

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER
#####

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. III, No. 1

Sept. 15, 1970

Editorial: "America, love it or leave it" - I left it.

Second Anniversary

Well, honestly, nobody could be more surprised than I am to see this modest newsletter enter its third year of uninterrupted publication. This has been possible only because of the continued faithful support of the great majority of the initial subscribers as well as the newcomers of the past two years.

And TRUTH LETTER does get around. Witness that letter just received from a bookdealer in Wellington, New Zealand, of all places, saying "... We have obtained the name and address of your publication from a list of the underground press published in the U.S..." That label, of course, does not quite fit. There is nothing "underground" about TRUTH LETTER and it is no longer published in the U.S. but from various places in Europe. How it got into that list, I don't know.

However, TRUTH LETTER is and will remain an American publication in the sense that it deals exclusively - or almost, anyway, - with the iniquities of the U.S. political scene and the hushed-up truth about the Kennedy-King-Kennedy assassinations. And it will stubbornly stick to its task.

Dallas, Cancer City par excellence

TL's British correspondent, Mike Masterman, writes:

"Today's Telegraph (Sept. 1, 1970) has a short item of news concerning the death of Abraham Zapruder from cancer. The article also states that he made an estimated \$ 50,000 from Life (actually he made a million, see TL II/13, p. 3 - J.J.) The interesting part of the story is the following: 'His 15-second close-up sequence of the president being hit and slumping forward in his car...' The myth of the forward slump is still being perpetuated. The brainwashing goes on and on..."

TL readers of course know that the Zapruder film shows the exact opposite of what the Daily Telegraph contends: Kennedy's body was visibly and even violently hurled backward by the head shot (for details, see TL, Vol. II, Nos. 5, 6 and 14). Like his film, Zapruder himself could have become a dangerous witness (dangerous to the plotters, that is) in any honest investigation of the Kennedy assassination - which may still take place some day. So he had to be removed some time - and it was done through that special Dallas method of silencing inconvenient witnesses: purposely induced cancer. After Jack Ruby and Police Chief Charles Batchelor (TL II/10) Zapruder thus becomes the third prominent assassination figure to be liquidated the cancer way.

Popularity Poll

"From 2,400 reported threats (to kill the President) in 1965, the number rose to 12,800 last year; in 1970, it will probably reach 15,000" (Time, Sept. 7, 1970) So for every brave soul who wanted to do away with LBJ, there are at least six who want to get Nixon. While one may sympathize with their hearts' desire, a word of caution is needed: Imagine getting Spiro Agnew for President!

The Truth About Chappaquiddick (ctd.)

Indeed, the next thing District Attorney Dinis did after he had learned about the high content of ethyl alcohol in the blood of a person who, as he knew by that time, had been practically a non-drinker, was to impound Mary Jo's clothing (which had been kept in a plastic bag at the Frish Funeral Home) and send it also up to Boston for chemical analysis by Dr. McHugh. And the results of that analysis were even more staggering than those of the blood sample! Here are a few illuminating excerpts on that score from the transcript of the Inquest:

Question (by Assistant DA Fernandes) "What tests did you perform on these clothings?"

Answer (by Dr. McHugh): There were a series of tests. First of all I was not present in the laboratory when the clothing first was received, so Mr. Topjian had run a series of preliminary benzidine tests on this material.

Q. Would you instruct the Court as to what is this benzidine test?

A. A test that indicates the presence of blood on the material. This test had shown positive over certain areas of the submitted white shirt.

Q. Could you tell us, and if you would examine the shirt and point to those areas so the Court is informed where on the shirt?

A. Yes, sir.

The Court: I think for the record you ought to state where it is, such as the back of the neck or the inside or something of that kind.

The Witness: If I might, I have it noted here. Let's see. Yes, sir. To continue, on gross examination of this item under visible and ultraviolet light disclosed the presence of reddish brown and brown washed-out stains principally on the back and left sleeve surfaces. Most of these stains gave positive benzidine reaction indicating the presence of residual traces of blood.

Q. Would you point to those areas now?

A. This would be the back of the shirt, this whole area in here gave positive benzidine tests (indicating). To continue, the back of both sleeves and the back of the right sleeve of the submitted shirt reacted positive, right sleeve in particular reacted positive to the benzidine test. It is the back of these two sleeves extending down here (indicating) Unusually strong benzidine tests were obtained on the outside rear collar areas of this shirt. That would be along this area right in here (indicating.)"

Later on in the questioning, Dr. McHugh was asked:

Q. What findings did you make with reference to the tests you performed on all the clothing?

A. That in my opinion there was based on the benzidine test, there was probably blood at one time originally present on the rear collar and the back area and the backs of both sleeves of the white shirt. All of the tests on the submitted clothing were negative."

As Judge Boyle himself had said to Esther Newburgh in a different context (see above), "chemical analysis is practically irrefutable." And the chemical analysis of Mary Jo's blouse (for it was a blouse, rather than a shirt), carried out by the State's top police chemist, had unmistakably proved that there was blood "at one time originally" on the rear collar, most of the back of the blouse and even along the backs of both sleeves.

Shouldn't this evidence have been strong enough to cause DA Dinis to initiate immediately an investigation of possible murder?

The discovery of the blood traces on Mary Jo's blouse came late, for the chemical analysis was not made until Sept. 2, 1969 - one day before the date originally set for the opening of the Inquest (which then was postponed by order of the Superior Court - see below).

The Truth About Chappaquiddick (ctd.)

By that time, Dinis had gotten into a fierce verbal bout with Dr. Mills over the question why no autopsy had been performed on Mary Jo's body. That question, to which we shall come back in a different context, is of the utmost importance. According to Dr. Mills, he had received the go-ahead signal from the DA's office for releasing the body for interment. He told the Court (as he had previously told the press):

"Yes, I working through the State Police, which is my custom, I requested the officer to notify the District Attorney's office that such - that there was such a case, giving the details, such details as I had and asking if an autopsy should be done, requesting an autopsy if in the opinion of the District Attorney's office an autopsy was indicated. I received a reply back that the District Attorney himself was not available at that time, but his associate, Lieutenant George Killen, had stated that if I was satisfied that there had been no foul play, that as far as he was concerned there was no need for an autopsy."

Now, assuming the doctor's version to be correct - as we shall see, Mr. Dinis is of a different opinion - the responsibility of determining whether or not a suspicion of foul play existed, rested upon him, by his own account. He had to be "satisfied" that there was no foul play involved, before he could release the body.

How did he make sure? He didn't - in spite of circumstances which clearly suggested that there had been foul play. Under further questioning by Assistant DA Ferrandes, Dr. Mills had to admit that he released the body for burial (a) without knowing the identity of the girl; (b) without knowing how the accident had happened; (c) without knowing whether the dead woman had been alone in the car or she was accompanied by somebody else.

What is even more important, while Dr. Mills examined the body on the scene, the scuba diver, John Farrar, who had just brought it to the surface, was still present and, by his own testimony, he spoke to the doctor. Is it conceivable that during this conversation - about which the Court, incidentally, displayed no curiosity - the fact that the body had been found under the rear seat of the car should not have been mentioned at all?

Here you have an attractive young woman, found dead and alone in the rear compartment of a submerged car and a doctor - a medical examiner! - is instantly "satisfied" that there could be no question of foul play!!

One of Dr. Mills' most eminent colleagues, the Chief Medical Examiner of New York City, Dr. Milton Helpern, summed up the situation accurately and succinctly in a talk with reporters: "When you find a young woman dead in an auto, even if the car is not submerged, you do an autopsy," he said (NY Post, 8-16-69).

Dr. Mills, then, who in the same news story is described by his local colleague, the regular examiner, Dr. Robert W. Nevin, somewhat derisively as "a sweet, gentle, kind person who hooks rugs and plays the organ" bears a heavy responsibility for the fact that no autopsy was performed. Incidentally, Dr. Nevin, too, has come out stating unambiguously that he would have ordered an autopsy, had he been in charge.

After DA Dinis had been alerted by the excessive level of ethyl alcohol in Mary Jo's blood and even before the girl's blouse had been subjected to chemical analysis, he started moving heaven and earth in an attempt to obtain a court order for exhumation of the body so an autopsy could still be performed. On August 15, 1969, Dinis flew to Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) to confer with Luzerne County Judge Bernard C. Brominski, in whose district Miss Kopechne had been buried, on the proposed exhumation.

There, however, he ran into unexpectedly strong opposition from the parents of the deceased girl who fiercely resisted exhumation, allegedly on religious grounds. After a court battle that lasted for weeks, Mr. Dinis' request for exhumation of the body was denied - even after he had supplied additional information about the blood traces detected by chemical analysis.

Key Witnesses the Warren Commission Ignored (ctd.)

There are of course those who would claim that Kennedy's coat was not used in the reenactment out of respect for the excited status of the victim, for reasons of good taste etc. - a spurious theme that recurs again and again in the Kennedy Murder Fraud as organized in Dallas and later rounded out by the Warren Commission.

Actually, it is quite easy to discern why it was decided to dispense with this piece of evidence of the highest importance. At the time the reenactment was to be staged, the Warren Commission was deeply split on the question of whether or not to go for the single-bullet theory advanced by Arlen Specter as the only way of seeming to explain the inexplicable. If a majority eventually agreed to that theory, the bullet hole in Kennedy's coat would stand in the way. For to make a bullet go in through that hole, come out at Kennedy's throat and then enter Connally's body at the point he was struck would take more than magical ballistics.

The hole in the back of Kennedy's coat is so minute, as the pictures in "Inquest" p. 56 and in "Six Seconds in Dallas", p.48 show, that it had to be enlarged on an inset to become visible to the naked eye. By contrast, the chalk mark on the back of the FBI agent representing Kennedy during the "reenactment" is a blotch almost as big as a fist, leaving plenty of room for shifting the supposed location of the impact later, as the occasion required. Even so, it was an impossible, even ludicrous show those FBI agents put on, as the UPI picture first reproduced in book form in the documentary section of my "Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?" shows. In that picture, which was published in many newspapers at the time, but disappeared like magic after the Warren Report had come out, you see a dotted line leading from the chalk mark on the back of the Kennedy stand-in to the exact spot in Connally's right shoulder where he was hit, supposedly representing the trajectory of the "single bullet." And that trajectory misses the throat of "Kennedy" by such a wide margin that the absurdity of the whole thing simply hits you between the eyes!

All that hocus-pocus with a stand-in car that didn't even come near the measurements of the presidential limousine - for the follow-up car used in the reenactment was, according to the Warren Report, "a 1955 Cadillac eight-passenger convertible" while Kennedy was riding in a "specially designed 1961 Lincoln convertible with two collapsible jump seats"; with a big chalk mark on somebody else's coat taking the place of the small hole in the real coat of the victim; and with a trajectory that has a bullet jumping up and down and going in all directions was ~~the handiwork of Shaneyfelt and Frazier.~~ the handiwork of Shaneyfelt and Frazier.

With such a credibility record, approaching the famous Johnson Gap, Shaneyfelt got admiring and approving banner headlines across the nation with his totally unsubstantiated statement that, after he had viewed the Zapruder film "my impression is that the shots came from the rear."

To go back to Simmons after this long, but necessary digression, he, too testified that he had seen "a puff or wisp of smoke" arising near the picket fence on the grassy knoll right after the shooting - a fact his colleague S.M. Holland had already attested to in his testimony before the Warren Commission.

Summing up - all the evidence offered at the Clay Shaw trial concerning the events in Dealey Plaza, and all the depositions of credible witnesses about those same events point in the same direction and add up to the same inescapable conclusion:

President John F. Kennedy died in a crossfire ambush planned and executed with military precision. His assassination, far from being the irrational act of a lone fanatic, as the Warren Commission would have us believe, was a regular coup d'état - the first in American history as Garrison himself has pointed out on another occasion. And its purpose was to put Lyndon B. Johnson in the driver's seat.

The End

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 Vol. II, No. 24)

If one examines this peculiar document more closely, it is easy to see how specious and misleading it is. The only relevant paragraph, of course, is the sixth, in which Frazier candidly admits that he could "draw no conclusion as to whether or not the submitted bullet was fired from the submitted rifle." In other words, there is no ballistic proof whatsoever that the bullet which killed Dr. King came from the rifle that had been found in the doorway of a music store on S. Main Street in Memphis * and which had Ray's fingerprints on it. And since nobody saw Ray in the act of shooting, there just isn't any evidence against him at all.

In order to hide this basic fact, Frazier did his best to bury it in a welter of irrelevant double-talk. It does not matter in the least that he was able to identify the expended cartridge as having been "fired in and extracted from the submitted rifle." Cartridges don't kill people; bullets do. Anyone who even for a short time had been in possession of Ray's rifle could have fired a bullet into the ground and then removed the cartridge to plant it later in the bathroom next to the room Ray had taken at Memphis, or he could have secretly picked up and kept for that purpose a cartridge expended by Ray in firing practice and then thrown away. Neither Ray's fingerprints on the "submitted" rifle, nor the expert's statement that an expended cartridge found in the bathroom had been fired in that rifle, nor any other of the profuse facts and numbers cited in Frazier's affidavit would be acceptable in a court of law as proof that Ray had killed Dr. King. Nothing short of a clear-cut, positive identification by a firearms expert of the bullet that had been removed from the body of the Negro leader as having been fired from Ray's rifle would serve that purpose - and even such evidence would not suffice to prove that the finger on the trigger had been that of James Earl Ray.

That this is not just my private opinion, but one shared by authentic experts in the field, is shown by another passage from the above-cited article in Saga (Oct. 1969) in which private investigator Renfro T. Hays, who had assisted Ray's first lawyer, Arthur Hanes, tears the phony evidence compiled by the FBI to shreds. Referring to the farcical Ray "trial," in which the prosecution manipulated the Frazier Affidavit in order to create the false impression that it represented conclusive ballistic evidence, Saga wrote:

"The question of ballistics on the .30-06 rifle left in the doorway and the slug removed from King's body is puzzling. The police and prosecution claimed the bullet was fired from the abandoned rifle. However, in testimony presented at Ray's trial, these questions were left unanswered (emphasis added - J.J.)."

Let me stop here for a moment to point out that the Frazier Affidavit, which had already figured in the extradition proceedings in London, was of course also available to the police and prosecution in Memphis. In view of the fact, documented by the precise text of this affidavit - as reproduced in the preceding issue of TL - that Frazier was unable to identify the fatal bullet as having been fired from that rifle, the bad faith of the Memphis authorities is glaringly conspicuous. How could they continue to "claim" that the bullet had been fired from the abandoned rifle when the expert testimony clearly ran counter to that contention? Well, a bit of finagling helps in such cases. According to Saga: "Assistant Attorney-General James C. Beasley entered little material on ballistics into the record. He stated:

" 'Mr. Robert A. Frazier, the chief of the Firearms Identification Unit of the FBI with 27 years experience would testify to the firing of this rifle, that has been here to introduced. He examined the cartridges, the hull from the chamber of this rifle, the slug removed from the body of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and would testify to the conclusions as...'

"(At this point - writes the author of the article in Saga - I will paraphrase the remarks of Asst. Attorney-General Beasley and add the comments of a respected attorney who specializes in criminal law.)"

* For details, see The James Earl Ray Hoax, Vol. I, Chapter II