COMPLETE NEW YORK STATE SERVICE

Sunday, August 14, 1966 VLB VNV TIMES TINION

fother Salvo at Kennedy Inques

\$5.95. Rinehart & Winston, 478 pp. Mark Lane. New York, Holt RUSH TO JUDGMENT. By By JOHN BARKHAM

of the Warren Commission weighing these attacks on a disagreeable prospect of gation. Leo Sauvage's post-mortum on the Warren Reyears of on-the-spot investiquest" last month, and here Jay Epstein with his "Insalco was fired by Edward in full swing. The opening prestigious C o m m i s s i o n port is due next month. The based on more than two his own penetrating critique is attorney Mark Lane with headed by the Chief Justice. reader is thus faced with the The assault on the findings

Harvey Oswald, to represent give the critics a hearing. party. He had been asked by not exactly a disinterested Unlike Epstein, Mark Lane is Mrs. Uswald, mother of Lee

> and introduces evidence not sion. considered by the Commisthan Epstein's. It is broader book is even more searching fact remains that Lane's standing in the matter, the sion. Granted his special her son before the Commis-Most of Lane's book con-

report is not an impartial finding based on the evi-dence, but in effect a brief supported by the British hisvamen of Lane's charges--bound to occur. Yet the grawhich he puts his finger on sists of a minute analysis of the testimony presented at discrepancies of all kinds are omissions and contradictions the hearings, in the course of in his trenchant introduction torian, Hugh Trevor-Roper, involving over 500 witnesses an inquiry lasting a year and too numerous to list here. In is that the Commission's

sion do anything with the of the Texas Book Repositonesses like Mrs. Eric Wal shots was conclusively estaeffect? (The timing of the in 51/2 seconds to such deadly single assassin have fired couldn't be sure). Could a example, were actually port. How many bullets for damaging lacunae in the Re-Trevor-Roper all point to cept that Epstein, Lane and or unfounded or crackpot, exthese claims as sensational to pin the quilt on Oswald. photograph taken by Mrs. Mary Ann Moorman, and ry? Why didn't the Commismen, not one, at the windows ther, who said she saw two the Commission question witgrapher's film.) Why didn't blished n an amateur photofired? (The Commission three bullets from an old gun for the prosecution designed It is tempting to dismiss

> confiscated by the police, of -a photograph which would the alleged assassination winpresumably have shown Os-wald at the window?

"Who Did?"

did?" Enter here the conspi-racy theory. Since Oswald (a mand: "Well, if you don't think Oswald did it, who asked by Lane. Indeed, a natone of whom is presumably sis involving two assassins, York Review" actually pro-pounded in detail a hypothein so short a time, two people must have been responsible. dent and Governor Connolly is to make the reader deural reaction to this bookscores of pertinent questions still walking around among poor marksman according to us today. A recent article in "The New tired three shots at the Presithe testimony) could not have These are a few of the

is going too far, even though For the average reader this

> call witnesses with valuable one-sided job, should have been. Lane stops best stated by Epstein when with shame," he declares. Commission covered itself testimony, and so on. "The hearsay evidence, ommitting that the Commission did a himself with the assertion short at this point, contenting was not as thorough as it that the Warren investigation he may be inclined to agree The case for the critics was accepting

reassuring report the Comwanted to believe the kind of words, the American people pelling rumors." In other plicit purpose was "to protect and expose the facts, its imcit purpose was to ascertain produced such a report. the critics contend is why it mission gave them, the national interest by diswhile the Commission's explihe concluded in his book that, which,

ð