

commission has any competence as an investigator; nor does any have access to a disinterested investigative staff. The commission will be almost wholly dependent upon the facts made available to it by the Secret Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Dallas Police Department. In a sense, of course, the special commission is investigating the role played by each of these agencies, and it is manifestly naive to expect these cops to bear witness against themselves or, indeed, each other." After a searching analysis of events in Dallas and the failure of the F. B. I. and Secret Service in their respective security functions, Starnes concludes by asking, "Will the presence on the panel of Allan Dulles, erstwhile headmaster of the Central Intelligence Agency, assure us that the truth of Oswald's sojourn in the Soviet Union will ever be known? The Russians suggest they suspected him of being a spy. Can any realistic person ever believe any tentacle of the nation's elephantine espionage apparatus will own up to ever having Oswald on its payroll? Can we expect the F.B.I. to explain why Oswald was not under close surveillance? How many would-be defectors to Russia did they have to watch that day in Dallas when the President's widely-heralded visit was scheduled? It is not in the nature of bureaucracies to destroy their carefully-nurtured fables of omniscience. It would be well to bear this in mind, and to remember that the findings of the Warren Commission will depend wholly on what it is told by these agencies." (N. Y. World-Telegram & Sun, December 3 1963.)

If the death of the President was a well organized conspiracy to change the military and political direction of the United States, dark days are ahead for our country. People of good will everywhere will hope that some less calamitous explanation for the weird and terrible events in Dallas will present itself in the coming weeks and months. But if the President was indeed struck down to frustrate his aim of a limited detente in the Cold War and to plunge East-West relations into a new maelstrom of suspicion and fear, his death may be the prelude to far more terrifying events. Americans can best avenge the slaying of John F. Kennedy by searching out those behind the murder, whoever and wherever they may be, and by making sure that the policies and vision the President's enemies sought to destroy do not go to the grave with him. Let us determine to lock from our lives forever the cruelty and treacherous arrogance that erupted in Dallas, so that November 22nd need not mark, as the assassins may well have intended, the portal to a nuclear hell.

AN OPEN LETTER TO CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN CHAIRMAN OF THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Dear Mr. Chief Justice:

Together with the shock and grief with which most of mankind reacted to the assassination of President Kennedy, many people have experienced a terrible fear: Could it be that his life was taken in an organized attempt to alter the policies of the United States? Could it be that within our national structure of political and military power there operated an internal opposition which tried to achieve its ends by having the Chief Executive felled? Could it be that there was a criminal plot not only against the person of John F. Kennedy but also against his attempts to bring the Cold War to an end?

History teaches us that whenever a head of state is assassinated there is a strong likelihood of a political plot behind the act. It also teaches us that at times the plotters hold such positions of power as enable them to divert suspicions from themselves, or to intimidate into silence those who suspect them.

When the alleged assassin of the President was himself assassinated, millions of Americans began to wonder whether we will ever learn the truth about the essential facts of the tragic days in November. Uncheckable rumors were circulating in the nation, suspicions were carried by word of mouth, contradictory reports were appearing in the

Fidel Castro disclaims any association with President Kennedy's assassination by disavowing any association with Lee Harvey Oswald, an alleged member of the pro-Castro Fair Play for Cuba Committee. On the other hand, even if he were not involved in the foul deed at Dallas, he is demonstrating every day, through behavior of his agents in Caracas, that he is perfectly capable of political assassination."

In Washington, the investigations analyst for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Robert C. McManus, attacked FPFCC and urged a new crackdown on the Left. "I have long believed that Congress should meet the terms of the Communist Manifesto head-on, make a declaration that the Cold War is a real war, and create a new set of laws which would designate anyone giving aid and comfort to the enemy as an enemy of the United States." (*N.Y. Journal-American*, Nov. 24, 1963.)

Oswald's role as a lightning rod to draw the public's bolts of wrath upon the heads of the Left was meeting with success, so much so that responsible figures in the Washington Establishment were becoming alarmed lest a tidal wave of neo-McCarthyism sweep the nation. James Reston reported in the *New York Times* on November 26, 1963 that "one of the things President Johnson is said to be concerned about is that the pro-Communist background of Lee Oswald, the man who is accused by the Dallas police of assassinating President Kennedy, may lead in some places to another Communist hunt that will divide the country and complicate the new President's relations with Moscow."

The more that is revealed about Oswald's actual political background, the more murky it becomes. Far from being pro-Communist, he appears to have been a bitter critic of Soviet life. According to the *N. Y. Times* of November 23, Oswald became "disillusioned with life under Communist rule" while within the USSR. On November 29, the *Times* reported that Oswald, in a radio interview in New Orleans in the summer of 1963, expressed bitter opposition to the Soviet Union. On November 29, it was learned

that Oswald had been writing a book on his stay in Russia in which, according to a UPI dispatch of that date from Fort Worth, he "criticized everything he found in the Soviet Union" and hinted that he "was working as a United States Secret agent." On November 30, 1963 the *New York Herald Tribune*, in an article entitled "The Oswald Enigma: His Anti-Soviet Book," reported that "Lee Harvey Oswald variously described as a Marxist, pro-Communist and Communist, was writing an anti-Soviet book a year before he was seized as President Kennedy's assassin." According to the *Herald Tribune* account, Oswald "was bitterly critical of everything he had found during his travels" in Russia, and "hinted that he had gone to the Soviet Union as a U. S. secret agent."

If Oswald really did have ties to U. S. Intelligence, much that is cloudy in the Dallas events would become clear, including perhaps the ambiguous role of the F.B.I. in the whole affair. But the implication that men in high places in Washington may have known, approved and even planned the tragic death of the President portends as much danger to the peace and security of the world as to the stability of the American polity.

If the facts of the President's murder and its aftermath are ever fully revealed, it will not be as a result of the plethora of official government investigations now taking place. While the special Presidential commission established by President Johnson to investigate events in Dallas is headed by a great jurist and a firm supporter of human rights, Chief Justice Earl Warren, his influence alone will not be enough to dispel the smoke-screen of contradictions, lies and distortions laid over the assassination by powerful forces in the government and press. As Scripps-Howard columnist Richard Starnes wrote in a column entitled "Truth Won't Out," on December 3, "realism instructs us to expect little from the special commission created by President Johnson to investigate the death of his predecessor." According to Starnes, "no member of the

press, and the Dallas authorities were being having strangely.

Against this background you, Mr. Chief Justice, were appointed by President Johnson to head an investigative commission. Enlightened people everywhere hailed your appointment. Counting on your consistently manifested integrity and judiciousness, they were certain that whatever you might announce to be the truth about the assassination could be taken at face value, that your findings would be accepted as the final word. It has been a terribly frustrating thought that we may never learn the truth about the assassination, a frustration which your appointment dispelled.

Then came your first public comments on the investigation. The press quoted you as saying that if any testimony before your commission contained information affecting national security, its release "might not be in your lifetime." At least one newspaper quoted you as adding, "and I say that seriously."

The following day, however, you were alleged to have said that you had been "a little facetious." We, Mr. Chief Justice, think too highly of you to assume the possibility that in your first public comment on so historic an investigation you were "facetious."

The contingency situation for which you claimed the prerogative of suppressing information in fact obtains; any testimony pertaining to the assassination of a United States President *ipso facto* affects national security. But it would seem that there can be only one set of circumstances in which disclosure of information might result in public peril: if the assassination was plotted by individuals so powerful that an attempt to expose them might trigger off a challenge to the country's political stability.

You, Mr. Chief Justice, were quoted as saying that Mrs. Marina Oswald, the widow of the alleged assassin, is not in protective custody, that she is a "free agent," who can come and go at any time, and that "there is no compulsion of any kind." The unsuccessful attempts of Mrs. Marguerite

Oswald, the mother of the alleged assassin, to contact her daughter-in-law strongly suggest that you have made this statement without adequately investigating the post-assassination association between Mrs. Marina Oswald and the security agencies that have been supervising her.

Mrs. Marina Oswald appeared before your commission after six weeks of maintaining no communication except with security agents and persons authorized by those security agents. She was quoted in the press as having testified that "the facts presented to her since the assassination would not permit her to reach any other conclusion" than that her husband killed President Kennedy. In your public comments about her testimony you seem to have accepted Mrs. Marina Oswald's testimony at its face value without disclosing any awareness of the need to inquire into the possibility that it did not derive from free and uncoerced judgment.

Mrs. Marguerite Oswald contended her son to have been an agent for the Central Intelligence Agency and protested his innocence. Despite this, you, Mr. Chief Justice, were quoted in the press as having concluded that Mrs. Marguerite Oswald "had not given . . . any facts that would change the picture . . ." You have obviously assessed her testimony as well as that of Mrs. Marina Oswald without waiting for an opportunity to consider it within the context of all the evidence.

A key question to be answered by this investigation is who killed President John F. Kennedy. On this your commission seems to have arrived at a conclusion even before having gathered all the evidence. While announcing the belated appointment of a lawyer to protect the interests of the late Lee H. Oswald, it disclosed that the investigation has "not caused the commission to doubt the reasonableness of the action of the authorities in charging Oswald." This statement bespeaks a reversed procedural sequence of the gathering of evidence following the reaching of a verdict.

These circumstances, Mr. Chief Justice,

make us wonder whether there is accord between the public conception of your task and your own conception of it. It seems probable that you intend to make only such public disclosures about the investigation as would, in your opinion, serve the public interest. We, however, believe your task to be judicial, not political. We think your primary duty to be to discover the truth, whatever it is, about a tragic national event and to tell this truth to *this* generation. You hold no mandate to cause or avert political events by suppressing information. Let us as a nation chart our destiny in full awareness rather than be manipulated by any one man or commission.

In a sense, it is immaterial how accurately the conjectures in this letter assess your motives. What is important is the fact that, after several of your public comments, it is no longer possible to be sure that yours will be the final truth about the assassination of President Kennedy. The frustration of possibly not learning the truth is revived. However strong may be your noble desire to act in the public interest, it can give us a feeling of being protected by you, not a certainty of being fully and correctly informed.

It seems to us that with such doubts raised in the minds of people the world over, your and your commission's effectiveness as fact-finders with regard to the assassination has been impaired. The nation's need to fully ascertain the facts continues, however, and should be acted on in ways most conducive to generating public trust. It therefore seems to us that at this point the most meaningful service you, Mr. Chief Justice, can render on this issue is to help bring about a new investigative body, composed of prominent public officials and distinguished private citizens to ascertain and publicly disclose all the facts pertaining to the assassination.

As a publication dedicated to the eradication of all restrictions on thought and seeking alternatives to the many wrongs in the structure of our national life, we have devoted much space to analyzing facts pertaining to the assassination of President

Kennedy. As such a publication, we believe we are speaking for many Americans, and not only Americans, when we respectfully call on you, Mr. Chief Justice, to tender your resignation as the Chairman of the Presidential commission.

THE MINORITY OF ONE
M. S. ARNONI, *Editor*

THE INVESTIGATION

By M. S. Arnoni

While this publication believes that the Presidential commission investigating the assassination of President Kennedy has outlived its usefulness, it is important that we emphatically state to our readers that we do *not* know who killed the late President. This statement is not only consistent with all we have said about the assassination in these pages, but is actually a derivative of our analyses. To speculate about possibilities is not tantamount to discovering the truth about a given situation. Theories and hypotheses do not become proved reflections of reality by virtue of their versimilitude. A multitude of theories is possible about any situation; some, perfectly self-consistent, contradict others which are equally self-consistent. Also, it is possible for the truth of a given situation to sound much less convincing than do some false theories.

This must be especially remembered by those who are dissatisfied with the Presidential commission. We must insist that the investigation of the assassination be conducted by people whose character as well as conception of their task will guarantee that everything possible will be done to discover the truth. It would be folly, however, for anyone to "test" the integrity of the investigation by the coincidence of its findings with one's own premonitions, deductions and speculations. All thoughts must be thought and all theories must be checked out, but findings must be made on the basis of evidence alone.