

THE DOUBTERS

AT LEAST TWO JFK ASSASSINS

By JOHN BRYAN
Herald-Examiner Staff Writer

● Mark Lane is finally ready to reveal his theory about what happened in Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963.

In an exclusive Herald-Examiner interview, the New York attorney and former State Assemblyman whose book "Rush to Judgment" has helped reopen debate about the Kennedy assassination, described how he thinks the murder was accomplished.



MARK LANE

"Who killed Kennedy?" he was asked.

"I think at least two people fired at President Kennedy," said Lane.

"Maybe more. And they fired at least five shots. Therefore it was a conspiracy, because conspiracy is defined by the law as two or more persons acting in concert to effect an illegal end. That's what happened in Dallas that day."

Q. Where were the two gunmen?

A. At least one was behind the wooden fence in front of and to the right of the President. At least one was behind the Presidential limousine. I'm inclined to doubt that he was in the Book Depository Building, although that is a possibility. I think an examination of the frames of the Zapruder film will indicate that he was more likely in the Dallas Sheriff's Office.

Q. Who killed Officer Tippett?

A. I don't know but I guess a short, fat, bushy-haired fellow. I think the evidence against Oswald is inconclusive. There are only two eyewitnesses and they said the man was short, somewhat stocky and had bushy hair. One woman, Mrs. Clemans, said that when she came out of the house she saw the man that I have just described standing over Tippett's body and she saw him wave to another man across the street and the two of them ran in opposite directions. She raised the question that two were involved. Since some shells from one manufacturer and some bullets from another manufacturer were found on the scene and in Tippett's body, that gives further credence to the possibility that two people were involved.

Q. Was Oswald set up as a fall guy?

A. I think there's a very real possibility of that. It seems that someone was going around the Dallas area posing as Oswald and involving himself in a series of bizarre activities, which would leave a trail that one day would point to Lee Harvey Oswald. This to me is an indication that he was set up as a patsy.

Q. Why did the Warren Commission cover up the facts as you claim they did?

A. There is one relatively innocent explanation. The

Commission may have been concerned that the country could not face the facts after two traumatic experiences—the murder of the President and the murder of the alleged assassin in the basement of a police station. They perhaps felt we could not face the fact that we did not really know who killed the President of the United States and that these assassins were walking the streets of America. And perhaps for that reason—in order to restore the domestic tranquility—the Commission said that it was the one man who was dead and the case was therefore closed.

Q. Do you want an official reopening of the inquiry?

A. Yes. I think that's where we have to begin. We have to start again at the beginning because I think that today we know no more about the assassination of President Kennedy than was known when the shots were fired. I think we have a right to know. There was no serious investigation. The previous ersatz investigation was designed to cover up the fact that the Commission had a foregone conclusion that it wanted to present to the people of this country. I think it is now the time—although it is three years late—to begin from the very start.

(CONT'D)

Q. Who should hear the case?

A. If we can have public hearings—perhaps before the Congress—and the witnesses are given assurance that what is wanted from them is the truth, I think the American people will learn a good deal more about what actually took place in Dallas that day. I would like to be one of the investigators preparing for such a hearing. Such investigators should be private individuals, not police. Also, I think that instead of relying on the police laboratories we should rely on the laboratories and experts at various universities who are impartial instead of those already committed to the government's view.

Q. Why didn't the Warren Commission examine the X-rays and photographs taken by the government of the President's body?

A. Because they would have had to admit they showed that the back wound was not in the throat at all but lower in the President's back and if this were the case the bullet could not have exited from the front of the President's throat and gone through Governor Connally's back and exited downwards through his wrist and into his leg. If this one fact is admitted, then there was no lone assassin. So I think it's been necessary to lose or to classify the photos and the X-rays and for the autopsy doctor to burn his notes—if he burned them—or to say that he burned them.

Q. Why do you say that the Warren Commission has helped to destroy our American governmental system of checks and balances?

A. President Johnson was asked how he influenced Chief Justice Earl Warren to accept chairmanship of the commission and he replied that he didn't influence him to do it, he ordered him. Our system of checks and balances with truly independent legislative, executive and judiciary branches goes down the drain when the executive begins giving orders to the Chief Justice. I think one of the biggest causes of the whole Warren report imbalance is that we have a President who is a great developer of consensus for his own ends. On the Commission we find representatives of Johnson, four legislators and the

Chief Justice representing the judiciary. It's hard to know where to appeal to from this verdict. It seemed to be the final court . . . except the American people. And one out of three Americans today does not believe the central conclusion of the Warren Report—that it was Oswald acting alone who was the assassin. In a half a year I think it will be very difficult to find anybody who believes the Warren Report outside of Earl Warren, his family and the lawyers of the Commission. *End*