

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newfaking in the Press

Vol. I, No. 6

December 1, 1968

What a Faker You Are, Mr. Huie!

An Open Letter to William Bradford Huie

When your first article on "The Plot to Assassinate Martin Luther King" appeared in LOOK magazine, a friend wrote to me that "it appears to be a piece of the Company script"-- the "Company" being of course the CIA.

At first I found it hard to credit such an assumption. I could not bring myself to believe that you, William Bradford Huie, could be working for or with the CIA. You used to have a good reputation as a writer. In several of your books, you had stood up for civil rights and battled the evil in the South.

Even after it had become known that you were working hand-in-hand with the Ku-Klux-Klan lawyer Arthur J. Hanes Jr., I tried to find excuses for your behavior. I just couldn't imagine that two men who had been for years on opposite sides of the great battle for justice and human dignity in the South should have become all of a sudden friends and allies.

But now, with genuine sadness, I have come to realize that you are a traitor, Mr. Huie. Like so many others before you, you have bartered away your soul for the Big Money and have trampled on your past so as to become acceptable to the powers-that-be.

Your second article in LOOK leaves no room for doubt. Summing up your findings in the James Earl Ray case, you write with melodramatic hypocrisy:

"The outline of the plot to murder Dr. King now begins to become visible to me... Dr. King was to be murdered for effect... by calculating men who wanted to use his murder to trigger violent conflict between white and Negro citizens... He was to be murdered by a white man, or white men, who would be described as "Southerners" and "racists." In this plot, Dr. King was the secondary, not the primary target. The primary target was the United States of America."

That spurious patriotic line, designed to shift the blame for the King assassination from the real instigators to the "worldwide Communist conspiracy," was first taken in the case by your great friend, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, and then was spelled out half a dozen times by your other confederate, Arthur J. Hanes Jr. If you haven't been quite so explicit yet as these two gentlemen, the reason, I suppose, must be that you're a little ashamed of yourself to be found in such company. Still there is no mistaking the meaning of your remarks. You want to convey the impression that Dr. King fell victim to a conspiracy hatched by Communists and black militants for the purpose of creating civil war conditions in the United States and thus weakening the country in the international power game.

Louis Lomax, the able and courageous Negro reporter who did a lot more than you to bring out the truth about the King murder - and who didn't accomplish it by throwing somebody else's big money around - wrote in the series of articles distributed by N.A.N.A. last spring:

"Let me make it plain, very plain: America's blacks never have and do not now trust either J. Edgar Hoover or the FBI. Those of us who have been assigned to cover civil rights stories in the South know all too well how much the FBI can fumble when it does not wish to solve a case. The suspicion is defended by the fact that the FBI 'leaked' a story to newsmen that suggested that a Negro with an animus toward King was behind the assassination. The story was completely false, but if newsmen had written it, Dr. King would have been smeared even in his grave."

The smearing goes on, nevertheless, and you, William B. Huie, are now in the forefront of the smear artists. Anyone who has learned to read between the lines will realize that you are working hand-in-glove with the FBI and the CIA, which both have a vital interest in hushing up the truth about the King murder as well as the two Kennedy assassinations. And your dealings with the K-K lawyer Hanes are even a matter of public knowledge.

Also a matter of public knowledge is, to quote Lomax again, "that Hoover deeply disliked Martin Luther King. He once referred to King as 'the most notorious liar in the nation.' Now Hoover is called upon to locate King's assassins."

What Hoover's minions did locate, in fact, is not King's assassin, but only a miserable stooge who allowed himself to be used as a paid decoy by the real killers and who then was trapped by them into a fall-guy role. On this point you seem to be in agreement with me, but you have the nerve to suggest that the people behind this ugly travesty of justice are Negroes and Leftists, whereas in fact they are right-wing fanatics and secret intelligence agents - exactly the same combination that killed President Kennedy on behalf of the man who was eager to succeed him. Indeed, just about the only difference between the two Kennedy assassinations and the slaying of Dr. King is that in the latter case the gunmen were operating on their own. Or rather, they were being paid by someone else than Lyndon B. Johnson and his Texas gang.

You know all this to be true, for you can't be as dumb as you pretend to be. Hoover knows it, too (though he is as dumb as he pretends to be), and so does Hanes, a smart, but unscrupulous fellow.

Hanes, with whom you have been in almost daily contact, for he regularly slipped to you the product of Ray's unremitting literary labors in his jail cell, was the first to assert boldly that the murder of Dr. King had resulted from a Communist conspiracy. In doing so, he tumbled over his own words, but a trifle like that wouldn't bother a Hanes, of course.

Indeed, Hanes, in one of his earliest pronouncements on the Ray case, had said, "There are no political overtones to it" (AP-dispatch from London, June 20, 1968). A week later, however, on his return from London, Hanes told reporters who met him at the Kennedy Airport in New York, that he saw in the Dr. King case "powerful forces at work," trying to divide Americans against themselves. "It has been shown," he added darkly, "that there is such a thing as an international Communist conspiracy and you must admit they are working in this country."

Granted, for the sake of argument, that there is such a conspiracy, the question that matters is: What has it got to do with the King case?
(to be continued in the next issue of TRUTH LETTER)

It Can't Be Blood That Flows in the
Veins of Edward Kennedy

"Neue Revue," a German illustrated magazine, published in its issue of November 10, 1968, a picture that speaks volumes indeed. Taken by a Greek photographer and originally published in the Athens newspaper "Apogevmatini," this photo shows Senator Edward Kennedy on the deck of A.S. Onassis' yacht Christina during that Mediterranean cruise, last August, which Jackie Kennedy also attended as guest of honor and bride-to-be.

A luscious young woman, in a bikini, is also seen in this picture, sitting on a railing, blonde hair blowing in the wind. The man standing close to her, also in bathing trunks, is quite unmistakably Ted Kennedy. But the girl is just as unmistakably not Mrs. Edward Kennedy, although a rather dim version of this photo published in the London Daily Express on Oct. 19, 1968, carries the legend: "Edward Kennedy and wife Joan on the Christina at Scorpios earlier this year."

The article in Neue Revue goes further. It states that a Greek reporter, also working for Apogevmatini, had slipped aboard the Christina disguised as a musician. While the band played, he surreptitiously took snapshots of the guests by means of a mini-camera. Some of them were of Ted Kennedy and his blonde partner. "They were flirting and drinking a lot," the paper says. But the cameraman had bad luck. He was found out and his snapshots were seized by Onassis' private police. The films were destroyed and the Greek government clamped down a harsh censorship on all news and pictures concerning the event. But it was already too late to do anything about that photo showing Ted Kennedy and the young woman on the railing of the yacht. Snapped at a safe distance, by means of a tele-camera, a few days earlier, it got into print before the iron curtain of the Greek censorship came down. The only thing left for the Greeks to do was to say that the lady on the rail is Mrs. Edward Kennedy, which she quite obviously is not.

So what? TRUTH LETTER is not a scandal sheet and I am not a moralist. Nothing could be of less interest to me than the question whether or not Ted Kennedy has had any extramarital adventures. But I am interested in the timing of this incident and its possible implications. On June 5, Senator Robert Kennedy had been assassinated, the second of Ted's brothers to suffer that fate. Would it not have been the duty of any man of flesh and blood to cast everything else aside and concentrate with savage single-mindedness on finding out who was responsible for the two murders?

Doesn't the term "blood-feud" have any meaning for the Kennedys? Not that I am an advocate of vendetta in the sense of suggesting that now Ted Kennedy should have recruited a gang of thugs determined to rub out a few members of the Johnson family, but he could have started an investigation of his own. Instead, barely a few weeks after the second of his brothers has been foully assassinated by implacable enemies, Ted Kennedy goes off living the gay life of the jet set aboard Onassis' yacht. And, in doing so, he takes the obvious risk of being observed while philandering and having his picture taken on the sly in a compromising situation.

Robert Kennedy, too, had been blackmailed into silence and inactivity by Johnson and the CIA (see my report "The Case Against the Kennedy Clan"); now Ted Kennedy has laid himself open to even stronger pressures. If he was spineless before, he'll be all jelly now.

4

Book Review

The Private Life of the Warren Commission

by Sylvia Meagher

(A review of Document Addendum to the Warren Report. With an introduction by David S. Lifton; Sighttext Publications, El Segundo, California, 1968; \$ 17.50. - 361 pages)

Note: This is the first of what I hope will be many contributions to TRUTH Letter by Sylvia Meagher, distinguished author of "Accessories After the Fact" (Bobbs-Merrill, 1967) and "Subject Index to the Warren Report and Hearings and Exhibits" (Scarecrow Press, 1966), who ranks with the leading critics of the Warren Report. - J.J.

"We will next go to Item H under Roman Number II, remains of Lee Harvey Oswald, letters received from Nicholas Katzenbach. Now that situation is that this man is buried in a cemetery, and it takes officers around the clock to watch him, watch and see that they don't come in and exhume him and do something that would further injure the country, and so it has been suggested that to save expense they exhume him and then cremate him."

With this introduction by Chief Justice Earl Warren, the Chairman, the Warren Commission, at its executive session of January 21, 1964, embarked on a ghoulish discussion. What to do with the mortal remains of Oswald, to spare the expense of guarding his grave? Even the Chairman balked at the idea of cremating the body: "But the question might arise before this thing as to something on that body now. I don't know what it is. It might be the course of the bullet. It might be something else. But I don't think we would want that disposed of until our report has been made."

Senator Russell suggested another way out. "We might get some mausoleum to take this body, and seal it up and put it in the mausoleum, unknown to anybody else, if they can do that, and no one would know where it was, the wife would consent to it, I think, and the mother hasn't got anything to say about it anyway if the wife consents to it, and I would have that done rather than to dig up or cremate that body. We might get into a great religious controversy."

After further discussion in which the Commission showed its coldblooded indifference to the murdered Oswald and equally to the sensibilities of his surviving mother, it was agreed that "cremation is out of the question." Whether the body was secretly removed from its grave in Fort Worth, Texas, and placed in a mausoleum, is not entirely clear from the Chairman's closing remarks: "I think the suggestion that has been made is most sensible, and we should try to insist on it."

Between December 5, 1963 and September 18, 1964, the Warren Commission held eleven executive sessions. The transcripts were classified "top secret" until February 1968, when seven of the transcripts were declassified (some in their entirety, and others with sections missing) and made available in the National Archives. David S. Lifton, one of the California first-generation critics, has performed a valuable service by publishing the declassified transcripts (reproductions of the original pages as they appear in the Archives) in a soft-cover book, Document Addendum to the Warren Report. (To be continued in the next issue)

Silent Prayer: Republican spokesmen tell us "Truth will be the Hallmark of the Nixon Administration." Oh, God. Let TRUTH LETTER stay in business.

The new book by Joachim Joesten TRILOGY OF MURDER
An analysis and interpretation of the John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy and
Dr. Martin Luther King assassinations. - Copyright 1968 by J. Joesten

(continued from Vol.I, No. 4, p.5)

Sirhan of the C.I.A.

It is one of the characteristic hallmarks of the secret agent that he cannot be tracked down continuously, even where government sleuths (in this case the Arab government from which Jon Kimche obtained his information) are on his trail. After moving about in the open for a while, he is suddenly swallowed up by the earth, then after a suitably long time "surfaces" again, only to disappear once more without trace. Such is exactly the course of Sirhan's erratic journey through the Middle East in 1964 and 1966. Jon Kimche continues:

"In 1966 he (Sirhan) is said to have spent an even longer period in the Middle East, including a stretch of five months in Cairo. He returned to the United States, according to this report, at the beginning of 1967. "The Arab Government is convinced that its records are accurate but they are being sent to the United States so that they can be checked with the information assembled by the FBI."

What a laugh! Does the Arab government in question imagine the FBI is going to lend a helping hand in exposing Sirhan as a CIA operative? Or that the State Department, the first recipient of any such information from a foreign government, would make the records public - no matter how accurate they are?

At this point, the British reporter, warily though he treads on this slippery ground, clearly gives to understand that he is well aware of the nature of Sirhan's travels.

"There is an evident and increasing disinclination, however, for witnesses to talk," he writes, "and even those who spoke at first - such as Sirhan's father - have now adjusted their responses..."

This is another sur-fire indication that we are dealing with an "intelligence" case. Under normal circumstances, witnesses, in a sensational matter like this, are only too eager to tell all they know or believe they know. And the press, normally, would use all its resources to try and find out about the background, the comings and goings, and all the activities of a foreigner who ginned down a presidential candidate.

Yet, most significantly, not one U.S. Newspaper or magazine exerted the slightest initiative in the case, leaving it to a lone British reporter to come up with something better than canned official hash. They shied away from basic elements of the Sirhan story as though they were smitten by the plague, because they smelled a rat - and did it stink!

The most telltale reaction, however, came direct from the State Department. No sooner had Kimche's first report appeared in the Evening Standard than it was described as being "without foundation" in a statement issued by State Dept. press officer Robert J. McCloskey. The spokesman added that the US Government "has no evidence to support the contention that Sirhan ever left the country, even briefly, after immigrating here."

The State Department, of course, will deny everything that doesn't suit its purpose. It is one of the greatest lie factories on earth and during the Johnson regime it had to work overtime to keep up with the personal output of the boss. In this particular case, however, the denial is so obviously false and contrived that it really represents the clincher

TRUTH LETTER is published every other week by Joachim Joesten,
87-70 175th Street, New York 11432, USA.

The Moment of Truth

January 20, 1969 - the Usurper leaves the White House

January 21, 1969 - the trial of Clay Shaw begins in New Orleans

District Attorney Jim Garrison himself has underlined the symbolic significance of setting the opening date of this trial on the first day of the new Administration. For on that date also begins, in a very real sense, the trial of Lyndon B. Johnson, the man who staged "the first coup d'état in American history" (a Garrison term) and whom the District Attorney has publicly charged with being "the person most active in protecting the assassins of President John F. Kennedy."

Now is the time for every thoughtful American to start thinking the Unthinkable - because it happens to be the truth. If you want to know what really happened at Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963, if you want to acquaint yourself with the full background and significance of the Clay Shaw trial, you will find all the information you seek in Joachim Joesten's five "books-in-exile" about the Kennedy assassination.

They are "books-in-exile" because no American publisher has yet mustered the courage to break the No. 1 publishing taboo during the Johnson regime - revealing the whole truth about the Kennedy murder. All five of these outspoken books were published in 1967-1968 by a daring British publisher, Peter Dawnay of London. They are:

The Dark Side of Lyndon B. Johnson (272 pp., cloth, September 1968)

This book reveals with brutal frankness why the then Vice-President ordered the "execution" of President Kennedy at Dallas (another Garrison term) and how the coup d'état was carried out by the CIA. When the time comes for the Usurper to sit in the dock, this book will serve as a prosecution brief. What the district attorney will tell the court tomorrow, you will find in this book today.

Oswald: The Truth (372 pp., cloth, July 1967)

The author's most comprehensive work on the subject, this book reveals in staggering detail how Lee H. Oswald was framed by the Dallas police, the FBI and the Secret Service for a crime in which all of these "law-enforcement agencies" were directly implicated themselves and how the Warren Commission covered up for this gigantic fraud.

Marina Oswald (165 pp., cloth, August 1967)

The unvarnished story of Oswald the fumbling CIA agent and of Marina, the Soviet counter-espionage agent who married by order and then betrayed her husband in death.

The Garrison Enquiry (158 pp., paperback, October 1967)

A detailed background study complementing and explaining tomorrow's trial headlines from New Orleans.

How Kennedy Was Killed (192 pp., paperback, April 1968)

The only complete and truthful account of how the President was lured into the Dealey Plaza death trap to be gunned down by a CIA execution squad in a carefully organized crossfire ambush.

Please order signed copies of these books direct from the author:

Joachim Joesten, 87-70 173rd Street, Jamaica 11432, New York City
or Joachim Joesten, Munich 13, Griegsstr. 13, c/o Rahim, Germany