

- 8/29/64** Quote from letter to the editor, signed Robert Arnow, New York. Blood is more durable than whitewash. *National Guardian*
- 7/5/66** President Johnson today signed a bill designed to insure the public greater access to Federal records. The new law's most important provision establishes the right of judicial review of government decisions to withhold records. The law, which becomes effective a year from now, puts on the government the burden of proving that it has the right to withhold records. ...provides exceptions to the kinds of information that Federal agencies are required to give inquiring citizens or reports ... national security secrets, foreign policy information required by executive order to be kept secret, trade secrets ... [etc]
- [the President apparently signed with some reservations, as language of his statement changed in a second release succeeding the first.] *New York Times*, San Antonio, TX, [7/4]
- 7/24/66** [Review of Epstein book.]
- If we cannot deny this book, then the investigation must be reopened if we wish to approach the truth more closely. ...
- An independent group should look at these charges and determine whether the Commission investigation was so defective that another inquiry is necessary. Such a procedure will, perhaps unnecessarily, stimulate rumors and doubts and disturb the political scene. Yet there seems to be no other course if we want to be sure that we know as much as we can know about what happened on 11/22/63. *Book Week, The Washington Post*, Richard N. Goodwin
- 7/28/66** The assassination of Kennedy was a momentous event in our history. We cannot hide from it by clinging to a hope that one lonely, alienated nut did it all by himself, and that nobody else was involved. And we cannot hide from the fact that some of our most serious and well-meaning citizens have catered to our childish needs for security, and have given as an inadequate and perhaps grossly misleading explanation of the event. Many of us in this country are afraid to face reality, and part of our reality is living without history. Can we continue to live a lie about what happened in Dallas on 11/22/63, or has the time come to face what it means and what it involves for all of us? The public must cry out for a real examination and understanding of the events of that day. *The New York Review of Books, The Second Oswald: the case for a conspiracy theory*, by Richard H. Popkin, p 11, concluding paragraph:
- 7-8/66** ... [*Inquest*] contains new data sufficient for thoughtful people to become convinced that the lone assassin claim of the Warren Commission is untenable. ... Americans have grown quite comfortable with the lullaby quality of the *Warren Report*; they are not going to welcome attempts to undermine their equilibrium, such as it is. ... truth is the least sought commodity in our society. Unless it serves an advantage, it is deemed less desirable than seemingly advantageous falsehood. ... Thus, President Kennedy is buried not only under a heap of soil but also under an impregnable layer of moral callousness of the society that hailed him as Chief and that grieved for his untimely end. ... *The Minority of One*, editorial, *The Relevance of an Inquest* [in same issue as Sylvia Meagher's review of Epstein's *Inquest*], p. 6.

**7-8/66** It is time we set out in earnest to establish the truth about Dallas. If we let sleeping dogs lie, as we shall undoubtedly be urged to do ever in the aftermath of Epstein's book, then we are willing accomplices in the escape of the assassins, and perhaps ever in other crimes -- whether committed to conceal the truth, or in fulfillment of the assassination's ultimate purpose. *The Minority of One, On Closing Doors, Not Opening Them, or The Limits of the Warren Investigator* by Sylvia Meagher. Review of Epstein's *Inquest*, concluding paragraph:

**8/66** ... We do not pretend to know what would have been the consequences of an investigation of the Kennedy slaying which did not presuppose the results. We do know that the whole story has not been told. We think the American people are entitled to that story. We think the American press, for once, should not neglect its responsibilities and should force the Administration to take the necessary steps to get that story.

We would suggest that Arlen Specter take the lead in insisting that the case be immediately reopened. *Greater Philadelphia*, editorial [with article, *The Warren Commission, the Truth, and Arlen Specter*]

**8/28/66** ... So one would propose one last new commission, one real commission - a literary commission supported by public subscription to spend a few years on the case. There are major intellectuals in this country who are old now and have never been able to serve in American life. Not ever. It is time for that. Time for the best of intellectuals to serve. I would trust a commission headed by Edmund Wilson before I trusted another by Earl Warren. Wouldn't you? Would you not estimate that Dwight MacDonald, working alone, could nose out more facts and real contradictions than could 20 crack FBI investigators working together? ... The solution to President Kennedy's murder will come not from legal or government commissions, but from minds deeply grounded first and last in the mysteries of hypothesis, uncorrupted logic, tragedy and metaphor. *Book Week*, Norman Mailer

**8/28/66** ... The inevitable query that follows a reading of Lane and other Commission critics is "what now?"

Are we to settle for Commissioner Allen Dulles comment: "If they've found another assassin, let them name names and produce their evidence?" Neither Lane nor other critics have named names, but evidence has been offered that requires more than a thoughtless rejoinder.

Perhaps the Commission's most serious error was to write "finis" to its work. It is correct in saying its work was not a trial, not an adversary proceeding. If so, then the principle of *res judicata*, or final; answer, does not apply.

Although we call it the Warren Commission, we must mind ourselves it was created by the executive order of President Johnson. Obviously he can reconvene it if he so wished. ... a supplementary report is required. ...*San Francisco Examiner & Chronicle*, *This World* supplement, *Challenge to the Warren Report*, review of *Rush to Judgement*, by Douglas C. Riggs, formerly associate warden at an Quentin and now-member of California bar.

Warren Commission, Reopening

- Late 8/66** An account by rGoerner of the official secrecy and obfuscation he encountered with the armed forces, the state Department, CIA and White House in trying to uncover the evidence that [about 30 years after the event] that Earhart and Noonan were on a spying mission when forced down and later died in Japanese hands. *San Francisco Examiner & Chronicle, This World, The Earhart Mystery*, Fred Goerner
- 9/1/66** William F. Buckley, Jr., editor of ... *National Review*, said yesterday that a foundation of which he is an official, is the process of authorizing a \$2,000 grant to study the adequacy of Warren Commission's report on the assassination of President Kennedy.
- Mr. Buckley said the organization was the *Historical Research Foundation*, set up by (the late) Alfred Kohlberg ...
- ... "I think the presumptions are with the Warren Commission's report, but I think as a public matter for the same of the public tranquillity" there should be a commission that is not partial to the report. *New York Times*
- 9/6/66** ... it seems to me that Lane has proved his point against the Commission. It just did not do it's job properly. ... I think Senator [Edward] Kennedy is right. The contradictions and apparent enigmas can be resolved. There is probably a rational explanation for the throat wound, for the time sequence shown by the Zapruder film, for the pseudo-Oswald and other questions raised by Mr. Lane. That is needed now is a commission to investigate the Warren Commission and its findings. *National Review*, p. 887, *Doubts About Dallas*, by Frances Russell. Review of Epstein's *Inquest*, and Mark Lane's *Rush to Judgment*.
- 9/11/66** Author, English political commentator, discusses recent books. While he apparently supports Commission's findings, he is also willing to accept the idea that "two or more ... fanatics or nuts" were responsible for the assassination - put not that they were involved in a conspiracy.
- ... At some point, it is clear, there will have to be another independent inquiry. But, even if this is agreed, it is by no means equally clear that the time for such an investigation is now. A portion of the investigative reports in the United States National Archives is not yet declassified. The whereabouts of other important evidence have still not been ascertained. In these circumstances, the chances of a further inquiry producing a report which would carry conviction are slight.
- To set up another independent body, with no promise that it could succeed, would be to agitate public doubt without being certain that it could, in the end, settle it. *New York Times Magazine*, Henry Fairlie
- 9/15/66** There is something ugly and monstrous moving around in America ... [conspiracy theories tending to converge on LBJ] ... More importantly, the existence of such a theory demands that the entire assassination be once again thrown open to investigation. In their drive toward calm and consensus, the politicians on the Commission played loosely with the details of truth. Now we end up

Warren Commission, Reopening

with murderous theories. No country can exist with theories like this becoming general. And the Warren Commission, unfortunately, has not done enough to settle them. *New York Post, The Assassination*, Pete Hamill

**9/25/66** ... But has every means of establishing the truth of the Kennedy assassination been exhausted? Representative Theodore Kupferman of New York, with many other Americans, does not think so. Next week he will ask Congress to establish a joint legislative committee empowered to review the whole case and, if necessary, to reopen it. ... *New York Times, The Right of Appeal for Lee Oswald*, Tom Wicker

**9/26/66** Discusses Warren Commission Report in the light of Epstein and Lane criticisms. Says the President has the choice of three main courses: 1, ignore the criticism and merely state his confidence in the Commission. 2. set up a new commission with instructions to start again at the beginning and take as much time as it needed. This would be a devastating gesture of no confidence in the Chief Justice of the United States and all the other distinguished members ... 3. reconvene the Warren Commission with instructions to answer its critics and if necessary to examine some of the evidence. One danger of this would be that the commission might then be suspected of seeking vindication rather than truth, about this could be partly averted by co-opting some new members. ...

... it is now clear that it did cut some corners. There would be nothing shameful about going back to work and producing a supplementary report on the questions that have now been raised. *The Times, London, The Shots Are Still Heard*, lead editorial

**9/30/66** Washington, [9/28] - Representative Theodore R. Kupferman asked Congress Wednesday [9/28] to conduct its own investigation into the adequacy of the *Warren Report* on President Kennedy's assassination.

Citing recent books and articles critical of the report, the Manhattan Republican called for the creation of a 10-member joint Senate-House committee to review the Warren Commission's work.

The committee, composed of five members from each house, would first determine whether there is a need to go beyond the Warren Commission's investigation. This would be based on a review of the commission's findings and also the critical writings and outside data. *New York Times*

**10/66** ... The likelihood that Congress or President Johnson will organize a fresh investigation is easily overestimated. To do so would be to say officially something quite unusually harsh about the performance of such personages as the Chief Justice of the United States, the most influential Southerner in Congress [Senator Russell of Georgia], and the Majority Whip and the and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives [respectively, Messrs. Boggs of Louisiana, and Ford of Michigan], let alone the other members of the Commission. ...

... All that is called for is a compact body of three to five men, drawn from private life or perhaps on leave from judicial office,

whose independence is assured, whose full energies are devoted exclusively to the task at hand, and to whom are confided the necessary power [which the Warren Commission possessed] and the resources to use that power [of which the Warren Commission hardly availed itself]. ... there are models on which to pattern such an investigative institution and its modes of operation, and there are ways of constituting one. It should be done, and quickly, before total staleness of the evidence sets in. *Commentary. The Failure of the Warren Report*, by Alexander M. Bickel.

**10/6/66**

... According to the *Greater Philadelphia Magazine*, 8/1/66, issue, Dr. Humes refused to discuss the discrepancies between the autopsy report and the FBI statements. The quotation attributed to him hardly inspires confidence: "I am not concerned with what was in the FBI report. We did our job and we signed the report and it was very straightforward and unequivocal. We don't feel we should discuss the matter any more. That is the position we are taking and that is the position we have been instructed to take by our superiors."

... If the FBI reports turn out to be accurate, the public should be immediately informed as to the identity of those superiors who are now telling Commander Humes what to say, and what not to say. If the FBI reports are inaccurate, we deserve an explanation of how this elite, expensive police force could have been so grossly incompetent in perhaps the biggest case of its career. The *New York Review of Books*, p. 32, Richard H. Popkin, letter to the editor, rebutting one from Curtis Crawford which had taken mild exception to Popkin's original letter in 7/28/66 issue.

**10/6/66**

p. 33 - ... I think, as I said in my article [same journal, 7/28], a new investigation is urgently required, and it should start by examining the fundamental data of the X-rays and the autopsy photographs, so that we can know what is really a possible explanation.

p. 34 - Considering what is at issue, I think the Commission owes it to the public to answer the critics, to justify itself, and to produce the basic data of the X-rays and the photos. . The *New York Review of Books*, Richard H. Popkin, in reply to letter from Curtis Crawford

**10/7/66**

Discusses criticism of *Warren Report*, mentioning only Epstein's *Inquest* and Popkin's *The Second Oswald*.

... If they haven't entirely swung me over to their view, I, like many others, am beginning to wish very much for further clarification ...

... There seems little doubt that the skeptics of the Report will continue to speak out, and that more and more people will be listening. That raises some important questions. Should the field of exploring and investigating this enormously complex business be left now to individuals acting on their own initiative? More than that, should the questions they raise be left for historians of future generations? Can we in the present bequeath to these historians a confused and sharply challenged record and

Warren Commission, Reopening

let thews draw their own new -- and quite possibly incorrect -- conclusions from dry documentation and from the testimony of witnesses long dead?

I think the answer to all these questions is "no," and that we should begin right now to make some official response to the growing problem. Congressman Theodore Kupferman of New York has asked for the creation of a joint Senate and House committee to study the record and see if a new and complete investigation is necessary. Though it is doubtful the Congress will act on Kppferman's resolution at this session, I think it is an entirely sensible beginning. ... *Life, The Warren Report Is Not Enough The View From Here*, by Loudon Wainwright [not identified and name does not appear with rest of staff].

**10/7/66**

A Warren Commission lawyer said this week there was no doubt that Lee Harvey Oswald killed President John F. Kennedy and that another investigation could not turn up any new evidence to alter the Commission's verdict.

Arlen Specter, now district attorney of Philadelphia , defended the Commission's report against recent books and articles criticizing the investigation ... in a copyrighted interview in *U.S. News and World Report* ... *San Francisco Chronicle* [unattributed] Washington

**10/10/67**

p. 63 - Q. Do you think anything new could be brought out by a reopening of this investigation?

A. I do not believe that a reopening of the investigation would disclose any additional evidence, based on all that which is known at the present time.

But I would not make any statement which would be in opposition to any such reopening of an investigation, just as I would not make any statement that would suggest a limitation on any scholar's work in reviewing, analyzing or disagreeing with anything the Commission has said. It's a free country. *U. S. News & World Report*, Interview. of Arlen Specter

**10/14/66**

Stanford - ... "While I'm not generally in favor of Congressional investigations," [Mark] Lane said he supports a recent bill which would provide for a Joint House-Senate probe of the Commission's work.

"No one will believe the commission if they hear the witnesses," he said. *Stanford University News Service*

**10/16/66**

Tom Wicker [retraces deterioration of public confidence in *Warren Report* findings, and concludes:]

But has ever means of establishing the truth of the Kennedy assassination been exhausted? Rep. Theodore Kupferman of New York, with many other Americans does not think so.

## Warren Commission, Reopening

He has asked Congress to establish a joint legislative committee empowered to review the whole case, and, if necessary, to reopen it.

A sound precedent for this is found in the joint congressional group that reviewed the findings of the special Roberts Commission that first investigated the Pearl Harbor disaster. The appointment of such a group in this case need have no implication that the Warren Commission was inept or unjust, or that Oswald was guilty or innocent. It would imply only that further investigation and ... ought at least to diminish confusion, if not correct error. ... *San Francisco Chronicle, New York Times Service*, Tom Wicker, Washington.

**10/18/66** The archives of the Warren Commission's investigation ... probably will be made public before the end of the year, according to an assistant counsel to the commission.

Wesley J. Liebeler, an acting professor of law at UCLA, told a *Stanford University* audience yesterday that the full 26 volumes of testimony would demonstrate the thoroughness of the investigation. ...

... "I think the X-rays will be made public, and should be made part of the record," he declared.

... Photos ... probably should not be made public for reasons of good taste, he continued. But he suggested that a panel of pathologists might be appointed to study them and make a public report to settle some of the questions raised by Lane and other critics who believe more than one man was involved in the slaying. ... *San Francisco Examiner*, Mary Madison

**10/18/66** ... On 8/17/66, the Attorney General's office asked the National Archives "to apply the same standard of public accessibility to the working papers and administrative reports" as to other public documents it has received from the Warren Commission.

Initiated by asst. Attorney General Frank Wozencraft, head of the department's office of legal counsel, this little-noticed move could clear the way for the publication of hundreds of secret FBI, Secret Service, State Department and Warren Commission staff papers dealing with the assassination.

In most instances these documents already have been carefully' combed by William Manchester ...

... Only a directive from President Johnson can rip the secrecy seal from these papers ...

... In the sharp debate now raging in the administration Under-secretary of State Nicholas DeB. Katzenbach has taken the lead in arguing for publication of all documents. He was still attorney general when his aide called for disclosure ...

Katzenbach's position is supported by a number of officials, especially in the Justice Department, who are holdovers from the Kennedy administration. They believe publication ... will revive interest in the late President's death and indirectly help the political fortunes of Senator Robert Kennedy, D-NY.

[*Oakland Tribune* version, 10/14/66:] ... As this administration controversy begins to come out in the open, President Johnson will have to decide personally on whether all the Warren commission papers will be made public, and when.

Regardless of the decision he makes, many long-time Washington observers believe it will spark a public controversy that could shake this country from coast to coast. *San Rafael Independent Journal, Inside Washington, Warren Papers Brewing Feud*, by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott [same column in *Oakland Tribune*, 10/14/66 but each version contained material the other did not].

**10/18/66** ... The danger now is that this uneasy, doubting sentiment may become so contagious that the government will feel compelled to plunge into a new investigation of what is involved ... [talk in Congress of a new inquiry, including Kupferman's resolution] ...

... Nevertheless it will be a disservice to the nation if Congress is stampeded into some action without carefully weighing the substance of the attacks on the Warren Commission which have been receiving so much uncritical publicity. ...

... Arlen Specter ... says, "There has not been a scintilla of new evidence disclosed in any of the books ." : Is this so, or isn't it? So far the critics have not rebutted this rebuttal. *Oakland Tribune*, Clayton Pritchey, *Warren Report Critics Have Weak Case* [copyright, *Newsday*, 1966]

**10/21/66** Fullest account in the press of Wesley Liebeler's plan to conduct massive study of Warren report using selected law students.

... Although Liebeler himself has been critical of some of the things done by the commission staff ... he is thoroughly in accord with the Commission findings. ...

... "The time rush basically affected how the report was written, not the investigation," he said. ... *LA Times*, Gene Blake.

**10/25/66** [*Ramparts*' 11/66 issue published articles calling for reopening of investigation of the assassination]: A year ago *Ramparts* totally believe the Warren Report. After a year of investigation we totally disbelieve it. We do not accept its conclusions; we do not accept its premises; we do not accept its logic; we do not accept the facts that lead to that conclusion. We think that the Commission, for political motivations, rushed to get out an answer to the country before the presidential election in 1964, that in the course of that they discarded any evidence whatsoever that would tend to go away from their conclusion of Oswald acting alone as the single gunman who killed the President. ... San Francisco -- *KGO* newscast, excerpt of taped interview with Warren Hinckle, managing editor of *Ramparts* magazine.



Warren Commission, Reopening

- 10/31/66** Story in *New York Times* says Kupferman seeking first full term in Congress from 17<sup>th</sup> Congressional District, NY; re-elected. Kupferman is a Republican.
- 11/66** Traces the editors' initial acceptance of the Warren Report, then doubts, investigation and finally disbelief.
- ... The responsibility for the mounting doubts, theories and confusions must be placed first with the Warren Commission and now with the President who has the power to invoke a new investigation and release the necessary evidence. ... *Ramparts*, editorial, p. 3
- 11/4/66** Account of broadcast at *KCBS* the previous Tuesday including Penn Jones Jr. and William L. Turner of *Ramparts*.
- At a press conference the next day Jones joined with *Ramparts* publisher Ed Keating in demanding a new investigation. ...
- Keating urged the formation of a new three-man commission: to be appointed by President Johnson. According to Keating the three-man panel would consist of a distinguished jurist, a pathologist and a noted religious leader.
- A committee tentatively called the *Citizen's Committee for Public Disclosure* is being formed, Keating said. It will meet with President Johnson in the near future. ... *The Berkeley Barb*, Hal Verb
- 11/21/66** *Life* Magazine called yesterday for a new investigation of the assassination of President ... Kennedy, contending there is "reasonable doubt" that ... Oswald acted alone.
- ... "One conclusion is inescapable," *Life* said. "The national interest deserves clear resolution of the doubts. A new investigating body should be set up, perhaps at the initiative of Congress. In a scrupulously objective and unhurried atmosphere, without the pressure to give reassurance to a shocked country, it should re-examine the evidence and consider other evidence the Warren Commission failed to evaluate." *Life* issue dated 11/25/66, New York, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *AP*
- 11/21/66** *Time* Magazine said today "there seems little valid excuse" for a new investigation into the assassination of President Kennedy.
- Time* said a new inquiry would not end ... doubts.
- "The discussion and the doubts are not likely to abate, for nearly every significant incident of that tragic day is fraught with controversy and coincidence ..." *AP* 802 pes
- 11/21/66** Oxford, MS - Historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. said tonight doubts raised in the assassination of President ... Kennedy warrant reopening the matter.

Warren Commission, Reopening

Schlesinger, who served Kennedy as a White House assistant, made his remarks in an interview at the *University of Mississippi* ...

He said that it "appears to me substantial facts and doubts do exist which would warrant a very intensive inquiry." He suggested a commission established by Congress as the best means.

Schlesinger added he had found his grief too great to read the report of the Warren Commission ... or any other books on the assassination. *AP* 1051 pes

[See *New York Times*, Peter Kihss, 11/23/67]

**11/21/66** Mark Lane called yesterday for creation of a new investigating commission "made up of leading faculty members at universities, medical schools, experts in various fields."

In a taped interview over *WABC-TV* yesterday, Mr. Lane proposed that such a commission get full Government support, with full power of subpoena and power to punish witnesses for contempt. He said it should not have members associated with the Government. *New York Times*, Peter Kihss

**11/22/66** Edward Jay Epstein ... told some 200 *University of California* students yesterday that the Warren Commission "conducted a superficial investigation" into the death of President Kennedy.

He called on the government to establish immediately panels of experts to re-examine the evidence.

He said that if the "single bullet" theory were abandoned "all the rest of the facts will fall down like a house of cards." *San Francisco Chronicle*

**11/22/66** Washington - ... Former Kennedy press aide Malcolm M. Kilduff, while disputing commission findings about the shots, took no issue with the over-all commission conclusion that Oswald, acting alone, killed Kennedy. ... Kilduff ... said he agrees with Connally [that he was hit by the second shot]. *Oakland Tribune (AP)*

**11/22/66?** New York - ... Asked for comment today on the *Life* magazine suggestion [new investigation], White House press secretary Bill D. Moyers referred reporters to Johnson's 11/4 statement. *AP* 233 pes

- 11/22/66** Washington - ... The leaders of both parties in the House of Representatives said they saw no need for a new investigation ... These views came separately from the majority leader, Rep. Carl Albert, D-OK, and the minority leader, Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R.-MI, who was a member of the ... commission ...
- ... "Unless there is new and significant evidence, I don't think there is any need for Congress to investigate the ... assassination - and I know of no such evidence," Ford said. If some significant new facts were to turn up, he said, he would not object to a new investigation by responsible authorities.
- ... In similar vein, Albert said in an interview, "There is no new evidence I have seen that would justify even considering that Congress take this up."
- Albert said he is aware of the controversy over the number of shots fired at the Presidential automobile ... But Albert said "I never did get excited about minor inconsistencies such as an extra bullet." *AP* 602 to 839 pes
- 11/22/66** Washington - ... The office of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy ... said he has no comment on the suggestions for a new investigation. *AP* 602 to 839 pes
- 11/22/66** Washington - ... Sen. Russell B. Long, D-LA, said yesterday in New Orleans he has always thought a second person was involved in the assassination who was "a much better shot than Oswald."
- Long said he thinks there should be further investigation. *AP* 602 to 839 pes
- 11/22/66** Round-up of opinion on reopening investigation.
- Washington - ... As to whether a congressional committee should look into the matter, Chairman James O. Eastland, D-MS, of the Senate Judiciary Committee and of its Internal Security Subcommittee, declined to give a personal opinion. "It's up to the committee," he said in a telephone interview. *AP* 602 to 839 pes
- 11/22/66** Atlanta, GA - Sen. Richard B. Russell, D-GA, said today that unless new evidence is uncovered in the assassination of President ... Kennedy further review or investigation will produce no new conclusions.
- "It is quite easy to raise questions about nearly every aspect of this tragic event and of the commission's report," Russell said.
- "I am not completely satisfied about the completeness of some of the answers. But the commission was compelled to make its report on the basis of the evidence before it and not on speculation, rumors and questions.

"While I have not read all of the articles and books written about this hearing, I have not known of any instance where the author brought forward any hard testimony to answer the questions that are so easy to raise.

"In the absence of new facts to answer the questions now the subjects of these writings, I do not propose to engage in an endless war of words that will never terminate, but only generate, new speculation."

"I certainly do not have any objection whatever to appointing any number of commissions to review this tragedy," [Russell] said, "although I am of the opinion that in the absence of additional testimony, any of these commissions ... will come to the same general conclusions." *AP* 626 pcs

**11/23/66** *Life* magazine calls for new investigation; *Time* disagrees.

"Even a new investigation," *Time* declared, "would be committed to making its own judgments and offering its best reasoned opinions - just as the Warren Commission did - in crucial areas where no firm facts exist. Thus, lacking any new evidence, there seems little valid excuse for so dramatic a development as another full-scale inquiry." *New York Times*, Peter Kihss

**11/23/66** Partial transcript of Governor John Connally's press conference. *AP* 713 pcs

**11/23/66** From partial transcript of Governor Connally's press conference, apparently from opening statement before questioning by newsmen:

... I think it is time that we pause and reflect on who these individuals are ["journalistic scavengers such as Mark Lane"] and rather than calling for a further investigation of the assassination, which in my judgment is neither warranted, justified or desirable. We should turn our attention to doing a little research on and evaluation of the credentials of the self-appointed experts who, with no evidence, no new facts, nevertheless use distortion, inference, innuendo, in order to cast doubts and create confusion. I suspect that a searching investigation into their own credentials will divulge that their motives have political overtones and that their views have been given prominence out of proportion to their value.

From transcript of question period:

Q: Do you feel there is any need whatever for further investigation, official or non-official? Would it serve any purpose at all?

A: None whatever unless and until there is some new evidence or significant fact that is discovered, i see no justification for further investigation or re-opening the investigation by the Warren Commission or anyone else. *AP* 713 pcs

Warren Commission, Reopening

- 11/23/66** Washington-Leaders of both parties in the House of Representatives have rejected suggestions that Congress conduct its own investigation of the assassination ...
- Rep. Carl Albert, the Democratic leader, said "there is no new evidence I have seen that would justify even considering that Congress take this up."
- Rep. Gerald R.Ford, the Republican leader who served on the Warren Commission ... said "unless there is any new significant evidence, I don't think there is any need for Congress to investigate the Kennedy assassination -- and I know of no such evidence."
- But both Ford and Albert agreed that if some significant new facts are turned up they would not object to a new investigation. ...  
*AP A44*
- 11/24/66** Philadelphia - ... Regarding proposals that the investigation be reopened, [Arlen Specter, at a news conference yesterday], said, "I would not express any disagreement with anyone who wanted to review the commission's work or reopen the investigation, but personally I don't think this would serve any useful purpose. There has been no new evidence and no sound inferences to change in any way the conclusions or logical deductions of the commission." *AP A123 758 aes*
- 11/24/66** Devoted mostly to making snide remarks about Mark Lane, the amateur investigators, and reviewing Governor Connally's dissent about the single bullet, the article concludes:
- "Even a new investigation would be committed to making its own judgments and offering its best reasoned opinions -- just as the Warren Commission did -- in crucial areas where no firm facts exist. Thus, lacking any new evidence, there seems little valid excuse for so dramatic development as another full-scale inquiry." *Time*, p. 34, *The Assassination, The Phantasmagoia*
- 11/24/66** Austin, Texas - Texas Governor John B. Connally, Jr. said yesterday that many criticisms of the Warren Commission may have "political overtones."
- He said he was shocked "that in the backlash of tragedy, journalistic scavengers such as Mark Lane attempt to impugn the motives" of commission members.
- ... Connally would not elaborate on the "political" implications of recent criticisms of the commission's findings. "I am going to let it rest right there," he said.
- The governor said he had not read any of the books critical of the commission's findings, including Lane's *Rush to Judgment*. ...
- Connally said he had read reports and book reviews of the books he was talking about and said that he always accepts as accurate

whatever he reads in newspapers.

Connally made his remarks at a news conference after [publication of] a *Life* magazine article in which the governor said he disagreed with the Warren Commission's finding that both he and Mir. Kennedy were hit by one of three shots ...

... The *Life* article was not one of those with "political overtones," the governor said. *San Francisco Chronicle* [from *New York Times*]

**11/25/66** 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. ...

... It would seem the commission has the most reason to answer. Certainly, it should be given the chance. ...

Further clarification and answers to unanswered questions by them now would be a logical epilogue. *New York Times* editorial, *Unanswered Questions*.

**11/27/66** *University of Cincinnati* law school Dean Claude Soble said yesterday he believes the investigation into the Kennedy assassination will be reopened.

"I think pressures for that step have become so great that it is imperative and inevitable that it be reopened." *San Francisco Chronicle* UPI Cincinnati

**11/27/66** Boggs: [I have] complete confidence in the commission report. As far as I'm concerned, as a member of that commission, if new evidence can be presented, then it should be looked at objectively.

Q: Well, Mr. Boggs, you carry tremendous weight in the House, Senator Russell carries tremendous weight in the Senate, and without the at least tacit approval of you two gentlemen it's unlikely that there'll be another investigation authorized by Congress. ... Would you actively oppose, if other persons were in favor of it, would you actively oppose a re-investigation, say by Congress - without the introduction of new evidence, simply going over the same old ground that you plowed in the Commission?

A: Well, I would not actively oppose it. I would be for - if any new evidence exists, for it being brought out. ... If there is new evidence, certainly it should be gone into ... *KCBS, Face the Nation*, Interview of Hale Boggs

**11/28/66** Two New York members of the House said yesterday they favored a review by Congress or the Executive branch of the current questions about the case. They were Representatives Ogden R. Reid, Republican of Westchester, and William F. Ryan, Democrat of Manhattan, appearing here on *WCBS-TV* ...

Warren Commission, Reopening

... Rep. Reid said he thought "some new questions have been raised, some of them by Governor Connally" and "I hope either the Executive or the Congress" will look into the issues.

Rep. Ryan said he had "no doubt" that "Oswald fired shots which killed the late President." But he said so many questions had been raised that "it would further the interests of the American people if it was taken into a Congressional committee." *New York Times*, Peter Kihss

- 11/28/66** Unless someone has some new evidence that goes beyond split-second nit-picking and 007 mumbo-jumbo, the case should stay closed. *San Francisco Examiner*, Carl Rowan
- 11/29/66** Editorial survey. American newspaper editors generally agree that "confusion" and "doubt " persist today in the public mind about the assassination. ...but they disagree sharply over the potential value of a new investigation. ... AP A57 Relman Morin
- 12/66** Notes for a new investigation. The woman who indexed the entire 26 volumes ... emerges from her task with this advice: reopen the hearings and finish the job. For a starter ...
- All the important witnesses not heard.
- Restudy the evidence, stage new tests. *Esquire*, Sylvia Meagher
- 12/1/66** ... The question is whether they CAN be removed. Would another set of judges, acting as a kind of court of appeal, interpret differently the evidence collected by the Warren Commission? Or is there new evidence, which was not considered by the Warren Commission, that might reverse the verdict? The argument for an official reopening of the case depends on affirmative answers to those questions. They have not yet; been answered affirmatively. At the most , a certain amount of reasonable doubt exists ... I think that a reopening of the case would not now resolve the mystery. ... There is good reason to think that the doubts which persist will remain unsolved. ... There ought to exist a reputable agency, politically and financially independent, which is ... qualified to examine new interpretations of the old evidence and any new evidence that may be brought forward ... we must expect, I fear, to live for a long time with questions that will not be answered conclusively. ... *San Francisco Chronicle*, Walter Lippmann -- *The Assassination Doubts*.
- 12/10/66** Robert Oswald tells Jerry Flemmons of the *Fort Worth Star-Telegram* he is writing a book about Lee's overall character, which he says was cut short by the Warren Commission. Said he agrees Lee shot JFK but that the Warren Commission failed to determine why, that the public's confusion about the report shows the need for additional details.

Warren Commission, Reopening

Suggested that a committee of some sort be created to look into the so-called unanswered questions raised by critics of the commission. *New York Times*, Wichita Falls, TX

**12/20/66** Rep. John W. Wydler, Republican of Garden City, L.I., called today for public Congressional hearings on what he termed controversial aspects of the Warren Commission's report on the assassination of President Kennedy. ... for the purpose of assuring the public that the truth of the assassination had been reported. *New York Times* UPI Washington

**1/3/67** The *Saturday Evening Post* published a copyright article by author Richard J. Whalen concluding that there is circumstantial evidence to support the theory of a second assassin in the shooting of President John F. Kennedy.

... In a companion editorial, the *Post* called for what it termed a "meticulous re-examination of the disputed findings of the Warren Commission report.

Whalen proposes that President Johnson appoint a special committee of Congress or a citizen's panel of independent investigators to "weigh every shred of evidence, old and new." *Saturday Evening Post*, 1/14/67]

**1/4/67** Joseph A. Ball says he does not see how Ruby's death can have any effect on validity of *Warren Report*, sees no reason to reopen Warren inquiry unless new evidence develops. *New York Times*

**1/4/67** Joseph A. Ball said he saw no reason to reopen the Warren inquiry unless new evidence developed, suggested that public confusion about the autopsy might be dispelled if X-rays and other medical data that relatives recently placed under seal in the National Archives could be examined by "an objective panel of scholars." *New York Times*, Los Angeles

**1/13/67** Shows 32 per cent of American adults favor another investigation, compared with 63 who don't and 5 % who have no opinion.

The same poll shows 36% of Americans now think Oswald was the lone killer, as compared with 29% in late 11/63; that 64% now feel others were involved, compared with 71% in 1963. *San Francisco Chronicle*, Gallup Poll

**1/30/67** Marathon *BBC* telecast on JFK death ends with a split verdict by a jury of Lord Devlin and Alexander Bickel of *Yale*.

Lane debated David Belin and Arlen Specter in an "angry confrontation." Belin stood on the evidence. Specter made the interesting admission that the one-bullet conclusion was "not indispensable" to the Warren Commission case, that there could have been an earlier shot fired by Oswald, meaning that Governor Connally could have been struck by a second shot.



Warren Commission, Reopening

Devlin and Bickel held that Lane, part of whose film was shown in its British premiere, had presented no new evidence. But whereas Devlin said public interest had been served by the Warren Commission findings, Bickel said he still felt the confused evidence over the number of bullets justified a reopening of the case by a small, full-time official body. *San Francisco Chronicle Times-Post Service*, London

**1/30/67** Four and a half hour television debate on assassination; Lane, David Belin, Arlen Specter, summing up by Lord Devlin and Alexander M. Bickel. Lord Devlin argued there was no reasonable doubt of Oswald's guilt; Bickel said Commission's conclusion [single bullet hitting JFK and Connally] not convincing, and suggested investigation be reopened, possibly by a full-time group of two or three retired judges. *BBC* switchboard jammed with complaints that Lane had not been given a fair hearing. *AP* and *San Francisco Examiner*

**2/21/67** From feature story on Lane:

Last August *Rush to Judgment* was published. ... And now, three years after the fact, a *Harris poll* finds that 54 per cent of the American people think the Warren Commission left "a lot of unanswered questions about who killed Kennedy" and, according to a *Gallup poll*, an even more substantial majority, 64 per cent, feel that Oswald did not act alone.

Lane's detractors claim that he fails to offer any answers; that may well be true, but perhaps it is enough that he offers questions. ... Some of his findings have given thoughtful people pause and he is at least one of the reasons why so many prominent rational voices - the *New York Times*, the *Saturday Evening Post*, *Life* magazine, the *London Times*, Walter Lippmann, others - have called out at this time for a reopening of the investigation. *Oakland Tribune*, Mike McGrady

**3/6/67** Los Angeles Full story told

|                             | <b>2/67</b> | <b>3/66</b> |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Full story told             | 30          | 32          |
| Still unanswered questioned | 59          | 54          |
| Not sure                    | 11          | 14          |
| Oswald was assassin         | 70          | 69          |
| Was not                     | 7           | 3           |
| Was not sure                | 23          | 28          |
| One man                     | 35          | 34          |
| Part of broader plot        | 44          | 46          |
| Not sure                    | 21          | 20          |
| Should be reopened          | 27          |             |
| Don't reopen                | 58          |             |

|          |    |  |
|----------|----|--|
| Not sure | 15 |  |
|----------|----|--|

- 3/15/67** ... "If Garrison indicts people for complicity in the assassination, it seems unlikely to me that President Johnson could hold off the appointment of a new commission of inquiry until after the 1968 elections." Mark Lane comments on New Orleans developments, reprinted from *National Guardian*, 3/4 issue. *Assassination Bulletin*, Vol. I, No. 1, published by *San Francisco Citizens Committee*.
- 4/18/67** For the first time since the Warren Commission published its findings, President Johnson is seriously considering designating a federal agency to receive and examine any new evidence turned up. ... Under a proposal discussed in the White House, the Justice Department, with FBI assistance, would be empowered to study and pass on new information. ...
- Authority for such a review and the issuing of reports and findings by the Justice Department would be included in an executive order to be issued by the President. This order, it has been suggested, might be promulgated in connection with the National Freedom of Information Act enacted by Congress last year and due to be come effective 7/4. This law requires the President to determine which of the still-classified records of the Warren Commission should be made available to the public. ... As interpreted by the Justice Department, under the new law government documents can be kept secret only if the President rules that is necessary "in the interest of national defense or foreign policy." *Oakland Tribune*, Allen & Scott column. *New Play to Revive Assassination Probe?*
- 1/24/68** Asked by Spann why Robert Kennedy and the Kennedy family had not asked for investigation to be reopened, said, "In politics as in war, a successful politician or warrior does not move until he knows he will be victorious, that he will win his point, and it may be the case that Senator Kennedy has not moved because it has not been apparent to him that this issue has outstanding public support." Josiah Thompson, interviewed by Owen Spann, *KGO*, Tape No. 66, at 430 feet (Sony 104)
- 3/25/68** Campaigning in Southern, California, RFK is greeted at *San Fernando State College* with placards including one asking "Are you going to open the archives up?" During question period students ask whether if elected he will open the archives. At first he tries to ignore the question, but then says the archives will be opened "at the appropriate time. ... If I became President ... I would not reopen the *Warren Commission Report*. I have seen everything that's in there." [*UPI* quotes him as saying "I have seen everything that is in the archives."] An aide says this is Kennedy's first public statement of this kind.
- 11/21/68** *Washington (DC) Examiner* says a congressional subcommittee has been quietly conducting new investigation into JFK assassination. Subcommittee is not further identified by *Examiner*, which says investigation is being conducted under Congressional auspices, but if such should not longer be possible the investigators will continue to work on their own. Investigators have been interviewing persons who may have additional leads.

Warren Commission, Reopening

Unnamed subcommittee spokesman says further investigation might be possible under a new [Nixon] administration which being "totally unconnected with the assassination might not be so emotionally involved in reopening old wounds," but emphasizes that present [Johnson] administration has not hampered any investigation. Same source says some Congressmen are sympathetic to reopening the case. *Washington (DC) Examiner*, [Quoted by Hal White, *Berkeley Barb*, filed Garrison 12/13/68]

**2/18/69** Kupferman appointed to State Supreme Court by Gov. Rockefeller to fill vacancy created by retirement of Justice Bernard Botein.

**5/14/75** [Text of speech (?) by Rep. Gladys Noon Spellman of Maryland, calling for reopening of investigation of JFK's assassination. Text includes petition to her by several students of the *University of Maryland*, and transcript of executive session of Warren Commission, 22 Jan 64.]

Check Warren Commission, Reopening file - in particular, beginning with 1975 - for other clippings on reopening the investigation, as they have not been entered and probably will not be, due to lack of time.

**9/22/75** "Sen. Frank Church [D-ID] said [today] that his Senate intelligence committee may hold public hearings on the caliber of the FBI's and CIA's investigations for the Warren Commission.

"He told reporters that he would not hesitate to urge reopening of the Warren Commission inquiry into President Kennedy's assassination in 1963 if the evidence seems to warrant it, but he said it would be premature to make such a recommendation now. ...

"The committee met in closed session [today], first to hear from Sen. Edward M. Kennedy [D-MA] and then to begin hearings [on another matter].

"Kennedy said later that he was still satisfied with the conclusions of the Warren Commission, including its finding that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in killing John F. Kennedy." *Washington Post* [9/23/75], by George Lardner, Jr.

**10/14/75** "A House of Representatives subcommittee has opened an investigation into the [FBI's] relationship with [Oswald and Ruby] before President Kennedy's assassination, the subcommittee's chairman said [yesterday].

"This is the first official public inquiry by Congress into whether evidence was withheld from the Warren Commission since its report saying that Oswald was the sole assassin was issued in 1964.

## Warren Commission, Reopening

"Representative Don Edwards, chairman of the Civil and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, said the purpose of his panel's investigation "is not to reopen the Warren Commission, others may decide to do that, but to set the record straight on just what went on." *New York Times*

**9/23/75**

"Today the Senate Intelligence Committee announced it will conduct a formal inquiry into the Warren Commission Report on President Kennedy's assassination. The announcement reverses the committee's position. Two weeks ago Chairman Frank Church said he didn't think there was enough evidence to warrant a new investigation; in any case, he said, it was beyond the scope of his committee's mandate. Today, Church apparently changed his mind. Two Senators will conduct the study: Richard Schweiker of Pennsylvania and Gary Hart of Colorado. They will have their own staff, power to examine the still secret archives of the Warren Commission, power to subpoena witnesses and documents and to compel testimony. They will work in executive session and report back to the full committee some time before next March first.... " *KPFA News*