

(Mount Clipping in Space Below)

President Kennedy Assassination --the Unanswered Questions

This is the second instalment from the book "The Unanswered Questions about President Kennedy's Assassination," by Pulitzer prize-winning reporter, Sylvan Fox. Yesterday set the scene. Today's instalment examines the possible motive for the slaying.

LEE HARVEY OSWALD

MOTIVE IS AN essential element of virtually every crime. With rare exceptions, crimes are committed for a reason. Some are committed for financial gain, some for revenge, some with a political objective in mind. To understand a crime, whether it is the assassination of a President or the theft of a car, one must understand the motive that impelled that crime. To exclude this element is to fail to tell the full story, to fail to answer the crucial question: Why?

Only occasionally is a crime committed senselessly. The perpetrator in such a case is deranged and his motivation lies deep within his distorted mind, usually beyond the reach of rational people.

More frequently, the man who commits a seemingly senseless crime is adjudged deranged after he has performed the act. Up to the time of the crime, he was considered rational and sane; only the crime itself establishes him as irrational. Something suddenly snaps, the advocates of this approach to criminal psychology would have us believe.

Psychiatrists are understandably wary of this "sudden snap" theory. They know the processes of mental breakdown usually are slow and that derangement so extreme as to express itself in murder rarely occurs overnight.

IMPLICIT IN THE Warren commission's conclusions is the thesis that Lee Harvey Oswald killed President Kennedy for obscure reasons stemming from some extreme derangement, and that Jack Ruby's murder of Oswald was similarly motivated. Thus, the commission suggests, two of the principal "players" in one of history's greatest tragedies were men who simply went berserk.



LEE HARVEY Oswald as he appeared as a marine when stationed in California. Clues to Oswald's motives can be found in his family history, his education or lack of it, his acts, his writings, and the recollection of those who had close contacts with him thruout his life. . . . The commission could not make any definitive determination of Oswald's motives."

In other words, on the vital question of motive, the commission is frankly inconclusive and suggests that "others may study Oswald's life and arrive at their own conclusions as to his possible motives."

Mr. Tolson	_____
Mr. Belmont	_____
Mr. Mohr	_____
Mr. DeLoach	_____
Mr. Casper	_____
Mr. Callahan	_____
Mr. Conrad	_____
Mr. Felt	_____
Mr. Gale	_____
Mr. Rosen	_____
Mr. Sullivan	_____
Mr. Tavel	_____
Mr. Trotter	_____
Tele. Room	_____
Miss Holmes	_____
Miss Gandy	_____

(Indicate page, name of newspaper, city and state.)

Handwritten notes:
 Ryback
 7-22
 62-119060
 SP-2

CHICAGO AMERICAN
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Date: _____
 Edition: 3 STAR FINAL
 Author: _____
 Editor: LUKE CARROLL
 Title: _____
 Character: _____
 or _____
 Classification: _____
 Submitting Office: CHICAGO

Handwritten notes:
 62-119060-4

Kennedy and did it alone, why did he do it? Did his purported derangement somehow focus on Kennedy? There is no evidence to support an affirmative reply. Did he see Mr. Kennedy as somehow causing his personal difficulties? There is nothing to support such a theory either. Did he conceive of Mr. Kennedy, in some paranoiac nightmare, as his persecutor? Nothing suggests that this is likely.

In fact, the whole system that assumes that the assassination grew out of some form of derangement is difficult to substantiate. It is just as reasonable to assume from the available evidence that Oswald had some undiscerned but completely comprehensible reason for killing President Kennedy.

THE COMMISSION'S attempt to interpret Oswald's motives relies upon a method that might be called psychoanalysis *a posteriori*. It is a technique by which almost anything can be proved about almost anyone, depending upon the selection of psychological data.

There are doubtless hundreds, perhaps even thousands, of men living in the United States today who have a deep-rooted resentment of authority, an inability to enter into meaningful relationships, an urge to find a place in history, a capacity for violence, and even an avowed commitment to Marxism and communism as they understand the terms.

Yet they did not assassinate the President, nor are they likely to do so. Some will live unhappy lives, work at drab jobs, marry, have children, leave their wives—just as Oswald did all these things. But the chances are slim that they will kill.

Oswald, somehow was, different.

ALL THE EVIDENCE available suggests that Oswald was sane, in both the legal and the medical sense, at the time of the assassination.

The earliest testimony to Oswald's mental condition was given by Dr. Rufatus Hartogs, the chief psychiatrist

Oswald, as a truant, was examined.

"I found him to be a medium-sized, slender, curly-haired youngster, pale-faced, who was not very talkative. . . . not very responsive. He had to be prompted," Hartogs told the Warren commission. "He was polite. He answered in a somewhat monotonous fashion. His sentences were well-structured. He was in full contact with reality."

Referring to Hartogs' testimony, the commission declared:

"Contrary to reports that appeared after the assassination, the psychiatric examination did not indicate that Lee Oswald was a potential assassin, potentially dangerous, that 'his outlook on life had strongly paranoid overtones,' or that he should be institutionalized."

After his release from Youth House, his mother took him back to New Orleans, the city of his birth. He returned to school for a while, and when he was about 15 became interested in Marxism. Upon completing the ninth grade, Oswald quit school and got a job.

Despite this interest in communism and Marxism, Oswald tried to join the Marines when he was 16 years old. He was rejected because of his age. But a year later, when he was 17, Oswald tried again. This time he was accepted.

AFTER SERVING in the Marines for almost 3 years, Oswald requested a transfer from active duty to reserve status.

This, at the age of 20, Oswald left the Marines certifiably sane and without any overt or even suspected psychotic tendencies.

After returning to civilian life, Oswald defected to Rus-

when the Russian authorities at first refused to permit him to remain in the country. This could be an alarming symptom of possible mental breakdown. But Soviet psychiatrists who examined him at the time found him sane.

The final clew to Oswald's condition must be sought in his behavior after his arrest. Was he irrational then, & out of touch with reality? Had something snapped during the



AS a schoolboy, Lee Harvey Oswald poses as a second grader in Fort Worth.

24 or 48 hours immediately preceding the assassination?

There is nothing to indicate that his behavior had changed in any significant way. Accounts of his interrogation do not suggest that he was incoherent or unaware of what was happening. He denied any role in the assassination of Kennedy or the shooting of Officer Tippit, and he requested legal counsel—both the acts of a reasonably rational man who realizes the nature of his plight.

THE INEVITABLE conclusion is that Oswald was sane at the time of the assassination. And, if he was sane, he must have had some reason—unacceptable to the rest of us—for killing the President. You cannot have both sides of it.

Nowhere does the Commission explain why it so thoroughly ignores the important political aspects of Oswald's life and personality, choosing instead to focus on his upbringing and his inability to form meaningful relationships. The political significance of Mr. Kennedy's assassination would appear to have been a far more fruitful area of speculation for the commission than the complex, undecipherable psychological convolutions of a dead assassin. Rather than hypothesizing on Oswald's capacity for violence, the commission might well have considered the possibility, even the probability, that Oswald killed Mr. Kennedy out of some belief that he was accomplishing an important political mission.

There is another conjectural explanation for Oswald's motive which hinges on the possibility—suggested by a great deal of interesting evidence and testimony—that Oswald was during the last few years of his life an informer or agent of the CIA, the FBI or both.

It should be stated at the outset that the Warren commission vigorously denies that Oswald was in the employ of any agency of the United States government.

Despite these disclaimers, the record discloses a number of curious items.

FIRST THERE ARE the circumstances surrounding Oswald's defection to Russia and his subsequent return. Altho Oswald went to the Soviet Union and there tried to renounce his American citizenship, and altho he may well have supplied the Rus-

sians with valuable electronic and radar information he picked up while a Marine, the United States government acted singularly unconcerned.

Some time later, while handing out pro-Castro leaflets on a New Orleans street, Oswald got into a fight with a group of anti-Castro Cubans and was arrested by the New Orleans police for disturbing the peace. After being held in jail overnight, Oswald "asked police to arrange for him to be interviewed by the FBI." The police agreed.

This, to say the least, is an unusual request for a staunch pro-Castro Marxist to make. But the Warren commission offers no explanation of why Oswald wanted to see an FBI agent.

Still later, Oswald applied for a passport, listing his destination, among other places, as Poland and the Soviet Union. Actually, as events later revealed, he really hoped to go to Cuba.

Despite the fact that he was a known defector who had attempted to renounce his American citizenship, a man who had returned to the United States only to engage in pro-Castro activities, Oswald was given a passport in 24 hours!

If Oswald was in fact working for the CIA or the FBI, the entire picture we have of him as a leftist and a pro-Castroite is a fiction.

Regardless of how Oswald is seen, he is clearly a man deeply involved in political extremism.