

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1972

Review Of Speakers Urged For College

By Lawrence Blisko

TEANECK - Tuesday morning I sat for several hours at Fairleigh Dickinson University and listened to two young men proselytize their belief that President John F. Kennedy, his brother Robert, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and several other men were murdered by government agencies. These two criminal experts - Rick Lareau and Roger Haynes, both of Cambridge, Mass. - also stated that the various prison incidents were undertaken at the command of the CIA.

Among the charges they bandied around, as if they knew what they were talking about, were that the government had committed treason against itself. Having willfully murdered the President, they charged, the government agencies also murdered witnesses to the crime, 60 or more.

The primary feeling I came away with was that while one could accept the possibility of such actions by an agency as nefarious as the CIA, they presented absolutely no proof. In fact, whenever confronted with the fact that they didn't know what they were talking about, their consistent defense was that they didn't feel that the specific facts should hinder what they were proposing. The pair replied many times that they were not at the university to present a dogmatic approach to the topic and that they simply wanted people to investigate for themselves.

The most amazing example of this philosophy was that they showed a section of the Abraham Zepruda film in which the President was hit by the fatal shot. In this segment they claimed that the film showed the President was hit from the front proving that Oswald had not shot the President. Each time I looked at the film the bullet obviously exited from the front of the President's skull taking a great deal of skull and brain with it.

I felt that I might be losing my mind and reversing the action, so I viewed the film again, with them, in private, at slow motion, and pointed this out. They said I was wrong. So when I returned to the office I examined a copy of the film they had been happy to sell me for 50 cents, and a blow up of one of the frames in question. The blow up was at least 60 diameters and is owned by Dr. John Kingsley Lattimer, the only civilian expert who has been allowed to see the Kennedy X-rays and autopsy pictures. It clearly shows that the President was indeed hit from the rear and the frag-

nents are flying forward.

This convinced me of my sanity, but just to be sure I took my own copy of the film and examined it again with a magnifying glass, frame by frame, and again confirmed that indeed the bullet exited from the front.

The rest of their "proof" consisted of quoting a series of books attacking the Warren Commission Report, which they also did not back up with facts.

This provided me with a long period of baseless allegations and spurious charges, at least on the basis of the "evidence" presented. It also provided me with the only first hand opportunity I ever had to examine what I term the St. Thomas Aquinas syndrome.

St. Thomas is the man who, when challenged to defend his beliefs, stated that he believed because it was absurd to believe.

Being a rather questioning person I tend to stick to the rules of evidence in examining any question and expect that others will, at least with allegations as serious as this, do likewise, to the extent of not insulting my intelligence. In this case I found that consideration was not given.

I personally have no objection to attacks on the government when they can be proven. I can see investigation when the facts are unclear. However, I strongly object to someone attacking my government when they have no basis for the attack. I strongly object to lying, speculation, and half truths, especially when a murder is being discussed.

I feel when a man takes it upon himself to charge someone or some institution, he must be prepared to support his contention. In ancient Greece, Israel, and other of the classical world a person who falsely accused another of a crime suffered the penalty that person would have suffered. Perhaps, if we re-adopted that policy there would be fewer opportunists wandering around making charges that they can't back up.

This brings me to Fairleigh Dickinson Univer-

sity and its student body, which sponsored the talk.

I feel it is the responsibility of any institution which purports to be educating the young people of this or any other nation to state the qualifications and credential of any person that is allowed to present a statement such as this one.

Freedom of speech is not a license for irresponsibility. I wish to make it quite clear at this juncture that I in no way advocate censorship. Nor am I unaware that the students choose who will speak, through the arts and letters society. However, it is incumbent on the university that they state whether or not in their best judgment, according to the rules of evidence which any scholar knows, there is supportable data in the talk.

The reasons for this are several. First, it

affords the student a yardstick with which to measure the objective, supportable truth in the talk. Second it affords the university an opportunity to dissent with the opinion stated, instead of implying approval.

To summarize, two young men came to attack the government of the United States, sell books (at 25 cents off list) and films.

I would hope that in the future both the university and its student body would exercise some small amount of intelligence when screening such prospective speakers. I would also suggest that they contact Dr. John Kingsley Lattimer and get an expert, on this assassination, assassinations in general (he is a recognized expert in this area of history), ballistics and the wounding capacity of weapons, and someone who is actually prepared to document and support his statements with objectively proveable facts, to speak.