THE PAINES:

by Barbara LaMonica, Steve Jones, and Carol Hewett

Hospitality

Ruth and Michael Paine, in whose home Marina Oswald lived in the Fall of 1963, are among the most significant, yet least studied of the figures surrounding the assassination. Wittingly or unwittingly they moved the "plot" along. By taking in Oswald's family, the Paines insured the continued separation of Lee and Marina, thus allowing Lee to "play his little spy games" in the absence of witnesses to his activities and associates during the critical time leading up to the assassination. The Paines were the closest persons to Oswald during the months just prior to November 22, and their portrayal of him as a cantankerous, violence-prone character with questionable political beliefs lent credibility to the official "lone nut" scenario.

In addition to sheltering Marina, the Paine residence provided a storage space for nearly all the evidence used in the official, unofficial indictment of Oswald. Even prior to the assassination Ruth was collecting "evidence". A letter from Lee to the Russian embassy had been found by Ruth on November 10. She copied it by hand and later turned it over to the FBI. The Kleins order form, the Walker photograph, the backyard photograph, and radical literature all surfaced when Ruth invited Dallas Police and FBI to search her home, giving them carte blanche to both Lee and Marina's possessions. Ruth went through Marina's drawers and gave the FBI items pertaining to Lee's Mexico City trip, including a bracelet, post cards, and a map. One wonders why someone planning to commit an assassination would allow such items to remain in another person's residence in lieu of destroying or removing the incriminating evidence.

According to her own testimony, Ruth is "irritated" at Lee when he phones her and asks if she will contact attorney John Abt. She was "stunned" that he would call her, and angry that he was "so presuming of his own innocence". Her lack of concern for people's civil rights and her anger at someone's "presumption" of innocence is strange on the part of a woman like Ruth who was in charge of the membership drive for the local ACLU. But most important, the basis for the locality of the murder weapon, and its association with Oswald, unfolds through the Paines' testimony.

Michael Paine's WC testimony [2] confirms that Lee owned a rifle, which was wrapped in a blanket in the Paines' garage. This is hindsight of course, since Michael Paine claims he never realized the item wrapped in a blanket and tied with string was a rifle. He admits to handling this bundle several times while working in his garage, but he thought it was camping equipment. Paine says he reasoned that since the blanket was green it must have contained something rustic! It is hard to believe that a man who was in combat artillery in Korea and in the Army Reserves for six years, as Michael Paine was, could not recognize the weight and feel of a rifle, especially if it belonged to a person whom he considered prone to violence. Not to mention green being a military color as well as a rustic one! It seems Paine knew it was a rifle all along, and later chose to hide that fact. Or perhaps it really wasn't a rifle, but he is willing to lead the WC to that assumption.

Ruth's testimony [3] places the rifle in Oswald's hands in time for the assassination. She claims that on Thursday night, November 21, Oswald showed up unexpectedly (he usually spent the weekend at the Paines' home) to visit his family. Around 9 p.m. that evening, Ruth went through Marina's drawers and gave the FBI items pertaining to Lee's Mexico City trip, including a bracelet, post cards, and a map. One wonders why someone planning to commit an assassination would allow such items to remain in another person's residence in lieu of destroying or removing the incriminating evidence.

According to her own testimony, Ruth is "irritated" at
never saw Lee go to the garage. Furthermore, the person who had the most access to, and reason for entering the garage was Michael Paine who himself testified that he often would stop by to use his tools which were also stored there. [5]

The Paines always maintain a delicate and contradictory balance between intimacy and distance vis a vis Lee Harvey Oswald. They take on the mantle of "expert witnesses" when they testify to his violent prone character or unconventional political opinions. On other occasions they say they never detected his violent-prone nature and that he was harmless. [6] The day after the assassination Michael Paine tells his father that he thought Oswald was the kind of person who could have assassinated the President. [7] Just prior to the assassination, Ruth tells the FBI that Oswald is an "illogical" person who is a "Trotskyite Communist". [8] Why would the Paines allow someone who was illogical and capable of murder stay in their home on weekends, especially with their own children present? But when they want to avoid further scrutiny the Paines subtly distance themselves from Oswald by exhibiting faulty memory, or claiming they didn't really spend much time with him. If they didn't know him well enough to detect his violent nature, how can they be so sure he committed the crime? Michael especially tries to avoid being pinned down when the WC seems to be asking how much time he spent with Oswald. In answer to the WC question of how often he would visit his home during the Fall of 1963, Michael Paine responds:

"...well as I say it was two nights a week, two evenings a week was a regular thing. I would frequently come around weekends. The garage had been my shop with my tools that I occasionally used, and I would stop by on weekends, on Sunday anyways, Fridays for sure, Sunday accidentally and generally on a Tuesday or Wednesday." [9]

One cannot imagine a more circumspect answer to the query of how many times he saw Oswald at his home. He also conveniently avoids mentioning Thursdays—the night Ruth found the light on in the garage.

The Eye of the Storm

In assessing the significance of the Paines, it is important to remember that there are two time-frames, the spring and fall of 1963, when the lives of the Paines and Oswalds are especially intertwined that coincide with several important events including: the purchase of the rifle, the Walker incident, the Mexico City trip, and LHO's employment at the TSBD.

Ruth Paine first meets Marina in February 1963. Everett Glover, a friend of both Michael Paine and George de Mohrenschildt, invites Ruth to a party to meet Marina because he knows Ruth is interested in honing her Russian language skills. [10] On March 8 Ruth Paine initiates contact with Marina by writing her a note, and on March 20 she visits Marina. Between these last two events, on March 13, Lee allegedly purchases the rifle. On April 2, Ruth invites the Oswalds to dinner, and although she and her husband Michael are separated, he is in attendance as well. He even picks the Oswalds up at their home. On April 7, Ruth writes a note to Marina (which she claims she never sent) inviting Marina to live with her. By April 20, there is a picnic with the Oswalds, and at the end of the month, Marina is staying with Ruth temporarily while Lee goes to New Orleans in search of employment and an apartment. In the middle of this cluster of activity, the Walker shooting takes place on April 10. During the summer, the Paines and Oswalds part company. After Lee gets a job, Ruth drives Marina and June to New Orleans to start a new life with Lee. Ruth returns to Irving, and the two women maintain a written correspondence with each other. [11]

During the first week in June, Ruth receives a letter from Marina. Ruth claims she only glanced at the letter and "about a month later when I sat down to reply, I read through more carefully and found in the middle of a paragraph a comment...very likely I will have to go back to Russia after all. A pity." Ruth says she was so shocked at having not picked it up because of her poor Russian. She immediately writes back and invites Marina to live with her in Irving instead of going back to Russia. [12] It does seem odd that Ruth, who has been so concerned about Marina's well-being, would only glance at her letter, and not even attempt to answer it until a month later. Marina responds by mid-July claiming that her relationship with Lee has greatly improved and she thanks Ruth for her invitation but declines. [13] By July 27 Ruth is on vacation, traveling around the country visiting friends and family. In mid-August while on vacation, Ruth receives another letter from Marina who writes that Lee is unemployed. Ruth decides to stop off in New Orleans on her way back home. She stays with the Oswalds for three days. It is
then decided that Marina will return to Dallas with Ruth so she can have her baby in the Parkland Hospital clinic. [14] Yet according to FBI interviews of Ruth’s friends and family, Ruth told everyone she was going to pick up a Russian woman in New Orleans and bring her home to live with her in Irving. [15] Did Ruth make up her mind, prior to arriving in New Orleans, that Marina was going to live with her? Was there another deliberate attempt to separate Marina and Lee, and for what reason?

By September 27 Marina is again living with Ruth in Dallas and Lee is in Mexico City. Michael Paine has even committed to contribute financially to Marina’s support while she is living with Ruth. [16] By October 15, Lee is back in Dallas and working at the TSBD, employment in large part facilitated by Ruth.

This synopsis places the Paines directly in the maelstrom of events leading to the assassination. Yet, the focus of the FBI investigation of the Paines concentrated almost entirely on whether they were subsversives instead of their day-to-day activities during the time period that coincided with their friendship with the Oswalds. They seemingly didn’t investigate Michael at all. They never searched his apartment in Grand Prairie, nor examined his telephone records. After the assassination, Michael quickly left his Grand Prairie apartment and reconciled with Ruth.

However, the FBI background check did reveal many “left wing” tendencies which the paranoid J. Edgar Hoover could have interpreted as subsversive such as: subscriptions to liberal periodicals, subscriptions to Russian periodicals, membership in the ACLU and the Congress of Racial Equality, associations with Americans who traveled to Communist countries, associations with convicted draft dodgers, and Russian penpals and relatives associated with communism. [17] In the climate of the times why weren’t the Paines considered suspects in a plot? In fact their left wing bonafides, spanning a fifty-year period (Michael Paine’s grandfather and father were on the FBI Security Index) [18] were more believable than Oswald’s. Ironically, Hoover sought to shield the Paines from further scrutiny. In a letter to Rankin, Hoover warns that there could be serious repercussions if certain information about the Paines were made public. [19] What type of revelations about the Paines would Hoover try to conceal?

Parallel Universes

Who were the Paines? According to friends and family whom the FBI interviewed, the Paines were upstanding, loyal Americans. Their relationship with the Oswalds could only have been of a charitable nature. Nevertheless, a close scrutiny of their FBI files reveals some intriguing intimations that link the Paines, like Oswald, with the intelligence community.

Michael Paine is a direct descendent of Ralph Waldo Emerson. His mother, Ruth Forbes Paine Young, was of the wealthy merchant and banking family, the Forbes of Boston. One of his aunts on his mother’s side married a Cabot. His granduncle, Cameron Forbes, served as both governor and later ambassador to the Philippines. In 1963 Michael, a Harvard dropout, lived off trust funds from both the Forbes and Cabots, and a job (perhaps a sinecure arranged by stepfather Arthur Young) as a research engineer at Bell Helicopter. [20] Nevertheless, in spite of their differences in social standing, Michael Paine and Lee Harvey Oswald bear some striking resemblances. Both their mothers married three times, and both men were deprived of being raised by their real fathers. Both men were described by associates as sullen loners, who liked to argue politics, and Michael would often take both sides of a political argument just to get people riled up. [21] Michael attended ACLU meetings and also expressed interest in attending John Birch Society meetings. Both men were experiencing marital difficulties in 1963, and living apart from their wives. More importantly, there were elements in both Paine and Oswald that suggested intelligence links.

Although the Forbes were a wealthy traditional New England family, the Paines veered off to the left. Michael’s father, Lyman Paine, was a famous Trotskyite who became a collaborator of socialist C.L.R. James. [22] His grandfather was an “eccentric” minister who championed “communist front organizations.” [23] Michael’s step—father, however, was connected to the defense industry as the inventor of the Bell Helicopter. Michael’s mother Ruth played a significant role in CIA deputy Cord Meyer’s World Federalists, and was a close friend of Mary Bancroft, former OSS operative and mistress of Allen Dulles. [24] At one point, Michael worked for the Franklin Institute, a known CIA conduit. [25] Furthermore, there are indications that Michael Paine, like Oswald, acted like a provocateur.

According to an FBI document [26], in 1963 a student at SMU often observed a man fitting Michael Paine’s description eating breakfast in a cafeteria across
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from the campus. On one such occasion this man accosted the student and began a heated discussion about America's unfair treatment of Cuba. In addition, the man claimed to know Lee Harvey Oswald who was a communist. This event allegedly occurred in April 1963, around the same time that an FBI informant claimed that Oswald had been passing out Fair Play for Cuba Committee literature on the streets of Dallas. [27] When questioned by the FBI, Paine admitted to eating breakfast on Sunday mornings at this cafeteria and in engaging the students there in political discussions about Cuba. Thus we have documented evidence of Paine and Oswald engaging in similar activities in the same time period. Perhaps Michael and Lee, sharing some psychological similarities, and commiserating over marital difficulties, hung around together more than Michael is willing to admit. Or were their activities being orchestrated by the same intelligence handler?

Ruth Paine's background discloses several links to the intelligence community. She came from an upper middle class New York family, who later moved to Ohio. Her father, a top executive for Nationwide Insurance, had worked for the OSS. [28] An FBI document stated that the CIA considered using him to operate a cooperative educational center in Vietnam in 1957, but for some unknown reason decided against it. [29] More interesting is Ruth's assertion to the Garrison Grand Jury that her father "...was on leave to an agency called the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA). [30] There is precious little information on this agency, but George de Mohrenschildt claimed in his WC testimony that he traveled abroad for the ICA. [31] Furthermore, CIA asset and de Mohrenschildt acquaintance, Joseph Dryer, was asked if he could associate anyone else with the name Clemard Charles, a Haitian business associate of de Mohrenschildt. The HSCA gave him a list of names and Dryer recognized the name William Avery Hyde, although he couldn't quite recall why. [32] A more interesting question is why did the HSCA put Hyde's name on this list in the first place?

In the same Grand Jury testimony, Ruth admitted that her brother-in-law John Hoke was employed by the Communications Resource Division of AID and that subsequent to the assassination so did her father. There is much evidence that AID was used as a CIA front and conduit to finance covert ops. Former Ohio governor John Gilligan, who headed AID during the Carter administration said, "...at one time AID field offices were infiltrated from top to bottom with CIA people. The idea was to plant operatives in every kind of activity we had overseas—government, volunteer, religious, every kind." [33]

Her sister, Sylvia Hyde Hoke, worked for "a government agency" but which one Ruth could not recall. FBI background reports on Ruth's family indicate her sister worked for the Air Force [34], but there is another document which claims she is a CIA employee. [35]

Could it be that William Avery Hyde the businessman had been recruited early in his career by the CIA (remember he was in the OSS) and that while doing insurance business abroad he also did intelligence work? Did he eventually use his influence to get his daughter Sylvia and son-in-law employment in the intelligence community? Was this an intelligence family, and did Ruth occasionally act as an informal asset? Is this how the lives of the Oswalds and the Paines become entwined? Was someone from the intelligence community manipulating the Paines? The question is who, if anyone, was controlling the Paines is a critical one.

In conclusion we believe that because of their proximity to the assassination, their immediate willingness to accept Oswald as the lone perpetrator, and their connections to the intelligence community, the Paines warrant further scrutiny. We do not necessarily believe they participated in a plot to murder President Kennedy, but as Sylvia Meagher has pointed out, referring to Ruth Paine:

Ruth Paine...is a complex personality, despite her rather passive facade. Some examples from her testimony show a predisposition against Oswald and a real or pretended friendliness toward the FBI and other Establishment institutions which should not be overlooked in evaluating her role in the case...Mrs. Paine is sometimes a devious person, and her testimony must be evaluated in that light. [36]

Since 1964, Robert Oswald has said on more than one occasion that he felt the Paines, especially Michael, knew more about the assassination than they were telling. [37] We believe the real story of the Paines' role in the life of the Oswalds still remains a mystery. There are many discrepancies in their stories and there is much they can still add to the historical record. We therefore believe they should be subpoenaed to testify...
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The Crisis in Assassination Research: Losing Touch
by Howard Platzman

Gary Savage’s First Day Evidence — essentially a defense of the Dallas police investigation — shows two photos of the alleged sniper’s nest. One (identified as DP#19 on page 152) was taken on the day of the assassination and “may have been the first photograph made by the Crime Lab on the sixth floor.” This photo very clearly shows 7 to 8 bricks between the corner of the box leaning against the window sill and the window sash to the right (looking out). However, another (on page 150), taken on November 25th as a “reconstruction photo of the sniper’s nest,” just as clearly shows only 4 to 5 bricks between these two points.

Is it possible that the police or others on the scene intentionally moved the boxes into a position that would have given a shooter more room to the left-hand side of the box in which to assume a more comfortable firing position? At least one assassination researcher has insisted that a truly suitable position to the left of the box was impossible. In trying to fire down Elm, the shooter would have been pressed against a vertical pipe just to the left of the window. Kneeling over or down and using a box to steady the rifle, as Oswald is alleged to have done, would not have been options for someone contending with this extremely awkward angle.

What, then, do these photographs tell us about the evidence purporting to prove that Lee Harvey Oswald’s work-site was actually a shelter he constructed in order to fire down Elm Street? Possibly something.
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