

"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. 23

7890 Guttenberg, Germany

August 15, 1972

Editorial: In German, they say "Teufel"; in French, "diable"; in English, "bison."

Dr. Lattimer of CIA University (ctd.)

In the preceding issue of *AL*, I quoted the question posed by Dr. Charles A. Ragan, Editor of "Resident and Staff Physician" and Chairman of the Department of Medicine at Columbia University: "Why was Dr. Lattimer, a Urologist, given the First Non-Governmental Look at the Restricted Kennedy Material?" and also the specious answer given by him.

"The fact that he is a urologist is irrelevant," says Dr. Ragan. Granted, that is eminently relevant, though, is the fact that Dr. Lattimer is not a forensic pathologist and that he was therefore not even eligible to view the Kennedy autopsy materials under the specific terms of the Oct. 29, 1966 Agreement with the National Archives. That Agreement explicitly excludes all but "recognized experts in the field of pathology or related areas of science or technology." By no stretch of imagination could it be claimed that the science of urology is in any way related to that of forensic pathology.

Dr. Ragan attempts to overcome Dr. Lattimer's conspicuous lack of qualification for the privilege granted him by pointing out that Lattimer has considerable experience in ballistics, and that he did a lot of testing with "Oswald-type rifles" and "Oswald-type cartridges." But ballistics is not the same thing as forensic pathology either, as Dr. Ragan surely knows, even though he chooses to overlook the basic difference. Nobody but a trained forensic pathologist is qualified to trace the course of a bullet through a human body and to infer from it the direction of the shooting. Precisely for that reason it would have been the duty of Burke Marshall to select for the "first non-governmental look" a person at least well qualified in forensic pathology, if not a leader in this field.

Were there none available or willing? On the contrary! Look at what Sylvia Meagher, author of "Accessories After the Fact," reports in the "Texas Observer" of May/26, 1972, in a remarkable piece entitled "The Case of the Urologist Apologist:"

"Why was Lattimer, a urologist and apologist for the Warren report in writings and lectures over the last six years, selected to view the autopsy photos and X-rays in violation of the agreement under which they were deposited in the National Archives? Eminent forensic pathologists who applied to see those items back in 1966 and again in mid-1972 have not been given the same opportunity. Dr. Cyril H. Wecht, preeminent in the field of forensic pathology and president of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences as well as coroner of the Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, is still awaiting the courtesy of a reply from Burke Marshall, the representative of the Kennedy family, with whom the decision ostensibly rests. Luncar has it that Burke Marshall has only one-third of a secretary at his disposal and has therefore been unable to answer letters from Dr. Wecht - although the lack of secretarial assistance did not obstruct Dr. Lattimer nor visibly retard Marshall in his various activities. Perhaps the discriminatory and discourteous treatment received by Dr. Wecht stems from the fact that he has the highest expertise and a sceptical, critical mind which he has no hesitation to speak."

Mrs. Meagher could have saved the word "perhaps." There cannot be the

slightest doubt that the slighting of Dr. Weent by Marshall was due to the fact that this top expert in forensic pathology had previously expressed serious misgivings about the honesty of the JFK autopsy. The shameless preference given to an obscure urologist over the president of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences speaks for itself, and loudly: Truth was the last thing wanted in the case!

Dr. Lattimer's lengthy piece in "Resident and Staff Physician" is an elaborate job of make-believe and deception, impressively rigged up with diagrammatic sketches and steeped in scientific lingo. This is not the place for discussing, and I am certainly not qualified to argue about all aspects of his "findings", many of which are totally irrelevant to the key question of where the bullets came from that killed President Kennedy. What matters here is the evidence of bad faith and fraudulent intent of which a few examples will be given below.

At the core of the fraud perpetrated by Dr. Lattimer with the help of Dr. Ragan and others lies his assertion, allegedly based on a careful study of the autopsy photographs and X-rays, that the first bullet, fired from behind and above, entered the back of the President's neck at a point even higher than the Warren Commission had assumed. In doing so, Dr. Lattimer even further complicated a problem the WC was unable to solve plausibly, to wit the five-to-six-inch discrepancy between this alleged high location of an alleged entry wound and the established location of the bullet holes in the coat and shirt. He then proceeds to "solve" the problem cavalierly by pretending to believe that Kennedy's garments had "humped-up" on the back of his neck to that impossible extent.

As "proof" of this wildly extravagant assertion, Dr. Lattimer reproduces, as Figure 4, what he labels "A photograph of President Kennedy taken a few minutes before he was shot, showing his suit-coat 'humped-up' behind his neck. If his coat and shirt were in this configuration when he was hit, probably due to his waving, which he appears to have been doing, this could account for the fact that the bullet holes in his coat and shirt were farther down from his collar than was the corresponding bullet hole in his back (a point about which there has been some confusion and argument)".

As far as I know this photograph has never been published before and, indeed, there is no reason why it should have been, for it was admittedly taken "a few minutes" before the shooting. It does not prove in any way, therefore, that the President was sitting in the same position the moment he was hit, as a matter of fact, both the Zapruder Film and other pictures taken at the instant of the first shot show Kennedy sitting quite erect with no indication of a bunched-up jacket.

Indeed, on p. 223 of his book "Six Seconds in Dallas," Josiah Thompson reproduces a picture taken by cameraman Phillip Willis "at almost the exact moment when the wounding bullet struck" and then writes: "I have studied the original slide under a microscope. Although it is not apparent on black-and-white copies, the original color slide shows clearly that the President's clothing was not bunched at the time he was wounded in the back."

Moreover, the picture Lattimer relies upon as "proof" of his absurd contention could well have been "doctored," and probably was. For an expert forger - and the CIA has legions of them at its disposal - it would be an easy trick to retouch the outlines of a jacket on a black-and-white photo in such a manner as to make it look "bunched up" under the collar. The source of the picture is suspect, too, for it was obtained by Lattimer "courtesy of Dallas Times Herald, Dallas, Texas." To assume the probity of a big newspaper published in the city that provided the facilities for murdering President Kennedy, would be adventurous, indeed. Not for a Dr. Lattimer, of course.

"Figure 2" of the Lattimer creation purports to be a diagrammatic representation of the course of the bullet which the author claims entered Kennedy's body "about two inches below the crease of his neck" and "exited low on the trachea in the midline." Appended to the back of the figure is a weird protuberance, which looks like something out of a comic strip, but is supposed to represent the "humped-up" coat. Very neatly, the doctor-faker manages to turn up the upper edge of the collar, in his sketch, in

such a way that the "In-Out" arrow, which is supposed to indicate the transit of the bullet through the body pierces only one hole into the allegedly "bunchedup" coat and shirt. For this is the big and indeed insuperable difficulty for Dr. Lattimer the same as others who before him have tried this absurd construction in order to explain the inexplicable away: had Kennedy really been in such a hunched position, with his garments riding up about six inches on his back, then the shirt would have to have been doubled up over the collar and there would have been two holes in it. (for details, see A.J. Epstein's "Inquest," pp. 55-58 and Josian Thompson's "Six Seconds in Dallas," pp. 222-223)

(to be continued in the next issue)

The Arthur Bremer Trial Farce

The pattern of the CIA-inspired shootings of American political leaders (see TL, Vol. IV, No. 18: "The Murderous Diversion") and the way the captured gunmen are prosecuted and dealt with by the courts is getting downright boring. It's always the same setup and scenario for the assassination(attempt), followed by the same ludicrous search for a plausible substitute for the missing motive and the inevitable grotesque staged in court by some expert in psychiatry.

I haven't seen the U.S. press accounts of the Bremer trial yet, but a British TL reader has forwarded to me a copy of the London "Daily Express" of August 3, 1972, with a story headlined " 'Big shot' Bremer hunted Nixon with gun" that was cabled from Washington and obviously reflects the handling of the matter by the American news media. The first two paragraphs read: "Arthur Bremer stalked President Nixon and Governor George Wallace across America and Canada for two-and-a-half months waiting for a perfect chance to assassinate them. His reason for hunting them with a loaded pistol: he wanted to be a big shot!"

Now that makes sense, a lot of sense, doesn't it? Just as much sense, in fact, as the official story of Lee H. Oswald first taking potshots at General Edwin Walker prior to assassinating President Kennedy, while the similarity of targets may be slightly greater in the Bremer than in the Oswald case, anybody with a minimum of common sense must realize that neither story is true.

Because they weren't true, a phony motive had to be rigged up in both cases and that's where your psychiatrist comes in, with a vengeance. Oswald never had the slightest reason for shooting at either Gen. Walker or Kennedy, but of course we know from the Warren Report that he, too, wanted to be a big shot and besides he was having trouble with his wife. If that isn't a perfect combination of valid grounds for assassinating the President of the United States, don't ask me.

The same happy combination turns up in the Bremer case: according to Dr. Eugene Brody, chairman of the Psychiatry Department at the University of Maryland Medical School (no loss!) Bremer is supposed to have said of himself: "I wanted to be a big shot because I am small. My future is small and my past is an insult to any human being." With such bitter feelings wrenching his heart, young Arthur had the misfortune of losing his only girl friend and now his mind was made up (exactly on March 1): He was going to assassinate either President Nixon or Governor Wallace. Killing a President of the United States is notoriously difficult, unless you can command the help of the Vice-President, the Pentagon, the CIA, the FBI and the Secret Service, as happened in Dallas, so Bremer settled for the lesser and easier target. Now he is going to pull 63 years for the pleasure of having been a big shot for a day.

Yes, that's what you and I and the whole world are supposed to believe. And, unfortunately, mass brainwashing, in our day, is such a gigantic operation, smoothly and successfully performed regardless of common sense and elementary logic, let alone any higher form of reasoning, that practically the whole world - except you, me and the rest of us kooks - is quite prepared to swallow such a cock-and-bull story.