

THE NATIONAL

Insider

104

Mrs. Oswald Reveals New Evidence

MY SONS KNOW

- Was JFK's death a "mercy killing?"
- Why does the FBI ignore new evidence?
- Why did Warren Report ignore evidence in Lee's favor?

Lee Harvey Oswald's Mother Tells

Why I Believe My Son Did Not Kill The President

By
MARGUERITE OSWALD

After two years of investigative work, I still believe in my son's innocence.

He did not assassinate President John F. Kennedy that terrible afternoon in Dallas, Texas, two years ago.

I say this not because I am a mother who stubbornly refuses to admit that her son murdered one of our most beloved presidents.

If you could prove to me that my son is guilty, I would accept it.

True, it would be a terrible truth, but it would not be a blot on the Oswald name or the mother, brothers, wife and children Lee left behind.

No, if Lee killed President Kennedy, the shame, the guilt and the responsibility would be his and his alone. Every man is responsible for his own actions. He and he alone must

stand, in pride or shame, beside them.

I defend my son's name not because I can't face the facts. I defend him because I do not accept them as facts!

No Proof

No one has proven to me that my son is guilty.

The hundreds of thousands of words I have read in newspapers, books and magazines have not proven it.

The twenty-seven volumes of the Warren Commission's report have not proven it.

And the two years I have spent investigating the assassinations of both the President and my own son—remember, Lee too was the victim of an assassin's bullet—have only confirmed my belief that Lee Harvey Oswald is innocent. Two years ago I stood vir-

tually alone when I said my son did not slay the president. The newspapers of America, acting as both judge and jury, had convicted Lee.

And television executed him.

Then the Warren Commission, as if to justify and confirm what the press had said and what a murderer's bullet had done, gathered the so-called evidence, added it up and reached a conclusion: guilty.

It was the answer everyone expected and secretly hoped for.

A Different Answer

The guilty verdict closed the book on dozens of mysteries, doubts and contradictions surrounding the assassination, not to mention calming the fears that would have plagued the nation if a killer hadn't been

identified.

But then as people read beyond the newspaper and magazine reports of the official Warren Commission's own condensation of the original 27-volume report, the doubts began again. When the critics added up the



They haven't proved my son is guilty, says Mrs. Oswald.

facts for themselves, they got an answer far different than the Commission's.

They discovered as I had that the Commission's evidence could lead to any number of conclusions.

Among the hundreds of thousands of words of direct testimony was enough conflicting information to raise doubts in even a hanging jury.

Just as an example, take the ballistics evidence which "proves" that the bullets which killed Kennedy were fired from Lee's rifle.

In the first place, the only identifiable bullet from the barrage of shots that felled Kennedy and Gov. Connally was

found two hours after the shooting on the second floor of Parkland Hospital, where Kennedy died.

Mystery Bullet

Where did this bullet come from?

The Warren Report says it fell out of Connally's body.

But the two Commission autopsy doctors in Washington both testified that no bullet in such relatively undamaged condition could have fallen from the Governor's body after the wounds he sustained.

The Report dismisses this point, as it does others that cast doubt on the guilt of my son.

It didn't even consider the possibility that the bullet might have been planted by someone who wanted to incriminate my son.

Now bear in mind that this is just one example of the Commission's ignoring a fact that didn't fit its case.

There are others, some of which I will present later in this series.

On top of all this there is the new evidence which I have discovered and which hasn't even been considered by the Commission.

This new evidence changes the "reasonable" doubt about my son's guilt to a positive doubt.

Why have I not revealed this evidence earlier?

Why have I held back information which could either clear up the mystery or, at the least, raise enough questions in official minds to reopen the investigation?

The answer is quite simple: I have tried, but I am ignored.

Except for The National Insider, which printed my story last November, no other paper in America has given me a chance to explain my position or present the facts I have accumulated in two years of investigation.

When I am quoted in the press, it is usually out of context so that I sound like a batty old lady who should be tending to her nursing instead of playing Perry Mason.

I have signed contracts for books that would tell my story, but for some reason the books are either not published or, in one case, published but not made available to the public.

I have been abruptly canceled from radio and television shows because I was too "controversial."

The few times I have been given radio or television time I have spent most of my appearance answering the same old questions instead of being allowed to offer new ideas of my own.

When I tried to present to the government evidence I discovered after months of private investigation, and at the cost of nearly every penny I possess, it has been refused without so much as a good excuse.

Why? Because the government and the press would like to let sleeping dogs lie. They have their assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald.

Why upset the nation by casting doubts on his guilt?

Lee Was Involved

Well, I don't think they have the right man.

And I will spend the rest of my life and energy to prove to the American people that Lee Harvey Oswald is innocent.

Now when I say that Lee is innocent I am not saying that maybe, somehow, he wasn't involved with the events surrounding President Kennedy's death in November of 1963.

I have repeatedly stated that

it is quite possible that Lee was involved in some way, but to this date I can truthfully state I find Lee was a "patsy."

But the question is not if he was involved but how he was involved.

Lee might have been involved not only legally but heroically.

Lee WTD
DECEMBER 18, 1968

Of the many theories, of Lee's involvement let me present two.

First, let me say that I believe that my son was a secret agent of the United States government.

I believe he was trained during his service in the Marines.

As you know, while in the the Marines, Lee learned to speak, read and write Russian fluently and also studied the Soviet political structure.

Even his wife Marina, in her testimony before the Commission, testified that when she first met Lee, she thought he was Russian. Why did an educated Russian girl think that Lee was Russian? Shouldn't he have had an American accent?

When he "defected" to Russia he was, I believe, establishing a front for himself.

He went to Russia as an agent of the United States.

So if Lee was connected in any way with the assassination of President Kennedy, it was as an agent of his government.

Lee was either working with a loyal group of agents within the Secret Service, that branch of the Treasury Department devoted to protecting the president's life, or he was framed by a small disloyal group within the Secret Service.

Mercy Slaying

Let's look at the first possibility, that Lee was working with a group within the Secret Service.

As you know, during the last months of President Kennedy's life, there were rumors that he was suffering from an incurable disease.

The trouble with his back, it was said, was both a symptom of this disease and also a cover-up for his more serious health problem.

As this disease progressed, Kennedy would slowly become an invalid, unable to effectively carry out his duties as president.

A group of persons high in

the U.S. government learned of this and was deeply concerned.

According to this theory, they feared that if Kennedy took to his sick bed and became an invalid, there would be no one to function decisively as the chief of state.

These men recalled too clearly President Woodrow Wilson's long illness right after World War I, when his wife was in virtual control of the Executive Branch because the President was paralyzed by a stroke.

Many historians believe that due to Wilson's illness there was no leadership in the fight to get the U. S. in the League of Nations.

Consequently the League was defeated and the disorder in international affairs led to World War II.

These men also remembered the confusion in Washington during President Eisenhower's heart attack in 1957, when no one was sure if Richard Nixon or Sherman Adams was the real head of government.

Viet Nam and Cuba

Now, please try to remember the national and international situation in late 1963.

Our troubles in Viet Nam were just beginning to blow up toward the present crisis.

Racial disorder had wracked the nation internally since the early part of the summer.

The Cuban missile crisis was over, but no one was sure what would happen if Khrushchev moved again to make Cuba an aggressive nuclear

base aimed at America.

Today, fortunately, due to recent Congressional action, there is a legal system of presidential accession in case the President becomes incapacitated.

But in 1963 there was no such law.

What then might happen if Kennedy lay ill, unable to act both wisely and decisively if a new international or domestic crisis developed which threatened the nation?

The vice president would not have had the authority to take over as long as the president lived. But if he died, law or no law, the vice president would take over.

It was this thought that stirred a small group of Secret Service men.

They knew their duty—a quick, painless death for the President which would insure a smooth transfer of power.

To carry out their mercy killing of the President, they chose another secret government agent, Lee Harvey Oswald.

Let me interject here that this is merely a theory. I am not saying this happened. But it is possible.

It may seem an outrageous theory to the Warren Commission but it's no more outrageous or improbable than the case they brought against my son.

Now there is another possibility as to the connection between my son and the assassination.

This theory assumes that a group or a single person within the Secret Service wanted to assassinate the President

for selfish, personal motives.

They succeeded but the plot was discovered by my son.

But with Lee's past record, his "front" of having been a "defector" to the Soviet Union, they didn't have to worry about anyone listening to Lee's story immediately.

By the time other government agents were able to get to Lee, a bullet had silenced him for good.

His knowledge of the plot died with him in an emergency room in the same hospital where Kennedy died.

Now I know you are thinking these theories are impossible, if not ridiculous.

But I am sure you said the same thing when recently the Prime Minister of Singapore accused the U.S. of offering him a personal bribe of some two million dollars.

Ridiculous? Of course. Except that the State Department later admitted it was true!

So you must admit, just as the Warren Commission members must admit, that these theories are possible.

And if they are possible, so are dozens of other theories that hold my son to be innocent.

I believe that the Warren Commission's own conclusion, that Lee Harvey Oswald, acting alone and with no apparent motive, shot and killed the President on November 22, 1963, is just an unproven theory.

I don't swallow the "lone marxist" theory.

Next week I will reveal some of the evidence which led me to this conclusion.