

"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. 13

March 15, 1970

Editorial: No, sir: American justice is not a two-bit whore, it's a \$ million one.

Tribute to and from My Readers

I doubt that any newspaper or magazine, big or small, has a more devoted and interested - as well as interesting - body of readers than this modest newsletter. They are an extraordinarily dedicated group of men and women of all ages - eager, zealous, responsive, with their eyes glued to the news and their ears close to the ground. They send in clippings from their local papers, news items picked up on their local radio and TV stations, quotes from books and magazines they've read, even complete newspapers and magazines they think I might have missed (I frequently did). They offer suggestions and explanations - usually excellent - and they ask questions (I wish I could answer them all).

Understandably, some are reluctant to have their names publicized. Others, presumably less vulnerable to economic reprisals or other forms of pressure, do not mind at all. Some are quite eager to have it known that they are active in the cause of TRUTH.

With very few exceptions, they write again and again that they like TRUTH LETTER and how much it means to them. Here a few samples from a recent batch of letters:

"I'm sending you a check to resubscribe to TRUTH LETTER. My last issue was V. II, No. 9, so don't let me miss No. 10; I'm serious, I don't want to miss a single issue of your publication." - Marvin Longton, Librarian, New York.

"... It is amazing the wealth of information you have." JLN, Los Angeles.

"Thank you for the sample copy of TL. I must have a subscription, but I shall have to have it on a six-month basis or quit feeding the kids." Carolyn W. Sandford, Orange, California

"I follow TL with great interest" - Madeline Goddard, Bellport, N.Y.

"I am glad that TRUTH LETTER is available with all of its fascinating information" - Mrs. Grace P. Vale, St. Louis, Mo.

Thanks to all of you, friends. But let me say this: We're not going to be a log-rolling society. Much as I appreciate these tributes, I am just as anxious to receive letters of criticism and dissent, whenever deserved. And, let us never stop digging deep, probing hard, scrutinizing everything that's said or written. Let's leave "consensus" to LBJ and his cohorts. Truth will come out the hard way.

It looks like my piece on "Truth Is Expensive, Angels Are Rare" in TL, March 1, has done some good. For, R.B. Cutler, Manchester, Mass. writes:

"Have just met the closest thing to an angel that Bud Fensterwald is going to see for a while... he is primarily concerned with the facts which indicate assassinations are too prevalent in the conducting of the Govt's affairs..."

It seems that he will aid in spreading the gospel... He has allocated some funds to use in this work and gave the CIA (Bud's) a sizeable chunk... "
(name of donor withheld for obvious reasons)

A British doctor who is a TL subscriber writes:

"I hope I am not wasting your time but I thought it would be of interest to you that on Sunday 8th inst. (Feb. 8) I heard an unexpected mention made of the J.F.K. assassination on a banal I.T.V. programme called the 'Simon Dee Show.' This is one of those T.V. programmes where show biz. personalities are presented and interviewed, usually as to their latest pop record new film or show or some such show biz. phenomena, screened in our area at around 11.15 p.m.

"By coincidence I was reading the last three articles of yours on the 'Polka Dot witness' and its implications and mentally was beginning to see spots of varying colour! I heard mention made by one of the guests on the show of Nov. 22nd 1963. Naturally intrigued at such an unexpected mention of such a date I forsook the polka dots and took note.

"The guest's name was George Lazomby (I believe he spells his name 'Lazenby' - J.J.), a film actor whom I think was involved in some James Bond film. He was being questioned about some letter he had written to the press about an actress (I was not listening to the programme initially) when he dismissed the subject and began to discuss how unimportant topics get large news coverage while matters of importance get a few lines - as for instance the woman in the Polka dot dress in the R.F.K. assassination!! The interviewer (Simon Dee) taken by surprise naturally wanted to get back to his original brief but George Lazomby expanded by mentioning 20 witnesses who had died in road traffic accidents and other mysterious ways. Further had R.F.K. become President he would have re-opened the investigation to discover the truth and that 'they' waited until he was successful in the Californian Primary before bumping him off!! In the end Simon Dee was obliged to state that had he known this subject was to be raised he would have tried to get some 'expert' to discuss it. Finally he said that this portion of the programme would be played back later and the material may be used at a later date. He even mentioned Josiah Thompson's book 'Six Seconds in Dallas.'..."

From another source, TRUTH LETTER has learned that Mr. Dee on his next show, Feb. 15, told viewers that he had received "thousands of letters" regarding the Kennedy assassination and that they would certainly follow it up and let the audience know "when we have something worthwhile to say."

Mrs. Grace P. Vale of St. Louis, Mo., a diligent researcher in her own right and a painstaking letter-writer, has called my attention to a tell-tale Warren Commission document which appears to have escaped notice so far. Numbered "CD 354", this is a report by Secret Service agent Roger C. Warner on several people he had questioned in connection with the assassination. The third paragraph of this report reads:

"On 1-1-64 Mr. Jack Brian, Detective, Dallas Police Department, stated that he had interrogated Mr. James Powell, Army Intelligence, who was trapped inside the Texas School Book Depository after the Depository doors had been sealed."

Now what was a man from Army Intelligence doing at the TSED on that particular day and at that particular moment? Obviously he had at least been posted there by his outfit to watch a predestined event come off according to plan. Quite possibly, though, Powell was one of the actual conspirators.

Needless to say, the Secret Service, itself haunted by a guilt complex as big as The Pentagon, didn't look at the matter that way. After pondering

the embarrassing situation for four weeks, Mr. Warner, in his report dated Feb. 3 ~~xxxxxx~~, 1964, stated:

"On 1-28-64 Mr. Powell was interviewed relative to his location at the time of the assassination and his actions subsequent to the assassination. Mr. Powell stated that he had been watching the parade from a position near the corner of Houston and Elm Streets, the site of the assassination. Mr. Powell stated further that he heard the shots and he then joined a group of Sheriff's Deputies, who were heading toward the rear of the Texas School Book Depository on the basis of information that the assassin had shot from the railroad yards (emphasis added - J.J.) Mr. Powell worked with the Sheriff's Deputies at the rear of the TSED for about six or eight minutes. He then entered the front door of the Depository, in search of a phone from which to call his office..."

A neat maneuver. When you are in Army Intelligence, you can get away with murder. Any time, any place, any murder.

Now, just for the record, let's turn to the first paragraph of that SS report: "Lee Harvey Oswald in the first interview subsequent to his arrest, stated that as he was leaving the TSED, two men (one with a crew cut) had intercepted him at the front door; identified themselves as Secret Service Agents and asked for the location of a telephone" (emphasis added - J.J.) This, according to Warner, was reported on 11-22-63, that is while Oswald was still alive, to the Dallas SS Chief of Bureau, Forrest V. Sorrels, by Captain Will Fritz, who had interrogated Oswald.

Clearly, Oswald had told the truth. Why wasn't he confronted with Powell?

There was another person on the scene, according to the same report: a TV executive named Pierce Allman. He was interview by Warner on 1-29-64. Of him, the report says among other things: "Mr. Allman stated that after he had entered the front door of the building, he had emerged into a hallway and there he met a white male whom he could not further identify. He asked this white male for the location of a telephone... Mr. Allman has seen pictures of Lee Harvey Oswald and could not positively state whether or not he is the one of whom he inquired..." Of course not, when you're in the wringer and that isn't what they want to hear from you. (to be continued)

Hail to the Thief!

Life is hopping mad, and for good reason. Its most expensive single piece of copyright property, the Zapruder Film, has been stolen and is being copied at will. Better still, it is being shown across the country, in private gatherings, at public meetings, even on some TV screens. Several copies have reached England (TRUTH LETTER's British correspondent, Mike Masterman, has secured a copy and will describe his impressions in the next issue)

By buying the explosive film from Zapruder for a cool million dollars (to be paid in ten annual instalments, for tax-saving purposes), LIFE, lackey of the Establishment that killed John Kennedy, hoped to prevent the American people and the world from seeing with their own eyes that the fatal head shot hurled the President's body backward with tremendous force and must therefore, have come from the front. Frame 312, which shows this telltale scene has been censored from all publications of the Zapruder Film authorized by Life. Now the unexpurgated version, which visually tells the truth about the Dallas Coup d'Etat, is available to anyone for the asking. Whoever the thief may be, he has performed an outstanding public service. Glory and more power to him!

Keep hopping, Life. The more you get mad, the more we'll cheer.

Due to tight space, the last instalments of "The Kennedy Autopsy Fraud" and "The Dallas Coup d'Etat" are postponed to subsequent issues.

Who's the Liar Now?

Curry pretends to have great esteem for his Chief of the Homicide Bureau at the time of the assassination, Captain Will Fritz ("one of the most skilled investigators in law enforcement," he calls him). Yet he has no qualms about exposing Fritz as a bare-faced liar. He does so with a picture, published on p. 72 of his book "JFK Assassination File."

The caption beneath the picture reads: "The Homicide Bureau Office under guard while Oswald was being interrogated." Now Craig and Fritz, in their respective depositions before the Warren Commission engaged in a swearing duel on the question whether or not the former had been present in the latter's office while Oswald was being questioned. (The background of this controversy and full details about how it was fought out before the Warren Commission will be found in my book "Oswald: The Truth", Chapter 10: "The Clincher: Officer Craig's Testimony").

The Warren Commission chose to believe Fritz, and by the same token implicitly branded Craig a liar and perjurer. The Report says:

"The Commission could not accept important elements of Craig's testimony. Captain Fritz stated that a deputy sheriff whom he could not identify (emphasis added - J.J.) did ask to see him that afternoon and told him a similar story to Craig's. Fritz did not bring him into his office to identify Oswald but turned him over to Lieutenant Baker for questioning. If Craig saw Oswald that afternoon, he saw him through the glass windows of the office."

Now, in that picture on p. 72 of the Curry book, you see two cops guarding a door with a glass window that bears the inscription "317 - Homicide and Robbery Bureau." Inside, three men are clearly visible: Captain Fritz, who is talking to a young man in a business suit and a police officer wearing a Texas hat, his back turned to the view. Close to this policeman one sees an arm and a shoulder of a fourth figure - apparently Oswald, for the position of the arm, held rigidly in front of a body that is otherwise hidden by the man with the Texas hat, suggests that it belongs to a manacled prisoner.

On Jan. 13, 1970, Madeline Goddard wrote me:

"Penn Jones points out that there is a picture of Roger Craig to be found on page 72 of Retired Dallas Police Chief Jesse Curry's book, JFK ASSASSINATION FILE, showing him in Captain Will Fritz's inner office at the time that Oswald was being interrogated. This picture verifies Craig's statement that such a meeting took place and destroys Fritz's denial that Craig was ever in his office during the time that Oswald was there."

Although I had no reason to doubt Penn Jones' word, and he has known Craig well for some time, I asked Miss Goddard, who is also in close touch with the Craigs, to obtain for me explicit confirmation from Roger Craig that he is the person Fritz is seen talking to in that picture. In an interim report, dated Jan. 25, 1970, Miss Goddard stated:

"The Craigs have not yet received my request for identification of the men in the picture of Fritz' office - but in FORGIVE MY GRIEF III, just out, Penn Jones writes that when Craig's five year old daughter looked at the picture she asked: 'What's my Daddy doing in there?'"

Then, on Feb. 25, Miss Goddard sent in a detailed report.

(to be continued in the next issue)

⁺ See TRUTH LETTER, Vol. II, Nos. 9, 10, 11 and 12

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, 1968-1970.

Chapter VII

The Freudian Gladiators' Donnybrook

Seldom, if ever, in criminal history, have so many talented men labored so hard to produce a complete mockery of justice as in the Sirhan trial which began on February 13, 1969 - discounting the jury selection process that had gone before, taking up the better part of six weeks - and ended on April 23rd with a verdict of death in the gas chamber.

Long before the trial proper got under way, it had become amply clear that this would not be an ordinary murder trial, but a put-up job of grandiose proportions. One of the most intriguing questions was, from the start, where the huge sums of money that were being expended for Sirhan's defense were coming from.

Time magazine, on January 17, 1969, indulged in this poppycock:

"From opening day it was clear that trial would be a classic of criminal jurisprudence. Sirhan attracted three of the country's most successful Los Angeles' Grant B. Cooper and Russell E. Parsons, New Yorker Emile Zola Berman... Underneath that story, a "box" of personality material about the trio was entitled, with just a hint of irony, "Priceless Defenders."

An Associated Press dispatch from Los Angeles, on Feb. 7, was a little more specific about the normally high price of these "priceless defenders:"

"Sirhan Bishara Sirhan and his mother testified during some preliminary legal manoeuvring about how little income the family had - a few thousand dollars a year.

"Yet three prominent criminal trial lawyers are defending him.

"Where is the money coming from?"

"Grant Cooper, 65, the chief defense attorney, says he and Russell E. Parsons, 69, and Emile Zola Berman, 66, are working for free. What would such a legal trio cost a rich man?"

"'A half million dollars probably would not be out of line,' says Cooper..."

The American public, which has patiently swallowed every incongruity and absurdity that has been dished up to it in order to explain all that's seemingly inexplicable in the three Great Assassinations, rose to that bait, too. It accepted as a fact - and of course greatly admired the generosity of such selfless lawyers - that Cooper, Parsons and Berman had put in "for free" half a million dollars' worth of legal talent to defend one of the most despicable scoundrels on earth.

Now, I would certainly not contest the fact that there are some truly selfless and idealistically minded lawyers, even in America where they are hardly legion, who would jump to the defense of a penniless person accused of a serious crime, in order to prevent a possible miscarriage of justice. Such generosity, on the part of a lawyer, however would normally be predicated on a belief that his client was really innocent, or at least on a reasonable doubt concerning his guilt. But Sirhan had been caught red-handed, a coldblooded thug who had just shot down one of the country's most prominent personalities and wounded five others. (to be continued in the next issue)