

EXCERPTS

Dr. Cyril Wecht, Jack Matonnis, and Dr. S. K. Feinberg: Long John WNBC Radio 11/2/66

Long John There are photographs, but they thought that these photographs should not be shown to members of the Commission...it might jar them, or something like that...and yet these men were supposed to determine for the nation and I guess for the world whether there was one or two men and whether Oswald was the killer...And yet I think I heard tonight if I'm not mistaken...I was only listening with half an ear at the time ...that the Kennedy family or someone contributed to the Archives some of the photographs of the autopsy...Do you know anything about it?

Wecht Yes; I have some familiarity with this. I have been interested in this matter for several months now, dating back to a talk that I gave--actually, a panel discussion that I participated in--at the American Academy of Forensic Sciences Annual Meeting this year in Chicago, dealing with a critique of the Warren Report. I spoke from the standpoint of forensic pathologists and the others were a forensic psychiatrist, a criminologist, an attorney, and a questioned documents experts. Now, at that time and in a paper I subsequently published in the Journal of Forensic Sciences, I pointed to the deficiencies...I must say in fairness to the pathologists that in this one particular phase it might be unfair to criticize them with regard to the fact that the pictures were not given to the Warren Commission. It is my understanding, and this is one of the big things that I criticized, that because they were military pathologists, they were under the control--under the thumb--of the government, and it was possible for a superior authority to say to them, here, you give us those films, and they are not going to be shown...

Long John (Suggests that the photographs could have been seized by the government from any pathologists who performed the autopsy.)

Wecht One big difference would be this--I at least would be able, and I would be sure to make the point later on, yes, indeed, these films were taken by me, and they were given to Mr. So-and-So of the Secret Service or the FBI, and what they did with them I don't know, and those pictures are important and they should be produced at this time so we can better explain this to the Warren Commission, to the public, and indeed to the world. This is the thing, you see, that the military pathologist was unable to do...He has remained silent as to where they were and yet we know for a fact that they were taken...and it is indeed an amazing coincidence that a couple of hours earlier this evening, before this show, in which we are discussing the Warren Report, that the announcement should have come forth, about the Kennedy family releasing some of the pictures to the National Archives with rather stringent requirements, as I understand it. They still haven't been released in a classical or complete sense--they've been released with a good many strings attached...They can't be viewed for one generation...

Long John This has always puzzled me about the case...There are some papers in the Archives...that cannot be opened for 75 years...We did a program last week with a gentleman by the name of Penn Jones, Jr...from Midlothian...a suburb of Dallas, Texas, and he wrote an article in Ramparts telling us about the number of people who are no longer alive...a string of additional murders...bizarre deaths...a rather shocking story...He comments on 10 people that are no longer alive, that had something to do with the assassination--I don't mean with committing the atrocity but that they had witnessed it, and had been interrogated by some group...Mr. Matonnis, you are associated with the Pittsburgh...the associate course director at the Pittsburgh Institute of Legal Medicine?

Matonis That's right, John. Dr. Wecht is the Director of the Institute, and I work with him on symposia, on matters that would be of interest to physicians and lawyers, such as the one we are having in Philadelphia on November 11th and 12th.

Dr. Wecht (Describes the Institute, its membership, activities, etc.)

(Station Break)

Feinberg ...About the pathological findings in the Kennedy assassination, the autopsy findings--First, I am not terribly well informed about this, so if I alter some of the facts, please correct me. It's inconceivable to me that the pathologists who did the autopsy did not testify before the Warren Commission. They must have revealed their findings.

Wecht They revealed their findings but there are a couple of things that had been deleted. For instance, in the autopsy report...there is no mention of the adrenal glands, either grossly or microscopically...they also omitted the pictures, as you say.

Feinberg That was the point I wanted to touch on. To a body, as learned as they may be, of lay people, would showing the pictures or other technical data to these lay people, who may be very intelligent...very well informed..would it serve any purpose to show the pictures, or x-rays? I could see a real purpose in bringing in other pathologists to review their findings, and I'm hoping that you'll say that other pathologists were called in to review their findings, because, as you very well know, but a lot of other people may not know, your specialty, like most medicine, is based on science, but there is a great deal of room for interpretation. So that it would be very helpful and useful for other pathologists to review. But the point--and this is in the papers and on the news tonight, so I'd like to stress it--the point that the pictures from the autopsy are not being revealed, even to a limited number of people, doesn't strike me as suspicious or an attempt to hide things; I think it might be all in the name of good taste, and I think that an instance like this revolves down to a question of trust and confidence. If you don't have trust and confidence in the whole area, in the whole investigating body, in the whole government--then you want to know minute details, you want to form your own judgment...But I for a long time have a thing against the era of minute details, particularly about our leading national figures...(discusses press bulletins during the Eisenhower illnesses)...I think you get the point I'm trying to make.

Long John I get the point. I think you're out of your mind...I don't know how you can come out with a statement like that, Sy.

Feinberg Well, I brought this out because of the apparent secrecy of revealing the pictures...

Long John Now wait a moment--I have never indicated that I think they should be on the cover of Life Magazine.

Wecht You just stole my line, John...Now the answer to the question so far as I am concerned is this--There is no reason to make available films, diagrams, charts, or anything else, or even do this in language which is lurid, something which is unnecessary, something which is designed to inflame and to arouse sympathies and passions...But you see, the significance in this case is that we still don't know today how many bullets were fired, from which direction were they fired, were they from up downward, or from down upward? Where were the points of entrance? Where were the points of exit? We don't know these things with certainty and in fact the more one reads, and the more one delves into the whole business, the more inconsistencies, the more contradictions, and the more lies come to light. Now, therefore, it was absolutely essential that before the Warren Commission, which was charged with the responsibility of arriving at valid conclusions, that all available evidence be produced before them. It was essential that they have it. Now, that would not have been made public in terms of, as John facetiously said, being

published on the cover of Life Magazine...There is the very real problem of trying to find the answers; and there is a second problem, I feel, in this case. The moment --in any medical-legal case--the moment that you hide something, the moment that you ignore something, the moment that you don't produce something...then that is the moment in a medical-legal autopsy that you leave yourself open for charges of having covered up, for charges of having missed things. This is the second reason--not as important as the first one of trying to find the exact and true answer--but nevertheless an important reason also. And for this reason I think it was a big faux-pas. It is amazing, isn't it, that at this moment, following the publication of books, and numerous articles, and comments--by reputable people--that the Kennedy family --the Kennedy family, it seems like when you spoke of the ruling families of England or something like that--the Kennedy family, I don't know what that means exactly...it is late in coming. Very late in coming. These pictures should be produced and should be reevaluated--and you're darn right, they should be evaluated by other pathologists--which, incidentally, in answer to the second part of your question, never took place before. No other forensic pathologist, or hospital pathologist, was ever involved in this case, was ever asked to evaluate, was ever asked to review, was ever asked to give an opinion. Just the three military pathologists, hand-picked by the government, were involved, none of whom had any training or experience in traumatic pathology--No, one did, one did. Lt. Col. Pierre Finck, who was an Army man, is a forensic pathologist, and he was involved, and it's a good thing that he was, one can only conjecture what would have happened if he were not there.

Feinberg May I go back to one of my points and try to suggest a reason or reasons why they would do this, and why they would do it in good faith. First of all, you did answer the question--no outside pathologist was used, and that suggests to me the reason. In the statement I made a little while ago, and you agreed, that much pathology, and particularly in this field of trauma and ballistics, is subject to interpretation. And if you brought in others, you would probably get some agreement, some disagreement. And if you brought in more, in other words, what you agreed with would apply here--if you brought in 10 of the world's leading forensic pathologists you might get some variance in all 10 reports; and the difference of one to another might be even as high as 50 or 70 percent of variation...

Long John Well what is your point?

Feinberg My point is that there would be as many interpretations which would serve no purpose, there would be constant wrangling...everybody would find the answer he wanted to hear...

Wecht There is much in all of medicine that is art and not science; but forensic pathology probably has more science than do other areas of medicine because there is much more that can be reduced to physical determinations--measurements...

Long John I think that our internist friend will agree that there couldn't be too much debate on the place of entry of the bullet...I imagine any man who has had any experience...would know where the bullet entered and where it came out...

Wecht This can be confused...In this particular case, it even was confused...I've had four cases this last week in Pittsburgh alone in which the police officers, experienced homicide detectives, had it completely backwards, entrance where exit was and exit where entrance was; and to many physicians, including surgeons...there will be a typical entrance wound...but I think that an experienced forensic pathologist would seldom make an error in the determination of an entrance or exit wound...Microscopic examination of tissues would confirm it. And the other thing is that an experienced forensic pathologist has enough sense to know that when he can't make the determination grossly--that is, with the naked eye--he keeps his mouth shut until he has examined things microscopically, until he has received reports back from ancillary personnel--be they toxicologists, be they criminologists, be they ballistics

experts, and so on--and then they can determine. This is another fault in the Kennedy case, because the surgeons, they tripped over themselves into the press conference, after the President died, they hadn't even examined the body, after he died, they hadn't spent 30 seconds to look, they had picked up only 2 wounds when indeed there were 4 as we know...and they put their foot right into it, because the question was asked of them, was the wound one of exit or entrance? Could it be entrance? And the one guy said, yes, it could be, and since that day there are so many people who still insist today that it was entrance, and, I can't say for sure--it might have been entrance...the fact is, we'll never know, because they went through that wound to make a tracheostomy incision, and the autopsy surgeons, the pathologists--to get back to this point of inexperience...--never even called up the surgeons in Dallas to ask them about the tracheostomy, whether they had gone through a pre-existing wound, and it wasn't until after the autopsy was completed, and they couldn't find a point of exit for a bullet wound that they found in the back did they think to call Dallas, Texas, and talk to one of the surgeons, and at that time they were told that there had been a bullet wound in the neck...In the meantime ...The FBI and the Secret Service were present at the autopsy, and they picked up the comments that were made--I daresay off the record--by the pathologists, and it was upon these comments that the FBI subsequently ran home, prepared a report, which was issued months later...in which they talked about these wounds.

Now, they may or not be right. I don't know. I'm not saying they were incorrect. But what I'm saying is that there was premature discussion on the part of the surgeons in Dallas, premature discussion on the part of the pathologists, premature discussion on the part of the FBI--who had no right to comment on the autopsy findings, did they? I mean, they had a right to be there, because it was still an unsolved murder, and a homicide detective always has a right to be present at the autopsy--but they had no right to go and write a scientific report based upon what they thought they saw.

Feinberg Dr. Wecht, I have never been subjected to it but I am sure there must have been enormous pressure on these people, I'm sure that they said things that they regretted later, as you indicate, but does this all add up to mean--unfortunately, and this is the unfortunate part to me--these areas of disagreement that this has given rise to, of almost nationally being interpreted as concealing all kinds of plots and, I don't know, machinations...

Long John I think that we wind up with a report that really doesn't tell us a lot and leaves a lot to be desired, so the next best thing for people to do is try to read something into it, in order to make it a complete report, at least for themselves, and a lot of them try to sell the idea to somebody else...Do you really think that the Warren Commission Report is a good one?

Feinberg Gee, I don't think that I'm competent to answer...I mean, I haven't read it...I have too much other things to read...but you see, it comes down to what I said a little earlier--do you have trust and confidence in an august body such as this...

Wecht Oh, that's too simple! No, really, the question is phrased too simply. The trust that we indeed had, most of us, at the time, I assure you, has been completely dispelled for any serious students of the Warren Report, because it is so filled with glaring inconsistencies and, as I said, contradictions and lies, that one can't help but be completely shaken. I'm not telling you that there is a particular conspiracy--I don't necessarily believe that...I believe this--there are as many facts known to us today, based upon the same witnesses' accounts that presented testimony to the Warren Commission, and upon other witnesses, who were talked to preliminarily, and who were not talked to by the Warren Commission, because their testimony did not fit into the puzzle that the Warren Commission was working on, the answer to which they had already arrived at before they even started, that would permit one to arrive at a quite different answer than the one that was arrived at. I assure you, it would not take any kind of great legal or scientific mind to show you that Lee Harvey Oswald

(1) was not the assassin, (2) may have been only one of two or more people involved, believe me--for instance, we talked about these bullet wounds. Don't you see how important it is, for instance, the whole Warren Commission report, and the premise that Lee Harvey Oswald was the sole assassin, is predicated on one thing, namely, the single-bullet theory--that the first bullet that went through President Kennedy came through the top of his shoulder, exited through the front of his neck, continued on through Governor Connally's chest, through his right wrist, exiting from his right wrist, and reentering his left thigh, because, and the films taken by Abraham Zapruder, a merchant in Dallas, have been checked, and there is no question about it, that if it was not the same bullet, it was absolutely--absolutely impossible for one man to have fired two shots in the period of 1.3 seconds. It has been shown that it takes--without aiming--2.3 seconds to use this rifle and fire it twice. It is a bolt-action rifle, 2.3 seconds. There is 1.3 seconds between the time that Kennedy was hit and...the time that Connally was hit, or at least, that he responded. Now you see that if it was not the same bullet, then two men had to be firing. So do you see the significance of forensic pathology observations.

Feinberg Are you convinced of these facts and therefore the conclusions...?

Wecht Oh, it's not a matter of being convinced, I assure you that what I've just said has been agreed upon by everybody, Warren Commission, everyone. That is why Arlen Specter agreed...that bullet had to be fired by two rifles.

Long John He has itemized for you a list of facts and from this he asks you to make some sort of decision.

Feinberg My immediate reaction is that the 1.3 seconds may be based on error.

Wecht No, no, no--not because I say so because it can be scientifically shown, taken in frames, and it is shown how long it is between each frame...

(Discussion of minimum time to
operate the bolt on the rifle)

Wecht This is pure science; this is not metaphysics...and did you know that the initial autopsy sketch showed the bullet to be significantly lower in the back than ~~longer than~~ the sketch...finally presented to and adopted by the Warren Commission... plus the fact that the bullet holes in President Kennedy's coat and shirt are approximately 5 and 3/4th inches below the shoulder level--the top of the shoulder--which would then mean, in order for it to have exited from the front of the neck at the knot in the tie, would have meant that the bullet was coming in from down upward--hardly a likely angle for a bullet fired from the 6th floor of the Depository.

Feinberg I'm really sorry that we got into this (LAUGHTER) these technical details.

Wecht It may be technical, but it gets to the heart of the case.

Feinberg Of course, that's the point. I'm sorry that we're actually trying the case, in a sense

Wecht It's unfortunate the Warren Commission didn't try it.

Feinberg Of course, I don't deny, from the little knowledge that I have, from what I've read, that many errors were made in the analysis of what happened...but you have got to look at it in the broad general sense...You have got to look at the positive evidence, too, don't ignore it...There was enough evidence, in my humble opinion, to have hung this man...

Long John ...Supposing there was another man, in another position with a gun, and Oswald and the other man were partners in this crime, and we don't know anything about him--we are not even looking for him, because there was no one else involved. Aren't we in a very bad position?

Feinberg My answer to that is that from the mishandling of the thing from the very beginning there is no possible way of unraveling what...

Wecht Yes there is, oh, yes, there is, yes, there is. There are many things that could be done if the proper government...if all the facilities and agencies of the government would participate, and if independent organizations such as the American Academy of Forensic Sciences were permitted to participate. Did it ever occur to you, Dr. Feinberg, that there is as much evidence to show that Lee Harvey Oswald was a set-up, was a patsy, may not have been involved at all, that it may have been a frame-up? There is a lot of evidence to show that, believe me.

Feinberg Now we are going off the deep end...in my opinion we are.

Long John But Dr. Feinberg, you admitted that your opinion is based on knowledge that is extremely limited.

Feinberg Right; very right. Okay. (LAUGHTER)

(Station break)

Matonis ...The Warren Commission...many people confuse with a jury, when actually it was not. It was more like a fact-finding panel. It was a non-adversary proceeding. There was no opportunity for cross-examination. And I feel that a lot more would have been released, and there would be a lot more education, not only where the Warren Commission was concerned, but also as far as the public, if they had something more of an adversary nature...I would say, even to have Mark Lane there to cross-examine some of the witnesses and some of the experts. I think that someone appointed, maybe, even by the government, to act as a public defender, to take the other side, could have, as an adversary, brought forth a lot of information such as we are discussing now, that came up later in the form of questions. So, first of all, I think that, well, these gory details, as you put it, in and of themselves certainly laymen should not see and certainly cannot analyze--but these details, if used to prove a point...backed up by experts such as pathologists, who may have disagreed with the pathologists in this case, would have revealed a lot more information than was revealed in this particular case.

Feinberg ...I want to make it very clear that I am in favor, highly and heartily, of an informed public. I don't want anything I've said to be misinterpreted about that....

(Discussion of writing on
medical subjects by lay
writers.)

Wecht There were approximately 16 or more doctors involved in the treatment of President Kennedy, if one can call it treatment--he was actually dead, I am sure--those gentlemen really did not know whether the wound in the neck was exit or entrance. And that of course is a key wound. When the pathologists had the body for the autopsy that wound was already destroyed by the tracheostomy incision. As far as using hypnosis on the pathologists, you don't need hypnosis--All you need is the opportunity to ask them questions and for them to have the opportunity

to answer without fear and without direction or ~~such~~ orders from a superior authority. ...Did you know this, John, that the pathologist destroyed the notes that they made at the time the autopsy was performed, they are not available. They of course are the ones that would have to be considered as most valid and it's really terrible--and I made this point very particularly earlier this evening--because earlier they stated that the bullet in the back was approximately 16 inches (~~six~~) below the level of the collar and in the final autopsy report it is moved up several inches so that entrance would be consistent at a downward angle with exit from the front...So who knows what's true? You asked before, Dr. Feinberg, about having faith and trust. It's not a matter of saying I don't trust Mr. Boggs, or Mr. Ford, or Mr. McCloy--it's just a matter of looking at the record and asking how can you accept the Report when it is so filled with glaring inconsistencies?

Feinberg ...You say the notes were destroyed. Was that after he dictated a protocol of the autopsy?

Wecht Apparently it was. There is a protocol...which was published in the 26 volumes of the Warren Commission report...

Feinberg Would it be unusual for somebody who dictates a more complete and well-worded and thought-out autopsy report from notes that he has taken, having now derived it from these notes, to discard the notes, is that unusual?

Wecht No; not at all unusual. It is only unusual when there is concrete evidence to show that what you had set forth in your original notes is quite different from that which you now set forth in your final notes.

Feinberg Were there people who had access to those notes?

Wecht Well, the FBI and the Secret Service were there and they made notes based upon what the pathologists told them, and the pathologists also made statements at the time too. Yes, there is concrete evidence that they changed it. That is why they should not have been destroyed...

Feinberg I still have faith.

Long John Faith in WHAT?

Feinberg Faith that no significant things are being covered up which would add...

Long John Well, let's say that they are insignificant. If they are insignificant, why shouldn't we know about them?

Feinberg Well, nothing that's provable, that's the point...Pro and con, there will constantly be pro and con, and the more you mull over it, the more...

Long John But there should be no pro and con...first of all, there is a man that's been accused of being the assassin of the President of the United States. He is not here to defend himself. The defense that he had during the time of the Warren Commission left a lot to be desired, because a fair percentage of the time the attorneys...very brilliant attorneys...were not there during the testimony...I think that we should be made aware, as citizens of the United States, whether or not Lee Harvey Oswald definitely was the person, or the only person; or whether he was involved with other people in this; or whether he actually had anything to do with the shooting at all. I don't know. He may have been the guy who carried the gun over. I really don't know. In other words, there is an awful lot that really

has not been answered, and no matter how much criticism be directed toward the Commission, I hear little or nothing being said about it. There is...Epstein...Lane...Weisberg...Sauvage...and I possibly missed one or two names, that have written books, very critical books. I am not saying these books are based on facts...I am not competent to determine this...but I must say that no one seems to want to answer these books...there is really no evidence, as far as I am concerned, that tells us that all four of these fellows are wrong in all instances as far as their criticism of the Warren Report...and I don't quite understand why the Chief Justice seems to be reluctant to even comment on any of these books...

Feinberg I hesitate to speak for the Chief Justice but I would think that he probably doesn't think there is anything to be gained...I am quite impressed with Dr. Wecht and with his experience and his intellectual honesty and I have the impression at this point...that here is scientific curiosity about this, because this is right in the middle of his...specialty, he is an expert...but my interpretation is that he is a little bit on the sidelines like I am when I read in the papers about the Presidents' illnesses, and I play a little game...I try to guess what is wrong...reading between the lines...I don't think that all of the things have been made available to you...

Long John That's what he's complaining about.

Feinberg Kind of puts you on the outside and now we may argue about whether they should have or not...

Wecht I don't feel they should be made available to me personally, and I don't feel that everything should be bared, necessarily, to any group of forensic pathologists, or other commissions, or other people. But, one cannot investigate a murder, and, look, let's face it, it may have been the President of the U.S., and he was a fine man and someone whom I think we all respected, whether we agreed with him completely politically or not, at all times, and we are all deeply regretful of this tragedy, but it was a homicide too, and a man has been tried posthumously, there is no question about it—you can call the Warren Commission anything you want to—they tried Lee Harvey Oswald. They set about with the mission to comfort the country, to see to it that everybody was pacified, that security and calm were restored, and in order to do this they had to arrive at the conclusion that one man was involved—Lee Harvey Oswald. The point I make is that the more you delve into this—and I am not talking about wild conjecture, I am not talking about kooks and nuts from either extreme, on the right or the left of the political spectrum—I am talking about the facts contained within the records themselves—the more you come to the conclusion that you can go to the quite opposite conclusions of the Warren Report...Let me say, incidentally, I'm reminded of it--You said before that you wrote things years ago that you have changed your mind about today—I must tell you this: I gave this talk at the American Academy of Forensic Sciences in February, and the paper was published a few months later, pursuant to that talk, in which I mentioned many of the points that I am mentioning now, but I arrived at the conclusion that despite these omissions and contradictions, I nevertheless agreed with the conclusions of the Warren Commission.

I must tell you today, just a few months later, I cannot say that. I wish I had not written that concluding paragraph of my talk. I am not able to say comfortably that I can agree with the Warren Commission Report.

(Discussion of whether the Warren Commission investigation was or was not tantamount to a trial.)

Wecht Dr. Feinberg, let me mention to you that many of the lawyers on the Commission withdrew, although they didn't submit formal resignations, withdrew in the sense that they didn't do anything, because they were so disgusted with the way things were going. They wanted to be able to interrogate some of the witnesses, and point out some things, and draw them out, and they were not allowed to do this. Do you know...much that was determined about...Oswald...about his whole personality structure...and to develop a motive, and so on...was based upon what Marina Oswald said...Well, do you know, there is no greater LIAR among all the witnesses that appeared before the Warren Commission than Marina Oswald! She was caught in so many inconsistencies! And do you know, it was only at the insistence of Senator Richard Russell that she was brought back again to testify --Chief Justice Warren was very much against it; he had babied her; he treated her, as someone put it, like one might treat a granddaughter--When she came back a second time, I understand that he was absent--the only time that he was absent... and they just caught her in so many lies that it was unbelievable.

Long John No, you can't say they were lies--they were "discrepancies."

Wecht Okay; they were discrepancies.

Long John Have you ever heard the real wild rumor...you know, it's ridiculous... that a very influential politician may have been the reason for it?

Feinberg Oh, yes, I've heard this, I hear it again and again, and it seems to me I hear it more often lately!

(Station break)

Long John ...Do you think that we should continue to investigate, to find out if there were more people involved in the assassination?

Feinberg John, I am going to make a firm statement about that: I think that we should continue to investigate, avidly and continuously, but not in the public press, not in articles and magazines...

Long John Where would you want this to be done, Dr. Feinberg...?

Feinberg ...government agencies such as the FBI...CIA, which is not enjoying a great reputation of late...but I think, properly constituted government authorities, and I'll tell you again--I think that such bodies or similar ones are engaged in this, without any publicity being attached to it, I think they probably are, and they will continue for a long, long time, gathering, and attempting to reach firm conclusions, and so on...I have no knowledge on which to base this, (just) confidence and trust.

Long John ...isn't there something disturbing about the fact that autopsy photographs can be released...by another person...another person makes the decision about what we should do, and how much we should do, and I'm talking about the Kennedy family.

Feinberg I don't think the Kennedy family really controls this evidence in its availability within federal circles. I think that their decision was only that they were approached, people came to them...and said, may we have these for the records now, do we have your permission to release them...release them to the archives...I don't think the Kennedy family had them...I think they went to them and asked their permission...

Long John Why???

Feinberg Well, I'll tell you why...There is some right--

Long John Are you talking legally now or are you just giving us--

Feinberg No; moral--

Long John Really?? To withhold evidence...?

Feinberg No! I don't think they ever attempted to withhold this evidence, not the Kennedy family!...Now that there is no further use for it...

Long John There's a lot of use for it! We could have another Warren Report--the Son of the Warren Report. (LAUGHTER)

Wecht Do you think that in any given murder the family of the deceased should have the right to decide what information relative to the autopsy should be released?

Feinberg No...

Wecht We are not talking about photographs in Mrs. Kennedy's album...we are talking about photographs taken by pathologists at the time of the autopsy pursuant to an order in the investigation of a murder. Now, the photographs and x-rays, and we must repeat this, are not merely things of academic interest but get to the heart of the case, and could possibly clear up the entire controversy, or significant parts of it, as to the direction and angle and number of bullets fired--this is vital evidence!

Feinberg I know this...please, we are getting away from the point...I don't know how public the archives are and how much people have access...We are arguing about different points. You're arguing about why aren't they released for further analysis, and...

Long John Not today--three years ago.

Wecht I understand that it is the Kennedy family that is now releasing the pictures...Now, it makes no difference whether it was in their physical possession or whether it was in a vault somewhere, it means to me that they have the power...

(Discussion of effect on Oswald's children
of his being branded the assassin.)

Wecht I'm not looking for more publicity on the case--I'm not looking for pictures, I see enough brain tissue and gunshot wounds of the head, and so on--I'm not saying, release it to the public for digestion: I'm saying, give it to investigative authorities. I am saying that there should be a reopening of this thing. Governmental authorities should certainly be involved, but not to the exclusion of outside scientific experts in the various fields...You know, there are so many other things about this whole business...I could list a dozen or more statements made by different people...to various authorities which were ignored and which were not brought into testimony before the Warren Commission, because it didn't fit in, and in other instances where it was given, it was just changed or ignored, to suit the Commission's analytical process.

(Discussion of Earlene Roberts'
report of a police car honking its
horn while Oswald was in the rooming
house.)

Wecht Do you know that there is definite testimony from people to show that J. D. Tippit was shot at a time when it would have been physically impossible for Oswald to be at the scene of the shooting?

Feinberg As a specialist in legal medicine...you know that discrepancy is par for the course.

Wecht This discrepancy was not resolved...that's the point, it was totally ignored...You know...let me give an instance...They said that Oswald had gone to his room on Thursday night, you know, in Irving, Texas, and that he never went on Thursdays...that was the only time...But there was testimony from a clerk there in the store that on a previous Thursday he had been there and cashed a check. You know what the Warren Commission said? Why, she's mistaken--obviously it was a Friday. And that's the way they put it in--that it was a Friday, because that permitted them to say that this was the only time he had gone there on a Thursday. Do you know that there are various people who have given testimony at various times to show that Oswald was a paid informant for the FBI? Do you know how they handled this? They said, dear Mr. Hoover, could you tell us whether this is so or not? Mr. Hoover answered, no, that's not so. They said, okay, thank you, and that was the end of it...I am not saying that he was, I don't know--I'm just saying that this whole thing was handled in such an unbelievably amateurish fashion that it is difficult if not impossible for me to accept the fact that agencies as experienced and knowledgable as the FBI, the CIA, the Secret Service, as a bunch of top-knotch lawyers...legislators...Supreme Court Justice...and scientific experts and so on, would have committed so many errors, this makes a joke out of it, a bunch of keystone cops...This scares you almost as much perhaps as the alternative, that they weren't just a bunch of inadvertent sincere errors...I don't know...But I'll tell you what I think ought to be done--Let's take another look at the whole thing.

Long John There are many rumors around about the fact that there is a possibility that Oswald...had nothing at all to do with the assassination. I must say that it would be shocking if it ever came out that there was anything to it...

Feinberg You know, I read everything I could, I don't mean the books, I mean the newspapers at the time...if there was anything that impressed me, it was that the evidence that he did, and was there, and did shoot that rifle, and did buy it, and so on, was very, very convincing and overwhelming to me. You can argue about all the other things, but that's the positive side...

(Discussion of whether any viewer of the shooting of Oswald could in truth testify that he saw Ruby shoot Oswald.)

Wecht Let me tell you something else that might give you cause to ponder. I just learned this tonight and I have been assured from a most reliable source, so I quote it freely--and perhaps John could arrange for it to be listened to on another occasion--that the sound track of the TV film of the moment that Oswald was being escorted out and then the shooting by Ruby, that there were very distinctly two auto horns--one at the time that he got off the elevator, and the second one immediately, a split-second before the shooting...

(Discussion of the finding of the stretcher bullet at Parkland Hospital)

(Discussion of the pristine appearance of the stretcher bullet and Col. Finck's testimony that it was most unlikely that it came from Connally's body or made the fracture in his wrist; discussion of Oswald's defection and subsequent assistance rendered by the State Department to him and his Russian wife; discussion of whether Oswald was "running like a fugitive" from the Depository or left without panic or haste, with many fatuous and ignorant assertions by Feinberg punctuated by "Really? Really?" from Long John.)

(Discussion of obesity and other medical questions unrelated to the assassination.)