

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's



An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. II, No. 18

June 1, 1970

Editorial: J. Edgar Hoover to the top - of the FBI's Top Ten!

"Computers & Automation"

A Death Blow to the Warren Report

I could hardly believe my eyes when I opened the May 4 issue of our small hometown newspaper for the area of Germany where I am living at present, the "Albbote," and found displayed in it, in a conspicuous place, an AP-dispatch about the May issue of the American technical journal "Computers & Automation" in which computer specialist Richard E. Sprague analyzes the events in Dallas, on Nov. 22, 1963, and arrives at the conclusion that at least four gunmen fired on President John F. Kennedy's limousine - and that Lee Harvey Oswald was not one of them!

The reason for my surprise was solely to find that story in such an unlikely place, for the "Albbote" is normally more concerned with golden weddings, milk production and Germany's East-West squabbles than with American history. As regards the story itself, I knew that it was forthcoming, for our friend R.B. Cutler, architect, who drew the splendid plat of Dealey Plaza showing the exact lines of fire of the six shots and the precise position of the gunmen and some of their helpers that constitutes the most important part of the "C.& A" article, had alerted me to it weeks ago. However, he had also cautioned me not to publish anything about this forthcoming event lest the FBI "descend" on publisher E.C. Berkeley and force him to cancel this special issue of a magazine normally concerned with other things than presidential assassinations.

Later, when I informed him of the publication of the AP story in the "Albbote," Cutler wrote back: "Believe it not, and you of all people will be the only one to really believe it, Gutenberg is better informed than the people of this great democracy about what Dick Sprague has been doing these past few years..."

Indeed, what Mr. Sprague has been doing is impressive. Although he has a full-time job on his hands - he was for many years an executive in several computer firms and now heads his own research and consulting firm "Personal Data Services Corporation" - he has taken enough time out over the past six-and-a-half years, to carry out that part of the investigation of President Kennedy's assassination which the Warren Commission most conspicuously failed to undertake: a thorough and painstaking examination of the photographic evidence available.



In a 32-page article (the longest ever published by "C. & A."), entitled: "The Assassination of President John F. Kennedy - The Application of Computers to the photographic evidence," Mr. Sprague notes that the Kennedy slaying was "the most photographed murder in history." From reading the Warren Report and looking at its exhibits you certainly wouldn't know that, for the WC people managed to overlook or suppress about 95% of the available evidence.

"Approximately 75 photographers took a total of approximately 510 photographs, either before or during or within an hour after the events in Dealey Plaza, and either there or nearby or related to those events," Sprague writes. "The word 'photograph' in this context includes both still photos and movie sequences. The number of frames in a movie sequence ranges from about 10 to about 500; and in the count of 510 photographs given above, the 10 to 500 frames of a single movie sequence are counted just as one photograph. The total number of frames is over 25,000.

"The Warren Commission examined 26 photographs, about 5 percent of the 510. The FBI examined about 50 photographs, or about 10 percent..."

The purpose of the FBI in examining those 50 photographs is strikingly apparent from "Table 2" of the Sprague article, entitled "Some Important Photographs Acquired by the FBI and Unavailable." Seven items from Sprague's "Main List" of over 500 photographs figure in this table. One is the first Moorman picture, which has already been discussed in TRUTH LETTER, in the section dealing with "The Dallas Coup d'Etat." Another is a picture of the TSBD (for what purpose? - J.J.) "about the time of the shots" by that mysterious Army Intelligence officer James Powell who was most likely one of the actual conspirators as I have indicated in TL II, Nos. 13 and 15.

But the most amazing case is that of the "Babushka Lady's" missing movie which Mr. Sprague describes in these terms: "As mentioned above, the pictures show other persons also taking pictures. One of these other persons has been called the 'Babuska lady' because she is wearing a babushka (a triangular head scarf). She took a movie as did Zapruder, but she took hers from the left hand side of the motorecade; and she was able to take all the scenes beginning with the rounding of President Kennedy's car from Houston St. on to Elm St., and ending with the dead president's limousine passing under the overpass to the hospital.

"Her movie would be particularly valuable for it would probably show all that was going on on the grassy knoll. She may have been Mrs. Beck, at the time a student at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, who was visiting in Dallas. After her movie was developed, Mrs. Beck talked about it to the Detroit Free Press. Then the Detroit FBI attempted to find her. The information at present stops there. However, from observing similar actions of the FBI, one would suspect that they found her, obtained her movie, and either destroyed it or filed it away unavailable to researchers..."

Zapruder was paid a million dollars for his movie by Life magazine, also for the purpose of making it unavailable to researchers. The latter, however beat Life at that crooked game (see TL II, Nos. 13 and 14).

The "Babushka Lady's" movie may have been worth several millions of dollars to the conspirators and their backers, but apparently she was paid off in a different coin. Unless the line of information opened up by Sprague on this essential matter some day ceases to "stop there", you can be sure that The FBI got hold of the movie and quickly got rid of it - and naby of the lady, too.

(to be continued in the next issue)



The Lowest Thing on the Totem Pole

From a batch of clippings which Miss Anne Smith of Stockport, England, was kind enough to send me, it appears that the British weren't overly impressed by LBJ's May 2 performance, in spite of a tremendous buildup given it by the BBC in advance. Here are two typical comments by reviewers of TV programs:

Mike Kerrigan in the Daily Mirror for May 4 said "after all the fireworks that had been so broadly hinted at, the programme itself turned out to be more of a damp squib." He pointed out that after "we had been almost brainwashed into believing that it was all so hush-hush" the 6 o'clock news that evening "contained many of the relevant points from the interview." (This is the first time, incidentally, that I have seen a British (or American) newsman referring to himself as "brainwashed." Of course they all are, day in, day out, the year round. Indeed Brainwashing is today the biggest industry in the so-called free world.)

In The Guardian, Nancy Banks-Smith observed somewhat acidly: "He (LBJ) was patently unable to tell a convincing lie. Which is not to say he told the truth. He told nothing... I do feel if you are going to talk you might as well say something. As history, it was several yards of inferior flannel. As television, it presented the interesting spectacle of a transparent (sic!) politician." Apparently Miss Banks-Smith considers the words "politician" and "liar" to be synonyms.

A detailed transcript of this show appeared in the BBC-magazine "The Listener" of May 7. In answer to a question from Walter Cronkite, "What was your personal relationship with President Kennedy?", LBJ replied:

"We were not like brothers, we were not constant companions. I don't recall that we ever had an element of bitterness or deep feeling enter into any of our discussions... We were friendly - cordial but not personally intimate... during the three years that he was President he included me in the official meetings of importance. I believe in the Cuban missile crisis there were 37 or 38 meetings of the Executive Committee of seven or eight that met on that crisis, and I was there 35 times. So I look over that period... and I don't think... that I ever saw any indication of anything but friendship and respect..."

Contrast now with these outpourings what LBJ's brother Sam Houston Johnson has written in a book entitled "My Brother Lyndon" which, according to the London Daily Telegraph of Nov. 18, 1969, was to have been published in January of this year. Apparently it has not come out yet and perhaps never will for Brother Lyndon, as the late Drew Pearson reported as early as April 1, 1969, had been "holding his breath for fear someone will buy the manuscript" - and for good reason.

For, according to Sam, his brother "wasn't the Number Two man in that Administration, he was the lowest man on the totem pole."

"Though he has never said this to anyone, I know him well enough to know he felt humiliated time and again, that he was openly snubbed by second-echelon White House staffers who snickered at him behind his back and called him Uncle Cornpone."

Even more revealing is this episode recounted by Sam: One day LBJ called him from the White House to tell him "I wouldn't be here if it hadn't been for you." - "Lyndon, I had nothing to do with Oswald," replied Sam. LBJ's reaction to that rather silly crack tells volumes. He "gasped, spluttered and then exploded. I have never heard him so angry. 'Godamit, Sam... Here I come... to have a serious talk with you, and you come out with a damned stupid horrible crack like that. Why in hell can't you ever be serious, you crazy ass? You make your lousy sick jokes about everything...' Only a guilt complex as big as the LBJ Ranch can have caused that typical outburst of fury.



Why, then, wasn't Robert Kennedy, the most important member of the family, consulted on the crucial question whether on this particular occasion the stern stipulations allegedly laid down by the Kennedys, when they turned over the materials to the Archives, should be disregarded?

The next paragraph in the States-Item story reveals at least a corner of the truth in the matter: "Burke Marshall, former assistant attorney general who represents the Kennedys in the matter, said Sen. Kennedy and Mrs. Onassis 'both asked me to say that they will have no comment to make on the report or its release,'"

The "Sen. Kennedy" referred to in this statement is of course Edward, for by that time Robert was dead. The inference to be drawn from his and Mrs. Onassis' "No comment" statement concerning the report and its release strongly suggests that Ramsey Clark's assertion, the family had been consulted did not refer to any permission to have the autopsy materials reviewed by a secret panel of experts late in February 1968, but to the question whether or not it could be released on the eve of the Shaw trial. That's why Robert, the key member of the family, at the time the authorization to make the material available to the panel, was omitted from Clark's statement. Once again, LBJ's devoted stooge and last attorney general, who was indeed, as Alcock said, totally unfit for his high office, has been caught lying!

Other pathologists, in particular Dr. Wecht, immediately questioned the validity of the Clark panel's "findings." In a list of discrepancies between the original autopsy report and the panel review of it, Dr. Wecht mentioned, among other things, a difference in measuring the spot of Kennedy's wound and said also that the panel review mentioned missile fragments in the neck, a fact which he said the autopsy did not include. He said also that the panel review mentioned a small piece of gray-brown matter in the center of Kennedy's head which had never been mentioned before. (AP dispatch from Washington, 2-14-69).

Dr. John M. Nichols, who testified for the state on Feb. 28, 1969, and who was qualified by the court as an expert in pathology and forensic medicine, also took issue with the panel's opinion and, in the course of a lengthy testimony, made it clear that in his view the conclusions of the autopsy report, as embodied in the Warren Report, were untenable. One of the most interesting points was Dr. Nichols' unqualified assertion that for one bullet to strike two persons in the manner claimed by the Warren Commission, the one sitting in front of the other (i.e. Connally in the case) would have to be sitting "very much to the left" of the other (Kennedy), to be exact about 18 inches to the left, while the Zapruder film, which Nichols had studied very carefully, shows that the Governor was seated "perhaps one inch to the left (of Kennedy), but not 18 inches."

Dr. Nichols also testified that he had sought in vain permission from the Secret Service to examine the limousine in which President Kennedy was killed and that he was now in the process of suing the government over this refusal.

After Garrison - unwisely, in my opinion, - had reversed his decision not to go to trial if the federal government continued to block his efforts to obtain the autopsy materials, he scored a point, but to no avail.

Indeed, on Feb. 18, 1969, Judge Halleck in Washington reversed himself, too, and ordered the autopsy documents, the assassination rifle, a spent pellet, fragments of bullets and other items connected with Kennedy's death and the wounding of Gov. Connally to be taken to New Orleans for examination at the Shaw trial.

In his ruling, Halleck indicated that he would not have issued this order if the federal government would have permitted a pathologist (he probably meant Dr. Wecht, who had been authorized by Garrison for that purpose) to examine  
(to be continued)



The new book by Joachim Joesten TRILOGY OF MURDER  
 An analysis and interpretation of the John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy and  
 Dr. Martin Luther King assassinations. - Copyright by J. Joesten, 1968-70.

Let's not forget the good Dr. Martin Schorr, another witness for the defense, who had also analyzed the psyche of Sirhan and come up with some startling conclusions. He told the court:

"He finds a symbolic replica of his father in the form of Kennedy, kills him and also regains the relationship that stands between him and his most precious possession - his mother's love."

At that, Sirhan's mother Mary, in her second row seat, murmured sadly, "I don't like this." (AP dispatch from Los Angeles, 3-13-69). Poor woman! She is obviously lacking in proper psychoanalytical training.

On the side of the prosecution, the state's chief psychiatrist, Dr. Seymour Pollack, of the University of Southern California, had a few sensible things to say.

"I am unable to accept Sirhan's denial of recall of his notes as a genuine amnesia," Dr. Pollack told the court on April 1, 1969, causing Sirhan to shout "I am not going to let him call me a liar," before he was hustled out of the courtroom by deputies.

Pollack also testified that, in his opinion, Sirhan "wanted very much to kill Robert Kennedy." At no time, he said, did Sirhan expect to be a martyr and "at no time did Sirhan expect to be caught."

Earlier Pollack had told the court that Sirhan was not clinically psychotic and was not now. He said Sirhan falls under a classification known as "psychosis-nonpsychotic" - whatever that may mean.

However, on the essential issue, the "motive" for the assassination, Dr. Pollack, too, took the official line, even though with some mildly formulated reservations. He testified:

"The question is whether Sirhan's belief was a delusion - his belief that Sen. Kennedy was the bad person... that Sen. Kennedy was anti-Arab, that the American people were supporting the Palestine Jews, that the American government was a hypocritical setup. I don't share these beliefs, but there are large numbers of people in the United States who do. It is my belief that Sirhan's ideas and attitudes about all these were not psychotic delusions.

"If he believed that Sen. Kennedy was not just a bad man, but really a devil, a man who came from outer space, I would consider more seriously that Sirhan had delusions."

On April 7, 1969, the AP reported from Los Angeles:

"For 18 exhausting, repetitive and oft-times boring court days, a swarm of psychologists and psychiatrists has interpreted the mind of Sirhan Bishara Sirhan to the jury trying him for the murder of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy.

" 'I suspect everyone in the trial may be tired of it,' sighed one of the defense lawyers."

I suspect my readers will be, too, and so we'll drop a most unpleasant subject which has made American psychiatry the handmaiden of political crime and the laughing-stock of the world. I agree with Time that the Sirhan trial has become a "classic of criminal jurisprudence" - but not the way that bellevether of the newsmaking industry meant this remark to be understood. It has become a classic of rigged and manipulated non-justice in America.