

5871

(Mount Clipping in Space Below)

The Whole Truth?

WE SHOULD LIKE to believe that President Johnson meant precisely what he said when he assured the American people that the full facts concerning the tragic assassination of President Kennedy would be laid before the world.

As a step toward that end, the new President created a special commission headed by the nation's principal judicial officer to gather and analyze the facts. The commission, moreover, has been empowered by Congress to subpoena witnesses and to take whatever other legitimate steps are necessary to complete its assignment.

There is much reason to believe, unhappily, that there are those in government who would prefer that the full story not be known—particularly since Mr. Kennedy's apparent assassin turned out to be a pro-Castro Marxist rather than a "racist" or a "right-wing extremist."

Let these suspicions be dismissed as idle conjecture, these factors deserve consideration:

In the moments between the time Mr. Kennedy was shot and the time he actually succumbed to his wounds, the Voice of America broadcast around the world that the shooting had occurred in "the center of the extreme right wing." The Voice of America, wittingly or not, thereby set the tone for the Soviet Union's official coverage of the event. "All circumstances of President Kennedy's tragic death," declared Pravda, "give grounds for considering that the murder was conceived and carried out by the ultraright, fascist and racialist circles." The Voice of America ultimately changed its story; Pravda has not.

John F. Kennedy

Very probably as a direct result, a Paris poll conducted five days after the assassination showed that 33% of those questioned were convinced that the assassin was indeed a "racist." Only 10% believed that he was an affiliate of a pro-Castro organization.

As soon as the identity of Lee Harvey Oswald had been established, says Marvin Kalb, correspondent for the Columbia Broadcasting System, official Washington began assuring the Soviet-bloc nations that it knew they were not implicated in the crime. In fact, of course, it knew no such thing.

There is, in addition, this report in the current issue of National Review: "In Dallas, a top reporter for a large East Coast daily learned—from an unimpeachable source," he said—that Oswald came back from Mexico City with \$5000 he had not had when he left. When he telephoned (so that the wire services couldn't copy it) his story, it stirred up a sensation at his paper, which rushed it to the

Mr. Tolson	_____
Mr. Belmont	_____
Mr. Mohr	_____
Mr. Casper	_____
Mr. Callahan	_____
Mr. Conrad	_____
Mr. DeLoach	_____
Mr. Evans	_____
Mr. Gale	_____
Mr. Rosen	_____
Mr. Sullivan	_____
Mr. Tavel	_____
Mr. Trotter	_____
Tele. Room	_____
Miss Holmes	_____
Miss Gandy	_____

(Indicate page, name of newspaper, city and state.)

- Cincinnati Enquirer
Cincinnati, Ohio
- Cincinnati Post & Times Star
Cincinnati, Ohio
- The Citizen Journal
Columbus, Ohio
- Columbus Dispatch
Columbus, Ohio
- Dayton Daily News
Dayton, Ohio
- Journal Herald
Dayton, Ohio

Date: 12/15/63
Edition: Final
Author: Editorial
Editor: Brady Black
Title:

Character:
or
Classification:
Submitting Office: Cincinnati

62-158060-A
NOT RECORDED
270 DEC 31 1963

74 JAN 2-1964

front page—but the managing editor ran into the press room to kill it at the last moment, substituting some filler on LBJ instead.

"Naturally speculation has been running high among the paper's personnel: What was the 'unimpeachable source?' And why was the story junked? Their answers: The FBI was the probable source (it reportedly found money in Oswald's room) and if so it would have taken something like a White House order to stop the story. In any event, the story . . . never appeared."

During the very week in which Mr. Kennedy's death occurred, there is evidence that the State Department chose to play down the details of Prof. Frederick C. Barghoorn's 16-day imprisonment in the Soviet Union on espionage charges—for the sole purpose of avoiding muddying U. S.-Soviet relations.

Said a New York Times dispatch on November 21, "The department believes that making the (Barghoorn) report public would impede future negotiations of problems." The day previous, another Times dispatch declared: "The State Department hopes to permit the emotions aroused by the arrest to subside so that the broad problem of American-Soviet relations and a new cultural exchange agreement can be viewed more calmly."

There are those in Washington, in other words, who have no anxiety about the possibility that Americans might be inflamed to fury at the excesses of their so-called right-wing neighbors. But they shrink from the possibility of inflaming public opinion—here or abroad—against the international Communist conspiracy.

That such apprehensiveness may very well be entertained in State Department circles is altogether believable in the light of the still-celebrated memorandum circulated a couple of years back by Sen. J. William Fulbright (D., Ark.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Remember?

"In the long run," Senator Fulbright declared, "it is quite possible that the principal problem of leadership will be, if it is not already, to restrain the desire of the people to hit the Communists with everything we've got . . ."

In the cause of U. S.-Soviet amiability, seemingly, not even the murder of an American President must stand in the way.