

History Must Answer Assumptions Commission Destroyed Chances

**ACCESSORIES AFTER THE
FACT: The Warren
Commission, The Authorities
and The Report**
By Sylvia Meagher
Bobbs-Merrill Co., \$8.50

Reviewed by,
DOUGLAS SPARKS
DNJ, Editor

There is the growing possibility that the number of volumes attacking the report of the Warren Commission may outnumber those aimed at extolling the late President John F. Kennedy, whose death the commission investigated.

If you have ever had an iota of disbelief in the Warren Commission report this analysis will support your hopes, contentions or fears, depending on what degree your interest maintains.

The author makes it clear the Warren Commission has issued a fake indictment and she insists that Lee Harvey Oswald had no motive for the crime, and the author also points out that the commission, instead of asserting a motive for the assassination, resorted to insinuations and assumptions about the accused.

She insists further that Oswald had no motive, no means (marksmanship of the highest order) and no opportunity (based on the time he was observed on the second floor of the Book Depository building in Dallas).

Mrs. Meagher, who wastes few words, insists the commission has destroyed all chances of ever uncovering the real criminals, and it is her contention too, they have possibly destroyed their reputations.

History must answer both assumptions.

But this is only a side issue in the finely balanced chain of events. We would not like to believe or be forced to believe that a representative collection of Americans would connive to feel the nation. This would of course, open a credibility gap between the people and the government too wide to bridge in the foreseeable future.

Mrs. Meagher points out one name that played an important role in the report, and whose family reaped hundreds of thousands of dollars in emotional funds, sent in when he was killed, presumably, by Oswald.

The man was Officer Tippits. Mrs. Meagher does not agree with the report on the death of Tippits and she asks why the report is so meager in conveying to the readers all that was available on the dead officers.

She finds this odd and says so. Mrs. Meagher wants a new

investigation and she wants those named to the task to check out carefully the case against Oswald. She contends that he was indicted without due process of fair play or honesty.

It would be foolish to ignore the fact Mrs. Meagher makes some telling points in the interpretation of the same set of facts or nearly so, that the commission based their opinion on.

Moreover, the reader will be forced to consider several areas of "Taken for granted facts," as the author holds them up for inspection.

Mrs. Meagher has drawn a

straight head on the Warren Commission. It is up to the reader to decide how accurately she has hit her target.

One thing is obvious, as the reader will find, Mrs. Meagher is not firing blanks.