

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newfaking in the Press

Vol. III, No. 3

October 15, 1970

Editorial: Only in America can one fool all the people all the time (TL readers excepted)

What the War is Really About

Oil corporation lawyer Richard Nixon wants you to believe that he has the best interests of the American people at heart by waging a cruel war in far-off parts, and that he is defending freedom and democracy in Southeast Asia. Reality is different.

Precise and detailed information recently published in a number of German-language newspapers and magazines has revealed the startling true background of the seemingly senseless American intervention in Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand and so forth. Unbeknown to the general public, the American oil industry in recent years has been pouring billions of dollars into a massive and extensive underwater exploration of the South China Seas and adjacent ocean areas. They have discovered a vast undersea petroleum pattern some 300 miles wide and 4,000 miles long that stretches from the Gulf of Siam through the seas of Indonesia to the coasts of New Guinea and Northern Australia. By common agreement, this area encompasses the world's largest deposits of offshore oil. Its potentialities are truly immense. Experts estimate that in a few years' time, oil production in this area could reach 400 million barrels a day.

Forty-odd major oil companies, nearly all of them American, American-controlled or with substantial participation by U.S. oil interests, are sharing this bonanza. The governments of South Vietnam (Saigon), Cambodia, Thailand and Indonesia are handing out to them offshore concessions as fast as they can. Most of these concessions far exceed even the 12-mile limit of territorial waters which represents the maximum acceptable under international law. It is the high seas, therefore, common property of mankind, that is being divided up by the greedy oil companies, with the tacit blessing of the U.S. government, biggest "ocean-grabber" of all times.

Amoco, Gulf Oil, Conoco, Union Oil, Tenneco and BP have grabbed practically all of the Gulf of Siam. Standard Oil of N.J. and Conoco have obtained from Malaysia "off-shore" concessions that reach out hundreds of miles into the South China Sea. Continental, Gulf Oil, Sinclair, City Services, Union Oil and a few Japanese oil companies more or less controlled by American interests have divided up among themselves all the waters of the Indonesian archipelago. Shell have carved out for themselves a big slice of the ocean floor off Sarawak. And that's not the end of the list.

All these concessions and the billions of dollars that have been spent and are still being spent on them would of course become practically worthless should the coastal regions surrounding them come under hostile control. You can't exploit an offshore oil concession unless the pipeline terminal, the nearby ports of supply, the refineries etc. are in friendly hands. That's why, despite all pious assurances to the contrary, oil president Nixon will never pull his troops out of South East Asia, unless American control over the coastal regions has been everywhere as firmly established as it is now in Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore (which even now has an American colony of some 12,000 persons, nearly all of them connected with the oil industry) and Thailand. He'll fight for his Saigon stronghold to the last G-I and for Cambodia to the last Thai. After all, some day the American people will send him back where he came from - the oil industry.

Secret - and Illegal - Censorship

From a student in California, I have recently received a letter that said in part: "... You have always been something of a legend over here because your books are unavailable and your research is so extremely important. I think you are a very courageous and valuable man and I want to congratulate you on your work. There are many, I am sure, who feel the same way. I for years have been reading all I can find on the assassinations and you are a goldmine..."

Why are my books about the JFK assassination - eight in all - "unavailable" in the United States? Because the FBI put pressure on the book dealers - especially at the wholesale level - not to accept any orders for them and like a man they knuckled under. The FBI tried to do the same thing to the librarians, but a good many of these resisted the pressure and bought the books anyway, either from me directly or by ordering them from the European publishers (only my first book on the subject, "Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?" was published in the U.S., whereupon the publisher, Carl Marzani, was promptly forced out of business).

A TL subscriber in Los Angeles, to whom I had sent a copy of "The Dark Side of Lyndon B. Johnson", reported back that she had received the bookbag with one of its two fasteners missing and the other one loosely attached. The bag was empty - the obnoxious book had been surreptitiously removed by the postal authorities.

Third case: a large Midwestern university library, which has been a TL subscriber from the first day, recently informed me that out of a total of about 40 issues published up to that date, 13 had failed to arrive. This state of affairs clearly bespeaks a determined effort by the unlawful postal censorship in the U.S. to intercept as many copies of TRUTH LETTER as they can get their hands on.

Thought Control Without Terror

A young visitor from the United States who recently came to see me here in Germany told me this story: Not long ago a group of Russian journalists, editors and scholars toured the U.S. for the purpose of making a detailed study of the press and the electronic news media. They came away highly impressed and, on leaving the country, congratulated their hosts on having achieved what they had thought was impossible: complete thought control without terror! What a compliment for the "freest country in the world!"

Another Kennedy Assassin Gone

Relatedly, I have received word that Bill Decker, the infamous sheriff of Dallas County who along with Police Chief Jesse Curry and other high Dallas police officials organized and covered the Dealey Plaza ambush of Nov. 22, 1963, died late in August. The cause of death was not revealed. To be sure, Decker was 71 years old and at that age death from a natural cause cannot be ruled out a priori. However, any death of a major Kennedy assassination figure is suspect, especially if it occurs in Dallas. According to the "Midlothian Mirror," Decker had been "irrational" for some weeks before he died. That certainly sounds suspicious. When a Kennedy assassin or accomplice cracks up under the strain of his guilt complex, he becomes a redoubtable threat to the higher-ups in the conspiracy and has to be removed, prestissimo.

Brain Pollution

A writer in the Los Angeles Free Press has suggested that the term "brain-washing" is inadequate and should be dropped. He thinks "brain pollution" would be a more appropriate expression. I agree. Incidentally, I used to know, many years ago, a fellow named Ed Hunter who claimed that he had first come up with the concept of "brain-washing." He was an authentic CIA agent and, in his eyes, only the Communists could be capable of such devilry as "brain-washing." Okay, let's leave the laundry work to the Commies. But, show me one country in the world where brains are as systematically and effectively polluted by the government as in the United States!

Kennedy has given three published accounts of his alleged accident which, though at variance with each other on some important points that will be dealt with later, all agree in one respect: the extreme skimpiness of detail as to how he managed to drive off Dyke Bridge.

In his first version - a statement given to the police the morning after the "accident" - he explained: "...I descended a hill and came upon a narrow bridge. The car went off the side of the bridge." Next, in his TV address to the voters of Massachusetts on July 25, he stated: "...The car that I was driving on an unlit road went off a narrow bridge which had no guardrails and was built on a left angle to the road..." And, in his sworn testimony at the Inquest, he set a record of brevity: "I went off Dyke Bridge or I went off a bridge."

"Thus deprived of accident details," Jack Olsen writes, "the public skipped over Kennedy's first description of the plunge into Poucha Pond and lingered long and deliciously on such questions as how he could possibly have made a wrong turn, how he could possibly have swum the boiling channel between Chappaquiddick and Edgartown, and what he was doing at a late party with unmarried women in the first place. The accident details, if they were not examined too closely, seemed to make a certain amount of sense. He had been driving on an unlighted, narrow dirt road; he had come over the top of a hill and suddenly confronted an off-angle bridge with no guardrails. No wonder he had gone off. As (Senator) Mike Mansfield had said in his telegram from Washington, it could have happened to anyone.

"But it had not happened to anyone before. The Dyke Bridge, ugly and primitive and unrailed and unmarked, twelve feet wide and some seventy-five feet long, had been in place for twenty years, and no one had ever driven off it. The bridge lay almost at the end of a washboard road, a road used by students learning to drive, by fishermen rushing like lemmings toward the sea, by lovers preoccupied with the oldest impulses, by wild-eyed young men full of beer and showing off. The very location dictated a slackening of inhibitions. Dyke Road was at the end of nowhere. Traffic cops did not police it; warning signs did not grace it, and highway engineers left its potholes and ripples till last on their schedules. And yet no one had ever gone off the bridge until Ted Kennedy came along on a moonless night two decades after the bridge's construction. Why did such a dangerous-looking structure have a perfect safety record?

"The answer lay in the nature of the road and the nature of the bridge. As Kennedy said on TV, they were unlighted. So is the New York Thruway. Powerful headlamps are built into modern automobiles to help drivers cope with the darkness. But suppose a motorist comes over the top of a hill and suddenly his lights play across a hazard that cannot be avoided? Suppose that 'after proceeding for approximately a half mile on Dyke Road I descended a hill and came upon a narrow bridge.' Then the accident begins to sound plausible, at least to those who have never seen the Dyke Road.

"The bump which Kennedy called a hill is 670 feet from the Dyke Bridge. The drop from the apex of the bump to the lowest point in the road ahead is about one foot per hundred. To call such a gradient an 'inclined' would be misleading, and to call it a 'hill' would be downright exaggeration..."

Let's stop here for a moment to insert what the already quoted engineer Donald L. Sullivan has to say on the subject: "Approaching the bridge, the road is straight for at least 3/10 miles of a mile except for the last 150 feet. A 1% downgrade extends from 630 feet to within 100 feet of the bridge..."

On the question of the "hill", then, Olsen and Kennedy's own engineering expert are in agreement. What Kennedy - supposing that he really was in the car - descended was a 1% downgrade which one could not, by the wildest stretch of imagination, describe as a "hill." By using that term, Kennedy was guilty of a deliberate attempt to mislead his audience - unless, of course, he himself had been misinformed, because he wasn't there.

However, on another important question, namely the visibility of the bridge, Olsen and Sullivan differ sharply.

The Truth About Chappaquiddick (ctd.)

## Dike

According to Olsen, "the fact is that the approach to the bridge is almost perfectly flat and perfectly straight, and the driver picks up the bridge squarely in his headlights at distances ranging as far as 300 or 400 feet away. Kennedy's own investigators reportedly found that the bridge was visible at no less than 150 feet, depending on the condition of one's headlights, and a photograph that appeared in Time showed the bridge standing out through the photographer's windshield like a wooden monument in the night."

By contrast, Sullivan reports: "Vegetation on the right at a distance of about 120 feet from the bridge forces one to turn to the left, so that high-beam headlights do not illuminate the bridge at this point. Just as one turns back to the right at between 90° and 30° from the bridge, one's lights are deflected sharply upward so that again the bridge is not illuminated. The rapid right turn, left turn and sharp upward deflection are not only distracting but also make it difficult to see the bridge before one is on it."

In evaluating this description one must keep in mind that Sullivan's report was prepared on behalf of Kennedy's lawyers and would therefore tend to accent the difficulties facing the driver. In any event, what militates against Sullivan is the unbroken safety record of the bridge - probably one of the best, if not the best in the United States - in the 20 years of its use by thousands of people, most of them vacationers unfamiliar with the surroundings.

Why of all the countless people who have crossed this bridge at night should Kennedy have been the only one to be so distracted by the "rapid right turn, left turn and sharp upward deflection" that he went off the bridge - at 20 miles an hour?

The heart of the matter, as far as visibility of the bridge is concerned, appears to be whether one approaches it in high or low beam. To a specific question by the Court, "Did you have on your high beams, do you remember?", Kennedy replied, "I can't remember."

The Court: You are driving along the dike sandy road and you are approaching the Dike Bridge. Now, can you describe to me what you saw, what you did, what happened from the point when first you saw the bridge?

The Witness: I would estimate that time to be fractions of a second from the time that I first saw the bridge and was on the bridge."

Now, when the Supervisor of the Registry of Motor Vehicles in Oak Bluffs, George W. Kennedy (no relation to the Senator) took the stand on Jan. 7, 1970, he explained to the Court:

"A car operating at 20 miles per hour has a reaction time of any person operating approximately three-quarters of a second before a person removes his foot from the gas and applies the brake, approximately at 20 miles an hour the vehicle would move approximately 22 feet in the three-quarters of a second for the reaction time. Then a vehicle after the brakes have been applied at 20 miles an hour, then the vehicle should stop in 25 feet. Now, there is a distance of 25, 22 - 47 feet."

To revert to the questioning of Senator Kennedy, he was asked by the Court:

"Did you see the bridge before you actually reached it?"

The Witness: The split second before I was on it.

The Court: Did you see that it was at an angle to the road?

The witness: The bridge was at an angle to the road?

The Court: Yes.

The Witness: Just before going on it I saw that.

The Court: Did you make any attempt to turn your wheels to follow that angle?

The witness: I believe I did, your honor. I would assume that I did try to go on the bridge. It appeared to me at that time that the road went straight.

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.

The Frameup of James Earl Ray (ctd. from Vol. III, No. 2)

According to Saga, "Hanes reports that Ray and a 'contact man' took the rifle to Memphis. Ray thought he was showing the rifle to Cuban exiles who were interested in purchasing or stealing rifles. 'The contact man abandoned the rifle, which had Ray's fingerprints on it, on the street so that Ray would be the fall guy in the murder,' Hanas said. "

At this point, let me quote from an AP dispatch, dated St. Louis, Mo., which appeared (among other papers, I presume) in the San Diego Evening Tribune of 8-15-69:

"James Earl Ray says federal agents who recruited him ostensibly to help overthrow Fidel Castro's Cuban regime killed Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and 'used me to be the fall guy.' Ray made the assertion in a statement dictated to his brother Jerry at the Tennessee State Prison in Nashville, where he is serving 99 years as the assassin of the civil rights leader. The statement was read by Jerry Ray in a televised program on station KMOX-TV.

"In the statement, the convicted killer said the federal agents employed him during the spring of 1968. 'They told me I was helping them to supply arms and guns to Cuba refugees to overthrow Castro and the Communists in Cuba,' Ray declared. 'I knew nothing about King being in Memphis until after King had been killed.' "

Here we have another truly striking parallel to the Oswald case. Both Oswald and Ray were used by "federal agents" - meaning of course the C.I.A. - in anti-Castro plots and were involved with Cuban exiles. In the end, the federal agents turned on their stooges, after they had been properly cast in the role of fall guys, and callously threw them to the wolves. And the FBI, in both cases, covered up the operation by fabricating false evidence against the alleged killers while helping the real ones to escape.

To revert now to lawyer Hanas and his double-dealing tactics: At first, then, he stated unequivocally that Ray had been used as a fall guy and that the bullet which killed Dr. King had not been fired from the rifle that had Ray's fingerprints on it. In his Look piece, however, Hanas completely reversed himself on this key issue.

"Why did James Earl Ray murder Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.?" With this question Hanas started his article and he answered it, unbelievably, with the statement: "I still believe that Ray killed Dr. King because he was directed to do it. Despite his plea of guilty in court, I also feel that Ray did not carry out the murder entirely alone..."

Here, then, Hanas postulates the exact opposite of what he had told Renfro Hays, to wit that Ray did kill Dr. King. This about-face is not mitigated by the fact that he feels Ray was directed to do it, that he had help and that therefore a conspiracy existed.

Later on in his Look article, Hanas presents a number of facts and makes a number of points that militate strongly against, and even rebut, his initial contention that Ray was Dr. King's murderer. Referring to the fact (assiduously concealed by the FBI and the prosecuting authorities) that a number of eyewitnesses on the scene had declared that the shot had come <sup>FROM</sup> high bushes on a vacant lot below the bathroom window (for details, see "The James Earl Ray Hoax," Chapter IV "The Grassy Knoll of Memphis") Hanas writes:

"From a concealed position in a firehouse just south of Bessie Brewer's rooming house, police were watching the area of Dr. King's room, trying to protect him from what they thought was the most serious threat to him: possible attack by Negro militants. A Negro policeman who could recognize the most dangerous of these militants was at a peephole and actually saw Dr. King fall. Both firemen and policemen who were in the back of the fire station heard the shot, and they all thought that it came from the bushes, not from any window 20 feet above the bushes. So I find the 'bushman theory' of this shooting hard to dismiss." (emphasis added - J.J.)

But there was only one shot fired in the case. (to be continued)

Second OPEN LETTER

to District Attorney Edmund Dinis (New Bedford, Mass.)

concerning THE MURDER OF MARY JO KOPECHNE

Dear Mr. District Attorney:

In an Open Letter dated August 15, 1970 and published in TRUTH LETTER of the same date, I called your attention to a number of tell-tale facts, established by the Inquest, which clearly show that Mary Jo Kopechne did not die in an accident, but was foully murdered. The three basic facts of the case are: 1 - The conspicuous and extensive blood stains on the girl's blouse, established by chemical analysis, which no amount of specious reasoning can explain away; 2 - The (seemingly) inexplicable fact that the victim was found in the rear compartment of the car; 3 - The irrefutable testimony of deputy sheriff Christopher Lock who saw the car one and a half hour after it supposedly had gone off the bridge.

Also, on the same date, I airmailed to you a copy of my 20,000-word documentation "The Murder of Mary Jo Kopechne" in which these and other facts established by the Inquest are examined in depth and correlated. I also warned you that this material would be published.

This now has happened. Today - Sept. 25, 1970 - the internationally known Swiss weekly Die Weltwoche of Zurich, which has a large circulation throughout the German-speaking area, began serializing a German-language version of "The Murder of Mary Jo Kopechne" which will run in eight consecutive instalments.

In an editorial note preceding this series, Die Weltwoche states that there is a solid chain of circumstantial evidence (lückenloser Indizienbeweis) to the effect that Mary Jo was murdered. Also, a major German book publisher, who has seen this manuscript and immediately expressed keen interest in it, wrote me: "... Your thesis of murder is baffling - but the circumstantial evidence you present is convincing."

Only in America, the country most directly concerned, my arguments are being ignored. Are Americans so obtuse that, unlike Europeans, they are unable to see clear-cut, conclusive circumstantial evidence that hits you right between the eyes?

Are you, Mr. Dinis, so totally blind or so completely unqualified for your office that the tell-tale traces of foul play which abound in the transcript of the Inquest have failed to elicit from you any investigative response?

How dare you accept Dr. Mills' ridiculous explanation of how those blood stains got on Mary Jo's blouse and deeply penetrated the fabric? How dare you ignore the revealing fact that the girl's body was found in the rear of the car when she had been riding in the front passenger's seat at the start of the trip? How dare you blandly overlook the devastating testimony of the Deputy Sheriff?

You are the district attorney and you have a grave responsibility in the case. It is not a matter of discretion for you to decide whether or not you want to prosecute a case of murder. You are bound by law and by your oath of office. If you fail to take action now that my accusations are in print and the evidence is in the public record, you will be guilty of the most serious kind of dereliction of duty conceivable. You will then become an accessory after the fact in a most heinous crime in which an innocent young girl was callously sacrificed for political profit.

And don't think I'm going to let up on you if you continue to play ostrich. I shall not rest until the murderers of Mary Jo Kopechne have been brought to justice either by you or by your successor after an aroused public opinion has ousted you from your office.

That, my dear Mr. Dinis, is a solemn vow.



Gutenberg, Germany, September 25, 1970

Joachim Joesten