

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's

" TRUTH LETTER "
" "
" "
" "

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newfaking in the Press

Vol. V, No. 2

7890 Gutenberg, Germany

October 1, 1972

Editorial: Wanna see some red faces going green? Watch the poll-fakers on November 8!

OPEN LETTER

to Mr. Richard Kleindienst

Attorney General of the United States

You are a criminal, Mr. Attorney General, a common criminal.

You are a criminal because you continue to protect - knowingly, deliberately, wilfully and with malice aforethought - the at least one assassin of President John F. Kennedy who is still at large. To be sure, others in your position have done this before, but your guilt is greater than theirs because the era of alleged "speculation", "sensationalism" and "Paranoia" about the assassination now has definitely ended. You have before you what amounts to a coroner's verdict, scientific evidence unearthed by one of the top medico-legal authorities in the U.S., Dr. Cyril Wecht, to the effect that there must have been involved in the shooting of the President at least one other assassin besides "Oswald." (You know of course as well as I do that Lee M. Oswald did not fire a shot that day, but that is beside the point here).

You read, presumably, The New York Times. It cannot have escaped your attention, then, that Dr. Wecht, after examining the autopsy materials at the National Archives for two days made the unqualified charge that they prove a conspiracy. Nor can it have escaped your attention that Dr. Wecht in the interview reported by the AP stated firmly that it was "physically impossible" for only one gunman to have slain Kennedy and that "there had to have been at least two people shooting."

If a coroner, a topflight forensic scientist like Dr. Wecht tells you that the material evidence of the autopsy X-rays and photographs establishes the certitude that there were "at least two people" shooting at Dallas, then you cannot shrug off such a statement the way you and your predecessors have persistently shrugged off the Warren Report critics and even the evidence presented by District Attorney Jim Garrison. It would have been your bounden duty, under the circumstances, to start moving heaven and earth to catch that other gunman who is still alive and at large, or at least to find out what happened to him after his escape from the scene of the assassination. Your failure to do so constitutes malfeasance of the worst kind and makes you a prime accessory-after-the-fact in the murder of a President of the United States.

Now that the cards are on the table, there is no more room for specious arguments, evasive action, intimidation of witnesses, the tampering with material evidence, secretiveness, furtiveness and all the flimflammy of the Warren "investigation" which you so recently described as "extensive, thorough and comprehensive."

If there is any justice on earth, some day, Mr. Attorney General, you will pay for the monstrous crime you are now in the process of committing.

How the Newfakers Operate

Slanting of the news is an old habit of the rotten press. Newsfaking, as I define it, goes beyond it. In essence, it is designed to deceive, rather than merely influence public opinion through the use of diversionary tactics such as emphasizing the irrelevant while playing down the relevant as well as outright distortions and significant omissions. The prime purpose of newsfaking - a press phenomenon born at Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963 - is to keep the public in the dark about all that really matters while making a great show of pseudo-objective reporting. The Dr. Wecht case provides graphic illustration of how the newfakers operate.

If the New York Times managed to bury Dr. Wecht's thunderous accusation of conspiracy - which normally would have rated a six-column bannerline - in such an inconspicuous place that most of its readers probably overlooked it altogether, other papers which take the NYT news service simply killed this particular remark as well as other essential and embarrassing parts of the story. Take for instance the "Houston Chronicle" of August 27 which carried a lengthy replay of the NYT dispatch by Fred P. Graham, but stopped short of those passages where Dr. Wecht declared that the evidence he had seen "destroys" the central Warren Report conclusion that Kennedy and Connally were hit by the same bullet, that he had found this bullet in "almost perfect" condition and that Oswald could not have fired three bullets so fast on his bolt-action rifle, as claimed by the WC. And, of course, the punch-line "That proves a conspiracy right there" is also missing from the Houston Chronicle's garbled account of the NYT's slanted story.

What Dr. Wecht Also Said

In the absence of comprehensive or nationwide reporting - such as would be automatically accorded every lie and misstatement emanating from Washington - one can only try and piece together from scattered newspaper accounts all or at least most of what Dr. Wecht had to say about his findings at the National Archives. Since the last issue of TL was published, I have received a copy of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of August 26, 1972 with the remarkably candid 7-column bannerline "Wecht Blames More Than One Gunman in JFK Slaying", capped by the headline "Coroner Examines Evidence in National Archives." The Post-Gazette, it should perhaps be pointed out, is Dr. Wecht's home-town paper, for he is coroner of Allegheny County and is director of the Pittsburgh Institute of Legal Medicine. Here are some of the salient things Dr. Wecht told the paper's staff writer Robert Voelker in a telephone conversation from Connecticut, where he was trying to get hold of Burke Marshall, now a professor at Yale, in order to induce him to allow a complete examination of the evidence by a team of experts in pathology, radiology, criminology and firearms:

"Very important pieces of evidence are simply absent with no comment on their whereabouts. We've got an incomplete case. If Oswald went on trial today, the case would be thrown out of court."

Precisely. So, almost nine years after the Dallas coup d'état, the true picture emerges if not yet on an official, at least on a scientific basis. It conforms, in essence, to the "wild speculations" I had been the first to set forth in my book "Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?" published three months before the Warren Report was issued. There never was a case against Oswald that would have stood up in a court of law, not even in Texas. And that is exactly the reason why those who had arranged the assassination of the President, with the full connivance of the local authorities, also saw to it that their hapless scapegoat was silenced before a word could be said in his defense in a court of law. I have been repeating that over and over again for nine years in an atmosphere of general disbelief. So I am understandably delighted to see a man of Dr. Wecht's high professional standing confirm it all.

"Wecht also criticized what he called 'the breakdown of the chain of custody' of evidence," the Post-Gazette story went on the say. "As a medical doctor and a lawyer, Wecht said there are so many gaps in the evidence that if the 'pro-governmant buffs' tried to present a case against Oswald in court 'their testimony would be totally cox-promised or barred completely."

This is a most important point the guilty authorities and the newsmakers have glossed over consistently. "The breakdown of the chain of custody of evidence" was deliberate and planned. It began with the unlawful removal of the President's body from the custody of the Dallas County Medical Examiner, Dr. Earl Rose, who struggled manfully but in vain against the kidnaping of the body by the Secret Service and who also insisted that the chain of evidence must be preserved so the rights of the accused to access to the findings of an impartial post-mortem examination would be safeguarded. (For details, see my book "Oswald: The Truth" pp. 288-292).

In this connection, mention should be made of another important disclosure Dr. Wecht made to the Post-Gazette reporter which had not been referred to in the previous news dispatches: "Also missing from the archives, he said, are photos showing the interior of Kennedy's chest and the interior of the brain." The missing brain had been reported by the New York Times, but not the fact that pictures of the interior of the chest had also vanished. Why were they sequestered? Obviously because they would show that a bullet, or fragment, still lodged in the body. More evidence of conspiracy that was deliberately suppressed in the course of the fraudulent autopsy at Bethesda, or following it?

In response to the stupid remarks made about him by Marshall, Wecht told the Post-Gazette: "I am not trying to be offensive and I deeply resent his arrogant remarks. I've got to say the things that are important. I am only interested in the very hard physical evidence that would get to the essence of this case."

Incidentally, honest and outspoken as this Post-Gazette story is, it is also the worst typographical job I've ever seen in print. I counted in it at least 20 misspellings, words or whole lines left out, botched paragraphs and other printer's mistakes. Coincidence or sabotage?

Reader's Forum

From Mr. T.M. Irwin, 32 Ravensdene Crescent, Belfast BT6 QDB, Northern Ireland, I have received two letters relating to his efforts to obtain a copy of Jim Garrison's book. On Sept. 2, Mr. Irwin wrote: "... I have now received a copy of Garrison's 'A Heritage of Stone' in hardback. I don't know what effect this had, but following your issue of TL dated 15 July last outlining Mr. Thomas' difficulties, I wrote a rather nasty letter to G.P. Putnam's Sons at their East Rutherford address referring to my order through Blackwell's. This letter was written on 21 July and to date I have not had a reply. However I received the book from Blackwell's yesterday (1 September) and I am enclosing their copy invoice for your information (date of order 27 March 1972 - date of dispatch 29 August 1972 - no comment!!)... "And, on Sept. 15, Mr. Irwin wrote:

"... Following my last letter to you regarding 'A Heritage of Stone' the following development has taken place. An old saying is that 'Lightning never strikes twice.' Well, in my case it has, as I had more or less given Blackwell's up for lost after five months, I had been trying to obtain a copy through another contact. In the final analysis I received the copy from Blackwell's on Friday 1 Sept. and the other copy on the following Tuesday. I therefore now have a spare hardback copy so if you know anyone of your subscribers who would require it they can have it at the cost price of £ 3.00 (British pounds - J.J.)..."

Well, as they say, it never rains but it pours. Let it pour!

The Shame of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis (ctd. from TL, Vol. IV, No. 24)

"The text that accompanied these four pictures read:

" 'In less than an instant Jackie was up, climbing back over the trunk of the car, seeking help. She reached out her right hand, caught the hand of a Secret Service man who was running to catch up, and in one desperate tug pulled him aboard. Then, in less time than it takes to tell it, she was back cradling her husband in her lap.'

"So here we have Jackie not only cradling one man but rushing out on a moving car to help another man, then rushing back to again care for the first man. It brings to mind those early movies where everyone is zigzagging about in a crazy, fast-stepping way.

"And there are two big lies in the above quoted paragraph. Mrs. Kennedy did not go out on the back of the car to seek help and she did not cradle her husband in her lap.

"WHERE DID TIME MAGAZINE GET THE INFORMATION THAT JACKIE WENT OUT ON THE CAR TO SEEK HELP AND DID INDEED GET AGENT HILL ABOARD THE CAR 'WITH A DESPERATE TUG'?"

"From nowhere. They just made it up in their editorial offices. You can go over the text with a magnifying glass for a single word of explanation from Secret Service Agent Hill, the man involved; or for a single corroborating word from an eye-witness as reliable and articulate as Presidential Aide David Powers or the seven other eye-witnesses who were with him in the follow-up car. (Of course, it would be unthinkable to ask Jackie, who was so busy with the funeral planning and receiving foreign guests, why she went out on the back of the car; but three years later she told why in the Jackie-Manchester book and her reason gave the lie to Time-Life's explanation, as will be seen later).

"When Time said Agent Hill's outstretched hand was in Jackie's because she was pulling him onto the car they knew this explanation was a lie and, furthermore, was ridiculous because it was based on two physical impossibilities.

"But millions of people, saddened and emotional over the death of the President, and bombarded for days on television with tributes to Jacqueline Kennedy, trusted Time-Life and believed all their picture captions and texts."

"WHAT ARE THE TWO PHYSICAL IMPOSSIBILITIES REFERRED TO?"

"Mrs. Kennedy -- way out on a lurching, accelerating car -- had no leverage and no grip.

"WHAT ABOUT MRS. KENNEDY'S LEVERAGE?"

"If her intention was to help the approaching Agent Hill onto the car she automatically would have knelt on the back seat and stretched out her hand to grasp Agent Hill's hand. In moments of the greatest stress no one makes matters worse by behaving unnaturally. It is instinctive to muster all one's resources to the limit and that goes double for an athlete, who has split-second reactions to a situation of this sort.

"WHAT ABOUT MRS. KENNEDY'S GRIP?"

"She wore smooth gloves on her hands, nylon nose on her knees and she was out on a slick waxed surface -- so she had no grip at all. That is why she almost fell off the car as it suddenly bucked and pitched forward at tremendous speed. (Warren Report). No one in the shockingly perilous position that Mrs. Kennedy had put herself in could have pulled a man onto the car, much less a man.

(to be continued in the next issue)