

X

nouncements which they know are far short of the truth. I make that assertion with utmost certainty, assuming that the evidence which they viewed has not been faked. (Knowing what I do about the assassination and its disreputable aftermath, I am reluctant even to make that assumption, for at this stage we have no reason to place unquestioning confidence in any new "evidence" that the government develops.)

The truth is this: the President was wounded at least twice from behind (in the back of the torso, and in the head), and at least once (in the head) from the right and slightly forward of him; he was struck twice in the head by bullets fired almost simultaneously from two directions. Medical evidence that "proves" otherwise is false. If Ramsey Clark does not know that, then he is a fool, for he has the means whereby to determine exactly what happened. If he does know it (and I believe he does), then he is a scoundrel. In either case, your readers have no warrant to trust either his own statements about the assassination or the statements of those whom he appoints to "study" the issues.

The autopsy photos and X-rays cannot refute what is already known to be true, for the evidence that bears on the question whether Kennedy was struck from the right-front is visible, massive, conclusive, and public; it cannot fail to persuade anyone who is not irrevocably dedicated to the government's version, however bizarre it may be. Further to maintain that one man fired upon the President requires an act of desperate and immense trust in the integrity of a government which by its actions, though not by its rhetoric, has repudiated its claim to any trust whatever.

I regret that the space of your "Letters" column does not allow me the opportunity to discuss the deliberate and unforgivable defects of the official autopsy report, or to describe the limits within which the photos and X-rays may yield relevant information. It is sufficient that your readers at least understand that if the press accounts accurately describe the major conclusions developed from recent medical findings, then they do no more than confirm some information which has not been a matter of dispute: that the President was wounded twice from behind.

The "new" evidence does not answer the two most important questions respecting the medical findings, although it pretends to answer them by implication and by deceitful omission: What is the precise location of the wound in the President's back? What are the indications that the President was wounded by a shot that originated from the right and forward of him?

Ramsey Clark and his medical minions dare not answer those questions, for if they reply truthfully, they will confirm

the already conclusive answers, and thereby will convict themselves of prior deceit. If they present "proof" that conflicts with what is already known, then Clark, and those whom he serves, and those who serve him stand convicted not merely of issuing the half-truth, but of spreading deliberate lies.

RICHARD BERNABEI

Glenburnie

Kingston Whig-Standard - "Notes" 2/10/64
KENNEDY ASSASSINATION

Sir: The U.S. Department of "Justice" has taken another giant step into the gummy mire of deceit that invariably surrounds the activities of U.S. government agencies in connection with the assassination of President Kennedy. It is beyond reason to hope that your readers failed to be deceived by recent reports concerning the photographs and X-rays that were made during the autopsy of the President's body.

U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, regularly the chief spokesman of the deceivers, disclosed that four doctors who viewed the photos and X-rays concluded last February that "the autopsy findings on President Kennedy were correct as detailed in the Warren commission report and prove that he was shot twice from behind."

To those who are familiar with the circumstances of the President's death and with the disgraceful efforts that have been made to conceal the truth about it, Clark's disclosure indicates merely that four more individuals have elected to set themselves among the ranks of sycophants who issue pro-