

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. II, No. 1

September 15, 1969

Anniversary

Today, TRUTH LETTER is one year old - and still going strong. No one is more surprised at this survival than the proud father of this creation. For, one year of uninterrupted publication is a lot for a newsheet started on one-tenth of a shoestring. Even million-dollar-magazines sometimes don't last that long.

The fact that TL did not fall by the wayside after a few issues - as many people doubtless would have hoped and quite a few might have feared - proves that there is a genuine demand for truth, at any rate in intellectual and academic circles. Politicians and businessmen do not read TRUTH LETTER, professors and students - especially in the fields of history and political science - do.

I am sincerely grateful for the support I have received from many of my readers. (As you will have noticed, I never use the editorial "We." TL is probably the only publication in the world that doesn't. There is a good reason for it: TL is strictly a one-man-show and intends to remain one.) This support has manifested itself in various forms.

For one thing, all but a very few of TL's early subscribers have faithfully renewed their subscriptions each time they expired in spite of the comparatively high rates which I am compelled to charge to make this newsletter go without subsidies - which are anathema to me. For another, quite a number of them have volunteered to contribute news items and comment, although I am not able to pay for such contributions.

And then, there are those testimonials, which give me the inspiration and the courage to continue, like this one that came in a letter just received:

"... May I say that it (TRUTH LETTER) gets better and better. Your pieces on the Shaw trial and on the autopsy were absolutely magnificent, and the TRILOGY of MURDER is absolutely excellent too..."

Thanks - and let us continue together in the search for the truth.

The Roman Holiday That Fizzled

Pity the poor newsmen! There they had descended like locusts on Edgartown, lusting for Kennedy blood and streaming of unspeakable orgies, and then what happens? A Superior Court judge intervenes and the inquest is off - long enough to make it too expensive for the bosses of the newsfaking industry to keep their men on the spot. Lamented the German newsmagazine Der Spiegel (once a courageous voice of dissent, now allied to and similar to the unspeakable Newsweek): "The 355 newsmen who had gathered in Edgartown received the news that the inquest had been cancelled with dismay rather than with indignation. No one mentioned the huge expenses that could have been avoided, had Kennedy's advisers urged him to appeal the inquest when it was first announced. Each one of the

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

television networks alone spent 17,000 dollars a day in Edgartown..."

Isn't that too bad? What a waste of time, talent and money! And all because of that beastly Ted Kennedy whom Der Spiegel describes as a "Prince Charming touched by the magic wand of a wicked witch..."

Disappointed, the horde of newsmakers retreated to a bar called "Harborside," where, according to Der Spiegel's man in Chappaquiddick, Gerhard Mauz, "they discussed noisily, amidst heavy drinking, a psychoanalytical theory that seeks to explain what happened as an unconscious revolt by Edward Kennedy against the attempt to build him up as a presidential candidate - shaking off his tempters through a catastrophic blunder induced by his unconscious mind."

Now, if that doesn't explain the Riddle of Chappaquiddick...

READER'S FORUM

Letter from Peter Dawnay (London)

Dear Jo,

In your issues No. 22 and 24 of August 1 and September 1, respectively, you state your belief that the 'accident' which befell Edward Kennedy on the island of Chappaquiddick was in fact an attempt on his life. I too formed this opinion at first, but as the facts began to emerge, I very soon altered it and reached the conclusion that something even more sinister had occurred. After an exhaustive study of everything which has been published since on this episode, which I could obtain, I am now convinced that this conclusion is the correct one.

What changed my mind was a report by Laurence Stern of the Washington Post which was published in the London Times of July 24, in which he said: "According to Mr. Arena (the Edgartown police chief), Mr. Look said he saw a car resembling Senator Kennedy's driving aimlessly at 12.40 a.m. on Saturday near the scene of the accident... Mr. Look told the authorities that he saw a man and two women in the car, which drove off as soon as he shouted an offer of help. Mr. Look added that several minutes after the first incident, he saw a man and two women walking along the road leading to the cottage where Senator Kennedy and his friends met for a party on Friday night."

Now whilst the first part of Look's evidence has been referred to over and over again in the discussion of the case, and it seems to be established as fact (although he has been induced to say that he may have been mistaken about their being two women in the car), the second part of his evidence has never been referred to again. This could be because it has generally been assumed to be irrelevant, or else because people's minds simply boggled at its implications. For if the second trio were the same as the first trio, then it follows that Miss Kopechne's body was lying on the back seat of the car when Look first saw it, and that she was either already dead, or at any rate unconscious.

Now it is well known that people do not walk along country roads in America, for to do so, in a land where everyone travels everywhere by car, is to run the risk of being picked up for vagrancy. Indeed this has happened to many Englishmen in America who were ignorant of local 'customs.' More particularly, people do not go walking in the middle of the night. Why then has no effort been made to discover who these night walkers were?

I believe that I know the identities of the two women, at any rate. They were Esther Newberg and Rosemary Keogh whose handbag was found in the car. I had already reached this conclusion when I received information that Miss Newberg was employed by the Urban Institute in Washington, a so-called "think factory" which allegedly has ties with the CIA. But I would need several

TRUTH LETTER subscription rates: £ 45 a year; £ 25, six months; £ 15, three months

pages to set out the whole of my reasoning for identifying these two.

As to the identity of the man, I am convinced that it was either Paul Markham or Joseph Gargan. Everything that is known about Kennedy's actions following the accident indicates that he knew nothing about it until after he had crossed on the ferry to Chappaquiddick island the following morning. He was then accompanied by Markham and Gargan. Twenty minutes after they had landed, they were approached by the ferryman who asked them if they were aware there had been an accident. Kennedy said nothing, but looked worried. Markham replied: "We just heard about it."

It is my firm belief that Miss Kopechne was murdered with the intention of framing the Senator for this crime and that the successful consummation of the plot was frustrated by the intervention of Mr. Lock. I strongly disagree with you that Dinis was goaded by the press into setting up an inquest, for all the indications are that he has guessed the truth. Indeed, it has been fascinating to observe that a press campaign, on precisely the same lines as that employed against Jim Garrison, has already been initiated. He has been called "politically ambitious" and "flamboyant." It has also been instructive to note that whilst there is any danger of an inquest or an autopsy being held, the public printshave been at immense pains to establish that they would serve no purpose, but the moment the prospect of their being held recedes, they turn around and lambast Kennedy as though he was using some underhand influence to prevent their taking place.

Nor do I agree with you that there is any evidence that the car was rammed. The conspirators could not possibly have known in advance that he would be crossing that bridge at that time, and in any case the bridge was too narrow for this to have been effectively accomplished. There was a dent in the car, but it was on the right hand side, and the car went over the right hand edge of the bridge. Photographs show that the left hand side was undamaged. The physical evidence is more compatible with the car having been halted with its right front wheel over the edge of the bridge, and then having been turned over onto its side so that it was balancing on the edge of the bridge, and then with the help of a gentle push, allowed to slide into the water. The dent is exactly where one would expect to find the point of balance, and this point would have taken the entire weight of the car.

At first sight, it may seem that this was rather a clumsy method of accomplishing the "accident," but only a little thought is required to realize that there was practically no other way to put that car over the edge of a steep upward incline without anyone at the wheel. Moreover, if the intention was to frame Kennedy, then the more suspicious the accident was made to look, the better the conspirators would have been suited.

Whilst this solution does provide answers to all the unanswered questions, it does raise others. Why did Kennedy say he was driving the car when he was not? And who was driving it? But I believe it is a simple matter to guess the answers. If Kennedy left the party about 11.0 pm. and was not seen again until 2.25 am. when he checked the time at his hotel, then his hours in between are unaccounted for. His wife was not with him in Martha's Vineyard, and gossip has for long credited him with a roving eye. Who then would have known where he really was that night? Who but his closest confidants, Markham and Gargan? Who advised him on what to say to the police the following morning? Who but Markham? After all, Kennedy had been involved in a fatal accident before, and it had not had any adverse effect on his political career. The girl was dead, and nothing that he could say or do would bring her alive again. To say that he had been the driver of the car would save him from having to reveal where he had really been, and if that got out, then his political career really

would have been wrecked. All he had to do was to explain why he had delayed so long in reporting the accident. No one reading his first statement to the police could fail to see that it was elaborately constructed to provide just such an explanation. Unfortunately, it was not quite elaborate enough. But it was only when the story fell apart at the seams, and it became apparent that he was lying, that the damage to his career was done.

Every move Kennedy has made from the moment he first reported to the police has clearly revealed that he is clay in the hands of his so-called friends and advisers. They have led him into making one blunder after another, and if allowed to continue, they will undoubtedly finish his political prospects for good. To find out who is in the conspiracy, one only has to study the names of these "advisers," one of whom, incidentally, is Kenneth O'Donnell.

But is there any proof that Kennedy was not involved in the accident? Yes, there is. A photograph published in the Sunday Mirror on July 27 clearly shows that the car was on its side when found, and not upside down, as Kennedy said. Its caption read: "How it all began... the ghostly outline of the car just beneath the surface of the water." Nothing in the photograph indicates that it was being turned over at the time...

If I have reproduced Peter Dawson's long letter in extenso, despite the tight space of a five-page newsheet, the reason is that, with due reservations in some respects, I do find it very thought-provoking and even, as the clowns of the Warren Commission loved to say, "persuasive."

There is considerable support for his theory. For one thing, there seems to be little doubt that the car was indeed found lying on its side, not upside down. While I have not seen the picture in the Sunday Mirror, a two-page splash in the German illustrated magazine Der Stern (August 3, 1969) shows this very clearly indeed. It is probably the same picture and the "ghostly outline... just beneath the surface of the water" rules out any possibility that Kennedy's statement about the car having overturned was true. And, indeed, as Peter says, nothing in the photograph indicates that the wreck was being turned over as the picture was made. There are no ropes or chains attached to the wreck and there are no people visible in the picture. It must have been made before the towing.

Jack Anderson's widely quoted story about Kennedy planning at first to let his cousin, Joe Gargan, "take the rap" also would seem to bear out one of Peter's arguments and of course the presence of Rosemary Keogh's handbag in the wreck remains to be explained (her own explanation is just as implausible as everything Kennedy has said about the "accident.")

I don't agree, however, that the car could not have been rammed and that therefore the theory of an attempt on Kennedy's life should be ruled out. An aerial closeup of the scene of the accident, presented as another two-page spread in the above-mentioned issue of Der Stern shows several cars comfortably parked side by side, at the foot of the bridge, on the right hand side (looking towards Edgartown). An automobile lying there in ambush could easily have caught Kennedy's car just as it was about to enter the bridge and pushed it over the edge by means of, say, a cushioned bumper that wouldn't cause a scratch, especially if it hit the other bumper. And why shouldn't the conspirators know that he was going to head for the bridge at that time. It stands to reason that they had a "plant" - or perhaps even more than one - inside the group that attended the party who could have alerted the assailant car, already lying in wait to attack anywhere the opportunity arose, that Kennedy was heading for the dunes. Quién sabe?

Note: Because of the importance of the foregoing, the continuation of "The Kennedy Autopsy Fraud" and of "Where Garrison Went Wrong" is postponed to 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

Chapter VI

Dead Men Tell No Tales - Neither Do Dead Women

It is axiomatic that murder begets murder. But the lone assassin who has been caught is not in a position to repeat his crime, unless he escapes from custody. That is not the case in any of the three great assassinations we are here concerned with. Oswald was murdered himself; Sirhan awaits execution in the death cell; Ray is safely behind bars for 99 years.

Yet in all three cases, the assassination of the prominent politician has generated more killings, more assassination attempts, more suspicious deaths. This is indeed so much the common hallmark of the John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King assassinations that it reveals a common inspiration and a common pattern. It is one of the firmest links between the three crimes.

Penn Jones Jr., the courageous editor of the Midlothian Mirror, the only newspaper in America that has consistently rejected the official versions of the three assassinations, has been keeping tab on these follow-up killings. At first he counted only the deaths of people - mostly inconvenient eyewitnesses - who were somehow connected with the triple slayings in Dallas in November 1963. He was, and continues to be, in an excellent position to do so because he publishes his paper not far from Dallas and has local sources of information not available to anyone else. More recently, Mr. Jones has been chalking up grand totals for all three assassinations. By the end of July, 1969, he had arrived at the impressive figure of 67 and it is certain that his death count will continue to rise.

"But ten a week could be killed and the American people would continue to chant: 'What an amazing coincidence!' ", Mr. Jones wrote in his paper (July 31, 1969).

While it is possible, and indeed likely, that some of these 67 deaths incidental to the three assassinations were not murders (people do die of natural causes, even if they happen to be bystanders in an historic event), it is even more likely that some cases of persons who were killed surreptitiously (the favorite killing method being the fake traffic accident), because they knew too much of the truth, have escaped even the alert eye of Penn Jones Jr. And it is a certainty, established by case records, by reason and even by computer that the great majority of these 67 deaths were overt or disguised murders, most of them connected with the assassination of President Kennedy.

In the case of Robert Kennedy, the death count stands, so far, at two murders disguised as suicides and one twice attempted assassination. Most likely, though, this tabulation is behind reality. For, in all three cases, the FBI, as well as the local police and state authorities, have labored hard to cover up these crimes, hush up the truth and silence those in the know. And in quite a few cases, a strong suspicion is warranted that the follow-up murders were committed by the FBI and the police themselves, while the rest almost invariably can be traced to the CIA.

Why, I am being asked again and again by friends and relatives who cannot bring themselves to believe that such a monstrous state of affairs could possibly exist in America today, should the CIA, the FBI and the police, all of them government agencies, want to cover up crimes and shield criminals?

Why?

(to be continued in the next issue)