

# Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2008-08/msg00278.html>

---

- *From:* [Willie.Mookie@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:Willie.Mookie@xxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Thu, 14 Aug 2008 20:24:05 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Aug 14, 3:34 pm, Eric Chomko <pne.cho...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Aug 14, 12:24 am, Willie.Moo...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:> On Aug 11, 4:52 pm, Eric Chomko <pne.cho...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:  
Wille Mook wrote:

[...]

Clearly, the CIA has the capacity if it wishes  
to ensnare and  
discredit a President.

Or support a boob like the current one.

Does it seem reasonable that the CIA would operate to protect the USA  
\*from\* a President that it had determined was proposing a course  
detrimental to the USA if it had to? from a candidate that might  
become such a President? what about political activists in the USA?

Who are they to make that decision? I question decision-makers that are  
unelected officials.

When the Congress decides to go to war, they put Generals, Admirals,  
and so forth in charge of the war, and leave it to the experts. Who  
are these Generals? They are un-elected officials – yet they have  
the authority in the context of the war to execute the war  
efficiently. Its impossible to carry out a war with every decision  
by the field commanders second guessed by an elected official.  
Obviously, field commanders must have the authority to run their  
battles and their war without such oversight. To this end you have a  
specialist class of experts to carry on the war without such  
oversight.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

In the nuclear age, we entered a 'Cold War' period – where the exigencies of war applied, but the war would never be allowed to go 'hot' – that is, a global thermonuclear war would be equivalent to a defeated USA in this view, and so, there was a moral imperative on the level of warfare to AVOID conflict by any means necessary. This required the CREATION of a specialist class to carry on the cold war without political oversight – for the very same reason you can't have politicians telling field commander what sort of tactics to carry out.

Now, in both cases, you CAN have 'rules of engagement' that theoretically protects everyone – but such rules themselves can get mangled in the heat of battle.

The OSS was the intelligence arm of the Army in WW2 – and it was in a natural position to carry out this role in the nuclear age – to carry out a cold war.

what about political activists outside the USA? On this spectrum, where would the CIA limit itself? If it does not limit itself then it MUST evaluate and plan to use its authority responsibly (by its light) all the time.

Congress and the Supreme Court oversee what the Executive Branch does, which includes the CIA.

and the Army – but when a decision is made to go to war, we cannot let the politicians tell the field commanders how to prosecute the war. Same here. There was a decision to engage in a cold war – the purpose of which is to keep the world secure from a global thermonuclear conflagration. This benefits primarily the USA – but it also benefits all of us.

You may think the President a boob or not. The CIA – if it has the responsibility of protecting the USA from a popular politician it thinks is a mole for a foreign power – evaluates THAT risk – regardless of what else is going on.

Again, I question unelected decision-makers.

The elected decision makers made a decision following WW2 to maintain a war footing so that the USA could engage in a cold war – that is, do everything needed to avoid a global hot war from breaking out in the nuclear age. They were given their rules of engagement and marching

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

orders, and the equivalent of generals and admirals in the intelligence community, carried out the battles after reviewing them with the President and the various Congressional intelligence committees.

[...]

Are you claiming the Cuban exile community mostly in Miami liked JFK?

I don't know – the JFK library is saying that.

What about everywhere else?

<shrug> the cubans seemed to be happy in the photos! – what people say of JFK after he died really doesn't matter does it?

<http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/JFK+in+History/JFK+and...>

What you fail to mention in your commentary is that these three NSAMs were written on June 28, 1961 – two months AFTER the invasion!!

That is not a failure! It is a point that states that JFK as a lesson learned from the BOP that he no longer trusted the CIA. He wanted all paramilitary operations handed over to the Joint Chiefs of Staff (the Military!).

I thought you meant those NSAMs \*caused\* the BOP failure.

No, no! These NSAMs were written as a RESULT of the BOP failure!

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

Right – I got it, I thought you said something different before – so, we seem to be in agreement about that.

I see now I misread what you wrote. So, yeah, all I'm saying is that the NSAMs didn't have any impact on the BOP since they were written after. That they got a few noses out of joint – that's absolutely true. Was that enough for them to organize an assassination of the President of the United States? NO.

It was another straw of many. The last? Probably not, but certainly it added to the weight on the Camel's back, so to speak.

I think the CIA – if it were involved in the assassination – would have handled the decision professionally. That is, JFK would have had to merit it according to the rules of engagements and the operating plans in force at the time. To my mind that suggests there was some evidence pre-existing that suggested he might be a mole on the order of Alger Hiss or Armand Hammer. This was rejected at the time of his election, but then re-interpreted in light of the decisions he made in his last 12 months in office – reflecting the probability that there was a larger conspiracy. Then, there was probably a study – assuming again the CIA was involved – showing the outcomes of various courses of action – with a formal decision being made – following all the rules – that JFK was out. The likely involved LBJ and Congressional leaders. Also, they likely killed the CIA operatives who organized the whole thing – again following the double blind procedures set up at the outset. I'm assuming again that the CIA was involved which is may not have been.

You seem to suggest that people get pissed off and then decide to kill someone. If it were that easy, and that poorly thought out – there would be leaks and there would be a lot more killings. No, there has to be a pre-existing set of conditions in the rules that let the CIA to take out a candidate, a president, a congressman and so forth – and those rules have to be followed – and the pre-conditions must be met. JFK and the whole Kennedy clan with their checkered background – and liberal ties – may have something in it that suggests there was a connection back to Russia – for him to have been elected, means that the CIA didn't think much of that evidence. However, following a series of decisions that challenged the agency to reinvent itself, it had to have chosen not to, and reinterpreted the evidence it earlier discarded in a different light. It then followed professionally laid out plans – which likely involved people getting killed who carried out those plans. i.e. Ruby and Oswald and unfortunate witnesses, along with RFK weren't the only ones to bite the dust on this – gray men in gray offices died too – they had to – if

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

the CIA was involved – which it may not be. So, anyone filing FOIA – should look for patterns of deaths mental breakdowns, reassignments, accidents, WITHIN the CIA – following the assassination.

Did it cause some in power to revisit the theory that the Kennedy's were moles like Alger Hiss and Armand Hammer? That would be the response. They wouldn't even admit to themselves that they were doing it for selfish reasons. They would develop the information they needed to honestly say the President needed to be killed – if that's indeed what happened.

Who makes that decision?

If the agency has the authority to take out a president under certain conditions, they have an entire staff of people organized to test those conditions constantly. Once the decision is made, then there is a procedure already on the books to involve others in the process, the VP, specific leaders in the Senate and House are likely contacts – then there are people to carry it out – already in place that get called up and so forth.

Right-wingers

Are subject to this analysis as well

in industry that honestly thought the Russians were crazier than our own crazies?!

I am assuming if the CIA were involved that the organizing documents of the CIA permit such action and spell out the conditions such action will be required. This presupposes that they must take any means necessary to avoid a global thermonuclear war in the coming period creating the conditions for a cold war that could not be allowed to go hot – but requires a professional class of experts in intelligence and covert operations that maintained

Hell man, Linus Pauling was called a "Red" by many including Hoover.

Yes, and these folks figured the OSS leadership were perfectly suited to be the generals in the coming Cold War.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

Pauling had the double helix down way before Watson and Crick and was barred from leaving the country because the State Dept., thanks to Hoover, called him a Red. That same sort of lunacy, dubbed McCarthyism, is what leads to thinking that JFK was supporting them and not us.

You are making moral judgments over details that don't matter based on an outdated morality. The big picture is that

- a) the bulk of the world's people were poised to develop industrially;
- b) all societies who developed industrially engaged in major warfare and projected power globally
- c) warfare in the coming period would be nuclear
- d) the USA would get involved or be a target of any major war

therefore,

We are in a period NOW where we must take ALL MEANS NECESSARY to

- a) keep development slow to non-existent so that
- b) all societies are too part to even think of warfare and those that wish to project power are focused on their own backyards;
- c) keep technology secret and contained so nuclear capabilities do not spread
- d) keep USA isolated from conflicts and world affairs so they do not get involved or become a target

This is the cold war – we're still in it. 9/11 changed things – because 9/11 was a failure of (d) and possibly (b) – and us enriching the Middle East – following Nixon's going off the gold standard, and letting the oil companies set energy policy for the USA – was a failure of (a).. and Nixon's detente with China has led to a failure of (c) with the Chinese helping Korea and Pakistan get the bomb.

You seem to think that the timing should have been before hand. No!

I thought you were saying the BOP was caused by these NSAMs – I misread what you wrote. I am saying just what you are saying – that the NSAMs were a reaction to the failure of the BOP.

Good.

JFK wrote these memos as a reaction to the failure of the BOP. What part of THAT don't YOU get?!

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

That's exactly what I was saying because I thought you were implying the JFK caused the failure at BOP and these NSAMs proved it. In response to that apparent statement – which you didn't make I now see – I was saying that these NSAMs came after the BOP and could not have affected the BOP one bit.

It was the BOP that caused the NSAMs not the other way around.

agreed

The invasion had already failed. What these NSAMs are about are Bundy, McNamara and Kennedy's efforts to make damned fucking sure the President, or any future President for that matter, wouldn't have his fucking dick hanging out after committing resources and people (even non-nationals as in this case!)

The memos were based upon lessons learned. Do you not see where the CIA was stripped of power?

Absolutely.

Or at least that was what was attempted by these memos?

That wouldn't have been enough for the CIA to organize a coup. There had to have been information already circulating that the Kennedy's were on Stalin's payroll or something like that.

Or, that the MIC, of which Ike warned the contry about on his way out, decided that JFK was going to cost them too much money by making the DOD basically go dormant during the Cold War.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

The CIA wouldn't have been involved for something not directly impacting their marching orders, and if they weren't involved they would have destroyed any attempt on JFK's life. No, there had to have been specific order of battle so to speak based on pre-existing rules of engagement – and JFK had to have something that existed in his background that triggered the pre-existing panel to begin looking at doing him in after he made his series of decisions that adversely impacted the ability of the CIA to carry out its mission. Understand, that in the Cold War– the CIA is more important than the Army or Navy or Air Force – it is the primary instrument of national policy – and must remain flexible enough and capable enough to meet ANY threat cooked up by a scientifically advanced adversary in the nuclear age.

Even if it were unlikely, if there was any scintilla of evidence, they would have analyzed that in light of his recent actions and stated goals, applied a Bayesian analysis to it and generated a paper saying that the President was not acting on behalf of the best interests of the USA and had violated his oath of office –and was part of a Communist conspiracy – yadayadayada.. before they organized a coup – if that's what they did. LBJ had to have been a part of it – it would be interesting to see whom he met with in the days and weeks preceding the assassination of Diem.

Wealthy Texans within the oil and defense industries?

No, it wouldn't have been that shallow. If it were that easy to trigger CIA involvement, we'd be a banana republic already where the winner arrests and murders his opponent after each election. The CIA is more professional than that – if it were involved at all. It may very well be that it is forbidden for the CIA to murder a sitting president no matter what the provocation. However, I cannot imagine folks like Hoover and Dulles allowing a Manchurian Candidate free reign. At the same time, I cannot imagine these same folks letting the US sink to using the CIA as a lever to become the world's richest banana republic. That is a failure mode that's easy to see and avoid. The trouble is – rules of engagement and so forth – have their own less obvious failure modes.

That is, look at the dates of the invasion – look at what happened – and look at the dates on the NSAMs – and what the President was saying.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

Yes, I know!

Me too! lol. I thought you had said (but I see now you did not) that the NSAMs proved JFK had screwed around with things and caused the BOP failure. Since the NSAMs came after – they were the result of the BOP – not the cause of the BOP – on that we agree – I thought we did not. That's all.

In the intervening two months from April to June the President was given a lot of stories FROM the CIA and DOD explaining the 'failure' in Cuba – and in response to that the President with HIS advisors was laying down the law to both those groups of assholes – don't fuck with the President!

Right, but do you see where it said "Joint Chiefs of Staff" several times, and "paramilitary", also several times, and how paramilitary ops were to be turned over to the JCS?!? Translation: Covert operations going away from the CIA and shifted over to the military, as per JFK's memos.

Yes – and in retro-spect – JFK needed to tread a little more lightly in dealing with these fellows – reassuring them personally that this was in the best interests of the USA and so forth – it might not have changed things – if they did organize a coup – but it is likely that it might. haha – but we're piling speculation upon speculation here – and I get rather tired of that – haha.

I think you're missing a huge point regarding the "follow the money" angle about all this.

If the CIA was involved, it wasn't about money – it was about the security of the USA.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

Clearly, JFK wasn't killed over pure ideology related to Communism vs. Capitalism. He was killed because a powerful group was being hit in their pocketbooks due to his policies.

No – not at all. If it were that easy to subvert the agency, we'd already be more controlled than Marcos' Spain! lol. No, no, no. The money serves the CIA – not the other way round. If the CIA were involved, then they had to be convinced – to the point of scientific certainty – that the USA would be better off as a nation by the assassination. Period. Now, these NSAMs reign in the power of the CIA. Perhaps there are others still classified, that did more damage – perhaps the firings were viewed as a concerted effort to undermine the agency – with clear evidence – still classified – that JFK was doing this to harm the USA – at the behest of Russia. If such a story could be scientifically validated – and if the agency has the authority from the outset to murder a sitting President under these conditions – i.e. the USA is better off after – THEN and only then – would such action have taken place.

Those  
same felt and got what they wanted out of LBJ. Who does that leave?

Once you have the rules in place, and the process in place to execute those rules – then all that has to happen is that the process conditions are met and the action takes place – if no one has the guts to stand up and say no.

Look at the case of Colonel Stanislav Petrov. In 1983 Petrov deviated from standard Soviet doctrine by positively identifying a missile attack warning as a false alarm. This decision, according to several sources, was a major factor in preventing an accidental retaliatory nuclear attack on the United States. This was a high risk decision by Petrov – and cost him his career. But, we are all alive today to thank him for it. IF the CIA was involved in the assassination of JFK, it had to be a similar malfunction of a pre-existing process – which no one was able, or willing, to make a high risk decision to stop.

You think the CIA is hired by business interests. No, the CIA uses business interests to carry out its mission. The only failing is common mode failure not being able to question or make high risk decisions within the organization.

That's all this is. Any effort to paint it as anything more is ludicrous – any effort to say it had any impact on April's operations – is also ludicrous and impossible.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

Okay, so these memos get written AND Dulles, Cabell and Bissell, the top 3 men in the CIA get replaced a few months later

Yes – but I doubt that given the nature of these men's commitment to the USA – that their sacking alone would have resulted in a CIA backed coup to kill JFK.

No, but they sure as hell could be counted on when the operation came down, no?

No, the way the CIA has to work for it to actually carry out its mission – is that there had to be scientific quality proof that JFK dead left the USA stronger than JFK alive. The CIA would never be involved in internecine rivalry that in the end would weaken the USA. In fact, any claim of controlling political discourse within the country must stem from the fact that a Civil War would so weaken the USA that it would be at risk – so, political discourse leading to such a situation would be managed to avoid it. See? If the CIA is as involved as some fear – it HAS to be this way – for it to be otherwise would mean that we would already be living in such a capricious and repressive regime – we wouldn't be having this conversation! lol.

Bissell, the plans guy, what kind of plans did he do? Coup de etat and that sort of thing. Assassinations!

Of course – if the CIA has responsibility for dealing with a sitting President that is a Soviet mole – with a pre-existing authority to take him out – then those plans are ALREADY worked out in detail. It is merely developing the conditions so that the process in place is triggered.

Like the malfunctioning soviet satellite that Petrov refused to believe – it may be an unfortunate set of conditions that JFK created that set off the process – and there was no Petrov like character willing to risk his career or even his life – making high risk decisions.

Cabell, sacred cow of Intell since WWII. His brother just happens to be the mayor of Dallas in 1963!

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

You can see all sorts of shadows – but if the CIA was involved in the assassination of JFK – something we cannot establish with certainty – then the CIA operated according to procedures in principles in place at the time – and no one stood up and said no. It was an unfortunate malfunction, or the evidence developed against JFK was incontrovertible.

Once the decision was made – if it was made – then it would be carried out professionally – and such correlations would be expected. Such correlations are not proof of the original thesis however. When the evidence is released – along with other records – we'll see.

Dulles, sits on the Warren Commission after being sacked by JFK all they while investigating the assassination itself! More like making sure the CIA doesn't get implicated actually. You don't smell a rat in these three?!

Sure. But this is all weirdness. Lets break it down to something obvious. JFK gets killed, then RFK in June 1968 – a few months earlier MLK, Malcolm X in 1965, Medgar Evers in 1963 – ever since Sun Tzu wrote the Art of War – assassination has been an important means to carry out an effective war effort. Now, behind closed doors at the end of world war two – we have a group of people who worry about;

- 1) the propensity of societies to engage in warfare as they industrialize
- 2) the bulk of humanity on the verge of industrializing
- 3) the fact that the USA gets involved in every single world conflict because of its leading position
- 4) the fact that any future conflict will likely involve nuclear weapons
- 5) the fact that the USA will not survive a surprise nuclear attack if unprepared..

this creates the conditions necessary to create a new sort of professional soldier – that operates in secret – to carry out a cold war – to maintain conditions in the world that keep the world from slipping into a global thermonuclear conflict – this is beyond communism, beyond selfish interest – the USA will cease to exist if such a war is allowed to occur – so we must take steps to make sure it does not.

That is the organizing principle behind the CIA – and we are at war – right now – and if this cadre of experts decides that the USA is safer with someone dead than with someone alive – then they will organize to make sure that someone is dead – no matter who they are or how deserving they are – or what the rules outside the agency say should happen – to do any less makes the rules moot since the USA would cease

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

to exist if left in an unsafe condition.

Not taken into consideration is the danger of what I have called here common mode failure – and the inability of the agency to effectively take high risk decisions that would avoid such failure.

Now ask yourself that if the same three had been Soviets in the KGB and the same thing happened over there with their Premier; you'd be fine with LHO lone nut as the killer?

Who knows? You can argue until you're blue in the face and it gets you nowhere since you don't have any knowledge. You are accepting things as articles of faith. I prefer to look at things rather simply. JFK was killed, RFK was killed Teddy was discredited – at interesting times in their careers. If the CIA was involved – it was involved at a professional level – not a selfish or narrow level. That is not to say that if it was involved, it wasn't a failure or malfunction of the rules of engagement. It was. or it seems so – but even that is a guess about a guess about a guess – haha..

- 1) if the CIA was involved and
- 2) if there was evidence of JFK malfeasance
- 3) I am assuming the evidence should have lead to a high risk decision to ignore it.

see? You can fabricate all sorts of things in your head – but without accurate sure knowledge – you are only going to see what you want to see. You see conservatives and money interests killing a liberal candidate. That's more a reflection of your internal thought process than fact. I see the CIA being setup for deadly serious purpose – and so, I see that.

Somehow we are supposed to  
simply be above that sort of thing because were are we!

No the CIA is above all that because its primary goal is to maintain the safety and security of the USA in the nuclear age against a very specific range of threats. If the CIA has authority to take out a sitting president under certain conditions, those conditions will be very well spelled out. Furthermore, those conditions will be scientifically proven. Finally, there will be rules of engagement. This will be proof against misuse of this power in the minds of those who set it up. They under-estimate the potential of complex systems to malfunction – as in the case of the Soviet satellite – and the need for folks in the decision making process – to be authorized to make high risk decisions – to avoid common mode failure.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

What  
Bullshit!!!

If the CIA was as compliant as you suggest, we would already look longingly at the freedoms of Marcos' Spain! lol. Fact is, you are attempting to paint the assassination of JFK in terms of class – conservative vs. liberal, rich vs. poor, ignoring that Kennedy was one of the richest families on Earth at the time. This is your agenda. Its obvious.

I look at the same situation and say – the CIA is not compliant. It cannot be and still function. If the CIA was involved – then I view that as a failure of the agency to detect common mode failure and take high risk decisions to avoid such malfunctions of the processes put in place.

Of course, the CIA might not have been involved. It might have been the mob, or some other special interest – in that case, yeah, sure. But who knows? Its only an agency like the CIA that has the staying power to make sure that RFK and Teddy don't become avenues of their undoing. So this is suggestive but by no means conclusive.

I \*do\* think if there was any stain on the private life of ANY of the Kennedy's that suggested there might be a connection back to Stalin, the Communists, and so forth – THAT would have been re-evaluated in light of THESE decisions – and blown into a rationalization to implement a pre-existing SIOP that involved a coup of a harmful President. That is, if these men or others like them, did organize to kill JFK, they convinced themselves it was the right thing to do given the best available evidence at the time..

Or they were driven by greed.

Who? Then all they have to do is wait for the next election. sheez. Look, you have to ask yourself – are these wealthy powerful folks so poor that they can't wait and buy the next election? haha.. Of course they can. That by far is the easiest path for them. So that shoots in the head the idea that a bunch of rich bastards organized this. That leaves two possibilities – a band of malcontents with no real power – mob guys, Castro, whatever... – or the CIA executing some process that already pre-existed and got triggered somehow and couldn't be stopped once it was triggered.

I think you project your emotions onto them.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

You're the one talking about emotions – I'm not! lol. Why do you need to see this as a class warfare thing? Hell, LBJ said that he thought JFK would have died of Addison's disease before the end of his second term. There's nothing the President could have done while in office that very rich very powerful families and businesses could not have undone after he left office. So, he didn't go into Vietnam and Bell helicopter would have to carry a few more years' losses on the textron division before they became profitable. This isn't a reason to kill a sitting president. No, the only two things that make sense is – some malcontents (either alone or as a group) do it, or the CIA has proven to itself that the president is a clear and present danger to the USA in the nuclear age and must execute the plans it has in place already in that eventuality.

Of course  
once this happened – if it happened – the requirement to maintain the secret and so forth – would take precedence following the killing.

Clearly all the CIA did during the Cold War years under Ike made them more emboldened.

Hubris.

Does that make it right?

You are trying to inject morality into a process who's only measure of performance is the answer to the following question; Is the USA safer and stronger in the nuclear age as a result of this action? If so, then the action MUST be carried out – regardless of conventional morality – to do less means to invite a global thermonuclear war after which conventional morality would be moot.

It is "groupthink" gone  
arwry

Yes, the question and the purpose of the agency is rife with paths of common mode failures. A sophisticated system that on occasion malfunctions – and no one has the authority or capacity to make high risk decisions – since such authority or capacity could be exploited by a scientific adversary to destroy the agency from within.

until something like the JFK assassination comes about.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

If the agency were involved in the assassination I would count it a failure of the agency. If the agency were not involved in the assassination I would count it a failure of the agency as well.

However, the failure of the agency in the first instance, is small compared to the failure the agency is leading us to today. The agency has failed to see that it has failed to secure all the goals for which it was organized – and has failed to take high risk decisions to reinvent itself in light of today's challenges.

They can  
convince themselves it was the right thing to do until they go to the  
grave,

Yes.

but is it?

No it was a malfunction of the machinery and no one had the authority to challenge its operation.

Was the coup in Iran given the whole Shah business  
in 1978–9?

This is lower on the arc of seriousness... no one would challenge the agency's right to carry out these actions in light of the goals of the agency.

Guatemala, Argentina, Congo, and so on...?

You are arguing from conventional morality and ignoring that if a global thermonuclear war takes place – such morality would be moot.

I have read that the CIA and especially the plans division is likened to a gun. It is suppose to point outward and at the enemy to protect the US. But who has control of that gun and who decides where it points?

They do, based on a simple decision – is the US benefitted by this action?

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

What happens when a whole bunch of CIA people find themselves out of a job?

They would go to their deaths to see that the USA survives the cold war – I cannot imagine that such people would act selfishly if they lost their job. Now, on the other hand, if a lot of them found themselves out of a job, they would naturally ask themselves – is this a good thing for the USA or a bad thing? If they convince themselves it was a bad thing, then they would naturally ask themselves, would the USA be better off if this decision was reversed? If they convinced themselves of that – without bringing their own needs into it – then, they would naturally move to have the decision reversed. Through this series of events, the pre-existing process that was put in place to protect the USA against a rogue president, may have been inadvertently triggered – without anyone being able to catch the malfunction.

Does that ability to wield the gun simply go away because of a bunch of pink slips got distributed?

If the CIA were so narrow and selfish, we would already be history. Such is not the case, so I think the CIA acts with more than a modicum of self restraint and professionalism.

Or, can another  
with enough resources and \$\$\$ pick up the pieces and create their own  
"gun"?

Like I said, malcontents might get away with one assassination attempt – not two and a successful discrediting of a third.

Perhaps access to the gun can be subverted at the top levels with just knowing exactly what buttons to push?

No one knows exactly which buttons to push that's another point. No, for your thesis of the CIA to be involved at all in the assassination of JFK to be correct, some malfunction of a pre-existing process had to have caused a triggering of events – and no one stood up to make the high-risk decision to stop it.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

and you're  
telling me the memos were what again?

a response to the failure of the BOP.

You fail to see the firing of  
the top CIA officials and the memos with "JCS and  
paramilitary" all  
over them together to paint the bigger picture.

I see that – and that is something totally different than what I  
thought you were saying. I do not believe that the mere sacking and  
reassignment of authority would be sufficient to trigger a coup.

Not trigger (pun!) the coup but assist with the coup.

The CIA with such broad authority must also be set up to avoid USA  
weakness due to political infighting. This is another powerful reason  
that makes me believe the CIA wouldn't be party to such infighting.  
They'd be like cops undercover looking for folks who are seeking to  
hire a hitman. They'd gather evidence and then use it against the  
perps for their own ends. They wouldn't go out and aid and abet such  
infighting.

So, for these reasons what you say doesn't make sense.

Rich powerful families and businesses that have money to last  
generations – don't NEED to have a president killed today. They can  
wait – especially when killing someone gives power to the killer to  
blackmail them and so forth. The CIA is set up and given its authority  
to make sure the USA avoids all weakness in the cold war era – which  
has got to include restraints on political infighting – so they're not  
going to aid and abet such fights. This leaves two possibilities –  
malcontents – either singly or in groups – that have nothing to lose  
and need to see action for whatever reason today – OR – the CIA has  
decided the continued presence of JFK in office poses a clear and  
present danger to the USA and he must be eliminated for the good of  
the nation. This – based on clear scientific evidence that is  
incontrovertible.

Like I said, if the CIA was involved, it is very likely that such  
evidence existed prior to JFK coming to office and that it was  
dismissed until such time that he sacked the people he did – and

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

someone somewhere re-interpreted that old evidence (because it was their job) and this set of a train of events that resulted in the assassination – and no where along the line was anyone able to make a high risk decision to stop the malfunction.

Assuming the CIA was involved, which it may not have been, that seems most reasonable to me.

I \*DO\* believe that a) plans for executing a coup were already pre-existing – given the arc of responsibility listed above, and b) that following the changes called for in these NSAMS – old data about JFK was revisited, and people honestly felt that the pre-existing plan needed to be carried out.– this is the most likely scenario in my view – if the CIA was involved at all – which it may not have been. haha.

Heck even the House Select Committee on Assassination in 1979 listed "rogue elements" within the CIA were involved along with Cuban Exiles. Have you read the HSCA report?

no.

[...]

Sure we are the good guys  
in white hats, with God on  
our side, and the  
Godless Russians and their  
KGB were the evil wearers  
of black hats.  
Gimme a break!

People actually believed that back then –  
many did.

Yes, I know. My father was in Military Intelligence from  
1958 – 1980  
specializing in the Soviet Union. He speaks fluent Russian to  
this  
very day.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

Well, I might be willing to give you a break, but I doubt anyone alive back then would – and they didn't give the President a break either – if they were involved with this.

My dad was in counterintelligence.

McCarthyism fell on its face and it is good that it did because rather than out a bunch of people that were evil it became more of a way to control people through fear.

Seeing people as evil, rather than as people, limits the range of responses available to you – which weakens you. This is part of the common mode failure I'm talking about.

A terrorist kills people,

On man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter. Surely you daddy told you this.

what have the  
US communists ever done to anyone in the US other than be different  
and believe in a failed system?

I haven't bothered to study such history – if I did I am certain I could generate a list of people who died at the hands of Soviet agents. Didn't Whitaker Chambers write a book about that?

I think I'm more concerned about being  
blown up.

Only because the media has made this into a cause celeb' – were you concerned about being blown up after the first attack on the world trade center? after the failed attempts by Al Queda to down airliners over the Pacific? after Hart Rudman warned the nation that it needed better homeland security more than star wars defense in the post soviet era?

Had Newt Gingrich allowed Clinton to go after Osama Bin Laden rather than worry about how presidential he would look – and how that would impact his plans to use Monica Lewinsky scandal to bring him down – thousands of AMericans might be alive today and you might not be so

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

concerne with being blown up – and we might be better able to engage those who challenge us openly.

Really don't have to create a bunch of pulp telling me the evils of terrorism in the face of suicide bombers, now do you?

The only thing we can control is ourselves. To what extent did we create the conditions we find ourselves in? To what extent can we modify our relationship to the world to reduce the number of suicide bombers? These suicide bombers are cardboard cutouts of people. Does anyone anywhere in the media study them – their history background – and so forth – calling them crazy and evil and so forth – doesn't really help. It limits our options. Understanding them as human beings – understanding what they are responding to – and taking actions based on that understanding – is likely to produce greater results at less cost – than responding to a cardboard cutout.

[...]

As fellow Irishmen JFK was considered less likely to really come down on McCarthy as they were old friends.

Yes HUAC was a response to the Soviet Bomb – and the UN. I think there is some evidence that the CIA opposed the UN on grounds that were outlined in their forming documents. Unfortunately the people of the US supported the UN at that time – and haha – there are elements in our government that have been going about changing that attitude since that time. The outing of Alger Hiss was just the first step.

What is so bad about the UN, in your opinion?

I didn't say the UN was bad, I said only that the UN stands against the goals of the CIA in the cold war. Recall, that industrial development of the world is a bad thing in the modern age – the UN stands for such development (as JFK did as well)– and it is likely therefore that the CIA targeted the UN early on. It is no surprise to me therefore that Whitaker Chambers outed Alger Hiss, who was an important political force supporting the early organization of the UN – the whole HUAC thing can be seen as an attempt to change the US opinion about the UN.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

Check out the timeline –

1945 Defeat of Germany and Japan – with Russians as allies.

February 4–11: Yalta Conference meeting of FDR, Churchill, Stalin – the 'Big Three'  
Soviet Union has control of Eastern Europe.  
The Cold War Begins

May 8: VE Day – Victory in Europe.  
Germany surrenders to the Red Army in Berlin

July: Potsdam Conference – Germany was officially partitioned into four zones of occupation.

My father worked in Frankfurt babysitting the Russians that were in the American zone from 1974–1975. I graduated from Frankfurt American High School. By my 18th birthday I had spent 8 years in what was once called West Germany.

Right. If he was presented with evidence that a President was a Soviet mole planted in the USA a generation before– schooled to sell out the USA to Russia in a cleverly crafted plan – if there were real evidence developed – and then shown these then secret NSAMs – would HE come to the honest conclusion that a coup needed to take place? What if the Vice President sat in on the meeting? I can imagine that there were a dozen honest men – true and unsullied – with clearances and reputations for keeping secrets well. That this was bounced off of – as a way to convince those they were acting prudently in the best interests of the nation – assuming, of course, the CIA was involved in such an act – which it may very well not have been.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

The JFK assassination was a right-wing domestic coup.

No it wasn't.

If JFK was  
killed because enough powerful people convinced themselves he was bad  
for the country then we needed a change alright,

Powerful people cannot impact CIA decisions. To allow that to happen means the CIA couldn't function. No, if the CIA was involved, then the CIA had to make the decisions internally based on clear incontrovertible scientific evidence that the USA was in clear and present danger from a rogue president. I do think if this is what happen, that is was a malfunctioning process – and that process needed more people capable of making high risk decisions to stop it – like Colonel Petrov's case.

and that would be  
from those that planned and implemented that coup!

Business types would never have given that much power to those who carried out the coup – besides the very powerful and rich – could wait. Every business person in the world knows about the wanting it tax. If you want something really badly – you pay a premium. So, every successful business person knows – to walk away from a deal until you can get a better deal. It would be so easy for powerful rich families to sit down and wait until the next election.

That's why malcontents are always out there in the fray. They can't wait. They need action now.

IF the CIA were involved – then they had to have come to the conclusion that they couldn't wait either. That for some reason there was clear scientific proof that another day another week another month with this rogue president created a clear and present danger to the continued existence of the USA.

This is a tall order – but not tall enough if the system malfunctions. As the Soviet experience with Petrov proves – even complex systems are subject to common mode failure – and in such cases people have to be in a position to make high risk decisions – to avoid such malfunctioning systems.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

[...]

However, committee member Richard Nixon received secret information from the FBI which had led him to pursue the issue. When it issued its report, HUAC described Hiss's

Nixon got is information from Hoover (and the FBI) who felt HE had to do more than that upstart agency the CIA.

I got that impression too! In JFKs campaign speech about Democratic supporters of Nixon – he said Nixon is okay as a follower – but as a leader he makes him nervous. He said Nixon reminds him of the symbol of his party. Ivory in his hair, a long memory, and poor vision. Good at being led around by the nose, attached to the tail of the elephant in front – but as a leader – prone to trample and destroy things we hold dear. A great speech.

The CIA felt it had a sacred trust – this is the way they've described Chappiquidick at Martha's Vineyard.– in Teddy's car – Teddy claimed to have driven the car – after getting the keys from his Chauffer Crimmins. Which was weird, Teddy seldom drove himself.

The whole thing was weird and it costed Ted any hopes of winning the White House.

Yes – which would have been the point of discrediting him. If he had DIED in the accident along with Mary Jo, that would have caused too much of an outrage – JFK – '63, RFK – '68, EMK – '69 .. no,he needed to be discredited – and the techniques developed by MK–ULTRA assured that.

## Re: Why We Haven't Been to Mars Yet

Harder to prove or even surmise that RFK and Sirhan–Sirhan.

of course – we can't know these things – i just think the timing is a bit odd – that's all I'm saying – and its consistent with the larger pattern of JFK and RFK getting killed.

Its like looking at pixels from a space probe. Lots of noise, but when you look at a lot of pixels a pattern emerges.

Again, I find it interesting to the point of incredulity – that the day before the moon landing – with Nixon in the White House – that Chappiquidick happened to Teddy THAT DAY– Imagine the news headlines following the moon landing – had Chappiquidick not happened! HE likely would have beaten Nixon in 1972 – and won re–election in 1978 – and would have carried out much of the program of his brother – AND REVEALED THE COUP DE TAT – and;the CIA would have many more problems than the Church committee.

Hard to say for sure.

Had RFK gotten into office, depending on what the facts were  
obviou