

Moderator I'd like to open the questioning in this segment of our program this evening with Professor Liebeler. Are you satisfied, Professor Liebeler, as an attorney who was associated with the Warren Commission, that the Warren Commission has presented the last word on the subject of the assassination of President Kennedy?

Liebeler I have no doubt that the basic conclusions of the Report are valid and supported by substantial evidence. As far as "the last word" is concerned, refinements can always be made in the analysis. And it seems to me apparent that the Commission anticipated this by releasing the 26 volumes of evidence, of testimony and exhibits, that they did. Since that time there's been a tremendous amount of interest in certain circles concerning the Report, and people have spent a lot of time comparing the Report with the underlying evidence. Undoubtedly some of them have had ideas that weren't in the Report and they have contributed to an understanding of the events of the time.

Moderator You are saying in a sense that the release of this full data--or at least the data that you describe as full--was done purposely in order that the Commission would present to the public facts on which the public could then examine and perhaps ask that at a future time the inquiry could be reopened?

Liebeler If that were justified on the basis of the evidence, I am sure there could be a request that the inquiry be reopened. I don't see any necessity for that. I think the idea was that the Commission didn't want its Report taken on faith, so to speak, but it wanted to present the evidence on which it relied so that the American people, to the extent that they are interested in it, could review the evidence and make their own judgments in the matters involved.

Moderator Did the members of the Commission and its staff unanimously agree on the accuracy of the material included in the Commission's Report?

Liebeler The Commission unanimously--they all signed the Report, there was unanimous agreement on the Report. There are always disagreements on the staff level as to what goes into something, a matter of language and that sort of thing. The final decision as to what went into the Report obviously was the Commission's and not the staff's; and that was a matter that eventually was resolved by the Commission on the basis of the work that had been done by the staff.

Moderator Isn't it true, though, Mr. Liebeler, that you disagreed, or at least protested the inclusion in a certain way of much of the material that appeared in the Report of the Commission?

Liebeler Well, during the time when some of the material was in draft form --or even in page proofs, in galley proofs--there was of course considerable discussion as to the way the thing ought to be phrased, as to the kind of language that ought to go in and to some extent as to the kind of evidence on which reliance ought to be placed. The desire on my part was to structure the Report in such a way so that it conformed as much as possible with the evidence in the underlying material. And I suppose that on the staff level not everyone agrees with ^{everything} that someone else on the staff might say or do. But as I say, once again, the final report was that of the Commission itself --they are the ones that decided what should be included.

Epstein When you say that there might be future refinements made in the Report, do you mean that some evidence might be missing that could be added later--some evidence that the Commission did not see, or witnesses that the Commission didn't see--or are you talking about simply adding analyses?

Liebeler Basically a question of analysis that might be made from evidence at hand. I think that there is enough material in the 26 volumes--certainly it is a lot of material--and I think--

Epstein But there is some evidence missing, isn't there?

Liebeler For example?

Epstein For example, the most basic evidence--the autopsy photographs. I don't believe the Commission or the staff ever saw them, and this is perhaps the center of controversy over the Report--not among the staff or the Commission, but among the critics at least.

Liebeler Yes, the critics have made the point that it would have been better perhaps if the autopsy photographs, or some of them, had been printed in the exhibits, or at least observed by the Commission.

Epstein I know this wasn't a court of law, I'm not a lawyer, and you are a law professor--but in a legal case, wouldn't this have been basic evidence? I don't know; I'm asking.

Liebeler I think they would probably invoke the best-evidence-rule. The best evidence of the location of the back wound in the President, for example,

would have been a picture of the President's back showing where the wound was. Now for reasons—as Mr. Rankin has indicated—for reasons basically of taste, it did not seem appropriate to the Commission to release those pictures of the President or even—

Epstein Well, they didn't have to release them—they could have seen them, even secretly, couldn't they? I don't know how reasons of taste enter into that matter. Maybe they did?

Liebeler I don't think they did see them secretly, and I think the reason that they didn't look at them was because of the fact that the doctors, the pathologists who conducted the autopsy, were present and testified, and they did use schematic drawings, and they did have the measurements as to where the wounds were. There wasn't any question in anyone's mind as to where that wound was.

Moderator I'd just like to put this in context for the audience, who may not be familiar with the importance of this particular piece of information. According to your book, Mr. Epstein, and others, and according to the reports at the very beginning, it seemed essential that the Commission determine how many bullets actually were fired at the parties riding in the car, and what damage they did; and in order to construct what according to my interpretation of your book was the basic objective of the Commission, and that was to determine the guilt of Mr. Oswald, and the circumstances of the assassination.

Epstein Yes; well, the autopsy was, I thought, crucial to the entire case of the single assassin, because if the autopsy report printed in the Warren Report was accurate then there isn't very much question of a second assassin, because it shows that all the bullets came from behind the President's car; and all the other questions, of witnesses thinking the shots came from the front, would become irrelevant, if the autopsy report was accurate. Would you agree that the autopsy report does have this vital importance?

Liebeler Yes; yes.

Epstein And a contradiction in the autopsy report, at least to the public and perhaps even to the legal profession, would invalidate the report and open up the question, or at least some reasonable doubt about a second assassin, if the autopsy report turned out to have a contradiction in it...And that's why these photographs seem to have some relevance, as far as I'm concerned.

Moderator Apparently there is a contradiction from what is reported in Mr. Epstein's book, and that is that the FBI indicated report stated that the bullets entered in a certain place and exited in a certain place, or did not exit, and the report in the Warren Report finally was different. I wonder if you could tell us, Mr. Liebeler, about this discrepancy, either why it is there or why it was not corrected with additional information.

Liebeler Well, the only thing that might be called a discrepancy, I think, is the fact that--the Secret Service agents and the FBI agents that observed the autopsy were there will the autopsy was actually being performed on the body of the President--they observed at that time the fact that the doctors were not able precisely to trace the path of the bullet through the President's body. The basic reason why they were not able to do this is because they did not know at that time that there had been a wound in the throat. They were not able to observe this because the throat wound had been obliterated by the fact that Dr. Perry in Dallas had performed a tracheotomy on the President's throat when he arrived in Parkland Hospital. So there was no direct evidence at that time of the existence of a throat wound.

Epstein This is an explanation of how of how a contradiction could be made but what I mean about a contradiction--I don't mean a discrepancy--is that if the FBI Summary Report to the President is accurate, then the autopsy report must be inaccurate--I mean, if A is true, then non-A cannot be true, I mean, it is a direct contradiction, in the Summary Reports. Now, you are giving the explanation of why this contradiction took place. It is a contradiction, I think, that is unresolved.

Liebeler The contradiction being that the FBI Report indicated that the bullet did not pass through the President's body, that it only came in to let's say a finger length, and it couldn't be probed beyond that. That was actually set forth in the FBI Summary Report--in the Supplement also--there's no question about that.

Epstein Which is two months after the autopsy.

Liebeler That's right.

Epstein Now, the explanation you gave was that during the autopsy the doctors were confused as to the path of the bullet and the next day they learned that there had been an exit wound in the throat...

Liebeler Well, that there had been a wound in the throat.

Epstein ...from the doctors in Dallas, and then they deductively concluded this. But in the Warren Report it seems to indicate that on the night of the autopsy the doctors reached that conclusion, and the telephone call to

Dr. Perry, and they used the word, simply confirmed their conclusions. Isn't this sort of a discrepancy in the Warren Report itself and what you are saying?

Liebeler Well, the testimony of Dr. Humes indicates clearly what happened during the autopsy, and he indicated that he was not aware of the existence of the throat wound until he called Dr. Perry. Now obviously this was done subsequently to the time that the FBI and Secret Service agents left; so they were not aware at that time that the doctors subsequently were able to trace the path of the bullet through the body. Now, you say that after learning of the throat wound, the doctors deductively--

Epstein I mean, they didn't have the body before them--

Liebeler That's right, they didn't have the body at that time, but they had--now whether they had the pictures of this before them or not, it seems to me that Dr. Humes mainly was testifying from his recollection of what he saw. But it wasn't as simple as just deducing the path of the bullet through the body because there was evidence of a bruise at the top of the lung cavity--

Epstein Which could have been caused by a fragment, I think, or even by the operation itself.

Liebeler Well, it couldn't have been caused by the operation, and there is another fact in that connection--the nature of the bruises around the throat--around the wound in the throat--were of a different nature than the other surgical incisions that had been made in the President's body. There were bruises that appeared there that did not appear in other places where surgical incisions other than the tracheotomy had been performed, and this showed that there must have been a wound there at a time when there was still circulation in the President's body, to permit this kind of a bruise to occur.

Epstein What you are saying basically is that the day after the autopsy the doctors changed their conclusion or they came to a new conclusion, isn't this right? when they learned of new information?

Liebeler In the sense that they were not able to trace the bullet through the body at first, not knowing of the throat wound, and then when they learned of it, yes, that's so.

Epstein Why doesn't the Warren Report say this? Why does the Warren Report, as distinguished from the testimony--the Report being the summary that the public read--why does the Report say that they reached their conclusions during the autopsy and it was later confirmed to them by a telephone call to Dallas?

Liebeler I am not aware of that precise language in the Report--if it says that, it's--

Epstein I think the exact quote is that during the autopsy the doctors rejected a theory that the bullet had penetrated only a short distance--I am not sure of the exact words.

Liebeler I don't know, I'm not familiar with that particular language; but I think it's clear that--from the testimony of the surgeons themselves --that that isn't the way it happened.

Epstein I think this is the point that really concerns me--it's not so much that the contradiction can't be resolved, but the fact that the Warren Commission left this contradiction between the FBI report--I mean, perhaps it can be explained, perhaps there is a simple explanation--but the Commission left the contradiction between three FBI reports and the autopsy doctors' testimony and the autopsy report without ever asking the FBI their reasons for this contradiction and why they gave different evidence on the autopsy. Why was this? Why couldn't someone have asked the FBI...?

Liebeler I don't know; I suppose someone could have asked the FBI. It seems to me, though, that it's not an accurate statement to say that the Commission left this contradiction there, because the Commission resolved this contradiction by concluding on the basis of the evidence they had, and on the basis of the autopsy surgeons' testimony that the bullet did in fact pass through the body.

Epstein There were at least three witnesses to the autopsy who testified that the bullet was below the shoulder. Now, everything you've said about finding a path through the body would not change the fact that two FBI agents and a Secret Service agent said that the wound was below the shoulder. No matter what further information they received about a bullet wound in the throat, that would not allow them to move the bullet wound from below the shoulders up into the lower neck. In other words, this is the real contradiction--the location of the wound--can further information change the location of the wound, do you think?

Liebeler No; I don't think there is any question about the location of the wound. Now, you've indicated that the agents that were there said that the wound was below the shoulder.

Epstein I'm talking about the Sibert-O'Neill report which was not published by the Commission, which recently came to light in the Archives.

Liebeler That's right, it was released in the Archives. I think that there was never any question about the location of the wound. When you say that the FBI agents said that the wound was below the shoulders, I frankly am at a loss to know where that would place the wound.

Moderator Gentlemen, I just want to ask this question: I've seen pictures in your book, Mr. Epstein, of the President's shirt, showing a bullet hole sufficiently below the shoulder line to make it seem difficult to determine how it could conceivably emerge from the neck, if it were coming from an angle above. Mr. Liebeler--

Liebeler Let me sort of fill in here on the detail; I think maybe we are discussing this on a level that might not be readily followed. The significance of the path of the bullet through the body hasn't really been made clear in the course of our discussion yet. Mr. Epstein points out in his book that based on an ~~analysis~~ analysis of the motion picture film of the motorcade that was taken by an amateur photographer it was determined that the President was hit at a particular point in the progression of the frames, and Governor Connally was hit at a point so close to the time that the President was hit that they could not have been hit by two separate bullets fired from Oswald's gun because Oswald simply couldn't have fired the rifle that rapidly--that fast. So it is essential to the conclusion that there was only one assassin, firing from the rear, that the bullet passed through the President's body and then also struck the Governor. Now the wound that was concluded to be an exit wound, in the throat, was located lower than the wound in the back, and the bullet went through at a slight downward angle and came through the President's throat and hit Governor Connally, who was right in front of him.

Now, Mr. Epstein, partly on the statements of the FBI and Secret Service agents that have said the wound was below the shoulders, or about 6 inches below the collar line, and partly on some of the schematic drawings on the face of the autopsy sheet, and even more specifically on the location of the holes in the President's clothes, suggests that it couldn't have happened that way. In fact, he says in his book, page 55, that this--being the Commission's conclusion of how this happened--could only have happened under either of the following two conditions: (1) the entire shirt, collar included, was raised six inches, or (2), a portion of the shirt was raised over the collar line, and thus doubled over. And of course he rejects that because there was only one

hole in the shirt, so that the shirt could not have been doubled over. Now, the fact of the matter is that on the face sheet of the autopsy which shows the wound, on which Mr. Epstein has relied to a considerable extent, also indicates that the bullet wound in the President's back or the base of the neck was 14 centimeters below the right mastoid process, which is the bony protruberance right behind here...that is equivalent to about 5.6 inches...and it is also 14 centimeters or 5.6 inches in from the right shoulder joint.

Now, Mr. Epstein has suggested that the hole couldn't have been 14 cm. down unless the shirt was raised 6 inches, collar included. And I'd like to hear your thoughts on that now, your thinking--have you clarified your thinking on that since you wrote the book?

Epstein Well, what I've clarified my thinking about is that I don't think it is as much as 6 inches. We did some measurements, and it appears that it was less--perhaps closer to 4 or 5 inches, or perhaps less than that. But the point I made was that there is a series of evidence such as the shirt, the hole in the shirt, which seems to be below the shoulder--even though this is an imprecise point--the point at which it can be seen seems to be at about the shoulder blade; there is an autopsy sketch which shows the hole in almost exactly the same place as the shirt hole; there is the testimony of two FBI agents and a Secret Service agent giving the hole in the same location--either 6 inches below the collar line, or below the shoulder--whatever that means--and one of the autopsy doctors is quoted as referring to the wound as a shoulder wound.

This is a coincidence of the evidence. Now, perhaps each point could be explained by mitigating circumstances, such as the shirt rose, or that the autopsy doctor made a mistake in marking the sketch, this is all possible. But the point I was making was--welll get into the shirt in a moment--and this I don't think I've made very clear, is that at least 3 people and I think 4, including one Secret Service agent, 2 FBI men, and I think the chief autopsy doctor, has given some indication that the wound was below the shoulder, or at least at a point substantially below the neck wound.

Now, what I want to know is, why didn't the Commission call these two FBI agents who had said that the wound was below the shoulder and ask them--I mean, they could have pointed out on a diagram where the wound was--or why didn't they call the Secret Service agent, Clint Hill--or ask Dr. Humes?

Liebeler We referred to the best-evidence-rule a moment ago, in connection with the autopsy pictures. Maybe we can establish a new rule known as the second-best-evidence-rule, which still, I suggest, establishes evidence that is better than the testimony of the FBI and Secret Service agents, which probably

is fourth-best-evidence. You see, the best evidence as to the location of the wound is the measurements that were made by the autopsy surgeon at the time of the autopsy--and that was 14 cm. or 5.6" below the bony point behind the ear.

Epstein But when there is a conflict between the second-best-evidence --I agree with you that the second-best-evidence is exactly as you say, 5.6" below the mastoid process--but--

Liebeler I want to point out this too, and that is that that evidence --and we refer to the shirt--that evidence is entirely consistent with the location of the hole in the shirt.

Epstein . It's not entirely consistent with it--it might be made consistent with it, but it is not consistent.

Liebeler Well, it certainly is so that you don't have to raise the shirt, collar included, any six inches or anything like it. I had measured on a shirt last night 14 cm. or 5.6" down, and that's, that comes out where the top black mark is on the shirt.

Epstein That was on you, was it?

Liebeler That's right, that was on me. Now, there may be differences between me and President Kennedy in terms of our muscle structure and the size of the neck, that's quite possible.

Epstein Was it a direct line measurement or was it a sort of curved measurement, following the contours--

Liebeler No, it was a measurement that used a soft tape, that came down and followed the contour of the body--it was a steel tape measure, solid to some extent but not entirely; and it was brought straight down and then extrapolated across so that it was 14 cm. in; and with the shirt on and pulled as tightly down on the bottom as it could be, the mark came where the top black mark is on that shirt. Now, that's three and a half inches below the collar-line. So even if you assume that the shirt was pulled tight, all we are talking about here--since the actual hole in the President's shirt was 5 and 3/8th inches down--

Epstein 5 and 7/8th.

Liebeler Well, 5 and 3/8ths, 5 and 7/8ths, so it was 5 and 7/8ths, that's fine, I'll give you that half-inch; but the difference we are talking about here is about 2 inches and not 6 inches.

Epstein We've done the same experiment--in fact this experiment was conducted quite a bit at Cornell, where it was known as the "creeping-shirt-experiment," and we tried to see how far the shirt could rise up when the

arm was raised. Of course, I don't have a great deal of experience in dealing with shirts and shirt holes, but we found that the difference was closer to six inches. But I see that from your measurements that I must have been mistaken, if your measurements are accurate.

Liebeler Well, to go on with the shirt: the second hole on the shirt that we were looking at a moment ago, there was a second hole below that, and that mark indicates the measurement once again of 14 cm. below the right mastoid process...the lower hole...that's 14 cm. from my right mastoid process...

Epstein You mean the lower one or the higher one?

Liebeler The lower one. Because this shirt comes up the two inches...

Epstein OH, I see, I understand.

Liebeler As soon as you raise your hand to the eye level the shirt comes up and when you measure again the 14 cm. and place a mark on the shirt, it comes again to the position of the lower hole. The lower hole in that shirt is a little over 5 and 1/2 inches below the collar line, which is almost exactly where the hole was in the President's shirt. So all of this conversation about the autopsy report being inconsistent with the holes in the President's clothing, it seems to me, is greatly exaggerated. Because the holes come out exactly where you expect them to.

Moderator I would just like to intervene here because I think we could spend a great deal more time on this point and albeit it is an important point but I think the question raised here, Mr. Liebeler, is the following, and that is, that had the Commission perhaps spent more time and more careful construction perhaps it could have explained this to the satisfaction of those who now review the Report more critically. Would you agree?

Liebeler Well, I don't know what more time you could have spent on this--you might have brought these FBI agents in and asked them why they said the wound was below the shoulder--

Epstein Or looked at the autopsy photographs--

Liebeler But the Commission concluded on the basis of the autopsy testimony--

Epstein Which is the second-best-evidence, and there was a conflict between the second-best and the third-best testimony.

Liebeler Well, if you give even third-best-testimony to the testimony of the Secret Service; I frankly can't place the wound with any degree of precision when it is just said to be below the shoulders. This is to some extent below the shoulders or the top of the shoulder line, but it is at the base of the neck--which is where the Report says it is--and which is higher than the exit wound in the throat.

Moderator Mr. Liebeler, if it was so crucial that the establishment of evidence here indicates that there was this one shot that could have penetrated both individuals rather than having two separate shots which was physically impossible, why was it that the Commission did not go the step further necessary to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that they had the evidence to prove this?

Liebeler I can only--Mr. Rankin has explained this as being a matter of taste. Apparently the Commission didn't feel that under these circumstances and in view of the evidence that it already had on this question that it was necessary to go on and look at these pictures.

Epstein Did the lawyer in charge of this area want to look at these pictures?

Liebeler Yes, there was a feeling that the pictures ought to be observed because a lawyer would, I suppose, instinctively, desire to observe the best-evidence-rule.

Moderator This would be the procedure in a courtroom, in a normal case.

Epstein Is there any reason today, aside from reasons of taste, why a panel, or even the Warren Commission itself, could not look at these photographs and give an exact judgment--even for the sake of history if not for the sake of ending all the rumors--exactly where the hole in the back was. I mean, is there any reason you can think of?

Liebeler Well, the Commission itself probably can't do it because it no longer exists, it was dissolved, or it dissolved itself, after the completion of the report. Perhaps to the extent--I would say, yes, to the extent that a legitimate doubt has been raised about this, one might think that it could be resolved by the production of the pictures. I think it would show clearly that the hole is 14 cm. below the right mastoid process.

Moderator You are stating that it would prove something but you don't have the evidence on which to base it.

Epstein You are basing it on the fact that you think the FBI agents were wrong and the FBI Summary reports were wrong.

Liebeler Well, more aptly, I would say that the Report is right. I am not here to make judgments about the FBI.

Epstein But you can't be absolutely certain until these photographs are observed by someone, whom you rely on.

Liebeler Well, I think that the testimony of the autopsy surgeons themselves--whose evidence essentially rises above the best evidence, after all, they were there, they observed the body itself, they performed the autopsy--

Epstein But on the sketch they made they placed the wound at a point much lower than the wound, 5.6" below the mastoid process, didn't they?

Liebeler Well, that's hard to say, because when you get into a one-dimensional drawing it's very hard to say. In your book you've got this picture from the autopsy, which at first glance does seem to place the wound a bit lower than 5.6 inches below the mastoid process, and this Commission exhibit, the schematic drawing--

Moderator I want to ask Mr. Epstein if he seriously doubts in his own mind that the wound is 14 cm. below the right mastoid process?

Epstein Well, the point is that this question is in the realm of ascertainable fact... Photographs show exactly where the hole is. Now for me to say that I doubt whether the hole is here, or there, is simply to speculate--I simply don't know where--whether the FBI reports are right, or the autopsy doctors are right, or whether the autopsy doctors changed their testimony. In fact, you say they changed it the next day. I don't see that the autopsy doctors, seeing that they say they did change their testimony, I don't see how they can be the best-reliable-evidence compared to the photographs.

Liebeler Well, now, your argument is that no amount of changing of whether the bullet came out in the front or stayed in the back can change the location of the wound--now, you are not suggesting for a moment that the autopsy surgeons at any time changed their notations as to the location of the wound--the only thing that they changed--

Epstein If the FBI report is right, they did change notations on that too.

Liebeler That doesn't prove that they changed notations.

Epstein If the FBI agents were accurate in saying the wound was below the shoulder, I don't think you'll find a neck wound below the shoulder.

Liebeler That problem is easily resolved by placing a point on the body 14 cm. below the right mastoid process. Now if an FBI agent wants to say that's below the shoulders, I suppose it is his prerogative.

Epstein In other words, you say it is a vague area, sort of a borderline area?

Moderator Mr. Liebeler, I'd like to conclude with this question, I think this is a critical question--Have you been under any pressure, from the very beginning of your association with the Warren Commission, to restrict the release of any

information, is there any privileged information that you or other of the assistant counsel or Members of the Commission have that they are not releasing to the public, that you have been requested not to release?

Liebeler No; no. We had luncheon toward the end of our work with the Commission when the Chief Justice spoke to us and indicated that he thought this was a question that should be left to the judgment of each lawyer involved and more or less something on the order of reaching a judicial decision. But there was never any request not to say anything or not to release information or anything of the kind. In fact, the fact that I'm on this television, and the fact that Mr. Epstein's book has been somewhat facetiously referred to by some of my colleagues as my book, because it was based on some of my files and on our conversations, indicates that there is nothing like that.

Moderator I'd like to ask you one more--Do you believe that there is reason that there should be at least a ~~renewed look~~ renewed look, in order to still ~~some of the so-called rumors~~ some of the so-called rumors that authors like Mr. Epstein and others have presented to the public and that many of the ~~critics~~ critics and others have apparently accepted as discrepancies? Do you think that something should be done to still these rumors or to give more evidence?

Liebeler Well, I was very frank about this: when I first read Mr. Epstein's book, and then spoke to him here in New York after I got back from California, this spring, I was interested in the questions that he raised. This was not my primary responsibility in writing the Report or in conducting the investigation.

Since that time I've gone through and this, and this--and Mr. Goodwin, who wrote a review of Mr. Epstein's book, indicated that he was disturbed and troubled about some of the things that Mr. Epstein had raised--Now, since then, I've gone and in some detail ~~gone~~ through the questions that Mr. Epstein has raised, and I'm absolutely satisfied in my own mind at this point that he has not raised any ~~substantial questions~~ substantial questions here, and that the material that is set forth in the Report and in the underlying testimony is quite clear as to the question of the bullet and the location of the wound.

Now, out of regard for Mr. Epstein, I might say, and if it would put his mind at rest, I'm not sure it will because he still hasn't told us whether he doubts that the wound is 14 cm. below the mastoid process or not, but if it would satisfy him, I personally--of course my personal view on the question of whether the pictures should be released, that's irrelevant really--but if it would still rumors and questions about the Report, I think they should be released. But as I

say, I myself have no doubt whatsoever about what is in the Report.

Epstein I'd like to answer your question: you have clarified a number of these things, these questions, for me; and you have shown there is a probability that the questions I've raised, about the location of the wounds, would conform to the doctors' point of 14 cm. below the mastoid process. But--

Moderator Gentlemen, I want to thank you very much, because we have covered this in great detail, and I simply want to say here that we seem to see some movement on both sides of this question, but undoubtedly it will not be stilled for a very long time to come.

- - -