



SF Examiner Oct 17, 1966
Bob Considine

Warren Report Critic Criticized

Mark Lane, a New York attorney who became a minor political figure in the shadow of John F. Kennedy, continues to prosper on his shroud.

Lane's "Rush to Judgment," an erratic blast at the Warren Commission report on the assassination, has been on the Best Seller list ever since it crept from the fogs of half-truth and rudderless conjecture.

Book critics are not good enough reporters to be trusted with assessing "Rush to Judgment" or the rest of the pompous drivel published recently in "answer" to a serious investigation whose findings fill 26 volumes. Their senseless salutes to detractors only serve to illuminate their utter poverty of investigative skills.

★ ★ ★

ON PAGE 307 of his book, Lane states, "The case against Lee Harvey Oswald was comprised essentially of evidence from two sources: Dallas police officers and Marina Oswald." The truth is that the case against Oswald was distilled from the testimony given by hundreds of individuals, dozens of exhibits and a preponderance of physical evidence.

Lane joins other critics in asserting that an FBI report dated Dec. 9, 1963, contradicts the official autopsy used in the commission report. The official autopsy declared that the bullet that passed through the President's neck was the same which wounded Gov. Connally.

The Dec. 9 FBI report, based on information orally furnished to two agents by doctors who were in the early stages of autopsy, indicated that one of the bullets had entered the President's back and there was no point of exit.

But the FBI's clarifying supplemental report of Jan. 13, 1964, is largely ignored by Lane and the others. That report, based on a study of an exit hole in the front of the President's shirt collar, and Dallas' Dr. Malcolm O. Perry's corroboration that he made the incision for the tracheotomy he performed on the same wound he found in the front of the President's neck, completely confirms the commission's finding.

★ ★ ★

FINALLY, LANE says the commission erred in not discrediting the testimony of one Howard L. Brennan, an eyewitness to the assassination who eventually identified Oswald.

Lane writes that the commission should have accepted the testimony of 18 year old Arnold Rowland, who claimed he observed another man "hanging out that window" of the Texas School Depository Building. Lane conveniently ignores the commission's finding:

"The investigation showed that numerous statements by Rowland concerning matters about which he would not normally be expected to be mistaken—such as subjects he studied in school, grades he received, whether or not he had graduated from high school, and whether or not he had been admitted to college—were false."

Who really rushed to judgment?

Hear Bob Considine on KGO Radio (810) Monday through Friday at 5:50 p.m.