

WATCHMAN WAKETH BUT IN VAIN

By:

Thomas Katen
Vincent J. Salandria
Gary Schoener

Why then the intimacy between this man of "superior education" (De Mohrenschildt) and this "unstable" and "mixed-up" person (Oswald)? With respect to Oswald, there should have been INACTION on behalf of De Mohrenschildt. If Oswald seemed to be a nobody, De Mohrenschildt was surely a somebody. A former CIA agent, an acquaintance of Bill Turner (who is on the staff of and contributes articles to RAMPARTS and is a careful student of the assassination) told Turner the CIA would have assigned someone the task of befriending Oswald and keeping an eye on him. De Mohrenschildt could be that someone. There is no other reason why he should have shown such an interest in Oswald. De Mohrenschildt is a petroleum geologist, associates with the socially most prominent people, was suspected of being a Nazi agent during World War II, was connected with our State Department in 1957-1958 (XIX H 555), and during the forties was involved in FACTS, INC. with a partner Baron Maydell, who was accused of being a German spy and who was certainly pro Nazi.

De Mohrenschildt also went to Yugoslavia and Ghana as a geological consultant for our State Department. The Haitian government repaid his work in the form of sesal plantation. Why was this man described as one with "superior education" interested in Oswald? Why was De Mohrenschildt interested in Oswald? And finally, why was no one interested in De Mohrenschildt on the day of the assassination? The one point at which we should have expected ACTION on the part of the government would have been in response to his subversive activities.

And why is it that this obscure, unimportant Oswald, seems to have a double leaving a false

path for him? Professor Richard Popkin has carefully followed the activities of a second Oswald. (8) Who was the Leon Oswald who met Mrs. Odio, and whom she was informed spoke of killing the President? Who was the Oswald who drove a car at 70 miles an hour, when Lee Harvey Oswald couldn't drive? Who was the Oswald who informed the automobile salesman he would soon come into money, and who told another salesman he was planning to go to Russia? Who was the Oswald who made a public nuisance of himself at a shooting range? Who was the Oswald who had a telescopic sight put on his rifle? In all cases the Commission tells us it wasn't Lee Harvey Oswald. Then who was it? What was he doing? Why was he doing this? The point is that the ACTIONS of Oswald, of his associates, or doubles, are not consistent with an interpretation on the basis of coincidence.

Oswald was given the most preferential treatment. No unfavorable action was taken against him when such action was called for. This was all BEFORE the assassination. After the assassination unfavorable action was taken against him, where it was not called for. The physical and eyewitness evidence of the officials themselves didn't justify an inference of guilt on behalf of Oswald. The paraffin test was not consistent with his having fired a rifle, because there was no nitrate deposits on his cheek.

The main witness against Oswald, Brennan, was unable to identify him in a lineup, and Oswald did not confess to having committed any crimes. Rather, he said he was FRAMED. That doesn't mean he was, but it was a charge nonetheless that could well have been considered. The government was obligated to consider the hypothesis of a frame, because the Secret Service had been given a tape by the Intelligence Division of the Miami Police Department several days after November 9, 1963, which tape described an actual plot uncovered in Miami to kill President Kennedy. The informant described how a patsy would be provided to throw the public off the real trail of the conspirators. (9) But, the authorities ignored this Miami revelation in interpreting Oswald's pos-

sible role in the assassination. They ignored it although the bullet designated Commission Exhibit 399 tipped itself off as a plant flying into the case as it did without benefit of blood, tissue, weight loss or deformation.

8. Popkin, Richard H., **THE SECOND OSWALD**, New York. Avon Books, 1966.

9. Jones, Penn Jr., *Loc. Cit.*, p. 47.

(To be continued next week)