

"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. 6

December 1, 1970

Ed. The Spirit of Nuremberg will hang Nixon, Assnew, Laird and all the other criminals.

Can Edward Kennedy Read?

I doubt it. For if Teddie Boy were not totally illiterate, it is inconceivable that he would not have heard by now of Jim Garrison's "A Heritage of Stone" (see BOOK REVIEW, below). And if he heard about it, he would be tempted to read it, even minor illiteracy permitting. For, after all, who ought to be more interested in learning, from an authoritative source, what forces really murdered his brother, President John F. Kennedy and his other brother, Senator Robert Kennedy, to boot?

And then, having read the whole unsavory story, and digested the evidence, even Teddie Boy, that effete snob (how right you are in the case, Assnew!) would have gotten mad and sworn to avenge his murdered brothers. Did he do anything of the sort? Will he ever do anything of the sort? Not Teddie Boy. Every time somebody in the family gets hit by the powers that be - he himself was the last victim in the Chappaquiddick incident - he tenders the other cheek. How many cheeks does he have?

BOOK REVIEW

A Heritage of Stone

by Jim Garrison

G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 253 pp., cloth, \$ 6.95

Garrison's long-awaited first-person, or rather first-hand, account of his long and tenacious fight for the truth is both an arousing experience and a keen disappointment.

To speak of its outstanding weakness first: Garrison, in this book, does not share with the reader more than a small portion of his intimate knowledge of the JFK assassination case. Those of us who had hoped that he would now at last lay on the line all of the pertinent facts he had dug up in the course of his inquiry must be disappointed, for he is holding back a great deal. As far as the "meat" of his book is concerned, it's rather thin soup. There isn't much in it that's really new; most of it is a rehash of what others, including myself, have written before (anyone who has read "Oswald-Assassin or Fall Guy?", "Oswald: The Truth" and "Marina Oswald" will agree, I believe).

This said, I must pay Jim Garrison the tribute that he has written by far the best of all the books about the Kennedy assassination. The reason is that he is a superb writer (the book doesn't sound ghostwritten and I doubt that it is) as well as a thoughtful philosopher, a compassionate humanist and a person endowed with a keen sense of history.

"A Heritage of Stone" is an essay more than anything else, but it is a masterpiece of the genre. And it does take real writing ability for the essayist to keep his audience spellbound.

The principal merit of his book is that he draws the overall picture and does so convincingly. At the root of the conspiracy to kill the President was the dissatisfaction of the military and the CIA with the conduct of the war in Vietnam. Garrison brings this out clearly, even though at the time his book went to press he could not

have known yet (and therefore does not mention) the most devastating evidence linking the assassination to Vietnam that has yet come to light: the simultaneous disclosures by Kenneth O'Donnell in Life and by Senator Mike Mansfield in the Los Angeles Times (Aug. 3, 1970) to the effect that President Kennedy was planning to pull out of Vietnam all U.S. forces after his reelection in 1964 ("In 1965, I'll be damned everywhere as a Communist appeaser. But I don't care. If I tried to pull out completely now, we would have another Joe McCarthy Red scare on our hands but I can do it after I'm reelected...")

Instead, Garrison quotes this statement by Senator Wayne Morse from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 26, 1966: "Mr. Kennedy told me ten days before he was felled by an assassin's bullet in Dallas on 11/22/63 that he (Kennedy) was re-examining Viet Nam Policy," and goes on to write:

"President Kennedy's program of deescalation necessarily had a tremendous impact on elements of our military-intelligence structure. From their point of view, we had reached a position from which we were close to military hegemony over the world, and this rich young man, this transient, was undoing it all by the systematic voluntary surrender of our military advantages.

"This steady, ineluctable course toward ending the cold war placed Kennedy on a collision course with the strongest forces in the United States government. His course, if continued, meant the end of the long hayride of billions and billions of dollars of military hardware purchase... It meant the beginning of the end of the dominance of the Pentagon and the CIA over American foreign policy, and, indeed, over much of the domestic policy as well..."

The Pentagon and the CIA - Mr. Garrison leaves no doubt in the reader's mind that they were the principal architects of the Dallas coup d'état and of the public execution (both Garrison terms) of President Kennedy. In marked contrast to some of his previous statements and, above all, to his conduct at the Clay Shaw trial, where the CIA was hardly ever mentioned, Garrison in his book ^{hits hard} at what he calls "the most effective assassination machine in the world."

While he is absolutely right in this as in most other respects, Garrison has a tendency to generalize which sometimes leads him astray. When he writes, for instance: "A coup d'état needs (emphasis mine - J.J.) a scapegoat to be thrown to the people so that public hostility can be discharged and the new order accepted," history and current worldwide experience contradict him. On the contrary, almost invariably coups d'état are carried out openly, the victor proudly claiming the spoils. The only case I can think of in which a scapegoat was used was the Reichstag fire which the Nazis used to seize uncontrolled power in Germany in 1933. It is no tribute to the masterminds of the Dallas coup d'état that they took a leaf from the book of nazism to camouflage their foul deed.

Now the hypocritical mask is off; the Pentagon, the CIA and, by implication, the FBI and Lyndon B. Johnson, all stand publicly accused by a public prosecutor of long standing (twice re-elected by the people) of having conspired to assassinate the President of the United States and, with the help of the Warren Commission, covered up their crime by blaming it on Oswald.

"There was never a real case, in terms of evidence, against Oswald," Garrison points out, "there was never even the beginning of a case. There was no case against him because he had not killed anyone. He too was a victim, as were the President and the American people, of a new force in America." A new force, as the author says in a chapter headed "The Craft of Deception," which operates in a fourth dimension "which generally is not known to exist in our nation." He adds "This invisible monster" (the CIA) serves not the American people but the warfare complex."

Vividly and forcefully written, "A Heritage of Stone" is a highly quotable book. Here is one of Garrison's most pungent remarks: "The assassination of President Kennedy demonstrated that many people will believe the most unlikely inventions rather than confront the fact that their government is lying to them. These people have become conditioned to accepting official announcements as rocks of reality, and it is painful for them to consider that these rocks are without substance."

(More about Garrison's book in subsequent issues of TL)

The Dr. Nichols Brief (ctd. from TL, vol.III, nos. 4 & 5)

"Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, realizing the widespread public discontent with the conclusions of the Warren Commission, and at the suggestion of the autopsy physicians Commander J.J. Nemes, M.C., U.S.N., and 'J' Thornton Boswell, M.C., U.S.N., convened a panel of 'experts' in the fields of forensic pathology and radiology to review the X-ray films and the photographs taken at the autopsy together with items of the President's clothing. this expert panel found many things which conflict with the original autopsy report. One of the most notable findings in the photographs is the presence of a 13 X22 mm. object in the base of the brain which was not mentioned by the autopsy physicians and others present at the autopsy. Attorney General Clark's expert review panel could not identify this object. The plaintiff wants to identify this object, in part, because he considers it might be a fragment of an explosive missile of a type heretofore not considered. Among other findings of the expert review panel is a bullet hole in the top of the skull, whereas the original autopsy physicians do not report such a hole but instead describe a bullet hole in the back of the head. The report of this expert review panel, completed in April 1968, has not been circulated." (emphasis added-J.J.).

These disclosures are most noteworthy, for nothing about the 13 X 22 object in the base of the brain and the bullet hole in the top of the skull had previously been reported in the press or otherwise discussed in public. Clark claimed at the time that the panel review, which he had set up for the specific, if unstated, purpose of torpedoing the Garrison investigation, had confirmed the findings of the autopsy physicians. This was, as now has been demonstrated, another example of shameless government lying to the people of America. Dr. Nichols, who apparently found a way of gaining access to the still secret report of the panel experts, is performing a great public service in exposing this lie.

"Additionally," the brief goes on to say, "the plaintiff desires to fire authentic ammunition in the alleged murder weapon, a Mannlicher-Carcano 6.5 mm. rifle, serial number C-2766, to determine if three well-aimed shots can be fired within a period of 5.6 seconds, this is the time determined by the Warren Commission during which the assassin's three shots were fired. The plaintiff also wants to learn whether or not this weapon, as do all other similar Mannlicher-Carcano rifles, ejects the clip OE 575 onto the floor when the last round is seated in the chamber. This empty clip was inside the weapon when the rifle was discovered in the Texas School Book Depository after the assassination in Dallas." (emphasis added - J.J.).

this is another glaring example of official fraud and brazen manipulation of the material evidence. For, needless to say, all Mannlicher-Carcano rifles of the same type do behave in the same manner. If other rifles of this kind eject the clip when the last round is in the chamber - and Dr. Nichols, I have been informed, has personally spent hours firing scores of bullets through a gun of this type - then this is additional and irrefutable proof that the rifle found in the TSDO was not a Mannlicher-Carcano, a fact that has of course been known for a long time. (For details see my book "Cswald: the Truth," Chapter 16, "Switching Rifles.")

(to be continued in the next issue)

READER'S FORUM

A new subscriber, Mrs. Mae Brussell, Carmel, California, writes:

"You will be interested to know that I called New Bedford, Mass., August 7, 1969, and talked to Mr. Dinis' secretary, Mrs. Travis. I had a list of questions for her to give the District Attorney. When we got to the fourth question, the lines were cut. I never could reach her again, and when I kept calling back, I was told 'you can speak to no one, and not Mrs. Travis.' It was impossible to reach the D.A.'s office after that. I suggested fingerprinting the steering wheel 'BECAUSE MR. KENNEDY DID NOT DRIVE THE CAR.' I knew then that the car was pushed over the bridge. They had not thought to take these tests, by her admission, when I called."

From Anne Smith, Haverport, England: "Yesterday I sent you a money order to cover a further 6-months subscription to TL. I find it indispensable and am especially interested in your investigation of the Chappaquiddick Incident. More power to your Gestetner!"
PS. I wish this sorry machine was a Gestetner. But thanks, anyway, Miss Smith.

"It does not take the imagination of a dime novelist to see Mary Jo Kopechne at the wheel of the car, struggling to control two tons of equipment on a strange road while her own adrenalin flowed at high pressure. She might not have taken time to readjust the seat so that her feet could reach the pedals comfortably. At five feet two, she was exactly one foot shorter than Kennedy; her own car was a Volkswagen, about half the size of an Oldsmobile 88, and most of her driving had been done on city streets. As a road racer, she would have been sadly miscast, lurching and bumping down the Dike Road. In less than one minute she would reach the bridge, but she would never see it. Hunched down in the seat, barely able to see, she would continue in a straight line off the bridge."

What's wrong with this scenario? Everything.

In the first place, the deputy sheriff, walking toward the other car (Kennedy's) was still 25 to 30 feet away from it when the driver backed up, turned and then drove down the Dike Road. He pondered the situation then decided not to give chase. If Kennedy after covering some distance of the way to the bridge had stopped, jumped out and told Mary Jo to take over, both would have seen that there were no lights following them yet. Thus, there was no need for excessive hurry and the girl could easily have taken the second or two necessary for adjusting the driver's seat to her person.

Secondly, if she had been in a position where she couldn't reach the brake with her foot, she wouldn't have been able to reach the gas pedal either. And, as Olsen himself has pointed out, the approach to the bridge is almost as flat as a pancake. With no pressure on the gas pedal, the car would shortly have come to a stop, at the very latest when it started going up the bridge.

Thirdly and most importantly, Esther Newburgh testified at the Inquest that Mary Jo was quite used to driving big cars and that she "certainly" could have driven Kennedy's Oldsmobile.

Why did Olsen reach such a conspicuously wrong conclusion?

Well, he finished his book before the Inquest and therefore lacked some essential points of information. He got no cooperation whatsoever from Kennedy and all the people who had attended the party and missed a good deal of what later came out at the Inquest.

In particular, he knew nothing whatsoever about the blood stains on Mary Jo's blouse and the exact nature of the injuries Kennedy had suffered. Otherwise, I feel sure, this able and shrewd reporter would probably have reached an entirely different set of conclusions, perhaps even identical ones with mine (Whether he would have been allowed by his publisher, or by Time Inc., his employer, to set them forth in his book is another question).

But even making all due allowance for the unavoidable margin of error with which Olsen had to cope, there is no excuse for his disregarding a fact of cardinal importance: the huge time difference (about an hour and a half) between the alleged accident and the observations of Christopher Look to which we now turn.

Chapter III

The Devastating Testimony of Christopher Look

If there was any doubt left that the truth about the Chappaquiddick affair, the truth, in particular, about the murder of Mary Jo Kopechne was deliberately hushed up by the authorities, including Judge Boyle, the amazing case of Christopher ("Huck") F. Look Jr. would settle it.

Huck Look, 41, was one of Edgartown's most respected citizens. A fuel dealer by profession, he served in his off hours as a deputy sheriff, a task for which he was perfectly fitted by his burly frame (six feet two, 235 pounds). He had a reputation for soberness, solidity, reliability. No one would ever have dared question his word.

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. 5)

One would think that such a shameless public utterance, along with the uncontested fact that Percy Foreman made several hundred thousand dollars by squeezing a false guilty plea out of his bound-and-gagged client, would be enough to cause the American Bar Association to take drastic disciplinary action against the felonious lawyer. Oh no, sir, not in America. Anything goes here.

There is no end to Foreman's cynical display of contempt for the hapless client he has sold down the river. Listen to him again:

"Before he fled the murder scene, James Earl Ray, carefully watched by three witnesses, deposited on the sidewalk the murder rifle that he had wrapped in his own laundry-marked bedcover to protect his fingerprints on the rifle from obliteration."

All right, rub your eyes first, then read it again. It's all there, word for word, in Foreman's Look article of 4-15-69.

Now, before I go into the hair-raising nonsense of a much-wanted fugitive from justice who has just committed a sensational murder wrapping the murder weapon into his laundry-marked bedcover "to protect his fingerprints etc.", I want to say to Foreman:

"You're lying, you crooked shyster, you're lying in your throat. There wasn't even one witness, much less three, who saw James Earl Ray deposit a rifle on the sidewalk. Some people have claimed that they saw a man do this, but not one of them has come forward to identify him as Ray. If the State of Tennessee or the FBI had ever had any such testimony in their possession, they would certainly have made the most of it. Neither the "London material" that was used to obtain Ray's illegal extradition by the British Government, packed as it is with irrelevant affidavits, nor the Memphis trial records make any mention of Foreman's "three witnesses" who "carefully watched" Ray deposit the rifle on the sidewalk. It was left for the lawyer of the man accused of murder to invent three phony witnesses for the prosecution even the police and the public prosecutor hadn't dared to dream up! And now here is Percy Foreman rubbing it in:

"He also left a canvas bag containing his laundry-marked shirt and underwear, along with a transistor radio clearly bearing his identification number as a prisoner at the Missouri State Penitentiary. Both rifle and bag he could have carried a few feet further and placed in his white Mustang. but that might have prevented his identification. He wanted to escape, but he didn't want to lose credit. As further precaution against such dreaded loss, he left his fingerprints in the side room that he had rented, and his palm print in the bathroom from which he fired the shot. all this by a man to whom fingerprinting had become a way of life..."

Here again, Foreman is lying grossly and impudently. For that palm print in the bathroom - actually a full hand with outstretched fingers deliberately smeared on a dirty wall - has never been identified as belonging to Ray and could not have been, for the prints were not his. The prosecution wouldn't have missed such an incriminating item either, had it ever existed.

Foreman winds up his piece by saying: "I don't believe there was any conspiracy. James Earl Ray wanted to win recognition. He hoped that by killing Martin Luther King, he could make the rest of his futile, boring life exciting."

That makes a lot of sense, doesn't it? The great criminal lawyer has really found the cure-all for the ills of escaped prisoners who find the futile, boring life in the Canadian highlands and in Acapulco not to their gusto. Just kill somebody prominent and leave all the fingerprints and other identifying marks you can think of on or around the murder weapon, so the police has no trouble finding you. Then, if you don't relish the chair, plead guilty and spend 99 years of a happy, exciting life in the pen! Let Percy Foreman guide your steps all the way.

(In the next issue: The London Court Comedy in new Light)