



Editorial

Conclusion of Jaffe Article On E. E. Bradley

An article appeared in a Los Angeles newspaper called the North Valley Mail, written by C. M. Shoenkopf, which stated that "a close personal acquaintance of Edgar Eugene Bradley" had revealed to that reporter that the night of the assassination, November 22, 1963, Bradley's wife called that acquaintance. The person's name was being withheld by the paper but was known to District Attorney Garrison.

The article went on to say that Bradley's wife told the acquaintance that "Bradley had just called her from Dallas and mentioned during the phone call that he thought he was being followed. Bradley himself allegedly confirmed his presence in Dallas, the day of the assassination to the acquaintance and several other persons later."

On March 6, 1968, the North Valley Mail carried another article on the Bradley case. This time the subject was a Garrison Investigation witness, known to the reporter who was again C. M. Schoenkopf. The article described an incident in which the Garrison witness was the victim of a hit-run accident. The witness' name was again "being withheld for his protection." "The witness . . . was struck down after dark as he crossed a Valley street, by a speeding white car which had pulled away from the curb with lights out, according to reports." The article did not confirm that the witness was the same as the one discussed in the first article, however, it did state that "the witness has been closely involved in the Eugene Bradley case."

Not long after Bradley's arrest, he submitted to a polygraph test, or lie detector test, in Beverly Hills. The test was given to him by Chris Gugas, a Beverly Hills criminologist. The result of the test, in the opinion of Gugas, was that Bradley answered all the questions truthfully. They showed that Bradley had answered such questions as, "Were you a part of a plot in any way, to assassinate President John F. Kennedy? Have you ever piloted a plane by taking off or landing one at any time? Have you ever talked to Lee Harvey Oswald, Jack Ruby or David Ferrie?" to which Bradley answered all of the questions "No."

Although such a test is considered inadmissible as evidence in a trial Bradley then challenged Garrison and his witness to take the same test. In his most recent statement, he said that he would be willing to take the test again even if administered by "the FBI or the Los Angeles Police Department" although at the time of the earlier test Bradley's lawyer, Jensen, refused to allow those agencies to make such a test or to open up the record of his private test (the graph of responses) to the press.

On Saturday, November 9, 1968, Bradley said that

he would seek felony indictments of those people who he felt had conspired to "frame" him by giving false information to Garrison. He spoke on KABC radio's Marv Grey Show, and told of someone "associated with Garrison" in the Los Angeles area who had made the statement "I don't care if he is guilty or not we will convict him on circumstantial evidence." This statement, according to Bradley, was tape recorded in a Hollywood bookstore and Bradley has a copy of the tape. Recently, Mark Lane made an appearance at the Pickwick Book store in Hollywood, at which this reporter was present for the entire period, and never did I hear him make such a statement.

In response to one of the questions asked him about Bradley, Lane did answer that he did not know if Bradley was guilty or not but that he thought a trial would be the best place for that determination to be made. However, if Bradley alleges that Lane is the one who made the statement he referred to, it would be interesting to know if he could provide the tape recording in proof of his allegation. Lane has never seemed to be a man, in view of his fifteen years experience in criminal defense law, who could make such a statement but this will remain to be seen when Bradley comes forth with the recording. There is a possibility that he was referring to someone else.

Whatever transpires it would seem that the American people are further robbed of their right to know the truth about the murder of President Kennedy. Bradley who has maintained his innocence from the beginning will never have the pleasant feeling of having been acquitted by a jury of his peers. However, he has said that he is "very pleased" with the result as it is now.