

Warren Reynolds.....shot in the head in attempted murder  
 Darrell Wayne Garner.....arrested on suspicion of shooting  
 Reynolds and alibied by his girl-friend,  
 later disappeared and cannot be found  
 Betty Moody MacDonald.....former "stripper" (allegedly for Jack  
 Ruby, although the Warren Commission says  
 she did not work for him), alibied  
 Garner for the Reynolds shooting, later  
 committed suicide by hanging herself in  
 the Dallas jail, where she was under arrest  
 for "disturbing the peace"  
 James Markham.....son of witness Helen Markham, fell out  
 of window while trying to evade arrest by  
 Dallas police shortly after Marguerite  
 Oswald and two amateur investigators had  
 visited Mrs. Markham and attempted to  
 question her about the Tippit killing  
 Earlene Roberts\*.....housekeeper at the rooming house where  
 Oswald was living when he was arrested,  
 has voluntarily or involuntarily  
 disappeared and cannot be located  
 Stripteaser Norton.....worked for Jack Ruby, said to have  
 committed suicide about the end of  
 September 1964  
 David Lane and  
 Alfred McLain .....Subjects of the following intriguing  
 passage from the transcript of the  
 interrogation of Jack Ruby:

Ruby.....There was one Lane that was killed in a taxicab.  
 I thought he was an attorney in Dallas.  
 Warren.....That was a Dave Lane.  
 Ruby.....And there was a McLain.  
 Warren.....Alfred was killed in a taxi in New York.



Let us hope that Mssrs. David Lane and McLain died of natural causes and that Mark Lane, whom many regard as the Emile Zola of the Oswald case, will shun the use of taxis and otherwise take excellent care of himself.

In addition to the three witnesses to the Tippit murder who are described in the Nash article, the Warren Commission in its report has failed to acknowledge the existence of the following persons who should have been questioned closely about the allegations made by or about them:

- Richard Dudman.....Reporter for St. Louis Post-Dispatch who saw an apparent bullet-hole in the windshield of the President's limousine and who published the story that the Parkland Hospital doctors remained convinced that there was an entrance wound in the throat despite the fact that they had reversed their original story
- Mary Woodward.....Reporter, Dallas Morning News, whose story in the 23 November 1963 edition said that she and three companions heard four shots which came from the grassy knoll near the underpass
- Bob Ferranti.....Newscaster for ABC/TV, who found the famous "doorway" picture (alleged to be Lovelady) and claims that the FBI took the photograph from him by force when he said he would show it on television
- O.V. Campbell.....Vice-President of the Texas School Book Depository, who ran toward the grassy knoll from the Depository "to catch the sniper"
- Mike Howard.....Secret Service agent, who told reporter Thayer Waldo that a rifle had been found on the roof of the Depository and that there had been two men present on the sixth floor in addition to Oswald at the time of the assassination

Still another thought-provoking omission from the Warren Report is the unacknowledged fact that the Tippit murder took place about two blocks from Jack Ruby's apartment. Tippit in his car and his killer on foot were headed almost in a straight line toward Ruby's residence, and away from the Texas Theater. If the killer was Oswald, he was heading for a destination

other than the movie-house. Study of the street map of Oak Cliff suggests two more points for cogitation: (1) According to the Warren Report, it took Oswald 24 minutes to run or trot or walk rapidly from his victim to the Texas Theater, about six blocks away. This seems inordinate for the veritable speed-demon who, within the hour, had raced from the sixth to the second floor of the Depository in 1 minute 30 seconds approximately, without a huff or a puff, and had then walked the four blocks from the Depository to the bus stop in 7 minutes, presumably at a normal pace. (2) At the end of 1962 Oswald was living on Elsbeth Street, and from March to May 1963 on Neely Street, in the Oak Cliff section. Neither address appears to be very distant from Ruby's apartment. One wonders if the Warren Report does not minimize the opportunities for contact between the two men.

The Warren Commission records but does not comment on the fact that Tippit's gun was out of its holster near his body. That seems to indicate that self-defense was involved in the murder---by the victim or by the killer? The circumstances under which Tippit stopped the pedestrian who calmly leaned on the car and chatted with him, without apparent alarm, merit thought in this connection.

In the absence of the Hearings, judgment must be suspended on the quality of the interrogation of witnesses who were asked to testify to the Warren Commission. (Packer is quite right in saying that the Hearings should have been issued simultaneously with the Report and it is baffling that they should be withheld still, well after a month has passed.) The testimony of Johnny Calvin Brewer will be of special interest and one hopes that it will explain why he was absent from all news accounts of Oswald's arrest in the Texas Theater. He should have been the hero of the capture. Perhaps his testimony will explain also why he did not execute his affidavit until 6 December 1963, two weeks later than all the other witnesses.

The testimony of N.M. McDonald, the policeman who made the arrest, perhaps will throw light on his reason for searching two other theater patrons before approaching Oswald, who ostensibly had been fingered by Brewer from the stage.<sup>28/</sup>

As for the witnesses who claimed to have seen Oswald at the Sports Drome Rifle Range in Dallas, one expects that the Warren Commission grilled them, since their testimony raises the possibility of collusion and falsification of evidence. If it was not Oswald at the rifle range, as the Commission itself concludes, was it someone who resembled Oswald (as Lovelady and Craford are said to do) who was there deliberately to plant evidence against him? Was it an innocent person who was innocently mistaken for Oswald? If so, has there been any appeal to him to come forward or any attempt to find him? Joesten suggests in his book that the Sports Drome Rifle Range did not open for business until late October. If that is correct, the witnesses who claimed to have seen Oswald there earlier are surely perjurers and it is essential to find out who put them up to their inventions.

Dial Ryder's story that he mounted a telescopic sight on a rifle for a customer named Oswald merits the same kind of investigation.<sup>29/</sup>

The interrogation of certain other witnesses, whose testimony seems to have been acceptable to the Warren Commission in direct proportion to its compatibility with Oswald's sole guilt rather than on intrinsic merit, will be of special interest---Wanda Helmick, Curtis Craford, Seth Kantor, Jean Hill, Harry and Kay Olsen, Bertha Cheek, Ralph Paul, and Nelson Bunker Hunt, among others.

The Interrogation of Oswald

The Warren Commission placidly has accepted the story that no transcript was made of the interrogation of Oswald and the excuses of the Dallas police for that incredible departure from police procedure. The Commission has ignored the story in the Dallas Morning News that a police stenographer was among the persons seen entering the room where the interrogation took place.<sup>30/</sup> It has disregarded the report by Postal Inspector H.D. Holmes that during the last interrogation session Oswald flared up at Captain Fritz and said,

I've told you all I'm going to about that card. You took notes, just read them for yourself, if you want to refresh your memory.

The failure of the Warren Commission to probe into the possibility that a record of the interrogation was maintained but has been withheld is a piece of negligence which must have a significant place on the list of shortcomings in its report.

The Commission tells us that the arresting officers found a forged draft card in the name of Alek J. Hidell in Oswald's billfold—having told us earlier that "his wallet containing \$170 was left intact in a dresser drawer" when he left Irving on the morning of the assassination—and that "on November 22 and 23, Oswald refused to tell Fritz why this card was in his possession, or to answer any questions concerning the card."

The apparent authority for this assertion is the report by FBI agent Manning C. Clements on the interrogation of Oswald on 22 November.<sup>31/</sup> Clements indicates that Oswald declined to explain his possession of the card in the name of Hidell. But his is the only report on the interrogation on that day which mentions the card or the name Hidell. FBI agents Bookhout and Hosty do not mention the name Hidell in their reports for 22 November and Fritz specifically states that he questioned Oswald about the Hidell card on the second day, 23 November. That is confirmed in the reports of Bookhout and Kelley, who were also present at the interrogation on the second day.<sup>32/</sup>

The Warren Commission has accepted Clements' report despite the fact that all the others indicate that there was no mention of the name Hidell until a day later. That is no coincidence. It will be recalled that suspicion that Oswald was framed by the Dallas police arose because of the failure of District Attorney Wade to mention the name Hidell when it was supposedly known to the police, and at the same time that he informed the

press that Oswald had used the alias O.H. Lee. When questioned subsequently about his belated mention of Hidell some time after the police presumably knew that Oswald had used that alias as well as the alias O.H. Lee, Wade replied blandly that he had "forgotten" to mention it.

The Warren Report does not explain how a wallet "left intact" in Irving that morning was found on Oswald's person when he was arrested in Dallas in the afternoon. It does not explain how Clements saw and heard things on the 22nd that no one else saw or heard until the 23rd. And it does not include among the "speculations" that the Warren Commission attempted to demolish the frank suspicion voiced in some quarters that the police had planted the Hidell card on Oswald after the FBI discovered that the rifle had been shipped to a customer of that name.

The reports on the interrogation sessions in Appendix XI, apart from Clements' report, indicate that although the Dallas police supposedly knew about the "Hidell" card beforehand, they did not ask Oswald about it until 11.30 a.m. on Saturday. They had already learned from the FBI at 6.45 a.m. that day that the rifle had been traced from Klein's in Chicago to "A. Hidell" at Dallas. It is nothing short of sensational that the police did not confront Oswald with the "clinching" evidence in an attempt to obtain a confession within ten minutes. The reports suggest that they never confronted him with the mortally incriminating link between his "Hidell" card and the purchase of the murder rifle by "A. Hidell."

Dallas Police Chief Curry did tell the press that morning that new and "clinching" evidence had been found but that it had nothing to do with the murder rifle (New York Times, 24 November 1963). That new evidence turned out to be the notorious map (Dallas Morning News, 24 November 1963), then regarded as damning but now acknowledged to be innocent, as Oswald himself had insisted.

If these mysteries are not enough, it is staggering to discover that there is not a word anywhere in the report on six hours of interrogation on the day of Oswald's arrest. Chapter V indicates that he was questioned for five hours and fifty minutes, in four sessions, from 4.20 to 11.25 p.m. but the reports in Appendix XI leave those sessions completely blank. We have no scintilla of information on the questions and answers during these crucial hours!

The questions that were put to Oswald, when extracted from the reports, seem strangely unimaginative and lacking in zeal:

Friday 2.10 to 4.15 p.m. (approximately)

1. Did Oswald work at the Texas School Book Depository
2. On which floor
3. Where was he when the President was shot
4. Where was he when he was stopped by a policeman (Baker) and Roy Truly
5. Why did he leave the Depository; where did he go
6. Did he own a rifle
7. Why did he carry a pistol to the Texas Theater
8. Had he been to Russia; had he written to the Soviet Embassy
9. Had he been to Mexico City
10. What were his political beliefs
11. Why did he rent a room on N. Beckley in the name of O.H. Lee
12. Had he won medals for rifle shooting in the Marines

Saturday 10.25 to 11.33 a.m.

1. Had he taken a taxi after leaving the Depository
2. What conversation had he had with the cabdriver
3. Had he told Frazier that he was going home for curtain rods
4. What had he done with the clothes he removed at the rooming house at 1 p.m. Friday
5. Why did he live at the rooming house and his wife at Irving
6. Did he belong to the Communist Party
7. Where did he get the pistol
8. Had he owned a rifle in Russia; did he bring a rifle from New Orleans to Dallas
9. Did he keep a rifle in the Paine garage; did he own a car
10. Why did he want Abt for his attorney
11. Had he ever been questioned before; had he had any previous arrests
12. What did he think of President Kennedy and his family; had he watched the motorcade
13. Did he shoot President Kennedy and Governor Connally
14. How did he explain his possession of the "Hidell" card
15. Was he willing to take a polygraph (lie detector) test

Saturday 12.35 to 1.10 p.m.

1. What were his previous addresses in Dallas
2. Where were his personal belongings kept

Saturday 6 to 7.15 p.m.

1. What did he have to say about the photograph of himself holding the rifle
2. Did he purchase a rifle from Klein's

Sunday 9 to 11.15 a.m.

1. How did he explain the map found in his room with the x-mark at the Depository
2. How had he learned about the vacancy at the Depository
3. What were his religious views; did he regard religion as the opiate of the people
4. Would Cuba be better off now that Kennedy was dead
5. Where was the photograph (holding rifle) taken
6. Was he a Communist
7. Where had he rented post office boxes; were others authorized to receive mail
8. Was he sent to Dallas to organize a Fair Play for Cuba cell
9. Why did he get a dishonorable discharge from the Marines
10. Why did he visit his wife on the night of 21 November
11. Did he carry a paper bag to work
12. Where was he when the President was shot
13. Did he know anyone named Hidell; did he ever use that alias
14. Had he ordered a rifle by mail and sent payment by money order
15. Had he allowed someone else to receive a rifle at his post office box

The questions asked, and more so the questions not asked, leave the impression that the Dallas police were not probing the suspect very energetically. Perhaps they already knew what they wanted to know.

It arouses some indignation that, in the face of the highly compromising performance of the Dallas police, the Warren Commission has included among its reasons for concluding that Oswald was guilty the allegation that he "lied to the police." There is more reason to believe that the police lied to the Commission. It defies understanding that the Commission complacently has accepted their version of events, and has not even appeared to notice the contradictions and inconsistencies in Oswald's replies to specific questions as reported by those present.

For example, when Oswald was asked to explain his possession of the "Hidell" card, he replied: (Fritz) he had picked up that name in New Orleans while working in the Fair Play for Cuba organization. (Bookhout and Clements) he admitted that he carried this card but declined to state the purpose of carrying it or any use he had made of it. (Kelley) he had received a letter from the Fair Play for Cuba Committee signed "Alex Hidell."

When asked where he was at the time the President was shot, Oswald replied: (Fritz) he was having his lunch on the first floor. (Kelley) he was having his lunch with the colored boys who worked with him and described one of them as "Junior" and the other as a "little short Negro boy." (Bookhout) he had eaten lunch alone, but recalled possibly two Negro employees walking through the room during this period, the name of one being "Junior" perhaps and the other, a short individual whose name he could not recall but whom he would be able to recognize.

These conflicting versions of Oswald's replies have not troubled the Warren Commission. His story that he saw Roy Truly and some others in the Depository looking at a rifle two days before the assassination apparently has not been followed up. His alleged encounter with a Secret Service agent who displayed his identification card and asked to be directed to a public telephone has not been investigated.



Packer and other practitioners of the law consider that Oswald was clearly and deliberately deprived of the assistance of counsel by the Dallas police. This is hardly debatable, in view of his known appeals for legal assistance during his brief opportunities to speak to the press. The Warren Commission has gone to extraordinary lengths to interpret this aspect of the case in a way that leaves the Dallas authorities looking virtuous and humane. No one should be deceived about the rot under that facade.

A final word on the interrogation: for lack of any rational motive for the crimes he is alleged to have committed, it has been suggested that Oswald was a psychopath. That, of course, eliminates the need to explain any of his actions or objectives which are inconsistent with guilt or appear to lack rational purpose. Yet the personality that emerges even from the fragmentary and biased reports of the interrogation is eminently rational, controlled, skillful in avoiding compromising remarks on religion or politics, and unintimidated. There is not a single sign of irrationality--on the contrary. The hindsight diagnosis of paranoia is spurious and rather contemptible.

#### Oswald's Trip to Mexico City

Oswald spent the period from May to the end of September 1963 in New Orleans, joined for part of those months by Marina and the child. (Jack Ruby visited New Orleans during June 1963,<sup>33/</sup> ostensibly to recruit a stripteaser for his club, but the Warren Commission has not acknowledged the possibility of contact between him and Oswald during that visit.)

At the request of Hosty, FBI agent M.R. Kaack kept an eye on Oswald while he was in New Orleans but only after he had applied for and received a passport in June. The Passport Office of the State Department did not notify any federal agency that Oswald had been granted a passport, apparently being unaware that the FBI took any interest in him.

Despite the fact that no agency and no individual other than Marina had any inkling that Oswald planned to visit Mexico, he was checked by U.S. Immigration and Customs officials at the border when he entered and returned from Mexico. U.S. Customs officials William M. Kline and Eugene Pugh told the ~~press~~ <sup>press</sup> ~~that they had been asked by~~ that they had been asked by

an unnamed federal agency to check Oswald and that this was not a usual procedure.<sup>34/</sup> How did a federal agency have advance knowledge that Oswald would visit Mexico when the FBI itself was unaware of his trip? What was the federal agency which had that knowledge and alerted the U.S. Customs officials at the border? The Warren Report pretends that these facts do not exist although the Commission certainly had knowledge of them, since the names of both Kline and Pugh appear on the list of witnesses. Why has the Commission excluded from its report any indication or explanation of these facts?

Other puzzles related to the trip to Mexico City are not explained fully or satisfactorily. If the trip was a prelude to defection to Cuba or redefection to the Soviet Union, how did Oswald plan to pay his passage? The Commission, whose reconstruction of his income and expenditures is a marvel, tells us that he was able to pay his way to Mexico City and return with about \$130 in cash.<sup>35/</sup> That sum would not have taken Oswald to Havana without permission from the Mexican Government to leave Mexico bound for Cuba. Such permission is normally withheld from Americans with passports "not valid for travel to Cuba." That is why Americans who defied the ban and visited Cuba had to go by way of Prague or other Eastern European capitals. Travel to Cuba via Europe was far beyond Oswald's known means. He was scarcely unaware of that, since he was preoccupied during his stay in New Orleans with pro-Castro activities. (It is far from clear why he asked to have an FBI agent summoned after his arrest in New Orleans, since he was frank to express his resentment and contempt for the FBI.) Oswald surely knew that he did not have the wherewithall to reach Cuba even if he was granted a visa. Why should he have wasted any of his scarce funds on a wild-goose chase? According to the Warren Commission, Oswald was exceptionally prudent with a dollar. How else can one explain the fact that on a salary that averaged \$244 a month he managed in the six months between August 1962 and January 1963 not only to support his family of three but to repay \$635 in debts without a hint of impatience from his creditors? The only alternative--that he had access to clandestine funds--has been ruled out by the Warren Commission, which is also satisfied that he was never an agent or informer for the FBI or CIA.

By the Commission's own reasoning, Oswald could not have intended to flee to Cuba after the assassination because he did not have financial means to do so.<sup>36/</sup> He had left \$170 with his wife and had only \$18 on his person when he was arrested. The same analogy applies to his trip to Mexico City, unless in fact Oswald did have clandestine income--perhaps received at his post-office box (Ruby also maintained one) or through Western Union (where Ruby sometimes sent money). Testimony that he did receive money through Western Union on one or more occasions has been discounted by the Warren Commission as inconclusive and probably mistaken.<sup>37/</sup>

On this phase of Oswald's activities the Warren Report has not told, as it purports, the truth so far as it can be known, for at the least the Commission knows which federal agency had advance knowledge of his trip to Mexico and has excluded that information. What other secrets does the Commission have?

#### Oswald and the State Department

The Commission has swallowed a gargantuan helping of clerical error and coincidence and concluded that Oswald received no unusual favorable treatment in his transactions with the State Department. We are asked to believe that the decisions taken by the State Department on a series of problems raised by Oswald--defector, expatriate, self-declared enemy of the U.S., and self-appointed apologist for Castro--were wholly innocent, although each decision worked to his ultimate advantage. We are asked to believe that decisions which violated regulations, policies, and common sense were the results of oversight, typing errors, and the imperfection of bureaucratic procedures and staff. These were the decisions which brought Oswald past every obstacle on the road from Minsk to Dallas, thanks to the solicitude of the State Department toward a would-be-traitor, solicitude which is usually lacking in its dealings with law-abiding and untainted citizens:

- (1) The State Department acknowledges that as early as October 1959 it had reasonable grounds for preparing a "lookout card" in Oswald's file but did not do so, for reasons not stated but apparently discretionary in nature.
- (2) In March 1960 the Passport Office made up a "refusal sheet" on the grounds of Oswald's possible naturalization in the Soviet Union. The automatic consequence should have been the insertion of a lookout card in Oswald's file. For the second time, no lookout card was inserted--although in this instance the procedure was mandatory and not optional. No clear explanation is given for this failure, but it is suggested that it might have resulted from a "clerical error."
- (3) Meanwhile Oswald was in the Soviet Union striving furiously to renounce his American citizenship. He appeared at the Embassy in Moscow with a written statement requesting that his citizenship be revoked. He told the Consul, Richard Snyder, that he intended to offer to the Soviet authorities whatever information he had on the Marine Corps and his specialty, radar operation. He announced that he intended to apply for citizenship in the Soviet Union.

One would think that Snyder, not knowing how much sensitive information Oswald might have, should have been patriotic enough to lock him in the nearest closet until advice and instructions could be obtained. Not at all. Snyder refused to allow Oswald to renounce his citizenship because it was Saturday, and told him that he would have to return on a regular working day. The infuriated would-be turncoat wrote Snyder a bristling letter, demanding his rights and threatening to have the Soviet Union, his new motherland, lodge a formal protest against the old for denying him his rights. Together with that letter Snyder received a cablegram from the State Department emphasizing that the Embassy had no authority to withhold from Oswald the right to renounce his American citizenship.

Nevertheless, his citizenship was never revoked for the pure technicality that Oswald failed to make a second personal visit to the Embassy for that purpose.

(4) Thus, despite his vigorous representations, 1961 found Oswald still with his unwanted American citizenship and still without a lookout card in his file in Washington. This was fortuitous for him, as it turned out. On 5 February, he asked for the return of his passport so that he could make his way again to his native land. But he set a condition--that he be given a full guarantee that he would not be prosecuted under any circumstances. The Warren Report does not tell us if he ever received such a guarantee or from whom. The fact is that he did return and that he was not prosecuted.

(5) Oswald's request to return to the United States, and later the application for the admission of his wife and child, met with a friendly and helpful response from the Embassy. The procedure for admission to the United States was set in motion, notwithstanding the fact that on his application Oswald apparently had admitted an act or acts implying his expatriation. It is not easy to make sense of the Warren Report's explanation of this peculiar transaction.

On his application, Oswald was required to indicate whether or not he had committed acts which might disqualify him from receiving a passport, by striking out either the phrase "have" or the phrase "have not." One existing carbon copy of the application shows that "have not" has been typed over. Snyder does not remember to which of the acts Oswald was thereby admitting: it may have been "swearing allegiance to a foreign state;" on the other hand, the blockout of "have not" may have been another "clerical error."

The Warren Commission next tells us that there is an "actual signed copy of the application" in the files of the Embassy in Moscow "which is not a carbon copy of the copy sent to the Department," in which the strikeout is slightly above the "have," which itself is above the "have not." The Commission assumes therefore that the strikeout may have been intended to obliterate the "have."

What, pray, is an "actual signed copy of the application...which is not a carbon copy of the copy sent to the Department"? Where is the original application filled out by Oswald? We have "one existing carbon copy," location unknown. We have an "actual signed copy" in the Embassy files but it is not a "carbon copy of the copy sent to the Department." Is it a carbon copy of any pedigree? Is it the original of the carbon copy sent to the Department? Such obfuscating language clarifies nothing and only raises the suspicion of subterfuge and concealment. We cannot be sure whether the phrase "have not" was struck out on the application that reached Washington and if so, why that was disregarded.

(6) Marina Oswald, on her application, made a false denial of membership in KOMSOMOL. This did not come to light until it was too late to bar her from admission to the United States as an immigrant. Another piece of luck for the Oswalds.

(7) Despite the defects in the Oswalds' applications, the Visa Office of the State Department in October 1961 referred the matter for processing to the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) at Dallas. In January 1962 INS denied waiver of sanctions against Marina Oswald's admission. The denial was transmitted to the State Department by telegraph as well as letter because "Washington had previously indicated its impatience." Why such impatience, one wonders, on behalf of an obscure, disagreeable, and disloyal citizen and his Soviet wife?

(8) When the Embassy learned of the negative decision by INS, it contacted the Brussels Embassy, at the suggestion of the State Department, in an attempt to secure a visa there for Marina Oswald and thereby circumvent the denial of waiver.

(9) That manoeuver proved unnecessary. The Soviet Desk of the State Department in March 1962 began to pressure INS to reverse its decision. On the 9th of May, INS formally reversed its prior denial. The impatient State Department cabled the good news to the Embassy on the 8th of May, on the basis of verbal indications that the decision would be reversed.

(10) Oswald had made unsuccessful attempts from February to May to obtain funds for repatriation from the Red Cross and the International Rescue Committee. The State Department came to his rescue by authorizing, sometime in May, a loan of funds and the renewal of his passport. On the first of June Oswald borrowed \$435 from the Embassy and left the Soviet Union with his wife and child.

(11) On 24 June 1963 Oswald applied for a passport in New Orleans (we are not told whether he struck out "have" or "have not" on this application--probably it would have made no difference in any case). He received the passport 24 hours later, a circumstance which has raised many eyebrows. The State Department and the Warren Commission would have us believe that this was perfectly normal. They suggest that it was mere coincidence that the letters "NO" in red were placed alongside of Oswald's name, one in a list of 25 names, and that those letters were an abbreviation for "New Orleans," where the list had originated. Against odds of 25 to 1 those letters were placed next to the name of the one man who should not have received a passport which he had signified he would use to return to a country where

his presence had already caused the United States considerable embarrassment and trouble.

This last in a weird chain of errors, oversights, and peculiar interpretation of regulations suggests an Oswald in Wonderland. It would be apropos to ask William Worthy, or the college students who violate our sensibilities each summer by their illicit trips to Cuba, or the other numerous victims of passport troubles, if they ever had the good fortune to benefit by a clerical error in the State Department. The assortment of missteps and astonishing denouements is too rich and too consistent to permit the assumption that they were random and unmotivated, as the Warren Commission at its full splendor of impartiality appears to assume.

Investigation of Possible Conspiracy

Dallas was so clearly a dangerous city for the President that grave anxiety for his safety was evidenced before the visit and the immediate reaction to the assassination on all sides was that the appalling crime was the work of the ultra-reactionaries who enjoyed carte blanche there. Even if the evidence against Oswald was absolutely airtight, it would still be an assault against logic to believe that a leftist of any degree or persuasion could have committed that crime, in that place, at that time.

The lack of any discernible motive on Oswald's part and the absence of any sign that he was a psychopath or irrational in his day-to-day conduct, justified the most exhaustive investigation by the Warren Commission of the possibility of a conspiracy on the part of those who were instinctively blamed by the whole world, including the Chief Justice himself, when the horrifying news issued from Dallas. The investigation actually conducted by the Warren Commission led to the conclusion that Oswald had acted alone and the reminder that it is impossible to prove a negative. True. Yet a number of questions which are susceptible of clarification still remain unanswered.

(1) Who was the "other" Tippit on the Dallas police force whom Jack Ruby knew? Tippit is not a common name. Was that Tippit related to the murdered Tippit? Was he in touch with Ruby around the time of the assassination or before Ruby murdered Oswald? What were his whereabouts at the time of the crimes?

(2) Has not the Warren Commission been too casual in dismissing the significant report by Mrs. Earlene Roberts that a police car stopped and signalled while Oswald was in the rooming house just after the assassination? Mrs. Roberts remembered the number on the police car as 106 or 107. Tippit's car was marked conspicuously with the number 10. Is it possible that Mrs. Roberts thought she saw a third digit which was not actually present?

This part of Mrs. Roberts' testimony was not known until the Warren Report was published. Oddly enough, it dovetails closely with Buchanan's earlier conjectures that policemen, or conspirators disguised as policemen, were involved in the assassination and were to engineer Oswald's escape.<sup>5/</sup>



(3) Three policemen and a former policeman testified that Jack Ruby had entered the basement, evading police security, via the Main Street ramp. The three policemen claimed that Jack Ruby had told them that he had come in that way, just after his arrest, but they withheld the information from their superiors "for several days." The ex-policeman Daniels had said on the day of Oswald's murder that he had not seen anyone slip past the policeman guarding the Main Street ramp. On 29 November he reversed himself and told a new story, consistent with the belated report of the three policemen. Jack Ruby himself refused to say how he had managed to evade security and enter the basement, with no apparent motive for secrecy if indeed he had received no help from the police and if he had already told three of them, as they claimed, how he got in. He maintained an adamant silence on the matter until the 21st of December, four weeks after the crime, when he suddenly volunteered the same information as the three policemen and Daniels had given.

This episode distinctly suggests the possibility of collusion and falsification. The Warren Report does not imply that the possibility was pursued with zeal.

(4) The Warren Commission has not acknowledged numerous allegations that FBI and Secret Service agents attempted to silence and intimidate witnesses or suborn their testimony. One witness, Jean Hill, says in a tape-recorded telephone conversation that a Secret Service agent pressed her insistently to change her testimony that she had heard four shots. Mark Lane has said publicly that a witness to the Tippit shooting was told by the Dallas police that her life would be in danger if she testified before the Warren Commission. The proprietor of Klein's Sporting Goods in Chicago has refused to talk to investigators, because of orders from the FBI. A television newscaster has charged that the FBI took a photograph away from him by force.

The coercion of witnesses, or the appearance of their coercion, is a very serious matter which should have been fully and frankly investigated, so as to provide reassurance that crucial testimony has not been improperly influenced.

(5) The allegation that a meeting was held between Jack Ruby, Bernard Weissman, and Tippit eight days before the assassination has been dismissed by the Warren Commission on the basis of a denial by Weissman and an alleged denial by Ruby. The Commission failed to use its subpoena power to compel Mark Lane to reveal the source of that allegation, as it could and should have done. Rather, the Chief Justice told the press that he had no reason to believe the allegation. Such a slur on the reputation of Mark Lane

was hardly warranted when the Commission had not even used its full investigatory powers to establish whether or not the allegation was well founded. It is all the more surprising that the Chief Justice should have disparaged Lane publicly when one recalls that a previous allegation which was in conflict with the testimony of a witness before the Commission proved to be truthful, and her testimony false. This hardly suggests that the Warren Commission has made an impartial or exhaustive investigation of the alleged meeting, the significance of which, if it took place, need scarcely be emphasized.

(6) It is passing strange, if it is true (as the Warren Report seems to indicate), that James Herbert Martin, close friend of Ruby's roommate George Senator, became the "business manager" for Marina Oswald. If Senator's friend and Marina's manager are the same man, a possible conspiratorial relationship has been left uninvestigated.

(7) It is a strain on credulity to accept the notion that Tippit, on the basis of a vague description which must fit thousands of Dallas citizens, recognized Oswald from behind as a man who fit the description sent out, "probably" on the basis of Brennan's report. If Tippit was so eagle-eyed and single-minded in looking out for persons who fit that sketchy description, how is it that he stopped no one except Oswald--if it was Oswald he stopped--in the half-hour after the alert was broadcast and before he himself was shot? The circumstances suggest that he stopped a man he knew, not a suspect in the assassination.

(8) The Warren Commission has accepted the testimony of Klause and Surrey on the abhorrent "Wanted for Treason" handbill. According to these witnesses, the idea was conceived about two or two and a half weeks before the President's visit and the handbill was printed about a week before the assassination. According to Warren Leslie, however, that handbill was already printed and circulating on the occasion of Adlai Stevenson's visit to Dallas on the 24th of October 1963.<sup>38/</sup>

Have Klause and Surrey lied about the circumstances and date of the printing of the handbill? If they lied, what did they wish to conceal? Why has the Warren Commission failed to take cognizance of the information in Warren Leslie's book, which was published months before the Warren Report and widely discussed? Was Leslie mistaken, or were Klause and Surrey perjurers?

The Hard Evidence Against Oswald

It is far from apparent, after the long journey through the massive Warren Report as well as much preceding literature and contemporaneous news stories, whether Oswald was part of a conspiracy, a fall-guy set up to appear so guilty that the real assassins would have immunity from suspicion, completely innocent, or, as the Warren Report contends, a man who acted alone and assassinated the President. There is evidence that incriminates Oswald, although considerably less than the Warren Report claims: it seems conclusive that Oswald purchased a revolver and a rifle by mail order, and that both weapons were in the possession of the Dallas police shortly after the assassination and the Tippit murder. It is also certain that Oswald made an unscheduled and unusual visit to Irving the night before the assassination, and that he was present in the Depository at the time of the crime. It is not absolutely certain, however, that the fatal shots came from his weapons or that he himself pulled the trigger. Neither fingerprints nor eyewitness testimony establish those allegations beyond a reasonable doubt. Against those contentions must be posed (1) Oswald's lack of motive (2) his unwavering denial of guilt (3) his dubious qualifications as a marksman (4) the extreme implausibility of the actions attributed to him between the moment of the assassination and his arrest scarcely an hour later, which requires that he met a time-table which barely brings his alleged movements within the range of possibility and the precision of which does not correspond to life, random as it is and characterized by the unpredictable hitch which crops up to delay and obstruct human plans (5) the still-unexplored indications of conspiracy (6) the sinister role of the Dallas police in depriving Oswald of his right to counsel (7) their failure to produce a transcript of interrogation (8) the absence of information on almost six hours of interrogation (9) the quick murder of Oswald by a hanger-on of the police (10) the failure of responsible agencies at any stage to consider any hypothesis other than Oswald's sole guilt, and, now (11) the grave defects in the Warren Report and its determination to seal his guilt by fair means or foul.

Today, after the labors of the Warren Commission, we have as little certainty that Oswald was the assassin of President Kennedy as we had when he was alive and at the tender mercies of the Dallas police. The

indictments which should have been handed down by the Warren Commission --against the Dallas police, District Attorney Wade, the FBI, the Secret Service, and the press--have been quashed. Instead of objective criticism of the Warren Report and recognition of its defects, we have heard a gusher of extravagant praise and facile concurrence with its findings.

Those who cannot believe that it is possible for justice to be perverted in this country, even at the highest levels, should bear in mind that the murderers of Emmet Till, Medgar Evers, the Birmingham children, James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner, among others, are still at large. Conversely, there is ample literature on the shocking number of convicted "murderers" who turned out to be innocent, after many years of imprisonment and in some cases after eleventh-hour reprieve from execution. Nor should we forget that, to our national shame, police authorities themselves have been implicated in many crimes and criminal conspiracies, and not only in the Deep South.

The Warren Report gives us no justification for declaring that the case is closed. Conscience demands that the search for the whole truth must continue.

Notes

1. Introduction to Bantam/New York Times edition of the Warren Commission report, issued 29 September 1964.
2. The Nation, 2 November 1964, pp 295-299.
3. I.F. Stone's Weekly, 5 October 1964.
4. See "The Other Witnesses" by George and Pat Nash, New Leader, 12 October 1964.
5. Thomas G. Buchanan, Who Killed Kennedy?, Secker & Warburg, London, 1964.
6. Joachim Joesten, Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?, Marzani & Munsell Publishers Inc., New York, 1964.
7. Mark Lane's Testimony to the Warren Commission, Folkways Records Album No. BR 501, New York, 1964.
8. Warren Commission Report, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1964, page 127.
9. Ibid., page 647.
10. National Guardian, 31 October 1964, page 8.
11. Harold Feldman, The Nation, 27 January 1964.
12. Warren Commission Report, page 368.
13. Ibid., page 538.
14. Ibid., page 519.
15. New York Times, 24 November 1963, page 2.
16. AMA News, 6 January 1964.
17. London Observer, 1 December 1963, pages 4-5, 12.
18. Warren Commission Report, page 640.
19. Ibid., page 253.
20. Ibid., page 235.
21. New York Times, 23 November 1963.
22. Warren Commission Report, page 81.

23. Ibid., page 79.
24. Ibid., page 119.
25. Ibid., pages 193 and 555.
26. Ibid., page 194
27. Newsweek Magazine, 9 December 1963.
28. Warren Commission Report, page 178.
29. Ibid., pages 315-316.
30. "Under Discussion" television discussion, Channel 5 (New York), 25 October 1964
31. Warren Commission Report, pages 614-618.
32. Ibid., pages 602, 623, and 627.
33. Ibid., page 797.
34. New York Post, 25 and 26 November 1963 and New York Herald-Tribune, 26 November 1963.
35. Warren Commission Report, page 745.
36. Ibid., page 415.
37. Ibid., pages 332-333.
38. Dallas Public and Private by Warren Leslie, Grossman Publishers, New York, 1964, pages 198-199.