While a relative newcomer to the position of commissioner of transportation, I have been active for many years, most recently as president of the [illegible] mce of Munic- erned with all

Hartford Courant 2/3/74

The New Haven Line rail commuter service is another area of major concern. We have been subsidizing and improving this service since 1971. And, again, the investment has paid off in terms of increasing usage of the transportation as our foremost priority.

Arthur B. Powers
Commissioner
Department of Transportation
Wethersfield

# The Agent is Wrong!

The Jan. 18 op-ed article by FBI agent Francis X. O'Neill Jr. makes numerous false statements about the assassination of President Kennedy, and raises questions about O'Neill's own role in the subsequent cover-up of the facts.

O'Neill says that the Warren Report reaffirmed the FBI's investigation of the murder. This is false, as O'Neill is fully aware. O'Neill neglected to mention in his article that after he attended the autopsy of President Kennedy, he wrote a report in collaboration with FBI agent James W. Sibert that stands in sharp contradiction with the Warren Commission's version of the president's wounds.

Sibert and O'Neill stated that a bullet struck the president below the shoulder blade, five inches below the collar line, and only penetrated the back two or three inches. The two agents reported that the depth of the wound was so shallow that Dr. James Humes, the autopsy surgeon, could feel the end of the bullet's penetration with his finger. O'Neill's report of the shallow back wound was reported in the Dec. 18, 1963 edition of both the New York Times and the Washington Post. The Warren report however, says that the bullet entered five inches higher on the back of the president's neck, and that the bullet passed all the way through the body and went on to cause all of John Connally's non-fatal wounds as well.

O'Neill asserts that Secret Service agents Roy Kellerman and William Greer agree with the official version about the shots and the wounds. He neglected to mention that both men, also in attendance during the autopsy, testified before the Warren Commission that the back wound was five inches below the collar line and penetrated only a few inches. O'Neill also neglected to mention that both agents testified that the final two shots fired on Nov. 22 were so close together that they were right on top of each other. According to the FBI's tests of the alleged murder weapon, it took a minimum of 2.3 seconds to work the bolt and jerk the trigger — without aiming.

Finally, O'Neill is correct when he says that the statements of the eyewitnesses immediately after the shooting is the best evidence. He is wrong, however, in saying that it shows the official scenario to be true. On the contrary, it shows that President Kennedy was murdered by cross-fire, with shots from the front as well as from behind.

Over two-thirds of the witnesses questioned by the FBI and the Warren Commission about the direction of the shots said there were shots from the president's right front, from behind the stockade fence on the grassy knoll. Forty-two witnesses told the Warren Commission, either through testimony or sworn deposition, that shots came from the front. O'Neill also failed to mention that the doctors who examined the president's body right after the assassination told the press that he was struck by two bullets, both from the front as he faced his assailant(s). They told us one bullet struck him in front of the throat, the other entering the right temple. The throat wound was reported as a wound of entrance by the New York Times in six different reports after the assassination, while the wound in the head was reported as an entrance wound in the right temple through Dec. 16, 1963.

The irreconcilable contradictions in the government's own facts developed over the years about this crime show that the need for the truth about the Kennedy assassination is as great today as it was on the afternoon of Nov. 22, 1963.

Andrew Liddell
North Windham

# Abortion Transcends Religion

According to the position of the American Civil Liberties Union, as expressed on the op-ed page, Jan. 29, it would seem that those who favor abortion, and those who hold to a woman's right to choice, maintain that these of us who speak against abortion are proceeding from a religious point of view. This does not necessarily follow.

There are certain things that are moral which are totally apart from religion. This is particularly true when the word "religion" is used in a sectarian sense — such as Christian or Protestant, or Roman Catholic or Jewish etc. There are certain moral areas of life which transcend religion. Abortion is one of these areas, I believe.

In our society there are certain rights which have been abrogated by the state, the most notable of which is capital punishment. No person has the right to take the life of another. The right has such a great consequence that no man can himself be judge and jury. I would hold that abortion rightly comes under this heading. The consequences are so great and pervasive that no woman can take to herself the right to determine the future of our race and, to some extent, society. Abortion, willy-nilly, develops an attitude toward life which demeans persons, which places ultimate values in the here-and-now and which takes little account of the future.

As to when a fetus becomes "viable human life" is to beg the question. There is no doubt that within hours of conception an egg and a sperm have begun to develop into a multi-cellular entity. Within days, any patholigist can recognize that "mass of cells" as being of the human species — not a cat or a cow, but a human. It is of the mother, and in the mother, and nourished by the mother, but it is a separate and distinct entity. Who can deny this? To speak therefor of rights is to — it goes to the heart of society and its future, indeed it is of the essence of law, order and justice. As such, its regulation and protection is of concern to more than the woman herself. It is the concern of all of society, men and women alike, for we are indeed our brother's keeper and sustainer. No man lives unto himself but rather, unto one another.

Let us be done with rights and with individualism and with causes. Let us learn the realities of the brotherhood of all mankind, learn to bear one another's burdens and be done with selfishness and self-interest. Morality transcends all of this and makes each of us responsible, in some degree, for all of the actions of mankind throughout the whole universe.

Abortion a religious issue? No. Abortion a "civil rights" issue? No. Rather abortion is a moral issue involving all of mankind, at all times, in all places.