

THE NEW YORK TIMES, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1963.

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 22 — President Kennedy's assassination threw the American political scene into turmoil today.

It removed at a single blow the man who would have been renominated for a second term in the White House by acclamation nine months from now.

It elevated into the Presidency and the leadership of the Democratic party an older, more conservative man still emerging from his Southern heritage.

It increased immeasurably for the leaders of the Republican party prospects of electing a President next November.

The shock of the President's death stifled the official voices of politics in the capital. But so profound was the potential effect on the government and leadership that private consideration could not be silenced.

Despite the many questions raised, one political consequence seemed clear in the hushed, almost ashamed, assessments that observers underwent this evening: The death of the President gave new life to Republican hopes.

Whatever political liabilities might have encumbered him, John F. Kennedy was an incumbent President, one whose person and personality had been impressed on the American electorate.

All Changed Now

Republican leaders knew this. While they loudly scored what they saw as his weaknesses, they saw Mr. Kennedy as a figure to be reckoned with politically. Their candidate would almost surely be the underdog.

Now, in the flash of a gunshot, all that is changed. The Republican Presidential candidate, whoever he may be, will be running against a man with nine months in the White House—or none at all—instead of nearly four years of unremitting public exposure.

When the first shock of the tragedy has subsided and politicians talk again, they are sure to feel that the Republicans face a new, more favorable course next year. And this is likely to affect their choice of a candidate considerably.

There is one final tragedy about today: Kennedy had a sense of history, but he also had an administrative technique that made the gathering of history extremely difficult. He hated organized meetings of the Cabinet or the National Security Council, and therefore he chose to decide policy after private meetings, usually with a single person.

The result of this is that the true history of his Administration really cannot be written now that he is gone.

He had a joke about this. When he was asked what he was going to do when he retired, he always replied that he had a problem. It was, he said, that he would have to race two other members of his staff, McGeorge Bundy and Arthur Schlesinger Jr., to the press.

Unfortunately, however, he was the only man in the White House who really knew what went on there during his Administration, and now he is gone.

Asks 'Defense' Of Oswald To Sift Possibility Of Larger Conspiracy

To The Reporter Dispatch:

The course of action of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy (the Warren Commission), will leave many questions unresolved as to the possible existence of a conspiracy which planned the assassination. For example, the job in the School Book Depository, which Oswald quite readily got when he applied for it, as his last unemployment check ran out. Did "conspirators" arrange for Oswald to get this job, there, at that time?

The Commission's counsel, J. Lee Rankin, says that the Commission is "not engaged in determining the guilt of anybody."

In Heaven's name, if the Commission will not do that, then who will? Supposing Oswald to be the dupe of a conspiracy, isn't there going to be any official inquiry into the possible guilt of the conspirators, or even into their possible identity? The mechanism for doing this would be to conduct a "defense" of Oswald, trying to find every bit of evidence that would throw the blame on others. This is what a defense lawyer would normally do, and it would go far toward exposing any conspirators. Call this a "devil's advocate" in reverse if you will; the Catholic Church has long recognized the need for a "devil's advocate" and never was this device more needed than in the present case, to get all possible facts thoroughly explored.

The fact that the Warren Commission's hearings will all be closed to the public will merely serve to raise doubts, increasing with time, that the Commission is able to face the unpleasant possibility that the assassination of President Kennedy was an "inside job" planned by conspirators some of whom may hold high places in the American business, governmental, military, or political scene.

Appointment of the Commission has had the result (whether planned that way or not) of keeping concealed from the public the various pieces of physical evidence in the case. Among these are the ballistic test photographs of the bullets and rifles, the certified autopsy reports, the medical report of the removal of the bullet from Governor Connally's thigh, and the transcripts or tape recordings of the many hours of interrogations of Oswald by the Dallas police on Nov. 22, 23, and 24, 1963.

Perhaps in Oswald's own recorded words we could find some leads to the conspirators who may still be moving freely in Washington or Dallas circles. Perhaps he told who it was who took the snapshot of him holding a rifle in a Dallas back yard in April 1963. Perhaps he named the man who drove him to the rifle range for target practice early in November 1963. Did he name a person working at the Book Depository who asked him to bring the rifle to work on that fateful Friday, so he could borrow it for the week-end?

The members of the Warren Commission (with one notable exception) all hold full-time and important jobs, and may not be able to devote enough time to the affairs of the Commission to do a thorough job. We have heard that the FBI report given to the Commission was not a very "tight" legal document. Thus, providing a team of (say) three well qualified, highly regarded, intelligent criminal lawyers, paid by the Commission to sift the evidence and present a defense of Oswald before a legal Court of Inquiry (such as the State of Texas originally proposed to set up) would seem to provide the only sure way to leave no stone unturned in seeking the truth.

LEON DAVIDSON  
64 Prospect St.  
White Plains

Read:

Seeds of Doubt

by Jack Minnis and Staughton Lynd

The New Republic, 1244 19th St., N.W., Washington 36, D. C.

Volume 149 Number 25 Issue 2561 December 21, 1963

**To The Reporter Dispatch:**  
"Un-American: Not characteristic of, or consistent with, American customs, principles, etc." (Webster's.)

Our attacks on North Vietnamese territory by naval and Air Force units, and our use of napalm there, are un-American.

Our gas warfare attacks in South Vietnam are un-American.

**To The Reporter Dispatch:**

At this time I would like to appeal to all truly patriotic readers of The Reporter Dispatch not to let an unreasoning fear of Communism serve as the excuse to plunge us into a full-scale war in Viet Nam. We successfully resisted such hysteria in the Quemy-Matsu affair, and in the Berlin episodes. If we are going to retain our current self-appointed role as "Peace-Keeper of the World," then during the next two years we will probably need to use our reserve strength for interventions in Africa, Israel, Indonesia, Germany, Cuba, Brazil, etc. We cannot afford to get our resources totally committed in a local land war in Southeast Asia. (The enemies of our country would be very happy to see us get sucked into this trap, you may be sure!)

Our growing military installations in Viet Nam are, in effect, creating an armed outpost of the U.S. on the borders of China, helping to close the ring of encirclement represented by our bases in Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, etc. Let us stand pat, hold our Viet Nam bases, and avoid expanding this war. The example of Guantanamo in Cuba shows that we can hold and use a base in unfriendly territory, if we make up our minds to do so.

The war in Viet Nam, as it is now being run by the Pentagon (with White House concurrence), is not the kind of war which the American people want or can fully support. Our only obvious goals, judging by the published daily "scores," are to kill Viet Nameese people. Are the unavoidable civilian casualties counted in the daily kill totals, along with the known Viet Cong? How can the record-keepers tell from the bodies which was which?

There are three main groups of people who are benefitting from this war, and unfortunately it would appear that these are the same groups that have the most to say about the way it is being run and escalated. These are: 1. The militarists in the

such as this will not be tolerated.

The countdown has already started. 1984 is only 19 years away, and little by little the evidence increases of the destruction of true Americanism in this country. What has happened to our sense of decency? Where are the remonstrances from our leaders of public opinion, against these unbridled activities of the Defense Department? Or are we just going through a period of increasing military activity to condition us to accept without shock the possible news that a Polaris salvo was accidentally launched against Red China's atomic production sites?

**LEON DAVIDSON**  
64 Prospect St.  
White Plains

Pentagon; 2. The industrialists; 3. The agencies of our "invisible government" (C.I.A., etc.)

For the men in the Pentagon, this is "their war," which the present generation of generals needs in order to justify its existence and its promotions over the past 20 years. Without a war at this time, their whole lives would have been spent in futile preparation for a day that never came! For the industrialists and Wall Streeters, continued prosperity is assured by the continued escalation of the American war economy. Such novel touches as the use of B-52 bombers as factual aircraft, and the spraying of the woods with thousands of rounds of ammunition per enemy soldier, all indicate that this war is going to be a record for consumption of material.

Above all, the various branches of our "invisible government" gain strength as the war increases, and more billions become allocated for undisclosed purposes. The control of TV, radio, and newsmagazines for molding public opinion in support of the war is already quite clear, in the buildup of Viet Nam "human interest" war stories. We are being made increasingly callous about loss of human life, and about violations of international law. (The U.S.A. is bombing sovereign nations against which we have not declared war!)

We are probably within one year of dropping H-bombs on the Chinese atomic plants, even if this means risking the start of a nuclear World War III. If we don't change our leadership soon, we may end up as the "Nazi Germany" of this generation, hated by all the world, and just as surely, defeated by the forces of justice and decency which the free world will muster against us. Before it is too late, at the elections this fall, let's get some sensible people in Washington aware that we must return to the principles and ideals which have made and kept America a great nation.

**LEON DAVIDSON**  
64 Prospect Street  
White Plains

DEC 8 1964  
**Questions Why Details Overlooked**

**In Warren Report Considerations**

**To The Reporter Dispatch:**

With the release of the full testimony and other exhibits of the Warren Commission hearings, there will be many questions raised as details become known which were formerly obscured in the Warren Report itself. Granted that the average person couldn't care less about these details, nevertheless it seems fitting to examine carefully those points which seem to support belief that a conspiracy was responsible for staging the assassination.

One detail of the testimony (out of hundreds of equally intriguing obscured points) is that the Commission staff chose to use a map of the Oak Cliff area of Dallas (in Exhibit No. 1119-A, p. 158, Report) which entirely omits the name from Lancaster Ave. (For those interested, this is the street lying between Marsalis and Ewing.) The large words "Fifth", "Sixth", "Seventh" and "Eighth" occupy the space where the name "Lancaster" should be found. Curiously enough the word "Av." remains on the map, along Lancaster, between Cornal St. and Addison St. The full length of Lancaster Ave. in Oak Cliff shows on the map as reproduced, so the name must have been there originally.

Why is Lancaster Ave. so important in the events of Nov. 22, 1963? Simply because Officer Tippit, in his police car "with No. 10 prominently displayed on each side", was at the corner of LANCASTER and Eighth St. at 6 minutes to 1 o'clock. (See p. 165.) That corner happens to be only 8 blocks away from Oswald's rooming house on N. Beckley Ave.

The testimony of the housekeeper at the rooming house (see p. 253) is that she saw a Dallas police car at about 1 P.M., while Oswald was briefly in the house getting his jacket. The number of this police car began with "10", as she recollects it, and the car drove slowly by, stopping momentarily in front of the house and honking its horn several times. Before Oswald came out, the car had left.

While this police car could have been Tippit's car, it probably was not, although the connection is quite remarkable, since the Commission found that no other police car was in the neighborhood of the rooming house at 1 P.M. (See p. 253.) Tippit could have been driven the eight blocks to the house in the six minutes available, Tippit was alone, whereas the housekeeper saw several occupants in the police car, but there is no evidence that the Commission tried to find them for questioning. The Commission went out of its way to say that there is no evidence that a police car was

in the neighborhood of the rooming house about 1 p.m., other than the housekeeper's sworn testimony to them and to the F.B.I. Since the official Commission conclusion is that Oswald had no accomplices and that nobody in the police department was working with him, is this a case of stretching the reported facts to fit the conclusion?

Unfortunately for our country's future, the Warren Commission Report is permeated with such instances of cavalier treatment of reported facts, and obscuration of relations. During the next few years, these instances may give rise to numerous articles and discussions which would result in unjustly (I repeat, UNJUSTLY) pointing the finger of suspicion at the very heads of the executive and judiciary branches of our national government. I believe the blame lies with the staff, and not the leaders.

A more probable area exists than those just mentioned, in which to seek out the cause of the assassination, if indeed there was a conspiracy. Quasi-military men, who have mastered the craft of psychological warfare, are technologically quite capable of executing a deed such as the assassination and getting away with it. Are we quite sure that all such men in Washington are morally utterly incapable of such dastardly action? Might they have done it if they honestly believed that President Kennedy was not acting in the best interests of the country, in attempting to reach an accommodation with the Russians, to allow "coexistence"?

It would be most unfortunate if we should find out that the Warren Commission Report had appeared to try to cover up the existence of such a conspiracy.

The public must learn more about the domestic (non-intelligence) operations of our so-called "intelligence agencies", so that, despite their limitless budgets, their secret use of Foundations and dummy corporations, their penetration of the military "Special Forces" and the radio and press services, ... so that, despite all this, they are not unwittingly permitted to undermine and overthrow what is left of democracy in our country. The growing attempt by the Defense Intelligence Agency (an arm of the Pentagon) to discredit the C.I.A. (not under Pentagon control) is of relevance in this connection, since Allen Dulles was removed as head of the C.I.A. by the late President Kennedy.

**LEON DAVIDSON**  
64 Prospect St.  
White Plains