

# ASSASSINATION 68

Vol. 1 Issue 1

18th October, 1968

## EDITORIAL

This is the first issue of a publication which has a number of specific and very clearly defined aims. The most important is to give its readers the news that is being systematically suppressed by the newspapers and electronic media concerning the developments in the three major political assassination cases that have occurred in the past five years.

It is not possible at this date to give a detailed account of how and why this suppression takes place. No one would be so stupid as to suggest that all editors and journalists are engaged in a gigantic conspiracy but the outlines of the system are beginning to become apparent. I believe that it depends to a limited extent on the outright bribery or blackmail of a few selected or key figures in the news media, but far more importantly it depends on the now highly developed art of news manipulation. This art, in turn, depends for its success on the following known human weaknesses: (1) the shortness of human memory, (2) the rooted objection of the majority to being made to think, (3) the inability of even highly paid newsmen to apply rational criteria to official statements, and (4) the herd instinct.

This last is probably the most important of the four. One of the strongest human instincts is the desire to conform, and this applies as much to fashions in dress as it does to fashions in thought. When Galileo said that the earth went round the sun instead of vice-versa, he was guilty of a heresy for which the penalty was death at the stake. It didn't matter that he could demonstrate positive proof of his contention. What mattered was that by calling into question the whole authority of the Church and undermining religious faith, he was challenging the power structure of the time.

Every establishment will seek to destroy those who challenge it and in consequence the vast majority will cold shoulder the non-conformists simply because they prefer the safety of the herd and would rather not be associated with those who are courting destruction. The herd will therefore eagerly seize on the slightest pretext for ignoring and forgetting about them. A whisper to the effect that so-and-so is a communist, or a crackpot will be enough. However absurd and demonstrably false the story the herd will prefer it to the uncomfortable and disturbing ideas which may reach it from outside and to the painful necessity of having to think.

History has repeatedly borne eloquent witness to this fact. Time and again the stone which the builders reject eventually becomes the head of the corner. Throughout the thirties Churchill warned against the renaissance of German militarism but until war actually broke out he was despised and rejected of men.

Today we see a new world system coming into force. The 1939-45 war was the last of the European wars fought between rival colonial powers and it gave birth to the two super powers who will henceforth dominate world affairs and to the two most powerful military forces that the world has ever seen.

Europe is caught between these two gigantic rivals, the one capitalist and the other communist. If it wishes to

avoid being crushed between them, it must declare its independence of both.

But how and why does this concern the murders of Luther King and the two Kennedys? The answer is chillingly simple. These murders ensured the end of the policy of peaceful co-existence and non-violence and put into power men determined to solve the problems of the world not by persuasion but by force. The blackman in America is now to be held down by force, hence the cry for 'law and order', and puppet military regimes are to be installed in countries bordering on the communist bloc, as has already occurred in Greece and South Vietnam.

The arm of the American Government which is most responsible for this policy is the Central Intelligence Agency, the CIA. It is a huge organisation disposing of billions of dollars and subject to no form of democratic control. It operates secretly in every country of the world, subverting cabinet ministers and eliminating influential people who oppose its policy. Its weapons are blackmail, bribery and intimidation at best, and at worst assassination. But it uses the latter method only when others fail. Its enemies are more usually disposed of by framing them on trumped up charges or otherwise discrediting them.

There are 60 agents of the CIA operating in this country. The cover for their headquarters is a bogus commercial firm with offices at 7 Cleveland Row, just by St. James' Palace. They tap telephones, they listen, observe, monitor and watch. They infiltrate the news media, they put stories into circulation and attempt with considerable success to influence and control opinion. No doubt they also employ agents provocateurs to discredit left wing groups. And no doubt, they are not above bribing public officials. This editor has first hand experience of their methods.

Thus the second most important purpose of this newsletter is to make the public aware of the operations of the CIA in this country and to counteract the pernicious lies which they circulate. It will therefore attempt to investigate and bring to light the hidden hand that often lies behind the seemingly inexplicable events that appear from time to time in the newspapers. (For example the kidnapping of Moses Tshombe).

And the third purpose is to warn the public as to where the present policies of the CIA are leading. The last world war was preceded by smaller wars in Abyssinia and Spain. I believe the Vietnam, the Israeli-Egyptian war and Biafra are the forerunners of the next.

And I also believe that the war party in America, driven more by the necessity to conceal its former crimes as much as anything else, will resort to desperate measures to consolidate its control of the political machine. It therefore follows that there will either be no election (the assassination of Humphrey followed by deliberately incited riots could postpone it indefinitely), or that the next President will be assassinated if he steps out of line. Since this is likely to be Nixon, it is worth remembering that Spiro Agnew, his running-mate, is a stooge of the CIA.



### Stalling of Justice

In its issue of July 20, 1968, the London Economist blandly suggested that Jim Garrison, the DA of New Orleans, may be "losing interest" in his case against Clay Shaw because the long-awaited trial "has not yet taken place". This comment is typical of the systematic distortion of every aspect of the Garrison enquiry the press constantly indulges in, both in the US and abroad.

It is certainly not Garrison's fault that the Shaw trial has not yet taken place. He has done everything in his power to bring the defendant to trial within a reasonable time after his March 1, 1967, arrest, but normal disposition of the case has been blocked time and again by the tricky legal manoeuvring of Shaw's lawyers.

Originally, the trial had been scheduled to take place in October 1967, but on September 26 of that year the defence applied for a six months' cooling-off period on account of the publicity surrounding the case. The court granted a 4 months' stay and the trial was then set for February 13, 1968. As this date approached, however, Shaw's lawyers moved for a change of venue, asking that the case be tried in a place at least 100 miles from New Orleans. After a lengthy hearing of prospective jurors, Judge Edward A. Haggerty ruled on April 4 that Shaw could get a fair trial in New Orleans and denied the motion for a change of venue. The ruling was promptly appealed by Shaw's lawyers but on April 23, the Louisiana Supreme Court, by a unanimous decision, turned down this appeal.

The stage now seemed definitely set for the start of the long-delayed trial. On May 8, Garrison, through his aid, Assistant DA James Alcock, issued a statement that said: "Now that Mr. Shaw's defence attorneys have exhausted their pretrial actions, the law permits the state to set the case for trial. Today we have set the trial of Clay L. Shaw for June 11, 1968. Trial of this case has been delayed unduly long and it is our hope that we can go to trial on this date. The state is ready for trial and will oppose any more attempts to postpone the trial."

At that moment, however, Shaw's lawyers were already all set for their most massive attempt yet to prevent the case from ever reaching the trial stage. On May 27, they filed a petition in Federal District Court for a temporary restraining order, to be followed by a permanent injunction, barring the DA's office from prosecuting Shaw further. The petition challenged the constitutionality of Louisiana's conspiracy law and contended that Garrison, through a "reign of terror", was depriving the defendant of his constitutional rights. Not content with this humbug, the defence asked the federal court to rule the Warren Report "valid, accurate, binding and controlling upon all courts in the United States".

Thus a patently spurious document, concocted in a flagrantly nonjudicial proceeding, by a panel that had deliberately set aside all guarantees of due process, was to be made for all time a binding instrument of American jurisprudence. And that would of course have been the end of the Clay Shaw case, without a trial.

As soon as Garrison learnt that Shaw's lawyers were about to move into the federal courts system, he issued a statement in which he said that "the federal courts have about as much jurisdiction over this case as the courts of England or India." When Federal District Judge Frederick J. R. Hoebe issued the temporary restraining order on May 28, Garrison issued another and very lengthy prepared statement (on May 29), in which he declared that the federal government had a special interest in the outcome of the Shaw case because it does not want "it known that it conducted a fraudulent inquiry, using altered evidence and false evidence to fool the people of this country."

He went on to say: "Another reason that the federal government has a special interest in this case - and should therefore keep its large nose out of it - is the very deep involvement of agents of the Central Intelligence Agency.

"The concealment of the involvement of the CIA was the major objective of the false federal investigation and the false inquiry by the Warren Commission. Many people in this country still do not know that CIA - which is completely uncontrolled by Congress - has been engaged in the assassination business for some years."

In the same statement, Garrison made the specific allegation that President Kennedy, after he had begun removing troops from Vietnam and had made other moves toward ending the Cold War, "and began to institute controls on the previously uncontrolled CIA, was killed in an ambush by men connected with the Department of Covert Activity". Needless to say, this most important statement, about the frankest that Garrison has ever made concerning the role of the CIA in the assassination, found no echo in the corrupt press of America outside New Orleans, nor indeed was it reported abroad.

In the same context, Garrison pointed out that his detractors, who constantly reiterate that he has "no case" against Shaw, could easily prove their point in a courtroom. "If the case of the State of Louisiana is as fraudulent as Shaw's attorneys pretend," he said (and he might well have added, as the news media keep pretending) "why not let him go to trial and be acquitted? Why is there suddenly such loss of faith in trial by jury?"

While Judge Heebe could and did issue the temporary restraining order on his own, he was compelled under federal procedure to ask the Chief Judge of the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals to designate two other judges to sit with him in considering the petition for a permanent injunction. Judges Robert A. Ainsworth and James A. Coniskey were then appointed to hear the case with him.

The next move by Shaw's lawyers was to file a motion on June 13 designed to bring U.S. Attorney General Clark into the case by alleging that the purpose of the Garrison investigation was to discredit the Warren Report. Therefore, the lawyers argued, Clark should be made a party to the suit "to protect the interests and integrity of the United States," by which of course they meant the interests and pseudo-integrity of President Johnson and his henchmen.

On July 23, the three judges handed down a unanimous decision rejecting every single point in the defence motion. "As a matter of law," the ruling noted, "plaintiff Shaw's request for relief in the Federal Court is premature, for under our system of Federalism in the circumstances presented here, he must first seek vindication of his rights in the state courts as to this pending prosecution. . . . We entertain serious doubts about the appropriateness of stopping a pending state court prosecution to consider a request of plaintiff for a declaratory judgement as to the constitutionality of . . . the conspiracy statute under which he is being prosecuted." Such a procedure, the court held, "would open the door to constant disruption of state court criminal proceedings." The judges also rejected Mr. Shaw's plea for a ruling that the Warren Report should be valid and binding on all courts.

Thereupon Judge Haggerty on August 1 once again set the date for the start of Shaw's trial for September 10, but within a few days the proceedings were once again obstructed. The defence lawyers filed notice with the District Federal Court announcing their intention to appeal the ruling of the three judges to the U.S. Supreme Court. Despite the firm tone with which they had made their own



decision, the three judges acceded, and on August 13 they granted a further stay of the trial pending the hearing of the appeal by the United States Supreme Court.

Not surprisingly, Jim Garrison was once again up in arms. After all, Shaw was in effect running for protection to Earl Warren, the very man whose Report was designed to put the lid on all further investigation of Kennedy's assassination. Garrison therefore announced that he would challenge Warren's right to take any part in hearing the appeal. And he also aimed some heavy artillery at another Supreme Court Justice, Abe Fortas, a life long friend of President Johnson from whom he received his judge's robes. (Incidentally, one of the first people whom Johnson called on the telephone after the assassination was Abe Fortas, and the lawyer was dutifully waiting at the airfield when Air Force One touched down that evening.)

"Justice Fortas", Garrison said, "helped work out for the President the creation of the Warren Commission whose finding have now been totally discredited." And it turned out to be "an excellent device for falsifying the truth... and prevented the appointment by Congress of its own investigating committee. This could have been catastrophic for the government." And then turning to Johnson, Garrison once more accused him of actively "concealing vital evidence with regard to the murder of his predecessor."

It may now perhaps be clear to the reader why Johnson tried so desperately to have his nomination of Abe Fortas, as Chief Justice and Chairman of the Supreme Court, confirmed by the Senate. Having failed he will have to resort to measures of utter desperation. That is why another assassination is in the air.

CONTINUED in next issue....

#### THE HICKS SCANDAL

Inconvenient witnesses to the Kennedy assassination have a habit of meeting a violent and untimely end whilst others are bribed or intimidated. But there is another method for dealing with people who have embarrassing stories to tell, and that is to have them committed to institutions for the insane. It is a method which very effectively closes their mouths, for even if they ever manage to come out it is a simple matter to discredit them with a quick reference to their history of mental instability.

A case in point — but there are many others — is that of Mr. James F. Hicks, a 29 year old surveyor. In 1963 he was living in Dallas, and as he said himself, looking for work. It so happened that he was a very close witness to the assassination, and soon thereafter all his employment problems disappeared. For what Hicks had seen in no way fitted in with the story concocted by the Dallas police and later taken over by the FBI and the Warren Commission. Although he had immediately given his name and address to a police officer, the Warren Commission did not call him and no one appeared to be interested. However, he was very shortly offered a good job at Vance Air Force Base in Oklahoma as a civil service employee. He accepted it and took up residence at 1713 Cedar Street, in a town called Enid, with his wife and family. He might have lived there happily ever after, had it not been for the Garrison Enquiry.

Among the many unpublished photos of the assassination scene which Garrison was obtained from various sources, there was one which clearly showed Hicks and his wife as, horror-struck, they watched President Kennedy's head explode under a hail of bullets only a few yards away.

Early in January, 1968, Hicks was subpoenaed to testify before the Grand Jury, in New Orleans, which was

investigating the conspiracy to murder Kennedy. He arrived on January 10, and stayed at the Fontainebleau Motor Hotel. In the early hours of the following morning, two men entered his room, beat him up and flung him through a plate glass window. As it led onto a balcony, however, he only suffered minor injuries.

On the 11th January, Hicks testified before the Grand Jury which as always held its hearing in camera. On emerging from the Jury Room, he told reporters: "It's really hard to say what happened because it happened so fast, but I do remember the President being shot and I knew he was shot when it happened because I saw his whole head explode. It didn't look like one shot... his whole head exploded... this meant to me that his head was struck by more than one bullet".

Hicks added that he had heard four shots (enough to blow the Warren Report sky high) and said that one bullet had passed over his head and struck a traffic sign. Almost immediately afterwards he had witnessed men whom "I assumed to be members of the Dallas police force" removing the sign. "I assumed", he said, "they would use it as evidence." (As a matter of fact, the sign was never seen or heard of again, and Garrison has been unable to discover its whereabouts. If it were possible to prove that a bullet had passed through this sign, it would prove beyond a shadow of doubt that more than one gunman had been involved.)

Hicks also told the reporters that he had received a number of "crank calls", including one threatening his wife and son if he didn't keep his mouth shut.

Hicks' testimony corroborated some crucial points made previously by critics of the Warren Report. It would seem that he had testified out of a genuine desire to help establish the truth without any suspicion that the calls he had received were from no mere cranks. He was soon to be disillusioned. On returning to Enid he was promptly fired from his job and a few months later was picked up by County officers and unceremoniously dumped into the Western State (Mental) Hospital at Fort Supply "for examination and treatment". This was revealed in an AP despatch from Enid of 25 June, 1968, but apparently some time after the event.

All this gave further point to the statement which Garrison issued at the time that he subpoenaed Hicks on January 4th, 1968. "There is nothing unusual about the fact," it said, "that witnesses of special interest, and persons whose histories otherwise relate to President Kennedy's assassination, have been given jobs with the United States government. Those who already had not worked with the Central Intelligence Agency, or were not working for it at the time of the assassination, consistently are found to have received jobs since in installations connected with United States defence operations."

All of the persons "who participated in the assassination or who could be important witnesses," Garrison went on to point out, "have profited one way or another. One after the other, their financial status has noticeably improved since the execution of President Kennedy in Dallas." And then he went straight to the point of adding, "the involvement of high officials of the United States government in the affair becomes more and more apparent." It was something of an understatement.

Printed by  
Copyrun Ltd.  
for the  
publishers

**COPYRUN LTD**  
**INSTANT PRINTING**  
25 VICTORIA STREET SW1 799/5876  
also at  
21 TOWER STREET WC2 240/1820



#### THE ASTOUNDING IGNORANCE OF FLEET STREET

On the 1st of October, the editor of this news-sheet was rung up by Mr. Ian Dunlop of the Evening Standard who had just seen the advertisement placed in the Personal column of the Times. "You seem to have rather a macabre plan", he said, referring to the advertisement and then started asking questions as to his sources of information. The editor mentioned the Garrison enquiry and this evoked the astonished response: "Is the Garrison enquiry still going on?"

Later on the same day, the Editor was being interviewed by a reporter from the Sunday Telegraph's Mandrake column. Another reference to the Garrison enquiry evoked precisely the same response and in precisely the same words.

#### INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OF FOREIGN POWER COOPERATES WITH GARRISON

In July of this year the New Yorker carried a 25,000 word article by Edward Jay Epstein, the author of Inquest, one of the better known books to assail the Warren Report. Epstein, it would appear, had now changed sides, and after dipping his pen in venom was attacking Garrison. For the CIA, this was no doubt something of a triumph. What could be better from their point of view than an acknowledged critic of the Report, who had actually cooperated with Garrison in his investigation, turning round and saying that Garrison had no evidence. It was, of course, part of the never ending campaign to goad Garrison into disclosing his evidence against Clay Shaw in advance of the trial and thus into jeopardizing his case.

How it is that men like Epstein and our own John Sparrow, the warden of All Souls College, Oxford, are induced to write and publish the sort of rubbish that appears from time to time under their names, is something that we may never know, and may, if we ever find out, prefer not to know. Epstein's article certainly succeeded in goading Garrison, but not in the desired direction. Dismissing Epstein as "an amateur" who had not been given access to his evidence and therefore couldn't know what it was, Garrison proceeded to make his most astonishing disclosure to date.

He told Peter Kihss of the New York Times that his office had been exchanging information with the intelligence agency of a foreign government which was a "military ally" of the United States. This agency, he said, "had penetrated the forces involved in the assassination", and one of its agents had had an "interview with one of the assassins". It had arrived "by a completely different route" at the same conclusions as himself about the assassination of President Kennedy. Garrison said that he had maintained a liaison with this agency for three or four months. A member of his own staff had been to Europe and had had long conversations with top ranking officers of this agency and members of the agency had also visited Garrison in New Orleans.

He then once more reiterated the facts that his investigation has established concerning the assassination. The "servicing of the operation was set up by individuals in the CIA", he said, "and the men shooting were trained by the CIA." Lee Harvey Oswald "didn't shoot anybody" but he had been an intelligence agent.

Involved, Garrison said, "were some extremely powerful men in the southwest oil establishment," whose industry "as a result of extensive operation in the Mediterranean area has to work closely with the CIA."

Garrison then went on to describe how the assassination was carried out. There were "four assassination teams", each with one rifleman and one lookout, he said — one team on the seventh floor of the Dal-Tex building, one on an upper floor of the Texas School Book Depository building, and two ahead of President's car on a grassy knoll.

Both Kennedy and Connally were struck from the rear whilst Kennedy was also hit from the front. One bullet hit him in the throat, another struck a street sign, and another "tore off the President's head" with a "frangible bullet".

Giving the reasons for the part played in this enterprise by the CIA Garrison said that President Kennedy had been "getting ready to recognize Cuba and Castro", arranging a detente with Krushshev and had started bringing back troops from Vietnam. This latter fact is, of course, one that the Johnson government has done its best to conceal from the American people and from the world.

It is not difficult to guess the name of the foreign power to whom this intelligence agency belonged that had been helping Garrison. It was quite obviously France. De Gaulle has in fact shown all along an uncanny appreciation of what really happened in Dallas, as has been recently revealed. His inside knowledge explains his detestation of Johnson — "the cowboy who shot his way into power", he calls him — his far-sighted determination to kick all the American NATO forces out of France, and his intransigent attitude towards American efforts to dominate the world money markets.

At present the Johnson government is seeking to use Czechoslovakia as an excuse for moving another 100,000 troops into Germany. As Johnson has always effectively managed to disguise what he was doing as something else, it might be worth while pondering on this intended move. As de Gaulle has said, "we must be prepared to meet attacks from every point of the compass."

The Daily Telegraph, one of two English newspapers to make any mention of the story, did make an effort to check on the country to which the intelligence agency belonged. One of Garrison's associates told them that it was France. The Telegraph gave the story three tiny paragraphs on an inside page. It was, at any rate, one better than the Times who did not report the story at all. Poor Louis Heren!

5 books by Joachim Joesten currently available:  
(postal charges in brackets)

OSWALD : THE TRUTH	42/- (2/-)
MARINA OSWALD	25/- (1/3)
THE GARRISON ENQUIRY (paperback)	5/- (6d.)
HOW KENNEDY WAS KILLED (paperback)	6/- (6d.)
The Dark Side of LYNDON B. JOHNSON	42/- (1/9)

Write for complete brochure to Peter DAWNAY Ltd.

If you wish to subscribe to this monthly newsletter, fill in your name and address and send this coupon to the publisher with 21/- (U.S. \$3 seamail \$4 airmail)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

ASSASSINATION '68 is published by

PETER DAWNAY LTD.  
13 Westmoreland Place,  
London, S.W.1.