

## Nizer Calls Criticism of Warren Report 'an Outrage'

By RALPH BLUMENTHAL  
Special to The New York Times

BRIDGEPORT, Conn., Nov. 16—Louis Nizer, the lawyer, tonight assailed recently published criticisms of the Warren Commission's report on President Kennedy's assassination. He called them "an outrage."

"The mischief caused by these false, inaccurate books, is terrible," he told several hundred persons attending a seminar on communications at the University of Bridgeport.

"In Europe I was so terrified by the reaction [to the report] that I don't even want to repeat it," Mr. Nizer said. "They have charged murder to the highest officers of the United States Government."

Mr. Nizer mentioned the authors of two books that have attracted considerable attention recently for disputing the official version of President Kennedy's assassination.

These were Edward Jay Epstein, author of "Inquest," and Mark Lane, author of "Rush to Judgment."

Mr. Nizer alluded to other writings critical of the Warren Report without mentioning their titles or their authors' names.

"They have done dishonor and mischief to America," the prominent New York lawyer said. "Let's at least put on the record the irresponsibility of these crusaders."

Mr. Nizer was a member of a four-man panel at the fourth annual Dr. and Mrs. James Halsey Symposium on "The Role of the Mass Media in Achieving and Preserving a Free Society." Dr. Halsey is the chancellor of the University of Bridgeport.

Dr. Max Lerner, the syndicated newspaper columnist, who is professor of American civilization and world politics at Brandeis University, was the moderator.

Members of the panel, besides Mr. Nizer, were Clifton Daniel, managing editor of The New York Times; Otto Fuerbringer, managing editor of Time magazine, and William T. Corrigan, director of N.E. News

Dr. Lerner dissented from Mr. Nizer's remarks. He said that after reading Mr. Epstein's book "I believed the commission made a considerable mistake in pushing its staff to make a report so quickly."

Dr. Lerner also objected to Mr. Nizer's statement that he would not dignify the criticism of the report with a reply.

"I think," Dr. Lerner told Mr. Nizer, "you owe a reply to the entire nation as a matter of responsibility."

"I am considering that right now," replied Mr. Nizer.

Mr. Daniel said that he accepted the conclusions of the Warren Report. He accused its critics of "dragging red herrings all over the place."

Mr. Daniel and Mr. Nizer engaged in a brief exchange over whether the courts should limit the right of newspapers to report details about a suspect in a criminal case before trial.

Mr. Nizer suggested that the United States adopt the British system, which severely restricts

the publication of such information before trial.

In reply Mr. Daniel said he saw some danger in such a system in the United States.

"Giving elected judges the right to censor what may or may not be printed in newspapers that endorse them is dangerous," he said. "I shudder to think what might happen to your rights and mine."

He suggested instead a policy of self-restraint by the press, a policy that Mr. Nizer said he would endorse.

Mr. Corrigan was asked his opinion of the Ford Foundation proposal for nationwide educational television broadcasts by means of communications satellites. He said there was a possibility that the networks would agree to donate money to such a system if they had access to the satellites with all their commercial possibilities.

Mr. Fuerbringer defended the right of his and other news magazines to interpret the news rather than merely publish objective accounts.