

"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. 14

April 1, 1969

EDITORIAL: Percy Foreman, once a famous lawyer - now an infamous one.

Why They Killed

Thanks to the pseudo-psychiatrists, who abound in the United States, political assassination is becoming easy as child's play in this country. All you have to do to get rid of an enemy or a rival is to hire a few experienced thugs and have him gunned down in the street, in a hotel or on a balcony. If one of the toughs gets caught and can't explain why he did it, just send your psychiatrist around and he'll take care of it.

Look at the way these fellows have been "explaining" every one of the three great political murders of our time. It started with Lee Harvey Oswald who, according to the "experts" of the Warren Commission, "sought for himself a place in history" - but then unaccountably spurned that place when it was all set up for him, by refusing steadfastly to admit that he had killed President Kennedy. That, of course, was only a minor flaw in reasoning, compared to the whoppers we're now getting dished up in the Dr. King and Senator Kennedy murder cases.

The case of Dr. Martin M. Schorr, who testified for the defense in the Sirhan trial, is worthy of textbook honors. After Dr. Schoer, "a small eager man with the queering profile of a near-sighted squirrel" (New York Post), had spent a day on the stand, belaboring the dazed jurors with a hodge-podge of scientific locutions and meaningless verbiage, it turned out that his report had been cribbed almost integrally from the published work of a colleague, "Casebook of a Crime Psychiatrist," by Dr. James A. Brussel. Sirhan's urge to kill the presidential candidate, Dr. Schoer had "explained," stemmed from a "long, slow insidious process" that began in childhood and culminated in the killing of Sen. Kennedy because - hold your breath! - Sirhan was consumed with hatred of his (own) father. Quite apart from the inherent insanity of such a "diagnosis," the fact, brought out under cross-examination, that Dr. Schoer had based his conclusions on the premises drawn from an altogether different case (one picked from Dr. Brussel's Casebook) completely invalidates his opinion.

As far as the James Earl Ray affair is concerned, it would be hard to beat the performance of the London Observer which ran, on March 16, 1969, a dispatch from Washington by Nora Beloff entitled "Why James Earl Ray shot Martin Luther King."

Admitting, at the outset, that the non-trial of Ray "is being widely interpreted - particularly, but not only - in the black community as a shameless cover-up for a politically motivated conspiracy," Miss Beloff then goes on to recite the views of "a very highly placed personality who has been involved in the investigation since the day of the murder," - apparently none other than the great J. Edgar Hoover himself.

Memo to Elmo Roper: There are no believable American news media, period.

Now, of course, nobody in his right mind would expect Hoover to tell anybody anything but a pack of lies, but still he really outdid himself in the case. Witness these lines from the Beloff dispatch:

"As for the motive, they are inclined to think it lay in the viciously disturbed personality of the murderer - 'a nut case', one authority said, who had shown himself consumed by race hatred from his early childhood. Digging into Ray's past record the police found that he used to beat up Negro children in the 'typically Southern Huckleberry Finn country' in Southern Illinois where he was raised. It was not just that Ray, like other white Southerners, was racially intolerant, but that he was permeated with fanatical hatred..."

Since when, one might ask in passing, is Illinois a "Southern" state? To describe James Earl Ray as a Southerner is just about as accurate as it would be to label J. Edgar Hoover a champion of justice. What is certain, in any case, is that Ray was not racially intolerant and that he was never motivated by anything but greed for money. His brothers, and all those who have known him well have stated repeatedly that Ray never harbored or displayed any ill feelings towards Negroes and that in fact he got along with them very well, in jail as well as in his rare moments of freedom.

The whole thing is a typical FBI concoction and indeed a shameless cover-up for a politically motivated conspiracy. In this context, the last paragraph of Miss Beloff's dispatch deserves particular attention:

"But even the men who are most convinced that Ray was 'a loner'... privately worry about the anger and suspicion which the anti-climax of the non-trial provoked. Serious thought, consequently, is being given to the case for appointing a public commission on the model of the Warren enquiry into President Kennedy's murder." A Warren repeat performance, indeed. That would be the last straw.

Who Is James Hepburn?

(continued from Truth Letter, No. 12)

In reply, the Dusseldorf publishing house wrote on Sept. 13, 1968: "... As regards the English edition of the book, please contact the author's agent, Mr. Patrick Lamarre, c/o Frontiers Fiduciaire Wanner, 18 cours des Bastions, Genève, Switzerland."

A "fiduciaire" is a trustee and it was clear, therefore, that "James Hepburn" had surrounded himself with a double layer of protection against indiscreet inquiries. If his agent, "Mr. Patrick Lamarre," was real, he in turn was hiding behind the tight-lipped front of a lawyer's office, that of Monsieur Wanner of Geneva, Switzerland, that much I gathered from that letter.

On Sept. 14, I wrote to Mr. Patrick Lamarre, at the address given, and was not in the least surprised when my letter went unanswered. At the time, my interest in James Hepburn and his book was limited, so I did not pursue the matter any further.

A few weeks later, however, I got hold of a copy of the German edition of the book which I read with keen interest. While the overall thesis presented by Mr. Hepburn - namely that President Kennedy had fallen victim to a plot hatched by the oil magnates and other big business interests acting in conjunction with the CIA and some influential figures of the military establishment, with at least the knowledge of Vice-President Lyndon B. Johnson and the tacit approval of J. Edgar Hoover - was hardly news to me, a good many of the details contained in the book were.

Ceterum censeo LBJ esse delendum.

Perhaps the most telltale characteristic of the book is the author's uncanny familiarity with the inside workings of the CIA, - and of the plot in the making. He not only informs us that the huge total of CIA agents scattered around the globe includes 28 persons stationed in Iceland, where there are two offices - an interesting, if inconsequential, example of detailed knowledge; but he also tells us - and this is important - that a representative of the Committee (which organized the assassination) followed President Kennedy, in September 1963, on his travels through nine states for the purpose of studying suitable assassination sites. And on Nov. 21, 1963, he says, the two men who were in command of the operation thoroughly inspected Kennedy's motorcade through Houston with a view of detecting usable flaws in security arrangements.

The fact that James Hepburn shows himself to be thoroughly familiar not only with the organization, structure, methods etc. of the CIA, but also of the Soviet KGB - he crams a lot of that specialized knowledge into his book, quite unnecessarily - definitely indicates that he himself belongs, or used to belong, to what is called "the intelligence community." But - is he CIA himself?

Or could he be a French intelligence agent stationed in the US? There is a curious Frenchness about certain parts of the book - quotations from Alexis de Tocqueville and the Chevalier de Beaujour, which would hardly occur to the average American writer, among other things; a detailed discussion of the unsuccessful attempt by Col. Bastien-Thiry and others to assassinate President De Gaulle at Le Petit Clamart on Aug. 22, 1962, which, Hepburn says, was carefully studied by the Dallas conspirators; and a lengthy comment on elementary rules for safeguarding the security of a president - by De Gaulle's chief official protector, Superintendent Ducret.

Another striking feature of the book is that it is obviously a two-tier job; a bulky, padded and occasionally rambling treatise on social conditions in the US superimposed on a concise and highly readable account of the plot to kill President Kennedy. And that, of course, explains the genesis of the book, which was originally called "The Plot" and as such had been published in "Bild am Sonntag," but later was expanded to about three times its original size (apparently to satisfy the German book publisher's preference for a more voluminous work) and thus became "Farewell America." But, - are these two so strikingly diverse parts the work of one and the same author?

(to be continued in No. 15)

Concluding the Essay by Prof. Thomas E. Katen:

(cf. Vol. I, Nos. 12-13)

Some Methodological Observations on the Assassination of President Kennedy

A myth preserving the goodness of the society in terms of a communist conspiracy would have been more easily accepted by the public at large, but under the circumstances difficult in the face of liberal establishment opposition. Thus those persons who would be in the most excellent position to interpret the meaning of the assassination have been somewhat paralyzed by an intellectually seductive myth. Now the myth is a powerful one, because it involves the notion of social stability. That cannot be countered merely by the producing of facts. Until one attacks the MYTH it can absorb facts. A framework that can better account for the facts than the myth does must be formulated.

Myth satisfies man's need for fancy; theory satisfies his need for truth. A theory should provide a conceptual scheme by the light of which we can see what the facts mean and understand their relevance. An adequate theory or conceptual scheme of the assassination, I shall maintain, should include the following: (1) a statement of WHY the assassination was carried out. This involves building a model of motivation; and (2) POSSIBILITY. This involves

setting forth the facts with a view to examining their relevance with respect to the conceptual model of motivation. Possibility may be subdivided in two parts; (a) objective evidence; and (b) subjective evidence. (a) has to do with physical facts, and a consideration of whether it was possible for those with the most likely motive to have carried out the killing. (b) has to do with behavior of relevant parties. What does human reaction to the assassination prove?

Examination of possible motivational bases would involve us in viewing Psychological, or this has to do with the question of emotional disturbance; economic, this usually has given rise to the consideration of Oil interests; sociological, usually the question of a sick society, or the problem of having too much violence. One might also consider a civil rights motivation. Political motivation must be considered. Was it the left wing, right wing, or a wing of the government itself?

There is no compelling evidence to show Oswald was driven to kill the president because of psychological problems, and even if there were it would be of little evidential value, because there is no compelling evidence Oswald killed the President. As for the question of big business, Kennedy may not have been the president most friendly to it, but he was not so unfriendly as to enable us to impute a motive to kill him. There is no sign that his continuation in office constituted such a threat to big business, particularly oil interests, that they had to blow his head off. As for civil rights there is no indication Kennedy was doing that much, nor that his death would significantly alter what he was doing. Politically, Kennedy was pro-leftist, in American political terms, and he was supported by the communist party. The left wing hardly had a motive to shoot him out of office, particularly since the man they would be shooting in was farther to the right. The right wing had the motivation, but behavior of relevant parties criterion raises doubts here. Would Earl Warren, whom the right wing would like to hang, rush in to protect these people by presiding over a mythical report?

Upon analysis of the assassination being but an expression of a sick violent society, one can only observe that it is interesting that in so dangerously violent a society politicians, and plenty of extremist ones and hated ones, are not shot down with more frequency. Ah, there is method in the madness. The ones shot are influential leaders, capable of effecting changes, and in the direction of peace: John Kennedy, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy! This is an important consideration, for in seeking to construct a model of motivation, it becomes very obvious Kennedy was increasingly becoming a threat to what President Eisenhower called the military-industrial complex. Careful examination reveals military-political power to be a key variable. The military really had the motive, because John Kennedy, who in the beginning had steered a clear military course, was threatening mutiny, as revealed in his American University address, his test ban treaty and re-evaluation of the cold war, including a diminishing enthusiasm for Vietnam. There was motivation. Further, if we look to the most fundamental changes since his death, we discover them to lie in the direction of militarization of our society. In our society today, not only is the military allied with big business, but it is itself gargantuan business. There is ample evidence of CIA involvement in the assassination, there has been high official coverup, and this suggests a big conspiracy. Here we have in its briefest details a sketch for the type model which must be worked out for a solution of the assassination and, perhaps, a saving of mankind.

Coming soon, exclusively in TRUTH LETTER: a new feature of compelling interest:

HIGHLIGHTS AND LESSONS OF THE CLAY SHAW TRIAL

What a careful study of the transcripts reveals - and why the newsmakers were so eager to keep you uninformed about the points that matter

This is a "must" - don't miss it!

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. (ctd. from 13)

Chapter IV

Robert Kennedy Never Had a Chance

The Ambassador Hotel Was Surrounded

History will record that Sen. Robert Kennedy was murdered by a bunch of CIA-recruited thugs operating on behalf and for the benefit of Lyndon B. Johnson, exactly the same as his brother, President John F. Kennedy, was.

There's one difference, though. Whereas the President, in Dallas, fell victim to a carefully planned "Operation Overkill", that did not leave him the slightest chance of survival because of the concerted crossfire directed at him, Robert Kennedy, in Los Angeles, was trapped in a different manner: his hotel was surrounded on all sides by CIA-gunmen. Sirhan was just one of half a dozen potential assassins who had been posted in the hallways leading to all exits from the Ambassador. It was just his bad luck - as in Russian roulette - that Kennedy came his way and he had to do the job. There are plenty of facts to prove it, as well as an inescapable point of logic.

To take the point of logic first: if Sirhan had been the lone assassin, as he has been officially portrayed, how on earth could he have known that he wasn't wasting his time, standing there in the pantry with his paper-wrapped gun, waiting for a Kennedy who was most likely to walk out through the lobby and the main exit? Why was the assassin lying in wait for his victim in the most unlikely place for coming face to face with him?

That simple, yet devastatingly significant question must have come to the minds of quite a few observers at the Los Angeles trial; perhaps it has even crossed the august brain of Judge Herbert V. Walker. But no mention of it was ever made at the trial, and for good reason. For, there is only one answer to it - and that answer spells trouble for the authorities: Sirhan was waiting in the pantry, because he had been assigned to that unlikely place, just in case. He, like his taskmasters, fully expected Kennedy to take a different route, but they weren't going to take any chances. Somebody had to keep watch at the rear exit and Sirhan, one of the minor punks employed by the CIA for dirty jobs at rock bottom prices, was picked for that job. And what a hell of a job it turned out to be - out of sheerest misfortune!

Concordant testimony, at the Sirhan trial, has made it absolutely clear that Kennedy's encounter with Sirhan in the pantry was due to a last-minute change in plans and could not possibly have been foreseen by the assassin. The most conclusive evidence of this is to be found in the ~~existing~~ testimony given by the late Senator's personal security chief, William G. Barry.

Why wasn't Mr. Barry, at the time of the shooting, ahead of the Senator, as he normally would have been? Because, Barry explained, his boss, after making a brief speech in the Ballroom, had taken a different exit from the stage than planned.

"At the conclusion of the address," the witness said, "I began to clear a path for the senator on the stage. The senator turned to go the other way. He was called by someone at the rear of the stage. The curtains were parted and he jumped down. Of course, I couldn't see them."

"What happened then?" asked the prosecuting attorney.

(to be continued in No. 15)

* cf. my book "How Kennedy Was Killed"