

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. II, No. 21

July 15, 1970

Editorial: The Curse of Colonialism is upon us everywhere.

THE TRUTH ABOUT CHAPPAQUIDDICK

How Edward Kennedy Was to be Framed for a Murder He Didn't Commit (ctd. from No.20 -Summary)

I

The Tell-Tale Traces of Violence

Tucked away in the most inconspicuous places of the 763-page transcript of the Kopechne Inquest, which was held at Edgartown Jan. 5 - 8, 1970, is explosive medical evidence of the highest significance which tells, in effect, what really happened the night of July 18, 1969, when Senator Edward Kennedy's car allegedly drove off Dyke Bridge on Chappaquiddick Island and Mary Jo Kopechne, 28, drowned.

This evidence consists of two different parts, presented in different form. One is the testimony on Jan. 6, 1970, of Dr. John J. McHugh, State Police Chemist and Supervisor of Laboratories of the Department of Public Safety in Boston, which describes in detail the findings of a chemical analysis of Mary Jo's clothing and leaves no doubt whatsoever that the girl had been bleeding profusely before hitting the water and drowning. Details of Dr. McHugh's testimony will be found below.

On the other hand, the transcript reprints without comment, in the form of appendices, the affidavits of two doctors, Robert D. Watt of Hyannis, Mass., and Dr. Milton F. Brougham, Chief of Neurosurgery of four hospitals in the Cape Cod region, which clearly show that Senator Kennedy suffered multiple injuries which are totally incompatible with his alleged automobile accident. To start out with the affidavit of Dr. Watt, who practices near the Kennedy Compound and was consulted first, it reads in part:

"On July 19, 1969, I was called to see Edward M. Kennedy at his home. His chief complaints were headache, neck pain, generalized stiffness and soreness. The history of the present illness was as follows: He stated that he had been in an auto accident last night on Martha's Vineyard. The car went off a bridge. There is a lapse in his memory between hitting the bridge and coming to under water and struggling to get out. There was a loss of orientation - at the last moment he grabbed the side of an open window and pulled himself out..."

Let's stop here for a moment to make an important point. So Kennedy told his doctor, who evidently came to his bedside immediately after his return from Edgartown, how he allegedly managed to get out of the car which had settled to the bottom of Poucha Pond: by grabbing the side of an open window and pulling himself out. Only a few hours earlier, in his signed statement to the police, Kennedy had declared: "I attempted to open the door and window of the car but have no recollection of how I got out of the car."

Kennedy's lucid moment did not last long. (Of course he couldn't know then that what he told Dr. Watt in the privacy of his home would some day become part of a public record). Somebody - perhaps Dr. Watt himself - must have told him soon thereafter that it couldn't be done - a man of his size and bulk escaping from the window of a submerged automobile with its roof resting on the bottom. So a few days later, pinpoint amnesia again conveniently set in. When Dr. Brougham examined Kennedy three days later, he reported that his patient "somehow escaped from the car, but does not know how he did this." And when he testified at the Inquest on Jan. 5, 1970, Kennedy in answer to a question by District Attorney Edmund Dinis, "And did you go through the window to get out of the car?", answered flatly: "I have no idea in the world how I got out of that car."

So much for Kennedy's "credibility gap." There is, to be sure, plenty of evidence that he has been lying throughout about the real nature of his accident. As a matter of fact, Judge James A. Boyle, in his final report on the Inquest, stated, without mincing his words, that he did not believe essential portions of the Senator's testimony, which is tantamount to a judicial accusation of perjury. Indeed, Kennedy and his associates lied so much, in and out of court, about what really had happened, that hardly any portion of their testimony can be taken without a heavy grain of salt.

Still, it would be patently unfair to hold these lying, even perjurious, statements against Kennedy, because he was in a position where he simply couldn't help himself. He was caught in a monstrous trap and unable to escape from it. He couldn't tell the truth, so what other alternative was there left to him, but to lie?

Before we go further into this matter, let us revert now to the affidavit of Dr. Watt.

"Physical examination revealed his vital signs and neurological examination to be within normal limits," he reports. "Positive findings included a one-half inch abrasion and hematoma over the right mastoid, a contusion of the vertex, spasm of the posterior cervical musculature with tenderness over the fifth and sixth cervical vertebrae (The area just above the nape of the neck), motion of his head was limited and was accomplished with difficulty, tenderness and soreness of the lumbar area without radiation.

"Diagnosis: Concussion, contusions and abrasions of the scalp, acute cervical strain. The contusion of the vertex was demonstrated by tenderness and a spongy swelling at the top of his head. The abrasion over the right mastoid was obvious. The acute cervical strain was substantiated by X-ray studies which showed a loss of the normal cervical lordosis, which was due to spasm of the cervical musculature. The diagnosis of concussion was predicated upon the foregoing objective evidence of injury and the history of the temporary loss of consciousness and retrograde amnesia. Impairment of judgment, and confused behavior are symptoms consistent with an injury of the character sustained by the patient."

After the therapy prescribed by Dr. Watt (bed rest and a muscle relaxant) had failed to produce the desired results, Dr. Watt recommended that an X-ray of Kennedy's skull and cervical spine be made and this was later done at the Cape Cod Medical Center.

Dr. Watt continues: "After reviewing the X-rays, in which there was obvious evidence of an acute cervical strain, I fitted him to a cervical collar."

"Because of these findings, I felt that neurosurgical consultation was indicated and then contacted Dr. Milton F. Brougham..." Now here is the latter's report on his neurological examination:

"At the time of this examination the patient is alert and fully oriented. Speech is normal. Examination of the scalp reveals a zone of tenderness approximately 3 cm in diameter over the mid point of the vertex of the skull with slight elevation of the scalp over the surrounding tissue in this zone. There is also an area of swelling and discoloration of the skin behind the right mastoid extending upward and medialward from the tip of the mastoid, a distance of about 3 to 4 cm. Over the top of this zone which is quite sensitive to pressure there is a linear excoriation of the skin which is 2 cm in length..."

What does all this mean? Translated from the medical lingo into common English, it means that Kennedy suffered numerous blows - in the neck, behind the ear, even in the loin (lumbar area), probably by a karate expert. (to be continued in the next issue).

READER'S FORUM

Dear Mr. Joesten - Everything else in Truth Letter is great, but put me down as totally opposed to your TRUTH ABOUT CHAPPAQUIDDICK, as indicated in the Summary in the July 1st issue.

Although it is possible the weekend gathering had some political purpose relative to Senator Kennedy's career, along with the purely social aspect, I no longer believe the tragedy to have been anything other than an accident.

Faithfully yours,

July 6, 1970

(signed) Madeline Goddard

From Peter Dawnay (London):

Dear Jo, - Your latest issue of TRUTH LETTER, which has just arrived, was one of the most exciting for a long time; I am dying to hear where you got your information from about Chappaquiddick. I must say, however, that I can't help feeling slightly uneasy about it. For the life of me, I can't see how you are going to answer the following questions:

- 1). Why did Kennedy not report earlier to the police?
- 2). How did he get back to Martha's Vineyard on the night of the "accident"?
- 3). Why did he cross back to Chappaquiddick on the following morning looking as if nothing had happened?

It seems to me that these are fundamental questions which cannot be ignored. If you are right, then there was no reason for Kennedy not to go straight to the police after being assaulted. Even if he was not in a fit state to do so, one of his friends could have called them.

The ferry was still running at the time of the assault, so why couldn't he have gone back on the ferry? And if he had been assaulted, surely Peachey would have noticed that something was wrong when he checked the time at the hotel. Ross Richards, who spoke to him early the next morning, didn't notice anything wrong with him either.

If you are right, Kennedy was attacked, and both the girl and the car were removed. Why should the conspirators not have assumed that he would go immediately to the police? Had he done so, they could hardly have expected the frameup to succeed. There had to be some built-in guarantee that he would delay reporting the accident until the morning after the discovery of the girl's body. If we accept your scenario, it means that the conspirators must have been running a number of unacceptable risks... etc.

From R.B. Cutler:

JJ: - On receipt of TL II/20, I hasten to write and offer what little help I can if it is not already too late... meaning that you seem to have everything under control and whatever I might have to add may well turn out to be superfluous... nonetheless here are the main items I feel should have bearing on the case:

1. Dinis' questioning hardly did any good at all... in fact the inquest was nothing more than the WC all over again... never getting down to the hard facts.

(Mr. Cutler's next eight points are largely technical and, with one or two exceptions, in complete agreement with the story you are going to read in the next few issues of TL. - J.J.)

10. And the final straw is I am having trouble with the woman clerk of the court in Edgartown granting me permission to view the exhibits and somehow procure copies... it is damned irritating that public documents are not public documents... well, good luck and I'm not sure I can buy pregnancy yet... maybe you'll convince me.. it sounds great.

All this is so extraordinarily revealing and so completely at odds with the version of the assassination first concocted by the Dallas police and the FBI and later endorsed by the Warren Commission, that the FBI's warning to Carr to keep his mouth well shut was practically imperative.

The amazing story of R.R. Carr would not be complete without this epilogue which appeared in Penn Jones Jr.'s Midlothian Mirror of Sept. 11, 1969, as an editorial entitled "ROGER CRAIG" and "RICHARD CARR:"

"Roger Craig and Richard Carr are two of the bravest men we have ever known. We have previously written about them in this paper. Attempts have been made to kill both, and both are out of work today. Their sin is that they told the truth and have not changed their stories as to what they saw on the day President John Kennedy died in Dallas.

"A month ago Richard Carr was standing on a street in Atlanta, Georgia. Two strangers came up and without saying a word one man stabbed Carr in the back. As Carr wheeled to face his attacker he received a deep slash on his left forearm. The attacker stabbed again and the blade broke off in Carr's arm.

"Carr ran to his pickup and begged the man to leave, but the assailant advanced saying, 'You son of a bitch, I am not through with you yet.' Carr shot the man three times. The man spoke for the second time when he said to his companion, 'Doodle Bug, he has killed me.' The companion fled. The man Carr shot is not dead yet; a grand jury has no-billed Carr.

"Both Carr and Craig have faced death in the military service of their country. They know how to die, but this drawn-out, constant and cowardly harassment is hard to bear. Carr has no idea why someone feels that he, Carr, should die. The stabbing in Atlanta is the second attempt (emphasis added) that has been made on his life....

"The real tragedy is that both men are now destitute, and not a friend of John Kennedy, not a fair-minded person in the country has come forward with a thin dime!"

But, one might add, people like William Manchester, who do not hesitate to falsify history on a grand scale to please the Establishment, are paid millions for their dastardly efforts. Such is the State of the Union today.

James L. Simmons

A third key witness (counting the Kennans as a unit) the Warren Commission avoided like the plague was James L. Simmons of Mesquite, Tex., one of the 10 or 11 railroad employees who were atop the Triple Underpass when the presidential motorcade passed through Dealey Plaza. He was called to the stand on Feb. 15, 1969, and testified that he had a clear view of the presidential limousine when "I heard three loud reports that I presumed to be shots."

Asked by Asst. DA Oser about the President's reaction to the third shot, the witness replied: "Well, he fell; and there was matter and a hail of blood. He fell to his left. (emphasis added)

Simmons further said that, after the third shot, the limousine paused, then accelerated; he also testified that the matter (from the President's head) he saw passed to the left side of his head and over the side of the car."

Later the same day the state called Dallas motorcycle policeman Billy Joe Martin, who was riding some 10 feet behind Kennedy when the shots were fired. He testified he was spattered with blood and tissue.

The combined testimony of Simmons and Martin on this point adds further proof, of course, to the already irrefutable evidence that the third and fatal shot was fired from the front and the right, not from the rear, as the Warren Commission had contended. (to be continued in the next issue)

* For details about the role of Roger Craig in the case, see my book Oswald: The Truth, Chapter 10.

An analysis and interpretation of the John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King assassinations. Copyright by J. Joesten, 1968-70

The Frameup of James Earl Ray (ctd. from No. 20)

"However, if Ray had pleaded innocent, then all of his story would have come out in court and become public property. Was he, then, persuaded to plead guilty, as he did in a surprising reversal of earlier indications, by news media anxious to protect their exclusive property?..."

Mr. Osborn's rhetorical question calls for a most affirmative answer. Only, it wasn't "the news media" (meaning LOOK and Cowles Communications, Inc.) who played that dirty trick on him; even a professional criminal would hardly trade a 99-year-sentence for the privilege of reading exclusively about ~~his~~ his crimes in his favorite magazine. It was Ray's chief defense counsel, Percy Foreman, who working hand-in-glove with that venal author, William Bradford Huie, and the Cowles publishing empire, impressed on his client so strongly the alleged certainty that he would get a death sentence, if he did not plead guilty that Ray capitulated and entered a false guilty plea which he has long since recanted. But he is now so snarled up in legal technicalities that there is little hope this "even greater perversion of justice" (how strange to find such an expression in the Daily Telegraph - this could have been straight out of TRUTH LETTER!) can ever be righted again.

On this score, Mr. Osborn reported: "Ray was sentenced to 99 years in prison. Early last month (that would have been at the beginning of January 1970) the Tennessee Supreme Court rejected an appeal for a new trial because a State law says that a person who pleads guilty waives all rights to appeal, or to a new trial. Ray, however, continues to fight for a new trial."

Ray, the near-perennial convict, may not have known about this Tennessee State Law, but his felonious lawyer, Percy Foreman (who also worked hand-in-glove with the prosecution in the case) certainly knew about it. And now these conspirators have got their man trussed up like a chicken and are feasting together on the spoils of one of the rawest deals in the history of "justice."

In case you think I might be misinformed, or exaggerating, because such a monstrous state of affairs couldn't exist in America, let me now quote from an AP-dispatch, by Hal Cooper, dated March 24, 1969:

"Percy Foreman, the lawyer who advised James Earl Ray to plead guilty to the Martin Luther King Jr. assassination, said today an offer of \$ 175,000 has been made for the movie rights to the story. Foreman said the offer was made by Carlo Ponti, film producer and husband of Italian actress Sophia Loren, to William Bradford Huie, Ray's official biographer (official biographer?! - J.J.)

" 'And I'll get 60 per cent of it', Foreman said in an interview in his New York hotel. In addition to the flat fee, Ponti would pay 13 per cent of the gross receipts of the movie. Foreman, of Houston, Tex., said Look magazine had guaranteed another \$ 85,000 for Huie's series of articles on Ray's life, and that he was entitled to 60 per cent of that also.

"The attorney said that his 60 per cent share of the movie, book and magazine rights might total \$ 400,000 or so, but that he would take only the \$ 150,000 agreed upon with Ray. Foreman said he would put anything above that figure into trust for Ray's family. 'I didn't fix the fee, he (Ray) fixed it,' Foreman said.

He said he advised Ray to plead guilty 'because I believed he would be electrocuted if he didn't.' "

So there you have the whole sordid story straight from the horse's ass.

(to be continued in the next issue)