

Wagner  
15

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. I, No. 23

August 15, 1969

Earl Warren's Biggest Lie

Were he to live another 100 years, former Chief Justice Earl Warren would not be able to live down the ineffaceable shame of having presided over the most fraudulent investigation in history. There are so many demonstrable lies in the Warren Report, it is hard to find a grain of truth in it. That is almost axiomatic by now. However, it took the Clay Shaw trial to bring to light the biggest whopper of all: the alleged "identification" of the alleged murder weapon by Marina Oswald.

This cynical sleight-of-hand, which was designed, like all the other trickery in the Warren Report, to shield the real murderers of President John F. Kennedy, was performed by Earl Warren in person, rather than by the Commission. He bears the full responsibility for it.

Even as Marina Oswald was being questioned by the Warren Commission early in 1964, Chief Justice Warren confided to newsmen: "I haven't shown her the rifle yet, but I am sure she'll identify it," and after her testimony, "She recognized it all right, as I had told you." (For details, see my book "Marina Oswald," pp. 131-133). The newsmen promptly took the cue and proclaimed to the world that Marina had identified Oswald's Carcano as the rifle used in the assassination of President Kennedy. To them, this was positive proof that Lee Harvey Oswald had shot the President.

The Warren Report was a little more cautious in its approach to this matter than the Commission's chairman had been. It stated that "Marina Oswald testified that the rifle found on the sixth floor of the Depository Building was the 'fateful rifle of Lee Oswald.'" Whether the use of the suggestive word "fateful" was Marina's own idea or it had been put into her mouth by a Commission member, that sentence was clearly intended to convey the impression, without actually saying so, that Marina firmly believed her husband had shot the President.

As I had pointed out in "Marina Oswald," the Warren Report was prudently silent on the crucial question of how Marina could have identified the weapon that was being shown her. "Hundreds, if not thousands, of Carcanos have been sold in this country by surplus arms dealers. How could she - a woman and a recent immigrant from Russia - tell that the one she was being shown was without question her husband's to the exclusion of all other rifles of the same or similar shape and make?" I wrote in that book published in 1967. And then:

"The only way to make a valid identification would have been, of course, to check the serial number. The Warren Report... does not state whether Marina was asked by the Commission if she had ever seen and noted, or memorized, the serial number on Lee Oswald's 'fateful' rifle. If she had not, or if the Commission failed to ask that question... then Marina's 'identification' was pointless and without a shred of legal validity."

This sceptical view has since been confirmed on the best possible authority - by Marina herself. Indeed, during her testimony at the Clay Shaw trial, the woman - now Mrs. Porter - was shown a rifle similar to Oswald's Carcano which had earlier been introduced as state's exhibit 18. Then followed



2

this exchange (questions asked by Shaw's defense counsel, F. Irvin Dymond):

Q - Now, Mrs. Porter, I show you a rifle identified as S 18, is this familiar to you?

A - No, I'm not an expert in rifles.

Q - But, you did testify that you did know that he had a rifle?

A - Yes.

Q - With reference to the rifle that you say that Lee Harvey Oswald owned, had you seen that rifle during the time you lived in New Orleans?

A - Not very close. I had seen him cleaning it or sitting with it on the porch.

If Marina had never seen the rifle at close quarters, before the assassination, if she couldn't even say that an exact replica of it was familiar to her, it is self-evident that her "identification" before the Warren Commission, of "the fateful rifle of Lee Oswald" was pure humbug and sham.

Nor is that all. Marina's testimony in New Orleans contradicted her earlier deposition before the Warren Commission on another important point: In answer to further questions from Mr. Dymond, Mrs. Porter testified that Lee kept the rifle in a closet with his clothes, that she didn't remember whether he ever took it off the premises, but that she later saw it again at Ruth Paine's house. Then:

Q - When is the next time you saw the rifle?

A - I saw the rifle when the police arrived.

Q - Was that before or after the assassination?

A - After.

By contrast, one reads in Appendix XII of the Warren Report:

"... On the afternoon of November 22, she (Marina) told the police that her husband owned a rifle and that he kept it in the garage of the Paine house in Irving. Later, at Dallas police headquarters, she said that she could not identify as her husband's the rifle shown her by policemen..."

Contradiction upon contradiction. In New Orleans, Marina swears that she saw Lee's rifle again "when the police arrived" (i.e. at the Paine house, where she was staying); five years earlier she had said it was at Dallas police headquarters. Then she could not identify the rifle that was shown to her as being the one owned by her husband; in New Orleans she testifies that it was the rifle. i.e. the one belonging to Oswald she saw again when the police arrived.

The only thing that is certain in this hodge-podge of implausible and contradictory statements - apart from Marina's well-established inability to identify any kind of rifle - is her willingness to play the game any way it is wanted by those who have power. This was also demonstrated when Assistant DA James L. Alcock at one point asked Marina if she had ever been told by the FBI she would have to cooperate if she were to stay in the country. Dymond raised an objection to this line of questioning, which Judge Haggerty sustained (because the FBI is sacrosanct and virtually above the law). So Marina didn't have to answer that telltale question which, coming from a chief prosecutor at a conspiracy trial proves of itself that this is what happened: Marina was forced by the FBI (and the Secret Service) to perjure herself over and over again and to falsely incriminate her dead husband when all participants in this macabre farce knew perfectly well - and the Warren Commission better than anybody else - that Lee Harvey Oswald did not kill President Kennedy.

Because Marina desperately wanted to stay in a country which suddenly had showered riches on her, the pauper's wife, she went to any length in cooperating with the FBI, even to the extent of identifying a "fateful rifle" she had never seen close and knew nothing about.



Reader's Forum

3

Dear Mr. Joesten,

The five books of yours that I wanted have arrived safely - also the back issues of Truth Letter as well as current ones. Thank you very much. I have now read them all and have been most impressed - and grateful that there are some voices raised to present things in the light of reality. I find OSWALD, THE TRUTH most valuable of all. I do disagree with you in certain interpretations and hypotheses, but agree profoundly on major matters.

I feel I should say that I disagree with your interpretation of the Mary Jo Kopechne tragedy. I would urge doubt. All the same, I too felt that opportunists took advantage of the Moon Walk excitement to do away with Rev. A.D. King - and Mary Jo Kopechne. I think Ted Kennedy could, perhaps, have prevented it - but only at the cost of his own life - and more.

The current Green Berets case of premeditated murder and conspiracy to murder a Vietnamese civilian appears to me to have a connection - perhaps a kind of blackmail threat. The fact that Col. Robert B. Rheault's home is on Martha's Vineyard (Oak Bluffs) seems to me not a coincidence, but a relevant fact.

Sincerely yours,

August 7, 1969

M.G. (New York)

Very interesting letter. I'd like to hear more about the reasons why M.G. feels that Miss Kopechne, rather than Ted Kennedy, was a target for planned assassination. The disclosure that Colonel Rheault lives on Martha's Vineyard may indeed be significant. It looks like the CIA has a hideout on that island - or perhaps I should say a base of operations (I keep forgetting that this gang of professional criminals is an arm of the U.S. Government). That would explain the smoothness of the arrangements for dispatching Ted Kennedy (or Miss Kopechne) via the fake accident routine.

From M.B. Masterman, Lynton, Hants. (England):

Dear Jo,

... May I congratulate you for the Paul Tabori interview in LORDS. It is to be hoped that it set a few minds thinking and stirred up a bit of grey matter in the brains of a poor misguided public who still genuinely believes that we are living in a society that offers free speech, freedom of the press etc...

The reference is to the Summer 1969 issue of LORDS ("The Gentleman's Companion"), an expensive British "glick" magazine with a large circulation, published by Penthouse Publications Ltd., London. Besides Paul Tabori's interview with this writer, that issue contains a lengthy article by Eric Norden entitled "The shooting of President Kennedy - an end or a beginning?" which goes much further in questioning the official story of the assassination than anything I have seen so far between magazine covers. Among other things, Mr. Norden strongly hints that the CIA was responsible for the Dallas ambush. In an editorial note, LORDS says, "The murders of Bobby Kennedy, Martin Luther King and other liberal leaders give rise to the fear that conspirators continue to strike..."

The interview, entitled J'accuse, begins with the words "Protagonist of the theory that the murderers of Kennedy are still walking free is the German-born American author Joachim Joesten" and in the final paragraph I am quoted (correctly) as saying that "President Kennedy was killed by CIA agents on behalf of Lyndon B. Johnson, with the Dallas police helping to set up the ambush, with the Secret Service looking the other way, and with the FBI covering up. That is the hideous truth about the assassination." How about a libel suit, LBJ? Penthouse Publications has plenty of money.



Where Garrison Went Wrong (continued from No. 21, p. 4)

Indeed, that portion of Garrison's opening statement reads as though it had been lifted from the Warren Report:

"At the Book Depository, Buell Wesley Frazier was employed in the order filling department. Frazier lived in Irving, Tex., a suburb of Dallas, and was a co-worker of Oswald's. Oswald's wife and baby daughter also lived in Irving with Mrs. Ruth Paine, a friend of the Oswalds. Frazier's sister, Linnie May Randall, was a neighbor of Mrs. Paine's in Irving.

"Since Oswald had an apartment in Dallas, he made arrangements with Frazier to ride to Irving with him only on weekends. Oswald thereafter rode to Irving with Buell Frazier every Friday except the one immediately preceding the assassination. Oswald did not go to see his wife and daughter on that weekend because, he said, he was working on getting his driver's license. However, that next week Oswald once more broke his ritual with Frazier. On Thursday, Nov. 21, 1963, Lee Harvey Oswald asked Frazier if he could ride to Irving that night for the purpose of picking up some curtain rods for his apartment. On Friday morning, Nov. 22, 1963, Buell Wesley Frazier drove Oswald from Irving to the Texas School Book Depository. Oswald had with him a package wrapped in brown wrapping paper. When he inquired as to its contents, Frazier will testify, Oswald replied that the package contained the curtain rods he had returned home to pick up the night before. Frazier will further testify that Oswald told him that he would not be returning to Irving that night, Friday, Nov. 22, 1963..."

What is Garrison driving at here? Obviously the same totally false conclusion that represents one of the key elements of the Warren Report (which Garrison correctly has labeled "a gigantic fraud"), to wit that Oswald that Thursday night had gone to Irving for the purpose of picking up his rifle which he had stored at Mrs. Paine's home, in the garage, and that he made up the curtain rods story to explain the package he was going to take from Irving to the Book Depository on Friday.

Actually, there is plenty of evidence that the curtain rods story was strictly true, as I have set forth at some length in my first book on the assassination, "Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?", published in June, 1964. Since Garrison, for reasons known only to himself, chose to rehash the Warren Report on this crucial issue, I feel the reader may be interested in what I had written on that subject in "Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?" which is no longer available in book stores:

"As a matter of fact, any independent and unprejudiced observer who, like this writer, has seen with his own eyes that tiny room at Mrs. Gladys Johnson's boarding house at 1026 North Beckley Avenue<sup>+</sup> in the Oak Cliff section of Dallas must have been struck immediately by one peculiarity: the entire "wall" facing you as you enter this cubicle from the Johnson's large living room consists of four windows. With a ground-floor window front running the full length of his room and opening out on the neighbor's driveway, Oswald was indeed living, as his landlady herself said in the course of a 45-minute talk I had with her, in "the most public room" of the house. A goldfish has more privacy in his glass bowl than Oswald had behind this unbroken window front, especially at night, when his room was glaringly lighted by an unshaded bulb dangling from the ceiling.

"In a cheap rooming-house like Mrs. Johnson's, you don't argue with the landlady about improvements. Either you take care of them yourself or you do without. If Oswald wanted curtains, he would have had to install them - and the first step might well have been to get some curtain rods!

"But why, it might be argued, should Oswald want to procure these rods in suburban Irving rather than in metropolitan Dallas? There may be a very simple and plausible explanation for that apparent anomaly, too. The Oswalds had lived before in a number of small apartments, in Dallas as well as in New Orleans.

(to be continued in the next issue)

<sup>+</sup> I visited there about 10 days after the assassination



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.

Yorty also "revealed" at his news conference that Sirhan's car once had been observed at the site of the "subversive" Du Bois Club - which, as Sylvia Meagher has pointed out in the Sept. 1968 issue of "The Minority of One", "happens to be defunct, a small detail that Yorty overlooked."

Before he killed Senator Kennedy, Sirhan was of course a nobody who had never called attention to himself in any way. If Yorty's police, or some other government agency, kept him under observation - in a manner reminiscent of the way Oswald was constantly shadowed by FBI agents before the assassination of President Kennedy - to the point of noting the temporary whereabouts of his car, it may be inferred from this detail, too, that he was an undercover agent well known to, and constantly watched by the police. Thus the case against Sirhan, the "Communist" assassin-to-be, was built up methodically in almost exactly the same manner as Oswald's label as a "Marxist" was fabricated before his frameup.

On the basis of such contrived "evidence" Yorty, himself a rabid rightwinger, then proclaimed to the world: "Evil Communist organizations played a part in inflaming the assassin of (Robert) Kennedy."

The speed and vicious determination with which Yorty rushed forth to pin two false labels on Sirhan as an alleged Communist and Jew-hater betrays the mayor's personal interest in camouflaging the crime and covering up for its real inspiration and the guiding hand behind it.

Yorty was in such a hurry to spread the news that once again a Kennedy had been slain by Communists and to supply a ready-made "motive" for the captured assassin that he couldn't wait for a search warrant to be issued by a court of law. He instantly dispatched Police Sgt. William E. Brandt and other policemen to Pasadena where they invaded the home of Mrs. Mary Sirhan without a warrant and without her permission. According to the police version, Adel Sirhan, 30, eldest of three brothers living at Mrs. Sirhan's home, had authorized the search "after having been told of his constitutional rights," but this was just another bit of obviously prearranged trickery. Adel had no right to authorize a search of his mother's home.

When the illegally seized notebooks were first produced in court at Sirhan B. Sirhan's pre-trial hearing, on Oct. 22, 1968, defense counsel Russell Parsons immediately asked that they be suppressed because of the unlawful search, but he was overruled by the court. During the proceedings, Parsons specifically asked Adel Sirhan, "Did your mother give you permission for police officers to take anything from your brother's room?" "No, she did not," Adel replied.

Trying to explain the reasons for his illegal action, Sgt. Brandt told the court that the police were "anxious to discover quickly if there had been a conspiracy." Reuters reported from Los Angeles on 10-22-68. That this was only a hollow pretext, has best been demonstrated by the subsequent eagerness of the police and prosecuting authorities to suppress the telltale traces of conspiracy, as detailed in preceding chapters of this book.

In this connection it should be pointed out that the Supreme Court has ruled again and again that the police may not enter and examine a person's home without a judicial search warrant. In the latest of these decisions, a case (Ted Chimel) also involving California, the Court ruled by a 6-to-2 majority that police may search only an arrested man's person and, to prevent him from destroying evidence, "the area within his reach." But if broader searches were permitted without a court warrant, they concluded, the Fourth Amendment privilege against unreasonable search would "approach the evaporation point."

(to be continued in the next issue)  
TRUTH LETTER is published every other week by Joachim Joesten, 87-70 173rd St.,  
Jamaica 11432, New York City.