

# The Evening Star

With Sunday Morning Edition

Published by THE EVENING STAR NEWSPAPER CO., Washington, D. C.

SAMUEL H. KAUFFMANN, *Chairman of the Board*

CROSBY N. BOYD, *President*

NEWBOLD NOYES, *Editor*

BENJAMIN M. McKELWAY, *Editorial Chairman*

A-8

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1964

## Oswald's Guilt

The findings of the Warren Commission clearly prove, it seems to us, that Lee Harvey Oswald, alone and unaided, assassinated President Kennedy. The evidence is also strongly persuasive that Jack Ruby, and Jack Ruby alone, was responsible for the subsequent murder of Oswald.

There already have been expressions of doubt in the wake of the report, and the probability is that these will never be entirely stilled. New York Attorney Mark Lane, retained by Oswald's mother to represent her son before the commission, says the report raises more questions than it answers, and that he still doesn't believe Oswald fired the fatal shots. In Europe, where the "conspiracy" theory has been most strongly held, a French newspaper, *Le Figaro*, has challenged the validity of the report. And that chronic dissenter, Lord Bertrand Russell, without having read the report, says it is "a sordidly incompetent document and covers its authors in shame."

This is the rankest sort of nonsense. Of course the proof is not altogether conclusive. In the nature of things it could not be. The commission recognized this when it said that "because of the difficulty of proving negatives to a certainty" it could not say categorically that no one else was involved with Oswald or Ruby. But, said the commission, "if there is any such evidence it has been beyond the reach of all the investigative agencies and resources of the United States and has

not come to the attention of this commission."

This should satisfy reasonable minds with respect to the central proposition: That there was no "conspiracy," but that, instead, Oswald killed the President and was in turn killed by Ruby—all without benefit of aid from third parties.

In its conclusions, the commission was critical of some of the procedures followed by the Secret Service, which is directly responsible for protecting the President, and of the FBI. Its recommendations for improving these procedures were specific, and if carried out they should reduce the risk in the future.

It seems to us, however, that the report falls short in not urging that Presidents should contribute more to their own security. It states that Presidents must make frequent trips to all parts of the country, and that "consistent with their high responsibilities Presidents can never be protected from every potential threat."

This, of course, is true. But Presidents can avoid needless risks when embarked on electioneering campaigns. In this connection there comes to mind a recent photograph of President Johnson, standing (and almost toppling over) in an open car so that the crowds could get a better look at him. Unfortunately, this sort of thing also makes the sniper's mission easier. It is the kind of risk which need not be taken, and which should be discouraged by every means.