

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. II, No. 24

September 1, 1970

Editorial: Some day America will have a decent President again.

The Crimes of J. Edgar Hoover

In these pages, I have repeatedly expressed the considered judgment that FBI-Director J. Edgar Hoover, that vaunted "symbol of law-enforcement", is in fact the nation's top criminal - way ahead of any of his famous "Top Ten." He will go down in history as one of the great felonious police tyrants, on a par with Beria, Himmler et al. He aided and abetted the assassination of President John F. Kennedy; he actively assisted the corrupt Los Angeles authorities in covering up the true background of the RFK assassination; and he deliberately framed James Earl Ray for the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, knowing full well that somebody else was responsible for that killing - and knowing the assassin's identity as well.

New new evidence of Hoover's ingrained criminality has come to light - of all places in that most loyal servant of the Establishment, Time magazine. In its issue of Aug. 17, 1970, Time published a story entitled "Posthumous Pillory" which throws a frightening light on the extent to which Hoover abuses and misuses the tremendous powers vested in his office. The article purports to be a review of a new book just published by Negro novelist John Williams, "The King God Didn't Save", but its real impact lies elsewhere.

Williams, it seems, is of the opinion that Dr. King was, in private life, something less than a saint and that "white power" used his weaknesses to "manipulate, castrate and ultimately destroy him."

"King unwittingly provided the noose," Time reports. Suspecting that some of his associates had Communist connections, the FBI began tapping King's telephone and bugging his hotel rooms in 1963. From a security viewpoint, the wiretaps uncovered nothing. They established no links between King and the Communists. But, Williams reports, they did turn up an astonishing amount of information about King's extensive and vigorous sexual activities...

Tapping Dr. King's phone calls and bugging his hotel rooms was, of course, utterly illegal, no matter what the excuse. But only a J. Edgar Hoover would go so far as to use the illicit information thus obtained to blackmail the Negro leader into some kind of submissiveness, even though it was only a temporary one.

The first thing Hoover did was to "leak" some of the information he had thus gained to the news media. This is clearly apparent from another passage in Time:

"Most newspapers ignored the rumors and leaks to them of King's extramarital activities, but their existence undermined King's effectiveness just the same..."

Needless to say, there was only one source from which these "leaks" could have come and that was J. Edgar Hoover.

But the real giveaway in this story is yet to come.

\* For details, see my mimeographed publication "The Case Against J. Edgar Hoover", published in 1969. \$ 20.00 a copy, with a 50% discount to TRUTH LETTER subscribers.

"Williams has the correct outline of the FBI tape story," Time goes on to say. "What he does not have is precisely what happened at the celebrated meeting between FBI Director Hoover and King in 1964. Hoover, Time learned, explained to King just what damaging private detail he had on the tapes and lectured him that his morals should be those befitting a Nobel prize-winner. He also suggested that King should tone down his criticism of the FBI. King took the advice. His decline in black esteem followed, a decline scathingly narrated by Williams..."

One never ceases to marvel at the combination of crass stupidity, and pompous hypocrisy, ruthless criminality and musty puritanism that is so characteristic of J. Edgar Hoover. Why should a Nobel prize winner have special moral standards "befitting" him, but not others? What has King's private life to do with the services to mankind for which he was awarded the peace prize by a Scandinavian panel that fortunately could not be influenced by the minions of J. Edgar Hoover?

That King to some extent, and for a certain period of time, was stymied by Hoover's shameless wiretapping and bugging tactics, now may be taken for granted. But in the end he rallied. To quote again from Time:

"Only toward the end of his career, Williams feels, did King fully understand the realities of power in America and begin to take steps that would have made him a truly effective leader by seeking to unite the nation's poor across class and color lines against the Vietnam War. (emphasis added - J.J.) This idea, Williams argues, so threatened the hegemony of the white power structure group that it decided that King must be destroyed."

What a terrible and revealing indictment of the utter depravation of the American Establishment in our day!

#### READER'S FORUM

From Marvin Longton, New York: "...I don't know if you have seen the film Z, but briefly its plot concerns the assassination of a liberal political figure in Greece. A fearless investigator finds evidence of complicity by police and persons in the highest circles of the government and the military. He doesn't hesitate to charge these important persons publicly with being involved. Then comes the coup: the investigation is stopped, honest men go to jail, witnesses die 'mysteriously.' You will admit, I'm sure, some parallels to American events.

"Well, this April Senator (Edward) Kennedy spoke at the presentation of the 'Profiles in Courage Award' (!) to Earl Warren. Speaking of the various acts of repression occurring in the country, Kennedy said: '1984 may be less than 14 years away, and ... 'Z' could happen here.' Really, sometimes the Kennedys make me sick."

R.B. Cutler, Manchester, Mass., in two recent letters raises the interesting possibility that the murder of Mary Jo Kopechne may have been executed with the help of a stuntman (the CIA has lots of them at its disposal - J.J.), rather than pushing the car off the bridge, standing still, with the girl lying prone on the back seat:

"...If you can figure some way of lashing the wheel and allowing the accelerator pedal to remain depressed by a stick or whatever then it could possibly have been set in motion some distance from the bridge and a stuntman could have jumped off the driver's side at the last moment... it needs a driver but not a sitting-down one... (second letter:) ... My thought is that the locked driver's door indicates a stuntman hanging on to the steering wheel and the door until almost the bridge and leaving the vehicle then or maybe even diving into the water..."

Whichever way it was done, it surely was murder. District Attorney Edmund Dinis, incidentally, has not yet reacted to my "Open Letter" (TL, II/23), nor acknowledged receipt of the material I've sent him. Judging by past performance, he probably won't do anything about the Kopechne murder, unless he is forced by an aroused public opinion. But that would require a bigger voice than TRUTH LETTER and the American press, almost in its totality, has lost its former capacity for crusading on behalf of truth and justice.

The Truth About Chappaquiddick (ctd.)

To go back to Mr. Farrar's explicit testimony - the tremendous significance of which was simply ignored by the Court - let me quote again from the transcript:

- Q. And you say you walked to the back of the car and you observed two feet?  
 A. That is right, a pair of feet.  
 Q. A pair of feet?  
 A. Right.  
 Q. You were looking now through the rear window of the car?  
 A. That is correct, looking through the rear window of the car, and a pair of feet were visible clearly because the light hit them.  
 Q. What light? that  
 A. Well, the light is reflected. This is difficult to describe, but when you are under water light is very indirect, there's sort of a halo of light over everything. The light in this case would be reflected off the bottom of the pond and I could see the two feet in the rear window there.  
 Q. The lights of the car were not on?  
 A. No, sir.  
 Q. With reference to the feet, what position were they in? You say you saw two feet. With reference to the car which is now on its roof, what is the position of the feet?  
 A. I saw the two feet together in the top of the right side of the rear window. Now, by top I am referring crossways to the surface of the water.  
 Q. So you mean the floor of the car?  
 A. The section of the window closest to the floor of the car, if you will, yes. The position of this is diagonally across from where I first looked into the car. On entering the open right window - I proceeded around to the right side. On entering the open right window and looking up I found the victim's head cocked back, face pressed into the foot well, hand holding onto the front edge of the Back seat. By holding herself in a position such as she could avail herself of the last remaining air in the car."

At this point, Farrar produced a sketch of the body's position, prepared by an artist under his direction and, as he himself put it, "worth a thousand words." This sketch became Exhibit No. 14 and, like the other 32 numbered exhibits, it has not yet been released for public scrutiny. The reason is clear enough: the authorities do not want the public to see too clearly what really had happened. Words can always be used to distort the true meaning of evidence: pictures can seldom be thus abused.

The belabored questioning of the DA with regard to the exact position of the two feet betrays his own bewilderment and embarrassment. How can anybody reconcile such a position of the body, when found, with the assumption that Mary Jo had been sitting in the front seat, next to Kennedy, when the car went off the bridge?

Farrar's unambiguous statement that he found the girl with her face pressed into the foot well, hand holding onto the front edge of the back seat, so she "could avail herself of the last remaining air in the car" finally and completely disposes of the notion that she might have been washed from front to rear by the motion of the water. Had she been dead by the time that movement is supposed to have taken place, she could no longer have pressed her face into the foot well, or gripped the edge of the back seat. And if she was still alive, is it conceivable that she would have crawled from front to rear under the upside-down upholstery separating the two parts of the car, instead of trying to get out through the open window - as Kennedy supposedly did? No, the whole thing is too preposterous for further comment.

There is simply no two ways about it: Farrar's testimony demonstrates beyond a shadow of doubt that Mary Jo was not in the front seat, when the "accident" occurred. She was either sitting, or lying or sprawling on the back seat.

The Truth About Chappaquiddick (ctd.)

How did she get into that position? It stands to reason that she must have been placed there in a state of unconsciousness. (Kennedy never claimed that Mary Jo had been in the back seat when the car went off the bridge. In his - demonstrably false - account of the "accident," he testified: "...and the next thing I recall is the movement of Mary Jo next to me, the struggling, perhaps hitting or kicking me...")

Once this premise is granted - and, frankly, I cannot see how any person in his right mind and not totally blind can fail to grant it - it follows automatically that Mary Jo was a victim of murder.

The record shows that District Attorney Edmund Dinis (Southern District of Mass.) suspected foul play at an early stage of the game. His suspicion was first aroused by a chemical analysis of a blood sample that had been taken from Miss Kopechne's body at the Frier Funeral Home - at the suggestion of the State Police, as far as can be determined - before the body was flown to Pennsylvania for burial after a very perfunctory inspection by Dr. Mills that lasted only from 10 to 15 minutes, by his own account.

When this blood sample was subjected to chemical analysis by Dr. John J. McHugh, Supervisor of Laboratories of the Mass. Department of Public Safety in Boston, it showed a surprisingly high level of ethyl alcohol - 0.09 per cent. This level, the doctor explained during the Inquest, in a person weighing about 110 pounds, would be consistent with about 3.75 to five ounces, 80 to 90 proof liquor consumed within one hour prior to death, or higher amounts of liquor over a period of two hours prior to death.

Now, Mary Jo Kopechne was "notoriously among all our friends", as Esther Newburgh put it during her testimony on Jan. 8, 1970, a person who hardly drank at all. By the concordant testimony of all her friends at the party, she was completely sober when she left the Cottage in the company of Senator Kennedy. In the case of Esther Newburgh, this led to the following (slightly condensed) exchange between the Court and the witness:

The Court: If I tell you the testimony has indicated that Mary Jo's blood had a content of .09 hundredths percentage of alcohol, which by expert testimony indicates five to six ounces of whiskey, would this change your testimony in any respect?

The Witness: No. I wouldn't understand the five or six ounces anyway. Would that be X number of drinks? ...

The Court: ... "Well, the alcoholic content indicates that if an ounce of whiskey or rum or scotch in the neighborhood of 80 or 90 proof was used in each drink, that there would be somewhere between five and six drinks to reach an alcoholic content of .09.

The Witness: "...Five or six drinks would have been completely out of order with the way she lived. And if a girl who didn't drink had that much to drink you would certainly be able to tell if she was more jovial than normal, and she was not.

The Court: I am only telling you what a chemical analysis shows and the chemical analysis is practically irrefutable.

The Witness: Then I am the wrong person to be asked, because as far as I was concerned she was completely sober.

The Court: And you saw her the time she left?

The Witness: Exactly the time she left."

How is one to reconcile the "irrefutable" evidence of the chemical analysis with the concordant testimony of all her friends stating in the most positive manner that Mary Jo was cold sober when she left?

There is one - and only one - explanation and it fits perfectly into the pattern as we have seen it unfold so far. Mary Jo, having been abducted by persons unknown, was reduced to a state of unconsciousness through the injection of a stupefying mixture with a strong content of ethyl alcohol. Is there any evidence to corroborate such an assumption?

There is conclusive evidence.

In New Orleans, on 13 Washington, Shaneyfelt was held on a tight leash by his boss, J. Edgar Hoover. Significantly, he went to the Shaw trial "accompanied by two D.S. attorneys who asked to hear his testimony" (N.O. States-Item, 2-14-69).

What could poor Shaneyfelt do, under the circumstances, but parrot a story he had already been taught before he went before the Warren Commission? Indeed, could he have testified in New Orleans in a sense substantially different from his testimony before the Warren Commission without laying himself open to a charge of perjury? Didn't Garrison realize that when he decided to call Shaneyfelt as a state witness?

The fraudulent nature of that "re-enactment" staged by Shanefelt and Frazier on May 24, 1964, "based on instructions from the (Warren) Commission," as the witness said, is also clearly apparent from the following portion of his testimony:

"The basic setup in the reenactment was to select models the same height and build as the president and Gov. Connally. Agents were selected to reenact President Kennedy and Gov. Connally and the one who acted as Gov. Connally wore the same coat Connally wore when he was shot. We placed a mark on the back of the coat of President Kennedy's stand-in at the point of the wound in the back." At this point, Asst. DA Oser asked :

Q. - "Was that a skin wound?"

A. - I have no knowledge of that. All of the angles and calculations of distance were related to that spot. We used the bullet hole of the coat of the agent standing in for Gov. Connally to compute the angles and the distances.

Q. - Am I correct in stating that you used the skin hole for Kennedy and the coat hole for Connally?

A. - Yes

Q. - Why didn't you use Kennedy's coat?

A. - I don't know.

It is not only amazing but downright shocking that Oser was content with this obviously unsatisfactory answer, which cried out for clarification, but tendered the witness at this point to the defense for cross-examination.

Either Shaneyfelt, who with Frazier was in charge of that "reenactment" was lying when he testified that he didn't know why Kennedy's coat was not used when Connally's was, or else he had performed like a puppet, just doing exactly as he was told, without reasoning or asking any questions.

In any ordinary murder case, where a reenactment is in order, it would be held under judicial supervision and, in a case such as this, the car in which the victim was shot - not a "stand-in" - and the clothing he wore - not a mark placed on another coat - would be used, if available. And both the presidential limousine, in which Kennedy died, and his coat were available, or at any rate could have made available, had the will to find the truth existed. I have already stated that the limousine was made "unavailable" because someone - and that someone could only have been Lyndon B. Johnson, the new possessor of that presidential limousine - decided that it had to be repaired and refitted at that particular moment. Kennedy's coat, too, was available and in the possession of the FBI, as the photos reproduced on pp. 56 and 57 of Edward J. Epstein's Inquest prove. (to be continued in the next issue)

The Frameup of James Earl Ray (ctd. from No. 23)

Dull and tedious as this document may seem to be on the face of it, I find it necessary to reproduce it integrally, for it is a veritable schoolbook example of the way the FBI deceives the public and even some judges - in the case, the Bow Street Court magistrate in London - by dint of technological abracadabra, deliberate double-talk and sheer verbiage in order to hide the essential facts - just as the Warren Commission did.

AFFIDAVIT

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ) ss:

ROBERT A. FRAZIER, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am 49 years old and I reside in Hillcrest Heights, Maryland.
  2. I obtained a Bachelor of Science Degree from the University of Idaho in 1940. I have been a Special Agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation since December 1942. I am Chief of the Firearms Unit of the Physics and Chemistry Section of the Federal Bureau of Investigation Laboratory in Washington, D.C. I have been assigned to the Firearms Unit continuously since June 9, 1949. I received the specialized training program in firearms identification of approximately one year duration from the Federal Bureau of Investigation when I was initially assigned to the Firearms Unit. Since being assigned to this unit I have made thousands of comparisons of bullets and cartridge cases with the firearms for the purpose of determining whether a particular firearm fired a bullet or cartridge case. I have testified on numerous occasions in federal and state courts, as well as in military courts martial, as a firearms identification expert witness.
  3. On April 5, 1968, at the Federal Bureau of Investigation Laboratory, I received certain items of evidence from Robert Fitzpatrick, Special Agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who had brought them by airplane from Memphis, Tennessee. These objects had been obtained in connection with the investigation of the shooting of Martin Luther King, Jr. on the previous day.
  4. Among the items of evidence I received was a .30-06 Springfield caliber Remington rifle, Model 760, serial number 461476 with clip, and a Redfield telescopic sight, serial number A 17350. I also received from Special Agent Fitzpatrick a .30 caliber metal-jacketed 'soft-point' sporting type Remington-Peters bullet, an expended .30-06 Springfield caliber Remington-Peters cartridge casing, and a Peters cartridge box, bearing manufacturer's index number 3033 containing five unfired .30-06 Springfield caliber Remington-Peters cartridges and four unfired .30-06 Springfield caliber U.S. military cartridges containing full metal-jacketed bullets.
  5. I determined from microscopic examination that the expended .30 caliber metal jacketed rifle bullet had been fired from a barrel rifled with six lands and grooves, right twist. As a result of my examination of the submitted rifle I determined that it produces general rifling impressions on fired bullets having the physical characteristics of those on the submitted bullet. I also determined that the submitted bullet was a 150-grain soft-point bullet identical to the bullets in the five Remington-Peters cartridges contained in the submitted Peters cartridge box.
  6. Because of distortion due to mutilation and insufficient marks of value, I could draw no conclusion as to whether or not the submitted bullet was fired from the submitted rifle. (emphasis added - J.J.)
  7. The .30-06 Springfield caliber Remington Peters cartridge case was identified by me as having been fired in and extracted from the submitted rifle. This determination was based on a comparison of the microscopic markings of the firing pin, bolt face and extractor left on the cartridge case by the rifle. Based on physical characteristics, I determined that the fired bullet was of a kind that the manufacturer loads into the submitted cartridge case to produce cartridges similar to the Remington-Peters cartridges in the Peters cartridge box." (Sworn to etc.etc.)
- A masterpiece of official deception and phony evidence solemnly presented  
in the guise of expert analysis ! (to be continued)