

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. II, No. 23

August 15, 1970

OPEN LETTER

To District Attorney Edmund Dinis
New Bedford, Mass.

Dear Mr. District Attorney:

The record shows that you have known all along that Mary Jo Kopechne did not die in an accident, but was murdered.

You began to suspect foul play when you learned, late in July 1969, that the blood sample taken from Mary Jo's body showed an unusually high 0.09 percent level of ethyl alcohol in the blood of a girl who was notoriously a non-drinker.

You became convinced that Mary Jo was murdered when the chemical analysis of her blouse, performed on Sept. 2, 1969 by State Police Chemist Dr. John J. McHugh, proved beyond a shadow of doubt that the girl had been bleeding profusely before she hit the water and drowned.

You are well aware that the lesion which soaked Mary Jo's blouse with blood, but left no visible mark on her body, was caused by a syringe with which a stupefying mixture with a high content of alcohol was injected into her.

You cannot be unaware of the tell-tale fact that Mary Jo, who by Sen. Edward Kennedy's account had been sitting beside him in the front passenger seat, actually was found dead in the rear compartment of the car, indicating that she had been lying unconscious on the back seat when the Oldsmobile was pushed off the bridge by manual force.

Could you have missed the wealth of circumstantial evidence which proves that Kennedy and Kopechne have been victims of an assault in which the Senator was knocked down and the girl was kidnaped for the purpose of framing Kennedy for a murder he didn't commit?

Surely you know that Mary Jo, at the time of her death, was pregnant (not by Kennedy) and that the whole "accident" was rigged in such a fashion that, if an autopsy had been performed, and had shown her condition, the weight of nearly insuperable suspicion would have fallen on Kennedy - the married man with the classic motive of (supposedly) wanting to get rid of a mistress who had become an embarrassment?

And I can't believe that you don't know why Kennedy has kept silent about the assault, why he has lied and lied and lied (even under oath) about the circumstances of an accident that never happened and even has pleaded guilty to a traffic offense he never committed.

Just to refresh your memory, Mr. Dinis, and to advise you that this material will be published, I'm mailing to you under separate cover today, a copy of my 20,000-word exclusive report on The Murder of Mary Jo Kopechne which proves all these points and a lot more. Do your duty, Mr. District Attorney!

(For the continuation of "The Truth About Chappaquiddick" see pp. 2 and 3.)

The Truth About Chappaquiddick(I) The Tell-Tale Traces of Violence (ctd.)

Now, in the light of the well-established facts that Kennedy's automobile (a) dropped into Poucha Pond from an extremely low height and (b) hit the water surface on its right side, let us again examine the injuries suffered by the occupants of the car - or lack of such.

It stands to reason that the driver of the car was, in the case, doubly protected, - assuming, for the sake of argument, Kennedy's version of the accident to be true. As the vehicle tumbled into the water, he was clutching the steering wheel, which held him in place since the impact was not frontal, but came from the far side of where he was sitting. On the other hand, if he was jerked sideward by the fall, he would be thrown against the body of Mary Jo, since she was supposed to be sitting next to him, not against any hard metal parts.

The girl, for her part, was by far the most exposed to injury of the two. Since the window on her side was blown out by the impact, she was liable to be cut by flying glass before the water rushed in. Also, she had nothing to hold on (at a speed of 20 miles it is unlikely that she was holding on to the safety grip, if there was one), but was bound to feel the full force of the impact which might have thrown her against the windshield or any other part of the car.

By the laws of physics and logic, then, the person bound to suffer the most serious injuries in the fall was Mary Jo. Yet miraculously - there are no miracles - she was not hurt at all. According to the concordant testimony of the medical examiner, Dr. Donald R. Mills, and the mortician, Eugene Friehe, who both examined her body on the spot, immediately after it had been taken from the water, the girl was completely unscathed. This is a matter of the highest importance for a correct assessment of what really happened that night, so we shall have to dwell on it at some length.

To begin with, let me quote from Jack Olsen's "The Bridge at Chappaquiddick" (Little, Brown & Co., Boston), a highly informative as well as vividly written book, which was published on Jan. 3, 1970, just before the Inquest got under way. He specifically lists Dr. Mills as one of a number of "kind and patient people who aided in its preparation" and on p. 144 he writes:

"He (Dr. Mills) looked and probed around the body and could find no visible signs of injury, marks or obvious lesions. The neck was white and unblemished. There were no apparent bruises on the face or upper body. The major bones were unbroken. Under the nails, there was a small amount of foreign matter, but the nails themselves were unbroken and nicely manicured, and Dr. Mills could see no significance to the debris. He ran his hands across the scalp; it was smooth and regular. The woman had not bumped herself in going off the bridge. He pulled down the slacks and observed that the woman had been wearing nothing underneath. The abdomen was flat. He pushed against the abdominal wall and noted that the uterus was normal, unenlarged. It was not impossible that the victim had been in the early months of pregnancy, but looking at her small white belly and feeling the uterus, Dr. Mills doubted it..."

At the Inquest, Dr. Mills confirmed that Mary Jo's body was intact as the following questions (by Assistant DA Armand Fernandes) and answers (by Dr. Mills) show:

- Q. Did you find any external marks on the body?
 A. No.
 Q. In your examination, as I recall from previous testimony, Doctor, although you say you did not, I think you said you rendered a complete examination of the body, you did not remove all the clothing. You would --
 A. No, that is correct.
 Q. Would you tell us exactly what you did?
 A. I removed the clothing as much as was necessary.
 Q. And you examined the head?

A. Yes.

Q. You found no incised wounds?

A. No.

Q. No other bruises?

A. No.

No incised wounds, i.e. cuts from the broken window glass; no bruises from bumping the head against any part of the car; no external marks whatsoever.

The DA did not even attempt to elicit from the doctor any information as to how Mary Jo's body, especially her head, could have remained so completely unscathed by the car's plunge into the water, but then the whole Inquest was never designed to bring out the whole truth about this "accident." Whenever the interrogation got too close to the truth for comfort, questioning was quickly shifted to some other topic.

Now here is what the undertaker, Mr. Frish, told the Court about the condition of Mary Jo's body:

"Well, I assisted my own assistant in cleansing the body, soaping the body down with a germicidal soap and taking the spray and washing the body and I personally took charge of cleansing the hair which was impregnated with much salt water and a little seaweedage and things of that sort that we usually find on a decedent, and in so doing I thoroughly examined the scalp and manipulated it in my fingers to see if there were any fractures, feeling in my mind going over a bridge of that sort and crashing there might be some fractures but I didn't find any fractures.

Q. In any event you saw no marks or bruises or anything?

A. The only bruising I saw was on the left knuckle. That was very slight. We call that a slight abrasion, that is all."

How is one to explain the immaculate condition of Mary Jo's body who was far more exposed to injury than the man allegedly sitting at her left side and who - assuming his story to be true - hurt himself so much in the same fall that he suffered the multiple injuries already listed above, from a big bump on the head to pains in the loins?

There is only one explanation: Mary Jo was not sitting in the front passenger seat, as the official version of the "accident" has it. She was lying, unconscious and prostrate, on the back seat of the car - where she was found by the scuba diver, though in an upside down position - and therefore escaped injury from flying glass or impact.

Far too little attention has been paid in the press - and also by the Court - to the tell-tale position of the body, as it was found by the scuba diver, John Farrar. He testified:

"I went into the water and checked the car on the left-hand driver's side. I looked through the open window and found nothing in the front seat. Fifteen to thirty seconds were necessary to accustom my eyes to the darkness of the car. I then walked around to the back of the car and saw two feet together in the top of the right side of the rear window."

If Mary Jo had been sitting in the passenger's front seat, next to the driver, when the "accident" occurred, as Kennedy's own version - sustained to that extent by the Court - had it, how on earth could she have been found, a few hours later, with her feet sticking out of the right rear window?

It has been suggested in some quarters that she may have been swept by the tide from her original position in the front seat to her sprawling position in the rear, but that is complete nonsense. The car was resting in shallow waters - so shallow that when Farrar started on the recovery he saw, in his own words, (Police) "Chief Arena who was sitting on the rear of the car in the middle of the stream". It did drift in the water for a distance of some 36 feet from the point of impact, but it did not sway or tumble in the water to the extent that a body could have been lifted by the waves out of its front seat position into the rear - much less since it was upside down. Nor did the Court adhere to this wild suggestion - it preferred simply to dodge the issue and let it go at that.

Key Witnesses the Warren Commission ignored (ctd.)

Previously, another motorcycle policeman, Bobby W. Hargis, who had also been riding on the left and to the rear of the presidential limousine, ahead of Martin and almost abreast with the Kennedys at the time of the shooting, had testified before the Warren Commission: "I had got splattered with blood - I was just a little back and left of - just a little back and left of Mrs. Kennedy." Talking to newsmen, shortly after the assassination, Officer Hargis had been even more explicit: He told them that the flesh particles from the President's shattered skull had struck him with such force that "I thought at first I might have been hit." (New York Daily News, Nov. 24, 1963).

To round out a perfectly clear picture, it might be added that Deputy Constable Seymour Weitzman, according to Vol. VII, p. 107 of the "Hearings" later recovered a portion of the President's skull from the south side of Elm Street.

It is self-evident, even without reference to Newton's laws of motion, that a shot from the rear could not have produced the effects attested to by Hargis, Martin, Weitzman and later at the Clay Shaw trial by Simmons. Only a shot fired from the grassy knoll area could have produced them.

In the face of this concordant and conclusive testimony, Lyndall L. Shaneyfelt, a photographic expert for the FBI, whom Garrison inexplicably had called as a state witness, although he must have known that Shaneyfelt had already testified before the Warren Commission in a manner wholly agreeable to the latter, told the court "My impression is the shots came from the rear."

"My impression is..." can hardly be rated as a very affirmative statement, yet it sufficed for practically all the newspapers in America to bannerline it as absolute proof that Garrison was wrong in his contention, the President had been killed by a shot from the grassy knoll.

The New Orleans States-Item, for instance, ran this double-spread bannerline across its entire front page of Feb. 14, 1969:

JFK SHOT FROM REAR, FBI EXPERT TESTIFIES

Here are some samples of other headlines: "KENNEDY WAS SHOT FROM REAR, FBI EXPERT TELLS SHAW JURY" (International Herald Tribune, Feb. 15-16, 1969)

"GARRISON'S WITNESS FALLS TO BACK ⁴TW_A GUN THEORY" (NY Daily News, 2-15, 69)

Shaneyfelt, it turned out at the Shaw trial, was the hitherto anonymous FBI agent who, on May 24, 1964, had staged, along with his buddy Robert A. Frazier, a firearms expert for the FBI (who also was called by the state as a witness, at the Shaw trial and then testified in favor of the defense), the totally fictitious and indeed totally fraudulent "re-enactment" of what supposedly had happened in Dealey Plaza on Nov. 22, 1969.

Kingpin of that particular fraud was the deliberate substitution - on the pretext that the limousine in which President Kennedy was killed had to be "repaired and remodelled" just at the critical moment when it would have been needed for an accurate and honest re-enactment - of one car for another it didn't match at all, with the result that all measurements taken were wrong and had to be "adjusted" - which left no end of room for clever manipulation. On this score Shaneyfelt testified:

"Yes, the limousine we used was not the president's car. It was a stand-in actually 10 inches higher from the ground than the presidential car. So we moved the car to an approximate spot where the president was hit on the back and made the 10-inch adjustment."

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.

The Frameup of James Earl Ray (ctd. from No. 22)

This so-called "London material" - so named because it was used by the American authorities to obtain the extradition of James Earl Ray by Bow Street Court in London at the June 27, 1968 hearing (for details, see my "The James Earl Ray Hoax," Chapter II, p. 4) - is approximately 200 pages long. It consists of a number of affidavits, one more worthless than the other, such as that near-unbelievable piece of fakery in which the habitual drunkard Charles Q. Stephens, an inmate of the flophouse on S. Main Street, Memphis, from which the shot that allegedly killed Dr. King is supposed to have been fired, becomes the State's "key witness" against Ray. I have already shown up the complete emptiness and deceptive nature of this "Affidavit" in Chapter IX of "The James Earl Ray Hoax," pointing out, in particular, that Stephens, by his own testimony, "did not get a good look" at the man he saw running down the stairs of the flophouse after the shooting. How can one take seriously the "positive identification" of a suspect by an eyewitness who admits he didn't get a good look at him? This is even more hair-raising than the "positive identification" of Lee Harvey Oswald by the Warren Commission's star witness, Howard Brennan.

Since then, new evidence has come to light which completely destroys Stephens' credibility. In a remarkable article published in the October 1969 issue of the magazine Saga, Renfro T. Hays, a Memphis private investigator whose help had been enlisted by Ray's first defense lawyer, Arthur J. Hanes, has presented a statement by Stephens' common-law wife Grace Hays Walden who at the time of the King murder was ill in bed, with the door to the hallway wide open. Her testimony - which does not figure among the papers of the "London material" is far more precise than that of her husband and proves conclusively that the fugitive in the hallway cannot possibly have been James Earl Ray:

"At about 6 o'clock I heard a shot. I cannot tell where the shot came from. I know it echoed in the arcade beside my window. At this time Charles Stephens was in the kitchen fixing a radio. Right after the shot a man left the bathroom and went down the hall and down the steps to Main Street. I saw this man as he passed the door of my room.

"My best guess of this man's age was in his 50's. This man was not as tall as I am. He was small bone built. He had on an army colored hunting jacket, unfastened, and dark pants. He had on a plaid sports shirt. His hair was salt and pepper color and he carried something long in his right hand but I cannot swear what it was. Charlie was still in the kitchen then but he got to our door by the time the man had gotten to the head of the stairs. Charles Stephens went out in the hall and looked down the hall. In about two minutes Charlie came back into the room..."

Not one particular in this very detailed description fits the physical appearance of James Earl Ray, or the way he was dressed that day.

Now, where would you think Renfro Hays discovered this genuine eyewitness, Grace Walden, and obtained that devastating statement from her? You guessed it - in an insane asylum! While her Charlie, having volunteered to "identify" Ray as the man he had dimly seen in the staircase, was being pampered by the Memphis authorities - they provided him with, and paid the rent for, a nice apartment in another part of town and the DA even picked up the tab for a charge account for Stephens at Jim's Grille, his favorite hangout - the woman was hustled off to the Western Tennessee State Mental Hospital at Bolivar "under unusual and suspicious circumstances", as Saga puts it.

This sort of thing has become an established practice in America today. Inconvenient eyewitnesses, if they are not shot at, die in mysterious traffic accidents or can be browbeaten into changing their testimony so as to fit the official line, almost invariably are committed to mental institutions in flagrant disregard of law and justice. It's happened, time and again, in all of the Three Great Assassinations.

One document stands out among the heap of trash known as the "London material" and which a British court unbelievably deemed sufficient to warrant extradition - and that document proves the innocence of James Earl Ray. (To be continued).