

NOTE: In the Spring of 1965 New Classics House in Chicago published in paperback form Kerry Thornley's first-hand portrait of the accused assassin of President Kennedy, Lee Harvey Oswald, with whom Thornley was closely acquainted in 1959. The implicit assumption of that book, entitled OSWALD, was that Oswald was indeed guilty of the assassination in precisely the manner indicated by the Warren Report—and the purpose of the study was to analyze Oswald's earlier words and actions in view of the Commission's conclusions. At the time of the writing of OSWALD (fall, 1964) the Report of the Warren Commission had just been issued, but the 26 volumes of testimony upon which it was based were not yet available. Since examining the 26 volumes, Mr. Thornley has begun to question the basic assumption of his book: that the conclusions of the Warren Commission are correct. In the article that follows he presents what he has called "an ad hoc epilogue" to OSWALD.

In the back of the mind of nearly every American statist of either the so-called Liberal or so-called Conservative variety is the entrenched and nearly paranoid assumption that individuals acting alone are NEVER to be trusted. Added to this is the even less rational correlative idea that institutions, which is to say many individuals acting together, are—particularly if they are "your" institutions—nearly ALWAYS to be trusted. When, on top of this, the distinction between noncoercive individuals and coercive institutions, or States, is blurred you have a condition of the mind which leaves it barely fit to cope with the complex problems of modern society. People suffering violently from this form of psychosis are called politicians and many other people look to them for leadership, because, if nothing else, they seem to radiate the self-confidence of so many Napoleons.

Anyone who has not yet seen reason to doubt the Warren Commission's lone-assassin theory, should read carefully the Warren Report and then the 26 volumes to see how many, if any, of the Commission's conclusions are supported by the evidence the Commission used. Or he might, if his interest does not warrant such extensive research, read any or all of the books by such critics of the Commission as Epstein and Lane.

Many libertarians acquainted with the writings of the revisionist historians know that the conclusions of what was known as the Pearl Harbor Commission have in the light of post-war evidence been convincingly demonstrated to be nothing more than political lies designed to justify FDR's desire to enter the war. The Japanese "sneak" attack on Pearl Harbor, it is now argued, was provoked by the U.S. and was considered by the Japanese who launched it to be a defensive measure. So much for the reputation of Presidential "fact-finding" commissions.

It is becoming embarrassingly clear—embarrassing at least to those of us who, like me, initially tended to accept its findings—that the Warren Commission was in all probability simply another variation on the Pearl Harbor theme.

The specific reasons for my own shift in opinion include: differences between the testimony of the witnesses as it appeared in the 26 volumes and as it was paraphrased in the Warren Report; the inexplicable censoring of telegrams, movie films, and other photographed evidence which appeared in the 26 volumes; and especially the astoundingly unprofessional "doctoring" apparent on the photos which appeared in the evidence, and one on the cover of LIFE Magazine, displaying Oswald's head and arms pasted on someone else's torso. (No independent investigator has yet been able to my knowledge to reproduce the shadow effects of this picture, which would require that the sun be simultaneously at the high-noon position and a late-afternoon position. There is also what appears to be air brush work on these photos and one of Oswald's arms in one of them seems to stick out at a slightly impossible angle.)

For all I know my doubts of the Commission's conclusions may be unjustified. There is so much data that could lead in so many different directions and so much of it cannot be checked out for this or that reason that I do not think it is rational under these circumstances to

It is rare indeed when an individual can advance general education on behalf of liberty and enhance his own well-being considerably as a result of government meddling. So rare, in fact, that many advocates of sound economics are apt to overlook the opportunity that now presents itself under the guise of inflation.

Inflation is not to be sniffed at nor whined about. It is good news to those who are willing to use it as a means of motivating large numbers of people to become familiar with laissez-faire economics, and to those who are willing to prepare for its long-range effects by investing in commodities which will be in particular demand as a result of the sure-to-come havoc.

All over America these days irate citizens are gathering into consumers' unions, voters' leagues, and protest lines because prices are going up and they want to know why. For years the "Liberals" have been blaming the businessmen, and the "Conservatives" have been blaming the unions, and the Government has been blaming all four. But at last there is in office a STRONG President who exercises his political power to keep business and labor "in line"—and prices are going up even faster! The people want to know why. Credible information is, in this age of credibility gaps, in demand.

Libertarians can begin to fill this market demand. Libertarians understand that it is the enormous and increasing output of fiat money and other money-substitutes by the Federal Government that is inflation, and as such is responsible for the bidding up of prices—inflation's best-known side effect.

That interested citizens are gathering in public places makes it possible for one libertarian to achieve extraordinary coverage on this issue. For a few dollars he can have hundreds of leaflets printed, which he can distribute by hand in less than an hour by standing outside a meeting hall where inflation has just been the topic of discussion. Further, he can offer himself as a speaker at many of these gatherings.

Ideally, the libertarian inflation-troubleshooter will appeal to the self-interest of his audience. He will, after explaining what inflation really is and how it causes prices to go up, tell people what to do about it AS INDIVIDUALS. This will keep them listening, and it will multiply his audience—as its members persuade relatives and friends to listen also.

Nor, ideally, will he forget his own self-interest. Not only will he practice his counsel on investing for survival of economic chaos; he will charge a fee for his services to others, as groups and as individuals. As for the leaflets he distributes, he will either advertise such services in them or require a small payment for them. Nor is there any reason not to earn additional profits by selling other books on inflation which are available from liberty-oriented sources.

It is useless to complain about that over which you have no control, actual or potential. It is foolish to advance causes which can at best only remotely benefit your well-being. But it is moral and sensible to meet an information gap with desperately needed and wanted facts and collect a fee for your service.

Don't delay. As a libertarian you are uniquely qualified. And your customers need you NOW! GIDEON SMITH

---

form a final conclusion (or even a strong tentative one). But I am saying that if the Warren Report is not correct AND if deliberate deceit was involved, then libertarians should point out to their friends on the radical Left the necessary implications. It means that many of them had better do some premise checking, FAST.

\*\*\*

Recalling his initial reaction to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor Earl Warren said, "At first I was inclined to dismiss it as some maniacal undertaking of individuals." I'm sure the Honorable Earl Warren joins many a so-called Liberal and authoritarian Conservative in checking beneath his bed each night—suspecting an individual. May they all sleep peacefully. KERRY THORNLEY