

10/11: VICTORS-10

MARINA OSWALD PORTER'S

STATEMENTS OF A CONTRADICTORY NATURE

This survey of contradictory statements made by Marina Oswald Porter was undertaken for the purpose of clarifying which issues, relevant to the Committee's investigation, her statements bear upon. Every effort has been made to insure that these statements have been quoted accurately and in proper context. At this time, no attempt has been made to explore whether Mrs. Porter's contradictory statements were the product of deception or simple confusion.

Reference copy, JFK Collection: HSCA (RG 233)

29 pages

Check with
JFK's Test in Book

<<	9/11: VICTORS-09	<	>
----	------------------	---	---

even try to answer.

Yet, with questions remaining, the Commission concluded as follows:

The Commission evaluated the following evidence in considering whether Lee Harvey Oswald fired the shot which almost killed General Walker: (1) A note which Oswald left for his wife on the evening of the shooting, (2) photographs found among Oswald's possessions after the assassination of President Kennedy, (3) firearm identification of the bullet found in Walker's home, and (4) admissions and other statements made to Marina Oswald by Oswald concerning the shooting...The finding that Lee Harvey Oswald attempted to murder a public figure in April, 1963, was considered of proba-
18
tive value in this investigation...

But since it was the Commission's stated opinion that items (1), (2), and (3) were PROBATIVE ONLY "when combined with the other testimony (item 4) linking Oswald to the shooting," and since item (4) pertains to the testimony of Marina Oswald (whose testimony has all the weight of a handful of chicken feathers), we regretfully refuse to accept the judgment of the Commission in regard to the Walker shooting, hoping that its prides and prejudices were a result of error and not expedience.

<<	6/11: VICTORS-06	<	>
----	------------------	---	---

3 pages

June 29, 1981

TO: SENATOR RUSSELL

FROM: FREDDA SCOEY

It appears that staff members will be present at the meeting this afternoon. Several of them wished presented the question of whether Marina Oswald should be further cross examined. As a matter of fact, when she was examined the second time a list of questions were prepared, but the Chief Justice gave instructions that cross examination should not be pressed beyond a discussion (primarily) of the Nixon-bathroom episode. My understanding is that these were given directly to Mr. Rankin who so informed other staff members. It was requested that the question be brought up before the full Commission; Mr. Rankin indicated he could not do so; no other staff member wants to "beard the lion" but I think some of them might speak out if the issue were raised. The following points occur to me off hand:

1. Marina directly lied on at least two occasions:

(a) When asked where she first heard the name "Hidell" she said on the radio broadcast Oswald took part in after the Fair Play for Cuba incident. She later admitted she had ^{earlier} signed the name on one of the alias cards about FPCC membership under Oswald's direction, and the name Hidell actually was not mentioned on the radio broadcast, as examination of the tape shows.

(b) She first said she locked Lee in the bathroom to keep him from going after Nixon with his pistol. She later admitted this was

*Warren
protective
sympathies
for
Marina
whose
D. Pearson
file?*

RELEASED PER P.L. 102-526 (JFK ASSASSINATION RECORDS ACT)

<<	7/11: VICTORS-07	<	>
----	------------------	---	---

~~3~~ 3

7 pages

MARINA

Marina's Testimony is so full of confusion and contradiction that without the catalytic element of ~~her~~ cross-examination it reads like a nightmare. By her own admission Marina is a liar, and it is her voice that tells us how intensely she disliked the FBI and how she lied to that agency almost uniformly. When asked, for example, about the Walker note, she denied knowledge of it, but later admitted her husband wrote it. And when asked on December 3, if she had ever witnessed her husband leaving the house with the rifle, she replied No, but afterwards reversed this by saying she had frequently seen Lee go in and out carrying the rifle, once to "Lopfield" (Love Airfield) for target practice, and, on other occasions, to the park to shoot leaves. How, one asks, can a man ~~will~~ go to the park with a rifle either by day or night and shoot leaves off the trees without being reported to the police?

On November 22, Marina told authorities she had never seen a rifle WITH A TELESCOPE in Lee's possession and that the only¹¹ weapon she remembered was a shotgun he had bought in Russia. But in her appearance before the Warren Commission when comment was made about a rifle SANS scope, she grew instantly irate and snapped: "How is it about the telescope? HE ALWAYS HAD THE¹² TELESCOPE." Marina's interesting statement to the FBI that Lee "buried" the rifle in Turtle Creek on April 7th in preparation for the Walker attack on the 10th, was ignored by the Commission; The Commission quizzed her only about her allegation that Lee "buried" the rifle AFTER the shooting. On the other hand, in a

11/11: VICTORS-11

DISPATCH		RECEIVED - ()							
CLASS. CONTROL STATIONS AND ROUTES		X							
Document Number 1035-960		X							
For FOIA Reply to SUP 1976		X							
<p>Continuing Criticism of the Warren Report</p> <p>From the day of President Kennedy's assassination on, there has been speculation about the responsibility for his murder. Although this was stemmed for a time by the Warren Commission report (which appeared at the end of September 1964), various writers have now had time to scan the Commission's published report and documents for new pretenses for questioning, and there has been a new wave of books and articles criticizing the Commission's findings. In most cases the critics have speculated as to the existence of some kind of conspiracy, and often they have implied that the Commission itself was involved. Presumably as a result of the increasing challenge to the Warren Commission's Report, a public opinion poll recently indicated that 465 of the American public did not think that Oswald acted alone, while more than half of those polled thought that the Commission had left some questions unresolved. Doubtless polls abroad would show similar, or possibly more adverse, results.</p> <p>2. This trend of opinion is a matter of concern to the U.S. government, including our organization. The members of the Warren Commission were naturally chosen for their integrity, experience, and prominence. They represented both major parties, and they and their staff were deliberately drawn from all sections of the country. Just because of the standing of the Commissioners, efforts to impugn their rectitude and wisdom tend to cast doubt on the whole leadership of American society. Moreover, there seems to be an increasing tendency to hint that President Johnson himself, as the one person who might be said to have benefited, was in some way responsible for the assassination. Incidents of such seriousness affects not only the individual concerned, but also the whole reputation of the American government. Our organization itself is directly involved; among other facts, we contributed information to the investigations. Conspiracy theories have frequently thrown suspicion on our organization, for example by falsely alleging that Lee Harvey Oswald worked for us. The aim of this dispatch is to provide material for countering and discrediting the claims of the conspiracy theorists, so as to inhibit the circulation of such claims in other countries. Background information is supplied in a classified section and in a number of unclassified attachments.</p> <p>3. Action. We do not recommend that discussion of the assassination question be initiated where it is not already taking place. Where discussion is initiated, however, addresses are requested:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>9 attachments 3/4</td> <td>10/1/77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 - 3000</td> <td>DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER NEEDED</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8 - Unclassified</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>				9 attachments 3/4	10/1/77	1 - 3000	DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER NEEDED	8 - Unclassified	
9 attachments 3/4	10/1/77								
1 - 3000	DESTROY WHEN NO LONGER NEEDED								
8 - Unclassified									

unscrupulous politicians and philosophers, pointing out that the Warren Commission made as thorough an investigation as humanly possible, that the charges of the critics are without serious foundation, and that further speculative discussion only plays into the hands of the opposition. Point out also that parts of the conspiracy talk appear to be deliberately generated by Communist propagandists, urge them to use their influence to discourage unfounded and irresponsible speculations.

* 4. To employ background studies to answer and refute the attacks of the critics. Book reviews and feature articles are particularly appropriate for this purpose. The unclassified attachments to this guidance should provide useful background material for passages to assets. Our play should point out, as applicable, that the critics are (i) without theories adopted before the evidence was in, (ii) politically interested, (iii) financially interested, (iv) hasty and inaccurate in their research, or (v) infatuated with their own theory in the course of discussions of the whole phenomenon of criticism; a useful strategy may be to single out Epstein's theory for attack, using the attached Fletcher (Cubel) article and Spectator piece for background. (Although Mark Lane's book is much less convincing than Epstein's and comes off badly where contrasted by knowledgeable critics, it is also much more difficult to answer as a whole, as one becomes lost in a morass of unrelated details.)

5. In private or media discussion not directed at any particular writer, or in attacking publications which may be yet forthcoming, the following arguments should be useful:

a. No significant new evidence has emerged which the Commission did not consider. The assassination is sometimes compared (e.g., by Joachim J. Gierman and Bertrand Russell) with the Greyness case; however, unlike that case, the attacks on the Warren Commission have produced no new evidence, no new culprits have been convincingly identified, and there is no agreement among the critics. (A better parallel, though an imperfect one, might be with the Reichstag fire of 1933, which some competent historians (Fritz Tobias, A.J.P. Taylor, E.C. Watt) now believe was set by Van der Lubbe on his own initiative, without setting for either Nazis or Communists; the Nazis tried to pin the blame on the Communists, but the latter have been much more successful in convincing the world that the Nazis were to blame.)

b. Critics usually overvalue particular items and ignore others. They tend to place more emphasis on the recollections of individual eyewitnesses (which are less reliable and more divergent -- and hence offer more hand-holds for criticism) and less on ballistic, autopsy, and photographic evidence. A close examination of the Commission's records will usually show that the conflicting eyewitness accounts are quoted out of context, or were discarded by the Commission for good and sufficient reasons.

c. Conspiracy on the large scale often suggested would be impossible to conceal in the United States, esp. since informants could expect to receive large payoffs, etc. Note that Robert Kennedy, Attorney General at the time and John F. Kennedy's brother, would be the last man to envision or conceal any conspiracy. And as one reviewer pointed out, Congressman Gerald R. Ford would hardly have held his tongue for the sake of the Democratic administration, and Senator Russell would have had every political interest in exposing any misdeeds on the part of Chief Justice Warren. A conspirator moreover would hardly choose a location for a shooting where so much depended on conditions beyond his control: the route, the speed of the cars, the wrong target, the risk that the assassin would be discovered. A group of wealthy conspirators could have arranged much more secure conditions.

d. Critics have often been noticed by a form of intellectual pride: they light on some theory and fall in love with it; they also scoff at the Commission because it did not always answer every question with a flat decision one way or the other. Actually, the make-up of the Commission and its staff was an excellent safeguard against over-commitment to any one theory, or against the illicit information of probabilities into speculation.