

WATCHMAN WAKETH BUT IN VAIN

By:

Thomas Katen
Vincent J. Salandria
Gary Schoener

*11-2-68
Maddalena
Maddalena*

Again we see the pattern. There was PRE-JUDICIAL action taken against Oswald after the assassination. This official action wasn't justified by the very data authorities were themselves presenting as evidence. Before the assassination, when there was a justification for action against Oswald, none was taken. This pattern is only consistent with a frameup, and this frameup must go up to

the highest levels—those levels which prevent our knowing information concerning Oswald's relationship with the government. It certainly goes up to the Warren Commission, which refused to consider any evidence bearing unfavorably on a lone assassin theory.

Further, it is interesting that while Oswald was arrested without real evidence, and tenaciously clung to as the lone assassin, no such action was taken against others who may have been suspicious. Only action against Oswald, where it most probably was unjustified, but none against others where it might have been justified. As we have already observed, Richard Sprague has brought the fact to our attention that a number of arrests were made after the assassination. There is photographic evidence of this. What happened to these men? Why were they not regarded with more suspicion considering the fact there was sufficient suspicion to arrest them—at a time the military was informing the new leaders there was no conspiracy.

A most interesting figure is Igor Vaganov. We are not suggesting he is guilty of anything, but he was sufficiently suspicious for the FBI to question him for two hours. He was an excellent shot; carried a gun; turned up in Dallas not long before the assassination; left shortly thereafter, and fit the description of one of the men Acquilla Clemons

said she saw kill Officer Tippit. He had a red Thunderbird and, Domingo Benavides, one of the witnesses to Tippit's murder, saw a man in a "red Ford." Tippit was shot with a .38 caliber revolver, the same kind Vaganov had with him. Further, Vaganov's whereabouts during the killing of Tippit haven't been substantiated. And the evening before the assassination, Anne Vaganov was hysterical, and she called her sister to tell her that her husband "Turk" (Igor Vaganov) was going to do "something horrible tomorrow." (ESQUIRE, August, 1967, p. 122) Now all of this is circumstantial, and we need come to no conclusion of guilt on Vaganov's part. That is irrelevant in any case. The point is that he was a most suspicious person, and one might have expected after the assassination of our President more interest in him. Why was there not further ACTION taken against him at the time? Even though he may have been cleared subsequently, in a situation during which a desperate search was supposed to be in process for solution of the mystery of the President's assassination, one would have expected federal authorities to have been less generous with someone in Vaganov's predicament. Yet, Vaganov told Salandria in an interview that at about 3:00 p.m. of November 22, 1963 the FBI agents left him after calling their Dallas headquarters and learning that "They got him." So early? Again, they knew before they

could know who the assassin was, and that he was alone in his work.

One might also be curious concerning why there was not a greater interest in Mrs. Ruth Paine, a Quaker, who helped Oswald to get a job at the Book Depository and who was supposed to have carried his rifle into the Dallas area, and who played other vital roles which no conspiracy could have left to chance. We certainly do not advocate paranoia on behalf of police in investigation of crimes, but based on past action, we know the police have a suspicious mentality, and we cannot help but wonder what happened to this characteristic bent of mind here.

Finally, it should be observed, that on the Commission's construction of the kind of person Oswald was, HIS ACTIONS seem to make no sense. Indeed, where he has acted, one should have expected INACTION. Why did Oswald, if he was

a pro Marxist and leftist LONER, go out of his way to associate with leftwing groups before KILLING the President? He had associations with the Communist Party, Fair Play for Cuba, Socialist Labor Party, American Civil Liberties Union, and a person Michael Paine) with some associations with the Socialist Workers Party. Oswald's family also lived with a Quaker. If he had any sympathy toward the left, he was doing it no favor by OPENLY associating himself with such groups, before murdering the President. Such action would have been incredible—the exact opposite would be expected. The only reasonable interpretation is that Oswald wittingly or unwittingly was setting up the left for some agency which had predesignated him as the lone PATSY in the Kennedy killing.

Wherever we should expect action to solve the mystery of the President's murder, we find inaction. And where we should expect inaction, we find action. In noting this pattern, it is significant to keep in mind the fact that, according to the NEW YORK TIMES, November 27, 1963: "Dallas authorities announced that they were turning over all evidence to the Federal Bureau of Investigation." This means that there was a lack of action, where there should have been action to solve the assassination, and that this inaction was at the FEDERAL LEVEL. The federal authorities very early assumed a MONOPOLY over the evidence.

It must be emphasized that in rehashing evidence and facts pertaining to the assassination that have long been discussed by critics we are not judging such evidence, but only making what we regard to be the very important observation that such evidence should have been ACTED upon, even though it might subsequently have been proven baseless. This is important, for the clear implication is that in light of evidence of a conspiracy our authorities had no fear about the conspirators, and could feel safe while refraining from action directed at apprehending them. What is interesting — and merits further exploration — is that this pattern of action where it is uncalled for, and inaction where there should be action, may be discerned in major foreign policy behavior of the post-assassination government.