

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

*Meagher -
last page*

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. I, No. 24

September 1, 1969

Libel Suit, Anyone?

Time and again, this writer has publicly accused, in the most outspoken terms, Lyndon B. Johnson, H.L.Hunt, Richard Helms, J. Edgar Hoover, Jesse Curry and other Dallas police officials of having jointly planned and executed the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. This accusation is contained - and substantiated - in all of my eight published books on the subject, most emphatically in "The Dark Side of Lyndon B. Johnson" (Peter Dawnay, London, 1968).

Time and again also, this writer has challenged the above-named criminal conspirators to bring libel suits so that the question whether these charges are false or true could be thrashed out in a court of law. None of the cowards has dared do so, and for good reason.

I have been given to understand, though, that the reason I haven't been sued yet is simply that the chances of collecting any substantial damages from an impecunious writer aren't too good and that the same goes for my British publisher, Peter Dawnay. That may be so, but my Swiss publisher, Herr Carl Meyer of Schweizer Verlagshaus AG., is a multimillionaire. He published my book "Die Wahrheit über den Kennedy-Mord" (The Truth About the K. Assassination) in 1966 and he still hasn't heard from any lawyer for LBJ, Curry et al. My Dutch publisher is also quite wealthy and the Dutch and Belgian printers of several of my books on the subject - in particular, "Oswald: The Truth," "Marina Oswald," "How Kennedy Was Killed" and "The Dark Side of LBJ" - all are quite well-heeled and could be profitably sued.

The real test, however, is now at hand. In its summer 1969 issue, the British magazine LORDS published an interview with this writer entitled J'accuse, the final paragraph of which reads: "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."

Can an accusation be made more direct or more forceful?

British libel laws are notoriously strict and LORDS has a very wealthy publisher. Now is the time and here is the place for LBJ and his gang to bring an action for libel if they are confident they can prove in court that there is no truth in my charges.

On the back cover of "The Dark Side of LBJ", I published a Challenge that ended up with the words: "If Messrs. Curry, Batchelor and Decker were to bring actions for libel, they could undoubtedly collect far more in damages than they are supposed to have pocketed in bribes. But if they don't sue, the whole world will know that these so-called law-enforcement officers in Lyndon B. Johnson's bailiwick conspired among themselves and with others to murder the President of the United States."

They didn't sue. The challenge still stands. And it includes J. Edgar Hoover, Richard Helms and H.L.Hunt, among others. Libelsuit, anyone?

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

That Telltale Silence

Nothing could demonstrate more clearly that Sen. Edward Kennedy's plunge from the bridge at Chappaquiddick was no banal traffic accident at all than the obstinate silence maintained to date by all those really in the know. "Those girls aren't going to talk," Mary Jo Kopechne's father was quoted as saying when his wife suggested that the five other girls who had attended that party could lessen the heartache of the bereaved parents by giving some answers.

Why aren't those girls - or the men who were at the party - talking? Since when are goings-on at a party TOP SECRET? Why should everybody have clammed up instantly if it had been only an accident? In all the history of traffic mishaps in America, there has certainly never been anything comparable to that strange and obviously concerted silence which even Time, that great believer in official falsehoods, has labeled "preternatural."

Had there really been a sex-and-drug orgy, as has been widely hinted, - and Ted Kennedy really couldn't have been so stupid as to attend one in his home state, with six campaign workers from his own and his late brother's staff as female partners - some of the participants would surely have yielded to the lure of the fortune any mass circulation newspaper or magazine would gladly pay for the inside story.

The fact that there was no such disclosure, not even a leak, proves that there is nothing scandalous to reveal, that the party really was a political strategy meeting graced by social amenities. And there is a strong political loyalty at work in the combined, and so far successful, endeavor to hush up the real background of the tragedy.

Will the impending inquest be able to break through that loyalty and get to the bottom of the facts? I doubt it very much indeed. District Attorney Edmund Dinis didn't do anything to explore the hidden aspects of the case until he was prodded by the press beyond endurance. Now he is going through the motions of investigation because the public is clamoring for one, but if he knows what really lies behind that "accident" - and I feel sure he does - he isn't going to push too hard, that's certain. And Judge James A. Boyle has already given every indication that he is more anxious to preserve appearances than in unearthing the truth about what really happened.

With the supremely farcical and fraudulent Warren Commission investigation in mind, which covered up for the first Kennedy murder; and with the equally phony Sirhan trial in mind, which covered up the real background of the second Kennedy murder, it is a safe bet that the Edgartown inquest will be another sham performance, designed to appease the public while withholding the truth about the attempt to commit a third Kennedy murder.

I am more convinced than ever that this is what really happened that night. However, considering all the circumstances, I now believe that the attempt to kill Sen. Edward Kennedy was carried out by ramming, rather than by sabotage. Among other things, Kennedy's reluctance to give any details of how his car, moving at low speed in fine weather, happened to plunge from the bridge, suggests that it was not carried over the edge by its own motion but was pushed off the bridge by another vehicle. This type of murder disguised as traffic accident has long been popular with the Mafia as well as the CIA.

The Mafia of course is not likely to be involved in the case (except perhaps through a "contract"), while the CIA has an obvious interest in preventing another Kennedy from reaching the top where he could reveal to the world how his two brothers were murdered by agents of the criminal agency.

For reasons hard to fathom, the Kennedy Clan still prefers to suffer in silence rather than to speak out and take action. If they persist in this course, their enemies will triumph by driving the last of the Kennedys from public life through a phony scandal after failing to kill him in a phony traffic accident.

The Kennedy Autopsy Fraud (ctd. from No. 22, p. 4)

"I don't know," the doctor replied. "I understood it was the wish of the attorney general who was then Robert Kennedy."

At this point, it must be emphasized again that the X-rays and photos that had been made of the President's body in a government hospital by government personnel and with materials owned by the government could at no time be claimed as property of the Kennedy family. These X-rays and photos have always been government property. It was, however, an essential aspect of the well-organized Kennedy autopsy fraud to shift the responsibility for withholding these essential materials from the Warren Commission, and from public viewing through burial in the National Archives, from Lyndon B. Johnson to the Kennedy family. It was LBJ who organized the fraud and supervised its execution at all levels, from the shameless body-snatching in Dallas through the fake autopsy performed by Dr. Finck and his colleagues under military orders to the TOP SECRET treatment of materials that should be open to inspection by all, or at least all those professionally qualified, and finally to the legal manoeuvring that effectively denied access to these materials even to District Attorney Jim Garrison and thus contributed much to wrecking his case against Clay Shaw. LBJ's guiding hand could clearly be perceived in the background, yet to all appearances it was the Kennedy clan itself that was responsible for this continuing travesty of justice. Machiavelli couldn't have done better.

To return to the questioning of Dr. Finck, Oser then pointed out an exhibit pegged "State 68" which he said was the autopsy report from the Bethesda Naval Hospital. He asked the witness:

"Do you recognize this drawing?"

A. - "I recognize it, but I'm not the author of it."

Q. - "But it's similar to something you've seen before?"

A. - "I recognize it. At the bottom is the autopsy number given at Bethesda for the autopsy performed on President Kennedy. The drawings may have been made by Drs. Humes and Boswell."

Note again the self-betraying vagueness of the answer. Here is a pathologist who signs an autopsy report of the highest importance, yet he isn't even sure who made the drawings that went with it and became an integral part of the Warren Report!

Later during this questioning, Oser brought out a photographic blowup of President Kennedy's head and a blown-up drawing of the path which the bullet allegedly took through the president's skull. He noted these were the same drawings presented to the Warren Commission by the team conducting the autopsy.

"Can you tell us who made these drawings?" Oser asked.

A. - "As far as I know, they were made at the time we testified before the Warren Commission in March 1964. They were made under the direction of Dr. Hume at Bethesda Hospital in a short period - two days, as I recall."

A most revealing answer, exposing another prop of the Kennedy autopsy fraud. The Warren Commission successfully created the impression that the drawings in question had been made on the spot after the autopsy, i.e. on Nov. 22, 1963, or shortly thereafter. Now we learn from the lips of one of the participants in this hoodwinking operation that they were actually manufactured ad hoc for the deceptive purposes of a Commission which knew well from the start that the fatal shots had not come from the rear, but was determined to twist the truth around. Those drawings were not the normal accompaniments of a genuine and honest autopsy, but fake materials fabricated post factum to justify a false foregone conclusion. (to be continued in the next issue).

Where Garrison Went Wrong (ctd.)

"On moving out, they undoubtedly had taken along all of their small belongings and these could very well have included a set or two of curtain rods."

In the absence of any proof to the contrary - and the Warren Commission was certainly not able to prove that Oswald that morning carried a gun with him to the Book Depository - these simple, factual observations will stand. What Oswald had in that bag as he went to work was nothing more lethal than a set of curtain rods which he had picked up at the garage in Irving and planned to take to his room in Dallas after storing them during working hours somewhere at the Depository. That the curtain rods were subsequently spirited away by the plotters who were determined to frame Lee H. Oswald for their own crime is a matter of course. How could Garrison, the man who did most to destroy the credibility of the Warren Report, be so foolish as to follow in its steps on this key point?

Actually, he did worse than just take a leaf from the Warren Report. He tried to prove on his own what the Warren Commission had been unable to do. He put Buell Frazier on the stand for the purpose of establishing that Oswald had taken a concealed gun to his place of work instead of the curtain rods he claimed.

As is well known - even the Warren Report had to acknowledge it - Frazier, when he testified before the Commission, disputed the Commission's contention that the bag Oswald was carrying must have been thirty-eight inches long, the minimum length required to hold a disassembled Carcano rifle. He was backed up by his sister, Linnie Mae Randle, who had also seen Oswald with the brown paper package. Frazier and his sister concordantly estimated the length of the bag at 27 to 28 inches, which would have completely ruled out the possibility of a rifle hidden in it.

In spite of this firm testimony by the two only eyewitnesses of this incident, the Warren Commission arbitrarily concluded that Oswald had taken his gun to the Book Depository that morning - and Garrison, unbelievably, went along with that particular showpiece of the "gigantic fraud." Indeed, in his opening statement at the Shaw trial, he went on to say:

"Buell Frazier will testify that he entered the Texas School Book Depository building that morning about 50 feet behind Lee Oswald. Oswald was still carrying the package. Frazier will testify that he saw Oswald a couple of times that morning, but never saw the package again... At the conclusion of Frazier's testimony, the state will introduce into evidence pictures of a paper sack found in the Texas School Book Depository... Evidence will also indicate that a bolt-action Mannlicher-Carcano rifle was found at the Depository and that, based upon the testimony of Buell Wesley Frazier, this rifle had been brought there by Lee Oswald that morning when he arrived with Frazier."

This is a complete falsehood, a distortion of the truth worthy of a Warren Commissioner. Frazier testified to no such thing when he was put on the stand on February 14, 1969. On cross-examination by defense counsel Dymond, the witness was asked, "Did Lee Oswald ever tell you what was in that package that he carried into the Texas School Book Depository Building?"

Frazier replied: "Well, when he got in the car, I asked him what was in that package and he said, 'curtain rods.' I said, 'Oh yeah.'"

Frazier's testimony at the Shaw trial was consistent with the evidence he had given before the Warren Commission. Only, since nobody in New Orleans brought up the crucial question of the length and width of the brown paper bag Oswald had been carrying, his testimony at the trial was much shorter and less complicated. At no time did Frazier make any statement suggesting that Oswald had brought a rifle to the Depository. That was Garrison's invention, based on a previous Warren concoction. And he deservedly got slapped down for it.

(to be continued in the next issue)

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.

In flagrant disregard of the Supreme Court's consistent rulings in the matter, Judge Herbert V. Walker permitted the diaries to be introduced as evidence at the Sirhan trial. The reason for his doing so is obvious: without these notebooks, which had been most likely prefabricated like the Oswald diary - and by the same people - the phony anti-Zionist "motive" for the killing of Robert Kennedy could not have been made to stick. Rather than have a trial run its course without a shadow of motive, Judge Walker, who was firmly determined not to allow Sirhan's past as a CIA agent and his self-evident role as a hired assassin to get into the record, let due process once again reach the "evaporation point."

Sirhan's lawyers and the defendant himself protested repeatedly against the use of these notebooks at the trial. To give the devil in the case his due, Sirhan was dead right when he told the judge, after saying he would plead guilty if his notebooks were introduced at the trial: "I will do so, sir, not so much that I want to be railroaded into that gas chamber, sir, but to deny you the pleasure, sir, of after convicting me, turning around and telling the world, 'Well I put that fellow in the gas chamber but I first gave him a fair trial,' when you in fact, sir, will not have done so. The evidence, sir, that was taken from a home was illegally obtained, was stolen by the district attorney's people. They had no search warrant, I did not give them any permission, sir, to do what they did to my home." Judge Walker simply ignored this outburst and went instead into the question whether Sirhan's proposed guilty plea could be accepted.

That the Sirhan trial from the start took a turn away from the truth on the crucial issue of motivation and degenerated instead into a free-for-all of pseudo-psychiatric baloney was squarely the fault of Mayor Yorty. With his hasty and intemperate "disclosure" of Sirhan's alleged motive and political affiliations, he set the tune and direction for another organized miscarriage of justice.

Even some of his associates and subordinates in the city government were aghast at what they considered Yorty's "indiscretion," while it really was a deliberate attempt at perverting the course of justice. Time reported on June 14, 1968: "District Attorney Evelle Younger and State Attorney General Thomas Lynch wanted to avoid any such discussion (i.e. of Sirhan's alleged anti-Zionist motive - J.J.) until the trial. Thus they were aghast, and said so, when Mayor Yorty went before a news conference to divulge what he described as the contents of Sirhan's private notebooks, found in the Sirhan home. According to Yorty, Sirhan wrote that Kennedy must be killed before June 5, first anniversary of the last Arab-Israeli war... Yorty went on to characterize Sirhan as pro-Communist..."

Newsweek, in its issue of June 17, 1968, put it this way:

"The apparently fatal connection between Israel, Kennedy and Sirhan became a good deal clearer when flamboyant Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty decided to jump into the case with both feet. Up to that moment, the behavior of the city authorities had been a model of professional decorum... Police Chief Thomas Reddin skipped tactfully over any revelations that might prejudice Sirhan's eventual trial. Not so Mayor Yorty... (who) proceeded to impute to Sirhan motives clearly colored by the mayor's own right-wing prejudices."

And in the words of Sylvia Meagher (The Minority of One, Sept. 1968):

"Yorty repeated almost exactly the inglorious performance of the Dallas authorities who had energetically and insidiously tried to inflame public opinion against Oswald by portraying him as a communist, seeking to divert logical and irresistible suspicion from the ultra-Right in Dallas and to redirect it to Castro or Mao..."

The pattern is the same, the tactics are alike, the inspiration is identical.
(to be continued in the next issue)