

TARENTUM, PA.

Valley Daily News (e)
circ. 23,494



By NANCY ANDERSON

Although it has been three years since Kennedy's assassination, the controversy surrounding his death remains alive.

Two new books, one by Mark Lane entitled "Rush to Judgment" and another by Epstein, "Inquest: the Warren Commission and the Establishment of Truth," have added fuel to the smoldering fire.

Having just read "Who Killed Kennedy?" by Thomas Buchanan, I have a consuming desire to devour material on the subject and, luckily, there has been an outburst recently.

Buchanan's book has been called "scandal mongering" by many reputable writers and it was with this epithet in mind that I opened to the first page.

I was immediately engrossed in "Who Killed Kennedy?" because it raises several valid, and as yet, unsatisfactorily answered questions.

Before going into the startling theories of the author, I think it is important to state that he is not a crackpot. Buchanan, educated at Yale and George Washington universities, is a reporter on a reputable French newspaper, L'Express. He was assigned to cover the trial of Jack Ruby which is how he became involved with the Kennedy assassination story.

Buchanan is also the author of "The Unicorn," a book which the New York Times chose as one of 1960's outstanding books.

Buchanan begins with the climate of our country at the time of the tragedy, particularly Texas and reviews assassinations of past U.S. presidents.

He then launches into the

crime itself and the most controversial point — the direction of the first bullet. If you recall, early reports of the shooting stated that a man was seen running from a railroad trestle over the bypass.

Several witnesses stated that the first shot came from the direction of the trestle and other shots from behind, or the Texas Book Depository building. One man standing only a few feet from Kennedy stated that the President slumped backward, not forward with the first bullet's impact.

The surgeons at Parkland Hospital told reporters that the first shot struck Pres-

ident Kennedy directly from the front," a view on which they were unanimous.

They changed this statement after their colleagues at Bethesda Naval Hospital performed an autopsy and charged that all bullets entered from the rear.

However, it is important to remember that the Parkland doctors saw the bullet holes before an incision was made to restore the patient's breathing.

Another puzzling point raised by Buchanan is the rapidity with which the three bullets were fired. The three had to have been fired in from 4.8 to 5.6 seconds, which is the time established by the President's commission for the shots.

Yet, when the commission brought in the top expert riflemen in the country, they could scarcely do it in that time with accuracy.

Coupled with the fact that Oswald had not fired a rifle in four years (reports that he had been seen at a rifle range have been proven erroneous), that

the rifle Oswald used had to be manually loaded after each shot and the target relocated in the telescopic sight, and that the target was moving, not stationary, make the possibility of such a direct, accurate hit highly improbable.

Buchanan mentions that the parafin tests on Oswald proved he had fired a pistol "but why was powder absent from his cheek, if he had also fired a rifle with a telescopic sight?"

Also there were not any fingerprints of Oswald's on the gun; only one palmprint on the barrel, but there were other identified fingerprints on the gun. The FBI said the other fingerprints were of no value... but whose were they?

All of these arguments and several more are explored in detail in the first half of the book; the remainder is Buchanan's hypothesis.

He sees the murder as a conspiracy of approximately six men, although only two did the shooting. He does not believe Oswald was one of the assassins.

He implicates Jack Ruby as the man on the trestle and claims there was another man in the stockroom with Oswald who fired the rifle, a rather far-fetched assumption.

Perhaps the most haunting

effect of this book is that whether you believe it or not, and I'm not sure I do, it is just possible.

The main purpose of the Warren Commission report was to dispell all doubts and rumors, but it has failed to do so.

People whom I admire and respect, such as Dwight McDonald in Esquire and Murray Kempton in the New Republic, are willing to take the word of the Warren Commission after reading its lengthy report but they still find many questions unanswered.

"Inquest: the Warren Commission and the Establishment of Truth" is perhaps the most disturbing piece of journalism because it reveals that the commission's investigation was conducted in a hurried and slipshod manner.

While "Who Killed Kennedy?" is far from being a definitive answer, the Warren Commission's report does not do the job for which it was mainly created.

The renewed speculation and inquiry may stir up more extensive investigation, but until then we have to abide uneasily with the simple, uncluttered answer to what seems to be the most complex and intriguing question in our life times.