

C.B.C. Television Program "News Magazine"
Panel Discussion on the Warren Commission
Report - November 22nd, 1966

Present: Harrison E. SALISBURY (Moderator)
Wesley LEIBELER (Commission Counsel)
Burt W. GRIFFIN (Commission Counsel)
Edward Jay EPSTEIN (Author)
Leo SAUVAGE (Author)

Announcer: Two members of the News Magazine panel of experts helped to write the Warren Report, Attorneys Wesley LEIBELER and Burt GRIFFIN. They face two authors who challenge Commission findings, Edward EPSTEIN, author of "Inquest" and French journalist Leo SAUVAGE, author of "The Oswald Affair". The moderator is Harrison SALISBURY of the New York Times.

SAUVAGE: I believe it has not been established by the Warren Commission not only that OSWALD was alone but that OSWALD was indeed involved in the whole assassination complex, so up to the moment when this has been clearly established beyond a reasonable doubt I have to believe according to the American rule of justice that a man is innocent until proved guilty. So for me OSWALD is innocent.

SALISBURY: I find in travelling around the world and I think most of us even in this country and in Canada have found that there is a feeling among many people and in Asia I found this to be true last summer that there was, in fact, a patterned conspiracy centering around the President's assassination of

ENCLOSURE

4222...

SALISBURY:
(Cont'd.)

large scope in which perhaps even Government agencies were involved and I wonder whether the Warren Commission addressed itself to that particular aspect of the situation - a possibility that the Government itself might have been involved in this.

LEIBELER:

I think there's two areas in which we want to look at this. There's the area of the physical evidence of what happened at the time of the assassination. For example, if there was any indication that there was more than one person firing at the time that would certainly be strong evidence of the conspiracy and, of course, the Commission checked that in great detail and concluded that there was only one person firing the shots and that they'd all been fired from behind and above. Then you go into the area of checking out his associations - what he did, where he went, the people that he knew - and you just track that down as closely as you can and develop all the information that the F.B.I. and the C.I.A. and the Secret Service and the Commission could develop. And we weren't able to find any relationship between OSWALD and anyone else that seemed to bear on the assassination in any way.

SALISBURY:

Now we come to the autopsy photographs and that's the question I think we ought to address ourselves to because those photographs were not, as I understand it, examined by the Warren Commission or by the investigators for the Commission. They were in the possession of the KENNEDY family and have now been put in the National Archives under very severe restrictions, and I think it's a reasonable question to ask why were they not examined by the Warren Commission?

LEIBELER:

I think that first of all Mr. SPECTOR who was the lawyer responsible for this area of the investigation and myself, among others, and I don't know if you were involved in this at the time or not but Allen and I talked about it at some length, recommended to the Commission that they take the pictures and that they look at them and the question of releasing them to the public or making them available is not involved. That's not our problem but it was clear to Mr. SPECTOR and to me and the other lawyers involved that the Commission should look at these pictures. We've always taken that position and I still think that that was right which they should have. Now the reason they didn't is because I think that the Chief Justice and some of the other Commissioners were concerned about the situation that might result if they did look at these

LEIBLER:
(Cont'd.)

pictures and put them in the Archives and then foreclose any independent examination of them because there is a matter of propriety or taste involved in here with these pictures. That was, at least, the excuse or the statement that the Chief Justice made. Now he looked at this problem - that was one side of it - the other side of it was that he had the Autopsy Report itself....

EPSTEIN:

What situation could have developed by putting them in the National Archives? There's all sorts of F.B.I. reports with very secret information in them - I mean you said, you know, you passed over it very lightly "a situation could have developed if the Commission had looked at these photographs"

LEIBLER:

You have a problem that you've got a photograph of a dead President on the autopsy table which if the were made available in the Archives for anybody to

EPSTEIN:

Well there wasn't - everything has to be made available in the Archives.....

LEIBLER:

Well because I think that the - I've listened to various explanations of this - the Commission felt that if it looked at any material and then did not make that fully available to the public.....

EPSTEIN:

But look at the F.B.I. reports with all sorts of secret information and put in the Archives.

LEIBELER:

But it's all been made available.

EPSTEIN:

No, not all the F.B.I. reports.

LEIBELER:

Oh yes.

SALISBURY:

No I think, as a matter of fact, some of it has not been made available.

EPSTEIN:

I'm not disagreeing but I don't see why they couldn't have conceived that they could look at information and not make it available.

SALISBURY:

I'm going to ask you another question. Why could they examine the X-Ray photographs which, it seem to me, are the key things here which I don't believe mean anything to a non-expert or mean anything even if they were published. They don't reveal anything particularly about the President in his appearance. Why couldn't there have been a distinction made between that material which is really what we're talking about and these photographs of the President lying on the autopsy table.

GRIFFIN:

I think, you know, I happen to agree with Mr.

LEIBELER that perhaps the decision on all of that should have been made differently and now we're faced with the situation to-day and that situation is that both the autopsy photographs and the X-rays have been placed in the Archives, I understand, the KENNEDY family and the doctors who testified

GRIFFIN:
(Cont'd.)

before the Commission and performed the autopsy, at least two of the three - one of them is in VietNam now - examined these photographs and X-Rays and reaffirmed that their testimony was accurate.

EPSTEIN:

You get a superficial examination. They reaffirm that these autopsy photographs were the authentic autopsy photographs I read and it's a press conference.....

LEIBLER:

And nothing that they saw in these photographs or X-Rays which would have changed their testimony or reflected that their testimony was anything but accurate.

EPSTEIN:

Well without referring to a press conference.....

LEIBLER:

All right, but the point is that we now have even a better situation here. The doctors have now seen them and they've reaffirmed that they are accurate. Now the issue is, it seems to me, the critical thing is, is there something in these photographs? Is there something in these X-Rays that would change the conclusion of the Commission.

EPSTEIN:

Or confirm.

LEIBLER:

Or confirm it. The doctors have said they have looked at it and it confirms the conclusion.

EPSTEIN:

Well not really. It confirms the accuracy of their testimony but the conclusion that the Commission never made....

LEIBLER:

Was based on their testimony.

EPSTEIN:

Is that both men were hit by the same bullet, both KENNEDY and CONNELLY were hit by the same bullet.

They simply said that they couldn't agree on this

LEIBLER:

Do you think OSWALD was the only assassin of President KENNEDY, that he fired the shots from the

sixth floor and do you have an opinion as to what

.....

EPSTEIN:

I do have an opinion but I'd like to wait and it might be a period of five years or so but I'd like to wait till some people.....

(all panelists speak at once at this point)

LEIBLER:

You've written a book, Mr. EPSTEIN, and it's been sold all over the world.

EPSTEIN:

C.K. I'll give you my opinion then Mr. LEIBLER and Mr. GRIFFIN. My opinion depends on the question whether there is evidence that the bullet passed through President KENNEDY's body, I mean evidence in the autopsy photographs. Now I'm willing to wait until Federal Investigators - it might be tomorrow, it might be in five years - give me a statement on these autopsy - not give me but give the public a statement on these autopsy photographs. And then I will have an opinion. If their statement is that the bullet passed through President KENNEDY then I think that one man alone, OSWALD, did the assassination.

LEIBLER:

Now which bullet? The one that hit him in the back

EPSTEIN:

That's right. That's the bullet. If by any chance

EPSTEIN:
(Cont'd.)

they show that the bullet didn't pass through then I would think that this isn't proof of an assassin but I would leave the question unresolved in my mind.

SALISBURY:

I'd like to know Mr. SAUVAGE's opinion on this.

SAUVAGE:

Well I certainly disagree with what Mr. EPSTEIN has just said. I even disagree with the words "circumstantial evidence" he used before because what I've heard, especially on this precise point of his rifle capability and his presence, I would call that not circumstantial evidence but pure guess work and I believe you cannot call a man an assassin on the basis of pure guess work. He may have done it, he might have done it, it is not impossible to have done it, it's not even circumstantial. It's far below circumstantial evidence and I don't believe that autopsy pictures are the key to everything. I don't make a State Case out of it. I believe it shows a contradiction in the methods of the Commission but it's not all and I believe there are quite a number of points which should be elucidated and explained in a satisfactory way to people who are not out of principle against a Warren Commission but to want simply to be convinced. Now I want to be convinced if you are able to do it.

SALISBURY:

May I ask one question more, Mr. SAUVAGE, on this particular point. If the autopsy photographs do show that indeed a bullet passed through the President entering below or just below his neck, or in his lower neck, and passing out through his throat - in other words, that there was this one bullet, it was not two wounds, and then we know about the other bullet hitting him in the head - would this, to your way of thinking, tend to support the theory of a single assassin or would it not be conclusive on that point?

SAUVAGE:

It wouldn't be conclusive because as members of the Warren Commission staff have said, the whole thing is connected. It's not just one question. It would give a satisfactory answer to one aspect of the case but there are twenty or twenty-five major aspects and the twenty-four or twenty-three others would still remain open, but it would be at least one step forward toward giving logical answers to logical people.

SALISBURY:

I would like to bring in the question of where the shots came from because this is an area in which there is disagreement with some of the findings of the Warren Commission. Did all the shots come from the School Depository building, was there one marksman, were there more than one? I'd like to know what the opinion of the critics are on this.

EPSTEIN: I think that the shots did come from behind the President and I think they did come from the Texas School Book Depository. The question was there one rifleman or two riflemen - and this to some degree hinges on what we were talking about before - if President KENNEDY and Governor CONNELLY were hit by the same bullet I think it proves, in fact, that all the bullets came from one rifle and this is very convoluted.

SALISBURY: In other words, one man and one gun and one assassin

EPSTEIN: Yes and I think that this is a question that the Commission left unresolved although I know a number of the members of the staff feel very strongly that both men were hit and they feel very strongly the evidence indicates this. But the Commission itself in its conclusions said it couldn't decide whether - and I'm not phrasing them exactly - it couldn't - decide.....

LEIBELER: It said "most probably".

EPSTEIN: No it didn't say "most probably". It said it couldn't reach a decision but there was very persuasive evidence but that's not most probable evidence.

SALISBURY: This reflected did it not a disagreement among the Commission members themselves?

GRIFFIN: That's my understanding, yes.

LEIBELER: Now it seems to me, on this question, we do have all the evidence available, that was available to the Commission.

EPSTEIN: Yes.

LEIBELER: And that in a democracy it's now incumbent upon each of us to decide whether the Commission should have stated it more strongly as some of the staff members feel that it should have been stated definitely. I happen to be one whom also prepared to state definitely that there was one shot.

EPSTEIN: Yes, well I'd like to see....

LEIBELER: But I'd rather - you see it bothers me to focus on the language that the Commission decided to use in its conclusions when we have the evidence here.

EPSTEIN: But the Commission is the people that were chosen to give us.....

LEIBELER: But we published....

EPSTEIN: You say we can reach another conclusion ourselves...

LEIBELER: But we published 26 volumes of materials and made it all available in the Archives so that in this democratic system that we operate every individual, including Mr. SAUVAGE, can come to your own conclusions.

EPSTEIN: But if we come to conclusions different than the Commission's conclusions it's not the Commission's conclusions we're discussing. It's our own conclusions (all speak at once at this point).

SALISBURY: Mr. SAUVAGE I'd like to have your opinion on the question of one marksman or more than one and where the shots came from. What did it look like to you at the scene down there?

SAUVAGE: I don't know where the shots come from. What I regret is that the Commission has not checked every possibility and that is for me the major question in all discussions. In every discussion I will always come back to the same point. Did the Commission check the other possibilities and the answer is "no".

LEIBELER: Which ones, Mr. SAUVAGE, do you have in mind?

SAUVAGE: Did you ever make an investigation of the grassy knoll?
LEIBELER: Of course.

SAUVAGE: Yes you talked to the witnesses. You have eliminated two thirds of the witnesses who thought it comes from there and have kept only the witnesses which.....

LEIBELER: All of those - every witness was reported.

SAUVAGE: Now I am quite sure that one of the bullets at least came from the Texas School Depository.

EPSTEIN: Well how could - if the autopsy shows that the bullet came from behind the President how could the shots come from the grassy knoll?

SAUVAGE: I don't know what the autopsy pictures show.

EPSTEIN: Not the autopsy pictures. I meant the results of the autopsy. I mean this is what bothers me about a number of people, you know, that quote witnesses saying the shots came from the grassy knoll. I mean I think that you know.....

SAUVAGE: The thing has not been explained at all. For instance I haven't been at the National Archives, I haven't seen the film....

EPSTEIN: You don't have to.

SAUVAGE: No, but someone saw it and someone made a report

SAUVAGE:
(Cont'd.)

describing it as the second bullet which hit the President that he fell backwards and according to some technicians who have interpreted the film they come to the conclusion that the bullet which blew up his brain came from here, from the side. Now I don't know. I don't want to enter technical discussions.

LEIBELER:

But Mr. SAUVAGE, if you're going to make a determination of what's going on here you're going to have to talk about it in technical terms.

SAUVAGE:

No I ask questions. I don't explain.

LEIBELER:

O.K., well let me try and answer the question.

SALISBURY:

But this is an obligation that we all have though.

LEIBELER:

Let me try to answer the question. What you're doing now is comparing a statement that's been made by some of the people who have looked at the film and it does seem like the President moved to the left and toward the rear when you look at the sequence of films involved here, and you are suggesting that that shows or suggests that somebody fired from the front and to the right, say from the grassy knoll which.....

(both men talk at once at this point)

SAUVAGE:

I suggest that the Commission....

LEIBELER:

Let me go on. Let me finish on that. You're going to have to compare that supposition, that hypothesis with the Autopsy Report. The Autopsy Report and the surgeon who examined the President after he was shot testified it was absolutely conclusive that all the shots that hit the President came from behind and above. Now

...

LEIBELER:
(Cont'd.)

there's just no question about that in terms of the physical examination and they can tell the way the bullets entered, the way the bones break and the way they exit. It's perfectly clear that they all came from behind and above.

SALISBURY:

Isn't that particularly true with this massive wound that there's a small entry in the back of the skull and you can just see how it sort of exploded.

LEIBELER:

Yes.

EPSTEIN:

Is it possible that the head was turned? Do we know that from photographs? I don't know this point.

LEIBELER:

Well there is an explanation of why the body moved that way, as a matter of fact, and Jacob COHEN has it forth in a recent article in "Frontier Magazine" and that was he suggested that the President started to turn slightly to the left before he was hit by the shot and the film shows this. And then the bullet hit him on a tangential line and since he had already started to turn this did tend to spin him to the left and could have thrown him backwards. Now the back brace also may have had something to do - that he was wearing at this time.

EPSTEIN:

Yeah, well I agree with you basically that the autopsy report is crucial and if the autopsy report is accurate then these other questions are just simply.....

LEIBELER:

Now I went over this just the other night. I went - I was in Dallas the night before last on my way home from Los Angeles and I took the time between planes to go there and I walked over this whole area again.

LEISELER:
(Cont'd.)

And one thing that impressed itself upon me when I was there, Mr. SAUVAGE, was that it just would have been absolutely impossible for anyone to have fired from the area of that grassy knoll without being seen.

SALISBURY:

Was OSWALD, in fact, a marksman at all? I know he had a medal from the Marines. Was he capable of firing these shots from the distance of the School Depository? What was the Commission's determination in that?

GRIFFIN:

The Commission had testimonies from people who had observed the type of shot that was involved in here and they conducted tests to see whether it was a difficult shot or an easy shot.

SALISBURY:

Nobody was able to duplicate these shots were they?

GRIFFIN:

Oh as a matter of fact they were. Sure they were.

EPSTEIN:

Under certain conditions but the interesting thing here is the Commission had different type witnesses. They had some witnesses that had attempted to duplicate it - his actual feat of firing three shots in 5.6 seconds. Other witnesses testified in general about a Marine Marksman, how good he was. They also had F.B.I. witnesses and what happened is that in July, while they were writing the Report, they called two witnesses from, I think, the Marine Corps, Major HASAN (phon) and I don't remember the name of the second witness. And they asked them a hypothetical question of whether it would be a difficult or easy shot. And they left out the time factor of 5.6 seconds in other words a distance factor, and of course it was a relatively easy shot to shoot someone from 70 yards.

LEIBELER: It's a very easy shot.

EPSTEIN: Right, if you leave out the time factor.

LEIBELER: We'll but you've interjected a time factor that is no necessarily related to reality in any way haven't you Mr. EPSTEIN? It's 5.6 seconds to fire three shots.

EPSTEIN: I did, I did, but this is the assumption they were working under at the time - the Commission thought that - they stated....

LEIBELER: That's the....

EPSTEIN: It's stated in the Report.

LEIBELER: That's the outside possibility. That's the most extreme case, that it was three shots in 5.6 seconds

EPSTEIN: But they had to consider the most extreme case.

LEIBELER: That's right, that's right.

EPSTEIN: In other words if the Commission couldn't agree that both men were hit by the same bullet, then 5.6 seconds is the maximum amount of time that OSWALD had to fire the three shots. They had to consider that.

SALISBURY: Why is it fixed at 5.6?

EPSTEIN: Well they fixed it by determining the earliest point that OSWALD could have fired the first shot and the latest point that OSWALD could have fired the third shot, counting the frames of film an amateur photographer had taken....

SALISBURY: Isn't there an alternative theory that someone has advanced that there could have been a first shot early in the sequence of frames that the Commission established?

LEIBELER: If the Report discusses that....

EPSTEIN: Only if one bullet misses.

LEIBELER: Yes but that requires, as Mr. EPSTEIN suggests, that one bullet missed which it seems that it did in order that the single bullet passed through the President's neck and hit Governor CORNELLY which it seems likely that it happened.

EPSTEIN: In other words if one bullet missed you can have much more time, and that's why....

SAUVAGE: Not much more.

EPSTEIN: Yes you can.

SAUVAGE: Who can at three more?

EPSTEIN: You could have 5.6 seconds.

LEIBELER: 5.6 seconds to operate the bullet once.

EPSTEIN: Or even more than that.

LEIBELER: Just 5.6 seconds to operate the bullet just once bec you're computing from the time the first shot hit.

EPSTEIN: There is no time problem.

LEIBELER: The bullet's already been operated at that point.

EPSTEIN: There really is no time problem if both men are hit by one bullet because the first shot could have miss and that means that.....

SALISBURY: What about OSWALD's actual ability with a gun. Was the Commission ever able to determine whether he'd d any practicing with this particular gun?

GRIFFIN: It seemed that he had done some after he'd got the rifle. There was no indication that would have been in July.

EPSTEIN: Practicing? Live practicing with rifles?

GRIFFIN: Yes, yes. Marina testified that he went out.

EPSTEIN: Do you rely on Marina's testimony on this?

GRIFFIN: Not unless it's corroborated by something else.

SAUVAGE: By whom was it corroborated?

GRIFFIN: In this case there was no independent corroboration but you can take it for what it's worth.

LEIBELER: It's evidence that she testified that he did practice actually firing it and she also testified that he worked the bolt constantly.....

EPSTEIN: Did she testify that she saw him practice or that he went out?

LEIBELER: No, she....

EPSTEIN: She never testified he practiced. She testified he went out with the rifle.

LEIBELER: Went out with the rifle to practice.

SALISBURY: When was it that he was supposed to have had that practice?

LEIBELER: That would have been the Summer of '63....

SALISBURY: When they were in New Orleans.

LEIBELER: No it would have been before they went to New Orleans in the Spring of '63 before they went to New Orleans. It was in Dallas.

SALISBURY: BUT HE TOOK THE GUN WITH HIM TO NEW ORLEANS?

LEIBELER: YES HE DID.

SALISBURY: WHAT ABOUT THE PISTOL? WAS THERE ANY EVIDENCE HE'D EVER PRACTICED WITH THAT?

LEIBELER: NOT THAT I KNOW OF, NO. NO, I THINK THE WHOLE QUESTION OF HIS RIFLE CAPABILITY, AND THIS IS A POSITION THAT I'VE MAINTAINED THROUGHOUT HERE, THAT YOU'VE GOT THE OTHER EVIDENCE THAT INDICATES THAT THE BULLET CAME FROM THIS RIFLE. IT'S PERFECTLY CLEAR, THE TWO LA...

LEIBELER:
(CONT'D.)

FRAGMENTS IN THE CAR AND THE BULLET THAT WAS FOUND GOVERNOR CONNELLY'S STRUCTURE IN THE HOSPITAL. SO THAT IT'S PERFECTLY CLEAR THAT THE TWO SHOTS WERE FROM THIS RIFLE. SOMEBODY FIRED THIS RIFLE IN SUCH MANNER AS TO INFLICT THESE WOUNDS.

EPSTEIN:

YES.

LEIBELER:

IT'S PERFECTLY CLEAR THAT THESE PEOPLE WERE STRUCK BULLETS FROM THIS RIFLE.

EPSTEIN:

YES.

LEIBELER:

AND IT'S ALSO QUITE CLEAR - THERE'S VERY STRONG EVIDENCE AND CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE THE COMMISSION THOUGHT THAT OSWALD WAS THE PERSON WHO FIRED THEM. NOW I'M PERFECTLY WILLING TO THINK.....

SAUVAGE:

DO YOU THINK IT'S NATIONAL? (OR NATURAL) (PHON)

LEIBELER:

WELL THAT'S YOUR VIEW MR. SAUVAGE. LET'S GET OFF OF THAT IN A MINUTE. I THINK THAT THE BASIC PROPOSITION HERE IS SIMPLY THAT IT'S PERFECTLY CLEAR THAT OSWALD HAD THE PROFICIENCY TO FIRE THIS RIFLE AS ACCURATELY AS HE DID BECAUSE ALL THE INDICATIONS ARE THAT THAT EXACTLY WHAT HE DID.

EPSTEIN:

IN OTHER WORDS WHAT HAPPENED PROVES THAT HE HAD THE ABILITY.

LEIBELER:

YES THAT'S RIGHT.

EPSTEIN:

I THINK THAT THAT'S A FAIR POINT OF VIEW, THAT IF YOU COULD PROVE THAT SOMEONE'S ABLE TO DO SOMETHING THEN HE MUST HAVE HAD THE ABILITY.

SAUVAGE:

MR. LEIBELER, ARE YOU AWARE THAT YOU DIDN'T ANSWER THE QUESTION BEFORE?

LEIBELER:

WHICH ONE WAS THAT?

SAUVAGE:

OF OSWALD'S RIFLE ABILITY - BECAUSE YOU FORGET ABOUT THE QUESTION AND THEN YOU SAY THE BULLETS WERE FIRED BY THAT RIFLE, AND YOU SAY IT WAS ESTABLISHED THAT WAS OSWALD WHO DID THE SHOOTING.

LEIBELER:

YES.

SAUVAGE:

WELL BOTH THINGS ARE COMPLETELY GRATUITOUS (PH) AND THEY'RE NOT ONES THAT GOT AFFIRMATIONS (PH) BECAUSE I HAVE NOT A SHADOW, NOT A SHRED OF PROOF FOR THAT.

LEIBELER:

FOR WHAT?

SAUVAGE:

THAT OSWALD DID THE SHOOTING. YOU HAVE MR. BRENNAN. NOTHING ELSE.

LEIBELER:

NO WE DON'T EVEN HAVE MR. BRENNAN, MR. SAUVAGE. YOU NOT GOING TO PIN ME DOWN...

EPSTEIN:

WELL I THINK IT'S AN INTERESTING POINT THAT HE'S MAY BE HERE AND THAT IS THAT IF YOU WERE CORRECT AND YOU COULD PROVE THAT OSWALD FIRED THE SHOTS YOU COULD PROVE THAT OSWALD HAD THE ABILITY AND I AGREE WITH YOU THAT TWO OF THE SHOTS CAME FROM OSWALD'S RIFLE. NOW THE POINT THAT MR. SAUVAGE IS RAISING IS THAT HOW DO YOU KNOW THAT OSWALD FIRED THE RIFLE?

LEIBELER:

WELL WE GO BACK THROUGH ALL THE EVIDENCE INVOLVED HERE THAT OSWALD CARRIED - IT WAS HIS RIFLE, IT WAS FOUND THERE AND IT WAS HIS RIFLE THAT FIRED THESE SHOTS.

EPSTEIN:

YES.

LEIBELER: HE CARRIED THE RIFLE IN THAT MORNING OR HE CARRIED BAG IN THAT WAS LARGE ENOUGH TO CONTAIN THE RIFLE. CARRIED IT UP TO THE DOOR OF THE BUILDING. THE RIFLE WAS THEN FOUND ON THE 6TH FLOOR. SOMEBODY SAW SOME SHOOTING A RIFLE OUT OF THE 6TH FLOOR OF THE BUILDING

SALISBURY: THE BAG WAS FOUND...

EPSTEIN: CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.

LEIBELER: THE BAG WAS FOUND RIGHT THERE AND IT HAD OSWALD'S P ON IT. THAT'S RIGHT, IT'S ALL CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE. THERE'S NO QUESTION ABOUT IT. YOU CAN MAKE THE ARGUMENT THAT OSWALD CARRIED HIS RIFLE IN THERE UP TO THE 6TH FLOOR AND THEN SOMEBODY ELSE FIRED IT.

SALISBURY: THIS LEADS US TO A VERY IMPORTANT POINT AND MAYBE THE CRUCIAL POINT OF THIS WHOLE DISCUSSION, IS THIS. SHOULD THERE BE A RE-EXAMINATION OF THE WARREN FINDINGS AND SO BY WHAT MEANS? WOULD THIS RESOLVE ANYTHING? WOULD THIS BE A USEFUL EXERCISE? YOU GENTLEMEN WERE ASSOCIATED WITH THE WARREN COMMISSION.

GRIFFIN: OF COURSE, MR. SALISBURY, I THINK THAT WE'VE BEEN UNDERGOING A RE-EXAMINATION IN ONE FORM OR ANOTHER THROUGH THE PRESS AND T.V. MEDIA FOR SOME TIME NOW. I THINK THIS IS HEALTHY. I THINK THAT WE COULD HAVE A BETTER EXAMINATION AND IF WE ALL HAD THE TIME AND WERE PREPARED IN ADVANCE ON WHAT WE WERE GOING TO DISCUSS AND I DON'T MEAN TO SUGGEST THAT WE HAVEN'T - YOU HAVE CONDUCTED THE PROGRAMME VERY WELL - BUT WHAT I HAVE IN MIND, PERHAPS, IS THE ALLOWANCE OF TWO OR THREE DAYS AT A UNIVERSITY SITE WHERE WE WOULD ALL HAVE THE ISSUES LAID OUT TO US IN ADVANCE - WE COULD HAVE A CHANCE

GRIFFIN: ASSEMBLE OUR INFORMATION. PERHAPS REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMISSION STAFF COULD APPEAR WITH GENTLEMEN OF CALIBRE THAT WE'VE GOT HERE TO DISCUSS THIS BEFORE WE EVER WANTED TO COME AND I'D THINK THAT PEOPLE...

EPSTEIN: YOU MEAN SET AGENDA OF QUESTIONS?

GRIFFIN: YES AND I WOULD THINK THAT PEOPLE OF MR. SALISBURY'S STANDING AND PEOPLE IN THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY, PROFESSORS AND WHAT NOT WHO ARE INTERESTED IN THIS, SHOULD BE INVITED TO COME AND TAKE THE TIME TO HEAR BOTH SIDES PRESENTED. I THINK THAT MIGHT BE USEFUL.

SALISBURY: WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THAT MR. LEIBELER?

LEIBELER: I THINK THAT'S A GOOD IDEA AND I THINK THAT THE REASON WHY SOMETHING LIKE THAT MIGHT EVENTUALLY HAVE TO BE DONE IS BECAUSE I THINK WE'VE GOTTEN OUT OF FOCUS WITH REGARD TO THE RECORD HERE. I THINK THAT THERE ARE MANY THINGS THAT ARE IN THE 26 VOLUMES THAT UNDERLIE THE COMMISSION REPORT... THAT ARE NOT MENTIONED IN THE REPORT BECAUSE IT WASN'T PERFECTLY CLEAR THAT ALL THESE QUESTIONS WERE GOING TO BE RAISED IN THIS WAY. I'VE GOT A SEMINAR GOING NOW, AS YOU KNOW, OUT AT U.C.L.A. IN WHICH I'VE GOT ABOUT 20 STUDENTS WHO ARE GOING THROUGH A LIST OF QUESTIONS THAT I'VE GIVEN THEM AND TRYING TO DIG THIS MATERIAL OUT OF THE RECORD AND THEY'RE PREPARING PAPERS, AND IF WE HAD THIS KIND OF A CONFERENCE SOME TIME NEXT SPRING, FOR EXAMPLE, THESE PAPERS COULD BE AVAILABLE, THE WORK THAT THE SEMINAR STUDENTS HAVE DONE. MR. GRIFFIN COULD PREPARE A PAPER OR A PRESENTATION ON CERTAIN ASPECTS. MR. EPSTEIN COULD RAISE POINTS. WE COULD ALL RAISE THIS QUESTION AND

LEIBELER;
(CONT'D.)

IF THERE IS EVIDENCE THAT'S IN THE RECORD THAT'S NOT REFLECTED IN THE REPORT THAT CAN CLARIFY THE QUESTIONS THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED, THEN WE'LL SEE WHAT IT IS AND THEN WE CAN MAKE A DECISION AS TO WHETHER WE NEED AN ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION OR NOT. I DON'T THINK WE CAN MAKE THAT DETERMINATION NOW UNTIL WE REALLY KNOW WHAT'S IN THE RECORD BECAUSE, WHAT DO YOU DO, YOU HAVE TO LOOK AT WHAT'S IN THE RECORD NOW BEFORE YOU CAN DECIDE WHERE YOU'RE GOING TO GO FROM THERE.

SALISBURY:

WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THAT MR. SAUVAGE?

SAUVAGE:

I BELIEVE THAT DISCUSSION IS A VERY GOOD IDEA, I AGREE WITH THAT, BUT I BELIEVE THAT THE WARREN COMMISSION DOESN'T EXIST ANY MORE - BUT NORMALLY THE WARREN COMMISSION HAS OBLIGATION TO PUBLISH AN ADDENDUM TO WARREN REPORT WHERE THEY TAKE UP HONESTLY EVERY QUESTION ASKED. AND WHEN I SAY EVERY QUESTION ASKED I DON'T MEAN JUST A SUGGESTION MADE BY MR. THOMAS BUCHANAN WHICH WAS UNANSWERED MOSTLY IN THE ANNEX ABOUT SPECULATIONS AND THE RUMOURS, BUT TAKING REALLY THE QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE BOOKS AND SO ON, AND ANSWER THEM HONESTLY POINT BY POINT. MAYBE IT'S GOOD ARGUMENTS. MAYBE THEY HAVE ARGUMENTS WHICH WE DON'T KNOW. BUT THEY HAVE A DUTY TO STAY ON THEIR RECORD WHICH IS FULL OF HOLES, IN MY OPINION, BUT TO EXPLAIN, TO ANSWER EVERY QUESTION BY SAYING 'HERE IS WHAT WE HAVE TO SAY'. 'HERE IS WHY WE SAY THAT WHICH HAS BEEN ARGUED ABOUT'. 'HERE IS WHY WE DID THIS' AND 'HERE IS WHY WE CAME TO THIS CONCLUSION'. THEY HAVE THE DUTY TO PUBLISH AN ANNEX.

SALISBURY:

WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT IT? (TO MR. EPSTEIN)

....

EPSTEIN:

WELL I AGREE WITH WHAT EVERYONE HAS SAID HERE. I THINK THAT MR. GRIFFIN'S SUGGESTION OF A DISCUSSION AN ACADEMIC SURROUNDING WITH PRESENTING PAPERS WOULD A GREAT DEAL TO AT LEAST FINDING OUT WHAT THE REAL ARE.

SALISBURY:

WOULD THIS, DO YOU THINK, SATISFY THE GENERAL PUBLIC JUST LOOK AT THIS ONE PARTICULAR ISSUE AND NOW LOOK IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE QUESTIONS ARE BROADER THAN I MUST SAY THAT I, MYSELF, HAVE A FEELING THAT WITH REGARD TO THE UNIVERSITY DISCUSSION, THE ACADEMIC DISCUSSION, I THINK THAT WOULD BE A WONDERFUL THING THAT ULTIMATELY WE MAY HAVE TO HAVE A GOVERNMENT BOARD OF SOME KIND TO MAKE A NEW FINDING. I, MYSELF, THINK IT WOULD BE THE SAME FINDING THAT THE WARREN COMMISSION CAME UP WITH BUT IT SEEMS TO ME THESE QUESTIONS WILL NOT REST, THAT THEY KEEP COMING UP AGAIN AND AGAIN.

LEIBELER:

WELL I THINK THAT BEFORE WE KNOW WHETHER THE QUESTIONS ARE GOING TO REST OR NOT, MR. SALISBURY, WE HAVE TO WHAT THERE IS IN THE RECORD ON THESE QUESTIONS AND I THINK THAT COULD VERY LARGELY BE BROUGHT OUT IN THE CONTEXT OF A CONVOCATION OR A MEETING SUCH AS MR. GRIFFIN HAS SUGGESTED, AND MY SEMINAR....

EPSTEIN:

I FEEL THAT WHAT MR. SALISBURY IS SUGGESTING IS AN OFFICIAL ACTION OF THE GOVERNMENT RATHER THAN UNOFFICIAL. THE UNOFFICIAL WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL AND I ENDORSE IT WHOLEHEARTEDLY BUT I DO THINK THAT SOME OFFICIAL ACTION OF THE GOVERNMENT IS NECESSARY BECAUSE THE GOVERNMENT HAS PUT ITS REPUTATION ON THE LINE WITH THE WARREN REPORT AND I THINK IT'S UP TO THEM....

GRIFFIN: LET ME SAY WHY I THINK SOMETHING LIKE THAT IS PREMATURE BECAUSE....

EPSTEIN: IT MIGHT BE PREMATURE, I'M NOT TALKING....

GRIFFIN: AT THIS POINT MR. LEIBELER AND I AND ALL OF OUR COLLEAGUES ON THE COMMISSION FEEL STRONGLY THAT THE CRITICISMS THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED ARE NOT JUSTIFIABLE CRITICISMS.

EPSTEIN: BUT ARE THEY BELIEVED?

GRIFFIN: NOW, THIS IS WHY I THINK THAT THE FIRST STEP IS TO PUT THIS IN THE HANDS OF AN INDEPENDENT GROUP SUCH AS THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY. NOW IF WE'RE STILL FACED WITH THAT QUESTION, YOU KNOW, AFTER WE'VE HAD THIS CPPCR THEN I THINK WE MIGHT HAVE TO TAKE OTHER.....

SALISBURY: GENTLEMEN, I THINK THAT'S A VERY GOOD POINT ON WHICH WE CAN END THIS DISCUSSION. I THINK THAT THERE'S NO QUESTION IN ALL OF OUR MINDS THAT THERE MUST BE MORE WORK, MORE HARD WORK, MORE EXAMINATION OF THESE QUESTIONS THAT REMAIN IN THE PUBLIC MIND EVEN THOUGH THE ANSWERS MAY EXIST IN THE 26 VOLUMES OF THE WARREN COMMISSION REPORT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

ANNOUNCER: ABOUT SEVEN O'CLOCK THIS MORNING I WENT BY THE ARLINGTON CEMETERY GRAVE OF JOHN F. KENNEDY AND IN A SUNNY, CRISP, MORNING AIR THERE WERE SCORES OF PEOPLE WAITING TO PAY THEIR RESPECTS AND NOBODY TO WHOM I THIS MORNING WAS REALLY SATISFIED WITH THE WARREN COMMISSION REPORT.