

"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. 17

May 15, 1969

EDITORIAL: Nixon, get rid of J. Edgar Hoover before he gets you.

Was "Truth Letter" Unfair to the Kennedys?

In response to my article "The Shame of the Kennedy Clan" (TL, May 1st) I have received a communication from a source evidently in close touch with the Kennedy family which earnestly questions my conclusion that the Kennedys' total lack of reaction to the outrage of the Sirhan trial indicates that they must be either fools, or cowards, or just plainly indifferent to the crimes of Dallas and Los Angeles.

My informant points out that there is a fourth possibility which I failed to take into account, to wit that the Kennedys, well aware of the true facts, the background and the inspiration of the two murders, and determined to bring the culprits to justice, are just biding their time for tactical reasons and will strike back when the moment is ripe. In raising this point, which I evidently did not overlook, but have had so far no reason to credit, my informant strongly suggests that a surprise move by the Kennedys that will throw the conspirators into a panic may be just around the corner.

I still can't bring myself to believe that the surviving members of the Kennedy clan will have the guts to do something drastic to end the intolerable status quo of total deception, but I'll keep an open mind, for I'm rather impressed by the communication I have received. If the Kennedys are really working hard but clandestinely to expose the real assassins of the President and the Senator and to avenge the two murders - hurrah and more power to them!

One Down, Two More to Go

TRUTH LETTER today is able to reveal the name of one of three southern businessmen with KKK affiliations who conspired to arrange and pay for the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. He is, or rather was, Leander K. Perez Sr., multimillionaire, longtime boss of Plaquemines Parish and a kingpin of Louisiana politics. The "Judge," as Perez was called by friend and foe, was an out-and-out segregationist and, though a registered Democrat, an ardent supporter of former Governor George C. Wallace of Alabama. In the spring of 1967, Perez and two like-minded friends - one a fellow New Orleans businessman, the other a Mississippian - got together to recruit a couple of professional thugs who would take care of Dr. King. For a handsome fee, the trio were able to enlist the services of an experienced marksman who had already taken part in the Dealey Plaza ambush, in which President Kennedy was slain, and who now was using the cover name of "Eric Starvo Galt." This fellow was quite willing to commit a second murder, but he wasn't going to take the rap if anything happened to go wrong. So it was decided to bring a decoy into the game and that part fell to James Earl Ray whose "escape" from the Missouri State Penitentiary was also arranged and paid for by Perez and his two accomplices.

In the preparatory stage of the crime, Ray also assumed the identity of "Eric Starvo Galt," in order to shield his accomplice, the real killer and to throw off potential pursuers. In the end, however, Ray was doublecrossed by his alter ego and forced to take the rap for a murder he did not commit (for the full details of this fantastic imbroglio, see "The James Earl Ray Hoax")

Perez, perhaps not the mastermind but certainly the chief financier of this operation, suddenly died on March 19, 1969, at his sumptuous estate outside New Orleans, allegedly of a heart attack. As he was 77 years old, the possibility that this was for once a genuine heart attack evidently exists. On the other hand, in view of the ever-lengthening chain of suspicious deaths that has followed the three great assassinations, the possibility of foul play cannot be ruled out either. Here is wishing more of the same for Perez' accomplices in plotting the dastardly Dr. King murder!

Who Is James Hepburn? (ctd. from TL 14, p. 3)

Even as I pondered the matter and contacted various potential sources of information for further enlightenment, the mysterious James Hepburn quite unexpectedly popped again into the picture. Indeed, on Oct. 20, 1968, Bild am Sonntag published an article entitled "Why Does America's Jackie Marry the Greek Onassis?" which carried the by-lines of James Hepburn and Goesta Schilling. The latter is a staff correspondent of the paper. The way the story was handled made it clear that the bulk of the information contained in it came from Hepburn while Schilling had been instrumental in rewriting and editing it for the purposes of the German paper. Significantly, at the end of the article, there was this copyright notice: "Copyright Bild am Sonntag and Frontiers Publishing Company, Geneva."

The article was curiously bitter about Jackie Kennedy. It seemed to reflect the feelings of a person who had once idolized this woman but in the end had become thoroughly disillusioned with her. (Could "James Hepburn" really be William Manchester? I wondered for a fleeting moment). In any event, and unless an extraordinary amount of fakery was involved in the case - a possibility never to be excluded altogether in such matters - it was evident that the writer had known Jackie and her surroundings well. He described her as a spoiled, petulant woman without class or tact who treated her staff arrogantly.

"When the Kennedys visited Paris," Hepburn wrote, "a high-ranking official of the Quai d'Orsay (French Foreign Office) remarked: 'The President himself has shown himself to be a great man but one got the impression that he was taking out his secretary for the first time.'"

Again, on Nov. 9, 1968, Bild am Sonntag published this item:

"Jackie is selfish, tactless, not really pretty, rather a bit vulgar, spurious, typically nouveau riche, anything but a First Lady. This devastating portrait is painted... by James Hepburn who is reputed to be an intimate friend of the Kennedy family..."

My curiosity about James Hepburn more and more aroused, I wrote on Feb. 2, 1969 a letter to Frontiers Publishing Co., Vaduz, Liechtenstein (the imprint carried by the German edition of his book) to inquire where I might be able to obtain a copy of the original English version of "Farewell America." A few days later this letter was returned to me unopened with a postal notice indicating that the addressee was "unknown" in Vaduz. Liechtenstein is a tiny country with many corporate offices registered there only for tax purposes, none of which escapes the attention of local officials. If there was such a thing as a Frontiers Publishing Co., Vaduz, Liechtenstein, my letter surely

would have reached them. The fact that it did not prove that the outfit is a phony at least in so far as it pretends to be a registered Liechtenstein corporation.

On the same date I wrote to Vaduz, I also addressed to Herr von Wehrenalp, head of the Düsseldorf publishing firm, a long letter in which I pointed out that the information given about the author on the jacket of "Verschwörung" was unusually scanty and seemed to be, moreover, deliberately misleading. In what I must confess was at least in part a fishing expedition, I wrote: "According to information I have received from various sources, there is no James Hepburn; rather, this is the cover name of a group. The Kennedys disclaim any knowledge of such a person. There are indications that the book was really written by a number of people affiliated with the French intelligence service (S.D.E.C.E.) which is known to be better informed about the Dallas murder than anyone else..."

In conclusion I asked Herr von Wehrenalp to tell me specifically where and on what date James Hepburn was born; what his nationality and place of residence were and how I could reach him. I also inquired about the way the Hepburn manuscript had reached the German publisher and whether there were any previously published books by this author.

(to be continued in the next issue of TRUTH LETTER)

#### Judicial Farce on the Instalment Plan

So Sirhan now has added another glamor name to his star-studded cast of defense lawyers. His appeal from the death sentence is to be handled, it seems, by Melvin Belli of "Dallas Justice" fame. And what, if one may ask, is Sirhan using for money to pay for the services of the great Belli? In contrast to Jack Ruby, Belli's last notorious client, Sirhan is a pauper pure and simple who couldn't pay half an hour's worth of legal consultation out of his own pocket. Who, then, is paying the astronomical fees such "high-priced defenders" (cf. TRUTH LETTER, No. 10, p. 5) as Messrs. Grant Cooper, Russell Parsons, Emile Zola Berman and now Melvin Belli normally charge?

The law rightly provides for free legal assistance to needy defendants, but it does not give them the right to pick the cream of the profession, or even a whole quartet of topflight attorneys at state expense. Nor is it in the least believable that men like Belli, Berman, Cooper and Parsons would really volunteer their services, least of all in a cut-and-dried murder case leaving no room for a dramatic demonstration of innocence. American lawyers aren't that unselfish (nor are their colleagues elsewhere). Obviously, then, someone else is picking up the tab for Sirhan's costly defense, which is already running into hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Who could have an interest in putting up such a huge amount for the defense of an assassin caught red-handed? Who can spend lavishly for any purpose without ever having to account for expenditures? Who but the CIA?

As long as there is no plausible explanation from any quarter as regards the origin of the vast funds that have been available for Sirhan's defense, the suspicion is warranted that all or most of it has come through one or the other of the CIA's innumerable "conduits." Taking into account Sirhan's background as a CIA agent - already documented in TRUTH LETTER - and the manifest reluctance of the news media even to touch on this matter, the suspicion becomes a certainty.

This issue of TRUTH LETTER comes to you from France where the CIA cannot intercept mail or monitor telephone conversations as effectively as it can in Germany.

READERS' FORUM

Mrs. Grace P. Vale of 7551 Byron Place, St. Louis, Mo. 63105 has sent me copy of a letter originally addressed to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch but which that august leader of newfakers apparently failed to publish. Here are some excerpts of that letter:

"It is nice to note that the massive amount of overkill directed at discrediting the District Attorney of New Orleans which appeared in your editorial 'Verdict at New Orleans;' the editorial you reprinted from the Wall Street Journal, 'Trial by Publicity, Indeed;' and similar editorials appearing in concert across the country, with the same specious humbug and seemingly ghost-written by the same hand, did ~~have~~ not have the desired effect and has been ignored by the American people.

"This was made evident last week by a radio talk show. One woman calling was concerned that the truth about the assassination of President Kennedy would not be made known because of the acquittal of Clay Shaw. Apparently the Warren Commission conclusions were not considered relevant. They were referred to once as being completely illogical, but the gist of the conversation was whether the truth would be made known.

"Your statement that 'it remains a fact that neither Mr. Garrison nor anyone else has produced a shred of solid evidence to refute the conclusions of the investigating committee headed by Chief Justice Warren,' indicates that you have been misinformed. There is photographic evidence backing eyewitness testimony that shots were fired from the front as well as the back. And this was clearly brought out in evidence at the <sup>the</sup> Shaw conspiracy trial.

"The press didn't publish outside of New Orleans area any of the testimony brought out in the cross examination of Mr. Shaw such as the fact that he knew two of David Ferrie's roommates, one of whom was apparently using the name of Leon Oswald. Nor was it published outside of New Orleans that the house to which Mr. Spiesel led the judge and jury in the French quarter was one that Mr. Shaw admitted had formerly belonged to him and was next door to an almost identical house which had also belonged to Mr. Shaw as late as 1963 which is when Mr. Spiesel said the party he attended that was hosted by Mr. Shaw took place.

"When the trial was over and Mr. Shaw had been so luckily acquitted, it was obviously decided to direct this massive smear attack on Mr. Garrison's character in order to divert attention from the fact that the Warren Commission's conclusions had been completely demolished.

"Headlines across the country proclaimed, 'American Bar to Seek Probe of Garrison!' However, few of the television networks or newspapers reported the following retraction which appeared in small type in the Times-Picayune, 'The whole story is inaccurate,' the American Bar Association president said. He was also quoted as saying that Garrison's witnesses 'must have been pretty good or the grand jury would not have indicted Shaw.'

"In the attempt to discredit this district attorney who had the courage and integrity to fulfil the duties of his office... many others were maligned including the three judges who ruled that there was cause to try Mr. Shaw; the jury of citizens who also ruled there was cause... the judge whom both the prosecution and the defense said tried the case fairly and who twice ruled that the case should not be dismissed but should go to the jury; and all of the state's witnesses who testified against Mr. Shaw... and many others who were unfairly smeared in order to keep afloat the Warren Commission conclusions. It seems to me that this is not acceptable in the United States."

Note: The points so eloquently made in this letter by Mrs. Grace P. Vale, and others relevant to the case, will be explored in depth in "Highlights and Lessons of the Clay Shaw Trial" beginning in the next issue of TRUTH LETTER.

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 No. 16)

The witness added that a woman he spoke to told him she had also seen the young man with the package (not Sirhan) earlier in the evening. She had noticed him because he was acting strangely. This is probably a reference to the natural state of agitation in which all of the potential assassins must have been as the decisive moment approached, for the lot of having to carry out the assassination could have fallen to any one of them, according to which way Kennedy went. They all must have known that the one who had to do the job would be practically lost, as Sirhan was, and so naturally they were excited and "acting strangely."

Strain described the five young men he had seen making their exit through the front door of the ballroom, four of them carrying a "wounded" fifth on their shoulders, as having dark hair and looking very much like Sirhan. He thought they were Latin Americans, but it is far more likely that they were all Arabs. This assumption, indeed, is inherent in the nature of the plot as it subsequently developed. For, the "motive" immediately attributed to Sirhan by the authorities and the news media, evidently following a prepared "tipoff" that was in effect an order (emanating from Mayor Sam Yorty) purported to be anti-Zionist fanaticism and resentment at Robert Kennedy's allegedly pro-Israel stance.

Far-fetched and spurious as this "motive" was, it was the only one the plotters could dream up that had any semblance of validity at all; without it, the real motivation for the crime, i.e. political assassination committed by hired thugs in order to remove a dangerous candidate from the threshold of the presidency, would have become too clearly discernible. This bogus motive, therefore, had to hold good regardless of which one of the six assassins who lay in wait for Kennedy in various parts of the hotel did the job and therefore they all had to be Arabs.

Nor is this purely a matter of speculation, for there exists, indeed, cogent testimony to the effect that other Arabs were involved in the planning of the crime, alongside of Sirhan. Before we turn to this matter, however, and in order to dissipate the false notion, deliberately spread by the news-fakers, that the Los Angeles police did a thorough and honest job of investigating the Robert Kennedy murder, it must be pointed out and stressed that none of the three all-important eyewitnesses mentioned above - Samuel A. Strain, Dr. Marcus S.W. McBroon and Dr. Fred Parrott - were called before the grand jury which met on June 7 to indict Sirhan. Although all three men had promptly told the police what they had seen and heard, they were simply shunted aside as unwanted witnesses because their testimony did not fit into the pattern of the lone assassin version ("no evidence of conspiracy") which was already being accredited by the authorities and the news media. The same thing also happened to another key witness we must now turn to. He is the Rev. Jerry Owens, a Baptist evangelist from Orange County, Southern California, whose story was first reported in an Associated Press dispatch from San Francisco, dated June 30, 1968, which did not, however, give him his real name, but called him "Jones," and then again in greater detail in the National Enquirer. Here is the gist of what the Rev. Owens experienced and after the murder of Robert Kennedy told the Los Angeles police who recorded his story - and then ignored it:

(to be continued in No. 18)

---

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