

LAWRENCE LIPTON'S RADIO FREE AMERICA

WHO KILLED PRESIDENT KENNEDY? In the light of what has been presented in current books like Edward J. Epstein's 'Inquest: The Warren Commission and the Establishment of Truth,' and Mark Lane's year-long investigation of the matter, and all the articles which have been appearing in the national magazines of late, there is only one course open to anyone interested in the truth of the matter: RE-OPEN THE CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION OF THE KENNEDY ASSASSINATION, this time in the hands of civilians, but with the power to question the FBI, the Dallas police, all public officials including LBJ (who was excused from testifying by Chief Justice Earl Warren and the Commission), as well as members of the Secret Service and the military; this time taking nothing for granted, checking behind the testimony of everybody and, this time around, giving due attention and proper weight to the testimony and witnesses ignored by the Warren Commission. It should be nothing less than a hard-boiled, private-eye-type operation, run by tough, probing minds like those of Epstein and Lane, and people like Nader, The Nation's Cooke and the late nemesis of newspaper skulduggery, Liebling of the New Yorker. The money should come from a publicly-raised subscription fund, so that no Foundation or academic or governmental strings will be attached to it. And it should have only one question to settle: Who killed Kennedy? Who had what ax to grind in accepting the Dallas police theory that Oswald alone committed the crime? And bearing in mind that the truth may lead to suppressed evidence and intimidated witnesses (hitherto silent out of fear or awe of the police, the FBI or other powers) and maybe even murdered witnesses whose surviving friends and relatives may throw some light on why they met their death so conveniently soon after the assassination.

WARREN AND HIS BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION: Blue for what? For blue blood? For bluenose? Why was the Commission in such a hurry to accept the "hurry to judgment" (Mark Lane's book title) theory of the Dallas police? Kennedy's body was still warm when the Chief of Police of Dallas came up with the announcement that the crime was "solved": Oswald, alone and single-handed had done it. That circumstance alone is sufficient grounds for reopening the case. It is standard police procedure when someone reports a crime, particularly if he was at the scene of the crime, to regard that person as the FIRST suspect. The Dallas police, the Secret Service, and the FBI were all present and should have been the first suspects to be questioned AND SUSPECTED, if regular police procedure had been followed. Not as they were: the INVESTIGATORS of the crime were honored, respected and unsuspected witnesses before the Commission. What is needed now, before it is too late (if it isn't already too late) and everybody concerned is dead or well-covered up) is a gloves-off, bare-nobody investigation.

AND, SPEAKING OF MURDER, to hell with Johnson's Great Society. If for one, will settle for a Decent Society, to begin with. When we have a Decent Society in the U.S., it will look back on LBJ as an international robber/baron with innocent blood on his hands.

WHO WILL TRY WHO IN WAR CRIMES TRIAL? Bertrand Russell is sparking a war crimes trial scheduled for November in Paris. Lord Russell, now 94, says the tribunal will put President Johnson on trial, along with Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. Among the judges will be former President of Mexico Lazaro Cardenas, writers/Jo Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir, Italian lawyer Lelio Bassa, Brazilian economist Josue de Castro, a winner of a Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Foundation award who has been mentioned as a Nobel Peace Prize candidate, Italian social reformer Danile Dolci, Peter Weiss, German Swedish author of the play "Marat" and historian Isaac Deutscher who was an anti-administration participant in the 1965 Vietnam teach-in. The only catch is: All the warmakers, on ALL sides, are guilty of war crimes. Because war ITSELF is a crime. All armies are guilty of war atrocities because war itself is an atrocity. The institu-

134

tion of war itself would have to be brought to trial and it is guilty of so many crimes that no court could even list them. Crimes not only against the enemy but crimes against its own people, on both sides. Nuremberg was a farce (Stanley Kramer notwithstanding) because the guilty were trying the guilty, so that the result was just one more war crime. WAR ITSELF IS THE CRIME.

HOW DO YOU TRY WAR? How do you go about bringing war itself to trial? By ACTING IN TIME, before the war-makers have committed us beyond the point of no return. When you array man against man on the battlefield it's too late to expect them to behave like human beings. It's like that scene in "Mondo Cane," throwing a dog into a cannibalistic survival pit of hunger-crazed dogs.

In combat hand to hand and man to man
The basic issues tend to simplify
We only know that in the end death came
And posed the question simply: He or I.

Long before that agonizing confrontation can take place the war hawks have us committed. The crime for which they should be tried AT THE VERY START OF HOSTILITIES is the crime of forcing us to contribute against our will to the atrocity of war, on pain of prosecution, leins, garnishments and attachments, and even imprisonment. They tax every mouthful of bread we eat, every mile we drive, so withholding our income tax payments is little more than a frustrating gesture. Nothing less than total disaffiliation from the state process, FROM CITIZENSHIP, will suffice. Millions are ignoring the ballot box, other millions are boycotting consent to the war consensus by turning deaf ears to the howling dervishes in the Pentagon, the White House and the State Department. THE SILENT VETO. It's deafening. Warcrimes courts, on a world scale, may turn out to be helpful in STOPPING wars before they start. After that it's too late. Committees of observers should be set up like so many seismic detection centers, like listening posts, to report on the first tremors of war and bring the criminals to court BEFORE the crime is committed. Is that against traditional jurisprudence? Very well, then, it is the NEW jurisprudence. Prophets and poets have been practicing that kind of jurisprudence for a long time. It has an honorable history. The Paris trials in November come years too late. Here in the U.S., Congress is right now being primed to legislate at a nod from Johnson — that great defender of our "right to dissent" — to make all political criticism "in time of war" an act of treason. (At present it is still only lese majesty, not yet treason.) The move now is on to make it treason, which, in effect, will drive all the anti-war forces underground. Next, the anti-war politicians. Strange bedfellows!

RFA DICTIONARY. ITEM, NICE PEOPLE: A God-fearing, church-going, gun-bearing mammal; most dangerous when parroting patriotic slogans; sometimes seen wearing a holier-than-thou halo, especially when participating in a parade or a demonstration.