



The book, having been shipped in response to Miss Smith's cash order, was held up at the border by the secret censorship specialists of the U.S. Postal Service and returned to you. Apparently these fellows are under firm orders from the F.B.I. not to let a single copy of "A Heritage of Stone" slip out of the country. A total, and totally illegal, embargo has been slapped by the Government on this "subversive" book, in order to prevent the truth about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to become known in foreign parts.

You must have been warned before by the F.B.I. not to ship the book abroad. That's why Miss Smith received no acknowledgment of her order, no invoice and no receipt. Obviously your staff is under orders not to keep any records of any underground shipments of this explosive book, lest they fall into the hands of the F.B.I.

But you didn't want to steal Miss Smith's money either. So you were in a dilemma. If you returned the money, explanations were in order. But you couldn't very well inform a customer in England that you, a free American publisher, operating in the freest country on earth, had crumpled under to illicit pressure from a government set on preserving the Big Lie by all means available. No, that wouldn't do at all.

While you were pondering the problem, hoping maybe that the embargo would be lifted, the months went by and your English customer was getting impatient. Her "three threatening letters" were beginning to tell on your nerves. Perhaps there was a hint of court action in them. Think of it! That might really cause a scandal and deeply embarrass the government.

And so, after six months of shilly-shallying, you finally found a way out. Somebody you knew well enough to trust, him (or her) was about to fly to Luxembourg, which is the European terminal of Icelandic Airlines. So you asked this friend, who perhaps even had diplomatic status, to literally smuggle the book-bag containing Miss Smith's copy of Garrison's book out of the United States and mail it to her from what is really a free country.

All of which, Mr. Minton, is a highly disgraceful, as well as ludicrous, business. Long, long ago, I admired your courage when you published a great book no other publisher dared to touch. But as soon as the book was out, with the F.B.I. breathing hard down your neck, your knees began to shake and finally you caved in. All advertising was stopped, distribution difficulties began to appear, bookstores boycotted the book (without you reacting as vigorously as you normally would), even copies mailed within the United States failed to reach their destination.

In the July 1, 1971 issue of TRUTH LETTER, I published, under the heading "More Secret Censorship," the gist of a letter from one of my readers on the west coast who had gone through a similar experience as Miss Smith. That lady, having ordered a copy of Garrison's book the day it was published (Nov. 16, 1970) and paid cash in advance for it, also waited about six months for delivery, before getting "quite irate" on the telephone. During that conversation, she overheard the manager of the Pickwick book store, where she had ordered the book, telling the sales clerk: "We are cooperating and not stocking it. You can refund the money." She received the refund in the following day's mail.

Cooperation all around. With whom? With a government that violates the Constitution every day of the year, around the clock. Maybe the manager of a Pickwick bookstore in California doesn't have the guts to stand up to the unlawful pressures exerted on him by that peculiar "law-enforcement agency," the F.B.I., but one might expect a little more backbone from the head of a great publishing house like G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Maybe I'm all wet and you have a plausible explanation of why Garrison's book finally reached Miss Smith via Luxembourg, after six months. If you do have such an explanation, my dear Mr. Minton, please let me have it and I'll rush it into print in TRUTH LETTER - in between great helpings of nubble pie.

The Mafia Methods of the Nixon Gang

One of my readers has been objecting to my constant use of such derogatory expressions as "Nixon Administration," "Washington Misgovernment," "Nixon Gang" etc., which he feels are "insulting" to the man who is, after all, President of the United States. Sure he is, just as Hitler was head of the German State until Justice caught up with him. Chief of State though he was, world opinion adjudged him a criminal, which he also was, and he would have been hanged, had he not killed himself in time. But I don't want to push the parallel too far. Hitler was an evil genius. Nixon is no genius of any sort. Just evil, period.

Meanwhile, my objector will have read the lead article "Pershing Gervais' Sensational Turnabout Clears Garrison" which appeared in the last issue of TL and will presumably have come to realize that the Nixon regime employs outright gangster methods, including bribery, forgery, fraud and blackmail, among other assorted crimes, in order to frame an innocent man whose only offense has been to tell the truth about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Can one show any kind of respect towards a government so thoroughly committed to criminal misconduct?

In the New Orleans States-Item - unimpeachable source of the sensational disclosures about the recantation of Garrison's accuser - Gervais was further quoted on May 27, 1972 as saying that before he agreed to become a Justice Department undercover worker he was coerced into taking on the job by "two gangster agents." Gervais said, the paper added, he complained to Sen. Russell B. Long that the "gangster agents" terrorized him and threatened him with jail if he refused to work for the government in its investigation of Garrison and others.

Gangster agents? That sounds like the Mafia, doesn't it? But it isn't. The Mafia can kill or maim people, but it can't threaten them with jail, that kind of threat is the exclusive privilege of "law-enforcement agencies," in this case the F.B.I. But Gervais' characterization of the G-men as "gangster agents" is very much to the point. Since Dallas, they have been behaving more and more like authentic gangsters, especially in all cases somehow connected with the Kennedy assassinations.

The frameup of Jim Garrison by the federal misgovernment, which has been exposed in detail and on the best authority by the man who was to become the instrument of this travesty of justice, Pershing Gervais, is an outrage for which Nixon is directly responsible. He is the boss of the "gangster agents."

According to the same and preceding stories in the States-Item, rumor has it that there is now an underworld "contract" out on Gervais' life. I do not doubt that the F.B.I. and/or the C.I.A. would gladly spend a few tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars to get at the man who ruined the government's trumped-up case against Garrison. They would of course pick for the job an authentic professional killer, as they have done before in many instances.

All of which goes to show that we do have authentic gangster government in the good old USA these days. Therefore, much as I'd hate to lose readers who object to my harsh expressions, I'll go on to call a spade a spade, a fraud a fraud and the Nixon regime a gangster regime.

Scream-of-the-Month

In a Time Essay, entitled "Assassins and Skyjackers: History at random," published on June 12, 1972, one Stefan Kanfer writes: "John and Robert Kennedy, whose enemies were supposed to be enlisted in a sophisticated right-wing conspiracy, were assassinated by naffs associated with Cuban and Arab causes." - If I had a nat, I'd take it off to the naffs of Time Inc. who still haven't begun to understand the real background of the Kennedy assassinations. History, my friends, is never "at random."

The Shame of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis

The other day I received in the mail a copy of an untitled 16-page illustrated pamphlet with a reddish masthead that says: "Everything you always wanted to know about Jacqueline Kennedy's behavior at the moment of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963, including the way the news media described it at the time and the way Mrs. Kennedy described it three years later."

The pamphlet, which states specifically "This article may be reproduced in whole or in part," gives as its source an outfit called "Veritas" and as address "P.O. Box 30277, Washington, D.C. 20014, U.S.A." It is, thus, an anonymous, or near-anonymous product. But this circumstance, which certainly makes the pamphlet subject to caution, does not detract from its factualness nor from the force of its reasoning. Discount a certain amount of tendentiousness and you still have an important contribution to the truth about what really happened at Dallas.

Since the hero and heroine of the story are rather conspicuously John B. Connally and his wife Nellie - among the illustrations is a 1971 picture of her with the legend "A Texas Lady, Quick-witted and Brave Under Fire" - I suspect that the pamphlet emanates from the LBJ crowd. This suspicion is strengthened by the fact that the story, while presenting Jacqueline Kennedy's role in the drama in a new and altogether unflattering light, ~~strictly~~ <sup>by and large</sup> adheres to the official version of the assassination, as laid down in the Warren report. The authors of the pamphlet are certainly not "on our side." But they do make a rather convincing case to the effect that Jackie, far from having been the tragic queen the news media made her out to be, behaved in fact like one of history's greatest bitches. Her subsequent failure to do anything to help expose the real murderers of her husband and her sordid affair with Onassis - even though it's a marriage now - make that characterization a cinch.

In the next few issues, TRUTH LETTER will reproduce large excerpts from this pamphlet, interspersed with occasional comments by this writer. So here we go.

"Would President Kennedy be alive today if Jacqueline Kennedy had pushed him down out of the line of fire after the first shot?"

"Yes. The President's throat wound was not fatal.

"Can it be proved that Mrs. Kennedy could have saved her husband after he was first shot?"

"The pictures of the assassination which appeared in Life magazine Nov. 29, 1963, prove it. See pictures 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 wherein Mrs. Kennedy did nothing for seven seconds but stare at the President (you can count to eleven in that length of time). In pictures 11 and 12, when his body sagged against her, she propped him up with her right arm which, incidentally, made him an easier target.

"What was the other woman in the car, Nellie Connally, the wife of Texas Governor John B. Connally, doing those seven seconds between the shots?"

"She was cradling her husband's head in her lap. See pictures 9 and 10. When he was hit his body sprung away from her to the right, but she reached over and pulled him down to her lap. Mrs. Connally wrote in McCall's magazine, Aug. 1964:

"My one thought was to get him out of the line of fire, and I pulled him down onto my lap and bent over him. It did not occur to me that I might be hit too. I thought my husband was dead and I could not think beyond that. As it happened, that instinctive action helped save his life." (This paragraph is underlined in the original. - J.J.)

"Did Mrs. Kennedy ever explain why she didn't get her injured husband down out of the line of fire after the first shot?"

"Yes, but her explanation to the Warren Commission seven months after the assassination consisted of two misstatements, one of them a wopper. They were repeated three years later in the William Manchester book, 'The Death of a President', commissioned by Mrs. Kennedy.

(to be continued in the next issue)