

# **The view from the bridge**

**Robin Ramsay**

*My thanks to Garrick Alder and Nick Must for help with  
the production of Lobster.*

## **Dallas again**

### **Ruby**

**I** receive Roger Stone's email bulletins. In the March 24 edition, 'Nightmare On Elm Street: JFK and the Assassination That Still Haunts America',<sup>1</sup> Stone recounts a conversation he had with Richard Nixon, about the JFK assassination, after Nixon's resignation. Nixon said:

I actually knew [Jack] Ruby. Murray Chotiner introduced him back in '47. He went by Rubenstein then. An informant. Murray said he was one of Lyndon's people . . . We put him on the payroll at Lyndon's request.

Chotiner was a lawyer/bagman who began working with Nixon in 1946. But whose payroll is Nixon referring to? His own? Or that of the House UnAmerican Activities Committee (HUAC) of which Nixon was a member? This question is answered in an earlier version of the same anecdote:

Nixon said, 'The damn thing is, I knew this Jack Ruby. Murray [Chotiner] brought him to me in 1947, said he was one of "Johnson's boys" and that LBJ wanted us to hire him as an informant to the Committee. We did.'<sup>2</sup>

So clearly HUAC. But the striking thing is the link to LBJ. This may explain why Ruby killed Oswald: he was tidying up for his political boss. Ruby's hints about LBJ's role to the Warren Commission people who interviewed him may have been provoked by LBJ not getting him out of jail.

---

<sup>1</sup> <<https://www.stonecoldtruth.com/p/nightmare-on-elm-street-jfk-and-the>>

<sup>2</sup> <<https://dailycaller.com/2013/11/22/roger-stone-nixon-thought-lbj-killed-kennedy/>>

## Lansdale

In this famous 'three tramps' photograph taken around 2.30pm in Dallas on



the day of JFK's assassination, a figure passes 'the tramps'. He was identified as being the CIA's Edward Lansdale by General Victor Krulak, L. Fletcher Prouty and Lansdale's second wife. Robert Morrow has noted that Lansdale has been recognised in the photograph by his current biographer, Gregory C. Lavin.<sup>3</sup> Morrow quotes Lavin:

Having spent hours in Lansdale's presence at each of his last two homes, I had no trouble identifying him in his Dallas photo. Ed Lansdale's superior at the OSO, Lieutenant General Victor Krulak, said it succinctly: "The haircut, the stoop, the twisted left hand, the large class ring. It's Lansdale." Ed's haircut, head shape, and posture remain his most memorable features to me. Ed's hair seemed to have been always semi-short, as in the Dallas photo. Also, Ed's head and face seem rectangular, rather long up-and-down. Combined with his natural slow-and-easy gait, right-shouldered stoop, and big class ring, he looked very distinctive to me.<sup>4</sup>

Four people identifying him means we have to accept that Lansdale was there,

---

<sup>3</sup> <<https://www.amazon.co.uk/dp/1662958781>>

<sup>4</sup> Gregory C. Lavin, *Chasing Ed: Was Major General Edward G. Lansdale the Mastermind of the JFK Assassination?*, p. 176 in the Kindle version.

even though we can't see his face; which means the CIA was involved at some level. However the only CIA officer who spoke of the Agency's role, E. Howard Hunt, did not include Lansdale in his version of the conspiracy;<sup>5</sup> and CIA contract agent Chauncey Holt, one of the three 'tramps', also does not mention Lansdale in his various accounts.

## **The shitshow**

The UK is now in unavoidable economic decline. The major unknowns are how bad it will get and how fast. None of the political parties will publicly admit this (yet\_ but they all must know it. They must also know that it began in 1979, with the arrival of the Thatcher government and the delusion that a modern western European society can function with low taxation. Florence Sutcliffe-Braithwaite reworks some of this in 'It's a shitshow', her review of a memoir by Tim Lancaster who had been Thatcher's private secretary for economic affairs for the first two and a half years of her tenure.<sup>6</sup> Lancaster shows – yet again – that neither Mrs Thatcher nor Chancellor Geoffrey Howe knew what they were doing. They adopted Milton Friedman's thesis that inflation could be brought down by controlling the money supply. But they found that there were many ways to define 'the money supply' and none of them were capable of producing reliable figures. In the end it really didn't matter which definition of 'the money supply' one they chose: what counted was the method chosen to control it. Eschewing controls on the creation of money and debt, they introduced high interest rates to discourage borrowing. Who benefits from high interest rates? The money-lenders.

If the PM and her Chancellor were footling with barely understood economic theories,<sup>7</sup> at the Treasury, Nigel Lawson – a financial journalist for

---

<sup>5</sup> See the account of his son St. John, at  
<[https://wikileaks.org/gifiles/attach/32/32349\\_bond-of-secrecy4.pdf](https://wikileaks.org/gifiles/attach/32/32349_bond-of-secrecy4.pdf)>.

<sup>6</sup> <<https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v47/n08/florence-sutcliffe-braithwaite/it-s-a-shitshow>>, reviewing Tim Lancaster, *Inside Thatcher's Monetarism Experiment: The Promise, the Failure, the Legacy*.

<sup>7</sup> 'A small group of ideologues pursued an incoherent policy based on some vague notions about "the money supply" and "expectations", and ignored compelling recent empirical evidence about how disruptive to the economy such policy lurches could be because of their effects on the exchange rate.' Jim Tomlinson, 'Mrs Thatcher's Macroeconomic Adventurism, 1979–1981, and its Political Consequences' in *British Politics*, 2007, 2, (3–19)  
<<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/palgrave.bp.4200038>>.

many years at the *Financial Times* and *Telegraph* – knew what the City of London wanted: the abolition of exchange controls and an end to some of the restrictions on bank lending. These duly came in late 1979.

It is commonplace to refer to all this post 1980 economics as 'neoliberalism'. But that's almost a cover story. The governments of the US and the UK in the 1980s became instruments of their financial sectors, abandoned their manufacturing bases and, as a result, had ever increasing trade deficits. The UK has had a trade deficit in goods every year since 1983, after the policy of high interest rates reduced UK manufacturing by about 15%.<sup>8</sup> Craig Murray pointed out recently that the US trade deficit is now 4% of GDP, with the UK at around 2%.<sup>9</sup>

Add to that the policy of not adequately taxing the well-off, let alone the actual rich, and you have the perfect racket. Without sufficient tax income, the US and UK governments borrow the money and pay interest on loans, some of which come from those who should be paying more taxes. In the US, interest on those loans is now 13% of government income. In the UK it is 8%; and set fair to get quite a lot bigger if this government refuses to raise taxes on the well-off and wealthy.<sup>10</sup> And, as it gets bigger, the cost of the borrowing rises.

## 9/11

Another pointed piece on the subject from Russ Baker.<sup>11</sup> He writes that while President Trump was hobnobbing with the Saudis:

Two men — directly connected to the 9/11 terrorists *and* the Saudi royal family — are living apparently normal lives under the royal nose of Prince Mohammed bin Salman, whom Trump "likes a lot". (Emphasis in the original.)

The two men are Esam Ghazzawi and Omar al-Bayoumi. Of Ghazzawi, Baker notes: 'Phone records and surveillance videos of their gated community

---

<sup>8</sup> <<https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-8261/CBP-8261.pdf>>

<sup>9</sup> <<https://www.craigmurray.org.uk/archives/2025/04/trump-tariffs-and-trade/>>

<sup>10</sup> <<https://shorturl.at/5qIZ0>> or <<https://obr.uk/forecasts-in-depth/tax-by-tax-spend-by-spend/debt-interest-central-government-net/>>

<sup>11</sup> <<https://russbaker.substack.com/p/memorial-day-flyover-off-we-go-into>>

showed frequent contact with the hijackers, including lead hijacker Muhammad Atta’.

The liberal website Propublica noted last year:

FBI agents identified Bayoumi as having helped the two young Saudis [two known al-Qaida operatives, Nawaf al-Hazmi and Khalid al-Mihdhar] rent an apartment, set up a bank account and take care of other needs.<sup>12</sup>

Both men – and others – were identified in the original official 9/11 Report, in the chapter which was initially withheld from publication. Subsequently declassified (but still redacted in places), that chapter is on-line.<sup>13</sup>

## Leeden

**M**ichael Ledeen’s death in May this year produced a flurry of articles about him. Not discussed, in those I read, was Ledeen’s possible relationship with Israeli intelligence. Which is odd, really, for Israel’s interests run through his career as an interface between US state and non-state officials and Israel. Google AI gave me this when asked about Ledeen and Israeli intelligence:

Michael Ledeen denied any affiliation with Israeli intelligence and resented allusions to his relationship with them. While he was involved in the Iran-Contra affair and had contacts with figures linked to Israel, his precise role and connection to Israeli intelligence were never fully established. He was a consultant to various US government agencies, including the National Security Council, and was involved in the Iran-Contra affair through contacts with Manucher Ghorbanifar, an Iranian arms merchant who had ties to Israel. The Senate intelligence committee questioned Ledeen under oath about his relationship with Israeli intelligence, and he denied any affiliation.

But as one 1987 account noted:

Whatever the ambiguities about his roles inside or outside the U.S. government, two facts stand out clearly. For a man without ‘close ties with Israel’, Michael Ledeen had remarkable access to its leaders; and

---

<sup>12</sup> <<https://shorturl.at/Zuzqt>> or <<https://www.propublica.org/article/saudi-officials-may-have-assisted-911-hijackers-new-evidence-suggests>>

<sup>13</sup> <<https://shorturl.at/2tIWc>> or <<http://intelligence.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/sites-default-filesations-28pages.pdf>>

for a man 'never particularly active in Jewish affairs' he was very, very, close to those who are.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> <<https://www.wrmea.org/1987-march/shadows-michael-ledeen-man-of-mystery.html>>