

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's

" TRUTH LETTER "

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. IV, No. 10

7890 Gutenberg, Germany

Feb. 1, 1972

Editorial: The dog-catcher as President would be more statesmanlike than Tricky Dick.

More Fraud and Trickery

A major new offensive against the truth about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy is underway. With the close cooperation of the fear-stricken Kennedy Clan, the Nixon Maladministration has moved to apply a new coat of camouflage to the worn-out coverup of the Dallas coup d'état. The whole operation is typical of the bad faith cunning which is so characteristic of the Nixon regime.

On Oct. 29, 1971, the first five-year period of the "contract" under which the Kennedy autopsy materials had been placed by the Kennedy family in the National Archives came to an end. From that date on, "recognized experts in the field of pathology or related areas of science or technology" are also eligible for permission to examine these materials. Even before the opening of the new phase, a host of genuine experts in pathology, including in particular Dr. Cyril H. Wecht, director of the Institute of Forensic Sciences, Duquesne University, and Dr. John Nichols of the University of Kansas - who is suing the U.S. Government for permission to inspect these items - as well as Dr. E Forrest Chapman, the medical examiner of Wayne County, Mich., had filed applications with Burke Marshall, the Kennedy family's top legal representative who has discretionary power to decide which "recognized experts" are to be admitted. In the past, this lawyer, who is also deputy dean of the Yale Law School, has consistently played the Government's game in the matter of the assassinations, to the great detriment of truth and the real interests of the Kennedys. He was also primarily responsible for Ted Kennedy's foolish decision to plead guilty to reckless driving and leaving the scene of an accident, in the Chappaquiddick affair, instead of telling the truth about how he was kidnapped by CIA agents and Mary Jo Kopechne was murdered by them. There couldn't be a more subservient stooge of the powers-that-be in Washington than this supposed defender of the Kennedy interests.

So, with an impressive array of qualified applicants for permission to view the autopsy materials before him, whom would Mr. Marshall pick as the first "independent" expert to be allowed access to the sequestered autopsy materials but one totally unknown Dr. John K. Lattimer, a urologist at Columbia University? Urology, the science of the urine, is a respectable and beneficial branch of medicine, but it has nothing whatever to do with ballistics or the forensic sciences. The fact that Dr. Lattimer has privately tinkered with firearms on the side doesn't make him a "recognized expert" in the field of pathology or any related area. Nor is it true, as has been reported in some newspapers - especially abroad - that Dr. Lattimer has been in the past a critic of the official version of the Dallas shooting. On the contrary, he has always been an apologist of the Warren Commission and his occasional writings on the subject, in medical journals, were always designed to bolster the official version.

It took Dr. Lattimer just a few hours at the National Archives to come up with the unqualified conclusion that the autopsy materials "eliminate any doubt completely" that the Warren Commission was right in affirming Lee H. Oswald fired all the shots that struck President Kennedy. This short time span is apparent from a Washington dispatch by Fred P. Graham to the New York Times, dated Jan. 8, 1972, which, after stating that Dr. Lattimer was "the first person not under Government auspices to see the items", said specifically that he examined them "yesterday at the National Archives here." and in the following paragraph we are told that the doctor "in an interview last night" narrated his findings.

The picture is clear, then; that interview with the NYT was prearranged and scheduled to take place just as soon as our eminent urologist had managed to dash over to the Archives to take a quick look at a complex collection of materials it would take any real expert days, if not weeks, to study before he could reach any valid conclusion. The New York Times, of course, has previously been in the forefront of the newsmakers in any matter relating to the assassination of President Kennedy and it has now again lived up to its established standards. The Times may be great in its stance on the Vietnam war, but its record in exploring the truth about the political assassinations of our time in the United States has been consistently and abysmally low.

According to the NYT story, Dr. Lattimer's report on what he had seen and supposedly studied made the following "crucial" points: First, the initial bullet passed through the President's body at a distinctly downward angle, "more than was shown in the schematic drawings released by the Warren report... the front hole is considerably lower than the one in the back."

If that is so, how does Dr. Lattimer account for the undeniable fact that the FBI pictures of Kennedy's suit coat and shirt (as reproduced in "Inquest", pp. 56 and 57, and in "Six Seconds in Dallas," p. 48) clearly and unmistakably show the bullet entrance hole to be between five and six inches below the collar, while the throat wound, which the WC mislabeled an exit wound, is located at the height of the tie knot and therefore considerably above the entrance point in the back? As is well known, the WC got around this little difficulty by simply omitting the FBI pictures - whose authentic authenticity has never been in doubt - from its report and the "hearings." By doing so, the Commission thought it could keep this striking and highly embarrassing evidence from ever becoming public knowledge. But the researchers, digging in the National Archives, found and published these pictures which demolish the Warren Report - and confound Dr. Lattimer. The latter's bad faith in ignoring the telltale evidence of these FBI photos is underscored by the fact that, by his own account, he had been allowed to see "the President's bloody and bullet-punctured clothing."

Incidentally, one section of the agreement under which the autopsy materials, the President's clothing and other items relating to the assassination were turned over to the National Archives by the Kennedy family stipulates expressly that when the time came (after Oct. 29, 1971) for "serious scholars" to be given access to these materials, they "may view photographs of said articles of clothing, but may not inspect or examine the articles of clothing themselves." So either Dr. Lattimer is lying when he says that he had seen the clothing, instead of merely the photographs of it, or else the Government, in this particular case which serves its purposes, has flagrantly violated key provisions of the agreement with the Kennedy family which it so fiercely defends against genuinely serious scholars and recognized experts like Dr. Nichols. Either alternative once again demonstrates that the public is still being duped about the realities of the assassination.

Lattimer lightly scoffs at the massive evidence which indicates that the President had also been fired at from the grassy knoll facing him. He is quoted by the NYT

as saying that the front hole was so far below the back one that "if anyone were to have shot him from the front, they would have to be squatting on the floor of the car in front of him." This argument is as specious as it is misleading. None of the critics to my knowledge - certainly not this writer - has ever suggested that the bullet that struck Kennedy in the throat had come out through the back. It is a case of two different bullets having hit the President, apart from the head shot or shots, neither one of which emerged from the body. It will be remembered that not only the doctors at Parkland Hospital agreed that the wound in the President's throat, at about the necktie knot, was an entrance wound, but that one of them, Dr. Kemp Clark, told reporters that the bullet that had caused this wound "ranged downward in his chest and did not exit" (NYT, Nov. 27, 1963). That was, of course, before they were all put under extreme pressure to change their views in order to make them conform to the "autopsy findings."

On the other hand, there is solid evidence that the other bullet that struck the President in the back did not exit either. Secret Service Agent Roy Kellerman, who was present at the autopsy, told the WC: "There were three gentlemen who performed this autopsy. A Colonel Finck - during the examination of the President, from the hole that was in his shoulder, and with a probe, and we were standing right alongside of him, he is probing inside the shoulder with his instrument and I said 'Colonel, where did it go?' He said, 'There are no lanes for an outlet of this entry in this man's shoulder.'" (Hearings, Vol. II, p. 93). The syntax of this statement may not be impeccable, but the facts are clear. The WC simply chose to overlook the unequivocal implications of that statement made by Dr. Finck before he, too, knuckled under to pressure and changed his views to conform with the official version. Dr. Lattimer, for his part, never bothered to look at the record or at the other side of the coin.

Further and detailed corroboration of the fact that the bullet which had struck Kennedy in the back did not transit at all can be found on pp. 43-51 of Josiah Thompson's "Six Seconds in Dallas." Dr. Thompson quotes from Commission Document 7 which he had found at the archives as follows: "During the latter stages of this autopsy, Dr. Humes located an opening which appeared to be a bullet hole which was below the shoulders (emphasis added - J.J.) and two inches to the right of the middle line of the spinal column. This opening was probed by Dr. Humes with the finger, at which time it was determined that the trajectory of the missile entering at this point had entered at a downward position of 45 to 60 degrees. Further probing determined that the distance traveled by this missile was a short distance inasmuch as the end of the opening could be felt with the finger." (emphasis added - J.J.)

Thompson goes on to write: "I asked Commander Humes's assistant, Commander J. Thornton Boswell, about Humes's inserting his finger in the back wound and feeling its end. Boswell told me that this was correct and that, in fact, all three doctors had probed this wound with their fingers up to the first or second knuckle - a penetration of 1 to 2 inches. Boswell also indicated that the back wound had been examined with a metal probe - a thin piece of stiff wire some 8 inches long with a knob on the end..."

Later on, the author points out: "It (the back wound) was explored with fingers and metal probes, but it was not dissected. Here is an essential problem that no number of autopsy photos and X-rays can clear up. Among forensic specialists it is known that the only ultimately conclusive way to trace the course of a bullet is to dissect the tissue along its path... The photos and X-rays now sequestered in the National Archives cannot help us much - bullet paths through flesh do not show up on X-rays..."

All this disposes effectively of another "crucial point" made by Dr. Lattimer: "The X-rays prove that the front and rear holes were made by the same bullet, which passed through the President's body and left two tiny flakes of metal and air in the tissues along the path between the two holes." A totally false and gratuitous assertion, wholly unworthy of a "serious scholar!"

The Echo Abroad

When a truly serious scholar publishes findings that contradict the Warren Report and raise the question of conspiracy, the world at large takes no notice because all channels of communication are blocked by official action or the concerted inaction of the newsmakers. But let a conspicuous phony like this Dr. Lattimer supply "independent" confirmation of the official version and the big news is instantly trumpeted around the globe by a propaganda machine as viciously effective as that of Dr. Goebbels and just as dedicated to the perpetuation of the Big Lie.

In England, for instance, the London Times carried the story on Jan. 10, 1972, under the nonsensical headline "Camera proves Dallas assassination findings." The Guardian, on the same date, headlined its Lattimer news "Findings on Oswald given support." Yet this paper must have felt a bit wary about Lattimer's qualifications, for it changed his official position to "chairman of the Department of Neurology at Columbia University." Neurology, of course, comes a little closer to the forensic sciences than urology does. The Daily Telegraph for its part used the headline "No doubts' on Kennedy Assassin." No doubts, indeed, among the confirmed believers.

"... It is a further demonstration of how poorly informed we are in this country" writes a TL subscriber in Liverpool in forwarding a clipping from the Times. But how can England be adequately informed about American affairs when the US public itself is constantly deceived and kept in the dark? The newsmakers' hands are tightly clasped across the ocean...

Mike Masterman, TL's British correspondent, sent me, in addition to complete press coverage, a most interesting transcript of an I.T.N. news broadcast (Jan. 11, 1972) including a filmed interview from an American TV program. Listen to our "serious scholar" and "recognized expert" shooting off his mouth on the screen:

"There was nothing to indicate a transverse bullet passage and of course, again, this is one of the things that people conjectured: that another bullet might have been fired from the front or the side, although I, myself, have sat on the box where Oswald fired from and have gone round and then stood on the so-called grassy knoll and on the railroad trestle and I can't see how any skilled marksman would assume such a position and how he could possibly hit anybody in just that way whereas the place that Oswald picked and the arrangement he made where the automobile was going downhill, away from him directly, almost directly, in his line of fire, made it so that between each operation of the bolt of the rifle the car moved very slightly and it was really not difficult at all. Now, I went in looking very intently for any evidence, for example, of a transverse bullet wound which came from another direction, another person really, and I spent a great deal of time being my own devil's advocate saying that suppose I was arguing the other side of the coin what could I claim or how could I refute these arguments? And after spending the entire day going over these things with a fine tooth comb, backward and forward, and plaguing the poor men at the National Archives, who had to re-run and re-view and let me see it again and do something I didn't register the first time - but they all showed great patience - and locked rooms and so forth, I could not find anything wrong."

Hille's comment: "So, what do you make of this? It's funnier than the script of the Bob Hope show." It is indeed, but enough of the comedy about a great tragedy. Let the eminent urologist go back to his urine and keep his ass out of murder.

Note: Because of the importance of the preceding analysis and rebuttal, which filled this entire issue of TRUTH LETTER, the other serial features now running in TL will have to be postponed to the next issue.

PS. The London Evening News of Jan. 10, 1972, also made of Lattimer a "neurologist."

Sounds better.