

# Film Tries to Make a Case for Oswald

Mark Lane may have done himself a disservice by preparing a film of his inflammatory book, "Rush to Judgment."

The two-hour documentary, which opened yesterday at the Clay, adds little or no fuel to Lane's arguments about another bullet and another assassin (still at large) in the murder of President Kennedy.

His witnesses — a couple of dozen submitted to filmed interviews — are neither as articulate nor as rational as attorney Lane appears to be. They are not the sort of people who inspire confidence. And we have ample opportunity to observe them on the screen — onlookers at the tragedy of Dallas, who think they heard and saw something that the Warren Commission deemed necessary to



**MARK LANE**  
Warren Report critic

ignore or refute, for lack of sufficient evidence.

They are eye witnesses

who saw only what they wanted to see and they now make no allowances for the shock that often distorts a man's memory of a horrible event.

Though they are certain they heard rifle fire coming from behind a picket fence in Dealey Plaza (rather than from the accepted source of the Texas School Book Depository Building), their testimony seems untrustworthy — or at best, inconclusive.

Nothing very concrete comes out of Lane's investigation, which he undertook as "a brief for the defense," to prove that Harvey Lee Oswald was innocent — that he could not possibly have murdered the President.

But Lane's theories of a Dallas conspiracy involv-

ing Jack Ruby and the local police seem loaded. He, too, reports only what he wants to believe, offering no solid evidence, but relying on the recollections of a handful of witnesses, whose memory may be faulty.

Lane has apparently closed his mind to the crushing evidence pointing to Oswald's guilt. Yet he has laboriously assembled the movie, which has been stitched together in straightforward documentary style by director Emile de Antonio, to promote the controversial theories that caused so much stir last September,

when Lane's book appeared.

## A BARFLY

Even if we may now see it all on film, the case for Oswald is not convincing. And when Lane accuses the Warren Commission of withholding evidence about a possible conspiracy, he can only draw upon a witness like Randolph Williams, an admitted barfly, who claims that he saw Ruby and Officer Tippett (slain a few minutes after the President) seated together in the front seat of a police car which took Williams to headquarters after

he was picked up on a narcotics charge.

While Lane has every right to question the accepted facts, his legal training should have prevented him from foisting a lot of far-fetched supposition on the public without conclusive proof.

— Stanley Eichelbaum