

LETTERS

23

The Warren Report Controversy

Sir: The U.S. press, we are told, is the freest in the world. This may or may not be true. Whether it is the most honest in the world is something else again. I have always been grateful to such as Oswald Garrison Villard, A. J. Liebling, George Seldes, Lincoln Steffens, I. F. Stone, Carey McWilliams, Fred Cook, Jr., Lyle Stuart, Cedric Belfrage, M. S. Arnoni and, yes, Phil Kerby for trying so valiantly to keep it honest.

From that unforgettable Friday (Nov. 22, 1963) when I was patching the roof on my house with a transistor at my side until this past week when I received the current issue of *Frontier*, I have (1) read (and listened to) everything coming my way relative to the assassination and (2) am aghast at the countless questions left unanswered (in addition to the many new ones raised) by a so-called blue-ribbon investigating body charged with getting the answers.

As a free American, as a concerned citizen, as a fairly intelligent individual, I frequently come to conclusions based on what I hear and see and read. It is only natural that I sometimes disagree with the conclusions reached by others, say, for example, I. F. Stone or Carey McWilliams, Fred Cook, Jr., or even Phil Kerby.

Imagine my chagrin when just such an occasion came to pass—when the Warren Commission made its report public—I. F. Stone (who does such a wonderful job, by and large) stated that I was “unscrupulous,”

“sick,” “wacky,” that I belonged in the “booby-hatch” and, finally, that I had “gone off the deep end.” I had merely disagreed with him (and the Warren Commission).

Imagine my chagrin—two years later—to be called part of the “hopped-up New Left” and a victim of “jumbled emotions and disjointed opinion” for disagreeing with Phil Kerby.

The less reverent often refer to the U.S. press as the commercial press or the kept press or the prostitute press. For that reason, the muckrakers (such as those listed in the first paragraph) are welcomed with respect and honor for the good job they do, for the courage they display, for the

17314

FRONTIER

December

1966

Vol. 18—No. 2

In This Issue

THIS MONTH

2

EDITORIALS

3

MARK LANE and his pupil, Mort Sahl, romped through another long and repetitious recital last month of their views on the assassination of President Kennedy. The program (KTTV, Los Angeles) went off as scheduled in front of an appreciative and tittering audience. Lane avows that his purpose is to find out who killed the President, and Sahl, fitting his goal to his talents, wants only to "save America." We wish them well but hope as time goes on that both gentlemen will shed their excessive modesty, drop their polite restraint in criticizing the Warren Commission and deal with the situation in the vigorous terms it deserves. While their motives are impeccable and they would be the last to impugn the sincerity of others (although they have suggested that Chief Justice Warren's

experience suffers in comparison to their own knowledge of men and events), they have committed a few tactical errors. They might well enlist the counsel of Robert Welch, the country's most creative investigator and political theorist (conspiracy division) since the late Senator McCarthy.