

"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. 5

November 15, 1970

Editorial: The Nix-assnew Lying Machine - "1984" come true in 1970.

The Day That Will REALLY Live in Infamy

Under the apt motto "It is unlawful to kill a President and disorderly as hell," The Echo Park Commission on Law and Order in Los Angeles is sponsoring a march on Washington, November 22, 1970, "to open the archives and force Congress to investigate all the political killings." The idea is a sound one, even though it is unlikely to draw much of a response. The Echo Park Commission is a small outfit and unless it gets help from a major organization, the "march" may well fizzle into a promenade. And it is of course an illusion to believe that Congress could be forced to investigate the killings. Regardless of political affiliations, Congress is a pawn in the hands of the Pentagon and the CIA, the forces primarily responsible for the Dal<sup>a</sup>is coup d'état, along with LBJ, Nixon and other egregious scoundrels of the Establishment, not to forget the nefarious oil magnates. Between them, all these forces of evil completely control Congress and will continue to do so in the foreseeable future. Nevertheless, a coordinated, well prepared march on Washington, rallying all the principal groups interested in the truth about the assassinations, might do some good. Any November 22 in the years ahead will do for that purpose. It is the date that will really live in infamy, for decades and perhaps centuries to come - long after the last person to remember Pearl Harbor has passed away.

"A Heritage of Stone" by Jim Garrison has just been received by courtesy of the publishers, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York. The date of publication is November 16, 1970. This important book will be reviewed in the next issue of TRUTH LETTER.

A Doctor Battles for the Truth (see TL, vol. III, No. 4)

TRUTH LETTER is proud to begin in this issue the exclusive publication of an historic document, the "Memorandum Brief for Plaintiff" filed on Oct. 13, 1970, in the U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas, by Attorneys Sam A. Crow, John E. Wilkinson and M.C. Slough, on behalf of Dr. John Nichols, who is suing the government for the right to examine the material evidence in the slaying of President John F. Kennedy.

Statement of the Case

At the outset, the plaintiff wishes to assure the court that he neither intends nor desires to attack or detract from the efforts of the Warren Commission. Basically, the plaintiff seeks to "fill in" some of the omissions of the Commission and, if possible, confirm or refute in an unequivocal manner one of its principal conclusions, namely, the theory adduced by Arlen Specter, Esq., Chief Counsel to the Warren Commission, that a single bullet passed through the neck of the late President Kennedy, penetrated



the chest of Governor John P. Connally of Texas, fractured his wrist, injured his thigh, only later to fall from the Governor's clothing at Parkland Hospital in Dallas, Texas. As indicated in the Complaint, this bullet was assigned Commission exhibit (CE) number 399 for purposes of identification and fragments of metal surgically removed from the Governor's wrist were assigned Commission Exhibit number 842.

It is proposed to submit this bullet CE 399 and these fragments CE 842 to harmless neutron activation analysis in the nuclear reactor at the University of Kansas facility located in Lawrence, Kansas. This method of analysis is the most sensitive method in existence for detecting minute traces of certain metals. The specimen remains intact, unaltered, and undamaged. If the results indicate that the content and ratios of these trace metals are identical in CE 399 and in CE 842 then it may be possible that the bullet CE 399 could have performed as accepted by the Warren Commission. If the results show the composition and ratios of trace metals to be different in CE 399 and in CE 842 then the bullet CE 399 could not have inflicted the injuries on both the late President and the Governor as proposed by Chief Counsel Arlen Specter and accepted by the Warren Commission.

It is intended also to examine, by neutron activation, the margins of the bullet holes in the coat (CE 393), shirt (CE 394), and necktie (CE 395) worn by the late President at the moment of assassination to determine if any metal rubbed off from a missile while traversing these garments and, if so, whether the trace metals so deposited have the same composition and ratios as that in bullet CE 399. If any trace metal composition and ratios found are different from those of CE 399 then the said bullet could not have caused the neck wounds of the late President. It is likewise proposed to discern whether or not metal fragments CE 843 recovered from the brain of the late President at autopsy have trace metal composition and ratios identical with that of CE 399 and CE 842.

(to be continued in the next issue)

---

Dr. Nichols advises that the defendants, i.e. the U.S. Government, on Oct. 23 filed a motion asking the Court for a 30-day "enlargement of time in which to file a reply Brief in the aforecaptioned action." In this motion, US attorney Robert J. Roth, and his assistant, Edward M. Funston, declare that the additional time is necessary "because the defendants' Reply Brief is being written and prepared for the defendants by the Department of Justice in Washington, D.C...."

Thus, Nixon and Mitchell are taking no chances on their underlings in Kansas messing up so important a case. The Department of Injustice itself will handle every aspect of it. They must be scared stiff at the thought that the Court just might show enough independence to permit Dr. Nichols to examine the material evidence in the manner described. The consequences could be disastrous for the Lying Machine and a major breakthrough for the Truth.

The Nichols brief is a model of cogent reasoning, but it is necessarily couched in the somewhat stilted language of the law. It may not be redundant, therefore, to sum up, in plain English, what is at stake. Basically, neutron activation is the "fingerprinting" of metals and other inanimate substances. No two bullets are exactly alike in their composition, just as two sets of fingerprints never match. The differences may be minute, but the nuclear reactor will spot them. As an example of its uncanny detective ability, Dr. Nichols, as reported in the last issue of TL, adduces the fact that British accelerators in 1964 spotted traces of arsenic in preserved strands of Napoleon's hair. Thus, after almost 150 years, science was able to prove that the Emperor had been murdered! Of course the gang in power in Washington since they murdered JFK (Nixon and LBJ have always been cronies, not foes) knows this, too. That's why the FBI, which is supposed to use the most modern methods of detection, blatantly failed to test the bullet fragments through neutron activation. They knew beforehand what the result would be: the test would prove that the bullet that shattered Connally's body was a different one from the one that killed Kennedy; and again that the President was hit by different bullets. The Warren Commission knew it, too, and therefore drowned the hard and fast evidence in a welter of irrelevant verbiage. Nixon also knows it, and he is scared to death of what science might prove, because then his own involvement in the plot might come out some day. Watch the criminals' desperate antics in trying to defeat the court action initiated by Dr. Nichols!



Readers' Forum

From Chris Longbottom, Dundee, Scotland:

"Dear Mr. Joesten, - I thank you very much for sending the book.\* I enclose a draft for the \$ 15.00. It is a very interesting book. I have not read the transcript of the Inquest yet but I have ordered it. When I have read this I will be better able to comment on your theory. For now, I would point out one small flaw: At the end of Chapter 1, p. 12, para 8, you suggest that the injection into Mary Jo hit an artery and thus caused profuse bleeding. If an artery had been hit by the syringe then a haematoma would have resulted. This would have exhibited itself as a swelling or bruise, and, as you know, Mary Jo exhibited no such bruising. Assuming this was a 'professional' job so to speak, and one must assume so if an injection of a stupefying drug was used, then the operator would almost certainly know the best site to use - this site is the anterior cubital fossa - the inside of the elbow - with an intra-venous injection into the median cubital vein. A fair amount of bleeding could ensue and yet leave very little mark, since the vein is quite superficial. The vein is sometimes a little difficult to veno-puncture correctly, and may 'contract' away thus making successful veno-puncture even more difficult. Thus one has to try the other arm (I am a final year Dental Student, we are taught intra-venous method of induction of general anaesthesia and I have used it on several occasions.)

"So might I suggest the following sequence of events: one person holds Mary Jo whilst another, the operator, attempts to veno-puncture the median cubital vein of the left arm. The operator is unsuccessful but punctures the skin and minor blood vessels producing a small amount of bleeding. So the operator turns to the right arm; the person holding Mary Jo takes her left arm and pulls it behind her back in a restraining action, trying to hold Mary Jo still. This twisting of the arm would place the inside of the elbow against the sleeve cloth normally opposite the back of the elbow. The operator successfully veno-punctures the right median cubital vein and injects the drug(s). This successful veno-puncture leads to more profuse bleeding than with the left arm. On completion of the injection the sleeve is drawn down (as with the unsuccessful left arm injection) and then her right arm is twisted behind her back to restrain her further, - she might well have struggled violently just after completion of the injection, the drug taking a few seconds to distribute itself throughout the body and thereafter begin to act. Thus, again, the sleeve cloth normally opposite the back of the elbow is placed opposite the inside of the elbow. The struggling Mary Jo could have freed herself momentarily; if the right arm was held such that the right hand was held behind her neck, the inside of the right elbow would be opposite the right rear collar. Perhaps when the injection was complete Mary Jo's right arm was free and she attempted to strike the person behind her, holding her left arm behind her, and in doing so she lifted up her right arm. The person holding her then grabbed her right arm and pulled it behind Mary Jo's neck. This theory accounts for the distribution of blood stains on the blouse. (Emphasis mine, for I fully agree - J.J.) The mark left by an intra-venous injection in the anterior cubital fossa is minimal and the small clot may well have been obscured due to the prolonged contact with cold salt water (Blood vessels contract away from the skin in cold conditions.) A small clot could well have been washed away by the water. There would be minimal, if any, haematoma resulting from the veno-puncture, thus explaining the blood stains but no cuts or bruises..."

HOW ABOUT SOME ACTION, Mr. DIJIS?

---

Scream-of-the-month: "We never even wanted to be Vice President and now, dear God, it's come to this," said Lady Bird Johnson to Jacqueline Kennedy aboard the plane carrying JFK's body back to Washington, according to her own "A White House Diary" just published. That from the wife of the Usurper. Dear God, indeed.

---

Political Zoology: If you want to see a real baboon in action, take a good look at the picture in Time (Nov. 9, 1970 - European ed.) with the legend: "Nixon gesturing with clenched fist at Republican rally in Anaheim."

---

\* The murder of Mary Jo Kopechne, now being serialized in TRUTH LETTER.



That leaves the two front windows. But Kennedy is a big and rather bulky man and with the open space of the window on his side reduced by one inch and, moreover, the steering wheel holding him in place - a doubly awkward position because the car is upside down - he couldn't possibly have squeezed out that way either - against the tremendous pressure of the water rushing in.

As to the front window on the passenger's side, Mary Jo would have been in the way, since she was supposedly sitting next to him when the accident occurred. Had Kennedy really been "trying to find a way that we both could get out of the car," as he testified, the obvious thing to do would have been first to try and shove the girl out that window - and she, being petite and svelte and moreover an excellent swimmer (according to the testimony of Esther Newburgh) would have had a far better chance of getting out that way than he himself - and then try to follow her. Of the three theoretical means of escape this would have been by far the most practicable - if escape was possible at all. But it must also be ruled out altogether, because Mary Jo didn't get out that way so that Kennedy, had he used that exit, would have had to clamber over, or rather, under her and, like all drowning people, she would have clung to him.

Whichever way you turn it, it couldn't be done. And it didn't happen.

As has already been mentioned in Chapter I, Kennedy first told his doctor that "at the last moment he grabbed the side of an open window and pulled himself out" - conveniently leaving open the question as to which window that was - but later abandoned such precision, for good reason, substituting for it instead that helpless and unacceptable "explanation,": "I have no idea in the world how I got out of that car."

This retreat from precision to vagueness, from the only explanation with a ghost of plausibility - as long as you disregard the tons of water pressure - into the delusion of a miracle is the last straw. I do not hesitate for one moment to say, on the basis of the irrefutable evidence presented above, that Kennedy lied - and lied under oath - about his "accident", that in fact he was not present in the car when it plunged off the bridge.

Jack Olsen, having reached the same conclusion, now was confronted with a problem he was unable to master. If Kennedy wasn't in the car when it dropped into the water, how on earth did it get there in the first place? There had to be some explanation, sure enough, but the one Olsen came up with is not only absurd, but it has also been completely disproved by the Inquest.

At first, Olsen postulates quite sensibly: "One can accept a given framework of information and try to arrange the available facts to fit into it, or one can hypothesize an entirely different set of conclusions and see if the available information correlates. In the case of the affair at Chappaquiddick, the tendency was to accept Kennedy's framework and tuck all the facts inside, even though the story seemed to be no more logical than Alice's wildest adventures through the looking glass. But what other explanation could there be? What other hypothesis could be made?"

Now, here is the situation Olsen envisions: Kennedy, driving late at night on a lonely road with a pretty young woman who is not his wife, has a chance encounter with a local deputy sheriff, Christopher F. Look Jr.\* He has done nothing illegal, but the appearances are against him. Having for a brief moment steered his car into a private road, he sees that the cop - still some distance away - stops his car and gets out to investigate. That would mean producing papers, identifying himself and his companion, and "rural cops could be nasty." So, believing his reputation at stake, Kennedy gets panicky, jumps out of the car "between the high walls of underbrush on either side" and tells Mary Jo to take the wheel and "to circle back and pick him up in a few minutes if the policeman did not give chase" (he didn't). The girl is agreeable, of course, for "the prospect of being interrogated in the car with the senator" does not appeal to her either. And then, Olsen goes on to write:

(to be continued)

---

\* This matter is discussed in detail in the following chapter.



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. III, No. 4)

Foreman closely toes the line the CIA, the FBI, the Warren Commission and all the other rogues guilty of plotting the assassination of the President, or of deliberately covering up for it, have been peddling from the start, beginning with Oswald and continuing with Ray and finally Sirhan in order to make up for the conspicuous lack of genuine motivation in all these cases:

"Why did they kill? They each wanted the world to hear of them. They wanted credit. Top billing. Headlines. Front-page pictures. A by-line. Self-realization. A shortcut to fame. To exercise the ego. To them, notoriety and fame are synonymous. What other men study, plan and struggle a lifetime to achieve, these killers thought they could win with lead."

It would be difficult to imagine a more brutal way of slapping the truth in the face, kicking it, trampling upon it, and raping it than such a statement. Coming from a man who is widely rated as one of America's most prominent lawyers, such violence to the truth and the evidence is a sickening spectacle.

Oswald, far from seeking any kind of publicity, was the most furtive of secret agents and also one of the most modest. He performed throughout his short adult life exactly as he was told by his bosses in the CIA and the FBI, seeking no credit, no self-realization and no fame, contenting himself with the low pay customary among the lowest echelons of intelligence. He was flabbergasted by the spurious charges the Dallas authorities hurled at him according to a diabolical plan prearranged with the real plotters and he never admitted one iota of guilt. Had he really been bent on notoriety, Oswald could certainly have gotten all he wanted. All he had to do was to confess, boast about his world-shattering action, proclaim himself a hero of this or that cause and defy his judges (for in that case, he would have had a trial). Oh sure, Oswald had all the notoriety in the world cut out for him; all he had to do was to grab it. But he didn't do it, because he was not guilty, because he didn't even have the faintest idea what the game was. All Oswald wanted was justice and his constitutional rights, because he believed in America until THEY put him down with lead.

Ray, as the record shows, also denied strenuously, after he had been captured in London, that he was the killer of Dr. King. For a brief moment in court he knuckled under to the pressure that was being exerted on him from all sides, with everybody, even his own lawyer, telling him he would be sentenced to death if he didn't plead guilty. The moment the pressure was off, he again proclaimed his innocence. The credit, the top billing, the headlines, the juicy contracts and the fat royalties all went to Huie, Hanes and Foreman. Ray never planned it that way. He was the perpetual loser, the convict assured of a lifetime in prison. All he wanted was his freedom and enough cash to allow him to get lost somewhere in this big world. So he accepted a minor part in some shady goings-on which he didn't even understand and wound up, like Oswald, a little rat trapped by the fattest cats in the land.

And Sirhan? Well, he was just a hired killer, one of several employed by the CIA to do away with Robert Kennedy, with no heroic ambitions either. Pure invention and deceit - all this talk about these fellows having sought glory by killing!

Foreman's professional ethics are truly appalling. Cynically, he writes:

"When a man accused of murder sends for Percy Foreman, I show him the courtesy of assuming he is guilty and that he hopes I can save him from excessive punishment. Else why would he be preparing to divide his worldly goods, or hope of same, with me?"

One has to read that paragraph at least twice to believe it's really there, in an article published by Look, from the pen of "a great criminal lawyer." In Foreman's eyes, then, a person who turns to him for legal help thereby automatically confesses his guilt - he admits murder ipso facto. Because the great Foreman, as everybody knows, wouldn't lift a finger to defend a lesser culprit! See Percy and get ready for the chair...

(to be continued)