



by Servando Gonzalez

December 30, 2021

Historical Forensics

To most people, forensics has to do with crime, autopsies, and the like. But, like Yahoo, Google, and other Internet search engines, forensic science mostly has to do with finding links. The basic principle of forensic science, as stated by Dr. Edmond Locard, one of the greatest experts in forensic science, is very simple: every contact leaves a trace. Finding these traces at the scene of a crime and, through them, establishing the links to the criminal is what forensic science is all about.

The job of the forensic investigator consists in discovering these links, and revealing the links between the crime and the criminal. Unknowingly, the authors who first pointed to the CFR as the true seat of an anti-American conspiracy were practicing the science of historical forensics. And, despite the efforts of the criminal conspirators at the CFR to erase all traces linking them to their crimes against the American people, these authors discovered an amazing fact: behind every act of treason against this country and its people there were always one or more members of the Council on Foreign Relations or their parasite organizations working hard in the shadows to betray us, the American people. The JFK assassination was not an exception to this rule.

Even though I have been studying the globalist conspirators of the Council on Foreign Relations for many years and I have written four books about them, in which I have briefly mentioned the assassination of President Kennedy, it was not until I read Professor Donald Gibson's book *Battling Wall Street* that I fully understood how and why the CFR globalist conspirators used their assets, Castro and the CIA, to kill President Kennedy. Gibson's book is the only one I know that tells in detail how CFR members in the press fought tooth and nail against Kennedy. Unfortunately, Gibson doesn't mention how CFR members infiltrated into Kennedy's administration betrayed him, as well as the

reasons they had to do it.

Dealing with an American conspiracy, I have dedicated much of my analysis of the Kennedy assassination to study the Council on Foreign Relations, the true center of a conspiracy some authors call the Invisible Government of the United States. In my investigation I found out that most of the links related to the JFK assassination point to the CFR and its master, David Rockefeller.

I have devoted most of my book on the Kennedy assassination to analyze the true role of the two main suspects of carrying out it, Castro and the CIA. Many books written about the CIA mention the Agency's inept attempts to assassinate Fidel Castro. Most of them, however, have failed to discover Castro's actions as an agent provocateur working hard to help the very people he claimed to hate. The result of this effort is that Castro's true role in the Kennedy assassination has been mostly ignored or distorted.

Over the past 50 years, more than 2000 books have been published about the Kennedy assassination. Most books dealing with the role of the CIA in the assassination, however, are either anti-CIA, written by authors who consider themselves "progressive," liberal Democrats or outright leftists, or pro-

CIA, written by authors who see themselves as “conservative,” Republicans, or outright rightists. Also, not many books about the Kennedy assassination have noticed that most of the people participating in the cover-up were CFR members. But, paraphrasing Upton Sinclair, “It is difficult to get a man to see something, when his salary depends upon his not seeing it!”

Moreover, most of these books focus on how it happened rather than on who was the mastermind who conceived the plan, gave the orders to carry it out and why he did it. In this sense my book is a totally different kind of book, perhaps difficult to classify. I just ask the reader to read it with the same open mind I have had to write it.

Finally, I devoted a large amount of this book to study an apparently non-related event: the assassination in 1948 of Colombian populist leader Jorge Eliécer Gaitań. The reason for this is because I have found out that the operational methodology – the *modus operandi* – used in Gaitań's assassination – in which Castro, the CIA and many important CFR members played key roles – was closely followed in the JFK assassination.

Actually, as I showed in this book, the Kennedy assassination was like a carbon copy of Gaitań's assassination. Moreover, the motive was essentially the same, because both Gaitań and Kennedy had threatened the interests of the same people.

Some Kennedy assassination scholars were salivating about a new batch of documents related to the CIA and assassination just declassified following authorization from President Trump. Apparently they believe they may get lucky and find the Holy Grail of the Kennedy assassination: a smoking gun in the form of a CIA memo from somebody ordering somebody to assassinate President Kennedy, or even a memo from some very powerful individual ordering the CIA Director to assassinate Kennedy. Well, this only shows that whoever expects to find

such document is using the wrong research and methodological tools to study this subject.

The conspiracy surrounding the JFK assassination is like a huge puzzle of which many pieces are missing or have been intentionally put out of place in order to mislead investigators. This explains why most analysts who have studied the phenomenon using the wrong method have failed to find the true source of the problem. Nevertheless, when you look at the whole thing coldly and from a distance the pieces simply spring into place.

Consequently, rather than using the traditional research and analysis of the historian I have used in my book a methodology coming from the field counterintelligence. It consists in tackling the problem in reverse, a process intelligence officers call "walking back the cat." It is a sort of "acid test" used to determine retrospectively the loyalty or treachery of a particular agent, or, as I did in my book, of a whole government agency such as the CIA or a policy organization such as the Council on Foreign Relations.

Historians vs Intelligence Analysts

The goal of the historian and the intelligence analyst is basically the same: search for facts and establish the truth. Their approach, however, is totally different. Give a historian a document and he will do three things: check it for accuracy; evaluate its place in the context of his own knowledge of its subject matter; and try to exploit it for producing a finished paper or book.

Now give the same document to an intelligence officer. He will do four things, but quite different ones. First, he will examine it to verify that its source is the one it purports to be; second, he will try to know if its source has disseminated it wittingly or unwittingly, and, if unwittingly, if its source knows the fact that the document has been compromised;

third, he will attempt to find, guess, or intuit the source's real motives for disseminating it; and, finally, he will try to use it – by divulging it, or by not divulging it – to influence somebody, either his employers, his employees, or his enemies.

In this sense, while the historian is trained to react *ad causam*, the intelligence analyst reacts *ad hominem*. The historian focuses on subject matter and its relevance to understanding recorded events, the intelligence analyst focuses on people and their motives. The tools of the historian are quite different from the tools of the intelligence analysts and, therefore, the results of their research will show considerable differences.

As a rule, intelligence analysts always keep in mind that some of their sources, particularly live ones, will try to intentionally deceive them. That is why, contrary to historians, intelligence analysts take vulnerability to deception into account, and do so explicitly. Therefore, one can conclude that intelligence analysts have better methodological tools than historians to successfully analyze relatively recent intelligence operations such as the Kennedy assassination, where deceit and disinformation played an important role.

Moreover, the first thing intelligence analysts must keep in mind is that, despite their best efforts, in the intelligence field they will *never* find the whole picture. The best thing they can do, therefore, is to analyze the facts they have and from them do their best to infer the rest. The bottom line is that ninety percent of this final product we call intelligence comes from reading critically, remembering, associating and analyzing, as well as looking for inconsistencies, implausibilities, gaps in knowledge, conflicts with known information and suspicious coincidences and, very rarely, discovering new key facts,

In the study of intelligence organizations, such as the OSS, the Mossad, the MI6, the KGB, or the CIA, we must always keep in mind that we are not dealing with innocuous aspects of history such as the origins of New Orleans Jazz, or Roman architecture during the Republic. On the contrary, this is recent history with a high content of intelligence and espionage and, therefore, deception. And, due to the fact that the basic principles of tradecraft [1] don't change much over time among its different practitioners, intelligence services are reluctant to give their past, current, or potential opponents, any feedback about the success or failure of their past operations. As a matter of fact their goal is to disinform their opponents as much as they can by keeping them in the dark.

Most of what an intelligence service claims has been its successes are most likely its failures, and vice versa. In intelligence and espionage things are seldom what they seem. No wonder Sun Tzu's main precept is "All warfare is based on deception." Under this light, events like the Bogotazo riots, the Bay of Pigs invasion, and the September 11, 2001 events, just to mention three of the CIA's alleged greatest failures, need to be reevaluated.

The bottom line is that nobody is ever going to find the smoking gun about the Kennedy assassination in the form of a declassified CIA document. First, for the simple reason that it doesn't exist. This is not the way these things work in the real world. The orders to carry out this type of action are never written out, but given verbally, tacitly expressed in a cryptical way in highly nuanced conversations – Will no one rid me of this meddlesome priest? Secondly, because, even if such document ever surfaces, taking at face value the information appearing in photocopies of strongly edited documents provided by an organization that has a whole department devoted to the falsification of documents is a high-level form of idiocy.

When OSS Director William Donovan, following orders from his Rockefeller masters, told one of his assassins to get rid of Gen. George Patton, he most likely alleged that Patton was becoming pro-Nazi and, in order to save his image as a hero, it was necessary to terminate him. When Fidel Castro told Gen. Patricio de la Guardia to assassinate Chile's President Salvador Allende, he told him that Allende was planning to surrender to the military and, in order to save for posterity his image as a hero who fought them to the end, he must to be killed. In the same fashion, some of the low-level participants in the JFK assassination most likely were told that they were helping the American people to get rid of a President that had become soft on communism.

So, if it is most likely that we will never find the key document pointing to the person who gave the order to assassinate President Kennedy, what can we do? Well, as James Jesus Angleton, the CIA's legendary counterintelligence chief once said, "If one could not read the enemy's files, one could at least read his mind." By this Angleton meant that a patient accumulation and analysis of facts during a long period of time allows us to decipher the enemy's thinking and accurately guess his actions.

Finding the true causes of the assassination of President Kennedy is vital to understanding today's America. Nearly every form of the growing assault on freedoms that has overrun our country in the past 50 years has its roots in the assassination of President Kennedy. JFK was seemingly the last opportunity the American people had to stop the growing tyranny of the CFR conspirators' Invisible Government.

Today, a hundred years after John Fitzgerald Kennedy was born, an investigation of the true causes of his assassination is more relevant than ever because it connects directly to the communo-fascist growth of the U.S. government and its disregard of the rule of law, the growing economic gap between the working class and the hyper rich, the erosion of the

independence of the mainstream press, the growing of a pervasive surveillance society and the encroaching police state. Once the CFR conspirators were able to get away with the assassination of President Kennedy, it was a short step to the assassinations of Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King Jr., and many others they perceived as a threat. It was also a short step to the CIA mass assassinations in Vietnam under Operation Phoenix, the Waco massacre, the 9/11 events and the official sanctioning of torture at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo.

It seems that the conspirators' success in assassinating President Kennedy pushed them into a frenzy of assassination, abuse, theft, corruption and war. Apparently guided by the principle that the end justifies the means, they felt no constraints on their way to reach their cherished goal: a New World Order.

A long time ago Karl Marx wrote that Capital was born dripping with blood and dirt from head to toe, from every pore. I cannot think of a more accurate description of the birth of the CFR conspirators' New World Order.

© 2021 Servando Gonzales – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Servando Gonzales: servandoglez05@yahoo.com

Notes:

1. Tradecraft: the basic techniques, the *modus operandi* of a particular intelligence service in the conduct of its espionage activities. According to CIA veteran William Hood, tradecraft, though mysterious to outsiders, is just a "little more than a compound of common sense, experience, and certain almost universally accepted security practices . . ." William Hood, *Mole* (New York: Ballantine, 1982), p. xiv.

My book [*Partners in Crime: The Rockefeller, CFR, CIA and Castro Connection*](#) to the Kennedy Assassination is available at the NewsWithViews store.