

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's

\*\*\*\*\*  
" TRUTH LETTER "  
\*\*\*\*\*

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

---

Vol. III, No. 22

7890 Gatenburg, Germany

August 1, 1971

---

Editorial: Government of criminals, by criminals, for criminals - Guess where?<sup>2</sup>

---

Edging Closer to the Truth

Well, I could hardly believe my eyes, but there it was in cold print: A clipping from the London Times, July 3, 1971, sent in by the British correspondent, Mike Masterman, with the three-column headline:

Former Pentagon Colonel Tells of CIA Hatred for President Kennedy

For a paper as sedate as the London Times, that's a pretty stiff bannerline, but the contents of the story are even more startling:

"President Kennedy incurred the hatred of the Central Intelligence Agency by trying to clip its powers after the Bay of Pigs incident, Lieutenant-Colonel L. Fletcher Prouty, formerly of the U.S. Air Force, asserted in a television interview last night.

"He said in the BBC programme 24 Hours that the President issued two memorandums stating that further activity of a 'clandestine nature' should either be so small that CIA agents alone could operate it, or it should be referred to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Although the memorandums were signed by the President, they were not carried out, Colonel Prouty declared.

"Colonel Prouty, who worked in the Pentagon at the time when the minutes on United States involvement in the Vietnam war were being circulated, said that many people felt that there was very strong feeling between the CIA on the one hand and President Kennedy, and perhaps Mr. Robert Kennedy, on the other. This had been carried over from the memorandums.

"Asked if the assassination of President Kennedy was related to this animosity, Colonel Prouty said: 'I've heard many people mention this and it's a possibility. I'm not satisfied that the present explanation is right. I don't think Oswald by himself killed President Kennedy.'"

Prouty's unexpected remarks on the BBC show created something of a stir elsewhere in Europe, too (though not, as far as I have been able to ascertain, in the U.S.) The Munich paper Abendzeitung, for example, on July 5, 1971, devoted almost a full page to the story under the headline: "New Charges Against the US Intelligence Agency CIA - Was It Responsible for the Kennedy Assassination?"

The story in the German paper began with these words: "What Fletcher Prouty really was supposed to talk about on the British television show was the secret Pentagon study (on the Vietnam war). The former lieutenant-colonel in the US Defense Department - he now lives in Great Britain as a businessman - had been for many years a liaison officer between the US military and the CIA. Toward the end of the interview, Prouty dropped a little bombshell that made headlines and tore open old sores again: he thought it quite possible, the veteran Pentagon officer said, that the CIA had been involved in the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

In the final paragraph of its story - which once again reviewed all the incongruities of the official version - Abendzeitung, after mentioning the fact that Jim Garrison alone had attempted to clear up the apparent mysteries of the case in a court of law, wrote: "Now Garrison himself has been indicted on bribery charges - thus sharing the fate of many Americans who had attempted to throw some light on the murky background of the Kennedy assassination. Prouty, however, lives in England - outside the CIA's area of direct control."

It is evident from the foregoing that Prouty was one of the few people who had access to the CIA's darkest secrets and therefore his cautiously formulated hints about that agency's involvement in the assassination are of great significance. So does his remark "I've heard many people mention this," for Prouty at the time moved in circles that could hardly be described as cranks, assassination buffs, ghouls, scavengers, among other favorite epithets reserved for the Warren Report critics by the right-thinking news media. The "people" Prouty was dealing with were in the know, or at least in the antechambers of the inner sanctum. And they suspected the truth.

There are other straws-in-the-wind indicating that a creeping awareness of what really happened at Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963, is beginning to set in among circles that count. Take for example the rather remarkable way The New York Times has been reporting on the arrest of Jim Garrison. In view of the NYT's previous stand on the assassination controversy as well as on Garrison's attempt to convict Clay Shaw of conspiracy, one might have supposed that the paper now would come down like a load of bricks on the accused bribe-taker, as indeed most of the rotten press did.

Instead, however, the NYT in a follow-up story on July 2, 1971, entitled "Garrison Links Arrest to a Move to Hide Kennedy Death 'Truth'" - and the wording of that headline, too, is significant - reported:

"District Attorney Jim Garrison says that his arrest yesterday on federal charges of accepting bribes to protect gamblers is part of the Government's effort to suppress 'the truth' about the assassination of President Kennedy.

"When I went into this," he told reporters after his arrest, referring to his assassination investigation, "and found out that the Federal Government itself - and I refer to the warfare sector - had killed John Kennedy in order to open the way into Vietnam. I decided then I would never quit pushing to bring out the truth, no matter whether they killed me or put me in prison. I knew sooner or later they would try one or the other."

"Mr. Garrison, who attempted to prove a conspiracy in the 1963 assassination, has long contended that Mr. Kennedy was killed by the Central Intelligence Agency. He recently added the Pentagon and others in the Government's so-called 'warfare sector' to his list of alleged conspirators..."

Now, the way Garrison's views are presented here - without the usual heavy sarcasm and slanting - makes it quite obvious that the NYT is no longer 100% convinced that the official version of the assassination is right, or that the fighting DM is wrong. It looks very much like the paper that so boldly exposed the duplicity of the Pentagon and the deceptions of the Government's warfare sector in Vietnam is moving slowly - oh, ever so slowly - in the direction of the truth about the assassination.

That is also apparent from subsequent portions of the dispatch by Roy Reed, dated New Orleans July 1, which points out that "many New Orleanians" support Garrison and that "at noon yesterday, a little more than an hour after the announcement of his arrest, telephone callers on a radio talk show were 65 to 70 percent in support of the District Attorney. Seven of nine telephone callers on an evening talk show supported him."

The next paragraph truly reflects vox populi and in a most refreshing manner at that:

"One woman said, 'I've hated him all the way. I think he's being framed by the Federal Government and it's all just a conspiracy to keep people from finding out what the government's been doing to people.'"

Exactly.

New Light on the Robert Kennedy Murder Fraud (ctd.) - The Wolfer Incident -

As Mrs. Blehr put it in her letter to the Civil Service Commission, "These precepts are expressions of basic common sense and are universally accepted. They are truisms..."

While most of the violations of "inviolable" precepts of his profession with which Wolfer was charged, related to other cases, the most serious without question was committed by him in Case No. 2 (SC No. A 233421), which is the Robert Kennedy assassination case.

"In this case," Mrs. Blehr wrote in her statement, "Mr. Wolfer violated Precepts (1), (2), (3) and (4). He testified that the defendant's gun (Serial No. R53725) and no other was the single murder weapon which had fired three bullets into the bodies of three of the victims, the physical evidence, however, upon which his testimony was based, established that the three above mentioned evidence bullets removed from victims were fired, not from the defendant's gun but in fact from a second similar gun with a Serial No. R 12602. The only possible conclusion that must be reached is that two similar guns were being fired at the scene of the crime. Such a conclusion then leads unavoidably to the question: Which of the two guns fired the single fatal bullet? The presence of the second gun is firmly established in Exhibits A and B attached hereto which are photographs of Court Exhibit 59. This court exhibit is an envelope containing the test bullets which Mr. Wolfer matched with the three evidence bullets mentioned previously. The inscription on the envelope shows that the enclosed test bullets were fired from gun No. R 12602 and not from the defendant's gun No. R53725. This is a violation of Precept (1)."

On this score, the three above-named experts, Pinker, Snyder and Cadman state their uniformly worded opinion that "No identification can be made if the test bullet is recovered from some gun other than the evidence gun, even though the test gun may be of the same make and model and have a serial number very close to the serial number of the evidence gun. Such a procedure is a violation of Precept (1)."

The Los Angeles Police, having allowed its ballistics expert Wolfer to juggle the material evidence in the Sirhan case in the above-described manner then went one step further - a logical, but also downward criminal step - by disposing of the means used for that deception, which might have become embarrassing at the Sirhan trial - if the three famous lawyers for the defendant had taken a little time out from their pre-occupation with the state of Sirhan's mind to take a look at the material evidence, including the overwhelming evidence of police fraud. In the words of Mrs. Blehr:

"Although the inscription on the envelope shows that gun No. R 12602 was physical evidence in this case on June 6, 1968, the gun was reportedly destroyed by the Los Angeles Police Department roughly one month later in July, 1968. This is shown in the teletype report of Exhibit C attached."

That teletype report - also reproduced by the L.A. Free Press, but not by the Times, or any other paper - reads like something out of science fiction, yet its meaning, upon close inspection, becomes dazzlingly clear:

112570 1210 - GUS 1210 - R C R 503 OCS - SO SAN ANA - AMN SW ABELS-  
 PERGER /ID SEP - 11-15-70 1203 137 - LEHR 68 OCS DATE - MR FILES REVEL A.22  
 CALIVER JOHNSON SERIAL R 12602 REPORTED DESTROYED 7-00-68 BY PD LOS ANGELES ON 67  
 021055 - NO WANTS - C II PROPERTY IDENT UNIT KC OLLIVANT AB/30

There you have it, even though you might say be spinning. For better understanding, here is what the Los Angeles Times (May 20, 1971) wrote on that particular subject: "The test shots were made on Jun. 6, 1968, and a third photograph (attached to Mrs. Blehr's letter - J.J.) is of a message from the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation in Sacramento, stating that gun number R 12602 - the one identified in testimony as the gun used in its ballistics tests - was destroyed by the LAPD sometime in July, 1968, only a month after the murder of Kennedy."

(to be continued in the next issue)