

##  <br> Mark Lane Meeting vered Next Week

On December 4 an important public meeting took place at Beverly Hills High School about the validity of the Warren Commission report on the assassination of Pres-
ident Kennedy: Arguing for the point of view that the Warren Commission report did not conclusively prove the guilt of Lee Harvey Oswald was Mark Lane, a prominent New York civil rights and criminal lawyer who has been a mentiber of the New York state legislature.
Supporting the Warren report were Joseph A. Ball, Long Beach attorney who was one of the consultants to and senior trial counsel for the Warren Commission; Herman F. Selvin, attorney and past president of the Los Angeles city board of police commissioners and to-be-installed chairman of the ACLU Lawyer's division for 1965; and A.L. Wirin, chief counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union in Los Angeles.

Having turned down a challenge by Lane to formally debate the issue, the three attorneys agreed to act as cross-ex-
aminers after a statement by Lane. This procedure, however, was not followed through the course of the meeting, which left the audience somewhat dissatisfied.

Many of the important questions of fact remained unresolved when the pro-Warren Commission attorneys, instead of cross-examing Mr. Lane, largely confined themselves to statements which Lane was not given time to answer.

Another cause of audience dissatisfaction at the high school were statements by Mr. Selvin and Mr. Wirin, linking the arguments used by Lane with the arguments used by right wing elements and Herbert Philbrick, the FBI informer, urging the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren. The audience, which seemed from the start to be pre-disposed toward Mr. Lane, was visibly upset by hearing prominent ACLU attorneys using this guilt-byassociation methodology.

The meeting was taped by KPFK reporters for later broadcast. However, at the end of the meeting, attorneys Selvin
and Ball retusea to give their permission for the broadcast and said they were too busy to prepare a different program on the Warren Commission report for KPFK.

Refused permission to schedule the program, KPFK nevertheless aired the program on the day following the meeting, explaining that while it could not re-broadcast the tape recording at a scheduleḍ time without permission, it could morally broadcast the recording onceas a news story, particularly since the meeting was originally public.

The Free Press taped the KPFK broadcast and originally planned to reprint all or substantial parts of a transcript. However, after many hours of work in tran-. scribing the tape recording, it became apparent that the transcript could not be prepared by the deadline for this issue.

We have decided, therefore, to hold this material for publication in next week's issue of the Free Press, dated December 18th.

Like KPFK, we do not plan to editorialize for or against the Warren report or about the prot priety of the remarks made by the various at-. torneys. We do believe that important issues. were raised which should be discussed by the pub-: lic and it is our function as a newspaper to provide the facts, permitting the formation of an inttelligent public opinion. E

