

"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. 17

May 15, 1970

Editorial: Try to outlie Nixon on Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia - anything.

The Big Switch to a Bigger Lie

Well, Liars' Festival on CBS, officially described as LBJ's own account of "the events of that tragic day in Dallas", came up to expectations. R.B. Cutler, who listened in on the show, summed up his impresssions as follows: "The actual thing was awful, based all on sloppy sentimentality, wringing every morsel of pathos out of nothing. Disgusting. Only important item: "Youngblood was on top of me almost simultaneously with the first shot." " (I'll come back to this revealing matter later in a different context - J.J.)

Pierre Salinger, who, after having been President Kennedy's press aide, stayed on for a while in the Usurper's service, publicly denounced LBJ's contention that some holdover staff members tried to undermine his administration as "wholly untrue". He added that LBJ had been "highly complimentary" of the work of those Kennedy aides who stayed on and said "I don't know why he should decide several years later that what he felt at the time is not true now." (Los Angeles Times, May 5, 1970).

Well, Salinger ought to know better. In every single one of the talks between the Usurper and CBS' Walter Cronkite, which that currently greatest of American newsfaking organizations has been airing under the title "LBJ: Tragedy and Transition," Johnson has said a lot of things which were "true" at the time they happened, but are no longer now and vice-versa. He is uncontestedly the greatest liar politics has produced in our time, with Nixon as a feeble, but promising runner-up.

However, the real significance of this performance lies elsewhere. A few days before this TV show, The New York Times (4-29-70) reported:

"The Columbia Broadcasting System said today that its forthcoming television interview with former President Johnson had had material cut out, at Mr. Johnson's request, on the ground of national security. The network declined to confirm or deny published reports that in the deleted film Mr. Johnson expressed fundamental doubts about the Warren Commission's conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald was the 'single assassin, acting alone in the death of President Kennedy."

Later on, in the same dispatch, the NYT stated:

"Sources at CBS and close to the network's management said that in the original interview, filmed in Texas earlier this year, Mr. Johnson said that he had never entirely dismissed doubts and questions about the Kennedy assassination. As he has also reportedly confided to friends, Mr. Johnson was understood to have told Mr. Cronkite that he was not absolutely convinced that Oswald acted alone, and also that in the immediate aftermath of the shooting in Dallas he was concerned that the assassination might have been part of a larger international conspiracy. About three weeks ago, sources said, Mr. Johnson thought better of the remarks and asked that they be cut out..."

According to The Boston Globe of May 2, 1970, "the deleted portion dealt with implied criticism of the Warren Commission's finding that a single assassin killed Kennedy. President Johnson, a friend reported yesterday, had second thoughts about criticising the commission 'because he didn't want to create more doubts about evidence.'" (Emphasis added throughout by me. - J.J.)

What is behind this suspicious manoeuvring and manipulating of a completed film text?

The Warren Report is as dead as a doornail and everybody, except Earl Warren himself, is ready to admit it. In particular, its two key contentions, to wit that Kennedy had been killed by a single assassin and that the President and Governor Connally had been hit by one and the same bullet have become the laughing stock of the world and a great embarrassment to the conspirators, in particular LBJ, Nixon, J. Edgar Hoover and the CIA. All of them have begun to realize that a substitute lie has to be found and solidly entrenched in order to prevent people from instinctively grasping the fact that the assassination really was a coup d'etat, planned and executed by all the right-wing forces of the Establishment, mainly for the purpose of escalating the war in Vietnam.

So the new coverup is the "large international conspiracy." You will hear a great deal more about it in the near future, I predict. To the average American, of course, you don't have to spell out what a "large international conspiracy" is. It is, sure as hell, the "Communist conspiracy." Just make the point that Oswald, the "Marxist", "renegade" and "traitor" had plenty of help and people will become convinced that Kennedy fell victim to a plot hatched by wicked Russians and evil Castroites. It's as simple as that to the boobs.

The opening shot in this concerted campaign to shift the blame from the "single assassin" to international, read Communist, conspirators was fired in mid-January of this year by Sen. Richard B. Russell, one of the seven dwarfs of the WC, in a TV broadcast in Atlanta. After stating that he had never really believed that Oswald planned the assassination alone (which did not stop this great statesman from signing an official document that stated just that), Russell declared:

"I think someone else worked with him (Oswald). There were too many things - the fact that he (Oswald) was at Minsk (in the Soviet Union), and that was the principal center for educating Cuban students..." (Washington Post, 1-19-70) So there you have it, straight from the horse's mouth: the Commies were behind it.

Then came the sudden "revelation" by Gary Powers - ten years after he had been shot down; almost seven years after Oswald had been "convicted" and executed by the police - that his U2 flight had been "betrayed" by Oswald (see the lead story in TRUTH LETTER II/16 and also below).

And now, as the third move towards establishing the Bigger Lie, LBJ's "reluctant" admission that he had always believed in a "large international conspiracy." Be patient, there will be more of the sort to come.

-----

Gary Powers' Stink Bomb, Dropped on a Grave (ctd. from TL II/16)

As I said at the end of my preceding article on this subject, there is conclusive, incontrovertible, irrefutable proof that Lee H. Oswald never betrayed any military secrets to the Russians, nor offered to do so. That proof is provided by the fact that Oswald, upon his return to the United States on June 13, 1962, was neither arrested nor prosecuted for his alleged treason. Anyone who has been following espionage cases, as this writer has done for many years, knows that that kind of offense that is now being charged to the dead Oswald would have earned him, had it ever been true, a minimum of 20 years in the penitentiary. The fact that absolutely nothing happened to him, that he was not even questioned by the FBI or military intelligence about what he is supposed to have told the Russians, proves that that scene at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow where Oswald, according to the Warren Report, attempted to renounce his citizenship and told officials "that he had already offered to tell a Soviet official what he had learned as a radar operator in the Marines" was just a staged show designed to delude the Soviets (They weren't for one moment. For details see my book "Marina Oswald.")

Also, when Oswald, on June 24, 1963, applied for a new passport in New Orleans, stating explicitly in his application that he was planning to make another trip to the Soviet Union, this "renegade and traitor" got extra special lightning service, for the passport was issued to him within 24 hours, which the WC writers considered "routine." Sure, routine for CIA agents about to depart on a secret mission, but certainly not for anybody else. This writer, who never proclaimed himself a Marxist, never defected to the Soviet Union and never offered to betray any military secrets, has had to wait up to six months to get his passport renewed. And I know plenty of other people whose passport applications were either held up for an unconscionable time or even denied on no better grounds than that they had been critical of the powers-that-be in Washington.

Finally, let us recall that J. Edgar Hoover, in a public statement released on Oct. 2, 1964 (for details, see my book "Oswald: The Truth", p. 258) declared that the reason he had not referred Oswald to the Secret Service as a potential threat to the President was "the report of the State Department that indicated this man was a thoroughly safe risk" (sic)....!

All this must prove to anybody not totally blind or totally dishonest that Oswald never was a genuine Communist, never defected and never betrayed or offered to betray any military secrets, but was just a CIA operative loyally following instructions and playing the game according to the rules of what is ludicrously enough called "intelligence."

Gary Powers and his superiors in the CIA know all this as well as I do, indeed much better, and that makes their posthumous smear of Oswald as the man who betrayed America's top military secret of that time, the U2 operation, to the Russians the most despicable action so far of a year that promises to be extra-rich in infamy.

After Gary Powers had been shot down and promptly started singing in Moscow, S.L.A. Marshall wondered in The New York Herald Tribune of August 31, 1960, whether that fellow, at his trial, had been proved to be "a man, a mouse or a long-tailed rat." I have no personal knowledge whether Gary Powers ever was a man, but I do know that he behaved in captivity like a mouse and now he has proved that he is a full-fledged long-tailed rat. The species, of course, abounds in the CIA.

The Three Worshippers

On April 6, 1970, The Los Angeles Times carried this heart-warming story: "HISTORIC PRECEDENT - NIXON AND JOHNSON WORSHIP TOGETHER". The text began with these words: "Old political foes Richard M. Nixon and Lyndon B. Johnson worshiped together in the White House Sunday and established a historic precedent. With members of their families beside them, the President and former President sat on opposite ~~xxxx~~ sides of an aisle in front of an altar in the White House East Room and heard John Cardinal Krol, Roman Catholic archbishop of Philadelphia, attack crime and communism.

"But it was the occasion itself which was outstanding. Mr. Nixon opened the services with a welcome to former Chief Justice Earl Warren and Mrs. Warren and added: "And also this house is especially honored to have here again President and Mrs. Johnson..."

Let's skip the blatant nonsense about Nixon and Johnson being old political foes. As a matter of fact they have always been secret political allies, conspiring with each other across party lines to further the interests of the oil industry (which made both of them millionaires), to keep the US on a "right" course, to throw Liberals in jail, to escalate the war in Vietnam and to eliminate President John F. Kennedy for that purpose. They are two pillars of the monolithic military-industrial complex.

It is the simultaneous presence of Earl Warren (a Protestant, like the two other worshippers, at these services held by a Roman Catholic archbishop) that makes the story interesting. For, as has been noted above, The New York Times, on April 29, 1970, reported that LBJ "about three weeks ago" had changed his mind about his already filmed remarks to Walter Cronkite to the effect that the shooting in Dallas had been "part of a larger international conspiracy." And especially let us recall here the above-quoted report in The Boston Globe that "the deleted portion dealt with implied criticism of the Warren Commission's finding etc." and that Johnson had second thoughts about criticising the commission "because he didn't want to create more doubts about evidence."

The dates coincide exactly (for the NYT dispatch was actually dated Washington, April 28). About three weeks earlier, Johnson and Warren met with Nixon at the White House, evidently for the purpose of ironing out their differences ~~xxxx~~ over the way the Cronkite interview should be doctored. One can well understand that Warren, who has lost every ounce of the respect and dignity he once commanded as Chief Justice, when LBJ tossed the coverup job in his lap, was incensed at having Johnson, of all people, "create more doubts about the evidence" he had so painfully corrected. Behind the pious facade of worshipping together, the three rogues held a strategic conference of outstanding importance to all of them.

-----  
Welcome, Sister, to the "Flat Earth Society!"

From a new subscriber in England, Miss Anne Smith of Stockport, I have just received a friendly letter containing this witty remark: "... It will be great to have some regular communication with like minds. Surrounded by the conventional media, one starts to feel like a founder member of the Flat Earth Society." - We all know how it feels, Anne.

-----  
Just before going to press, TRUTH LETTER received a copy of the sensational May 1970 issue of "Computers & Automation," which really deals the death blow to the infamous Warren Report. Its contents will be thoroughly discussed in the next issue.

"The three entered the car and it took off almost immediately. The fourth man, he continued, came across the street on Houston and appeared to be in a 'very big hurry' turning frequently to look over his shoulder 'as though he was being followed.'"

Then followed this tell-tale paragraph which the Times-Picayune, probably on purpose, presented in a confusing, even garbled manner, evidently in an attempt to hide as much as possible its enormous significance:

"Carr said he gave this statement to the FBI, and the district attorney what he did as a result of his conversation with the FBI.

" 'I done as I was instructed,' he answered. 'I shut my mouth.' He told Garrison he was never called before the Warren Commission."

Had the Times-Picayune meant to be explicit, had it wanted its readers to grasp the significance of what happened, then the paper would have had to insert a period (.) after the sentence "Carr said he gave this statement to the FBI." By running this sentence together with "and the district attorney etc." the impression is created that these two things happened at the same time and that Carr, who had been interviewed by FBI Agent Scott in Dallas then talked to the district attorney there, to wit Henry Wade.

Actually, the district attorney in question is Jim Garrison, as the context clearly shows (but how many newspaper readers take the time or the trouble to try to elucidate an obscure passage in their paper?). It is further indicative of the Times-Picayune's slanting technique - a technique used in the matter by practically the entire American press - that the question Garrison must have asked at this point, to wit, "Why didn't you say all this before?" or something to that effect, is not mentioned at all, although Carr's answer "I done as I was instructed - I shut my mouth" unmistakably indicates that such a question had been asked of him.

The States-Item was even more laconic in dealing with this matter, reducing it to the brief sentence: "He said he 'kept his mouth shut' about what he saw after talking to an FBI agent about it."

It is perfectly clear that it was the FBI which had "instructed" Carr to keep his mouth shut and he obeyed because like so many other witnesses in the case who were similarly bullied and browbeaten by the FBI - their number is legion, as any reader of all of my books on the subject will know - he did not realize that the FBI has absolutely no right to tell anybody who is an actual witness to a crime to keep his mouth shut about his observations. Or, if he was aware of his constitutional rights in the matter, then Carr was afraid, and it must be conceded that he had reason to be, for the number of witnesses who have died since Nov. 22, 1963, mainly from unnatural causes, is also legion. Whether or not they promised to keep their mouths shut, many of them just happened to know too much and could not be trusted by those in command of the whole operation - and that includes the FBI - to preserve silence forever.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the States-Item, on Feb. 21, 1969 published a "Special" from Washington which began with the paragraph "A Federal Bureau of Investigation report on Richard Raymond (actually the middle name of the witness is Randolph - J. J.) Carr is somewhat different from the testimony he gave in New Orleans in the trial of Clay L. Shaw" and culminates in the downright ludicrous sentence "FBI agents interviewed Carr early in 1964, but the reports on the conversation make no mention of any order of silence." !!

The real difference which does exist between Carr's testimony in New Orleans and the official record of the statement Carr is supposed to have given to FBI Agent Scott early in February 1964 is only perfunctorily alluded at in the above-cited dispatch although it is a big and most important one.

(to be continued in the next issue)

6

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, 1968-70.

---

Such a performance seemed hard to beat, yet actually Marcus' colleague and co-witness for the defense, Dr. Bernard L. Diamond of the University of California at Berkeley - whom one newspaper report described as "a giant in the field of psychiatry and the law" - went him one better. Diamond told the court he had examined Sirhan eight times in his jail cell for a total of about 20 to 25 hours, and had spent more than 100 additional hours studying the results of his psychological tests. One of these tests was described by Time magazine, in its issue of April 4, 1969, under the headline "Sirhan Through the Looking Glass" as follows:

"A mirror. Two flickering candles. And Sirhan. Alone in his cramped room, day after day, hour after silent hour, Sirhan studied Sirhan. Mail order courses in Rosicrucian mysticism had given him a new creed. They told the disturbed Christian Arab that he could unlock from the mirror the image of Sirhan inner knowledge, happiness and power he craved. Focusing his mind power on the looking glass, Sirhan soon convinced himself that he could order an inanimate object to move... Yet telekinesis - the ability to cause objects at a distance to move through the exercise of the will - was a frightening power and Sirhan feared that he might lose his mind. Once, instead of his own image in the mirror, Sirhan saw a vision of Robert Kennedy, the man he was soon afterward to kill... reported Dr. Bernard L. Diamond, noted psychoanalyst... star witness for Sirhan's defense..."

In his testimony before the court, the "giant" from Berkeley also had this to say about Sirhan: "He was gradually programming himself exactly like a computer is programmed by its magnetic tape, programming himself for the coming assassination... He was confused, bewildered and partially intoxicated. The mirrors in the hotel lobby, the flashing lights, the general confusion - this was like pressing the button which starts the computer."

Diamond further described Sirhan as "a robot-killer in a self-induced trance" and stated as his opinion that "through chance, circumstances, and a succession of unrelated events Sirhan found himself in the physical situation in which the assassination occurred."

"Chance, circumstances and a succession of unrelated events," - that has been the "psychoanalysts'" favorite explanation for everything they couldn't rationally explain about the three Great Assassinations - such as the fact that the well-programmed computer killer happened to be lurking in the pantry of the Hotel through which Sen. Kennedy very definitely was not scheduled to pass.

Diamond also did his bit to bolster the official legend that Sirhan killed Kennedy because he believed him to be a friend of Zionists. "His fanatical hatred and fear of the Jews increased with each radio and television broadcast concerning the tension in the Middle East," the Giant declared.

In winding up his testimony, Diamond uttered the only sensible words that had come out of his distinguished mouth that day: "I agree that this is an absurd and preposterous story, unlikely and incredible."

Then, why had the mental giant served up such a story for the jury? He had an answer for that, too, in keeping with the rest of his performance: "The crime itself was a tragically absurd and preposterous event, unlikely and incredible." That really must have caused some side-splitting among the CIA Hyenas watching the Sirhan trial on the spot or on their TV sets at headquarters in Langley, Va.

(to be continued in the next issue)