

Assassination of JFK

JOHN F.

REC 63

TRANSLATION FROM SPANISH

Two articles taken from the No. 157, November 1, 1966, issue of the bi-weekly publication, "Politica," that is printed by the "Talleres Graficos de Mexico" (The Graphic Offices of Mexico) at South 69-A, 402, Col. Banjidal, Mexico 13. The commercial address is Bucareli 59, second floor, Mexico 1. Its general director is Manuel Marcue Pardinaz. Boris Rasen is its chief editor.

[Handwritten signature]

6-M-L. de Artindale
1-1-1-8

Pages 28A-329
"The United States"
"Who Assassinated Kennedy"

U.S. public opinion is slowly but efficiently reacting against the "official truth" fabricated by the Warren Commission about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy that took place on November 22, 1963, in Dallas, Texas. This "official truth" tried to present this horrendous crime as the work of a person who was mentally ill; Lee Harvey Oswald, who acted by himself, with no outside intervention.

With the passage of time, the American people have been faced with these facts: The publication of several books that clearly show that Oswald could not have been President Kennedy's only assassin; the assassination, suicide, or accidental deaths of 14 of the witnesses who could have contributed decisive information at a trial; and the pardon of Jack Ruby, Oswald's assassin.

R. de Arred. Satellite

Many people have spoken out against the Warren Report; but a well-known group of Catholics are now asking for a revision of this report. This group is headed by Monsignor James Pike, who was an assistant bishop in California, and by Edward Keating, director of the Catholic magazine, "Ramparts."

To have more freedom of action, Monsignor Pike recently resigned as assistant bishop. In a document published on October 30, in New York, the group of Catholic personalities accused the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) of concealing revealing details of Kennedy's assassination.

Deleted Copy Sent Richard H. Popkin
by Letter 1/16/76
Per FOIA Request

ENCLOSURE

TRANSLATED BY:
ROSALIE A. GIACCHINO: cspoop
December 7, 1966.

BUJAN
[Handwritten signature]

REC 63

ST-103

62-109060-4324

NOT RECORDED

10 DEC 14 1966

The accusation adds that the Warren Commission "hid important documentation" referring to the facts. It also stated that 90% of the information obtained by the CIA and the FBI, concerning the assassination of the President, refuted the "one assassin" theory or that Oswald was the only killer. This 90% of the information was deliberately concealed by the Warren Commission according to the accusation.

Monsignor Pike stated that he and the other persons in his group propose to create a committee that will ask President Lyndon B. Johnson to make public the "documents hidden" by Warren and the other members of the Commission.

To refresh your memory, Jack Ruby, a prominent individual in the Dallas gang world and a police informer, assassinated Oswald in the very police station of this Texas city. Ruby was tried and sentenced to death. His lawyers made an appeal to the Supreme Court because the jury "had considered charges that had not been made." Ruby will now be judged by another jury, but the maximum penalty that this one can impose is five years. This sentence also includes Ruby's provisional freedom. His lawyer, Phil Burleson, stated that he is certain that he will be able procure his client's provisional freedom.

Ruby knows about the 14 important witnesses who died mysteriously. Shortly after being arrested, he himself stated that "he would kill them," if he was freed.

Will we ever know how Kennedy was assassinated?

The world was shocked by President Kennedy's assassination on November 22, 1963. Never before had a crime been committed before so many witnesses. The President was killed in broad daylight when his open car passed through the crowds that had gathered along the prearranged route. Special security measures had been taken to insure the safety of the President during his visit to this violent city where some of Kennedy's policies had stirred up strong feelings of hate.

These precautions did not stop the homicide from taking place. On the other hand, they certainly facilitated the capture of the assassin. Within an hour, the suspected killer was arrested, even though it was on other charges. He flatly denied having taken part in the crime. Two days later, he in turn was assassinated. This happened while he was in custody at the Dallas Police Station, and in front of more witnesses than had been present at the assassination of the President. Millions of television viewers saw the scene on their little screens. For months, Lee Harvey Oswald, presumed killer of the President, and Jack Ruby, Oswald's known assassin, were topics of conversation around the world. Nevertheless, various doubts persisted: Had Oswald killed the President? Who if not he? If he had done it, did he act alone or was he part of a conspiracy? Why had Ruby killed Oswald?

For ten months, speculations increased. Many theories were given; but the majority of these were based on rumors or imagination. Most of these also upheld the idea of a vast conspiracy. The most level-headed people, however, did not pay much attention to these ideas. They knew that the new President of the United States had set up a commission to investigate the facts. This commission was composed of six eminent persons from both political parties. Its president, Earl Warren, as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, was the highest magistrate in the republic. Thus, the most-level headed persons waited for the commission's report.

This report, the Warren Report, was published on September 28, 1964. It was sound, documented, and comforting. In 600 pages, it showed that Oswald had assassinated the President by himself and without accomplices, for purely psychological reasons. It showed that Ruby had killed Oswald, also by himself and without accomplices, and also for reasons that were purely psychological. The matter was closed.

The Warren Report's immediate success is well-known. The entire United States and most of the world submitted to its conclusions. The unthinking journalists in the United States outdid themselves with praises for the Commission and its work.

Two years have already passed since the Warren Report did this "public service." Without a doubt it was a great service. No one knows what might have been the result in the United States if a political conspiracy to assassinate the President had been discovered in the middle of an election year? The McCarthy era is not far behind us. Now that the danger is passed, the critics are once again making themselves heard. They are speaking out louder than ever simply because they have been silent for so long. Maybe in another two years it will be said that political stability was purchased at the cost of historic truth. It may be said that the Warren Commission's major accomplishment was to perhaps permanently stop the real facts from becoming known, to settle the public in a false sense of security, waiting long enough for proofs to disappear and for the mystery, which could have been revealed, to become unsolvable.

I must be frank.

I have never believed in the Warren Report. For this reason, as you might suppose, I am a declared enemy. I am going to explain the reasons that immediately led me to criticize it.

For the first ten months after the assassination, I was among the cautious ones who held back any opinion. Nevertheless, something worried me. By the very statements it withheld, I noticed that the Commission seemed to be investigating why Oswald had assassinated the President rather than if he had done so. This was prejudging the matter, as far as I was concerned.

"One Bullet Does the Work of Two"

I was in the United States when the report appeared. My first reaction, similar to that of many others, was to accept the conclusions. The report seemed to be very sound, very positive, and very logical. After examining it critically, I discovered innumerable and serious gaps in the section dealing with the identity of the assassin. I was disconcerted. Why were there hundreds of pages of psychological "explanations" of the facts if the facts themselves had not been proven? The longer I thought about it, the more I rebelled against this easily swayed group of orthodox journalists. It was obvious that the majority of them had barely had enough time to glance at the report. I then decided to continue my analysis. I obtained the 26 volumes of "testimonies" and "evidence" which seemed to have provided the basis for the report.

My doubts increased as I compared the report to the testimonies. The more I analyzed, the more my skepticism grew. Long before finishing the 26 volumes, I was convinced, first of all, that the Commission had not tried to discover the truth by systematically seeking evidence; secondly, that the report was not even an honest summary of the evidence that had been gathered. It only retained the evidence that indicated that Oswald was the only assassin. Those that suggested the opposite were toned down or concealed. At times, they were definitely changed.

Here are some examples:

First of all, where did the shots that hit the President come from? Twenty-three out of the twenty-six witnesses questioned stated that they came from a "high grassy area" to the side of the presidential car. Some added that they had seen smoke there. In addition, the doctors at Parkland Hospital in Dallas--the only ones who were able to examine the wounds before surgery changed their appearance--unanimously thought that the bullet had entered from the front. In the report, this evidence was concealed to preserve the conclusion that all of the bullets had been fired from the rear. The testimonies also bring out the fact that pertinent documents, such as negatives of the X-rays, disappeared from the case records. These facts throw considerable doubt on the report's conclusion, which maintains that all of the shots came from the "Book Depository" (student library) where Oswald's gun was found.

In the second place, presuming that all of the shots came from the library, were they all fired from the same rifle? It is hard to believe it since the rifle was old, ineffective, and inaccurate. In addition, it was physically impossible to manipulate this weapon and fire two shots within such a short interval. To solve this difficulty, it was suggested that one bullet did the work of two, wounding both the President and Governor Connally. Unfortunately, this theory cannot be reconciled with the evidence that was published in the testimonies.

In the third place, presuming that all of the shots, or some of them, had been fired from Oswald's gun, was Oswald the one who pulled the trigger? There is no evident proof of this. The Commission depended on the witnesses who contend they saw Oswald enter the student library on the morning of the crime with a large paper bag that, according to the Commission, hid the rifle. Unfortunately, a comparison of the report and the testimony shows that this could not have been the case. The only witnesses who saw Oswald enter the library with a bag, are in agreement: It was too small. Therefore, it is impossible to accept this proof. The Commission offered no others that might establish a connection between Oswald and the rifle on this day.