

Post 11/30/66

Warren Report: Is There

NEW YORK (AP) — American newspaper editors generally agree that "confusion" and "doubt" persist today in the public mind about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, but they disagree sharply over the potential value of a new investigation.

A nationwide survey of the numerous editorials commenting on the Warren Commission and its critics revealed the wide cleavage of opinion.

Questions have been raised about the conclusions of the blue ribbon commission, headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren, which reported on Sept. 27, 1964,

that Lee Harvey Oswald — alone and without conspirators — assassinated the President.

This finding has been challenged in varying degrees and on different grounds from many quarters.

Therefore, some editorials called for reopening of the inquiry, either by Congress or some select committee. Others, however, said no new evidence has emerged and a new review would serve no useful purpose and might add to the doubts and confusion.

Typical of the opposing views were these editorials:

The Boston Globe: ". . . There

could be no loss but there could be considerable gain, at least in nationwide peace of mind and conscience, in taking the new look at the evidence which the doubters demand.

"Universal certainty is not possible in terrible tragedies. But the reduction of uncertainty is vital, where it can be reduced. . ."

The New York World Journal Tribune: "Virtually every scrap of so-called evidence, every tortured argument advanced by the doubters, was carefully evaluated by the Warren Commission in reaching its conclusions.

Reasonable Doubt?

"Out of respect for common decency and for the memory of a martyred President, we think it is time to ask the ghouls, the 'buck-chasers' the sensation-mongers and the character assassins to desist — to shut up until or unless they can put up, as so far they have notoriously failed to do."

The Oakland (Calif.) Tribune agreed. "The current furor over some of the conclusions in the Warren Report is based on little more than speculation and the opinions of some individuals who did not have the investigative resources available to the Warren Commission," the Trib-

une said.

"They have guessed and guessed and guessed again but guesses are not fact . . . we doubt that another official investigation . . . is necessary or would produce any new evidence that would substantially change the conclusions made by the Warren Commission," the Tribune added.

But The Denver Post took the opposite view. "The more responsible of the Warren Commission's critics, it seems to us have succeeded in establishing that there is 'reasonable doubt' about a number of conclusions

(Turn To Page Five)

WARREN REPORT

(From Page One)

in the commission's report.

"And we agree that some of the conclusions of the commission leave room for doubt sufficient enough to nag the national conscience.

"In light of this, there ought to be some independent determination, based on a definitive review of the Warren Commission's work, on whether another investigation is in order."

The New York Times recalled that it praised the work of the Warren Commission two years ago. However, in an editorial captioned "Unanswered Questions," the Times said:

"There are enough solid doubts of thoughtful citizens among the shrill attacks on the Warren Commission, now to require answers. Further dignified silence, or merely more denials by the commission or its staff, are no longer enough."

"We have come to this conclusion not because of any of the specific charges brought by the dozens of books, TV shows and articles about President Kennedy's assassination but because of the general confusion in the public mind raised by the publication of allegations and the many puzzling questions that have been raised . . . it would seem the commission itself has the most reason to answer. Certainly, it should be given the chance."

From coast to coast, the con-

troversy brought these expressions:

Buffalo, (N.Y.) Evening News — "so under present circumstances, we fear a reopening of the 'Kennedy murder case' would be less likely to allay doubts now current than to aggravate them with a publicity extravaganza."

Chicago's American — "More disturbing are polls that show the American people are not satisfied with the commission report . . . a new inquiry would be painful . . . such an inquiry, however, could serve to quiet the furor and apprehension which still surround a slaying that shook the world."

St. Louis Post-Dispatch — "All the questions about the events in Dallas have not been answered; probably they never will be . . . nevertheless, we think it would be in the public interest for Congress or the President to appoint a new commission . . . whose objective it would be to sift the new theories that have been advanced since the conclusion of the Warren Commission's report in September 1964, receive any new evidence and conduct what further inquiry might be indicated from time to time."

"Establishment of a new commission should not be open to interpretation as a reflection on the work of the Warren Commission . . ."