

Taken from "The Kennedy Murder Fraud and how I helped Expose it"
Volume One "The Long uphill fight for the truth"
Joachim Joesten — 1968

21

scheme - and who was soon after the change of Administration rewarded with the top post in the agency - knew that Johnson would be far more amenable to their warlike plans than Kennedy had been.

Naturally, the CIA did not relish my revelations - which I further amplified in my subsequent books Die Wahrheit über den Kennedy-Mord and Marina Oswald, before Garrison confirmed everything I had written on the subject - and I am not surprised that they have been fighting back with all means at their disposal. And, since forgery is the CIA's principal weapon, next to murder, I was not astonished either to find myself the target of a CIA-attack based on forged Gestapo documents and other fabrications.

What did surprise me, though, was the fact that one of Britain's most respected newspapers, the Sunday Times, should take the CIA forgeries at face value and use them for a scurrilous attack on my personal and professional integrity. Here is how it happened:

Late in September 1965, the CIA presented to a "select group" of U.S. Congressmen, at a secret briefing, a 20-page special report on alleged Soviet efforts to "discredit" the agency as well as other U.S. government departments, such as the FBI and the USIA. The report claimed that the Soviet intelligence agency KGB was operating a special "Department of Disinformation" (or Department "D"), headed by a General Ivan Ivanovich Agayants, a veteran intelligence officer, and with a staff of 40 to 50 "desk officers and experts" in Moscow alone.

This mystical department, according to the CIA report, was primarily engaged in masterminding books and articles attacking the CIA and the other American intelligence outfits. It "now produces between 350 and 400 derogatory items annually," the CIA report boldly asserted.

Attached to this ~~is~~ report was a long list of books which allegedly had been inspired and financed by "Department D" in recent years. And, lo and behold, on that list also figured my book Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?

It didn't come to me as a surprise that the CIA accused me of being a Communist agent. That's standard practice in those circles. But it sure must have come as a big surprise to poor Carl Marzani to learn that he had been subsidized by the Soviet Secret Service. (The rascal - he never shared these bounties with me.)

Although the stupidity of this charge was self-evident (how could the Russians have masterminded a book about an American tragedy they knew nothing about and which, moreover, had been written and published much too fast to allow any kind of backstage negotiations), the Sunday Times, unbelievably, fell for this hoax.

Indeed, on October 3, 1965, the Sunday Times, in its INSIGHT column, not only reproduced this poppycock extensively, but even made it appear that the CIA had proved its assertions most convincingly in the case of Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?

After a lengthy exchange of correspondence, in which my British publisher, Mr. Martin Eve of The Merit Press, and a lawyer also took part, the Sunday Times, on October 31st, 1965, published the following letter from me which sums up the case:

CIA and the Nazi Files (headline by the Sunday Times)

Sir, - With utter amazement I have read your comments (Insight, October 3, 1965) on the preposterous charges which the CIA has levelled against me and my book Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy? You write:

"Last week the CIA replied to its critics with a report of some 5,500 words, published in the American Congressional Record. There is, according to the report, a special Russian Department of Disinformation (Department D), set up by the secret police (KGB), one of whose chief tasks is to discredit the CIA...

"The precise Communist links alleged are not always developed in convincing detail. However, in one remaining case, there is almost a plethora of detail. This revolves round the book, 'Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?' + published in New York last year. The author, Joel (sic -J.J) Joesten, is revealed in a German Security Police memorandum, November 8, 1937, as being active in the German Communist Party (KPD) since May 12, 1932, holding party card (Mitgliedsbuch: 53-2315. The reader wonders whether a heady and unaccustomed draught of documentation has gone to the writer's head..."

In the first place, it is irrelevant and immaterial in the case whether I was a member of the German Communist Party thirty-four years ago. I formally deny this and say that the memo of the "German Security Police" mentioned in the CIA report is a forgery either of the Gestapo or the CIA. I am not and have never been a member of the Communist Party in any country. I am and have always been a left-wing Liberal without party affiliation. The only thing I have in common with the Communists is a profound loathing of the CIA, which must be shared by every decent person in the world.

Nevertheless, the fact that the CIA, in an official and published document, should draw upon such an obviously tainted source as the Nazi Gestapo deserves to be noted. I am not surprised; there is an affinity of minds and methods between the CIA and the Gestapo. So it is simply a case of one criminal organization borrowing from another.

Had your writer taken the minimum trouble of leafing through my book, he would have known that its documentation consists solely of quotations from American newspapers and magazines, in particular the staunchly Conservative "Dallas Morning News" and "Dallas Times Herald," as well as the "New York Times," "New York Herald Tribune" and other publications that could not possibly be described as being pro-Communist. Apart from this published source material, I have used in this book only the results of my own on-the-spot research in Dallas early in December 1963 on an assignment from one of Germany's best-known editors, who also financed the trip.

Any suggestion that my book is a prime example of "books of disinformation" masterminded by the Soviet secret police, is absolutely false and grossly libellous. I have never had any contacts whatsoever with the KGB or, indeed, with any other Soviet agency. Prior to the publication of this CIA report, I had never even heard of a "Department of Disinformation" or of a General Agayants. If this Department is anything

+ In the Sunday Times article: "Oswald: Fall Guy or Assassin?" - another example of poor checking and careless writing in the case!

else but an ad hoc invention of the CIA, it has certainly contrived to operate quietly in the six years of its alleged existence.

Anyway, whether "Department D" is a myth or a reality, it had nothing whatsoever to do with the writing and publication of "Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?" I challenge you or anyone else to prove that there was any kind of link to Moscow in the case. As the reader can judge for himself, the CIA has produced absolutely nothing but that old and disputed item from the Gestapo files to link me in any way with international Communism. So much for the "plethora" of detail:

Joachim Joesten
Nieupoort/Bains, Belgium

Having been grossly libelled by a big English newspaper on the flimsiest of grounds, I naturally felt entitled to damages. But the Sunday Times, taking refuge behind the legal technicality that publication of the CIA report in the U.S. Congressional Record gave it the character of a "privileged document" refused to pay a penny.

It is a moot question whether the privilege attached to the publication of material in the U.S. Congressional Record also conveys immunity from libel under British law. However, this question could only have been settled by means of a long and costly lawsuit and I simply lacked the funds for instituting one. Accordingly, on March 22nd, 1966, I informed Mr. James Evans, the Legal Adviser of the Sunday Times, that for the time being I was unable to afford the cost of litigation but reserved all my rights in the matter with an eye on possible future action.

In a letter dated March 24, 1966, Mr. Evans replied: "... I can only repeat that, while we regret that the matter in question was defamatory of you, we adhere to our repudiation of any legal liability..."

In other words, the Sunday Times had to admit that they had wronged me and they even apologized, but still they steadfastly refused to make honorable amends.

Oh well, I suppose poor Lord Thomson just couldn't afford it.

Chapter VI

The "Mock Trial" That Never Came Off

I have always felt that if only a way could be found to throw the Oswald case into court, the whole fabric of lies and trumped-up evidence would rip and the truth would eventually come out. That's why I have so insistently goaded Jesse Curry, Henry Wade, Ruth Paine, Marina Oswald and other protagonists of the drama, in a vain attempt to get them to bring libel action against me. The issue at stake in my battle with the Sunday Times (see above) was too marginal to allow for a thorough ventilation of the case in a court of law, otherwise I would have moved heaven and earth to raise the necessary funds for a lawsuit.

In the absence of any possibility of throwing the Oswald affair into a regular court of law, it occurred to me that a "mock trial" of the defunct Lee Harvey, somewhat along the lines of the Reichstag Fire mock trial, might bring the desired results. My British publisher, Mr. Martin Eve, was interested in the project and tried to line up support