

TRANSLATION FROM SPANISH

REC-52

An article that appears in the November 15, 1966, No. 153 issue of "Politica." The first half of this article appeared in the No. 157 issue of this magazine.

25
X
X

article
FRANCIS

S. ER
S-JAN
(info)
Eng
of Loc.

Pages 40-43
"Who Killed John F. Kennedy?" by Ev. Trevor-Roper

II "The Established Order Leads a Deaf Ear"

Assassination of President John F. Kennedy

These three writers have expressed their opinion at the present time. They arrived at the same conclusions by way of three different routes. As we will see, they reduced the Report to nothingness.

MARK NY D.C TEXAS

Let's begin with Lane. He is a lawyer. His task consisted, not in discovering exactly what had happened, but rather in showing that the facts, as presented by his adversaries, the lawyers who wrote the Report, do not express the truth. To accomplish this, he took each argument separately, re-examined it by comparing it with the evidence, and showed that it is unfounded. That is to say, the plausibility of the Report is not an honest reflection of the testimonies that were collected. Similarly, facts and witnesses disappeared; difficulties were avoided or covered up. Favorable testimonies were overworked; and unfavorable ones were ignored. Lane, on the other hand, called upon witnesses who made definite revelations. He showed that abusive methods were used to prevent the testimonies of certain witnesses who might have placed the Commission in an embarrassing position. Just as the Warren Report can be considered as an accusation against Oswald, presenting him as the President's only assassin, Lane's book is, in turn, the allegation for the defense. In my opinion, no jury could find Oswald guilty after having heard both the charges and the defense.

Deleted Copy Sent Richard H. Poppen
by letter 1/16/76 pty
Per FOIA Request

ORIGINAL FILED IN 64-47255-97

10- M. H. Jones
10- Ruppel
10- Shaleget
10- P-55
NOT RECORDED
199 JAN 10 1967

TRANSLATED BY: ROSALIE A. GIACCHINO-jab
December 22, 1966

REC-52

JAN 10 1967

Although Lane's allegation has just recently been published in its entirety, it is not an innovation. This lawyer has held many conferences during the past two years. Why didn't anyone pay any attention to him? The answer is obvious. In the first place, Lane is a controversial personality. Since he is politically affiliated with the extreme left, his intentions are suspect. Like Cassandra, some people are never taken seriously by the influential members of the society, even when they tell the truth. I am afraid that Lane is one of these people. Secondly, as a lawyer, Lane had to limit himself to showing that the facts, as presented by his adversaries, were false. For this reason, he could not explain his motives.

Therefore, a jury would be confronted with the following dilemma: If Lane is right, his opponents are dishonest. I have already stated that this is an incorrect dilemma; but it is a dilemma that can be fatal for those who insist upon it too strongly. When a lawyer with progressive ideas states that an institution is dishonest as well as mistaken, the institution lends a deaf ear.

Edward Jay NY
Epstein then comes into the picture. Epstein, unlike Lane, is not a lawyer; rather, he is a university student who approaches the problem with complete objectivity. He wanted to study the Commission's activities. He, therefore, examined the official documents and interviewed the members of the Commission and many lawyers. Bit by bit, he became acquainted with the internal workings of the Commission, in this way. After discovering them, the problem was transformed. Due to his analysis, the dilemma with which Lane struggled has disappeared; and all of the arguments are accepted. Epstein showed that the Commission had a double structure and a double objective right from the start. The double structure was the Commission itself, on one hand -- the seven eminent personalities who endorsed it in the face of public opinion -- and the team of lawyers who helped them, on the other hand.

The members of the Commission only formed a facade. The lawyers themselves state that, "they did not have the slightest idea of what was happening." Their contribution was, "in one word, nothing." Neither did the experienced and well-known lawyers make any important contributions. They were simply well-paid accessories, and "did not actually contribute to the final wording of the Report." The principal work was done by a group of young lawyers who obeyed orders. These orders, in turn, were established on the basis of the Commission's ~~double~~ objective.

First of all, it was to dissipate the doubts expressed in foreign countries and to re-establish Americans' confidence in their own institutions. Secondly, it was to discover the truth. These two objectives could be harmoniously coordinated only by deforming the truth so that Americans would see the truth as they wanted it to be. . .

The tension created by pursuing these two objectives was evident right from the start. In January of 1934, the Commission accidentally learned that Oswald was an agent working for the FBI. It was alarming. What to do? The source of this information would have been verified if the truth had been the only objective. But if the information were to be true. . . wouldn't a discovery of this sort undermine rather than restore Americans' confidence in their institutions? Therefore, the Commission decided to continue its work in the light of higher interests. This "sinister rumor" had to be "buried." They contacted the FBI who solemnly belied the rumor. This deception could not have sufficed. Nevertheless, the subject was dropped. The published testimonies did not refer to this in any way. This precedent started a snowball reaction. Time after time, the Commission's higher interests -- political peace -- unconsciously prevailed over the secondary interests -- the search for truth.

As an example of this, let's consider the importance given to the testimonies. Since it accepted the basic postulate -- Oswald was guilty and his motives had to be explained -- the Commission made Oswald's widow the star witness. She was of Soviet origin and had received eloquent ratings from the FBI. After four days of questioning, the Commission's lawyers decided it was absolutely impossible to give the slightest credence to her statements. Some of them threatened to resign if she was not dismissed. However, the rumor had already been spread that the Commission had confidence in Mrs. Oswald's testimony. Thus, she continued to be the principal witness, 12% of the time that the Commission was in session was spent listening to Mrs. Oswald. Several impertinent young lawyers called her and the Commission "Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs." She completely changed her story when one of the members of the Commission finally proceeded to cross-examine her. By this time, the Report had already been written. Lane made some important revelations about "Snow White's" honesty and her real motives. It was decided that her repatriation to Russia was to be avoided at any cost. Naturally, this was incited by the desire to please the FBI.

"I Work for the Commission"

In relationship to the orthodoxy of the witnesses, the value of the other testimonies is also exaggerated. I have already stated that the most dispiriting chapter of the Report is the one that deals with the identity of the assassin. Epstein told me the story of this chapter. In the beginning, it seems as though it was written very differently by the lawyers in charge. It was not entirely satisfactory. It was said that the chapter was "absolutely insufficient" since it did not adequately identify Oswald as the assassin. After this, one of the men in charge rewrote it entirely, basing it only on the statements of three carefully selected witnesses.

The first of these was Howard L. Brennan. It was said that his description had enabled Officer Tippit to identify Oswald as the assassin. I have already shown that this was impossible. I have now learned that the lawyers also considered it to be impossible; but they overlooked it.

The second witness was Miss Helen Markham, who pretended to have witnessed Tippit's death. The lawyers who questioned her thought her testimony was "contradictory," "full of errors," and "without value." Nevertheless, those in charge stated that the "Commission wanted to place confidence in Miss Markham's testimony, period, paragraph." Therefore, it was trusted.

The third witness was "Snow White," whom the lawyers decided was "inconsistent, among other things." The Commission has also decided to believe her. Thus, due to the pressure of "higher interests," the chapter was rewritten, and three objectionable witnesses were chosen and declared to be trustworthy simply because they served these interests. One of the lawyers presented a 23-page protest in which he stated that some parts of the chapter were definitely dishonest. It did not accomplish anything. This is how the Commission wants it, explained the person in charge of the wording, and I work for the Commission. The Commission wanted to prove that Oswald had assassinated the President. If it did not do this, all of the other chapters, that explained the motives behind the assassination, would have become worthless.

One of the strangest revelations in Epstein's book deals with the autopsy performed on the body of the President. It was signed by Dr. Humes of the Bethesda (Maryland) Naval Hospital, where the cadaver was brought after it was flown in from Dallas. There are various reasons why this autopsy has always been suspect. Why was Dr. Humes angry -- as he stated he was in his "preliminary notes?" Why wasn't he authorized to see the X rays of the President's body, in spite of the fact that they were directly related to the autopsy?

It now seems as though these suspicions were very well founded. Epstein showed that the original autopsy, as it appears in the FBI Report, was substantially different. For that reason, the document that the Commission requested to be stamped as the "original autopsy" was a late substitution. It has been shown that the real original autopsy was the object of a report prepared by the FBI. In effect, the Commission introduced two documents: One was a photograph of the President's clothing; and the other was the "preliminary notes" of Dr. Humes. In one way or another, both of them were rejects. These documents cannot be reconciled with the version of the "original autopsy," that the Commission presented.

Epstein's study on the Commission's procedures and Lane's criticism of the Report completely destroy the Warren Commission's thesis. Perhaps the Report is not as deficient as Lane claims. The proposed arguments may be valid up to a certain point. However, in light of the known facts, it is impossible to believe in it down to the smallest detail. You have to start from the beginning if you want to find out what really happened on November 22, 1963. Leaving the Warren Report completely aside, it is necessary to examine all of the evidence that was collected but incorrectly used by the Commission, as well as other evidence that has not yet been made known. On these bases, a new theory must be formulated, one that is not influenced by the distortions that preceded it.

There is a difficulty: Hardly any of the evidence collected by the Commission is well-founded. We know that the President was assassinated with firearms; we know that Oswald's gun and three cartridge shells were found on the sixth floor of the student library. However, we have no proof of the fact that this gun was used that day. We don't know how or why it was left at that place. We have no idea if the shots were all fired from the same spot. We know nothing about the circumstances surrounding Tippit's death; neither do we know if Oswald killed him. We do not know why Ruby killed Oswald, or how he was able to do so. In this atmosphere of general ignorance, it is difficult to know where to start.

Nevertheless, something seems to be unquestionable. A movie of the Presidential parade, taken by an amateur photographer, clearly indicates that Governor Connally was wounded a second and one half after the President was shot for the first time. It is impossible that Oswald's rifle could have shot twice in less than two and one half seconds. Consequently, if there were two shots, there had to be two rifles. One of the lawyers on the Commission acknowledged this: If there were two shots, there had to be two assassins. This is an indisputable fact.

To avoid getting in this dilemma, the Commission persisted in the theory of a single shot that wounded both men. (This was first suggested by Dr. Humes.) All of the evidence collected -- the testimony of Governor and Mrs. Connally, the testimony of the other doctors, and a projection of this film -- show the ineptitude of this theory. After having adhered to it at a critical moment, the Commission calmly rejected it when it became no longer necessary. Therefore, the theory that not all of the shots were fired from Oswald's gun seems to be sufficiently proven. This is prima-facie evidence for the existence of a conspiracy.

Did Oswald's gun fire any of the bullets? It seems unbelievable that that old and inaccurate gun could have produced such results. In any case, no one could equal them in past demonstrations. The only really positive evidence that establishes a relationship between Oswald's gun and the assassination is the almost intact bullet that was later found on Kennedy's small bed in Parkland Hospital. Where was this bullet exactly? No one remembers. . . Is it absolutely certain that it was fired? Judging from its almost intact appearance, perhaps it was not. In other words, it is very possible that it was placed in the hospital after the attack. The gun could also have been placed in the library. There is nothing to prove that Oswald brought the gun there, or that he used it that day, or that he was on the sixth floor that morning.

From where, then, were the shots fired that killed the President? According to the testimonies given by most of the eye witnesses, at least one of the shots came from the "grassy incline" in front of the Presidential car. It also seems as though at least one bullet was fired from the rear. There is evidence (deliberately ignored by the Commission) that indicates that two men were in the student library and were firing a rifle (that was not Oswald's rifle).

Then there is the testimony of an experienced policeman, Deputy Sheriff Craig, who reports having seen a man who looked very much like Oswald who ran, out of the student library ^(sic) immediately after the shots were fired, and jumped into a stopped car. This testimony given by a trustworthy person was rejected by the police under the pretext that it "did not jibe with the known truth." The Commission overlooked it and preferred Brennan's worthless testimony.

After having analyzed the available testimonies and evidence, it is a natural deduction to say that the assassination was planned by a group of people and that the President was wounded by at least two men, one posted on the knoll, and the other in the student library. (sic)

Was he an angry spy or a passive accomplice? Even if he did not shoot the rifle, even if he was not on the sixth floor of that building, Oswald, after all, could have been an accomplice to the conspirators. At this point, we have to examine Popkin's investigation.

After having studied the 26 volumes, ^{Richard} he felt obliged to reject the Commission's conclusions. This is what any other serious reader would have done. In addition to this, he discovered a new approach. On various occasions, he encountered "a second Oswald." A man who looked very much like Oswald and who used the same name had attracted attention during the weeks preceding the assassination. He distributed bulletins in Oswald's name, visited gun shops, appeared on firing ranges, cashed checks, and led people to believe that he would soon receive a considerable sum of money. ^{Calif}

The Commission ignored all these episodes. They considered them as isolated cases of mistaken identity. Popkin points out that they were numerous, very evident, and too authentic to ignore so easily. It suggests a deliberate attempt to call attention to Oswald so that he would be introduced as a suspect. It also suggests that Oswald was in on the conspiracy and that on November 22, he was in charge of distracting attention, with the assurance that he would be able to prove his innocence at the opportune moment. By that time, the real assassins would be in the clear.

Popkin does not insist on his theory. He admits that it is the product of speculations. He only maintains that it resolves a great many of the problems that the Commission ignored and that it submits a

more plausible explanation of the evidence that was collected. However, this theory introduces other problems. It is particularly impossible to disassociate this from Tippit's death and the equally difficult problem (that Popkin did not go into) of Oswald's assassination by Ruby.

Tippit's assassination is a complete mystery. It certainly may be the result of an unexplainable confusion. If it is explainable, the natural explanation is that the Police, or Tippit personally, had unknown reasons to suspect Oswald, and that Oswald, (if it was he) killed Tippit to avoid arrest. In any case, it is proof that Oswald took part in the conspiracy. It also shows that a conflict, too subtle to be divulged, had developed between those who had an interest in calling attention to Oswald, and the Dallas police.

Oswald's death also casts a shadow on the Dallas police. Oswald was killed while he was surrounded by policemen, in a police station. No one could have gotten near him without police authorization or negligence. The assassin, Jack Ruby, was a great friend of the Dallas police. The Commission made light of this friendship. It says that Ruby was only casually known by a group of policemen. However, the lawyer, Lane, showed that this intimate, extensive, and corrupted friendship was a fact. It was known that Ruby acted as a connection between the police and the Dallas underground. His occupations were varied and sinister. He relied on police protection. Even though he had been inconvenienced many times and had often been arrested, sometimes on charges of violence, he had never been found guilty.

The manner in which Ruby could have gotten to Oswald is a problem that the Commission also ignored. After investigating, the police stated that the riddle could not be solved. The Commission went along with this. With the principal question dismissed in this way, it was concluded that Ruby had been overcome with emotion. It stated that he happened to enter (in some way or other) the basement of the police station at the opportune moment, and that he had killed Oswald to satisfy his own ego.

Unfortunately, this is completely impossible. There is evidence that Ruby had planned the assassination at least a day in advance. If that crime was premeditated and not impulsive, how did Ruby know exactly when he would be able to shoot Oswald (as was proven, Oswald's appearance was an hour later than had been announced)? How could he know that, if

he arrived precisely at this time, he would be able to enter that basement that was so carefully guarded? The Commission did not examine these questions correctly. As Epstein emphasized, it had resolved to, in no way, discredit U. S. institutions, among which is obviously the police. From the start, it also refused to use judicial methods of investigation: "cross examinations, tricky questions, and pressures."

Thus, once again, we must go back to natural explanations. The available evidence clearly indicates that Ruby, for an unrevealed reason, intended to kill Oswald, and that his intimacy with the Dallas police in some way permitted him to achieve his objective. Perhaps his motives were entirely personal; but the very nature of the person would lead one to believe that he was directed by certain forces. If this is the case, one can guess which forces these were. If Potkin (sic) is right, Oswald may have submitted, with the assurance that, after acting — as bait, he would be able to prove his innocence to the court. It could also be that the real assassin decided it would be better to kill him for security reasons. If he were alive, Oswald could have proven his innocence; but he also could have proven the guilt of the others.

We can go no further. All that we can say is that if there was a conspiracy to assassinate the President (and I think it is impossible not to propose this hypothesis), then, the assassination of Tippit and Oswald cannot be dissociated from the case. As such, it is most unfortunate, as the lawyer, Lane, revealed, that threats and, at times, violence were used to silence witnesses who could have spoken out on these two points. It is also terrible that the Dallas police let this happen, especially since it was the source of these threats and this violence. Another noteworthy fact is that Ruby, who often asked to be transferred to Washington before testifying, is still, at the present time, being carefully guarded by his good old friends in the Dallas police force.

How does one answer the question of who killed Kennedy when he is faced with all of these unresolved problems? The opportunity to discover the truth is gone. The courses of action that could have been taken are now closed. All we can say is that the Warren Commission's answer, to which America paid immediate and absolute homage two years ago, can no longer convince a rational mind. From an examination of only the evidence collected by the Commission, one must arrive at the conclusion that the President was the victim of a thoroughly prepared plot, whose origin can be suspected but not proven. Its ramifications may extend as far as the inner core of the institutions whose reputations must be protected by any means.

Perhaps some day, a confession, a new document, or a controversy will offer new evidence. It is equally possible that we will never know more than we do today. Maybe history will record the Warren Commission as the organization that efficiently and, perhaps for now, conveniently buried the truth.