

SUMMARY FROM SPANISH

The Mexican Magazine "Politica," Year V, No. 114, January 15, 1965.

Title: "Puerto Rico: New Governor"  
Pp. 35 and 36

*Assassination of  
President John F.  
Kennedy*

"In an article commenting on the recent elections in Puerto Rico, the pro-Independence Movement of Puerto Rico is mentioned thusly:

**"Electoral Farce:** The pro-Independence Movement (MPI), which is made up of the more valiant Puerto Rican patriots, announced that the elections which gave the victory to the Popular Democratic Party were an example of an electoral farce. This announcement has been confirmed, in part, by the national committee of the cited party, which has begun a survey to find out why more than 200,000 Puerto Ricans did not register or vote in the elections.

"The answer is easy: They did not vote because they followed the counsel of MPI, which urged them to participate in an "electoral strike," in spite of the fact that the law prohibits and demands that every citizen vote. If these 200,000 "striking" votes were added to the votes of the opposition parties, we could see that the PPD is in the minority in spite of having control over the electoral machinery.

"The MPI, which has increased in number and strength during 1964, besides denouncing the servilism of the new government to the will of the U. S., underlined the great successes gained by the movement. Among these successes is the release of their glorious independent leader, Pedro Albizu Campos, who was pardoned by Munoz Marin. Another of their successes is the treatment of the matter of Puerto Rican independence by the United Nations.

"The MPI is now preparing for the fight to succeed in the following objectives: preparing themselves

162-109060 - UNREC  
NOT RECORDED  
199 FEB 19 1965

58 MAR 2 1965

for the 1968 elections and put an end to the problem of "statehood" so that Puerto Rico can cease being a U. S. colony; cause the failure of Munoz Marin's plans to convert Puerto Rico into a state for the newly structured neo-colonialism of the United States, which is the objective of the U. S. in their request that the Puerto Rican question be dismissed by the United Nations; strengthen the expansion of the National Liberation Movement; seek the unity of anti-colonial forces upon a broad and highly militant political basis; and, develop diverse and increasing international pressures.

"To succeed in these proposals, the leaders of the MPI are reorganizing their party; this also includes the reorganization of their agencies in other countries, including the U. S."

Title: "United States: Who Killed Kennedy?"  
Pp. 36

The famous Warren report on the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, instead of clarifying the facts, it has hung a smoky veil over them. Such is the opinion of one of the more renowned European historians, the Englishman, Hugh Trevor-Roper, Professor of Modern History at Oxford University.

Trevor-Roper (?) has made an extensive study of the report and is writing a book which refutes the assertions which are contained therein, pointing out the incongruities, contradictions and lack of investigative logic.

The English historian has exposed some of his ideas in the "London Sunday Times." These ideas have caused a sensation throughout Europe, even though the American press has given them very little space. According to Trevor-Roper, there are two outstanding points. The first thing is the manner in which they proceeded to arrest

\*Translator's Note: This article is translated in full.

Lee Harvey Oswald, the accused Kennedy assassin, and second, the death of the policeman, D. D. Tippit (sic). The police gave Oswald's description and the order to arrest him, by radio, almost immediately after the President had been killed, without having any proof at all. To explain this anomaly, the Warren report says that a witness, Howard Brennan, saw them (sic) shoot from the window of the Texas School Book Depository Building and he told the police "a few minutes later." Trevor-Roper considers this to be improbable and suspects that the police had other proofs which they did not give to the Warren Commission.

According to the report, the police detained Oswald and Captain Fritz questioned him for 12 hours, without even writing down one line of the questioning, taking shorthand notes or recording anything on tape. This seems impossible; nevertheless, the report claims that it is so. The FBI - Federal Bureau of Investigation - could not have committed the grave error of not recording the questioning process, especially when it concerned the assassination of the President of the United States. Either the record was destroyed, or the FBI is guilty of complete indifference - the Warren Commission has not bothered to find out.

In the first report issued by the doctors who attended Kennedy and made the autopsy, it says that Kennedy was hit from the front, and all of the police investigations were based on this assertion. It was supposed that the President was wounded when he approached the building or when he turned his head toward it. However, the police, not being able to coordinate that which the doctors had said with their affirmations concerning Oswald's supposed responsibility, maintained that Kennedy was shot from behind. The doctors re-examined their opinion and agreed with what the police wanted. The doctors did not save their notes. In spite of all this, the Warren Commission considers everything that happened to be all right. "The police evidence concerning Oswald's arrest and the doctors notes were destroyed," says Trevor-Roper, "and the Warren Commission did not consider these anomalies important."

At the place from where the shots were fired, the police found a paper sack in which - they say - Oswald put the fatal weapon. The sack was too small to hold the weapon; nevertheless, the police analyzed and later destroyed it, however, not without substituting a new sack, "so as to provide an instrumental proof." The police

explained to the Commission that they destroyed the paper sack because it was discolored and crumpled. The Commission conforms with this explanation, since the "replica of the sack was the same as the original."

"After having completely destroyed all of the proof," says Trevor-Roper, sarcastically, "the police destroyed the supreme proof: Lee Harvey Oswald, the most important witness." How could Jack Ruby, Oswald's killer, enter the place where Oswald was in custody - even to the point of being held by two policemen - and kill him with one well-aimed shot from a revolver? He could have only gotten in the basement of the building with the consent or connivance of the police. Nevertheless, he did enter, and this is what the Warren Commission has not been able to clarify. In his initial declarations, Ruby refused to say how he had entered the place where Oswald was held. There appeared three policemen who declared that Ruby could have slipped-in to the place. Ruby then said that what the police reported was true.

The Warren Commission admits that Ruby was well known to the Dallas police and that they were on good terms. While referring to this part of the facts, the Warren Commission employs the word "probably" on various occasions in its report.

"The Commission," says the historian, "has considered valid everything that the Texas (sic) police and the FBI have told them, without ever submitting what they have said to a legal or intellectual investigation. Never has the Commission investigated further the proofs given by the police, and never has it insisted that the police express themselves or answer clearly."

Upon closing, Trevor-Roper criticizes the Commission and says that the confused and turbid report is limited to "criticizing the negligence" of the police. (sic) "The vast and disorderly Warren Commission report," terminates the historian, "has no more authority than the tendentious and defective police reports from which it was compiled."

The historian also refers to the declarations made by Mark Lane, Oswald's attorney, and says that these declarations were very just and well put. The historian adds that the report is a basis for accusation rather than an impartial document which could be used as a defense.

Mark Lane is now finishing a book in which he analyzes the Warren Report step by step.