

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newfaking in the Press

Vol. I, No. 21

July 15, 1969

The Kennedy Autopsy Fraud (ctd.)

"The specialty of forensic pathology is recognized by the American Board of Pathology, which gives subspecialty examinations in this field. The practice, experience, and knowledge of a forensic pathologist are to a great extent quite different from those of a general 'hospital' pathologist. The hospital pathologist spends much of his time examining organs or tissue slides as a means to establishing diagnoses on living patients. When he is called upon to do an autopsy, it usually concerns a patient who has succumbed in the hospital from some natural disease. The autopsy most often is performed to confirm a diagnosis already arrived at, or for research purposes.

"The forensic pathologist operates within quite a different setting. Often associated with the medical examiner's office, his job is not to verify an already arrived at diagnosis, but to establish independently the exact cause and manner of death. Whereas the hospital pathologist's milieu is natural disease, the forensic pathologist's setting is very often violent death. The expertise and tasks of the two specialties are quite distinct. As my colleague, Dr. Milton Helporn, Chief Medical Examiner of New York City, has noted, to give a hospital pathologist a gunshot wound case is 'like sending a seven-year-old boy who has taken three lessons on the violin over to the New York Philharmonic and expecting him to perform a Tchaikovsky symphony. He knows how to hold the violin and bow, but he has a long way to go before he can make music.' ..."

Ponder these remarks by two top authorities in the field well. They make it perfectly clear that the three military doctors who were called upon to perform the autopsy on President Kennedy's body were either totally unqualified or ill-qualified for the job. The man in charge of the autopsy, Commander (now Captain) James J. Humes of Bethesda Naval Hospital, in the words of Dr. Wecht, "had no special knowledge or expertise in forensic pathology." His official title was "Director of Laboratories of the Naval Medical School at Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md." Even for the layman it stands to reason that an administrative official in charge of laboratories is not the right person to direct an autopsy in a murder case, least of all in the assassination of the Chief Executive.

Humes' assistant, Navy Commander J. Thornton Boswell, was also a hospital pathologist with no special experience in medico-legal autopsies, Dr. Wecht points out. As to the third man in the trio, Dr. Wecht writes:

"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

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

working in a Navy hospital under the direction of a Navy doctor..."

The whole setup, then, couldn't have been more inadequate - or more suspicious. Instead of the most eminent forensic pathologists in the country, two administrative officers and a hospital pathologist without forensic experience were selected to perform the most important autopsy in contemporary American history. As was to be expected, they did behave like seven-year-old boys trying to perform a Tchaikovsky symphony...

What was the reason for such a malapropos? Couldn't the new Administration get hold of more experienced and generally better qualified doctors to do the job? Listen to Dr. Wecht again: "Yet within one hour's flying time were some of the greatest forensic pathologists in the world. Dr. Russell S. Fisher in Baltimore, Dr. Milton Helpern in New York City, Dr. Joseph W. Spelman in Philadelphia, Dr. Geoffrey T. Mann in Virginia and Dr. Alan R. Moritz in Cleveland (and, it should of course be added, Dr. Cyril H. Wecht in Pittsburgh - J.J.) are only some of the people who are located in areas quite close to Washington, D.C., and who could have been called upon by the government to assist. The irony of the situation is that these experts are men the military has called upon countless times in the past. They have lectured at the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology on forensic pathology. These are men the government uses to teach, yet in this autopsy - probably the most important of the century - the government chose not to call on them. Much of the controversy and mystery which enfolds the case owes its origin to this tragic choice..."

There is no mystery and "tragic" is certainly not the right adjective to describe this choice. I could think of a dozen more appropriate, but the good doctor would probably disapprove of them as being too offensive. Although he himself has made an absolutely devastating case for the contention that the Kennedy autopsy was a total fraud, Dr. Wecht is obviously reluctant to draw the inevitable conclusion from the premises he postulates.

As to Lt. Col. Pierre Finck being "an able forensic pathologist," I also beg to differ on the strength of the Clay Shaw trial transcript which strikingly shows up the pitiful role Dr. Finck played in the case. However, before we proceed to that particular matter, a few more quotes from Dr. Wecht's article are in order:

"Cdr. Humes's final autopsy report and his subsequent testimony before the Warren Commission reveal mistakes of procedure and technique which only an inexperienced person could make in performing a medico-legal autopsy. Experienced forensic pathologists do not probe bullet wounds with their fingers, as Cdr. Humes did (2H367), nor do their autopsy reports include newspaper articles as relevant to their findings. (See 16H979)."

Dr. Wecht then goes into a detailed discussion of some of the glaring mistakes and omissions the three military doctors committed and sums up the case in these terms:

"Either way we consider these deficiencies, the picture is not reassuring. If the military pathologists on their own decided not to examine the adrenal glands and the left cerebral hemisphere, then they are to be soundly condemned, and their report is to be strongly criticised. If they were told by their military superiors to make the omissions and obeyed that order, then two things follow: (1) The pathologists and their report are totally discredited, and (2) it becomes comprehensible why civilian medico-legal experts were excluded from the autopsy - they could not have been controlled in this way..."

This is, of course, the crux of the matter. These military doctors were not only unqualified for the job, but they were taking orders and performing accordingly. And because the autopsy was meant to be a total fraud, civilian authorities, who might balk at it, were a priori excluded. (to be continued)

Highlights and Lessons of the Clay Shaw Trial

Where Garrison Went Wrong (ctd.)

First, let us recall what Garrison had said at the start of his investigation about Oswald's innocence. As early as February 23, 1967, he publicly stated his belief that Lee Harvey Oswald did not kill President Kennedy. A few days later he amplified this statement by adding that Oswald had not killed Patrolman Tippit either.

In the course of an interview which he gave to a local television station in New Orleans, on the evening of May 21, 1967, Garrison was asked if Oswald had fired the fatal shots in Dallas. He replied, without a moment's hesitation: "No, Lee Harvey Oswald did not even shoot President Kennedy. He did not fire a shot from the Book Depository Building... He did not touch a gun on that day. He was a decoy at first. And then he was a patsy and then he was a victim."

If Garrison from the outset had affirmed Oswald's innocence in the killing of President Kennedy, he later went so far as to represent him as a sort of hero who had in vain attempted to save the President's life. Indeed, at his press conference in New Orleans, on Dec. 26, 1967, Garrison specifically and unambiguously stated that Oswald had been a stool-pigeon for the FBI and, having attended the "final, definitive meeting" of the principals involved in the plot on Nov. 17, 1963, "alerted the FBI that an assassination attempt would be made on President Kennedy in Dallas on Nov. 22."

Now compare to these forthright statements what Garrison had to say about Oswald in his opening address to the jury on Feb. 6, 1969. Outlining the results of his two-year-old investigation, the DA declared that the State would prove five "overt acts" committed in pursuance of the criminal conspiracy in which Clay Shaw allegedly was involved. Three of these acts referred to Lee Harvey Oswald as a plotter who, the statement said, had held a meeting with David W. Ferrie and the defendant, Clay L. Shaw, in the apartment of Ferrie at 3330 Louisiana Parkway in New Orleans during the month of September, 1963; and had discussed with them means and methods of execution of the conspiracy etc.

Specifically, the statement said: "...The evidence further will show that Perry Russo first met Lee Harvey Oswald at David Ferrie's apartment shortly before the principal meeting between the named conspirators took place. At this meeting Oswald, who was cleaning a bolt-action rifle with a telescopic sight, was introduced to Russo by Ferrie as Leon. Perry Russo saw Lee Harvey Oswald at Ferrie's apartment at least once after the meeting of the conspirators. On this occasion Oswald appeared to be having some difficulty with his wife and he gave Russo the impression he was leaving town..."

Now, Garrison knows as well as I do - much better, in fact - that the rather unkempt individual with a stubble several days old whom Russo met three times at Ferrie's apartment and who called himself Leon Oswald was definitely not Lee Harvey Oswald but an impostor who impersonated the real Oswald for the purpose of incriminating him in advance of the assassination (as he did again on numerous occasions in Dallas in the first weeks of November, just before the Dealey Plaza ambush). Hence the ostentatious cleaning of a bolt-action rifle similar to the Carcano that could be traced to Oswald - two months before it was to be used! The whole thing was an elaborate show put on for the purpose of laying a false trail and possibly to enlist Russo as a prospective witness against the real Oswald should the latter for some unforeseen reason go on trial instead of being "liquidated" as planned.

By his failure to tell the jury the truth about this travesty, Garrison laid himself and his star witness, Perry Russo, open to devastating attacks by Shaw's lawyers. Indeed, several witnesses, including the former Marina Oswald and a former landlady told the court that Lee Harvey always looked neat and that he never wore a beard, or even a stubble. Such testimony was bound to make Russo appear as a liar since nobody bothered to explain to the jury that they were dealing with two different persons.

Marina also testified - and for once she was telling the truth - that Lee Harvey, during their entire stay in New Orleans, had spent only one night away from home - and he spent that in jail. To the jury, who did not know that there was a False Oswald in the game - Garrison, in court, never even dropped a hint about this key element of the Kennedy Murder Fraud - this looked like conclusive evidence that Russo, who had described Oswald (Leon Oswald, that is) as Ferrie's roommate, and had claimed to ~~mak~~ have met him on three evenings, was a false witness.

An interesting point I have not previously discussed in any of my books and reports on the subject comes to mind re-reading the transcript of the Clay Shaw trial. Russo testified specifically that the man who had been introduced to him as Leon Oswald was wearing dirty clothes, had unruly hair and a light beard. In answer to a direct question by Assistant DA James L. Alcock, the witness stated that the beard appeared to be three or four days growth.

Why did "Leon Oswald" that night look so obtrusively disreputable? On none of the numerous occasions in Dallas where an impostor who looked strikingly like Lee Harvey Oswald repeatedly planted false clues against the latter in the weeks preceding the assassination (for details, see Oswald: The Truth, Part I, "The False Oswald") did the impersonator look shabby or dishevelled.

I have been giving careful thought to that intriguing question - which nobody else has ever asked in public (though Garrison must certainly have done so in petto), because everybody believes or pretends to believe that "Leon Oswald" and Lee Harvey Oswald were identical persons - and now I believe I have the answer.

Those meetings in Ferrie's apartment were probably put on for the benefit of the prospective witness Perry Russo who was expected to testify at Oswald's trial, if any. (Clay Shaw, parading as "Clem Bertrand" and Ferrie had well-prepared alibis and thus would have nothing to fear). In planning this particular phase of their complex plot, which took into account all foreseeable mishaps and alternatives, the conspirators apparently assumed that Oswald, a temporarily escaped scapegoat, might not be caught until a few days after the assassination. He would then be dragged out of his hiding-place, looking how? Well, of course, wearing dirty clothes, with dishevelled hair and wearing a stubble three or four days old. Just like the man Russo had seen cleaning a bolt-action rifle at Ferrie's apartment and engaging in conspiratorial talk! What a clincher!

Garrison, anxious to keep all unnecessary (or what he considered unnecessary) complications out of the courtroom, in order not to confuse the jury or to give the impression that he had fallen for a "Dr. No" or "Goldfinger" type of fictitious thriller, chose to ignore the clear-cut evidence that the man in Ferrie's apartment impersonated Lee Harvey Oswald and thus ruined his case by bringing easy discredit on his principal witness.

But he did even worse. He made one blunder that is absolutely breathtaking. No. 5 of the "overt acts" is, unbelievably, "Lee Harvey Oswald taking a rifle to the Texas School Book Depository in Dallas, Texas, on or before Nov. 22, 1963." In pursuing this absurd lead, he managed to get himself into a ludicrous position where the roles were actually reversed, he pleading for the truthfulness of the Warren Report and Shaw's lawyers attacking the "historic document!"

(to be continued in the next issue)

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.

Chapter V : Sam Yorty Calls the Tune (ctd.)

According to other published reports, Yorty on this occasion told newspapermen that Robert Kennedy had set a trap for him as part of a "lavish campaign to build himself up and tear President Johnson down. He's trying to ride on his brother's fame and his father's fortune to the presidency."

In an interview with the British newsmagazine Time and Tide (Dec. 12-18, 1968), Yorty predicted that the last survivor among the Kennedy brothers, Sen. Edward Kennedy, would also seek the presidency eventually. "The Kennedys want to make themselves the royal family of the United States," he said. "They have spent a fortune making John Kennedy a martyr. If he had lived he probably would not have got a second term."

John Kennedy was far from being a great president, in Mayor Yorty's judgment, Time and Tide went on to report. "People liked him. They did not like Robert Kennedy. They like Edward Kennedy."

It is necessary to keep Yorty's well-established background as an LBJ henchman and Kennedy-hater firmly in mind, in order to evaluate correctly the meaning of subsequent developments.

Mighty and influential rivals like Lyndon B. Johnson and Sam Yorty hated and feared the Kennedys. They were (and are) determined to stop the "royal family" and to get rid of its presidential aspirants one by one. And they had the power to do something about it.

By contrast, the Oswalds and Sirhans and Rays had neither a motive, nor, as individuals, an opportunity to commit the murders that have been charged to them. Clearly they all were just helpless tools in the hands of the powerful forces that instigated and manipulated them for their own selfish ends. And all of them were framed by their taskmasters in one way or another.

There are a number of striking parallels in the framing of Oswald and Sirhan that point to the same inspiration and the same guiding hand at work. For instance, both Kennedy killers reportedly engaged in rapid firing practice at gun ranges located in the immediate vicinity of the prospective assassination sites and practically on the eve of committing spectacular murder - strange behavior indeed for people about to plunge into the limelight as slayers of prominent politicians!

And then there are those notebooks... First, the "Oswald Diary" in which the writer firmly fixed upon himself a "Marxist" label and thus provided the instigators of President Kennedy's murder with an easy means to falsify the true inspiration of that foul deed and to divert suspicion from their own ranks to the Communist side (the reader will find a detailed exposé of the Oswald Diary Fraud in my book Marina Oswald)

In the Sirhan affair, the same thing happened again with a promptness and precision which clearly indicate the execution of a plan well prepared in advance. And who but Sam Yorty, the Kennedy-hater and LBJ vassal, would take the lead in foisting upon an unsuspecting public a totally false and misleading interpretation of the Sirhan notebooks, which are either complete forgeries or else were written under the influence of liquor, of drugs, or possibly even under duress?

It is precisely because Mayor Yorty jumped into the case so quickly and all by himself, eager and equipped to supply a phony motive and a sham inspiration for Sirhan's as yet incomprehensible deed that I do not hesitate to charge him with complicity in the RFK murder (to be continued in No. 22)