

Well, it seems obvious to me what happened: Some enterprising cameraman snapped an unauthorized picture (possibly by means of a telescope) of the unceremonious departure of J. Edgar Hoover from his home and UPI distributed it. The moment the FBI heard about it, they swung into action and forced the news agency to issue a "stop-Order" to all its clients. For some reason or other, however, the embarrassing picture got into the Santa Ana REGISTER and possibly into a few other small papers. So immediately after publication the FBI scoured out and removed all traces of the offending page which they could still delete.

For, to anyone who looks at that curious picture, it must immediately suggest the question: why was no hearse called? The answer to that question is, of course, that hearses take bodies to funeral parlors or autopsy rooms where the condition of Hoover's mortal remains might have aroused unwanted curiosity. So the body was first whisked away to a safe destination where it could be prepared for funeral with no questions asked. The ceremonial wrappings, eulogies, honor guards etc. would come later - along with the cruciate tears from Nixon & Co.

The CIA's "Schools for Assassins"

Coincidentally, another TL reader on the West Coast sent me a clipping from the "Esquire" of July 2, 1972, with a story by William Dick entitled: "3 Prominent Investigators of U.S. Assassinations Claim - Arthur Bremer Was Trained in Secret Gov. Alliance in 'School for Assassins'."

The paper quotes Park Lane, Harold Weisberg, and Theodore Charon as asserting unanimously that "schools for assassins" exist in the US and that they are operated by the CIA. Lane and Charon were most affirmative and specific, while Weisberg posed the rhetorical question: "Can we be sure that some now, super-secret, super-competent combine has not decided to infiltrate our leading political figures? Not sure about some tight conspiracy seeking to take over the government of this country by killing off these leaders?"

Next came TL: "I know that in the United States today there is a school for assassins run by the CIA. They have been training people for political assassinations for at least eight years. The attempt on the life of George Wallace is not the work of a fanatic. It shows coolness, planning and training..."

Theodore Charon: "... it's my belief that this is a CIA operation using psychotics and militants in a school of training. There is a very strong, secret group of men in our society who are trying to force a change in our system through the gun rather than the ballot box. In one camp I met an attorney who represented some very important men. He told me flatly that there was a training school out in the desert near the Los Angeles area where disturbed, hospitalized individuals are politically coached, coached and brain-washed. That is how they train the Oswalds, the James Earl Rays, the Sirhanes and the man who shot Gov. Wallace."

All of which is not exactly news to TL readers, for I have been telling them the same things consistently since the inception of this newsletter. I should like to add, though, that Charon's last sentence is at least partly wrong. If Oswald, Ray and Sirhan went to school in the assassin's camp, then they were trained there not to kill but to act as decoys and scapegoats for the real murderers. If the attorney Charon quotes as his source of information is right, then there is one such training school in the desert near the Los Angeles area. On the other hand, the Sirhanes has revealed that a CIA school for assassins operates in the San Jose (California) area (near the Pontomarin). And I happen to know that a third one is located at Oberlin (Ohio) in the Frankfurt area of east Germany, where assassins are trained for a school in Europe and overseas.

What is really remarkable about the "assassin" article is that it squirms, and publicly puts the finger on the national intelligence agency, an arm of the US Government, as being the power behind the assassin training program. Such frankness is rare in the American press, or the world press for that matter.

Here Illicit Censorship

The scandalous, unconstitutional embargo which the US Government has slapped on Jim Garrison's book "A Heritage of Stone" appears to be of much wider proportions than had been suspected, as the following letter from EL reader A.L. Thomas, Liverpool, shows:

"Dear Mr. Joesten,

I was interested to read in T-L, Vol. IV, No. 20 of the difficulty experienced by Miss Smith in obtaining a copy of "A Heritage of Stone" as I also encountered snags. Originally, I wrote to Putnam's at the Madison Avenue address on December 12th, 1970, requesting details of the cost of the book, including postage by surface mail. Months passed by without reply, despite my enclosing a self-addressed envelope and postage reply coupon with it. In June or July, to the best of my recollection, a Putnam's envelope bearing the East Rutherford, N.J. address arrived. This was postmarked "East Rutherford Dec. 30 '70" and was franked for thirteen cents, indicating it had come by surface mail. It contained the letter I had sent which had been stamped "Claim Dept. Dec. 18 1970" and had written on it in pencil the cost of the book and nothing else. Possibly, the reply got caught up in the backlog of post arising from the postal strike here early last year.

On July 27th, 1971, I arranged for the Exchange Control Department of my bank to make the appropriate payment to Putnam's at the East Rutherford address, and sent a covering letter the following day. Again, months went by, and, in October, I wrote seeking an explanation for the non-arrival of the book, although I don't recall to which address I sent my enquiry. Having waited a further two months in vain, I wrote another letter on 30th December, asking for a refund of my money. As far as I can remember, the book arrived around the end of January or beginning of February. The bag, which contained only the book, was postmarked "East Rutherford," either October or November 1971, and was in reasonable condition, the only thing about it that puzzled me being the fact that somebody had written on it the word "EMBARGO."

At the time, I thought this was possibly some reference to the dock strike which I believe was taking place in the U.S. during the closing months of last year, as it appeared that the letter I sent in October had in fact had its effect, I concluded that my July letter had probably only been mislaid. The day after I received the book, a reply to my letter of 30th December '71 arrived. Attached to the letter, which was stamped "Claim Dept. 5 Jan. 1972", was a slip, a copy of which I enclose here. As requested, I sent off a copy of the advice which I'd received from my bank in July '71.

The above is pretty well the whole story and, while many of the details may be of no importance, some of them may be of some interest, in the light of Miss Smith's experience anyway.

Yours sincerely,

A.L. Thomas,

The slip referred to above, a copy of which Mr. Thomas forwarded to me, was sent by the Customer Service Department of Putnam's and reads: "We have no record of receiving your check. Please supply us with a copy of the cancelled check."

EMBARGO - no records - a bag containing only a book, without receipt or invoice - months of delay in answering - months of delay in shipping - once again all the shennanigans which Miss Smith had experienced. Obviously Putnam's don't dare shipping Garrison's book abroad without going through all kinds of contrivances in order to ensure a maximum of secrecy and anonymity - even to the extent of smuggling the explosive book out of the country and mailing it from Luxembourg, as we have seen. Nor are American readers better off, for almost concurrently I received a letter from a EL subscriber in Texas that said in part: "I ordered 5 copies of Jim Garrison's book two months ago and have not got it yet!! Suppressed? It would not surprise me as much as that he lived to write it!!"

UNFULFILLED readers in the US are urged to bring these scandalous facts to the attention of Senator Sam J. Ervin and other members of Congress who in the past have shown concern about the erosion of constitutional guarantees by the Federal Government.

The Shame of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis (ctd.)

"WHAT WAS JACKIE'S BIG MISSTATEMENT?"

"I was looking this way, to the left ... I used to think if I only had been looking to the right, I would have seen the first shot hit him, then I could have pulled him down, and then the second shot would not have hit him."

"Picture B^{*} flatly shows that Mrs. Kennedy was looking to her right, at the President, within the second he was shot. In picture A^{*} the President is waving as he approaches a 24-inch road sign. The first shot struck him just as the car emerged from the sign, picture B. Mrs. Kennedy is looking into the President's face in this picture and some of the road sign is still visible. This picture shows the President raising his hands to his wounded throat as Mrs. Kennedy watches. She is still watching in picture C.

"Sylvia Meagher, in her book, 'Accessories After the Fact', says on p. 28: 'at the earliest point at which the President could have been hit by the bullet Mrs. Kennedy made a sudden sharp turn toward the President.'"

"WHAT WAS THE SMALLER MISSTATEMENT MRS. KENNEDY MADE TO THE COMMISSION?"

"You know, there is always noise in a motorcade... there are always motorcycles backfiring... I guess there was a noise, but it didn't seem like any different noise because there is so much noise, motorcycles and things."

"Mrs. Kennedy's implication was that noise and backfiring had kept her from hearing the sound of the first shot. But it was unusually quiet when the first shot rang out. Most everyone in the motorcade, including Mrs. Kennedy, was alerted by its frightening sound as it echoed across the plaza and tried to look at the President, realizing he was the target. Governor Connally was in the act of turning to look at the President when he himself was hit. Mrs. Connally looked at the President and described his expression as 'empty' (Warren Report).

"SINCE MRS. KENNEDY MENTIONED THE ASSASSINATION PICTURES IN HER TESTIMONY BEFORE THE WARREN COMMISSION (AS WILL BE SEEN BELOW) THAT MEANT SHE HAD SEEN THEM, SO HOW COULD SHE STILL TELL THE COMMISSION THAT SHE WAS LOOKING TO THE LEFT AT THE TIME OF THE FIRST SHOT?"

"That can be answered only by someone who knows Jacqueline Kennedy well -- and William Manchester did. When their book was ready for the publisher he had legal troubles with Mrs. Kennedy and made the following comment (Victorasky, 'Robert Kennedy: The Myth and the Man', p. 338):

"I knew for the first time what it was like to live in an absolute monarchy. It was like she was Marie Antoinette, completely isolated from the world around her by her court -- her advisers."

"Mrs. Kennedy was so flattered and fawned upon that she thought herself privileged enough to say whatever she wanted to, whether it was true or not."

"DID THE WARREN COMMISSION ATTEMPT TO REFRESH JACKIE'S MEMORY BY POINTING OUT THAT PICTURE B SHOWED SHE WAS LOOKING TO THE RIGHT RATHER THAN LEFT AT THE INSTANT OF THE FIRST SHOT?"

"No. The testimony shows they didn't say a word. Chief Justice Earl Warren and J. Lee Rankin questioned Mrs. Kennedy very gently in her home for ten minutes. When, in their opinion, her description of the President's wounds became too gory, they deleted it in the interest of "good taste" (Warren Report). This deletion was noted in Mrs. Kennedy's testimony.

"BEFORE PROCEEDING -- WHY DID THE COMMISSION'S SUB-GRAND JURORS BEFORE THE FINAL PROCEEDINGS GO TO THE PUBLISHER AND NOT MUCH WORSE? DID THEY HAVE OVER 'THE DEATH OF A PRESIDENT'?"

(to be continued)

* The references to "Picture A," "Picture B," etc. are to sequences of the Zapruder Film, as published in LIFE magazine Nov. 29, 1963.