

# FORGIVE MY GRIEF

VOL. II

By **PENN JONES** and **SHIRLEY MARTIN**

2/28/66  
**WINDOW DRESSING**  
by **Griscom Morgan**

**Note:** Although this book will be authored by Penn Jones Jr and Shirley Martin, some installments are by others working on the assassination of President Kennedy. These authors names will appear at the top of their contributions.

This installment is written by Griscom Morgan of Yellow Springs, Ohio, and we are proud to offer this fine work to our readers.

The literature on the Kennedy assassination is inadequate not so much because of there being insufficient wealth of detailed evidence as because no study has given an adequately substantiated suggestion as to why and how President Kennedy was killed and why the Warren Report failed in its job.

Beyond a shadow of doubt the Warren Commission subordinated consideration of objective truth (to which it had given verbal commitment) to political considerations, if only to the extent of rushing its Report to publication before important leads had been resolved. Its staff, according to Edward Epstein's *INQUEST*, had been so dissatisfied with this procedure as to be at times in revolt. This political motivation is understandable and to be expected, but its nature and dimensions require careful and intensive study.

The major books on the Warren Report have not answered the crucial questions asked by the public. Mark Lane's *RUSH TO JUDGEMENT*, Weisberg's *WHITEWASH*, and Sylvan Fox's *UNANSWERED QUESTIONS* rightly marshal evidence and raise insistant questions and leave the questions unanswered. Edward Epstein's lucid *INQUEST* attains much of its importance from Epstein's being the first author to be accepted into the confidence of the Warren Commission members and staff. It is not surprising that his conclusions are a justification for the findings of the Warren Commission on the basis of political expediency, or "national interest."

In this study we seek to find the answers to

crucial questions about the Kennedy assassination without fear of the implications of such an inquiry. We seek to do this in a brief overview of the case without involvement in the vast range of details of evidence (which we have so far found consistent with the overview we have developed.) It is not necessary to prove the conspiracy theory many times; one conclusive evidence should suffice.\* It is not necessary here to show that Lee Oswald shot at President Kennedy\*; if there was a conspiracy, it is the source and motivation of the conspiracy that must be discovered. Some steps of our argument are admittedly speculative, but speculation is inescapable until the case is closed.

\* Toward the end of the investigation Marina Oswald informed the Warren Commission staff that she felt it more likely that her husband had shot at Governor Connally than at the President. The attorney Carroll Jarnigan had written the FBI on December 4, 1963 of his overhearing Ruby planning with Oswald for Oswald to shoot at Connally in consideration of a large payment from a party Ruby was working for. This is consistent with Oswald's preoccupation with personal and financial difficulties and his having a grudge against the Governor. To get Oswald involved in shooting at the time of the assassination of the President would give the true assassins a perfect cover for their motives and actions.

The Warren Report confidently asserted that there was no acquaintance between Oswald and Ruby, and that at the time of Oswald's murder "it is doubtful even that Oswald could have seen Jack Ruby sufficiently to discern his identity." In flat contradiction to this assertion are the testimonies of two officers close to Oswald at the time of his death. D. R. Archer (XIXH20) testified "I distinctly heard the suspect shout a phrase, the only words I could make out were, 'son of a bitch, don't.'" Detective Billy Corbet separately testified he heard Oswald say "Jack Ruby, you son of a bitch, don't!" (XIX350). The lie

(OW TO) 12/28/66  
**THE MIDLOTHIAN MIRROR**

detector test Ruby took to clear himself of conspiring, is itself incriminating because it makes a case for Ruby's integrity that the evidence disproves. The government has classified evidence obtained by the Defense Department that, in the words of a New York Times report, "there is no scientific evidence to show that lie detector tests were worthwhile" and that "persons could be trained to fool the devices" (NYT 6-18-64).

The subject matter of the Warren Commission's investigation is the technical field of FORENSIC SCIENCE. This is the study of evidence, as for court use, and it involves various disciplines of science and technology. For example, FORENSIC BALLISTICS is that branch of criminal investigation dealing with identification of firearms and bullets, and study of the trajectory and effects of bullets.

Diverse disciplines are involved, such as psychiatry, physiology, and spectroscopy.

Last February the highest professional body in the nation exactly concerned with the field of the WARREN REPORT ON THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY had a panel of specialists analyze the Warren Report at its annual meeting. This body, the AMERICAN ACADEMY OF FORENSIC SCIENCE, like other staid and scientific professional bodies, has its own journal, and that journal has at last published the studies of the specialists that had participated on the panel. This issue of the JOURNAL OF FORENSIC SCIENCES is dated July 1966, but was sent out about two months late.

The significance of this study of the Warren Report is that it is the first objective study by competent scientists that cannot be said to be the work of self-appointed amateurs. Moreover, it is highly significant that the editor of the Journal, Morton F. Mason, is employed at the very hospital to which President Kennedy was taken after he was shot in Dallas.

The editor of the special section of the Journal dealing with the Warren Report observes of the studies by specialists in forensic science that they are the product of scientific discipline and not written with any intent to discredit the Warren Commission or the government. He asserts that where these well-qualified specialists find discreditable features in the Warren Report it is only because the evidence made these findings necessary.

These studies are important to the nation today because sound politics requires a basis in objectivity in science free from political bias. If we scramble politics and science we will be ill served by both.

Among the specialists studying the Warren Report some assumed with regard to areas in which they were not specialists that the Report had effectively accomplished its general purpose. But some of these specialists found as regards their special areas of competence that the Warren Report was not satisfactory. The criminologist, Osterberg, develops evidence that the majority of the public for whom the Warren Report was prepared had not been convinced by it—a poor showing for a legal case. The psychiatrist, Dr.

Maier Tuchler asserted (as the New York Times quoted him in its report of the meeting at which he gave his study) that with regard to the establishment of motivation he was "appalled at the conclusions reached without the benefit of trained professional thinking." We might note here that Edward Jay Epstein in his INQUEST shows that psychiatrists WERE called in by the Warren Commission staff, but "there was insufficient basis for drawing psychological conclusions about Oswald," so this was not mentioned in the Report.

The only occasions on record of Lee Oswald expressing his attitude toward President Kennedy are expressions of respect, as when he answered his wife's questioning about Kennedy with the response that he was "a good president," and in the words of the Warren Report, "shortly before the assassination Oswald expressed approval of President Kennedy's role in the area of civil rights."

The panel's specialist in pathology, Dr. Cyril H. Wecht, similarly concurred with the Warren Report but finds fault with the government's use only of military pathologists in performing the autopsy of President Kennedy's body. A military pathologist being under military orders cannot be assumed to be bound exclusively by professional considerations as a qualified civilian should have been. Those acquainted with the history of militarily ordered diagnosis of insanity in the army know that the army medical corps are not free from controls that may be in conflict with professional standards.

It was the attorney, Jay Schwartz, who analyzed the Warren Report in depth. His article taking legal exception to the Warren Report raises basic issues of fact that would be within the knowledge of the editor of the Journal located at the hospital at which some of the issues of fact were best known. The editor would have been in the position to correct them if they were mistaken. Schwartz finds

the Warren Report essentially a political instrument for achieving confidence in what was essentially the already discredited FBI report on the Kennedy assassination. Schwartz finds the Warren Report faulty, inadequate, hasty and that it does not stand up under close examination. In the words of the New York Times report of the meeting at which Schwartz' critique was given:

**Continued Next Week**