

MORE ON KENNEDY

Ivor Montagu

COPYRIGHT

A RECENT Gallup poll has shown that two out of every three Americans no longer believe in the Warren Report.

Seldom in human history has so monstrous a piece of nonsense, so elaborate and painstaking a structure, become so rapidly, so completely discredited. The air has collapsed out of it through two pinholes. The giant obfuscation has melted, like morning mist before the sun.

We come quite well out of it. 'If you want the gen, read *LM*' could be an excellent slogan for our fund. The moment President Kennedy was assassinated, the editor in the very first following Notes of the Month (see appendix, written within a few days of the murder), before damning new factual evidence uncovered by the indefatigable work of Mark Lane had begun to become available in the American progressive weekly *National Guardian* (after refusal of publication in all the other American press), pointed out the now admittedly significant features of the story. *The Observer* consequently commented on this prior role of our journal. As soon as the Warren Commission Report came out, broadcast over the entire world as a paper back, an article in the next succeeding issue (November 1964) subjected it to analysis and disclosed a few of its contradictions:

Certainly our voice was not entirely a lone voice. But how populous was the wilderness in which we then cried and which sought to shout us down! Can *The Times* ever blush? The *New York Times* printed whole, as it swallowed whole, every word of Warren. Overnight it became the longed-for manna. The multi-million news outlets of 'public servants' like the Thomsons, the gutter press and qualities alike, had neither doubts nor qualms. 'Truth' had been established. 'Rumours' were silenced. The whole world was satisfied. Only Reds out of step. The 'proofs' were now before history. The last word had been said.

But it had not.

And now, already: nobody will go to bat for Warren.

The bucket of whitewash with which the American establishment and its sacred-cow herds on this side of the Atlantic had sought to veil the form of the emerging truth is peeling off in flakes. The report is totally discredited. Its central thesis, its *raison d'être*, disproved.

Truly a fast job.

When Kennedy was killed, the Dallas police picked up a previously prepared 'fall guy', a van der Lubbe, and shut his mouth. Just as did the Nazis when they burned the Reichstag. But let no-one say conspirators do not learn from history. Like the original of that name, this van der Lubbe—Oswald—also had carefully prefabricated 'Communist' associations. Somewhere along the line, however, someone of brighter intelligence than the lower echelons realised such allegations could turn out too hot to handle. You could get rid of the fall guy. But not even in a St. Bartholomew's night would you be able to dispose of every alleged accomplice in such an imaginary plot. Trials would *have* to follow. And cross-examinations which the fabric could not face. The Nazis convicted themselves because, in trying to convict the Communists, they proved that van der Lubbe could not have done the deed alone. When the crime would not stick on those innocent of it, the Nazis found their evidence recoil upon themselves. From the outset, in Dallas, the concern of the police became to conceal the traces of *anyone* who could be associated with Oswald in the crime.

And as such traces multiplied, this became the concern of everyone else anxious to preserve the good repute of the U.S. establishment: that is, the FBI, the administration, its allies and sycophants abroad, the 'media', even the Kennedy family.

Just as it was the concern of Johnson, the concern of Warren, the concern of his Commission.

But it didn't work.

It cannot work for anyone who reads the two books.* These two pinpricks have settled the balloon. The first, as most newspaper readers know by now, is a simple students' social study on 'how a society sets about improvising machinery' for a job of this sort. The answer is, as will be seen by anyone who reads: by assembling a group of signatories whose variety and sanctity will preserve them from criticism from as many quarters as possible, regardless of whether they have time to do adequately the job they undertake; provide them with inadequate staff, inadequate time, a number of alibis from all those in the establishment who are under suspicion; draft for them the necessary conclusions however much these may be contradicted by the evidence that, even in such conditions, has become available; and rely on them (justly as it turns out) to sign, whatever their scruples, when it comes to the crunch. The second is

* Edward Jay Epstein: *Inquest: The Warren Commission and the Establishment of Truth*; Hutchinson; and Mark Lane: *Rush to Judgment*, Bodley Head.