

"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. 16

May 1, 1969

The Shame of the Kennedy Clan

Never in history has there been a sorrier sight than the Kennedy Clan. Here is one of the richest, most powerful and most highly regarded families in the world meekly swallowing insult after injury and tendering the other cheek after having twice been brutally slapped by implacable enemies.

Two heads of the family, one a president of the United States, the other a presidential candidate, have been gunned down in succession and in each case the true background and motivation of the murder have been officially hushed up - with the surviving members of the clan cravenly conniving at every turn in this monstrous travesty of truth and justice. What are these people made of - jelly, pulp, wax or paste? They are molluscs, not human beings.

How could the Kennedys take the ignominy of the Sirhan trial without even a whimper of protest? They didn't even pay any attention to what was going on in Los Angeles these past few months. Ted was off on a personal publicity stunt in Alaska; Jackie was living the good life in the gay spots of Europe; Ethel was posing for a TIME cover and mouthing platitudes; if Rose and her ailing husband did anything but enjoy the sunshine and go to church, it has been unreported in the press. None of them attended the trial of the man who had murdered Robert Kennedy in cold blood, evidently on orders. None of them showed any interest in the matter, or did anything to correct the cynically rigged proceedings.

As has been pointed out and documented in TRUTH LETTER again and again (and I shall continue to hammer these home truths into the blockheads), all the circumstances of the Robert Kennedy assassination as well as the manner the Sirhan trial has been handled clearly bespeak a conspiracy and point to the CIA as the power behind the plot - the same as in the John F. Kennedy murder.

The three key elements of the Second Kennedy Murder Fraud are:

(1) The fact that Sirhan was lying in wait in the pantry, a most unlikely place for Kennedy to pass through, instead of seeking to approach the senator in the ballroom, the corridor or the lobby of the hotel, as a single assassin determined to succeed would certainly have done, proves that he was only one of a group of potential assassins posted in various strategic places throughout the hotel. This matter of paramount importance has been, is being and will continue to be explored at length in the "Trilogy of Murder" section of TRUTH Letter, beginning with No. 14.

(2) The fact that Sirhan's true background, in particular his coming to the U.S. as a four-year-old child in 1948 (not, as the official myth goes, as a 12-year-old in 1957) and his repeated travels to the Middle East in 1957, 1964 and 1966, has been totally obscured before and at his trial proves a high-level conspiracy to dupe the public about the real character and associations of this

professional killer. Additionally, the fact that the US Government itself took it upon itself to falsify the Sirhan image and to cover his tracks in the Middle East through a conspicuously false denial of his movements abroad, proves that he was indeed an undercover agent for the CIA. These matters have been fully explored in TRUTH LETTER, Nos. 4 through 10.

(3) The fact that before and at the trial all parties concerned - prosecution, defense, the court itself - conspired to conjure up a totally phony "anti-Zionist" motive, preposterous on the face of it, in order to hide the real motivation of the crime; the fact that three of America's highest-priced lawyers contributed half-a-million dollars' worth of legal talent (allegedly free, in reality of course on behalf of interested parties) to bolster that make-believe motive; and the fact that a dozen equally high-priced psychologists and psychiatrists were available (the sum total of the fees paid to them must be staggering) to testify about Sirhan's supposed state of mind, all prove a fierce determination to keep the truth out of bounds at all costs. Only the CIA has the power and the resources to falsify history on such a massive scale.

All this, and plenty of other information not available to outsiders must be known to the Kennedys. The question now is:

Are they, individually and collectively, so stupid they don't see the clear-cut pattern of conspiracy revealed by these facts? (Hardly possible).

Are they, individually and collectively, such congenital cowards they don't dare to speak up, even now that the mastermind behind the two Kennedy assassinations, Lyndon B. Johnson, no longer wields supreme power?

Or could it be that they just simply don't care?

Whatever the answer, it makes one shudder.

The Polka Dot Swindle

Where all is lies, fraud, trickery and skulduggery, a minor piece of crookedness like the substitution, by the Los Angeles police, of one polka dot girl for another hardly counts, yet the facts have to be nailed down for the record. The more so as another suspicious death is involved.

Here are the facts of the case: immediately after the shooting of Senator Kennedy, several eyewitnesses declared that they had seen Sirhan in the pantry in the company of a pretty young woman wearing a white dress with black polka dots. At least two of these witnesses, Vincent Thomas di Pierre, a student and part-time waiter at the Ambassador Hotel, and Miss Sandy Serrano, a Youth for Kennedy worker, have been identified.

Serrano, moreover, stated that she later saw the girl in the polka dot dress run from the hotel, shouting "We've shot him." That was, of course, a mistake. Nobody right in his or her mind would after a murder shout "We've shot him." What the girl in question did in fact shout was "They've shot him."

Di Pierre's testimony, given at a grand jury hearing in Los Angeles at which Sirhan was charged with murdering Senator Kennedy, early in June 1968, and embodied in a formal transcript, is precise, detailed and highly significant. The witness stated that he was in the kitchen area when Sen. Kennedy arrived on the scene, on his way from the Ballroom, where he had made a brief election victory speech, to the press room.

He saw Sirhan standing with the girl in the white and black polka dot dress on a tray stand clutching what looked like a pipe in his left hand

Nixon's test of integrity. Will he fire J. Edgar Hoover and Richard Helms?

and with his right hand held to his stomach. He had "a very sick-looking smile on his face." The girl was also smiling.

"I saw him get down off the tray stand. And when I went to turn, the next thing I saw was him holding the gun. He kind of motioned around him and stuck the gun straight out, and nobody could move. It was - you were frozen; you didn't know what to do. And then I saw the first powdering of plastering when he pulled the trigger, the first shot. Mr. Kennedy fell down."

Di Pierro said Sirhan was four to six feet from Kennedy when the shot were fired. "The next thing I know, I had blood all over my face and my glasses." Two of the five people, apart from Sen. Kennedy, who were hit "fell on top of me", he added.

Of the girl who had been with Sirhan, just before he started firing, Di Pierro said, "He looked as though he either talked to her or flirted with her because she smiled." He did not see the girl again after the shooting.

On the basis of the statements made by Di Pierro and Serrano, the Los Angeles police issued an all points bulletin for the girl in the white dress with the black polka dots. Then a 22-year-old nightclub dancer named Kathy Fulton came forward to say that she had been the person standing next to Sirhan and after the shooting affray had run out of the hotel shouting "They've shot him."

San Yorty's police didn't like these statements, so they went to work on the two witnesses in approved fashion. According to an AP dispatch from Los Angeles, dated June 22, 1968, "There never was a girl in the polka dot dress," sought for questioning since the assassination of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, Los Angeles police said today. An all-points bulletin has been canceled... Inspector John Powers, assistant commander of the detective bureau, said police established that no such person... existed. "It was determined that the person who originally described the female in the white polka dot dress was erroneous," Powers said. (This was a reference to Di Pierro whom the fawning newsmakers subsequently did everything in their power to discredit as a liar). Of Miss Serrano, Powers said, according to the same dispatch, that she had been "overwrought" and had "misunderstood." Exit the girl in the polka dot dress.

By the time Sirhan went on trial, however, the police again had changed their minds. They also had changed the identity of Polka Dot and, most importantly, the color of her dress. On February 17, 1969, the mystery woman appeared in court and identified herself as Valerie Schulte of Santa Barbara. She testified that she had been standing near Sirhan and produced the dress she had been wearing that day. It was green with yellow polka dots. She hadn't been too close to the shooting scene, however, she admitted and she couldn't even identify Sirhan as the sniper. Yet it was now "determined" that Schulte, not Fulton, had been the famous Polka Dot.

Grant Cooper, Sirhan's chief lawyer, contributed to this typical piece of police legerdemain with a shyster's trick of his own. He first confronted Di Pierro with a dim picture of a girl in a dotted dress whom the witness thought was the person he had observed in the pantry and then produced a color slide showing a green dress with yellow dots instead of the black-and-white Di Pierro had seen. On the strength of that performance, Di Pierro was shunted aside as an unreliable witness.

On April 11, 1969, came the fitting climax to this blatant substitution of persons and transforming of the evidence by the "investigative authorities." During the night, Kathy Fulmer allegedly committed suicide by taking an overdose of sleeping pills (the CIA's favorite method of killing inconvenient female witnesses). It's Dallas all over again, with just a few changes in scenery, stage props and trimmings.

TRUTH LETTER is published every other week by Joachim Joesten, 87-70 173rd Street New York 11432.

Is Novel Ready to Spill the Beans?

Buried in the most inconspicuous place, in the context of another story, this potential bombshell appeared in the New Orleans States-Item of March 4, 1969: "... In another development, Gordon Novel, one of the central figures in the investigation into the (JFK) assassination, said he and two associates are ready to come to Louisiana and testify regarding Ferrie's death. Ferrie's death has been ruled due to natural causes, but Novel alleges that Attorney General (of Louisiana) Jack P.F. Gremillion had 'been told who killed David Ferrie and how it was done.' Novel asked that he and his associates be granted immunity in the event they testify before a grand jury."

As readers of my books well know, I have always held that Ferrie, kingpin of the Kennedy Murder Plot and a veteran CIA agent, was murdered, even though Garrison himself believed that he had committed suicide. His death, on the eve of Clay Shaw's arrest, was certainly not accidental nor due to natural causes. Ironically, Dr. Nicholas J. Chetta, the coroner who certified that Ferrie had died a natural death, because no trace of violence could be found, succumbed just over a year later (May 25, 1968) in the same mysterious fashion.

As to Gordon Novel, he was a close associate of Ferrie's both in the CIA and in the planning of the Dallas ambush. He probably knows more about how President Kennedy was killed than any other person alive (For details about the Novel case, see my books "The Garrison Enquiry" and "How Kennedy Was Killed") If the States-Item story is correct and Novel now is ready to "sing", the results could be far-reaching - or tragic for Gordon Novel.

Newsfakers International

In a letter dated April 15, 1969, Michael B. Masterman writes from Lymington, Hants., England:

"...Last night on ITV two teams from leading British universities (four men in each team) opposed in a quiz contest entitled 'University Challenge'. They were asked: 'What was the name of the man who was recently acquitted in New Orleans on a charge of conspiring to kill President John F. Kennedy?' Deathly silence reigned supreme. No one could even hazard a guess. Maybe this one incident will give you some idea of the sort of coverage this trial got in the British press. And being, no doubt, Times, Telegraph and Guardian readers they did, at least, receive the best coverage the British press could (or was allowed) to give..."

Now It's Ray's Turn

A plan to kill James Earl Ray is already in the works. Chances are that he'll be dead before the year is out. He certainly won't survive a new trial if one is granted him by the new judge who has the case under consideration now. Apart from the fear of exposure which must weigh relentlessly on the plotters of Dr. Martin Luther King's assassination, as long as Ray is alive, there are now huge business interests at stake in keeping him silent forever. The "literary" Syndicate headed by Ray's disloyal former lawyer Percy Foreman (see TRUTH LETTER, No. 15) stands to lose millions in publishing rights if the truth of the case were to come out into the open. As in the two Kennedy assassinations, the chain of coverup murders disguised as suicides or accidents is already in motion in the MIK case. Ray is a natural "next."

Again, for reasons of space, continuation of the series "WHO IS JAMES HEPBURN" has to be postponed to the next issue, along with the start of the new feature "Highlights and Lessons of the Clay Shaw Trial." Sorry.

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 15)

The pertinent facts have been published exclusively in the National Enquirer of July 28, 1968. Three eyewitnesses - Dr. Fred Parrott, a physician; Samuel A. Strain, manager of an insurance company; and Dr. Marcus S.W. McBroom, director of family and professional services for the California Human Development Center - told that paper they had observed a number of young men, looking more or less like Sirhan, rushing from the scene immediately after the shooting. The three men were at the time standing in the Hotel lobby, close to the corridor leading from the main entrance to the Ball Room (Embassy Room) and therefore in an excellent position to observe what was going on in this strategic area.

Dr. McBroom said in an interview immediately after the shooting: "I had a distinct impression there were two assassins. One seemed to have run out just ahead of me and he was seen by some of the news people and one of my friends." According to the Enquirer, the reference was to Mr. Strain.

Strain told a reporter from the Enquirer that he and Dr. Parrott were standing outside the front door to the ballroom immediately after Kennedy had made his victory speech. He said: "Suddenly, a little fellow, about 5 feet 3, with dark hair, Caucasian, ran out. He had a bulky object in his right hand, wrapped in black paper. I couldn't see what it was. The paper was about 24 inches long. The man wore black horn-rimmed glasses, black pants, a blue turtleneck sweater."

As is well known, Sirhan, too, had been disguising his revolver in a roll of paper about the same size before he opened fire. This can hardly be a coincidence. Obviously, the two men, while stationed in different locations, in order to trap Sen. Kennedy whichever way he went, were operating in like manner and following the same instructions.

"He ran directly at us," Strain continued, "and in a girlish voice he said: 'Excuse me please, excuse me please,' in an excited way. We thought he had stolen something. As he went by, three men with cameras ran from the ballroom yelling 'Stop that man!' At that time, we did not know there had been a shooting. A girl came out screaming, 'The Senator's been shot!' I started after the little man, but the physician who was with me hit my shoulder and said, 'They are bringing him out now.'"

"The four young fellows in their 20s came out of the front door of the ballroom carrying a chubby little fellow on their shoulders. They were telling people to get out of the way. The chubby little fellow kept saying, 'I've been shot. Get the hell out of the way!' But there was no blood visible that I could see. They went down the main stairway and out the front of the hotel. We ran into the ballroom and we saw two people lying there. They were two who were slightly injured in the party and who were carried into the ballroom to be treated.

"It was my opinion that there was some kind of decoy here. Because when I got outside later I asked about the men who went out, and someone said all of them jumped into a car and said, 'Let's get the hell out of here.' It might be a shrewd thing - four men carrying out one man who said he was shot, but I don't know. If it's true, it would mean seven people could have been involved. I think it is a conspiracy of some kind, at this point."

Strain's appraisal of the situation he witnessed is certainly correct. Not only is the basic pattern of the plot clearly apparent, but the details show that it was organized with great care, taking into account all possible contingencies. It is indeed evident that the main task force, assigned to ambush Kennedy at or near the front door leading from the ballroom, and consisting of five or six men, had been thoroughly trained for a joint escape by means of the "wounded man" stratagem once Kennedy had been shot by the gunman in the best strategic position to carry out the assassination effectively. (to be continued in No. 17)