

## MORE QUESTIONS

*Dear Vincent,*

You haven't answered any of the many questions I asked a few months ago about your speech on the assassination of President Kennedy to the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom last October in Cambridge, Mass. But you may want to discuss the attempt to kill Governor Wallace in Maryland a week ago. It bristles with problems.

Let me indicate a few. According to the New York Times accounts, the hand gun used by the would-be assassin had a capacity of five bullets. All were fired. At virtually point blank range. And frontally. Wallace and three other individuals were wounded.

Each of the three beside Wallace each sustained single wounds. But confusion surrounds the number suffered by Wallace. On May 17, 1972 the Times listed seven wounds for Wallace: "One bullet, the doctors said, passed through the upper arm and another through the right forearm. One or both of two wounds in the chest are thought to have been possibly caused by bullets that passed through the arm first. Wounds in the right shoulder and left shoulder blade" (the Times diagram identifies both shoulder blades) "were superficial and evidently the bullets causing them did not lodge in the body. A bullet is lodged against the first lumbar vertebra, just below the ribs, and is presumed to be the cause of the present paralysis in Governor Wallace's

legs" (p.28, col.3).

Four days later, James T. Wooten, leading off the Times "The Week In Review" with a piece on Wallace, did not enumerate all of Wallace's wounds, nor note any inaccuracy in the Times listing of May 17, but referred to "two superficial wounds in his back" and implied yet another wound with the statement, "One bullet was removed from his abdominal cavity..."

By the Times account of May 17 five bullets inflicted ten wounds on four individuals. It is possible, but is it so? If Wallace's abdominal wound is added the total number of wounds is eleven. And if the back wounds are also added the total may rise to thirteen, which strains credulity. Does the confusion resulting from these discrepant and ambiguous statements derive from usual journalistic imprecision or is it evidence of something more sinister, hidden from view, and to be dug out? What happened to the bullets? Two lodged in Wallace, none, apparently, in the other victims. One bullet was removed from Wallace's abdominal cavity. Another, at this writing, is soon to be removed from his spinal canal. Where are the bullets which caused ~~his~~ <sup>chest,</sup> arm/and superficial shoulder-blade wounds, and/or the superficial back wounds? And the wounds of the other victims? Were <sup>other bullets</sup> they recovered? Have you read any reference to their whereabouts?

As a veteran of the campaign against the Warren Commis-

sion what do you make of the late discovery by the local police of a second hand gun in a wheel well beneath the trunk of the would-be assassin's car several days after the FBI and Secret Service, according to the Times, virtually took the car apart but, it seems, missed the weapon? Is it characteristic incompetence on the part of the Federal police agencies or is evidence being manufactured? To what end? Can the second gun have some bearing on the difficulty of explaining how one gun fired five bullets into four persons, causing ten or eleven or thirteen wounds? Is there another explanation?

Wallace is a candidate for nomination by the Democratic Party for President of the United States. His attempted murder was a political act which has had and will continue to have political consequences. What was the motive? I found no statement by the would-be assassin, or by his attorney, or by his relatives, or by any official source. Only the usual twaddle by politicians, journalists, and psychiatrists about the climate of violence in the country and the "senseless" criminality of alienated, sexually incompetent loners. Have you come across anything meaningful? Is the government of Nixon, like that of Johnson, unable to find the motivation for political murder and attempted assassination? Or is it suppressing the motive? Do you see the hand of the CIA in the Wallace affair? Or the army? Or Soviet intelligence?

Inasmuch as the attempt on Wallace's life was a melodramatic incident in

dramatic incident in the process of electing a president of the United States, national legislators, and numerous state and local officials, do you still hold the view the American republic expired on November 22, 1963 when John F. Kennedy was killed?

Hopefully

Thomas Starn

Nov 22, 1972 ✓