

Wenzler p.5
(re "Luisiana")

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. I, No. 13

March 15, 1969

Three Phony Trials

Justice, in America, has really gone to the dogs. One would be indeed hard put to it, trying to find anything in the history of jurisprudence to match the triple shoddy performance put on, these past few weeks, by the courts in New Orleans, Memphis and Los Angeles in the three great political murder cases of our time.

New Orleans: Justice Denied. - District Attorney Jim Garrison, in his summation, had called upon the jury to render justice, for the first time, in the case of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in which so far the architects of "the most gigantic fraud ever perpetrated on the planet" have had it all their own way.

That was the heart of the matter - not the question whether Clay Shaw was guilty, in every respect, as charged. His role in the conspiracy appears to have been relatively minor, but he did play a role in it, that is certain in spite of his acquittal on all counts.

Why was he acquitted? From the start, the dice had been loaded heavily against Jim Garrison in this game. The concerted press campaign, lasting for close to two years, which depicted the DA as a power-mad, publicity-crazy charlatan or worse certainly left a mark on the jurors. So did the consistently slanted reporting, by virtually all news media in the country, on the preparation and progress of the trial, the unrelenting drumfire against the critics of the Warren Report and the systematic chanting, in every story on the subject, of the refrain "The Warren Commission found Lee Harvey Oswald to have been the sole assassin etc.etc." No amount of seclusion can protect the minds of a jury from the insidious effects of such a campaign.

Then there was the unbelievably foul and devastatingly effective blow delivered at the last minute by that die-hard Johnson stooge, Atty-General Ramsey Clark, when he released, on the eve of the trial, that anonymous and spurious report by four unnamed so-called medical experts backing up the conclusions of the Warren Commission.

The obstinate refusal, by the federal authorities, to release the Kennedy autopsy materials for inspection by truly independent experts also went a long way towards wrecking Garrison's case. In any other trial, it would have been a matter of course for any authority in the land to make available such vital evidence to any court requesting it. The assassination of President Kennedy, however, is a special case in which all normal rules are brushed aside, all precedents are violated, all injustices are condoned and every kind of malfeasance is permitted as long as it helps obscure the truth about The Crime of the Century.

On top of all this, there came that amazing outburst by Judge Haggerty, denouncing in open court the as yet untried and untested testimony of Officer Habighorst, which Assistant DA James Alcock ~~as~~ justly labeled "misconduct." With the presiding judge showing so plainly his bias in favor of the accused, how could the jury have failed to follow suit?

Besides, they were desperately eager to call it a day and go home. Locked up for a month, those unpaid jurors were facing another weekend away from their families if they really delved into the matter and started debating it. So they took the fast and easy way out by voting for acquittal.

That is the long and the short of the New Orleans trial. Its outcome in no way affects the validity of the criticism directed by Garrison and others at the conclusions of the Warren Report. On the contrary - Garrison certainly did prove his contention that the President had been assassinated in a triangulated crossfire, the victim of a conspiracy. But the jury never really bothered to "go into Dealey Plaza;" they preferred to stay on home territory and leave an influential, well-connected citizen alone.

The newsmakers, of course, were quick to jump to the totally unwarranted conclusion that Shaw's acquittal had vindicated the Warren Report. It did no such thing, as will be generally understood in due course. When the records of this trial are studied in perspective and with an open mind, it will be seen even by those still blind today that if the defendant was acquitted, the Warren Report was condemned by the evidence presented at this trial.

Garrison has vowed to continue the fight. I hope he will. For, he is the only one among the disbelievers in the Warren Report who can do something effective to expose that monstrous fraud - even if his first attempt was a flop.

Memphis: An Outrage Pure and Simple. - As had been forecast exclusively in TRUTH LETTER (see Nos. 10 and 11), James Earl Ray has been prevailed upon by his own lawyer, Percy Foreman, acting in concert with the prosecution, to plead guilty, against the truth, to the charge that he killed Dr. Martin Luther King. There are no words strong enough to adequately castigate Mr. Foreman's conduct. He is supposed to be one of America's most famous and effective lawyers. He is certainly one of the most expensive - and Ray didn't have the means to pay him. It is clear now that Mr. Foreman, who didn't lift one finger to defend his client, but forced upon him a false plea of guilty (by telling Ray that, if he balked, he would be convicted and executed), did not have the best interests of his client at heart, but did somebody else's bidding. Ray already has rued his mistake of trusting that Texas lawyer. The day after he had been sentenced to 99 years in prison, he recanted and started scouting around for a new lawyer, but now it is no doubt too late. It will take something of a miracle to free Ray from the trap which his own lawyer snapped on him. To Percy Foreman, disloyal lawyer par excellence, and to Judge Preston Battle, who accepted a guilty plea he knew to be false, goes TRUTH LETTER's second citation for CONTEMPT OF JUSTICE.

Meanwhile, the reality of the plot to murder Dr. King, which was so shamefully suppressed at the phony trial in Memphis, has been strikingly borne out (a) by the surprise statement by Ray in open court, even as he pleaded guilty, that he did not agree with the contention of his own attorney that there had been no conspiracy; (b) by the statement immediately issued by Mrs. Coretta King that she felt more convinced than ever her husband had been the victim of a plot; (c) by the announcement from Washington that the Department of Justice (under new management) did not consider the case closed and would continue the search for possible accomplices in the Dr. King murder.

Los Angeles: The Empty Show Goes on. - The trial of Sirhan B. Sirhan will certainly make judicial history as a textbook example of how to go through the motions of justice without ever getting anywhere near it. The pseudo-scientific hogwash delivered by so-called psychologists and psychiatrists trying to explain why and how Sirhan killed Sen. Robert Kennedy beats everything seen in the field since some of their colleagues purported to read the mind of the late Lee Harvey Oswald and to explain what he didn't do in terms of his family relationships.

It is interesting to note, though, that Sirhan himself on at least two occasions let out telltale hints that the official story of his life and background is not true, as I have held all along. It happened the first time when Deputy Dist. Atty. Lynn D. Compton on Feb. 4 cross-examined the defendant about the low income figures he had given for the years 1965 through 1968 (cf. TL No. 11). Was he going to school during the years cited, Mr. Compton inquired.

"Yes, in 1964, 1965, 1966," Sirhan replied and then quickly corrected himself: "No, just 1964 and 65 at Pasadena City College."

Why did he suddenly drop 1966? Because it can be proved, and has been proved by British reporter Jon Kimche (see TL, Nos. 5-10, last pages), that Sirhan spent most of that year on a mysterious journey through the Middle East. He had also made a previous trip to Syria in 1964, but returned to the US in the spring so that he could have attended the City College for the rest of the year. The year 1966, however - the year of his best earnings, - was out as far as school was concerned, and he couldn't account for any job either, because of the unmentionable nature of his assignments to the Middle East.

The other time was when Sirhan late in February confessed in open court that he had killed Sen. Kennedy and then added sarcastically that he had done so "with malice aforethought for 20 years." Why 20 years - a seemingly preposterous statement since at that time he was a child of four? The answer to that puzzle is that it was 20 years ago - in 1948 and not in 1957, as the official version goes - that Sirhan had come to the United States where he eventually was to fall a prey to the sinister influences which, 20 years later, pushed him into this crime. It was a clear enough allusion by one virtually gagged.

=====

Because of the pressure of space and for other reasons - which will be disclosed in due course - publication of the second instalment of "WHO IS JAMES HEPBURN" is postponed from the present issue of TL to the one dated April 1.

=====

A remarkable essay

Some Methodological Observations on the Assassination of President Kennedy

by Thomas Ellis Katen

(continued from the preceding issue)

The problem is that the disconfirmation of a myth is not achieved by conflict with empirical evidence. A myth is an account of life which is non logical, and it cannot be confuted by logical considerations. If a fact is discovered which contradicts a mythical account, the myth is not thereby rejected, but the fact is rejected. That this happened frequently with the Warren Commission has been amply established by critics of the Warren Report.

The Warren Report, with its great official seal, stood for two myths. One is that this is a peaceful, non violent democratic society in which political change occurs by ballots not bullets, and the other is one of a Golden Age of History. It is that our society is free from conspiratorial assassination of political leaders. That may happen in Europe, but not here, "it says here." Thus in battle with the facts the critics were met in rebuttal not with cogent argumentation but with appeals to faith in the order of this society and with observations the conspiratorial account is inconsistent with our historic past. Of course, that wasn't all defenders had to rely upon. They also had the myth of the HERO. Would Earl Warren lie? These commissioners were all honorable men. The position this is a society in which political change occurs by ballots not bullets is a petitio principii. For that is just what we have to discover in our analysis of the meaning of the assassination; it is not something we can assume. For if Kennedy were murdered for political reasons, then obviously this is a society in which change occurs by bullets, and there have been many bullets balloting against great men of peace since the killing of JFK.

The argument that there could have been no conspiracy to kill Kennedy in consideration of our history is an egregious example of the genetic fallacy. For even were it true our history were free from conspirational taints, and to so suggest seems counter to the facts, it would still be possible that in Cold War America this pattern was violated. There is no law of the universe which says a historical pattern cannot be broken. The appeal to membership's honor is an argumentum ad hominem. Before we bow down to highly respected men, we should respect highly established facts. Yes, the Warren Commissioners were all honorable men. That's just why we should not trust them. For at any given time to be honorable requires, in most cases, respect of those who hold power. In their time, Socrates, Jesus, Joan of Arc, Bruno, St Thomas, Spinoza, Freud, Gandhi were not honorable men. And they couldn't be precisely because they told the truth instead of lying.

Yet despite any logical objections myths about heroes, about our own history, about our great society serve to provide a socio-emotional integration. And these are all symbolized by the lone assassin conclusion of the Warren Commission. If there was one pro-Marxist, emotionally unbalanced assassin, without a motive, then this great society can still be a good society. This means not only that Oswald was not an expression of a sick society, but that in this society there is no evidence of any sick and dangerous forces. It is most interesting that identical methodological considerations apply to the killer of Robert Kennedy.

The Warren Report was a higher mystery. Most persons would not read it, but so many could believe in what it stood for. A myth is not a cognitive belief; it is not something men just believe; it is something they live. Myths are held so tenaciously, even when at variance with fact. Now what is interesting about the Warren Report myth is that it had to satisfy the American liberal academic. For Oswald as a pro-Marxist would not be swallowed too easily by a large sector of the liberal establishment. So the appeal was a pro-Marxist without any Marxist friends to help him kill the President.

With a Marxist conspiracy the whole Left could be in trouble, but without a conspiracy they could just be in. It is revealing in this connection that the general public less readily swallowed the myth than did the average liberal intellectual.

(to be concluded in the next issue)

TRUTH LETTER is published every other week by Joachim Joesten, 87-70 173rd Street, Jamaica 11432, New York City, USA. - European address: Joachim Joesten, Munich 13, Griegstr. 13, c/o Rahim, Germany.

(7th letter" of 3/15/69)

- 5 -

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 by J. Joesten, 1968-69.
(continued from No. 12, p. 5)

Garrison added, "One of these mutual friends pointed out that with these forces still active in America, Bobby Kennedy was very much aware there were guns between him and the White House. The details about what he said he would have done afterwards, I rather would not go into, except to say that what Mark Lane is saying is true."

It is clear that the reference to "one of these mutual friends" in the preceding paragraph is indeed to Mr. Jones Harris, who, according to Sylvia Meagher, had stated himself at a public meeting on June 29, 1968, that he was the author of the phrase "there are guns between him (RFK) and the White House, and that he used it in a conversation during a visit to New Orleans. (cf. TL No. 12).

It is rather irrelevant, it seems to me, whether Mr. Harris, in using that phrase during a talk with Jim Garrison was expressing his purely personal fears or meant to convey a message from Robert Kennedy. As a confidant of the Senator, Mr. Harris would hardly have given vent to such "personal fears" without some intimation from Robert Kennedy that they were well-founded. I see no point in quibbling about the question whether Harris was carrying a "message" or was just forwarding an impression he had received in talking to Robert Kennedy. In any case the guns were there, as the whole world knows now, and Sen. Kennedy was stopped dead by them as he crossed the political threshold to the White House.

As to the question what Robert Kennedy would have done afterwards, i.e. once he had been elected president, Garrison's statement that "what Mark Lane is saying is true" indicates that he had reason to believe the Senator, once installed in the White House, would indeed have investigated the assassination of his brother thoroughly and vigorously prosecuted those responsible - which is, after all, a matter of course. And nobody knew it better than "these forces still active in America", meaning the CIA, which engineered and executed the assassination of President Kennedy, and its political allies on the Right and among the phony liberals à la LBJ.

Mrs. Meagher, in a letter to me dated March 6, 1969, wrote: "A further comment on the Mark Lane/Garrison allegations of 'emissaries from RFK' (March 1 issue, page 5): Robert Kennedy was to speak at Tulane University but on March 29, 1968, he said that he would not enter New Orleans unless he was given protection against a Garrison subpoena. On 19 April 1968 Mark Lane attacked Robert Kennedy in a hostile article which appeared in the Los Angeles Free Press. I suggest that these additional facts are completely inconsistent with either the Lane or the Garrison versions of 'emissaries' or of any sympathetic understanding with RFK or his intermediaries."

I don't see any inconsistency at all. Robert Kennedy was playing a cagey game which he hoped would safely carry him to the White House, without driving his adversaries to desperate measures of self-protection. That's why he was constantly re-affirming his faith in the Warren Report, which he had never read and which on at least one occasion - in an interview with Jimmy Breslin of the New York Herald Tribune - he had given every sign of rejecting. He was hoping to fool his enemies by playing ostrich, but he didn't quite make it.
(to be continued in the next issue)

* For details, see my mimeographed publication "The Case Against the Kennedy Clan", pp. 11-13.