

"All the News That's UNFIT to Print"

Joachim Joesten's

TRUTH LETTER

An antidote to Official Mendacity and newsfaking in the Press

Vol. III, No. 10

February 1, 1971

Editorial: All the fools fell for "Tricky Dick's "Second American Revolution."

Paging Mr. Kutcharenko...

From a correspondent in Antwerp, Belgium, I have just received the following letter:

"Dear Sir - I have obtained your address from the daily paper Gazet van Antwerpen* and would like to get in touch with you, because I warned President John F. Kennedy of the attempt that was to be made on his life, and I also warned his brother Robert exactly three months before his assassination.

"I know for a certainty that Lee H. Oswald was not the assassin, but instead the Russian Ivan Kutcharenko, a native of Kiev, along with two Germans, one American and one Cuban. I talked to the five killers the night of September 4-5, 1963, in a night bar at Antwerp. The Russian was a fighter against the International Brigade in Spain and a partisan of Franco. I know exactly what organization was behind the assassins. I have a file of at least 400 documents. I have already written 200 registered letters to high-placed persons, but they are all afraid and some of them may not even answer me. I also wrote to the (German) weekly papers Der Stern and Der Spiegel, but it was all in vain. I am the little man one doesn't believe and one is afraid of the truth! I would appreciate it very much if I could hear from you. Sincerely etc."

This letter is reproduced for what it may be worth. At this stage, it is of course impossible to say whether or not it represents a genuine lead. Perhaps the name of Ivan Kutcharenko, evidently a Russian exile (of whom the CIA has many in its employ, along with countless Cubans and German soldiers of fortune) rings a bell somewhere in TL's circle of readers. In that case, I hope that reader will communicate with me. In the meantime, I shall try to work a little more information out of my mysterious correspondent in Antwerp, whose full name and address I have. If I am successful, TL readers will be the first to hear about it.

Our friend R.B. Cutler is working on a book about the Mary Jo Kopechne affair and writes "to suggest a small line in TL to the effect that anyone who has any ideas, good or bad, facts, rumors, anything pertaining to Chappaquiddick, please send them to me at Box 1465, Manchester, Mass. 01944..."

Assassination Makes Strange Bedfellows

It does, indeed. Time and again I find myself in the awkward position of sharing the views of political foes in the matter, while having to battle those I would normally be in sympathy with.

The record of America's professional liberals with regard to the three great assassinations is appalling. The Nation, the New Republic, Harper's, the NY Post, the American Civil Liberties Union, etc.etc. all have sided, again and again, with the perpetrators of the Oswald, Sirhan and May frauds. No voice was raised, in these circles,

* A leading Belgian newspaper which is now serializing my "The Murder of Mary Jo Kopechne."

on behalf of truth and justice, in any of these cases. By contrast, some of the most reactionary figures in American public life have come out against the official fakers and adopted a stand very similar to my own. Four examples come immediately to mind:

1 - Senator Russell Long, a Southern racist, goading DA Jim Garrison of New Orleans into undertaking his well-known investigation and backing him all the way through it;

2 - In mid-September 1970, the then Senator George Murphy, a standard-bearer of reaction, startled California by openly hinting at plots in both Kennedy murders. According to the Los Angeles Times of Sept. 16, Murphy remarked at a GOP political luncheon:

"A President and his brother are assassinated, for what reason and by whose order I'm still not certain."

Asked to amplify his statement after the luncheon, Murphy said of the slayings, "Somebody, I think, instigated them." With reference to Sirhan, he told reporters, "I am not certain this young man did it by himself. Neither are you. Neither are the courts."

Such outspokenness did not do Murphy any good. He lost the November election to the "liberal" Democrat John Tunney, a close friend of the Kennedy family, who has yet to evince any marked curiosity about the deaths of the President and the Senator. And thus another voice in search of the truth was lost.

3 - Then there is that remarkable review of the Albert H. Newman book by Redford Evans which appeared in American Opinion of September 1970 of all places. In other words, Evans is most likely a member of the John Birch Society himself, yet he writes:

"Personally, I agree with Jim Garrison that the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (C.I.A.) must have been involved. It seems likely that the C.I.A. is involved in every elaborate intrigue where such power is at stake..." And, about the RFK murder:

"I think there is a feeling, too, that what happened in Los Angeles in June 1968 was a consequence of what had happened in Dallas nearly five years earlier - the coup d'état (sic) of November 22, 1963... hidden forces were involved in the assassination of President Kennedy, and those hidden forces are still active..." (italicized in the original). Yes, sir, this is the Birchite organ speaking, not the NY Post!

4 - Again, it is an authentic Ku-Kluxer and extreme right-wing leader, attorney J. B. Stoner (cf. TL, III, No. 9), who is seeking justice for James Earl Ray and in the process has had some pretty harsh things to say about the FBI and the US Government. What is the A.C.L.U. doing about this outrageous frameup? Nothing.

There is nothing strange, on the other hand, about the Republican leader Richard Nixon sharing the Dallas bed of conspiracy with his nominal "foe", Democratic leader Lyndon B. Johnson. This is a case of birds of a feather flocking together.

The Dr. Nichols Brief (ctd. from TL, no. 9)

Because all autopsy procedures, whether obtained coincidental thereto, and findings thereof, at major hospitals such as the Naval Hospital in Bethesda are meticulously guarded, coded, studied, recorded and kept available for further study, it is difficult for the plaintiff to comprehend the ambiguity surrounding the disposition of the autopsy records, preserved gross specimens, preserved wet tissues, tissues in paraffin blocks, and microscopic preparations cut therefrom, all from this most important autopsy numbered A 63-272 (emphasis added - J.B.) are not all of the related similar items of the prior 271 autopsies for the year 1963 correctly accounted for and available for retrieval as well as the subsequent autopsies done for the remainder of the year 1963? It is standard procedure in all well-organized hospitals to preserve, in containers with wet formaldehyde, important gross specimens and routine representative portions of specimens from all organs acquired during usual routine autopsies. Specific and explicit consent for this retention and preservation of organs and tissues is routinely granted by the surviving spouse coincidental to autopsy permission. In the case

of federal institutions this is written on form SF 523 which also becomes a permanent part of the deceased's record. Further, representative portions of all organs, such as the brain, and lesions such as bullet holes in skin are preserved in paraffin blocks and the microscopic preparations cut therefrom are also preserved forever for future study. This preservation and study of lesions in unusual cases being, in part, the purpose of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology on behalf of all military installations, some civilian hospitals, and independent pathologists. All of the aforementioned specimens, easily identifiable in this, most extraordinary case of the late President Kennedy, will have the code number A 63-272 affixed in some manner. This number permits instant retrieval of any item related to this autopsy by appropriate persons at the Bethesda hospital or the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology in the same manner that corresponding items relating to any other previous or subsequent autopsy may be retrieved for confirmation or modification of diagnosis, study or other tabulation.

Commander Humes' supplementary autopsy report, CE 391, which Admiral Davis could not find, is attached as plaintiff's exhibit "B". It is dated January 6, 1963 (sic in the original; should be 1964 of course - J.J.), or twelve (12) days subsequent to the attestation by the Commandant of the Bethesda Naval Medical Center, vice Admiral C.D. Calloway, M.C., U.S.N., that his command held no additional documents in this case. Commander Humes' supplemental report reveals, on the first page, that routine examination of the brain was not done so the organ may be preserved intact as a gross specimen. No mention is made of the 13 X 22 mm. object later seen by Attorney General Clark's expert review panel in photographs of the brain. This preservation of the brain intact was considered of sufficient importance by Commander Humes that he recorded the fact for future scholars.

The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the United States Navy prides itself on its record keeping. The plaintiff notes that records in the form of official receipts signed by Admiral Birkley exist for such trivial things as a fragment which broke from the coffin during transit from Dallas, also a sheet in which the body of the late President was wrapped during transit.

It must, of course, be realized that the custodian(s) of the requested items from the autopsy may have abandoned the usual identifying number and adopted a secret code for purposes of concealment. The government simply alleges that a search has been made for the requested "records" and nothing has been found. Yet, assuming that these "records" were not or are not in the immediate possession of the Department of the Navy it appears beyond the realm of reason to further assume that responsible officials within said department are unable to apprise themselves of the ultimate disposition of these items of paramount importance upon which the understanding of the murder of our late President Kennedy hinges. It likewise appears obvious that the officials in question are constrained not to divulge those sources through which the desired information and items may be obtained (emphasis added throughout - J.J.).

The "Statement of the Case" portion of the Dr. Nichols Brief ends here. Because of its self-evident importance as an historical document which exposes many hitherto unknown or ignored facets of the outrageous Kennedy autopsy fraud, I have reproduced it in extenso. There follows a second part, entitled "Argument", which, while also very interesting and informative, is too legalistic in content to warrant reproduction in this newsletter. TL readers, however, will be informed of further developments in this lawsuit which concerns us all.

Self-Exposure

A few days ago, I airmailed an article entitled "Can You Explain, Mr. Hoover?" (identical in content to the act of accusation in TL, No. 8) to the weekly National Enquirer. It promptly came back with a note saying:

"Dear Mr. Joesten: Many thanks for letting me see this story. Unfortunately, it did not appeal to the boss who is a pro-Hoover man.

Very best wishes.

Sincerely,

(signed) Bernard Scott, Special Features Editor "

The Truth About Chappaquiddick (ctd.)

"... Later that morning, he (Look) saw the Kennedy Oldsmobile when it was towed to shore, but he cannot positively identify it as the same car he saw at 12:45 A.M.

"During the inquest, a preliminary investigation was initiated through the Registry of Motor Vehicles to determine whether a tracking of the location on July 18 and 19, 1969, of all dark colored cars bearing Massachusetts plates with any and all combinations of numbers beginning with L 7 and ending in 7, would be practicable. The attempt disclosed that it would not be feasible to do this..."

Such humbug! There can't be thousands of cars in Massachusetts that are (a) of a deep dark color and (b) have license plates with such distinctive features as an "L" followed by a "7" and with another "7" at the end. I bet that if a real check had been made, they would have come up with less than a hundred, if that many. And there would have been no need whatsoever to "track the location" of any of these cars on the night of July 18-19. A phone call enquiring of each of the owners if he or she perchance had been on Martha's Vineyard at the time would have been enough.

Besides, given the huge publicity surrounding this case, it is a near-certainty that after Look's statements had appeared in the press - months before the Inquest - anybody operating a vehicle answering that description who might have been on Chappaquiddick at that precise moment would immediately have come forward to say so. This is so self-evident, it takes real nerve to disregard it.

The odds against any ^{other} dark-colored car with a Massachusetts plate "L 7...7" being on tiny Chappaquiddick island on that particular night, after the ferry's closing time, are so overwhelming that the possibility must be regarded as nil. There can be no doubt whatsoever that the car Huck Look saw at that particular moment and in that particular place was indeed Kennedy's Oldsmobile. No quibbling about "positive identification" can change that fact and it is of paramount importance.

In his final sentence in this matter, Boyle clearly gives the show away:

"The attempt disclosed that it would not be feasible to do this since there would be no assurance that the end result would be helpful and, in any event, the elimination of all other cars within that registration group, (although it would seriously affect the credibility of some of the witnesses) would not alter the findings in this report."

This is tantamount to saying: "I've already made up my mind what I'm going to say in my report and I don't give a tinker's damn if they prove to me a hundred times over that the car Huck Look saw at 12:45 a.m. was Kennedy's Oldsmobile."

Why this obduracy on the part of a judge charged with the task of ascertaining the cause of a person's death? Why this blind determination not to see what must be self-evident to the mind of a child? Why this cynical disregard of an obvious fact that hits you right between the eyes?

Well, for one thing, Huck Look's observations do indeed "seriously affect the credibility of some of the witnesses," to wit Messrs. Kennedy, Gargan and Markham who had testified under oath that they were trying, desperately to rescue Mary Jo Kopechne from the submerged car (or were just about to wind up their vain efforts to that effect) at the precise time the "sunken" car was on its way to Dyke Bridge!

It is interesting to note in this connection that Judge Boyle, in the second of his formal "findings" indirectly makes room for the possibility that the plunge from the bridge took place at the time indicated by Look's testimony, i.e. shortly before 1:00 a.m., rather than at the time stated by Kennedy, for he writes:

"Death probably occurred between 11:30 P.M. on July 18, 1969, and 1:00 A.M. on July 19, 1969."

It doesn't take an hour and a half for a person in a totally submerged car to die by drowning. So the wording of this sentence makes it quite clear the Judge isn't sure of the time the car really went off the bridge.

The new book by Joachim Joesten. TRAIL OF DECEIT
An analysis and interpretation of the John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, and Dr.
Martin Luther King assassinations. - Copyright by J. Joesten, 1966-1971.

The Frameup of James Earl Ray (ctd. from Vol.III, no. 9)

Thomas Butler is dead and, in view of the remarkable discretion which Scotland Yard has exhibited throughout in this affair, it is more than doubtful that his successor would care to reply to those questions. Nor is that really necessary, because circumstances provide a perfectly plausible answer.

Indeed, the frameup of James Earl Ray has been from beginning to end an American show, run by that Mastermind of Deceit, J. Edgar Hoover, in which Scotland Yard and British justice have played only a minor and ancillary role. And, in the British judicial hierarchy, Hoover trusted nobody as much as Mr. Butler. In this particular case, anyway, the FBI Chief wanted to deal with the head of the Flying Squad and so it was arranged.

Now let us take a look at the testimony of Mr. Butler, as it appears in the transcript:

And this witness, Thomas Butler, Detective Chief Supt., New Scotland Yard, on oath says:

On June 8th, 1968, I saw the defendant in company with Chief Inspector Thompson of New Scotland Yard at about 1:05 PM in a police office at London airport.

I said "We are police officers. I understand you have in your possession two passports in names of SNEYD and SNEYA. What is your name?" He replied, "I can't understand why I am here. My name is Sneyd." I said, "Both passports show that you are a Canadian citizen born in Toronto on 8 October 1932. Are those details correct?" He replied, "Yes, of course they are."

After further conversation he was cautioned and told he would be taken to Cannon Row Police Station and detained.

At 4:45 PM again with Chief Inspector Thompson I saw accused in a cell at that Station. I said, "As a result of enquiries made since you were detained we have very good reason to believe that you are not a Canadian citizen but an American." He replied, "Oh well, yes I am" and he nodded.

I said, "I now believe that your name is not Sneyd but James Earl Ray, also known as Eric Starvo Galt and other names, and that you are wanted at present in the United States for serious criminal offences including murder in which a firearm was used." He had been standing up but at this he suddenly slumped down on the seat behind him, put his head in his hands, and said, "Oh God." After a moment or so he added, "I feel so trapped." I cautioned him again and he replied: "Well, yes, I shouldn't say anything more now. I can't think right."

At 5:20 PM he was charged with an offence against the Alien Order and one offence against the Firearms Act. Cautioned, he made no reply.

I spoke to him on June 18th, at the rear of this court at about 10:15 AM in presence of Mr. Eugene, his legal adviser. I read out these two extradition warrants -- Bow Street Exhibit 4. He was asked if he understood them and I then cautioned him.

In reply to the caution he said, "No, Sir."

I identify the accused.

F. Butler, Supt.

Cross Examined:

I agree he made no admissions of any kind in relation to any offence to me. Whilst he was in my presence he was very quiet. I read to him the very words of the two warrants.

Now, first of all it must be said that when Butler under cross-examination agreed that the defendant "made no admissions of any kind in relation to any offence," this is in contradiction with his earlier statement to the effect that Ray had admitted to being an American, rather than a Canadian citizen. For, in doing so, he admitted the offence of having used a false passport. (to be continued in the next issue)

JOACHIM JOESTEN

87-70 173rd Street, Jamaica 11432, New York City

Present address: 7890 Gutenberg u. Waldshut, Haus 12, Germany

Dear Sir/Madam:

May I call your attention to the fact that your subscription to TRUTH LETTER has expired.

I feel sure that you will want to continue receiving this informative newsletter and that you wouldn't want to miss a single issue.

Therefore, please check off on the form below the period of time for which you want to renew subscription and mail it back to me (preferably by air) to the address in Gutenberg, Germany.

Thank you for your cooperation

Sincerely yours,

Joachim Joesten

=====

Subscription Renewal

Mr. Joachim Joesten
7890 Gutenberg u. Waldshut, Haus 12
Germany

Please renew my subscription to TRUTH LETTER for the period indicated below:

<input type="checkbox"/>	one year, \$ 45.00	} -50%	<input type="checkbox"/>	I enclose check of money order
<input type="checkbox"/>	six months, \$ 25.00		<input type="checkbox"/>	Bill me later
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 months, \$ 15.00			

Name:

Address:

Date: