

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newfaking in the Press

Vol. II, No. 9

January 15, 1970

Editorial: 200 million Americans can't be wrong? -They're most of the time.

Jesse Curry's Confessions

If ever there was a bombshell, figuratively speaking, this is it. The book by Jesse Curry, I mean, that has just come out in Dallas under most peculiar and significant circumstances. Entitled "Retired Dallas Police Chief JESSE CURRY reveals his personal JFK ASSASSINATION FILE," and presented as a "Limited Collectors Edition," this large-size paperback, emblazoned with a gilded police badge that bears the inscription "Police Chief, Dallas, Texas," is bound to cause jitters and nightmares among Curry's one-time accomplices, in particular LBJ and J. Edgar Hoover.

Why? Because this book accomplished what none of the Warren Report Critics has ever been able to accomplish beyond a shadow of doubt: It proves (though it does not say so explicitly) that Lee Harvey Oswald was not the assassin of President John F. Kennedy; that the FBI did its best to cover up the true facts of the assassination; that the Warren Report was a deliberate fraud; and that Lyndon B. Johnson was behind it all.

Unbelievable? Of course, it is, - but also true. In the present and the following issues, TRUTH LETTER will reproduce large excerpts from the Curry book, analyze it as a whole and in detail, reveal its startling significance and, what is even more startling, the hidden, yet perceptible design behind its publication.

For, after a careful study of the book, and taking into account all the peculiar circumstances surrounding its publication, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the principal purpose of the book is BLACKMAIL.

Jesse Curry, who had been Dallas Chief of Police for more than six years, "retired" from the police department in March of 1966 for reasons that were never explained. Later, a biographical note in the book says he "took a new position as Director of Security for the Texas Bank at Trust at One Main Place, Dallas." (All these capital letters are meant to convey the impression that this is a mighty important job, but that's plain eyewash). In fact, the great Curry now is nothing better than a glorified bank watchman, even though "his present position involves the operation of one of the newest and most modern electronic security operations in the U.S.," as the book says. What a comedown! And what a splendid opportunity to blackmail his former partners in crime, especially that multimillionaire scoundrel Lyndon B. Johnson!

If Curry's book were a bona fide contribution to the historical record, it would not have been published under the suspicious conditions in which it has made its appearance.

To begin with, it should be noted that it is not a book by Jesse Curry in the usual sense of direct authorship. Most likely it was ghost-

written, for, believe it or not, it contains some passages of exquisite writing which a Texas cop like Curry could hardly have produced by himself. But even ghost-written books are usually claimed by the personalities who have ordered and paid for them, but that is not the case here. While the book, or at least part of it, is written in the first person and Curry claims copyright, no author's name appears on the cover. It is not labeled, as normal usage would have it, "JFK assassination File - by Jesse Curry," but carries the roundabout title already mentioned.

Secondly, there is no regular publisher's imprint. All there is, is a notice at the bottom of the fly-leaf that says: "All rights reserved to Jesse E. Curry and American Poster and Printing Company, Inc., 1600 S. Akard, Dallas, Texas 75215." If another book ever was published by the American Poster and Printing Co. of Dallas, show me.

But if you want to buy a copy of the book, don't go to the above-named outfit. The scattered ads that have announced the book's appearance in the press and the "reorder forms" that are enclosed with each copy (five at a time) all direct would-be purchasers to the "Mustang Advertising, Inc. P.O. Box 1654, Dallas, Texas 75221."

Advertising companies don't act, as a rule, as distributors for publishing firms; nor is it usual for them to hide behind a P.O. Box number, without a street address or telephone. The whole setup, then, clearly bespeaks caution, reticence, ambiguity. Curry is firing from the dark - at targets in the limelight.

And why should this paperback, which sells for a modest \$ 2 per copy, be a collectors' item? Anybody is welcome to buy a copy, at the cheapest going rate (for a richly illustrated book of this size), yet it purports to be a "Limited Collector's Edition!" How limited is limited - and how cheap can book collecting get?

Finally, there is this unusual copyright notice: "Both foreign and domestic users are restricted in the publication of any materials herein with the exception of matters of public record and knowledge herein." This "user", for one, is not going to respect that notice. Historical truth is more important than the copyright of a criminal. (to be continued in the next issue)

Reader's Forum

An appeal by Madeline Goddard

Former Dallas Deputy Sheriff Roger Craig is seriously ill with pulmonary emphysema, chronic bronchitis, severe headaches and other problems so that he is unable to work to support his family. His wife is also sick and they need funds very badly. They need the moral support, too, of those who understand about the extraordinary difficulties encountered by those who hold to the truth of "unwanted" testimony with regard to the events in Dealey Plaza on Nov. 22, 1963...

Although he had been an excellent Deputy Sheriff, Craig was fired on July 4, 1967. He has been shot at, threatened, followed and harassed in every way. His family has been threatened and he must live with constant worry for their safety...

I believe we are all of us indebted to this courageous man who, in the words of his wife "has only told the truth about his knowledge of President Kennedy's death and there's no one on earth that could make him lie or "change" the things that he has said, when he knows that he's telling the truth."

Mrs. Craig says that Penn Jones has kept them from starving at times. She writes, "There are no words to express the situation that Roger, I and our children have endured during the past almost three years... She adds that "the moral support - just to know someone cares - is greater than you can imagine." Their address is 419 Cameron Ave., Dallas, Texas 75223.

What happened next to the autopsy materials is thus described in an AP dispatch from Washington dated 11-22-67 which quotes Dr. James B. Rhoads, deputy archivist at the National Archives as its source:

"The family of the late president turned the material over to the Archives Nov. 1, 1966 with such heavy restrictions on its public availability that it may not be widely seen for many years."

Since then, the dispatch went on to say, the Archives had received and rejected 15 requests from persons asking to see X-rays and photographs. Dr. Rhoads was quoted as saying that these requests had come "mostly from people who already have done fairly extensive research on the assassination."

"We've explained to all of them that we just can't show it yet," Rhoads continued, and he added, "the heaviest volume of requests came in the month or two after we got the material. In the past eight months or so, nobody has asked."

The dispatch then went into the nature of those famous "restrictions:"

"The Kennedy family gave 14 X-rays, 25 black and white negatives and 26 color transparencies to the National Archives for safekeeping. For what Rhoads described as 'personal reasons', the family placed the following restrictions on them:

"During the first five years, no one but government investigation bodies and persons with the consent of the Kennedy family could see them.

"Thereafter, for the duration of the lifetimes of Kennedy's parents, brothers and sisters, widow and two children, only recognized experts in pathology and related fields should have access."

In practical terms that means, as has been repeatedly pointed out in other press dispatches on the subject, that these materials so essential to the establishment of the truth about the assassination are to remain sealed in the Archives until the year 2039 - along with such other "controversial material" as, for example Oswald's rifle.

This unwarranted and extreme secrecy is, of course, the very heart and core of the Kennedy Autopsy Fraud, and, by the same token, of the larger issues of the Kennedy Murder Fraud.

I have dealt with the various aspects of this subject in several of my published trade books and mimeographed publications before, so there is no need for me to go here again in details that have already ^{been} discussed fairly exhaustively, I believe, in these books as well as in the works of other authors.

The reader anxious to study the whole history of the Kennedy Autopsy Fraud from its inception - the body-snatching in Dallas - is referred to Chapters 28 ("The Strange Case of Kenneth O'Donnell") and 29 ("The Autopsy Fraud") of my book Oswald: The Truth; to Chapter 30 ("Why All This Secrecy?") of my book The Dark Side of Lyndon Baines Johnson; and to Chapter V ("The Pictures They Dare Not Show") of my mimeographed publication The Case Against the Kennedy Clan.

In the present context, I must limit myself to a discussion of what happened in the matter in connection with the Clay Shaw trial, that is (a) the testimony on the subject during the trial (much of which has already been discussed above); and (b) the various developments in Garrison's tenacious but fruitless struggle to obtain possession of the autopsy materials for use as state's evidence at that trial.

That struggle began on May 9, 1968, when Garrison issued a subpoena, signed by Judge Edward A. Haggerty Jr., ordering the then United States archivist, Dr. Robert H. Bahmer, to produce the photographs and X-rays of Kennedy's autopsy at the District Attorney's office in New Orleans on May 24 at 9 a.m.

"Dymond then began challenging Schuster's expertise.

Q. - What training have you had in photo interpretation?

A. - In the two-year course I took, interpretation was a part of the course.

Q. - What field of photography does this cover?

A. - Identifying objects from enlargements.

Q. Did you ever qualify before in court as an analyst?

"The witness asked, 'Do you mean identifying photographs?'

"Dymond said he did.

Q. - I mean, as a photo analyst, have you ever qualified in court before?

A. - Not that I can recall.

Q. - Did you ever attempt to qualify as a photo analyst before?

A. - Not that I can recall.

"The judge got out a law book to see what it takes to qualify as an 'expert.' Judge Haggerty said scientific training is not needed, and a man may qualify by virtue of practical experience.

"Dymond said the witness never had experience in photo analysis, in his opinion. The judge corrected him and said, 'I think you mean interpret and not analyze.' The judge allowed the witness to qualify as an expert in analyzing and interpreting photos. Dymond reserved a bill of exception when he raised an objection and was overruled."

In case some of my readers might think that this exchange of questions and answers concerning Mr. Schuster's qualifications is a bit tedious, I feel I should point out emphatically that the question whether or not Mr. Schuster was qualified to analyze and interpret - as the judge, after due consideration of the matter, explicitly attested him, is of the utmost importance in the case, as we shortly shall see. To continue with the transcript:

"Oser resumed questioning of the witness:

Q. - I show you state exhibits marked S-15 and S-52, and I ask you if you have seen them before.

A. - Yes, sir, I received them from you Jan. 20.

Q. - How long did you keep them?

A. - Until about Feb. 13.

Q. - Did you do any work or examine them?

A. - I examined these photographs from Jan. 20 to Feb. 10.

Q. How much time did you spend examining those photographs?

A. - I could not say accurately. I would estimate 50 to 60 hours.

Q. - I show you state exhibit S-51 and ask you if you had occasion to examine any specific area of the photograph?

"Dymond objected, saying this type of testimony has no place in rebuttal proceedings. Oser said it was relevant and the photos were being offered to rebut testimony that all shots had come from the rear.

"Alcock said the relevancy was for the jury to decide, but Dymond said he objected to their admissibility. Judge Haggerty overruled Dymond's objection and Dymond reserved another bill of exception."

(to be continued)

The new Bookn 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, 1968-1970.

Precisely for that reason, the Los Angeles police and prosecuting author-
ities immediately swung into action to eliminate this embarrassing witness.

"No 'Girl in Polka Dots,' Police Say" - under this five-column heading,
The New Orleans States-Item on June 22, 1968 ran the following AP dispatch
from Los Angeles:

"There never was a 'girl in the polka dot dress,' sought for questioning
since the assassination of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, Los Angeles police said to-
day. "An all-points bulletin has been canceled. It was issued after a Kennedy
volunteer reported such a girl rushed from the slaying scene with the cry
'we've killed him!'"

"Inspector John Powers, assistant commander of the detective bureau, said
police established that no such person with special knowledge of the killing
existed.

" 'It was determined that the person who originally described the female in
the white polka dot dress was erroneous,' Powers said..."

After digressing briefly into another matter related to the Sirhan case,
the dispatch went on to say:

"Shortly after the shooting, Sandy Serrano, 20, a Youth for Kennedy vo-
lunteer, told newsmen that she saw "a girl in a white dress with polka dots"
run from the hotel (in the earliest report on the matter, the color of the
dress had not been stated - see above - J.J.).

"Several young women who told authorities that they may have been seen
by Miss Serrano were questioned. One, questioned at great length and then re-
leased, said she had run shouting 'They've killed him.'"

While the identity of that particular girl was not revealed by the po-
lice, it seems fairly certain that it was Kathy Fulmer, notwithstand the dis-
patch of June 10 which indicated that she wore a polka dot scarf, - which does
not, of course, preclude the possibility that she also wore, at the same time,
a polka dot dress. It also must be kept in mind - more instances of this will
be found below - that there has been in this case quite obviously a good deal
of deliberate juggling of colors and other details, precisely for the purpose
of obscuring the true facts and discrediting inconvenient witnesses - a standard
practice that recurs again and again in all three of the Great Assassinations.

"After an extensive investigation," the dispatch continued, "Powers
said, "it was concluded Miss Serrano misunderstood and had been 'overwrought.'
The police bulletin had been for informational purposes only, and authorities
have never said anyone other than Sirhan was officially being considered a
suspect."

Of course not. A second suspect, officially admitted, would immediate-
ly throw the case for a conspiracy wide open - and that was the last thing any-
body in authority wanted. Hence the summary dismissal of Miss Serrano's testi-
mony as resulting from a misunderstanding and an "overwrought" condition, despi-
te the fact that it had first given rise to the issuance of an all-points bulle-
tin, i.e. an intensive hunt for a suspect.

The bad faith of the Los Angeles police in the case, however, is even
more glaringly exposed by Mr. Powers' failure to make in this context any men-
tion whatever of the corroborating testimony of di Pierro, who in the meantime
had testified before the grand jury, as has been detailed above.
(to be continued in the next issue)