

This is the conclusion of the second installment of FORGIVE MY GRIEF VOL. II. Author of this article is Griscom Morgan of Yellow Springs, Ohio. It is a review of a series of articles which appeared in the JOURNAL OF FORENSIC SCIENCE for July, 1966. The quarterly is published by the AMERICAN ACADEMY OF FORENSIC SCIENCE.

The Warren Commission staff had a number of firm leads as to a possible conspiracy to carry, out the assassination and the shooting of Oswald, mostly involving an anti-Castro organization. On March 12th the Commission's staff asked the CIA to investigate them since the Commission depended on existing investigative agencies, and the CIA' was the appropriate agency in this case in view of its own involvement in anti-Castro activity. On May 19th the CIA was reminded of this request, but it was not till September 15th when the Commission's Report' was about finished that its staff received a perfunctory response from the CIA that did not resolve these questions.

In the original request to the CIA the Commission's staff had stated that "a governmental informant in Chicago connected with the sale of arms to anti-Castro Cubans has reported that such Cubans were behind the Kennedy assassination." Another item listed was a report by a responsible Cuban refugee, Sylvia Odio, referring to a visit from a North American who looked like Lee Oswald and who called himself LEON Oswald According to Mrs. Odio, one of this man's associates, LEOPOLDO, said of him, "he told us we Cubans didn't have any guts, because President Kennedy should have been assassinated after the Bay of Pigs . . and he said it was easy to do it . . . he repeated several times he was an expert shotman."

Yet another piece of evidence referred to in the Commission's request to the CIA was testimony from a New England woman working there for the police, who had previously worked for Jack Ruby, to the effect that Jack Ruby had been a go-between in financing the shipment of arms taken by an army

Jone Shirt 3.3830 ¢ ; 5 n(minem er=2008. de bui reontiaŭ configned to of the esponded according to lipstelu we are supposed to be closing ain. General has found so little evi warment ıe At reast one variatives soughed then Costro work her soughed then Costro work her soughed then Costro work her soughed the termination of the the termination of the soughed termination of the termination of the termination of the soughed termination of the termination of the termination of termination of the soughed termination of te 

saying of President Kennedy, "I'm convinced that anyone else would be infinitely worse" as president and M. Daniel found Castro sincerely hoping for Kennedy's reelection. For the same reason the anth Castro forces DID have motive for the assassination -- as shown in the conversation between Sylvia Odio and "Leopoldo" to which we have referred. In view of the evidence that Jack Ruby was also involved with "Leopoldo" and the high likelihood that the Central Intelligence Agency also was in contact with him through its anti-Castro endeavors, one should at least suspect an interest on the part of Jack Ruby, the CIA and hence of the United States Government for keeping any anti-Castro involvement in the assassination top secret.

If Arlen Specter is right that "The decision of the Commission was not an egregious (flagrant, glaring, gross) use of their discretion," but was the necessary consequence of the President's decision, then the Warren Report ceases to be, in historian Trevor-Roper's term, "slovenly" and must be regarded as an extremely difficult achievement. If the task had been simply to find the truth, the highly qualified staff of the Commission and the FBI would most probably have done a competent job in finding it. But if its task was, as Jay Schwartz conceived it, to add a veneer of prestige by the involvement of important and honored public men to give credence to an already discredited FBI report, it had a much more difficult task to perform. Specter's sciatement and Schwartz independently tend to confirm the conclusions of Edward J. Epstein's book INQUEST: "Why did the Commission fail to take cognizance in its conclusions of this evidence of a second assassin? Quite clearly, a serious discussion of this problem would have undermined the dominant purpose of the Commission, namely, the settling of doubts and suspicions. Indeed, if the Commission had made it clear that very substantial evidence indicated the presence of a second assassin, it would have opened up a Pandora's box of doubts and suspicions. In establishing its version of the truth the Warren Commission acted to reassure the nation and protect the national interest."

Mr. Epstein does not express any recognition that for an assassin to be unexposed and for the motive of the assassination to be undiscovered constitutes a successful assassination. Not only would the

