

*Jack Colhoun's Rebuttal:*

It is telling that James Johnston has nothing to say about Johnny Rosselli's about-face on his Castro retaliation allegations in his secret April 1976 testimony before the Church Committee. Rosselli conceded he had "no facts" to back up assertions he had made in Jack Anderson's "Washington Merry-Go-Round" column since 1967. Rosselli had used Anderson's column as a soap box from which to pitch his claim that Fidel Castro, upon learning the CIA was plotting with the former Mafia gamblers in Cuba to kill him, had President John Kennedy assassinated in retaliation. I cited declassified CIA records that document how Rosselli used his Castro retaliation allegations to blackmail the CIA to intervene with the Immigration and Naturalization Service to prevent his deportation.

Equally telling is Johnston's take on the Castro retaliation allegations. To Johnston, it doesn't matter whether Rosselli's charges were true or false. Johnston writes, "Colhoun's article devotes considerable attention to rebutting the notion that the allegations about retaliation by underworld figures in 1967 were true, but he misses the point. The point is not whether the allegations were true. The point is those allegation[s] were not investigated in 1967. Why not?" In other words, Johnston wants readers to ignore new evidence from declassified documents in the JFKARC because they get in the way of promoting the Castro retaliation narrative.

There is a creepy element of distortion that runs throughout Johnston's response to my "A Theory Too Far." The most glaring example is comments he falsely attributes to me and then criticizes me for making. Johnston writes, "White House logs show [CIA Director Richard] Helms and President Kennedy talked from 6:15 to 6:45 that evening [November 19, 1963]. Colhoun's aside about the meeting, that Helms knew John Kennedy was going to be assassinated, is absurd." As readers can see, I did *not* write about the November 19 meeting.

Like a clumsy propagandist, Johnston also twists my words and takes them out of context to serve his purposes. For example, Johnston writes, "Colhoun concludes by saying 'Johnston makes a superficially logical and provocative argument for the Castro retaliation allegations.'" My full statement clearly states the opposite conclusion. I write, "From Johnny Rosselli to Rolando Cubela, Johnston makes a superficially logical and provocative argument for the Castro retaliation allegations. But Johnston's argument collapses like a house of cards when it is scrutinized in the context of the declassified CIA documents in the National Archives."