

Mark Lane :

In mid-August, Holt, Rinehart & Winston will publish "Rush to Judgement," an independent study of the JFK assassination by Mark Lane, 39-year old lawyer and former New York State legislator. The book will also be published in Spain and in England. What follows is an excerpt from an interview with Lane by Wendy Sonnenberg.

EVO: Who in your opinion benefited from the assassination of Oswald?

Mark Lane: Well . . . of Oswald?

EVO: Right.

Lane: Or of Kennedy?

EVO: Of Oswald.

Lane: Well I imagine that whoever wanted to prevent the full disclosure regarding the events of November 22 benefited from the murder — possibly.

EVO: What were those events?

Lane: Well obviously if Oswald had lived there would have been a trial. If there was a trial there would have been a full disclosure as to what Oswald did on November 22, I think. The reading of the record compiled by those who investigated for the Warren Commission, by the witnesses who testified to the Warren Commission, demonstrates quite clearly that Oswald could not have been convicted of the assassination of the President in the first place. And in the second place, the evidence would have shown very plainly that at least two people were involved.

EVO: It is your opinion that Oswald was framed?

Lane: Well, again, we move into the area of guess work . . . I think that the record shows clearly that what the Commission said hap-

ASSASSINATION, ESCALATION

pened on November 22 and November 24 did not happen.

EVO: It is your opinion is it not, that Oswald did not shoot the President?

Lane: I am rather old fashioned about these things. I believe in the presumption of innocence, which is theoretically the cornerstone of the American criminal jurisprudence. There is no evidence which compels the conclusion that Oswald was in any way involved in the assassination, and I, therefore, presume that he was not involved in the assassination. Insofar as the Commission's conclusion that Oswald was the lone assassin, that is an asinine conclusion and one which is rebutted by the facts because there was no lone assassin and no one—Oswald, or even a superior rifleman—could possibly have used that antique weapon which the Commission claims was used as the sole weapon and secured such effective results.

EVO: Do you believe that Ruby shot Oswald out of feelings of pure patriotism?

Lane: No, I do not. The fact is that Ruby, who claimed, after he had killed Oswald, to have been such a lover of President Kennedy, was among those who were present in Dallas on November 22nd and, according to his own

statement, did not even take the trouble to walk two short blocks from the DALLAS MORNING NEWS, where he was involved, he claimed, in a transaction, a business transaction, placing an ad for his Carousel Club—another club in Dallas—in the newspaper. He didn't bother to walk two short blocks to the Presidential route so that he could see this one man, the President of the United States, who he professed to love.

EVO: What are your plans after the book and movie are out?

Lane: Well I expect to be lecturing a bit in connection with the release of the book and the release of the film.

EVO: You've done a lot of lecturing, haven't you?

Lane: I have lectured at 75 to 85 universities in the United States, and about a dozen countries throughout Europe.

continued on page 14

EVO: Don't you think once the book is out you won't need to lecture any more? You can go on to another subject?

Lane: Well, I think that when the book comes out, there will be a renewed public interest in the assassination. While I'm not anxious to continue lecturing, because I think that almost everything I have to say about the assassination I have said in the book, and I would like to go on to another subject, I think that there will be an opportunity to advance the effort for pressure to force the government to conduct an adequate investigation anew to determine what took place in Dallas on November 22nd. And it seems almost as an obligation to stay with this matter until such time as that effort has either failed or succeeded, but has concluded in any event.

EVO: Don't you think that there are other subjects, such as the war in Viet Nam that require your concern and attention now, as President Kennedy is dead, as Oswald is dead, and as you've devoted so much of your time to this subject?

Lane: Well, the war is a massive war and is becoming much more massive. I'm not sure that the two matters, the war in Viet Nam and the assassination are unrelated matters. President Kennedy, two months before his death, announced to his administration that all American troops would be out of Viet Nam by the beginning of 1965, and we then had 17,500 men in Vietnam, and 1,000 were withdrawn from Viet Nam by President Kennedy in September, '63 and in November, '63, he withdrew another thousand men, and we were down then to 15,500. We now have a quarter of a million men in Viet Nam as a result of the policies of his successor, and the New York Times promises us (while relying upon Administration officials, of course, for the source of their information) that there will be 400,000 men there before very long.

Fifteen thousand five hundred, as a part of a reduction program of Kennedy. And almost a half million under President Johnson, as part of an escalation program. I think the two matters are not entirely unrelated. Although President Johnson likes to pretend that American participation in Viet Nam is the American program and always has been.



Kaplan photo

It is in fact, not so. It is the Johnson program. As the war in Viet Nam and its massive escalation is the Johnson War and the McNamara War in Viet Nam, and very different from the policies enunciated by President Kennedy during the final days of his administration. Nothing concerns me more at the present time than the American effort in Viet Nam.

EVO: You're for the withdrawal of all American troops?

Lane: Absolutely. Precisely. I believe in self determination. I believe that the national aspirations of people in every part of the world must be respected. And it is certain that what we are supporting in Viet Nam represents almost nothing in terms of popular will of the people of that country. There are two parts of Viet Nam—north and south. We deal only with the south.

Eighty to eighty-five percent of the south is controlled by the National Liberation Front. Eighty per cent of the twenty percent which is controlled by the government is controlled by the Buddhists, who oppose the administration. So we are left with, really, General Ky, his cabinet, and a few members of his family, for whom we are asked to send American participation and help and for which we are asked to bomb North Viet Nam which is not a party to this conflagration in the south, and participate in the use of chemical warfare and gas warfare and a whole series of other activities including the torture of those prisoners of war—a whole series of activities which have been outlawed at the Geneva Conference, and outlawed by other treaties to which the United States is a signatory.


We are involved in an immoral activity there. Our goals are immoral in the first place. And our methods are immoral. And I think every American citizen has the right and the responsibility to be ashamed of that which is taking place today.

Tel. WOrth 2-3797

AMERICAN
Press Clipping Service, Inc.


119 Nassau Street
New York 38, N. Y.

From
THE EAST VILLAGE
OTHER
New York, N.Y.
Aug. 1-15, 1966



VOL.1 NO.17

© 1966 by The East Village Other Inc.



AUGUST 1-15

20¢ outside nyc

15¢