

# The Murder of Dr. David Kelly. “A Symbol of the Blackness of the Tony Blair Cabal”

By [Dr. David Halpin](#)

Global Research, September 05, 2013

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#)

*Where has a very small band of doctors and lay persons got to in achieving a searching and lawful inquiry into the death of this man? Not very far is the answer. But their energy, ethos, powers of analysis and intelligence have unearthed so many unanswered questions and so many lies that logic dictates foul play was the cause of his demise. And the fact that Lord Falconer of Thoroton arranged for Lord Hutton of Bresagh “urgently to conduct an investigation into the circumstances surrounding the death of Dr Kelly ” within three hours of the corpse being found showed very clearly that the Blair cabal wanted to contain, manipulate and emasculate any inquiry into this most high profile and unnatural death.*

*Some have criticised us for focusing on the death of one man, when the ‘coalition of the willing’ had murdered over 1 million humans, by usual ratio maimed over 2 million and caused 4 million to flee their homes. 5 million orphans, 1 million widows, and unusual and frequent birth defects completes the ‘legacy’ of Anthony Blair. The media here in perfidious Albion have often referred to this need of his for a legacy. It is there in good measure as the sun sets on that multitude of graves.*

The focus on Kelly’s death is entirely appropriate. It is a symbol of the blackness of the Blair cabal.

It is also a bleak monument to the power and cunning of the British state. It has also revealed the principles in some. I can recall a colleague or two saying to me with a thin smile ‘He was bumped off wasn’t he?’ as the shoulders were shrugged. Many believe that cause of death but they go on to say that an inquest will never happen; Britain will never know the story until decades have passed. They might have in mind that most of the records will not be opened for another 60 years. These submissive people will still vote at the next election for Tweedledee, Tweedledum or Tweedle, lamely accepting that their government can do such things, and get away with it. This disconnection is maintained by the media, by shallow thought and by blind loyalty to an illusory democracy.

Norman Baker MP wrote a good book – ‘The Strange Death of David Kelly’. He concluded that he had been murdered.

That book would be longer now because many more facts, omissions and lies have been disinterred since 2007 but that has got us no further. I have described this case as being of very high voltage; the state, so shadowy in such things, has been determined to keep the lid tightly fastened on the truth in that churchyard of St Mary’s, Longworth. Every time one looks at the transcripts on the Hutton ‘Inquiry’ web site (1) contradictions and omissions jump out. The five chapters preceding the last two on the law, record some of the most salient. Some others are in the front of my mind.

The first policeman on the scene after the lay searchers had reported their grisly find, was Detective Constable Coe. When he gave 'evidence' at Hutton he said there was only one colleague with him – DC Shields. Others at and near the scene reported there were two men with Coe. In an important Daily Mail article of 9th of August 2010 (2) Coe confessed that there was a second man with him. His name has not been released but he should have appeared at Hutton and be named anyway. In the same interview he volunteered 'On the ground there wasn't much blood about, if any.' Coe, since retired, has been interviewed by the Thames Valley police but an inquiry under FoI showed it to be cursory.

There is no question that the body was moved. Ms Holmes was the lay searcher who was lead by her dog Brock to Dr Kelly and came within 4 foot of his corpse. The time was 9.20 am. She described the head and shoulders as being slumped against a tree. Mr Bartlett, the paramedic attended at about 10am with his colleague Ms Hunt. The body was 'laid on its back'.

An interview with him by the Daily Mail 12 September 2010 (3) records – 'He was lying flat out some distance from the tree. He definitely wasn't leaning against it.... 'When I was there the body was far enough away from the tree for someone to get behind it. I know that because I stood there when we were using the electrodes to check his heart. Later I learned that the dog team said they had found him propped up against the tree. He wasn't when we got there. If the earlier witnesses are saying that, then the body has obviously been moved.' At this point a coroner would have closed the inquest and the police would then have opened a criminal investigation. The only explanation for a dead body being moved by a person or persons unknown is a malign one. But Hutton did not adjourn the inquiry; the show had to go on. My Lord Hutton (4) –

"I have seen a photograph of Dr Kelly's body in the wood which shows that most of his body was lying on the ground but that his head was slumped against the base of the tree – therefore a witness could say either that the body was lying on the ground or slumped against the tree. These differences do not cause me to doubt that no third party was involved in Dr Kelly's death."

David Bartlett is a brave and decent man; he is now a threatened species in these fair islands. In this Daily Mail of the 12th September 2010 (3) he said this of Hutton's inquiry.

"I thought they'd already decided the outcome and wanted someone to confirm it for them. They'd decided it was going to be suicide and that was all cut and dried.... I wasn't impressed with how it was conducted. It should have been under oath, the photographs of the scene should have been released and they shouldn't have sealed the documents for 70 years."

David Bartlett should have been conducting the inquiry but instead it required wigs and mountains of smooth but vapid words.

So the 'law' denied a scientist, and the living, a factual inquiry into his death. The lie, and not the law was invoked. I have described my own examination of the forensic medical 'evidence' of Dr Nicholas Hunt that underpinned the verdict as to cause of death and thus of suicide. Firstly he did not reveal his first post-mortem report of the 19th of July 2003 at the Hutton Inquiry although Hutton referred to its existence in his opening statement. The scan of the only available report by Hunt dated 25th of July and which was made public in the autumn of 2010 had the title 'Final Post Mortem Report'. The coroner had also referred to

that first report in his letter to the Department of Constitutional Affairs –

“The preliminary cause of death given at the opening of the inquest no longer represents the view of the Pathologist and evidence from him would need to be given to correct and update the evidence already received.” (5)

We might assume the first report spoilt the narrative significantly. Secondly he spoke only of one blood sample when he took five. He stayed silent when Dr Allan spoke of NCH44 which by deduction from his opening description of his tests contained NO paracetamol or DPPP. We can assume the same for the two other samples that Dr Allan had examined in his advanced laboratories. Why else were they passed over by the barrister? And finally, we have the ‘enhancement’, the ‘sexing up’ of the blood observed by Hunt at the scene and on the corpse. We could at least say that Hunt did not provide sound and complete evidence for the causes of death he listed. Perhaps he was overawed by the Hutton circus.

I have written on the ‘report’ provided by Professor Shepherd to the Attorney General on the 16th of March 2011 in chapter 5 but there is more. (6) He omitted discussion or defence of Hunt’s failure to bring his first PM report to Hutton. He would have known how the GMC had castigated Shorrocks for his failure in this. (7)

Secondly, he dismissed the evidence of Ms Holmes.

Thirdly he dismissed my proposition that the volume of blood external to the corpse should be capable of measurement.

I had provided papers from the field of midwifery. Without such measurement, how can the pathologist say the victim died from haemorrhage alone? Dr Michael Powers QC has made this point with sharpness. Schorn MN Vanderbilt University School of Nursing, Nashville, TN 37240, USA ‘Visual estimation of blood loss is so inaccurate that its continued use in practice is questionable and it should not be used in research to evaluate treatment.’

Fourthly he dismisses the value of Henssge’s nomogram and his methods in estimating the time of death from the core and environmental temperatures. The scientific bases for Professor Henssge’s methods are very sound and backed up by observation. He has been most helpful in correspondence with me. Aside from the timing of events like a gun shot by witnesses or by CCTV for instance, Henssge’s methods remain central in estimating the time of death. Finally there is “ ..in which a young individual died solely as a result of a self inflicted, solitary incision of her left ulnar artery’ against the post-mortem report of the lady HSL82 recording a second cause of death – alcohol intoxication. Two other statements follow which emphasise the possibility. I have no words with which to sum up Professor Shepherd’s report to the Attorney General. None.

Given the lies it is fair to ask ten years on how he might have been assassinated, if that is what happened. No inquest, for a long list of reasons including the test of ‘beyond reasonable doubt’, could possibly have brought a verdict of suicide. When my little letter to the Morning Star was published on the 16th of December 2003 I said at the end

“I have hesitated in writing this because I would not wish to hurt any family feelings but the elite have shown no such qualms.”

That wish still obtains but the hurt in Iraq is still felt by many millions. That probably goes unfelt by millions in Britain.

So what might have taken place? He probably made a rendezvous outside the village with a familiar person. It is likely he was taken away by car and 'debriefed'. He would later have been sedated by an agent which could not be detected by standard forensic laboratory tests. One cannot force an adult to swallow tablets, especially given his difficulty in this, so to get Co-proxamol into his stomach and circulation a stout Ryle's tube would have been inserted and a suspension of ground up tablets instilled. This might explain the abrasion of his lower lip which Dr Hunt could not.

It was a common happening in anaesthesia if the blade of the laryngoscope was not lubricated and the lip was not held down as it was introduced, the lip coming up against the incisors. Dr Hunt – "Yes, in the mouth there was a small abrasion on the lower lip. This was of the order of 0.6 by 0.3 centimetres, so very small; and there was no significant reaction to it.

Q. How could that abrasion have occurred?

A. With the particular appearance and location of this abrasion then it may have been caused by contact with the teeth, in other words biting."

If a murder is to be made to look like suicide then the act has to be separate from the scene so that it is not contaminated by evidence of crime. It is possible that he was winched down from a helicopter with a man holding him by a 'fire mans lift'. The cutting of the left wrist and ulnar artery would have been done later with great difficulty, given the very unsuitable knife, at the final scene on Harrowdown Hill. Although it seems there was plentiful herbage in the wood, no police witness described a path that was taken by David Kelly from the bridle path to the tree. If he was winched down through the tree canopy that would explain the three abrasions on his scalp, and on dissection – two bruises over his chest on the left side, one bruise below his left knee and two below the right. But Dr Hunt's explanations are of interest. (8) see paras 18.4 to 19.5.

And how might his life have been ended? The morbid possibilities are wide. Dr Hunt described a 'tiny red lesion of uncertain origin on the inner aspect of the right thigh.' It is not reported that the tissues beneath the skin were dissected so this was not excluded as an injection site. But transdermal injection can be used and eutectic solutions/creams etc as shown by Mossad's attempts to assassinate Khaled Meshaal. As for agents, the ones that leave no trace are chosen. Physostigmine was used, again by Mossad, on Mahboub in Dubai with the help of sixteen cloned passports for entry and exit.

Our laws have been subverted; there has been no inquest. And Miriam Stevenson, through careful study and analysis, has shown that an inquest in this case would now be shackled in many ways. We were right to insist upon one although the sacrifices of time and effort have been vast. Others have sacrificed money. When the plea to the High Court was mounted in the summer of 2011 (9), Margaret Hindle and Miles Goslett, a free lance journalist, set up a fund raising campaign. Within a month £30,000 was raised from 440 members of the public. The outrage and disgust that people felt with the authorities over the death of Dr Kelly was great. One message by post conveys this very well –

*"I am a pensioner with very limited funds, and only say this as I feel that this is so important*

*to our Country that all efforts should be made to expose both governments of treating the public with total, and extreme contempt, As an ex Soldier thought that I had fought for democracy and pride in British standards. I feel let down, and betrayed by both Parties, the last for being totally vacuous and beyond all credibility, and practically the latest who seem to have lost all moral fibre, for which we were, as a nation, so proud. I wish the campaign well, and hope that you can give us back some pride and expose this cover-up."*

I consider the deportation of Dr Kelly from Kuwait as being highly significant. His withering dismissal regarding the two machines which had been promoted strongly by the US as being for germ warfare by Saddam's forces was even more significant.

The last words are Dr Hunt's -

Knox. You have already dealt with this, I think, but could you confirm whether, as far as you could tell on the examination, there was any sign of third party involvement in Dr Kelly's death?

Dr Nicholas Hunt. No, there was no pathological evidence to indicate the involvement of a third party in Dr Kelly's death. Rather, the features are quite typical, I would say, of self inflicted injury if one ignores all the other features of the case.

This went without remark or question and characterised the whole.

NB All the words and ideas in this piece are the author's alone.

## Notes

- 1 .  
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090128221546/http://www.the-hutton-inquiry.org.uk/>
- 2 .  
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1301210/Detective-Dr-David-Kellys-body-raises-questions-death.html#ixzz0y8AldUwV>
- 3 .  
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1311255/Dr-David-Kellys-body-obviously-moved-Paramedic-death-scene-reveals-concerns-Hutton-Inquiry.html>
- 4 .  
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090128221546/http://www.the-hutton-inquiry.org.uk/content/report/chapter05.htm#a29> para 151
- 5 .  
<http://dhalpin.infoaction.org.uk/23-articles/dr-david-kelly/144-letter-to-ms-c-f-floyd-investigation-officer-general-medical-council>
- 6 .  
<http://dhalpin.infoaction.org.uk/23-articles/dr-david-kelly/149-concerns-re-evidence-of-professor-shepherd>

7. <http://dhalpin.infoaction.org.uk/23-articles/dr-david-kelly/146-shorrocks-gmc>
8. <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090128221546/http://www.the-hutton-inquiry.org.uk/content/transcripts/hearing-trans33.htm>
9. <http://dhalpin.infoaction.org.uk/23-articles/dr-david-kelly/122-an-inquest-for-dr-david-kelly-now-or-never-our-laws>

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Dr. David Halpin](#), Global Research, 2013

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Dr. David Halpin](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)