

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. I, No. 20

July 1, 1969

A Textbook Example of Official Deceit

THE KENNEDY AUTOPSY FRAUD

How the Public Was Duped About the Cause of the President's Death

According to the wishful thinking of Judas Epstein and The New York Times, the Clay Shaw trial fiasco was "The Final Chapter in the Assassination Controversy." Not so, dear friends. If nobody else does, TRUTH LETTER will keep the issue alive; it won't let a single matter drop.

There has been, in my view, far too much discussion of trivia, technicalities and side issues in this controversy. We'll never beat the enemy on their home ground, which is ballistics. But we can show them up for the crooks they are by analyzing and tearing apart the pattern of deception which they have consistently used in the assassination of President Kennedy as in the subsequent murders of Sen. Robert Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King.

The outstanding example of official skulduggery in the JFK assassination is the autopsy fraud which was carefully prepared in advance and carried out with cool efficiency. Because an honest autopsy is the best means of ascertaining the cause of a person's death, the Johnson regime, which had prepared and executed the assassination of President Kennedy, with the help of the CIA and the FBI, took every conceivable step to make sure that a sham autopsy took place and that the X-rays and photos that had to be made even in these fake proceedings, in order to keep up pretenses, be kept from the public eye as long as possible, if not forever.

The first step was the disgraceful kidnaping of the President's body from the lawful jurisdiction of the Dallas coroner's office, which was cynically disguised as an act of reverence for the exalted status of the murdered man and carried out under the direction of pseudo-friends of the late President. I have dealt with this matter at considerable length in my book OSWALD: THE TRUTH and shall not, therefore, revert to it in detail.

If I raise the issue here again, the reason is that the Clay Shaw trial and its reverberations in Washington have brought forth a good many hitherto concealed facts and have shed new light on dubious aspects. And every one of the new developments has borne out and strengthened my contention that the so-called autopsy of President Kennedy was an all-out fraud, designed to hide the fact that the Chief Executive had been slain in a crossfire ambush and to make the world believe that Lee Harvey Oswald had been the killer. The saddest part of it all is that many eminent and prominent personalities who had not been personally involved in the conspiracy subsequently chose to cooperate with the Usurper and his gang and help prevent exposure of the autopsy fraud for the sake of maintaining the pseudo-integrity of the Establishment.

That the autopsy in Washington - which had no lawful jurisdiction in the case at all - was carried out in gross defiance of all normal rules for such proceedings, has been revealed by the reluctant testimony at the Shaw trial, on Feb. 24-25, 1969, of Col. Pierre A. Finck, one of the three military doctors who performed the sham autopsy under orders. Not an impartial coroner presided over the inquest, as the law prescribes in every civilized country, but an army general and a navy admiral who, if they were not somehow involved themselves in the plot, had every reason to want to please the now commander-in-chief and who certainly took his orders. It was a thoroughly rigged show, then, and it produced the expected phony results.

Not only was there no judicial control of the autopsy proceedings, as the law requires as a matter of course, but the doctors who performed it, including Col. Finck, were lacking in the necessary qualifications. Let us recall, in this respect, what Dr. Cyril H. Wecht, director of the Institute of Forensic Sciences, Duquesne University School of Law and director of the Pittsburgh Institute of Legal Medicine, has written in Appendix D to Josiah Thompson's book "Six Seconds in Dallas:"

"Had President Kennedy been a European head of state, his government would have appointed the most eminent forensic pathologist in the country to conduct the autopsy. As assistants, such a man would have had two or three other forensic experts or heads of medico-legal institutes. It is history's profound loss that men of this caliber were not appointed to perform the President's autopsy. Had they been, nearly all the troubling questions about the assassination which continue to vex us today could have been settled at the outset with scientific precision..."

Dr. Wecht, who is himself one of the top forensic pathologists in the U.S., here clearly senses that something was terribly wrong with the way the autopsy was set up, but like so many other Warren Report critics he cannot bring himself to believe that it was a deliberate fraud instigated by Lyndon B. Johnson to wipe out the traces of his own foul deed. Were he to accept the horrendous thought that "history's profound loss" was intentional, because history was to be falsified, he might well despair of a country and a way of life where such monstrous things can happen. That is the underlying reason why so many eminent personalities, who in their minds and hearts know or at least sense the truth, have preferred to play LBJ's game. The alternative was simply unbearable for them.

Further on, Dr. Wecht writes: "It is troubling in the extreme, then, to learn that a hospital pathologist was in charge of the President's autopsy. Commander (now Captain) James J. Humes of Bethesda Naval Hospital directed the autopsy. With the exception of a single course at the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, Commander Humes had no special knowledge or expertise in forensic pathology... He was assisted by Navy Commander J. Thornton Boswell, like Humes a hospital pathologist with no special experience in medico-legal autopsies. After Commanders Humes and Boswell saw the body and realized how difficult their job would be, Lt. Col. Pierre Finck of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology was called in to assist. Lt. Col. Finck is an able forensic pathologist, but his experience as of November 1963 had been mainly administrative - limited chiefly to reviewing files, pictures and records of finished cases. More importantly, his position at the autopsy table on November 22 was extremely difficult. He had been summoned only after the autopsy had begun, and he was working in a Navy hospital under the direction of a Navy doctor..."

What the difference between a hospital pathologist and forensic pathologist is, and why it is so important that the autopsy of a murder victim should be entrusted to the latter category of doctors alone, is explained by Dr. Wecht in these terms: (to be continued in the next issue)

Highlights and Lessons of the Clay Shaw Trial

Where Garrison Went Wrong (ctd.)

From a source very close to District Attorney Jim Garrison, I have just received a letter which says in part: "... Garrison, of course, knew how the American news media would treat the trial, so he did not use many of his witnesses, and held back on much of his evidence. His strategy considered the trial to be only one step of many, leading to the conviction of all the assassins and the exposure of the top structure above them. However, the strategy backfired when the jury, with lingering doubts about the solidity of Russo's and Speisel's testimony, could not find it in their hearts and minds to decide that Shaw was Guilty of conspiracy. The testimony proved beyond a shadow of doubt that Shaw knew Oswald, or at least someone posing as Oswald, and knew Ferrie and certainly did something together with them. Certain of Jim's other witnesses, notably Reverend Broshears, Jack Martin, David Lewis, Clyde Johnson, the taxicab driver from Dallas, and Darryl Garner had records so peculiar or bad that Shaw's lawyer's attacks on them, supported by the newsmakers, would have been much worse than those on Russo and Speisel. Jim now admits it was a bad move, but if the perjury trial ever takes place, he will not pull any punches or hold anything or anyone back..."

I hope so, but as of now it is almost unbelievable to what extent Garrison has been holding back on his evidence and pulling his punches. Compared to his previous public statements, which were generally outspoken and forceful, his presentation of the essentials and background of the JFK assassination, at the Shaw trial, was incredibly wishy-washy and evasive. Somewhere along the line, a very strong force seems to have pulled the DA from his pedestal and changed the mighty warrior for the truth into a lame duck.

When did this astonishing metamorphosis occur? It must have been fairly recently as witnessed by an incident that occurred on June 17, 1968, during the long period of legal maneuvering that preceded the trial. On that date, a three-judge federal panel in New Orleans took under advisement four motions filed by Shaw's lawyers and, in a countermove, by Garrison. One of the defense motions aimed to bring Attorney General Ramsey Clark into the suit as a defendant. The purpose of this motion was to get a ruling on the validity of the Warren Report which Shaw's lawyers wanted to have declared as "binding on all courts."

In arguing this motion in federal court, Shaw's chief counsel, Irvin Dymond said: "It is our position that it is the duty of the U.S. attorney general to become a party to this action" to protect the interest of the United States. He cited part of the U.S. legal code which he said makes it the duty of the attorney general to prosecute or defend any case in which the government has an interest.

Dymond then cited four reasons the government should have an interest in this case. While one of these reasons referred to a procedural matter, the other three are of the highest interest even today. For, according to Dymond,

"The District Attorney is attempting to brand the President of the United States as an accessory after the fact in the Kennedy slaying;

"The investigation attempts to impugn the chief justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, all other members of the Warren Commission and all federal investigative agencies;

"The investigation seeks to destroy confidence in the U.S. government. The District Attorney would have you believe there was one mammoth conspiracy encompassing everybody, including the President, the Dallas police force, the Secret Service, the FBI and the CIA."

TRUTH LETTER is published every other week by Joachim Joesten, 87-70 173rd Street
New York 11432

Garrison and his aides did not contest any of this, but merely argued that the federal courts had no jurisdiction in the case, a view that was eventually upheld by the panel.

As of June 1968, then, Garrison was still standing by his earlier statements in which he had indeed openly accused the President of the United States, i.e. Lyndon B. Johnson, of being an accessory after the fact in the Kennedy assassination (and why should he become an accessory if he had not been involved in the first place?) and had indeed proclaimed the existence of a mammoth conspiracy in which the Dallas police, the CIA, the FBI and the Secret Service were implicated.

None of all this, however, transpired in the opening statement which Garrison delivered to the Shaw jury on Feb. 6, 1969, or in the trial proceedings. Not once was the CIA mentioned in that statement, nor was there any direct reference to President Johnson. Only in one paragraph was there a vague hint of what Garrison had previously spelled out clearly and forcefully: "It is the position of the State of Louisiana that, regardless of the power which might bring about the execution of a President of the United States, whether it be initiated by a small group or the highest possible force, neither the planning of his murder nor any part of it will be regarded in Louisiana as being above the law."

Next to his failure to uphold in his address to the jury the grave charges he had previously made against Johnson and the federal investigative agencies, Garrison's most grievous mistake was to gloss over a key element in the conspiracy, namely the use by the plotters of a False or Second Oswald.

It cannot be emphasized too much that Garrison on a number of occasions and particularly in his Playboy interview had clearly and unmistakably acknowledged the existence of an impostor who impersonated Oswald in order to incriminate him. After recounting some of the telltale episodes which I had previously described in ample detail in my book Oswald: The Truth, Garrison told the interviewer: "I could go on and on recounting similar instances, but there is no doubt that there was indeed a 'second Oswald'." He added, however, that he was reluctant to stress this angle because, as he put it, "it was a story that already made Doctor No and Goldfinger read like auditors' reports."

This was, indeed, the crux of Garrison's problem and, unfortunately, he made a complete mess of it. He had on his hands a case of extreme complexity, as usually happens when the intelligence services are at work, which he tried to explain to the jury in the simplest possible terms for fear that, unable to follow him, they would reject his arguments out of hand. They did so, anyway, because even the skeletonized case which he presented to the jurors was too much for them, and thus the effect he had sought to achieve by sacrificing the best parts of his case was nullified. And Garrison had ingloriously missed the occasion to write an unforgettable chapter of history.

He became, as the French like to say, a "terrible simplifier" and now he is understandably sorry. As the above-cited letter from one of his friends shows, Garrison is still aware of the possibility - or rather the fact - that the person with whom Shaw conspired was "someone posing as Oswald," but he gave no indication of this in his opening statement or during the trial. By not even mentioning that possibility, the DA in effect ruined the testimony of his key witness Perry R. Russo, who had described a person ("Leon Oswald") decidedly different in appearance and manners from Lee Harvey Oswald and who now became an easy game for the defense lawyers, as will be further detailed below.

Worse still, Garrison committed a complete about-face on the vital question of Oswald's guilt. On this point, his opening statement and his further presentation of the case are in flagrant contradiction with his earlier statements. (to be continued in No. 21).

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, 1968-69 (ctd.)

Davis added, "And as an attorney who has handled many important criminal cases over the past 37 years I am not going to put my reputation on the line for something I don't really believe."

As far as I know, Mr. Davis is the only personality in America who has publicly voiced the opinion that the three assassinations were linked. Let us explore this angle further.

Chapter V

Sam Yorty Calls the Tune

President John F. Kennedy was murdered in the bailiwick of one of Lyndon B. Johnson's best friends and staunchest supporters, the Texas oil magnate H.L. Hunt who thanks to his tax-free millions has for decades controlled everything in Dallas, from City Hall down. Sen. Robert Kennedy was murdered in the bailiwick of another good friend and staunch supporter of LBJ, Los Angeles mayor Sam Yorty. Coincidence? Not at all.

It is an incontrovertible fact that Yorty, who has been mayor of Los Angeles since 1961, hated the Kennedys and has engaged in a running feud with them since John F. Kennedy, at the 1960 Democratic National Convention, bested the man Yorty had wanted to win the nomination for president - Lyndon B. Johnson.

According to "Current Biography," which in 1967 did a biographical sketch of the L.A. mayor, "...reports from fellow Democrats led Yorty to believe (in 1960) that Kennedy's unlimited money had enabled him to 'purchase' the Presidential nomination from under the nose of Yorty's favorite, Lyndon B. Johnson..."

After John F. Kennedy had won the nomination, Yorty bolted the Democratic Party, throwing his support instead to the Republican standard-bearer, Richard Nixon. He even wrote a pamphlet entitled "I cannot Take Kennedy." H.L. Hunt, Bobby Baker and a few others who had vainly sought to enthrone LBJ at the 1960 Convention could not "take" Kennedy either and so these fellows, with the aid of the like-minded heads of the CIA and the FBI got together to take his life instead. This done, Yorty returned to the Democratic fold now under the thumb of his great friend Lyndon B. Johnson; needless to say, he was not punished for his 1960 act of disloyalty to the party.

The Watts riots of 1965, brutally suppressed by Yorty's police, proved even to those who had not previously believed it that the L.A. mayor is an arch-reactionary and a racist. His recent, unfortunately successful, campaign against the popular Negro candidate for mayor, Thomas Bradley, proved it again.

In August 1966, Yorty was called before the Senate subcommittee investigating big city problems, including the Watts riots, of which Sen. Robert F. Kennedy and Sen. Abraham A. Ribicoff were co-chairmen. At the hearings, both Senators took Yorty to task for having failed to provide leadership, particularly regarding ghetto problems. That, coming from a Kennedy, was too much for Yorty. He could not "take" Robert Kennedy either.

The following day he held a news conference at which he suggested that the investigation was politically motivated, to enhance Robert Kennedy's chances for the Presidency. "I just got caught in a crossfire of Bobby Kennedy attempting to undermine President Lyndon Johnson," he was quoted by Newsweek (Sept. 5, 1966) as having said.

Crossfire, eh? Like the one President Kennedy got caught in at Dallas?
 (to be continued in the next issue)