

Star Nov. 6 1966

INTERPRETATION

Warren Report Doubts Worry U.S.

By LYLE DENNISTON
Star Staff Writer

Some government sources are now doing some thinking about what can be done to erase doubts that the public may have about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

It's understood that government officials themselves have no doubt that the Warren Commission was right in concluding that Kennedy was shot by Lee Harvey Oswald and that Oswald acted all alone, not as part of a "conspiracy."

President Johnson himself told the press Friday he knew of "no evidence that would cause any reasonable person to have any doubt" about the Warren Report.

Thus, the pondering that is now going on in some federal offices deals with the possible means of settling the issues in the public's mind.

Books Raise Doubts

Doubts about the commission's main conclusions have been raised in a series of books by private authors. Those doubts have been widely publicized and, so far, there has been little official effort to dispel them — either by the men who sat on the Warren Commission or by any

other ranking official in the government.

President Johnson's press conference remarks Friday represented his first direct reply to the critical books. He did not volunteer his remarks but offered them in a question about the books.

The critical books about the Warren Report did have "something to do with" the government's recent successful efforts to obtain for official safekeeping all the evidence that might bear on the assassination, officials said earlier this week.

On Monday, the items of evidence most often cited as crucial by critics of the commission — that is, photographs and X-rays made during the autopsy on Kennedy's body — were turned over to the National Archives.

That evidence was never shown to the full commission and there is some doubt that any single member of the commission or any of its staff aides saw it. Still, the government wanted those materials on file "to complete the historical record," it was reported.

Critics of the Warren Report have argued that these materials should have been used by the commission. It

could have been important, critics have suggested, in resolving such questions as the number of shots fired and the participation, if any, by persons other than Oswald.

The Kennedy family, which had possession of the autopsy data since shortly after it was prepared, turned it over to the archives with strict limits on how it may be used. The public will not see this data for many years, and almost no one outside the government will be able to inspect it in the next five years.

The fact that the materials had not been in government hands for the last three years had led some critics to conclude that it was being suppressed.

Some observers have suggested that a new, formal investigation of the assassination should be opened.

It is understood that some government sources feel that the mere possession of the materials by the government could not, by itself, answer the critics and deal with doubts that might have arisen.

But, going beyond mere receipt of the data caused a dilemma. It is that dilemma which some officials have begun to analyze.

On the one hand, it was felt that if an official organization

or panel were set up to go over the autopsy materials, this might suggest that the government itself questions the Warren Report when in fact it does not.

At the same time, to avoid some new review of the autopsy data, might seem, it was felt, to be "unwarranted government secrecy" about them. That might appear true to some private observers, particularly because the Warren Commission did not use the materials in its investigation, and even the doctors who performed the autopsy and testified about it did not see the autopsy photos and X-rays until just this week.

Recognizing this dilemma, as some officials now do, some sources began thinking about finding what has been called a "middle ground" between appointing a new study panel or doing nothing.

So far, these sources have not sat down to talk about the techniques that might possibly be used to persuade the public that the autopsy data does support the commission's conclusions.

Up to now, nothing formal has happened it was reported. But the likelihood is that the internal review of the issue will go on, at least for some time.