MEMORANDUM

November 13, 1964

J. Lee Rankin, General Counsel

From: Arthur Marmor Um

To:

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION,

LIBRARY

q

CONGRESS

The following memorandum is a brief summary of the report of the Central Intelligence Agency of October 12 and October 24, 1964, entitled "Foreign Press Reaction to the Warren Report."

This survey provides a cross-section of the comments of the leading newspapers of nearly all foreign countries except for a significant number in the Far East, Middle East, and Africa. Light coverage in the USSR stressed that doubts and suspicions had not been allayed. However coverage in Eastern Europe expressed strong skepticism, frequently quoting such critics as Lane, Russell, and Buchanan. A Yugoslav hoted, however, that the reaction of the U. S. and most of the foreign press was favorable. The Albanian press, like the Communist Chinese, did not mention the Report.

The press reaction in Western Europe was heavy and varied. Communist and pro-Communist papers were sharply critical. While they stressed the conclusion that there was no foreign involvement; they charged a "whitewash" of right-wingers and fascists.

The non-Communist press in Western Europe was generally favorable, although there were notable exceptions. Austrian dailies noted the absence of surprises and raised questions about the "mystery" that remained. Belgian papers accepted the findings of the Commission, but one noted that the assassination would still be listed among the mysterious deaths of history. Danish organs were skeptical, claiming that the Report did not end all doubt. Finnish papers accepted Commission findings. In France, a leading independent daily concluded that the truth "with all its irrational implications" was found in the Report, but an important moderate paper was critical. In Italy, independent and conservative papers approved, a Socialist daily disapproved. Dutch papers were factual, one praising the Report. Two Portuguese dailies were somewhat critical. Spanish newsmen commented favorably, although one right-wing paper Galled it "hard to believe." The leading liberal daily of Sweden and an independent Swiss newspaper praised the Report while non-Communist papers in West Germany generally accepted its findings.

In the Far East the Japanese press approved the Report, except for a Communist organ. Of the few items available elsewhere in that area, a Cambodian daily described the Report as a cover-up, but Malaysian and Thai papers were factual. Few newspapers in the Near and Middle East commented on the Report except the Communists who denounced it. A pro-government Greek organ and a naturalist Cyprus paper were highly critical. A leading Indian newspaper was objective, and Iranian independent papers were favorable. The non-Communist press of Israel was objective, one leading daily accepting the conclusions. Newspapers in Lebanon, Turkey and Pakistan were factual. Iraqi and Jordanian dailies linked the assassination to Zionists. Syrian nationalist organs highlighted negative reaction to the Report, and the U. A. R. press was critical.

Most African newspapers included the criticisms of Russell and others as well as skeptical French reaction. This occurred in Algéria, Angola, Chad, Congo (Leopoldville), Ivory Coast, and the Malagasy Republic. An independent Tunisian daily supported the Report, and an opposition party organ in South Africa was inclined "to accept it."

In Latin America the conservative press generally indicated acceptance of the Report, although many gave some space to the critics. The Argentine press was generally favorable, although a neutralist paper was critical. Important Brazilian papers supported the Report but two conservative papers were skeptical. A Bolivian conservative organ blamed the Communists but a liberal one accepted the Report. The Chilean press divided along political lines, with conservative papers favorable and leftist critical. A leading liberal organ in Colombia stated that the Report had not answered important questions. Comment in the Mexican press was generally unfavorable. The papers of Uruguay were objective except for pro-Communist criticism. The government-controlled Cuban press was hostile.

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

;

11

-

-2-