

Meagher p. 3

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. II, No. 2

October 1, 1969

Editorial "..." and keep that TRUTH LETTER coming." - A reader. I will.

The Pledge of the Kennedys

At the core of the riddle wrapped in mystery inside a conundrum that is the Chappaquiddick affair, there is the "Pledge of the Kennedys," TRUTH LETTER has been informed. It is like an immovable object now being assailed by an irresistible force.

After the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, leading members of the Clan vowed to each other and to God that they would not reveal one iota of the truth until another Kennedy had been inaugurated as President of the United States. With LBJ in power, they reasoned, they would not have a chance of convincing the public, much less world opinion, that the Dealey Plaza ambush had been a regular coup d'état, designed to put Lyndon B. Johnson in the driver's seat. They knew that the extraordinary sway which the CIA has over the press, the electronic media and the publishers of America, plus LBJ's own power and influence, would be strong enough to stifle any attempt to disclose the truth about the assassination, even with a Kennedy label on it.

As a result, they feared, public reaction to such an attempt would be so adverse as to discredit the whole Clan as hysterical, spiteful, vindictive, unpatriotic etc. Not only would they run into a wall of disbelief - as did Garrison later - but they would all be thereafter disqualified for public office.

With the subsequent experience of Jim Garrison in mind, it must be conceded that this reasoning was not entirely unfounded. Nevertheless, The Pledge was a grievous mistake, as later developments have demonstrated, and it has now become a total absurdity.

After the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, the Clan was stunned and more deeply divided than before on the question which course to follow from that point on. Mrs. Rose Kennedy, the only member of the family who after Dallas had actually done something to get to the bottom of the facts - she had hired a couple of private detectives to investigate the circumstances surrounding the assassination of her son - was in favor of speaking out now. But Senator Edward M. Kennedy was firmly committed to The Pledge, the same as Robert had been right up to his death. Both brothers were convinced that nothing effective could be done about unearthing the truth unless and until one of them succeeded John to the presidency.

They were supported in this stance by a majority of Kennedy advisers, which - unbeknown to both surviving brothers - included at least two, if not three, LBJ stooges. I have publicly identified one of these traitors, Kenneth O'Donnell, in my book "Oswald: The Truth" (Chapter 28), and I hope to be able soon to pillory another.

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

For Robert Kennedy, silence and patience turned out to have been a fatal mistake. The fact - well realized by the rest of the Clan - that he was murdered by the same gang who had staged the Dallas coup d'état for compelling reasons of self-preservation, ought to have been enough to make the last of the brothers, Edward, forego The Pledge. He wanted to, but the traitors inside his own camp held him back. They advised him, with a macabre irony in petto, to follow in Robert's footsteps, and he did.

At the beginning of this year, Edward Kennedy made an overt bid for the presidential nomination in 1972, apparently on the theory that, with the Usurper finally out of the picture, it would be a safe thing to do so. He forgot the CIA which is, unfortunately, still very much with us, (and very much after the last of the Kennedy brothers. As long as the CIA rules supreme in Washington - and Nixon, too, is clay in its hands - there will be no Kennedy Restoration, that is The Murderers' Pledge.

Whether it was an outright attempt to kill him, or a devilish plot to frame him, it is becoming increasingly clear that Chappaquiddick was another CIA operation designed to eliminate the last possibility of another Kennedy going to the White House till the next generation. So far this operation has proved outstandingly successful.

If the Kennedys again fail to rise to this ultimate challenge, they deserve to be driven from public life forever.

From a new subscriber, I have received the following copy of a memo recently addressed to DA Edmund Dinis, which should be of interest to all TL readers:

To: District Attorney Edmund Dinis Edgartown, Mass.
 From: R B Cutler 38 Union St. Manchester, Mass. 01944
 Subject: Suggestion re Edward M Kennedy (EMK) / Mary Jo Kopechne (MJK)

While pursuing your own reasoned line of action please keep in the back of your mind the possibility that EMK was apprehended and framed the night of 18-19 July 1969.... ideal location, ideal time = ideal crime executed by sea-based mercenaries....

There are four weak points in the story, three of which strongly indicate third party's participation:

1. no skid marks on bridge... car was set to run over curb
2. Peachey did not know to whom he talked at 0225 Saturday until EMK's TV speech the 25th.... the man, distant from the manager and in the shadow could have been other than EMK
3. swimming to Edgartown after exhaustion, shock and legal advice from friends does not add up.... holdup, knockout, return to motel via launch upon coming to next morning EMK's realization of real trouble explains his non report to police before 1000 Saturday
4. the medical examiner's report, made only after viewing MJK's fully-clothed body, was an inadvertent windfall for third party

Having researched JFK's assassination it seems more than a possibility that the same gang had a hand in RFK's death and they will not rest until EMK is either liquidated or at least neutralized beyond the point where he could command the opening of the Warren Commission's secret files in the National Archives prior to 2038.....

It is also quite possible that MJK was the intended victim because of some information she may have had concerning RFK and incidentally EMK happened along and had to be handled quickly.....

As you experience delays, postponements, extradition difficulties, fifth amendment pleadings and loss of witnesses' memories you may be persuaded to consider this third party action seriously..... at best you are forewarned and prepared for action should the occasion present itself... at worst your mind has only been partially cluttered by a biased opinion which can be readily jettisoned.....

(signature)
VIII/12/69

Murder Marches On

If and when the second trial of Clay Shaw (on perjury charges) ever takes place, the key witness Garrison had been relying on to prove that Shaw knew Oswald and had underhanded dealings with him won't be around to testify. Violent death a few months ago sealed the lips of the Rev. Clyde Johnson, 37, who was scheduled to be the prosecution's star witness at the Shaw perjury trial.

Johnson had already been called as a witness at the Shaw conspiracy trial. The day before he was to go on the stand, Feb. 18, 1969, he was beaten up so badly he had to be taken to a hospital. As a result, he never testified, thus bringing Shaw a big step closer to acquittal.

On July 23, 1969, TRUTH LETTER has learned, Johnson was shot to death near Greensburg, Louisiana. Though the police of course pretends to be in the dark about the motive for the killing, it must be obvious for anyone with eyes to see and a mind to reason with. Johnson was murdered by the same gang that was responsible for the three great assassinations as well as the slaughter of many other inconvenient witnesses.

Even in death, Johnson becomes an important witness, for it stands to reason that he must have known something that was true and important to have thus been marked for murder before the next Shaw trial. And again note the excellent timing: it was during the period of peak excitement over the moon landing and the Ted Kennedy affair that this important witness was so neatly disposed of, most likely by "federal agents" of some stripe or another.

No More "Potboilers"

In between producing a TRUTH LETTER every other week with a regularity seldom achieved by newsletters, this writer has just completed the second of two book manuscripts he had contracted to do, some time ago, for a big German publisher, the Südwest-Verlag of Munich. Entitled respectively "Wem gehört der Ozean?" (Who Owns the Ocean?) and "VA BANQUE!" (Masterminds of Fraud), the books will come out in October 1969 and the spring of next year. Both are "potboilers," as we say in the profession, i.e. books written out of economic necessity and designed to make money for the author and his publisher, rather than works of inspiration and conscientious compulsion (which rarely make money). From now on, however, I have decided, there will be no more potboilers for me. With even greater singlemindedness and determination than before, I am going to concentrate on the herculean job of exposing step by step, bit by bit, book by book, the truth about the three great assassinations in all its ugliness.

Sylvia Meagher, noted author of "Accessories after the Fact," is still busy as a beaver in the search for the truth. She has just managed to dig up in the National Archives an "unpublished document of the Warren Gang," as she puts it herself - and "gang" is the word! - which goes a long way, all by itself, to prove the bad faith of LBJ's "presidential commission." This explosive, if not sensational, document, which Mrs. Meagher was kind enough to put at my disposal, will be published in the next issue of TRUTH LETTER.

Indeed, by putting forward an allegation so unsubstantiated, untrue and preposterous, the DA laid himself open to a withering attack by the defense. On Feb. 20, 1969, Shaw's Chief Defense Counsel P. Irvin Dymond, made this point in his detailed rebuttal of prosecution charges:

"As to the alleged overt act of Oswald taking a rifle to the Dallas School Book Depository, it has yet to be proved by the state that Oswald ever took a gun to the book depository."

Now, if this isn't the world upside down, I don't know what would be. Here we have Jim Garrison, the man who had publicly - and correctly - labeled the Warren Report a "gigantic fraud", faithfully toeing the Warren line on a key issue, to wit Oswald's alleged carrying a rifle to the TSDB, while Dymond, who at the start of proceedings had his picture taken with the Warren Report tenderly clutched to his chest as if it were the Bible, tells us that it remains to be proved - as indeed it does - that Oswald ever took a gun to the depository.

If you don't quite believe your eyes, read on what Dymond further had to say on this issue:

"We have a witness's (Buell Frazier - J.J.) testimony that Oswald carried a package and, by implication, the state tried to show that Oswald had something to do with the shooting."

This remark by Mr. Dymond, a very intelligent man and a clever lawyer, as the outcome of the trial has shown, is absolutely breathtaking. For, if he says that the state "tried to show", and by mere implication at that, that "Oswald had something to do with the shooting," the inescapable conclusion is that Dymond, ostensibly a great believer in the Warren Report, really doesn't think at all that it has given a true version of events.

Indeed, Mr. Dymond, with the above-quoted two statements, practically acquits Oswald of all suspicion of having killed President Kennedy. For, if in his view, it has never been proved that Oswald took a gun to the book depository - and on this point alone I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Dymond - it follows, as a point of elementary logic, that Oswald had no weapon with which to carry out the assassination (nobody has ever suggested that he could have obtained a rifle at the depository.)

Moreover, Mr. Dymond's near-unbelievable statement (unbelievable, that is, only in the context in which it was made) that it wasn't proved Oswald had anything to do with the shooting of President Kennedy, exhibits a profound scepticism as to the veracity of the account the Warren Commission has given of the assassination.

It also exhibits, alas, a duplicity~~y~~ matched only by Gov. Connally's performance in maintaining steadfastly, on one hand, that he had been hit by a bullet different from the one that struck President Kennedy and, on the other hand, embracing the Warren Report. How can Connally believe that the Warren Report told the truth when he himself knows from his own experience that there was at least a fourth bullet and therefore, inescapably, at least one more sniper? And how can Dymond who, as his above-quoted remarks show, doesn't even believe Oswald was involved in the Dealey Plaza shooting, exhibit such faith in the Warren Report? In order to measure the immenseness of this duplicity, one has to bear in mind that Dymond, before the trial, unsuccessfully had attempted to obtain, in federal court, a ruling to the effect that the Warren Report was a semi-judicial document that should be binding on all courts in the land.

And, what is one to think of the duplicity in reverse exhibited by Garrison who, after once describing Oswald as "a victim and a patsy" tried to prove by implication that Oswald was the assassin? (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

Because they were all involved, in one way or another, in the basic, initial crime, the Dealey Plaza coup d'état. The Dallas police had helped set up the ambush; the snipers were gunmen trained and equipped by the CIA; and the FBI, under the direction of the Kennedy-hater and LBJ fan J. Edgar Hoover, had done everything in its power to hush up the true facts and cover the tracks of the real assassin. The same goes for the Secret Service.

Once all these disloyal "law-enforcement agencies" had become involved in a coup d'état and the assassination of a President of the United States, they were compelled by the instinct of self-preservation as well as by self-evident political necessity to continue hanging together, lest some day - which I hope will not be too far off - they all hang separately. So they again joined forces in the elimination of Robert Kennedy, who became a formidable threat to the safety of Messrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard Helms, J. Edgar Hoover et al. the moment he was assured of the Democratic presidential nomination. And again they all cooperated in suppressing inconvenient witnesses through fake accidents, artificial heart attacks or overt murder (as in the case of Clyde Johnson, discussed on p. 1 of this issue).

The unending chain of murders that has been set in motion by the assassination of President Kennedy will not stop until LBJ, Helms, Hoover and their accomplices have been brought to justice, or at least neutralized, and that is still a long way off since Nixon, too, has become an accessory after the fact through his refusal to make the crucially important autopsy materials available to Garrison at the Clay Shaw trial.

The Los Angeles police was not of course involved in the Dallas murders, nor in the systematic liquidation of embarrassing Dallas witnesses that followed. Yet they also did everything in their power to hush up the truth about the second Kennedy assassination, as has been detailed in these pages, and a strong suspicion is therefore warranted that they were also implicated in the systematic elimination of embarrassing witnesses in the Robert Kennedy murder, which is well under way.

The first victim in the post-RFK assassination murder series was a 17-year-old Mexican-American youth by name of Crespín Curiel Gonzalez. His story is as significant as it is disturbing.

Police records show, the AP reported from Juarez, Mexico, on June 20, 1968, that Gonzalez was picked up June 3 in Los Angeles on a vagrancy charge. As is well known, the "vagrancy" charge is in America a catchall police device for arbitrarily putting people in jail who have committed no offense, but whom the local powers-that-be for some reason or other want to get rid of.

Why did the L.A. police want to get rid of Gonzalez? It will be noted that it happened the day before the decisive California primary vote which led to the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy in the early hours of June 5th. But for what emerged later about Gonzalez' role in, or at least knowledge about, this event, that could have been described as a coincidence of scant importance.

"Gonzalez was sent to El Paso, Tex., across the Rio Grande from Juarez, for deportation to Mexico," the dispatch went on to say.

Why on earth such a circuitous deportation route? Tijuana, Mexicali and a dozen other border crossing points would have been much closer to Los Angeles. Was there a special reason for deporting Gonzalez from Texas, rather than from California? (to be continued in the next issue)