

"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. 23

7890 Gutenberg, Germany

August 15, 1971

Editorial: Nixon making like a statesman - that's the laugh of laughs, really.

The Garrison Frameup Scandal

On July 6, 1971, Rep. John R. Rarick of Louisiana, one of the very few Congressmen who have kept an open mind about the assassination of President Kennedy, the Warren Commission and the Garrison investigation, made a remarkable speech in the House of Representatives, which was reproduced in the next issue of the Congressional Record, but got scant, if any, coverage elsewhere in the press. Since the Congressional Record as a rule is neither the most exciting nor the most widely read of publications, I'm pretty sure that most, if not all, TL readers are unaware of this speech. I am equally convinced that they all will be glad it is reproduced below:

THE PENTAGON PAPERS AND PINBALL JUSTICE: A STRANGE COINCIDENCE (headline from C.R.)

Mr. Rarick. - Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Attorney General's Office has filed a 133-page affidavit against New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison alleging implication in pinball machine payoffs.

Now that the U.S. Attorney General recognizes the sinister threat to law enforcement by the use of pinball machine money to generate favoritism and as bribes, can we expect similar activity regarding payoffs, expenses, and royalties from other behind-the-scene activities carried on by corporations, labor leaders, and tax-free foundations, all intended to induce influence and favoritism? One thinks of "A rose, is a rose, is a rose" - Gertrude Stein.

In fact, while the U.S. Attorney is about it, he might consider taking legal action against State and local law enforcement agencies, including some judges who are accepting Federal funds being offered them through the Law Enforcement Assistance Act as inducements to get in line with the new Federal direction while veiling their duplicity in the interest of improving fair and impartial administration of justice.

I know nothing of Mr. Garrison's activities one way or the other; but as an attorney and former judge, I have always felt that it was the responsibility, if not the sacred duty, of all elected officials to take action to insure a fair and impartial trial for any accused, which should even include the district attorney of New Orleans. A 133-page affidavit of charges including testimony not subjected to cross examination and the usual safeguards of evidence is unique enough in the annals of legal history; but for the top legal officer in the Executive Department of our Nation to send the affidavit to the news people as if to try the accused in the newspaper is not only unethical, it is reprehensible.

(emphasis added - J.J.) Now we find the New Orleans District Attorney filing suit in Federal court in a futile effort to prevent the prejudicing of his defense and the abrogation of his constitutional rights by seeking to prohibit newspapers from publishing the Government's case.

And even more bizarre, the court action by the New Orleans attorney comes (2) within days of the recent action by the U.S. Attorney General in suing the New York Times and Washington Post to prevent publication of the Pentagon papers. This is a strange coincidence. (emphasis added - J.J.)

Charging any official is certainly within the authority and responsibility of the Justice Department; but once the accused is charged, the case should be tried on its merits in court under established procedures, rather than turned into a sideshow affair.

unless, that is, there is some believability in Mr. Garrison's remarks that the entire matter is but a federally financed propaganda move to discredit him because of his previous attempts to disprove the Warren Commission report. (emphasis added - J.J.)

And what was Garrison's theory in opposition to the Warren report findings which has made him so unpopular in high places? Was it not that President John F. Kennedy was assassinated because he had opposed further escalation in Vietnam? And what was it that Attorney General Mitchell sought to suppress by filing suits against the New York Times and Washington Post, except the Pentagon papers, classified as top secret, reportedly contained the recommendations and plans of the Kennedy and Johnson administration to escalate U.S. military involvements in Vietnam?

What relationships, if any, can there be among the Pentagon papers, the Garrison investigation of the Kennedy assassination, and the unusual timing of the pinball machine payoff charges? (end of quote)

TRUTH LETTER, in forthcoming issues, will answer Rep. Marick's rhetorical question fully and to the point. There exists the closest possible relationship between the NYT exposé of the hidden aspects of the Vietnam war, the Garrison investigation and the self-evident federal framework of which the indomitable DA now has become a victim.

Putting it succinctly, the evidence is now complete that President Kennedy, after an unwise start towards escalation (pressed on him by the same false friends in the State Dept., the Pentagon and even his own White House staff who later betrayed him by joining the Dallas conspiracy and rallying to the Usurper) sought to reduce the U.S. commitment in Vietnam and even contemplated a complete withdrawal of American forces after his anticipated re-election in 1964. This reversal - which has been fully documented by Senator Mansfield and others - sealed Kennedy's doom. It has now become abundantly clear that no other single factor - neither the CIA's resentment over the Bay of Pigs disaster, nor the Bobby Baker scandal, nor the oil depletion allowance, nor even Lyndon Johnson's personal ambition - has contributed so much to the near-top level decision to stage the Dallas coup d'état as did the determination of the warfaring sector in the Establishment to escalate regardless of how the President felt about it.

Nixon, Mitchell & Co. are fully aware of the possibly disastrous consequences which an eventual clear understanding of these relationships by the American public could have. They are scared to death by the possibility that a paper like the NYT, or an influential group in Congress might at last realize what has been going on and connect the Kennedy assassinations - both of them - with the Vietnam warmongering. As yet, the bulk of the American press is clearly unwilling to do so. In fact, there has been a noticeable attempt to make it appear as though the Pentagon papers incriminated both Kennedy and Johnson in equal measure. This deliberate distortion has been made possible by the fact that the Pentagon record is incomplete as far as Kennedy is concerned - probably on purpose. It does not include the President's crucial decision, prompted by Mansfield and only known to this Senator and to O'Donnell, which was made in the spring of 1963, to end escalation and begin withdrawal. But even though there is as yet no immediate danger of further exposure in this matter, Nixon, who was personally and deeply involved in the planning of the Dallas coup d'état, is understandably sensitive on this point. That's why he ordered his hatchetman Mitchell to get Garrison by fair means or foul - mostly foul, as Rep. Marick has pointed out - so as to discredit him in the public eye before the train of disclosures continues and people start sacking up to the real nature of the government we have been plagued with since Nov. 22, 1963. How about digging a little further, Mr. Marick?

Note: A lengthy series, showing in detail how Garrison was trapped by the always frame-up-happy FBI with the help of a real Judas will start soon in TRUTH LETTER.

Then, after adding that "substantiating details of the other violations by Mr. Wolfer can be made available," Mrs. Blehr wound up her philippic with this forthright blast:

"I find it very hard to believe that a man of the professed expertise of Mr. Wolfer could violate four of the basic precepts of his profession in a single case by sheer accident. I am more inclined to believe that these violations were made in response to an overzealous desire to help the cause of the prosecution. The choice seems to be rank incompetence on the one hand or morbid motivation on the other."

The reaction of Mr. Wolfer's superiors to these grave charges was self-betraying to say the least. Police Chief Edward M. Davis, at a news conference on June 1st described the criticism of Mr. Wolfer, "who, in my estimation is the top expert in the country," as a "vendetta" or all things. He claimed the three criminologists supporting Mrs. Blehr's charges had been beaten by Wolfer in various murder trials and intimated that they were using this means to get back at him.

Even as he ostensibly appointed three top-ranking police officials to probe the charges, Davis displayed his crass prejudice in favor of his subordinate, whose "overzealous desire to help the cause of the prosecution" had indeed been helpful in the Kennedy case, by declaring "I think that we're going to find that the charges are totally untrue."

What kind of a start towards an impartial and honest investigation is that? Can one imagine a panel of police officers rendering a guilty verdict, after their boss has publicly announced that he expects the charges to be disproved?

Davis also took the lead in scrambling for all possible phony and evasive explanations of Wolfer's behavior. First he suggested that the whole thing was a "clerical" error, then he came up with this silly pretext, "A similar type gun was used just to test the noise... to determine whether the sound would carry to where witnesses said they heard shots." (L.A. Times, June 2nd, 1971)

Now it so happens that Dr. Noguchi's autopsy report, which I have before my eyes, states clearly on p. 39, under the heading of "Test Firings:"

"Test firings were conducted on June 11, 1968, using a weapon and ammunition supplied by the Los Angeles Police Department as being of the most nearly identical manufacture possible to that of the fatal weapon... Personnel consisted of Drs. Holloway and Noguchi, Mr. Dwayne Wolfer and Sgt. William J. Lee..." (emphasis added - J.J.)

Now, maybe Drs. Holloway and Noguchi didn't know that, according to the universally accepted Precept (1) of the science of firearms identification (see the preceding issue of TL) only the evidence gun and no other may be used in test firings, but Wolfer and Sgt. Lee certainly did. They deliberately violated an "inviolable" dictate of their profession with a view to helping the prosecution convict the wrong person. The Noguchi autopsy report is there to prove it - even disregarding the firm evidence adduced in the Blehr statement.

In a letter dated June 3, 1971 and addressed to Police Chief Davis personally, Sirhan's new attorneys, George E. Shibley and Luke McKissack, countered Davis' contentions as follows:

"Dear Sir:

I have been informed that you have appointed certain police ~~officer~~ ~~state~~ personnel to undertake an examination of the Sirhan case, with a view to explaining manifest contradictions in the testimony and laboratory tests of Los Angeles Police Department forensic ballistics expert, Dwayne A. Wolfer.

"The evidence is clear, both from the letter to you by Mrs. Blehr and the trial record, that Wolfer testified that the three test bullets fired by him and contained in People's Exhibit 55 matched the bullets recovered from the sixth cervical vertebra of Senator Kennedy, and the bodies of Mr. Goldstein and Mr. Weisel, and that none of those bullets were fired from Sirhan's gun." (to be continued in the next issue)

New Light on the Robert Kennedy Murder Fraud (ctd.) - The Wolfer Incident -

While the L.A. Times did not publish the full text of Mrs. Blehr's letter to the Civil Service Commission, nor any of the supporting affidavits, the L.A. Free Press did in its issue of June 11, 1971. The document reveals not only the magnitude of Wolfer's derelictions of duty, but it also brings out the fact - soft-pedaled by the L.A. Times and other papers - that the three criminalists who had signed affidavits supporting Mrs. Blehr's contentions are authorities of the highest order in the fields of forensic science and ballistics investigation.

One of them, Raymond H. Pinker, was employed by the LAPD Crime Laboratory from 1929 to 1965 as a criminalist and Chief Forensic Chemist. After his retirement from the LAPD, Pinker became Associate Professor in the Department of Police Science and Administration at Los Angeles State College. He was also head of the master of Science program in criminalistics at Los Angeles State college until he retired in 1969.

Dr. Lemoyne Snyder is a doctor of medicine and also a member of the Bar. He has been for many years an expert in the field of legal medicine and in particular homicide investigation and writes of himself, "Expertise in this field requires a thorough knowledge of the fundamentals of firearms identification and over several decades I have pursued studies in this field. My book Homicide Investigation is a standard text in many police academies and it contains a chapter dealing with these fundamentals."

Walter Jack Cadman, a graduate of the University of California at Berkeley holding a B.A. degree with a major in Technical Criminology, has been employed from 1948 to date by the Orange County Sheriff's Department Criminalistics Laboratory and is now its Chief Criminalist. Cadman writes of himself, "I have presented approximately 24 scientific papers to criminalistic societies, law enforcement groups and chemical societies extending over a twelve year period. These papers deal with various technical problems in the general field of criminalistics. I am a member of the following professional affiliations: Fellow and past chairman of the criminalistics Section of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences; Southern California section of the Society for Applied Spectroscopy; American Chemical Society; California Association of Criminalists; American Association for the Advancement of Science; National Association of Police Laboratories."

Professionals of such caliber can hardly be rated as "cranks" - that's why the great majority of the news media preferred to say as little as possible about Messrs. Pinker, Snyder and Cadman, if mentioning them at all. And there was all but complete silence about their concurrent affidavits fully supporting Mrs. Blehr's statement:

"There are numerous fundamental precepts upon which the science of firearms identification is based. All criminalists and firearms examiners must abide by the precepts and disciplines of their profession. Six of these precepts, which Mr. Wolfer has violated, are listed below:

Precept (1) The positive identification of an evidence bullet as having been fired from a particular gun and no other must be based on a comparison of the evidence bullet with a test bullet recovered from the same evidence gun and no other.

Precept (2) The most accurate and reliable determination of the approximate distance between muzzle and victim (excluding contact) based on powder pattern distribution must be made with the actual evidence gun and no other. It is also important to use the same make and type of ammunition, preferably from the same batch or lot number. (When the evidence gun is not available, a similar gun may be used but the validity of the test is always more questionable).

Precept (3) The land and groove dimensions (part of the rifling specifications) may be identical or nearly identical between different firearms manufacturers.

Precept (4) very similar copper coatings are used on many different makes of lead revolver bullets.

Precept (5) Class characteristics as shown by the rifling impressions on a fired bullet play absolutely no role in the identification of such a bullet as having been fired from one particular gun out of the entire world population of guns having the same class characteristics.

Precept (6) A single land of the rifling of a firearms can produce only one land impression on a fired bullet.

(to be continued in the next issue)

The Panel Review (ctd. from TL III/20)

After that momentous, all-revealing statement about the "gray brown rectangular structure measuring approximately 13 X 20 mm" which the panelists had discovered in Kennedy's brain and which they "could not identify", - a discovery which all by itself destroys the validity of their conclusions - the four physicians go on to say: "In addition to the superficial and deep cortical destruction, it can be seen that the corpus callosum is widely torn in the midline."

Then comes this stupendous piece of pseudo-scientific doubletalk:

"These findings indicate that the back of the head was struck by a single bullet travelling at high velocity, the major portion of which passed forward through the right cerebral hemisphere, and which produced an explosive type of fragmentation of the skull and laceration of the scalp. The appearance of the entrance wound in the scalp is consistent with its having been produced by a bullet similar to that of exhibit CE 399."

Of all the wassal words in the Warren Commission's vocabulary none was more beloved and abused by the seven dwarfs than "consistent with." They used it just about every time they pretended to have proved something they could not prove and of which, in fact, the opposite was true. The four egregious doctors who concocted the "Panel Review" obsequiously imitated the master's voice. What else could they do? They knew only too well the opposite of what they were saying to be true, so they took refuge in such balderdash as an indistinguishable, non-measurable "entrance wound" which was in fact a huge gaping hole in Kennedy's skull being "consistent with" having been produced by a bullet "similar to that of exhibit CE 399." None other, mind you, of all bullets in the world.

Note that the panelists do not refer to a 6.5-millimeter bullet, a statement that would have made a minimum of sense, but they explicitly, specifically bring into play that mystical "magic bullet" which represents the only tangle link between the assassination and Oswald's rifle - a bullet almost undeformed and basically intact which according to the Commission had passed through two bodies and scattered a lot of metallic fragments in Governor Connally's chest and limbs; a bullet, moreover, which had most obviously been planted on that hospital stretcher by the fraud artists whose job it was to make the Dallas coup d'etat look like the lunatic deed of one L.M. Oswald.

That's why the four panelists, who were doing a job for the Government - one consistent with a fat fee - time and again refer in their "review" to Exhibit CE 399, which had certainly nothing whatsoever to do with the head wound we are here concerned with, and long since discredited beyond repair as the bullet that is supposed to have hit Connally and wounded him in many places, after passing through Kennedy's neck.

They are doing so, because, utterly unable to prove what they are supposed to prove, they feel they have to direct attention to Oswald, again and again, and that's where CE 399 comes in handy. A prime example of pseudo-scientific jargonism, cretinism, bores-pores and flimflamery, worthy of the whole manner the Kennedy murder investigation has been conducted, but totally unworthy of four eminent physicians with great reputations to defend.

The "Panel Review" then goes on to say: "The photographs do not disclose where this bullet emerged from the head although those showing the interior of the cranium with the brain removed indicate that it did not emerge from the supra-orbital region. Additional information regarding the course of the bullet is presented in the discussion of the X-ray films."

After linking a number of photographs used for further examination, the "Panel Review" continues: "There is an elliptical penetrating wound of the skin of the back located approximately 15 cm. medial to the right scapular process, 5 cm. lateral to the mid-scapular line and 14 cm. below the right scapular process. This wound lies approximately 5.5 cm. below a transverse fold in the skin of the neck. This fold can also be seen in a lateral view of the neck which shows an anterior traumatic wound. This view makes it possible to compare the levels of these two wounds in relation to that of the horizontal plane of the body."

(to be continued)