

Joachim Joesten's

```
|| ..... ||  
|| TRUTH LETTER ||  
|| ..... ||  
|| ..... ||
```

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. III, No. 15

7890 Gutenberg, Germany

April 15, 1971

Editorial: All the Murderers Are on the Right, All the Victims Are on the Left.

Open Letter to an American Historian

The time has come, Mr. Historian, for you to stand up and be counted on the side of Truth. For years now, you have been living and teaching in a world of total unreality, made up of official lies and fabrications; a world of "patriotic" make-believe in which anything goes as long as the pious pretenses are preserved; a world of violence cum hypocrisy the like of which has never existed before in the annals of mankind.

The America in which you were born, and which you believe still exists, died on November 22, 1963, at Dallas, Texas. It was murdered in a camouflaged coup d'état of unparalleled ferocity and duplicity.

As a historian, you are familiar with coup d'états, but all your insight and training did not enable you to discern the one that occurred in your own country and which, in less than eight years, has changed the face of America and the world beyond recognition.

You may have had your doubts about Oswald, the "lone assassin", at the time the triple slaying occurred in Dallas, but when the Warren Report came out you fell in line and accepted the "historical document" as gospel truth, regardless of its manifest fabrications, distortions, suppression of evidence and ludicrously false conclusions. You just couldn't bring yourself to believe that seven distinguished personalities, including the Chief Justice of the United States, could stoop, after a seemingly painstaking investigation, to render a deliberately false and fraudulent verdict. You looked at the people who wrote the Warren Report, not at the report itself, and you were impressed. That was exactly the way Lyndon B. Johnson, who benefited most from the crime, had it set up for you.

Again, as a historian, you are familiar with the concept of "reason of state," which, throughout history, has been used to pervert the truth and buttress injustice, but it did not occur to you that the seven sages might have yielded to its dictates, rather than to their consciences, when they blamed Oswald for a deed he could not have committed. To your mind, the obnoxious raison d'état, like the coup d'état, were foreign phenomena (as the French terms indicate), not applicable to American events.

You were wrong. Like the rest of the country you were duped, deceived, brainwashed and manipulated. For all your acumen and experience as a historian, you have been unable to look through the false pretenses of a violent overthrow that happened in your own time and your own country. That was because in all your studies of ancient, mediaeval and modern history you neglected the one subject one has to study most thoroughly if he wants to grasp the significance of most current events: the ways and workings of intelligence.

President John F. Kennedy was not killed by Lee Harvey Oswald, or any other lone or deranged assassin. He fell victim to an elaborate plot concocted by the Central Intelligence Agency's Department of Covert Operations ("Dirty Tricks"), with the connivance of powerful figures in the Pentagon, the FBI, and the Cabinet itself. He was ambushed by a C.I.A. commando numbering at least a dozen people and was ruthlessly slain in an over-kill operation marked by intensive crossfire from several directions.

And Kennedy was killed for a reason, which you, as a trained observer with a professional sense of history, should have suspected all along. As a matter of fact, he was murdered for a number of reasons, but primarily because he stood in the way of the Vietnam escalation coveted by the Pentagon, the C.I.A., and the oil interests (which were then about to invest billions of dollars in the exploration of the immense offshore oil riches of the South China Sea, requiring control of the Indochina coast). America has paid dearly in blood, tears and turmoil for the success of this shameful conspiracy by key elements of the military-industrial complex.

You don't have to take it from me, Mr. Historian, even though I have been investigating the true background and the motivation of the Dallas events for more years than any other critic of the official version and have published more millions of words about all its aspects than any other writer (eight printed books, the 250,000-word mimeographed TRILOGY OF MURDER, plus 63 issues of TRUTH LETTER to date). For, after all, I am only an amateur detective and an amateur historian.

Take it instead from District Attorney Jim Garrison of New Orleans, a professional investigator of great competence, integrity and insight, who has spent more than four years probing into the murky background of what he himself has been the first to label the Dallas coup d'état.

Thwarted by Government interference in his attempt to bring Clay Shaw to justice, Garrison has recently taken his case to the public with a remarkable book entitled "A Heritage of Stone" (G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1970) which I have reviewed in TRUTH LETTER (issue of December 1, 1970) at some length. I'm sure you have heard about it, too, although they tried again to kill the book through a conspiracy of silence, as was done most effectively with my own books on the subject.

I can't believe, Mr. Historian, that, having carefully read Mr. Garrison's book - and, for better understanding, also the 2,500-word letter he recently sent me, which was published integrally in the April 1, 1971 issue of TRUTH LETTER, you could still fail to see the nature of the game that was played at Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963.

Having granted the premise that this was a highly sophisticated intelligence operation, you will find that all the other pieces of the jigsaw puzzle quickly fall into place. And then you will come to understand the magnitude of the misfortune that has befallen America and the world as a result of the first coup d'état in U.S. history.

Proceeding from there, you will also begin to understand that the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy in 1968 was in a way also a coup d'état - a preventive one designed to forestall his almost unavoidable accession to the presidency, where he would have had the means to get at the truth about the assassination of his brother, and to punish the guilty ones. The killing of Robert Kennedy was, in a way, an act of self-defense by the same forces that had been responsible for the assassination of the President, i.e. primarily the C.I.A., the Pentagon and LBJ (with the FBI conniving in both cases).

One has to have a sense of history to understand all this properly and that is where you come in. Having been vilely betrayed by self-serving politicians and venal opinion-makers, the American people have but one chance left of ever learning the truth about the Kennedy assassinations: through the relentless labors of fearless scholars.

It is incumbent on you, Mr. Historian, to set the record straight, at least for future generations. You have learned the discipline of your profession and you know how to wield the tools of historic truth-seeking. You have been trained to sift and test the facts, to probe and weigh the evidence, to use your head, to substitute cool reasoning for blindfold belief. You can do the job.

You can do it, for one thing, by initiating, at your university or college, one or more research projects designed to bring out the truth about these assassinations. You can do it by instilling into your students a healthy scepticism towards the pronouncements of an illegal regime that was built on murder and sustains itself through continuous lying about domestic as well as foreign affairs.

You can do it, above all, by publishing the definitive, honest and truthful account of America's transition from constitutional government to what is virtually a military dictatorship resting on those two authoritarian pillars of secret service, the F.B.I. and the C.I.A. (would Richard Nixon be where he is today if President Kennedy had not been murdered?)

This is a great challenge and an enormous task. If you don't feel up to handling it all by yourself, then gather around you a few open-minded colleagues and get started on a joint research project, even if it is on a long-term basis. Believe me, Mr. Historian, the climate of public opinion, now so hostile to enlightened discussion of the subject, will change, perhaps sooner than you think. Five years from now, maybe earlier, I predict, there will be a great public clamor for truthful information of how and why the hopeful Kennedy era ended so abruptly. A nation fooled and subdued by two ignoble governments based on usurpation will avidly want to read the truth of how it all happened.

For you, and any fellow-historian worth his salt, this is the opportunity of a lifetime to make a great name by serving a great cause. Don't let it go by unused.

Publish or perish, professor.

PS. I shall be glad to place all <sup>of</sup> my vast documentation on the subject at the disposal of any non-official study group that may be formed as a result of this public appeal for the purposes of a scholarly investigation of America's first coup d'etat and its consequences. J.J.

---

### New Light on the Robert Kennedy Murder

#### Another Exclusive Treat in Store for TL Readers

Thanks to the tireless efforts of a devoted TL correspondent on the west Coast, I have obtained two more semi-secret documents of exceptional interest which, focussed together, throw an all-illuminating beam of light on the well-hidden background of the Robert Kennedy assassination.

One is the complete text of the RFK autopsy report by Dr. Thomas T. Noguchi, Chief Medical Examiner-Coroner of the County of Los Angeles, and his four-man staff. While it would not be possible for me to reproduce in TRUTH LETTER the full text of this 62-page document (much of which is couched in highly technical language, anyway) I intend to use selected excerpts from it to show up the falsity of the official version of the Senator's death. Indeed, this conscientious report on an unusually painstaking autopsy (one far more thorough and authoritative than the slipshod and fraudulent JFK autopsy report by the three military doctors) proves that Sirhan did not kill Robert Kennedy. Sure, he fired wildly at the Senator, but missed him, except for one glancing shot. The fatal bullet came from the gun of a man standing closely behind Kennedy in the pantry, whose identity is no longer secret.

The other of the two documents referred to above is the 271-page Reporter's Transcript of the June 7, 1968 Grand Jury Proceedings at L.A. which led to the indictment of Sirhan. Again the truthful testimony of Dr. Noguchi (who was later temporarily hounded out of office on the basis of trumped-up charges) and other honest witnesses as well as the manifestly contrived and lying testimony of certain police officials (in particular the LAPD ballistics expert DeWayne A. Wolfer) unwittingly reveal the basic pattern of a conspiracy that is, in essence, amazingly similar to the Dallas coup d'etat. Clearly the same crooked masterminds inspired the plot and the same ruthless extermination machine - the C.I.A. - carried it out.

Again, it will only be possible to use excerpts from this document, but they will reveal enough of the truth to present a clear picture of what really happened. "New Light on the Robert Kennedy Murder" will start in June, in the TRILOGY OF MURDER section of TL, following the conclusion of "The Frameup of James Earl Ray."

---

Note: Due to the pressure of space, the continuation of the "Panel Review" again has to be postponed to the next issue. Sorry.

## Chapter IV

A Key Element in the Frameup: Mary Jo's Pregnancy

Was Mary Jo Kopechne pregnant at the time of her death?

There is all but conclusive evidence that she was.

I have already quoted that significant line from the Olsen book about Dr. Mills examining the body at the scene of the accident: "It was not impossible that the victim had been in the early months of pregnancy, but looking at her small white belly and feeling the uterus, Dr. Mills doubted it..."

Now, why would a medical examiner tell a reporter, or give him to understand at all, that the possibility of pregnancy did exist, if he had not noticed some signs of it? Even in our day, the normal presumption is that an unmarried woman is not pregnant. It would have been a most unwarranted and gratuitous remark, therefore, if Dr. Mills had not had some reason to suspect possible pregnancy.

Then there is the significant disclosure by Mary Jo's mother, in an exclusive interview with the New York Sunday News (March 29, 1970), that her daughter had been having a rather torrid romance with a young diplomat in the last few months before her death. The paper reported:

"... Mrs. Kopechne said she was aware of the gossip and 'snide remarks' that her daughter had a romantic interest in Kennedy. Such remarks, she said, were 'so ridiculous that they make me a little nauseous.'

"Then she disclosed that Mary Jo had been going 'quite steadily' with a U.S. State Department diplomat who was sent overseas a month before the Chappaquiddick accident.

"My girl wasn't that fickle' to take up with another man so soon after her boy friend left Washington, Mrs. Kopechne said.

"She declined to identify the diplomat, but said he was 'a nice fellow, in his early 30s.'

"Mary Jo cared for him very much, but marriage wasn't his thing, Mrs. Kopechne said. 'If he had asked her to marry him, she would have married him. I used to tease her about wasting her time on him, and she said: "I don't care if I'm wasting my time or not."'

Such words betray a certain recklessness on the part of Mary Jo and may well indicate that she had gone the limit with her boy friend, and that there had been consequences.

In the light of this authoritative disclosure by her own mother, a story which was published on May 18, 1970, in the Canadian weekly Midnight under the headline: "Ted Kennedy May Be Sacrificing His Career to Protect the Identity of Mary Jo's Lover" cannot be dismissed lightly. The author, Norman Land, wrote:

"...The testimony given by Teddy, informed sources say, simply doesn't hold up. For some reason he refuses to be frank, to state what really happened.

"And what did really happen? A former high-level organizer in the Kennedy political machine sees it this way:

"I know Ted Kennedy, and like everybody else I'd be a fool if I didn't admit he's hiding something. A lot of people think he withheld information to protect his career, but I can tell you right now that's not the case.

"For one thing, he isn't like that, no matter what others may say. He's a courageous, honorable man. Sure, he used to have presidential ambitions, but not at the expense of his own self-respect.

The new book by Joachim Joesten TRILOGY OF MURDER  
 An analysis and interpretation of the John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy and Dr.  
 Martin Luther King assassinations. - Copyright by J. Joesten, 1968-1971.

The Frameup of James Earl Ray (ctd. from Vol. III, No. 14)

To begin with, here is the text of the Bonebrake statement, again from the transcript:

AND this witness, George Jacob Bonebrake, on 12314 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland, on oath says:

I have already sworn an affidavit in these proceedings. I am a fingerprint examiner in the Federal Department (sic), Washington, D.C., having held that position since February, 1941. During that time I have made millions of fingerprint comparisons for identification purposes.

On April 5, 1968, I received a Remington rifle, number 461476, a Redfield telescopic sight, a 17350 and a pair of Bushnell binoculars, DQ 408664. I examined each of those for latent fingerprints. I found one on the rifle, one on the telescopic sight and one on the binoculars.

On April 19th, 1968, I compared those three latent fingerprints with the known fingerprints of James Earl Ray from the officials of the Los Angeles Police Department. I found that the print on each of these items had been made by the same individual as had made the prints listed as those of James Earl Ray.

I have prepared comparison photographs. I now produce photographic enlargements, one portion being labeled "latent fingerprint 1" as an enlargement of the latent fingerprint on the rifle... another being labeled ink fingerprint 1 is an enlargement of the left thumb print appearing on the fingerprint card from the officials of the Los Angeles Police Department -- this Bow Street Exhibit 6. I found 14 characteristic points of identity between these two.

I also produce on a similar card a comparison of the fingerprint found on the telescopic sight. I found in respect of that eleven points of identity -- Bow Street Exhibit 7. I did the same in respect of the print found on the binoculars. I found eleven points here. I produce that card -- Bow Street Exhibit 8.

I also examined the fingerprint files in Washington containing the fingerprints of James Earl Ray taken in connection with his imprisonment in Missouri Penitentiary in 1960. I compared the Los Angeles prints with the Missouri prints. They were the prints of one and the same man.

I now identify in the authenticated documents before the Court the Los Angeles prints which are Exhibit 1 to my affidavit, Exhibit 2 to that is the Missouri prints.

I look now at Bow Street Exhibit 5. I have compared those with the Los Angeles prints, with the Missouri prints, with the latent print on the rifle, with the print on the telescopic sight, and with the print on the binoculars -- each of those last 3,4,5 to my affidavit. In my opinion these were all of one and the same man.

Now, on the face of it, this identification by an indisputable expert sounds mighty impressive of course. On closer inspection, however, one finds that it is sheer window-dressing, a matchless example of prestidigitation with fingerprints, unworthy of an FBI fingerprint examiner of (then) 27 years' standing and totally unworthy of being produced in, and approved by, a British court of law.

(to be continued in the next issue)