

THE WARREN REPORT: TRUTH OR COVER-UP?

No one would dispute the fact that the publication of the Warren Report has not cleared the air concerning the strange circumstances of Pres. Kennedy's assassination. Although it is likely that many people will accept and be perfectly satisfied with the official conclusion of the Commission, that there was no conspiracy, vast numbers of Americans--among whom this writer includes himself--find the Commission's conclusion unacceptable. Mr. Harrison Salisbury, of The New York Times, calls us "theory-mongers," of course, and the reason why we are theory-mongering, he tells us in his Introduction to the Bantam Edition of the Report, is because "there is in each of our hearts some feeling, however small, of responsibility; some feeling that each of us had some share in the crime because we had a role in a society which made it possible; which gave birth to a young man who by a long, dreary, painful path became distorted into an assassin."

Well, I've got news for Mr. Salisbury. I don't have the slightest feeling of responsibility at all for anything Oswald became or did. Of course, Mr. Salisbury should feel some responsibility; after all, he has been misinforming the American people for years and he belongs to the very establishment which has made it so easy for the Oswalds to operate. The New York Times, which was

Castro's most potent ally, has blood on its hands and it would like to share this blood with the rest of us. Well, I, and millions of other Americans, will not buy this hogwash about collective guilt. Let the collectivists wallow in their guilt, since they are collectivists. But we individualists hold ourselves responsible for our own actions only. Collective guilt is as alien to the American way of life as is communism itself. It is a transparent attempt to evade the job of finding and identifying the real perpetrators of the crime.

Now, there is no substitute for individual judgment. Collectivists, like Mr. Salisbury, are willing to accept the conclusions of the Warren Commission because obviously they have no independent means of judging the facts for themselves. They prefer to take, without question, what is handed down to them by the authorities. It reminds one very much of the Soviet Presidium, which decides what is true and what is false, regardless of the facts of reality, and hands it down to the people, who have no choice about accepting it or not. In the first place, they are denied the facts on which any independent judgment can be based; and in the second, they know what's good for them if they dare question the judgment of the authorities.

In the United States, a measure of the freedom we still have can be gauged by how the Warren Commission had to actually go through the process of gathering facts, testimony and evidence. The measure of our people's real concern for freedom will be in how we deal with those facts, whether we just let them sit in the books and do nothing about them, or go over them with a fine tooth comb and uncover what really happened on November 22, 1963 in Dallas. Of course, there is the risk of being stigmatized as a "theory-monger" by Mr. Salisbury or an "extremist" by Mr. Larson of the late glee club for Civic Responsibility,

but that's a very small risk for the moment. There may be other less publicized risks involved, but this nation was not built by men who were afraid to take risks and it will not be preserved by men unwilling to take risks. Risk taking has now become the condition for our survival, and every patriotic American knows this.

Now, if we set aside the Harrison Salisburys, we find that the rest of us interested in the assassination can be divided into two groups: the first group includes the Communists and their many dupes who have been taken in by the incredible fabrications of Radio Moscow, Joachim Joesten, Mark Lane and other left-wing spokesmen; ~~and~~ the second group includes those citizens who are convinced that Oswald was a Communist agent and the assassination a deliberate and carefully planned act of the Communist conspiracy. Since I am concerned primarily in proving the validity of this last thesis, let me first examine the Communist thesis, that Pres. Kennedy was murdered by a right-wing conspiracy.

The motive behind this Communist accusation is obvious. The Communists often accuse their opponents of the crimes they themselves commit. In addition, since there were so many indications that there was some kind of conspiracy at work, the Communists have had to fabricate a semblance of a story by which these tell-tale clues could be explained. For example, the Communists knew that many people would be puzzled by Oswald's getting his passport so quickly in New Orleans in June 1963. How could a defector to the Communists, who had turned over military secrets to the Soviet Secret Police and was still active in pro-Communist activities on his return here, how could a man like that get a passport issued to him within merely twenty-four hours, particularly since

he had written on the application that he intended to travel to the Soviet Union? Well, the Communists knew that this could be interpreted as meaning that Oswald, with his notorious Red record, was getting favorable treatment in the State Department, which would lead any thinking person to the conclusion that the State Department was in some measure controlled by Communists or Communist sympathizers.

It may be a little difficult for the average American to believe this, but the last thing the Communists want the American people to realize is to what degree the Communists actually control our government in Washington. Evidence of this control and influence is so rampant in the circumstances of the President's assassination, that the Communists have had to concoct some pretty far-fetched stories to explain away this evidence. So, in the case of the passport, they contend that Oswald must have been working for the CIA in some anti-Communist capacity in order to have rated such special treatment. (The Warren Report tells us that Oswald's passport was processed routinely, which is pretty preposterous, since anyone going to the Soviet Union normally gets special attention.) Those of us, however, who know to what extent anti-Communists are actually harrassed in the State Department, have no trouble understanding how Oswald, a defector to the Soviet Union, could be given special consideration. The Otto Otepka affair and the removal in March 1964 of six well-known anti-Communists from the security section of the State Department is a good indication of the power the pro-Communists have over the anti-Communists in that department. But the left-wingers and dupes who read Mark Lane or listen to his lectures are usually so ignorant of such basic facts, that they accept almost any nonsense Mr. Lane tells them.

This writer attended one of Mark Lane's lectures to the general public. The impression Lane tried to give was that Oswald had been framed by a right-wing conspiracy which had indeed committed the crime. He didn't venture any farther than this. He didn't offer a plausible outline of this right-wing plot--who might have conceived it, how it was carried out and for what reasons. But he left no doubt in the minds of his audience that all the so-called "evidence" pointed in that direction. Significantly, during the question and answer period, a young lady got up and said that she could accept the idea of a racist plot against the President, but she could not accept the complicity of the United States Government in such a plot. Which, of course, is the crucially weak point in the entire Communist-inspired thesis. In order to accept the thesis that Pres. Kennedy was killed by a right-wing conspiracy, you must also accept the only logical conclusion that one can draw from that thesis: that this right-wing conspiracy is being protected from exposure not only by the Warren Commission--whose head was chosen on the recommendation of the Communists themselves--but by the President Johnson, the FBI, the CIA, the Dallas authorities, and the entire United States press.

Now there is nothing the liberal establishment would like better than to pin the murder of John F. Kennedy on the right-wing, and so you would have to be a complete moron to accept the notion that the establishment is withholding or covering up the very evidence they wish existed.

Of course, the average left-winger rarely bothers himself about facts. He will just about accept anything he is told by a left-wing authority. It is this kind of slavish and slovenly mentality which is characteristic of the left-winger, combined with a fanatic insistence that he is right, although his mind never begins to separate fact from fiction. The left-winger rejects

the mind as a precise instrument for knowing reality. For if you accept your mind as being perfectly capable of knowing reality, then you are an individual, and that is something a collectivist, by definition, is incapable of being.

Now, what is it about the Warren Report which makes it impossible to accept its conclusion that there was no conspiracy?

Well, first we must begin with the government's very prejudicial attitude toward the happenings in Dallas. This prejudgment was exercised as soon as the news came over the wire, before any inquiry was even started. The first such prejudicial announcement was the Voice of America broadcast which blamed the right wing for the crime before the suspect had been caught. This was followed by an official statement by the Chief Justice himself, pointing the finger of blame in the direction of the right wing. Warren's statement, which was given the widest publicity, was as follows: "A great and good President has suffered martyrdom as a result of the hatred and bitterness that has been injected into the life of our nation by bigots, but his memory will always be an inspiration to Americans of good will everywhere." "Bigots", of course, is a well-known euphemism for "right-wing extremists." It was the cue word meant to incite national indignation against the right wing. The third prejudicial announcement came after the suspected assassin had been caught and identified as a defector who had lived in the Soviet Union, and the State Department sent Khrushchev a note of assurance, telling him that everything was all right and that we were still the best of friends.

Since this assurance was given before any inquiry had been made, we must assume that the United States Government decided that the identification of those guilty of the murder of our President was less important than keeping

Nikita Khrushchev happy.

In other words, it was obvious by the way our government responded from the very beginning that an objective investigation of the murder would be out of the question. It then became the purpose of the Warren Commission to produce a report which would confirm the Government's prejudged version: that Oswald was a twisted loner, in league with no one, and that he, in turn, was murdered by another loner, equally psychotic in motivation.

It should be noted at this point that it was The Worker, the official newspaper of the Communist Party of the United States, which called for the creation of such a Commission with the Chief Justice as its head in its editorial of November 26, 1963. That editorial stated:

"We believe that President Johnson on the one hand and Congress on the other should act at once to appoint respective Extraordinary Investigation Commissions with full powers to conduct a searching inquiry into all the circumstances around the assassination of the President and the murder of the suspect.

" . . . Such an investigating committee, headed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, should be composed of citizens and experts who enjoy the confidence of the nation."

Of course, this all may be one big coincidence. Even if it were proven that President Johnson had acted on the advice of the Communists, it would not mean that the Warren Report does not contain the facts. It contains them by the ton; but how it assessed, appraises, weighs and connects these facts with other facts is the area in which the Report leaves itself wide open.

As an example of the Warren Commission's bias, let's take the subject of

Oswald's finances. As the reader may know, after Oswald was caught, the authorities discovered \$13.87 on his person and a wallet at his home with \$170.00. Since Oswald was known to be an exceptionally low wage earner who was often unemployed, the question which immediately arose was how did Oswald manage to accumulate this cash? Had he been paid money from some undisclosed source? Well, the Warren Commission decided to show how it could be possible for Oswald to have had this money without receiving it from an unknown source, and they prepared a month-by-month analysis of Oswald's finances from June 13, 1962, the date of his arrival in the United States, through November 22, 1963, the date of the assassination, a period of 17 and a half months. (The table is in Appendix XIV of the Report, on pages 660 to 663 of the Bantam edition.)

The table tells us that Oswald arrived in New York City from Russia with \$63.00. He then received by telegram a loan of \$200.00 from his brother Robert Oswald, and later, \$10 from his mother, both of whom were in Ft. Worth, giving him a total of \$273.00 for the 17 days in June 1962 after his arrival. His expenditures for that same period, the first day of which was spent in New York and the remainder in Ft. Worth, are itemized as follows: \$10.35 for transportation in New York City, \$15.21 for a hotel in New York for one night, \$201.04 for plane fare to Dallas for himself, his wife and child--which means that Oswald had already spent \$226.60 during those first 24 hours--leaving him \$46.40 for the next sixteen days.

How was that huge sum of \$46.40 spent? The Commission itemizes the expenditures as follows: \$30.00 partial repayment to his brother Robert, \$10.00 for a public stenographer which Oswald had hired shortly after his arrival in

Ft. Worth, and the final item, that is, for food, clothing, and incidental expenses for all those seventeen days, \$5. As if this were not incredible enough, the Commission then totals Oswald's expenses for June 1962 as \$271.60, and leaves him with the balance, no less, of \$1.40 at the end of the month.

Now, assuming that you're so broke that you can only afford to spend \$5 for food, clothing, telephone calls, postage, bus fares, drugs, etc. for seventeen days, you don't go out and hire a public stenographer for twice that amount. Yet the Commission would have us believe that Oswald not only spent only \$5 on all his necessities, but that he also had \$1.40 left over at the end of the month. Somewhat hard to believe, isn't it. The \$5 would have been entirely spent that first day in New York just for the simplest meals for himself, Marina and the baby. Now, Oswald and his family were staying at the home of his brother Robert during those first weeks in Ft. Worth. Obviously Oswald had some money of his own, or else his brother would not have accepted a repayment of the loan so early. You don't pay back the money you borrow unless you've got sufficient money for your own expenses and do not have to borrow any further.

The following month is even more fantastic. The table lists Oswald's income for July 1962 as \$46.82. He had gotten a job during the last week of the month. They then itemize his expenditures for that entire month as follows: \$10.00 to his brother as partial repayment of the plane fare to Dallas, and-- now, get this--as the only other expense for that month--\$3.87 for a subscription magazine. In other words, we are to believe that Oswald, his wife and child were able to get through that entire month without spending a penny on anything except a subscription to TIME magazine. (That, incidentally, is the

best free testimonial Time ever got!) Yet, the Commission has the gall to tell us that Oswald managed to have left over at the end of that month the sum of \$34.35. If that isn't stretching things, I don't know what is.

The reader might well ask himself why did the Warren Commission go to such lengths to fabricate a phony financial analysis for Oswald. Well, the answer is very simple. If Oswald were a trained assassin, sent to the United States from the Soviet Union to perform certain jobs here, he would be what Lenin called a "Professional Revolutionary," that is, a full-time agent of the Communist Conspiracy, on the conspiracy's payroll. Many agents have wives and children, homes, cars and other expenses. In a country where everyone must file an income tax return, Communist agents obviously do not reveal the fact that they are professional conspirators drawing salary from the conspiracy; they maintain innocent-looking fronts which show a legitimate source of income. But when they are paid by the conspiracy, they are obviously not paid by check, money order or other traceable means. They are paid in cash by another agent and, unless you catch them red handed, there is no possible way in which these transactions can be detected, unless one compares the legitimate income with the known expenditures and detects a discrepancy.

In the case of Oswald, the Warren Commission knew that there was a considerable discrepancy between what Oswald earned during the eighteen months of the period under scrutiny and his expenditures. For example, during the month of December 1962--about six months after his return to the United States--Oswald earned \$243.13, yet during that same month he repaid the State Department \$190.00, he paid \$68.00 for rent, \$4.50 for a post office box and \$1 for a subscription to the Militant, a total expenditure--excluding everything he spent on food,

clothing, etc.--of \$263.50, or about \$20 more than he had earned. If we include the unknown sum he spent on food, clothing, etc., his deficit would run much higher. The next month, January 1963, Oswald earned only \$247.13, yet he was able to repay the State Department \$206.00, pay \$75.13 for rent, \$10.00 for a revolver, \$9.00 for a typing course and \$13.20 for subscriptions to various Soviet publications, including the Agitator. This gave him a total expenditure--without including food, clothing, etc.--of \$313.33, approximately \$65.00 more than he had earned.

Now, obviously, Oswald, his wife and child didn't starve for that month, nor did they apply for welfare. They had money, and the way the Warren Commission accounted for this money was to create these phony surpluses at the end of each month, slowly accumulating these surpluses so that by the time Oswald was on record of having made his big repayments to the State Department, they could account for the source of the money.

This is how they did it: for June 1962 they gave ^{as} Oswald's estimated cost of food, clothing and incidental expenses \$5.00; for July, hing; for August, \$75; for September, \$100; for October, \$50; for November, \$50. Thus, by virtually starving himself and his family, Oswald, by December, had allegedly accumulated in his mattress the astounding surplus of \$295.17 and was ready to make his big repayments on his State Department loan. In other words, the Warren Commission contends that Oswald, his wife and child had been living on \$1.65 a day up to December 1962, a total of five and a half months, in order to have enough money to pay back the government.

Now, considering what Oswald's attitude was toward the United States Government, I doubt seriously if he would have deprived himself of one single

frankfurter in order to pay back the State Department. Yet, that \$1.65 a day was supposed to take care of three meals for two adults and one child, clothing, toiletries, drugs, postage, telephone calls, bus fares, haircuts, laundry, movies, books, newspapers, stationery, pens and pencils, furniture, electric bulbs, camera film and many other so-called incidentals.

Now, what was the real reason why Oswald decided to pay back the State Department so suddenly? Here is the reason, and it had nothing whatever to do with his good conscience or any sudden financial affluence. He had decided or was instructed by his superiors to pay back the loan, because when he had signed the State Department's promissory note, he had agreed to the following stipulation:

"I further understand and agree that after my repatriation I will not be furnished a passport for travel abroad until my obligation to reimburse the Treasurer of the United States is liquidated."

In other words, Oswald had to repay the loan in order to be able to get another passport, which he did get five months later in New Orleans.

It would be interesting, at this point, to speculate on how Marina Oswald was able to manage a family of three on a mere \$ 65 a day. She was questioned along these lines by J. Lee Rankin, the Commission's General Counsel, who was trying to ascertain how Oswald had been able to make his big repayments to the State Department. The testimony, to be found on page 62 of Volume I, went as follows:

Mr. Rankin: Do you recall the money your husband borrowed from the Embassy in Moscow to come to this country? Do you know where he got the money to repay that amount?

Mrs. Oswald: He worked and we paid out the debt. For six or seven months we were paying off this debt.

Mr. Rankin: Some of the payments were rather large during that period. Do you remember that?

Mrs. Oswald: Yes. And no one will believe it--it may appear strange. But we lived very modestly. Perhaps for you it is hard to imagine how we existed.

Mr. Rankin: Did you handle the finances--

Mrs. Oswald: Of course, we were economizing. No, Lee always handled the money, but I bought groceries. He gave me money and I bought groceries, or more correctly, together.

Mr. Rankin: You would usually go to the grocery store together to buy what you needed?

Mrs. Oswald: Yes.

Mr. Rankin: And then did he give you any funds separately from that, for you to spend alone?

Mrs. Oswald: Yes, he would give it to me, but I would not take it.

Mr. Rankin: How much were these amounts?

Mrs. Oswald: Excuse me, I want to add something. You asked me yesterday to make a list of how much we spent during a month-- I forgot. Excuse me-- I will do it today. For example, when we paid \$60 to \$65 rent per month, we would spend only about \$15 per week for groceries. As you see, I didn't die and I am not sick.

Mr. Rankin: What do you mean by that?

Mrs. Oswald: In my opinion life is so very expensive here. Every one buys according to his financial status, and no one walks around undressed. You can buy for \$20 and at a sale you might buy for \$2, clothes for an entire season.

Mr. Rankin: What about clothing for your child? Did you handle the buying of that?

Mrs. Oswald: Yes. . . . Some of the things for children were given to us by friends who had children. But I didn't like them and ^I bought some.

And so, according to the testimony, Marina was the epitome of the frugal wife, able to purchase clothes for an entire season for \$2 and make do virtually with pennies a day. What with only \$1.65 a day to spend on so many essentials, it must have been a pretty drab life. But if we are to believe the following testimony (page 9, Volume I), it wasn't:

Mr. Rankin: Did you go out in the evenings?

Mrs. Oswald: Yes.

Mr. Rankin: Where did you go?

Mrs. Oswald: Sometimes we went shopping to stores, and movies, though Lee really went to the movies himself. He wanted to take me but I did not understand English. Then on weekends we would go to a lake not far away or to a park or to a cafe for some ice cream.

Movies, shopping, ice cream? How far could you stretch \$1.65? Marina must have stretched it far indeed, as this additional bit of testimony (page 12, Volume I) would indicate:

Mr. Rankin: Did you feel that you were getting along on what he was earning?

Mrs. Oswald: Of course.

Mr. Rankin: Were you urging him to earn more so that he could provide more for the family?

Mrs. Oswald: No. We had enough.

Indeed, they must have had enough. And indeed, one begins to suspect that Marina Oswald was not terribly good at counting. Was she the kind to keep track of all the money they had spent that week and confront her husband with the fact that they had spent more than he had earned? During the questioning, Marina was asked about her money habits in Russia. The testimony went as follows (page 86, Volume I):

Mr. Rankin: Did you save any money while you were working before you graduated?

Mrs. Oswald: I don't know how to save money. I like to make presents.

She was then asked about her money habits after she had moved to Minsk (page 89, Volume I):

Mr. Rankin: Did you save money?

Mrs. Oswald: No, I would receive my pay and I would spend everything in one day--three day tops.

Not exactly the kind used to pinching pennies. No, the kind to worry about where Oswald got his money from, nor the kind to count the nickels and dimes in his pockets. As for her contradictory testimony, the Commission, in drawing its conclusion, decided to forget about Marina's financial looseness in Russia and concentrate on her unique ability to buy a season's clothes for \$2. They also decided to forget about the movies, the ice cream, and the television set. What television set? The one Oswald bought on credit, made a few payments on and then gave back. The testimony is on page 6, Volume I:

Mr. Rankin: Did you obtain a television set at that time?

Mrs. Oswald: Lee wanted to buy a television set on credit. He then returned it. . . .

Mr. Rankin: Did Robert help any with the money or just in guaranteeing the payments?

Mrs. Oswald: I think that he only guaranteed the payments.

Mr. Rankin: Do you recall how much the television set cost?

Mrs. Oswald: No.

Mr. Rankin: So far as you know it was paid for out of your husband's income?

Mrs. Oswald: Yes.

Of course, you won't find any mention of the television set in the Commission's itemized listing of Oswald's expenditures. They also omitted a few other items from Oswald's expenses. For example, they forgot to include the fee for his new passport, unless Oswald was also getting free passports. They also omitted any expenses incurred by Marina's visits to doctors in New Orleans during her pregnancy, and they omit entirely any expenses incurred during and after the birth of their second child in October 1963, one month before the assassination. Now, of course, the Commission would explain that during this last period Marina had been living in the home of Ruth Paine who took care of all the expenses. But did she?

Before one could answer that, one would have to know something about Ruth Paine. Marina and Lee had met Ruth Paine at a party at the home of left-wing friends in Dallas in February 1963. There is no indication that Marina took a shine to Ruth Paine or vice versa, but they became "friends." Ruth visited Marina who was supposedly helping her with her Russian, and the Oswalds had dinner

at the Paines. On April 24, 1963, two weeks after the attempt to kill Gen. Walker, Oswald took off for New Orleans and Marina moved in with Mrs. Paine. Two days later, the Paines went off to spend a weekend at a left-wing Folk Dancing Camp near San Antonio, leaving Marina and child alone in their house in Irving, Texas, a suburb of Dallas. Then, on May 10, 1963 Ruth drove Marina and child to New Orleans where Oswald had rented an apartment. Ruth stayed with the Oswalds for three days and then returned to Dallas.

During that summer Ruth and Marina corresponded with each other. Ruth, out of the goodness of her heart, decided to invite Marina to live with her in Irving, Texas. In a letter she sent Marina on July 11, 1963, Ruth explained how moving to Irving would solve all her problems. She wrote: "You know I have long received from my parents, I live dependant a long time. I would be happy to be an aunt to you and Iccan. We have sufficient money. Michael will be glad. This I know. He just gave me \$500 for the vacation or something necessary. With this money it is possible to pay the doctor and hospital in October when the baby is born, believe God, all will be well for you and the children. I confess that I think that the opportunity for me to know you came from God. Perhaps it is not so but I think and believe so." (page 192, Volume II)

Now this is a most peculiar letter. Assuming that Mrs. Paine is the world's most generous woman, it is somewhat presumptuous of her to offer to pay all of Marina's medical expenses when Oswald, her husband, was supposedly responsible for such matters. In addition, it seems odd that Oswald would have entrusted Marina to a relative stranger when he had his own mother and brother living in Ft. Worth. Yet, in September, when Oswald was ready to make his famous trip to Mexico City, it was Ruth Paine who picked up Marina and the child in her station wagon and took them back with her to Irving, Texas.

Also, one ought not to be fooled by all this talk about God in Mrs. Paine's letter. She was more than likely using the Aseopian language common among those who wish to conceal the real meaning of their thoughts without resorting to an obvious code. In the first place, when Mrs. Paine came before the Commission to testify (page 431, Volume II), this is how she took the oath:

Mr. McCloy: Now if you will please take the stand, I will swear you.

Mrs. Paine: I would like to affirm.

Mr. McCloy: Do you solemnly affirm that the evidence you will give in this investigation will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mrs. Paine: Yes; I do.

Now, both Quakers and atheists affirm rather than swear. The Quakers, of course, affirm because they do not believe in taking oaths with invoke the deity. Now you would imagine that Ruth Paine was some kind of stickler about her adopted religion if, at the Commission hearing, she went to the trouble of affirming instead of swearing. Yet, when the famous Quaker writer, Jessamyn West, visited Ruth Paine to interview her for Redbook Magazine, Miss West observed the following about the dinner Mrs. Paine prepared:

"The dinner, simple and good, appeared with dispatch in spite of our talk. I thought there might be silent grace before dinner. There was none."

(Redbook, July, 1964, page 84)

Now, if you are a devout Quaker and invite as famous a Quaker writer as Miss West to dine in your home, it is not likely that you would forget to say grace before dinner.

Nor does it seem likely that Mrs. Paine would have written to Marina about "God", when Marina was no more religious than Nikita Khrushchev. We have ~~the~~ testimony to that effect from Marina's own publicity agent, James Martin, who was intimately knowledgeable concerning Marina's religious predilections. He testified as follows (page 498, Volume I):

Mr. Martin: . . . We were trying to create in the public mind an image of a bereaved widow and a simple lost girl. And I think we did actually. This was for her, as I say, for her benefit. She has received some \$68,000 in contributions, and the image is not all true.

Mr. Redlich: Would you tell us in respect to which in your opinion the image is not true?

Mr. Martin: Well, as I mentioned before about the bible, this is a very small incident, she has received numerous bibles in the mail, and to my knowledge has never read the first page of one, and most of them are in Russian.

This is a small thing really but it is part of her image, that she is a religious person. . . .

She was not a devout Greek orthodox. She was not devout anything so far as religion is concerned.

Judging from Mr. Martin's testimony and Jessamyn West's observation, it seems unlikely that Ruth Paine really believed what she was saying when she wrote to Marina: "I confess that I think that the opportunity for me to know you came from God."

Now there is a conflict of testimony between Mr. and Mrs. Paine on who

paid Marina's bills. In her letter Ruth had written that her husband had given her \$500 which would go to pay Marina's hospital bill. But Michael Paine, who was separated from his wife, gave an entirely different version in his testimony. He said (page 429, Volume II): "Ruth was enjoying Marina's company and I was glad to have Marina staying with Ruth. It actually reduced the cost. Ruth saved money. The bills were less while Marina was there, and Ruth, in general, was happier."

The inference, of course, is that Marina was in some way contributing to the household expenses while she was living with Ruth Paine. If we know from the Commission's financial analysis that Oswald contributed nothing to Marina's expenses and that Marina had no income of her own.

Had Michael Paine carelessly let slip the inference that his wife was receiving funds from an undisclosed source to cover Marina's expenses, a source euphemistically known as "God"? Mrs. Paine herself testified that Oswald had not contributed anything to Marina's support while she was staying under her roof.

Who, anyway, were Ruth and Michael Paine? Ruth Paine, born in 1932, was a graduate of Antioch College. Brought up as a Unitarian, she joined the Quakers in 1951 at the age of 19. In 1955 she served as a chairman of a Quaker conference at Quaker Haven. "This was at the time," she tells us, "that plans first began for encouraging an exchange of young people between the Soviet Union and the United States, and I became active with the committee planning that, and from the planning there was an exchange, three Soviet young people came to this country and four young Quakers went to the Soviet Union."

Mrs. Paine's interest in Russia led her to become chairman of a Quaker

committee devoted to encouraging the development of pen pals between the United States and Soviet Union. As Mrs. Paine testified: "I helped make contact between young people in this country who wished to write someone in the Soviet Union, and an organization of young people in Moscow which found pen pals for these young Americans." Mrs. Paine herself had several Soviet pen pals and even exchanged magnetic tape recordings with one of them. Thus, surrounded by Communists and pro-Communists and in direct contact with Soviet citizens, is it not possible that somewhere along the line Mrs. Paine could have been recruited into a KGB apparatus, which would account for the strange relationship she had with the Oswalds? The Warren Commission, of course, never posed any such question or even cast the slightest suspicion on the loyalty of Mrs. Paine. She was not even asked to give more details about her pro-Soviet activities.

As for Michael Paine, he also turned out to have a rather interesting background. Here is an excerpt from his testimony:

Mr. Liebelier: Do you have any knowledge of the political attitudes or activities of your father, George Lyman Paine? . . .

Mr. Paine: . . . He took me to a few, one or possibly two, Communist meetings at my considerable insistence. . . .

Mrs. Guiles: Did they try to recruit you at all or to get you to be a member or attend or join meetings?

Mr. Paine: No; they were glad to meet Lyman's son. That is he would introduce me to friends or people he knew there, and I liked--I had some favorable attitudes to the zeal of the group or the zeal of the assembled people. . . .

Mr. Liebelier: Did you know of your father ever using any aliases?

Mr. Paine: No, I don't.

Mr. Liebeler: You are not familiar with the name Thomas L. Brown or Lyman Pierce?

Mr. Paine: No. . . . I was aware that my father didn't talk readily about his affairs. When we met we would talk at great length and we always do talk. There is an amazing similarity in our natures. I have always thought that there was one person trying to live in two bodies.

In other words, Michael Paine closely identified himself with his Communist father who was in the habit of using a few aliases. Yet, the Warren Commission found little reason to suspect that Michael Paine was anything but an innocent bystander, despite the conflicting testimony ~~on the matter of~~ ~~on the matter of~~ who paid for Marina's upkeep while Oswald was busy planning to assassinate the President of the United States.

At one point, while Paine was being questioned, the Chief Justice himself interrupted the interrogation. "Is this of particular importance to the investigation," he asked, "it is very lengthy, and I don't know particularly what it bears upon. If it is in relation with his father, let's get at that and get it over with, but I don't see what this man's history from the time he was born--I don't see how it bears on it. It just takes altogether too much time for an extraneous purpose, it seems to me. Let's get on with the thing."

Naturally, this did not encourage further probing.

What did the Oswalds think of ^{Mrs.} ~~the~~ Paines, who did so much for them out her the goodness of ~~their~~ hearts? Marina Oswald's testimony on page 19, volume I is quite revealing:

Mr. Rankin: How did Mrs. Paine and your husband get along? Were

they friendly?

Mrs. Oswald: She was very good to us, to Lee and to me, and Lee was quite friendly with her, but he did not like her. I know that he didn't like her.

Mr. Rankin: Did he tell you why he didn't like her?

Mrs. Oswald: He considered her to be a ~~xxx~~ stupid woman. Excuse me-- these are not my words.

Mr. Rankin: Were you and Mrs. Paine good friends?

Mrs. Oswald: Yes, so-so, I tried to help her as much as I could. But I also--I was--I did not like her too well. I also considered her not to be a very smart woman.

In other words, there was no love lost between the Oswalds and the Paines, whose destinies merged briefly as a result of the mysterious workings of "God." Why Lee Harvey Oswald chose to have his wife stay, during her late pregnancy, with Ruth Paine, whom he considered to be stupid, rather than with his brother or mother in Ft. Worth is a question which has never been answered. It should be noted at this point, also, that it was Ruth Paine who was most instrumental in getting Oswald his job at the Texas School Depository, which, by coincidence, of course, turned out to be the ideal spot for a assassin to be in if he were planning to kill the President.

Now the Commission never bothered to reconcile the two conflicting testimonies of Mr. and Mrs. Paine regarding who paid Marina's bills. Like so much that is contradictory in the Warren Report, it is simply left there for future generations to ponder over.

Now, had the Commission been honest, it would have prepared an entirely different kind of analysis of Oswald's finances. Instead of arbitrarily designating Oswald's monthly expenditures to fit into the scheme they were concocting, they would have simply added up all of Oswald's known receipts for the 18 months, which totalled \$3,665.89, and then subtracted from that, all of his known expenditures, such as repayment of loans, rents, subscriptions, etc., and realized that the balance of \$195.23 (which amounts to \$10.85 per month, or \$2.58 a day) was hardly enough to keep a family of three in, for a year and a half in food, clothing, drugs, carfare, phone calls, postage, etc. They would have readily admitted that Oswald undoubtedly had an additional source of income which was unknown, and conscientiously they would have then proceeded to uncover what that source was.

Another instance of the Commission's bias is in its investigation of the circumstances surrounding Oswald's speedy issuance of a passport in June 1963, only five months before the assassination. Now, here was a man who had defected to the Soviet Union, handed over military secrets to the Soviet Secret Police, had married a Soviet national who was in fact the niece of a KGB colonel in whose home she had been living, was permitted to return by the State Department not because he had recanted, but because they considered his "continued presence in the Soviet Union damaging to the prestige of the United States," and here was this man now applying for a new passport in order to travel ~~once~~ once more to the Soviet Union. You would expect that a passport application from such an individual would at least be investigated before a passport was issued, if indeed it would be issued at all. Certainly if the State Department had brought him back because his presence in the Soviet Union was damaging to the prestige of the United States, they would have hesitated before permitting him to go