



Wait till Bob and Sally discover the other fine Canadian Pacific Hotels.

- The Algonquin**
St. Andrews, N.B.
- Le Chateau Frontenac**
Quebec City, Que.
- Le Chateau Champlain**
Montreal, Que.
- Le Baron Motor Hotel**
Sherbrooke, Que.
- Hotel Saskatchewan**
Regina, Sask.
- The Palliser**
Calgary, Alta.
- Chateau Lacombe**
Edmonton, Alta.
- Banff Springs Hotel**
Banff, Alta.
- Chateau Lake Louise**
Lake Louise, Alta.
- The Empress**
Victoria, B.C.

For complete convention information write to: Bill Gray, National Sales Manager, Windsor Station, Montreal.

Canadian Pacific HOTELS

TIME, NOVEMBER 24, 1967

nalists: "Does the sheer greatness of the enterprise that I have built draw their rage as the oak draws lightning? Do people expect me to go into the editorial offices and say, 'Gentlemen, please don't put out such good newspapers,' or into the publishing offices and say, 'Please don't be so efficient'? Should I block the path to success and demand: 'No, success must not be?'"

The answer, undoubtedly, is no—and a government commission presently investigating the trend to monopoly in the German press will probably agree. The most it is likely to recommend is some kind of tax break for smaller newspapers. Springer's most strident rival, Rudolf Augstein, publisher of the newsweekly *Der Spiegel*, has called for a "lex Springer," a trustbusting law aimed at Springer. With the crushing of press freedom still fresh in their minds, Germans are unlikely to go along. "When people stop buying my papers," says Springer, "they will show their opposition to my policies. I recall with horror the misfortunes the so-called apolitical press brought on us during the Weimar Republic. It is my credo that a newspaper publisher has no right to remain politically indifferent."

MAGAZINES

Back to Dallas

Few deaths in the history of mankind have been so minutely scrutinized as that of John F. Kennedy. Every detail of that fateful November day has been exhumed, examined and crammed into some theory or other, ranging from the plausible to the inconceivable. This week both *LIFE* and the *Saturday Evening Post* offer more intriguing bits and pieces on the assassination, but regrettably nothing so conclusive as to put an end to all the speculation.

Publishing excerpts from a forthcoming book, *Six Seconds in Dallas*, the *Post* can hardly contain its excitement. Calling Author Josiah Thompson, 32, a philosophy teacher at Haverford College, a "warm and engaging idealist with a mind like a rip saw," Editor Bill Emerson Jr. enthusiastically writes that the book "demolishes" the Warren Commission Report. An equally emotional editorial declares that the details amassed by Thompson "cry out for the truth to be told and for the murderers to be punished."

The details are not all that new; the conclusions are. Thompson states that "there were four shots from three guns in six seconds." What led him to this belief was a close examination of the film of the assassination. As he saw it, a split second after President Kennedy's head lurched forward under the impact of a bullet, it lurched back again. Thompson speculates that another bullet must have struck him from the front. Much of the debris from the wound, moreover, landed to the rear of the car, again an indication to Thompson of an oncoming bullet. After talk-



JOSIAH THOMPSON

Such a warm, engaging rip saw.

ing to various eyewitnesses, Thompson decided that one assassin had been posted behind the fence on the grassy knoll, a second on top of the Dallas County Records Building. The other two shots came from the sixth floor of the Texas Depository—but not from Oswald. Two other assassins had done the shooting; Oswald was the fall guy. The Warren Commission concluded that one assassin had fired three shots. This forced the commission to adopt the controversial "single bullet" theory: the assumption that the same bullet passed through Kennedy's neck, passed through Connally's chest and then struck his wrist and thigh.

Demand for Exposure. In *LIFE*, Governor John Connally gives his side of the story of the events leading up to Dallas. Contradicting William Manchester's contention that the President had reluctantly gone to Texas to patch up a local factional quarrel within the Democratic Party, Connally insists that Kennedy went to mend his own political fortunes. He wanted to show conservative Texas Democrats that he did not have horns. Connally, just emerging from a bruising election campaign, was in no mood for a presidential visit.

When the President insisted on coming anyway, Connally argued for a relatively low-keyed tour aimed mainly at Texas businessmen. Kennedy's advance men demanded more exposure to the crowd. After a "heated argument," the Kennedy people prevailed over Connally, and a Dallas motorcade was scheduled. The route was released to the press three days ahead of time, though Connally had objected that this would give hecklers a chance to organize. When Kennedy arrived, Connally was pleasantly surprised by the size of the crowds and their friendliness. During his last conversation with the President concerning the Dallas motorcade, he assured Kennedy that he would probably carry Texas in 1964.

OVER. →