

## WARREN REPORT GREETED SKEPTICALLY

**Doubt clings abroad on Oswald**

**P**UBLIC OPINION in the rest of the world, as reflected in newspaper reports, does not share the easiness with which the American people seem to have accommodated themselves to the Warren Commission Report on the assassination of President Kennedy.

The Report's contention that Lee Oswald alone and unaided murdered the President in Dallas last November has been met with skepticism in many capitals. In Western Europe, according to a survey by the United States Information Agency, newspapers in France, Belgium and Austria were extremely critical in their evaluation of the 888-page study. In Britain, Scandinavia and Germany, the agency said, most papers approved of the Report, except those of the Left.

The USIA reported that newspapers in Latin America, North Africa, the Near East and South Asia (excepting India) were critical of the findings.

In France, where the conspiracy theory is most widely held, both Left and Right were convinced that the assassination was political, not the act of a deranged killer. The conservative Paris Presse declared that "everything seems to point to a political assassination in which another assassin liquidated the first to silence him."

**IN ITALY,** ROME'S largest circulation daily, Paese Sera (Left), said in a headline that the Report "raises more doubts than it solves." The liberal II Giorno concludes by saying that "the most important question is why, if there were no plots, this young and unknown man—without any real ideals—decided to sacrifice his own life . . . The Report, faced with this disturbing question, has sought an explanation in the most obscure and unfathomable strata of the psyche."

The Socialist paper Avanti editorialized that the document "does not clarify the many obscure elements emerging immediately after the crime." The Communist Party paper Unita commented that the Report "not only . . . leaves unresolved so many doubts . . . but also contains contradictory proofs."

The West German Neue Rhein Ruhr Zeitung (Social Democratic), said: "There must remain a residue of doubt . . ."

Pravda, the Soviet Communist Party paper, declared that "evidently all the secrets have not been revealed."

**IN ISRAEL,** Ma'ariv, the nation's largest daily newspaper, referred to the assassination as the "Dreyfus case of our time" and published a lengthy interview with Mark Lane.

Despite the USIA finding, many Scandinavian newspapers have raised doubts about the Report. Denmark's middle-of-the-road Ekstra Bladet said in headlines that "the murder of Kennedy is still not solved" and that the Report was "a phony document."

The newspaper also published an interview with Lane, as did many other European publications. A statement from British philosopher Bertrand Russell ("It

is clear that much is still hidden from the public") was also widely reported overseas.

In the U.S., virtually the only criticism came from the left-wing press and a few maverick newspaper reporters. Of the latter, Hearst's Dorothy Kilgallen was perhaps the most emphatic:

"The whole thing smells a bit fishy," she said in her syndicated column Sept. 30. "It's a mite too simple that a chap kills the President of the United States, escapes from that, kills a policeman, eventually is apprehended in a movie theatre under circumstances that defy every law of police procedure and subsequently is murdered under extraordinary circumstances."

**MURRAY KEMPTON,** writing in the New York World-Telegram, remarked on how "implausible" it seemed that Oswald was endowed with such superlative marksmanship when firing at a moving motorcade—while failing to accomplish, under far more favorable circumstances, the murder of Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker.

The three Americans most closely associated with criticism of the assassination investigation—Mark Lane, Thomas Buchanan and Joachim Joesten—maintain even more strongly now that the Report has been published that Oswald was not the lone assassin.

One of the most interesting aspects of the Report has been the unexpected emergence of FBI director J. Edgar Hoover in the guise of a civil libertarian. In response to criticism of the FBI for failure to report the whereabouts of Lee Oswald to the Secret Service, the FBI leaked to the press excerpts of Hoover's testimony before the Warren Commission, which will be officially released later.

Hoover declared that he was opposed to tightening Presidential security to any large degree because "I don't think you can get absolute security without almost establishing a police state—and we don't want that." He contended that "total" security would entail rounding up all suspects before the President was to visit a particular city. The FBI director charged that an example of this nearly occurred recently in Chicago when, he said, Chicago police acquired a list of names from the FBI before a visit by President Johnson and held those persons "almost in a house arrest." The Chicago police said in response: "We received names from the Secret Service of potential security risks to be watched during the President's visit and we did. But nothing was done to embarrass any of these persons."

**HOOPER ALSO SAID** that the FBI did not act on Oswald because of "a report from the State Department that indicated this man was a thoroughly safe risk." The State Department denied such a document existed. Critics of the Warren Report were quick to ask why the department went so far as to consider Oswald "a thoroughly safe risk." They asked further whether the FBI usually accepts the State Department's word on

security risks—especially on defectors—or whether there were other reasons why the agency gave such weight to this particular estimate. Was Oswald "thoroughly safe" because, as critics speculate, he was on the government's payroll?

The Dallas Times-Herald reported Sept. 29 that the FBI had taken disciplinary action against two agents who had been in charge of the Oswald case before the assassination. The newspaper said one agent had been demoted at a loss of \$1,000 in annual pay and that the other, stationed in New Orleans, had been ordered transferred. He retired instead. Both agents, considered experts on "subversives," had been with the FBI more than 20 years.