

typedd by: kg
trans by: "
6-26-68
1. - PAS

DYNAMIC AFFAIRS STAFF

Extension 720

WGN Radio

June 20, 1968 - 8:00 PM

Chicago

INTERVIEW MARK LANE

NORMAN ROSS: Good evening everybody. Norman Ross speaking, with our Thursday night edition of extension 720. Our procedure's a bit different tonight. WE have two studio guests and noone by a telephone as we ordinarily do. WE won't have them on together though, I have participatorswit them in one of their several encounters. I must say they do generate a great deal of heat when they are together -- sparks do fly. But I think maybe we'll have a little more light if we talk to each of the two separately tonight. We don't want to blow out any of the tubes on tyour radio set before the night is over. And that's why we're going to divide the program straight down the middle as the Pope once divided the world between Spain and Portugal, was it not?

The second half of our program will be devoted to Roy Cohn, the New York Attorney and Professor of Law; the one time controversial chief counsel for the Seantee Investigating Sub-Committee under the even more controversial Senator Joseph Mc Carthy. He's the author of a new book about Senator Mc Carthy, and his flamboyant anti-communist crusade of the early 1950's. You'll be able to ask him questions beginning about 8:45 or 8:50 Or so, by calling us on extension 720 ; the telephone number is 591-7200.

The first guest is Mark Lane, he's the author of the widely talked about best seller "Rush to Judgement", the most provocative criticism of the Warren Commission Report on the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. He's also the author of a new book called "A Citizen's Dissent", a personal indictment of the Communications establishment for it's attitudes toward dissenters, that and much more as well.

*

*

*

MARK LANE: ...the only story tht I find at all imperative was in Broadcast in regard to a statement I made just before Robert Kennedy was shot, quoting him as having said there are guns between him and the White House and that's why he could not talk about the assassination of the President...

ROSS: You told me about that yesterday and I think it would be of great interest to our listeners if you would expand on that statement made to you through intermediaries because it hasn't had wide publicity and it's a very provocative remark that he reportedly made.

LANE: Yeah, this is, well, I'll read from the publication called Broadcast. It's an article written by Jack Anderson who is, of course, Drew Pearson's partner who was on the program with me.

Some 6 hours before Senator Robert F. Kennedy was shot by an assassin in Los Angeles, Mark Lane, author and critic of the Warren Commission Report charged, quote, there are guns between Robert Kennedy and the White House, close quote. Appearing on WFAM-TV in Washington Check Point Interview Program, Mr. Lane said the source of his information was two Kennedy aides.

Actually I had know for about two and a half months of two emmassaires of Robert Kennedy sent to Jim Garrison in New Orleans, District Attorney. Encouraging Garrison to continue to probe, continue his investigation and understand that Robert Kennedy would support him when he could and the emmassaries said that the visit was to reassure Garrison that, if elected President, Robert Kennedy would apprehend and prosecute those responsible for killing his brother, but was unable to publicly say that now because there are guhns between him and the White House.

And I had never said that, although I knew about it for more than a few months, because as long as Robert Kennedy didn't say it, I didn't think I should lea that confidence from the campaign.

ROSS: Besides you didn't want to give anybody ideas.

LANE: Also, yes, although I suspect they had the ideas already but I did say it on a Washington D.C. television program. Wenn I was asked the question I said to myself, the logical reason being, the polls will close in California in one hour, that's really the last real primary, and I suppose it's alright to say it now, and nothing I say in Washington will reach California in one hour, nor will it ever if we have to rely upon the communications industry, and so I said it and 6 hours later Robert Kennedy was shot.

The Garrison investigation has received very little encouragement, as you know, from the federal government since that time, even before that time. There has now been an injunction filed by the federal court to prohibit Garrison from prosecuting Clay Shaw. The reason being - the motion asking for the restraining order from the federal court submitted by Clay Shaw and attorneys, in essence it boils down to the sentence which in short states that Garrison doesn't like him and that's why he's prosecuting him. Garrison's answer was that what I don't like is that he killed President Kennedy, that's why I don't like him. Of course, Garrison had never met Shaw before he arrested him so there's no long standing animosity or hostility. If I can just add, I think there's an interesting comment sort of an epilogue to the Citizen's Dissent in terms of that. Because that injunction is historically unprecedented in this country, and it seems to me that even if it were in an ordinary murder case or a rape case - a federal Court injunction prohibiting the prosecution of a man charged for a local crime - here in New Orleans the man is charged with conspiracy in New Orleans (WORDS UNCLEAR) ...which is a local crime - even then it would have been a major story, I think, and featured in most papers around the country. But it's not a very ordinary case, it's related to the assassination of a president. And it's been published in very few newspapers and so far as I know, featured in none.

And a friend of mine in New York City, to whom I told the story, Katherine Johnson (?) was just amazed, she and her family are pretty deeply tied in the communications industry, that whole establishment, her cousin is Robert Morgenthau (?), the prosecutor; and her family owned the nation and Carnegie Hall (WORDS UNCLEAR)... and she spends, and her family spends, all their time in the summer with all the editors of the New York Times. And so I told her this, she was amazed and she told me that she called Abe Raskin (?) whom she knows very well and said how come the Times hasn't reported the fact that there's an injunction to prohibit Garrison from trying Clay Shaw. Raskin said there is no injunction. I never heard about it. And she said, well I understand that there is, I'm sure that there is, I've been told that. He said I'll call you back, let me check it out. He had his staff go over the last month's issues of the Times, he called her back and said there's not a word in the paper about it, you're completely wrong. She said, do me a favor, check with the stringer in New Orleans and find out. The next morning he called her and he was shocked she said. He had told her if anything like that had happened that would be a front page story in the Times.

The next morning he called shaken and said there was an injunction, more than two weeks ago, and I don't understand how I didn't know about it. But the ability of the people in the communications industry, important people like an editor, of the New York Times, to become engaged in this kind of self deception I think is quite remarkable. I knew they were deceiving us in important areas but the self deception opens a whole new area.

ROSS: We'll be back...

ROSS: Mark, I believe that you feel, without question in your mind, that Lee Harvey Oswald was not the lone assassin of John F. Kennedy. Do you feel it was a conspiracy with one or two other people or a large conspiracy, a political type whether it was right or left.

LANE: Well, I think the evidence is conclusive that the shots came from at least two different directions at the same time, therefore, clearly I believe the evidence shows there could have been no lone assassin, Oswald or anyone else. That's as far as I've gone in my own investigation. Garrison, of course, has taken it to stage two and that is the Warren Commission an invalid document to who killed president Kennedy.

The evidence he has uncovered indicates that it was a conspiracy of a number of persons. I've talked to the witnesses, I've examined the evidence, I think he has a very strong case and the only way we can be certain, I believe, about the validity of the evidence is for it to be presented in a Court Room and subjected to cross examination by the hostile party and for the other side to also have an opportunity to also present a direct case, witnesses and evidence of their own.

ROSS: Do you find any connection between the conspiracy, if there was one, in the case of the death of John F. Kennedy and of his brother Robert Kennedy, and of Martin Luther King.

LANE: Well, I don't know if there is a connection. I think one has to probe the area, this is an important, I think we cannot rely upon the federal government to do that for us. The original response in all of these matters by the Justice Department, in the case of Dr. King by Ramsey Clark, a lone man did it, there is no question about that. All of the evidence that is available seems to indicate that it was not a lone man who killed Dr. King, and in fact the FBI seems to agree since they've now charged that man with conspiracy who killed Dr. King.

I think that Robert Kennedy's statement before he was shot, in terms of the embassaries he sent to Garrison, indicated that he was concerned about the possibility of

a continuing conspiracy; the statements made by Senator Edward Kennedy and others of the family on the plane which took them and Robert Kennedy's body from Los Angeles to New York - the statements which were reported by Sandy Van Oker on television and repeated in some of the newspapers, indicated that Senator Edward Kennedy thinks there is a possibility...

ROSS: I will read that statement of Van Oker which I happen to have here, saying of Senator Kennedy, he does not know whether this is the act of a single person or is the act of a conspiracy. The Kennedys don't know, they don't, they don't know to put it clumsily. But from him, from others in the plane one got the impression it's no more than that. There's some kind of a pattern, faceless men, that's the phrase I heard.

ROSS: Mark, do you feel that we've learned from the mistakes that were made in Dallas.

LANE: No, I don't think the media has learned anything. I don't think the government has learned anything. I think, certainly, the Los Angeles Police Force has done a commendable job under any circumstances, particularly (WORDS UNCLEAR)... the Dallas Police, whose record is not hard to beat, all they would have to do in Los Angeles is keep the suspect alive a little bit longer than 48 hours and they would have beaten the Dallas record. But I think the Dallas police have done an excellent job, they've not commented upon the evidence...

ROSS: You mean the Los Angeles.

LANE: The Los Angeles Police, have not commented upon the evidence, except for the usual irresponsible statements made by Mayor Yordi, who true to form in this case, provided -- formed a great disservice and one which may allow the defendant eventually to have a conviction, should there be one, reversed. Because of the irresponsible, prejudicial statements made by Yordi about material he said he saw in the notebook which may or may not have been there.

But otherwise, I think the authorities in Los Angeles have performed admirably.

ROSS: If we had had effective gun laws, would these three men be alive today.

LANE: I think probably not. I don't think there's any relationship between the effort to register guns - between that effort - I don't think there should be any relationship - between that effort and the deaths of these three men.

I myself favor the registration of pistols and rifles, I don't like the idea of them being around at all and when

they are around there is a constitutional right to bear arms, but there is no constitutional right to bear arms which are not registered. I think the weapons should be registered.

I think another tragedy, terrible irony, is that the very things that Robert Kennedy was for, certainly in the later period of his life since he was a Senator, for Civil Liberties, for a number of Supreme Court decisions against wire tapping, -- all of those things have been undone by a Bill which was just passed because it had attached to it a rider for registration of handguns and the prevention of handguns being shipped through the mail. This was an extremely poor Bill, a very bad bill, it had that one rider and that's why it was passed through in hysteria.

Garrison's evidence indicates that elements of the Central Intelligence Agency planned the assassination of President Kennedy. If that evidence is correct then I don't think the provisions for the registration of guns would prevent the CIA from having access to weapons.

ROSS: Why on earth would an Agency of the United States government, the Central Intelligence Agency, want to assassinate their own leader?

LANE: Well, I think there's never been a President who has been the leader of the CIA. That's one of the tragedies of this country. Just as there's rarely been a President in charge of the FBI. Mr. Hoover runs that operation. He's been there 44 years and I think even the president who could only serve for 8 years, has transient attachment (?) to his administration.

But the CIA is certainly a very powerful force in our government and on occasion takes positions and established its own foreign policy, on occasion that foreign policy is the same as the American foreign policy and it works out alright, but it's not always.

We do know, of course, I don't like to talk about whether they a group in the CIA was involved in the assassination or not. I merely state that Garrison's evidence shows that, and he's anxious to present it and let a jury of American people pass upon it. But we do know that statements John Kennedy made after the Bay of Pigs, he would like to splinter the CIA, scatter the pieces to the winds; his position in Viet Nam was very different from the position then taken by the CIA and still taken by the CIA. He was actually, despite President Johnson's statements last year that he was following the lead of General Eisenhower and President Kennedy, he was following through on a commitment. That was ~~Robert Kennedy's~~ Kennedy's position in September '63 when he withdrew 1,000 from Viet Nam and in November of '63, just before he was killed, when he

withdrew another 1,000 men and said by the end of the following year every American would be out of Viet Nam and that's not exactly the position we find ourselves in in 1968.

ROSS: Are you implying that President Kennedy had gone soft on Communism and for that reason there were possible elements in our country who were hard liners who would have wanted to put him out of the way.

LANE: Well you know I would never use that phrase. I think that his foreign policy was sound and realistic and comfortable. I think there are people in this country who could view that and come to their own conclusions that he was going soft on communism; I think Senator Joseph Mc Carthy probably would have said that. I would not say it.

ROSS: If -- I asked you this question yesterday -- if there were any possibility that there was a conspiracy and not a lone gunman, and not just one or two people but a real political conspiracy of left or right to assassinate President Kennedy, could you imagine the Kennedy family, and Robert F. Kennedy in particular, would have stopped short of any end of the earth to pursue the purpotrators of such a conspiracy.

LANE: I think he was doing that in his quest to become president of the United States. I think his indication to Garrison, the statement that his emmassarés made on his behalf was that this was a matter that was uppermost in his mind, and that if he became president he would have done everything in his power to apprehend and prosecute those responsible.

ROSS: We're back at Extension 720, 591-7200 our phone number. The calls coming in. You're on the air. Do you have a question.

MAN: Yes, I would like to ask Mr. Lane how he came to rule out the theory of a mancherian (?) candidate in the incidence of the death of President Kennedy.

LANE: I don't really deal very much in theories. I leave theories and speculation to the Warren Commission; I'd rather stay in the area of fact. But I don't think anyone can rule out a theory; I've not done that. But I have to admit that an examination of the evidence shows conclusively that shots came from at least two directions and that's the first and basic point. One has to deal with the obstacle of the Warren Commission Report. And one can remove that then I think one can move into the second area.

MAN: Well, in order to come up with facts one has to have a theory. You can't divorce theory in that instance in fact. Now the problem comes with the selection of

theory open to the critical inquiry of fact. NOW, I have not read reams of literature on the subject but I believe that there are others who feel that you may be wrong in your interpretation of the impact of the question (WORDS UNCLEAR).

LANE: Well, I'll tell you this. There's one piece of evidence which would resolve all the questions. The photographs and the x-rays of the President's body which not one member of the Warren Commission ever looked at, not one employee of the Warren Commission ever looked at, not one member of the staff of the Commission ever looked at, -- the evidence is now locked away in the National Archives and no one can see it at the present time. So that's the best medical evidence. There is, however, an additional piece of evidence which is in itself conclusive, the film taken by an amateur photographer named Abraham Zapruder, it's a motion picture film, 8 mm., it shows the presidential limousine moving into the Plaza and it shows the effects of the bullets upon the president and film, by and large, has been suppressed. It's never been on television, it's never been in any theatre, and Garrison recently subpoenaed it. Life magazine and Garrison have it with the written provision in the order, that he could have it and show it to his investigators, the Grand Jury, the Judges, etc, and to the Jury of course, but it could never be seen by any member of the media, no newspaper man, no radio man, no television man, was ever allowed to look at it.

It shows that after some shots had been fired, the president had grasped his throat and collapsing forward, falling forward slowly, collapsing to the seat; and then all of a sudden, with a suddenness which you just -- I could not possibly begin to describe with words, but the most sudden, shocking movement you can imagine, he is driven back and to the left as if a tremendous force has struck, in fact it is, it's the bullet which has hit him in the head. The only possible way that he could have been driven so suddenly and dramatically and sharply back and to the left is for a bullet to have originated from the right front. At the point, according to the Commission, Oswald was almost directly behind President Kennedy, I don't think anyone who has ever seen that film has left the room without knowing for certain that the Commission's conclusions are completely invalid. And I've worked with these photo analysts, engineers, who've made a frame by frame analysis of the Zapruder film, and everyone has exactly the same reaction -- it's the only reaction that the evidence permits.

ROSS: We have another call coming in on Extension 720. You're on the air.

WOMAN: I was wondering Mr Lane feels a citizen can do in order to eliminate the handling of news by the communication media.

LANE: It's a tough problem. I think the first thing is to make it clear in letters to Congressmen and Senators that the FCC has the responsibility to play and that is to see that the facts are presented to the American people. I don't really know what else you can do. I suppose you can write to various radio stations and television stations and newspapers when its quite plain to you that important information is being suppressed. I'm sure you know very little about the investigations conducted in New Orleans ; it's in my view the most important investigation peding in America today and its not your fault you know little about it, it's just not available to you.

WOMAN: Well, in respnse to this, I'm amazed in hearing your comment tonight and the fact that about 4 days ago after your initial interview in Wasington, I only heard one news media in Chicago give your statement on the air. And I in turn quoted it tomy husband and he intended to listen to ity and we never heard it again, and it amazed me and I also have also just finished reading the death of a Presidnet and this handling of the news in more or less responded to in the book. Though the theory is not that of a conspiracy, but still in all its just beginning to open my eyes up, because I can recall reading news and believing what was said about it at that time and now I too am beginning to wonder about it.

LANE: You're worried now, I tell you, if you read a citizen's Dissent you'll be much more worried.

WOMAN: I intend to. I had just written it down, it'll be next on my list.

LANE: Actually there is one name and one organization - CBS, or NBC or Walter Cronkite, it just indicates very specifically what each of them have done in terms of presenting information which they knew to be untrue.

ROSS: You're on the air. Hello. Your'e on the air. Do you have a question for Mr. Lane.

MAN: Yes, I was wondering why there has never been a revision (?) review board, such as on the order of the Warren Commission, but carrtadgout by civilain people on the order of a Grand Jury.

LAN:E: To look into the assassination of President Kennedy?

MAN: RIGHT.

LANE: Well, I think there clearly should have been something done in terms of an appeal from the Warren Commission, the major problem with the Warren Commission -- I understand your feeling about a civilian review board because although these men are civilians they are not members of the Army. There wasn't one member of the Warren Commission who would have been eligible to serve as a juror had Oswald lived to face trial, because of this -- the government connection of every single member of the Commission. So in a sense it was a Commission made up of persons who would have been excluded because the court, the trial court, they were too prosecution associated to be involved in trying the case.

The problem I think is not, however serious I think that is, the gravity of the issue deals not so much with personalities of the members of the Commission or their connections with government but more with the methods they employed. Had Oswald lived he would have been entitled to counsel of his choice, or the choice of his family, (WORDS UNCLEAR)...he would have been entitled to have all of the evidence used against him brought out into the public, he would be entitled to cross-examine the evidence, any number of rights. After his death, however, he was tried by the Commission, he was found guilty by the Commission, was convicted by the Commission. Every single basic right which would have been available to him had he lived was denied to him. The evidence was taken in top secret, the evidence, a lot of it, remains locked up in the national archives at the present time; the attorney chosen by his family to represent his interests, to cross-examine witnesses was denied access to the Commission hearings. There was just no due process of law, and under these circumstances, I think, it is unusual that we did not find any editorials around the country condemning the methods used by the Commission at least in excluding the press from the hearings but even then the press did not raise its voice in protest.

ROSS: Thank you for calling. Go ahead you're on the air.

MAN: Yes, Mr. Lane, first I'd like to say I appreciate what you're doing. I sure I speak for many, your efforts are certainly appreciated in this quarter.

My question is this, was there a spectograph taken on the bullet fragments in the car, found in the car? Do you know what I'm talking about.

LANE: Yes, but I don't know if there were a spectograph report. I don't know that if they did so it was not published.

MAN: What I understood was that concerning the spectography report on the fragments, the bullet fragments, that was never made public.

LANE: As I said, there may have been one but I don't know of it. It's similar to asking the Oswalds if any

statements were taken from Oswald when he was in custody for 48 hours. All I can say is that he was questioned for more than 12 hours by the FBI secret service Dallas police, in the presence of a police stenographer. As to whether or not there are any records as to what he said, we can only say that the Commission said that there was no stenographic record made...

MAN: Maybe we're on differnt things...

LANE: Im just saying that this is -- my answr can only be that I don't know, all I can tell you is what the government has said about the evidence.

MAN: There must have been a spectograph report, and this is just my theory, the only reason it was never made public, nver even released to the archives, is that it obviously showed more than one type of bullet fragment.

LANE: Yeah, I wouldn't be surprised if that were so. I don know that a bullet that hit the main street curb left some parcels behind and left some alloys which were different from the alloys in the Commission exhibit 399. So the Commission conclusion, since we know that there was a lone assassin and he was firing one kind of bullet, the metal which was on the curb could not have been fired on November 22nd. So everyting was reasoned backward in that fashion.

MAN: Well, that's the one thing that struck me about this whole thing. I can't believe the ywouldn't take a spectograph report, can you?

LANE: It's hard to believe that they did not, it's an excellent question, to be frank with you, 4 and 1/2 years now after the event, I'd never thought of it. This is the first time I've heard it raised, I'm very grateful for you for raising it. I'll be in the archives in a few weeks and I'll be looking for it when I get there.

BOSS: Markn why would the government, why would the communications industry want to suppress the truth if indeed they did do this. What possible motive could they have for doing this.

LANE: Well, first we deal with the government. I suppose the kind of motive one could ascribe to them would be the desire to tranquilize the American people. Why would Ramsey Clark in Memphis say, one man killed Dr. King, when he knew that was untrue. He explained it, people were on the verge of riots, I had to help calm the American people. Well, if he's going to be the Secretary of Tranquility, President Johnson wants to make a new Cabinet position, I think he could probably do that adequately. As long as he wants to remain the head of the Department of Justice, I think he should be

concerned with other areas as well.

As to why the press suppresses information, I think it's primarily because at the network level and the major news magazines, U.S. News, Time and Life and Newsweek, of course, and the major newspapers, the characteristic which I would say is not most prevalent is courage. In fact, if I had to think of one characteristic prevalent, I would say its cowardice, a great deal of self censorship. But when that is not sufficient to operate, to prevent the publication of important information, and dissenting and uncomfortable information from the government's view, they go beyond this, the federal police move in.

I can tell you about experiences I've had in the last week now. ON your program last night, I made reference to what happened in New York City back in 1964. All one has to do is go to the national archives and find there on file the FBI report of interviews with broadcasters like Red Benson (?) and Murray Burnett (?) who were questioned about the propriety of allowing me on the air.

But I CAN TELL you about more recent cases than that. I just did this program in Cincinnati called Newstime with Dennis Holy (?) and the producer Mr. Steinmach (?) told me that Mort Sahl had been on the program 6 weeks before talking about the assassination. And two days later two FBI agents come in and confiscated the tape, all of the information, took it away from the station and they have not yet returned it. Add in Cleveland just before that, the day before that, also last week. I did the Allen Douglas Television program, it was a taped program for a UHF station and when we finished that we went to his radio station for a radio program, his producer from the television place called and said did you know that there were two FBI agents present in the control room for the entire time that Mark Lane was on was recorded.

Well, You don't have to tell people in the media who are a little shaken anyway what the police are doing in the control room. If they want to listen they can listen when it's presented. For example, the FBI called up Alan Douglas before I got there. They wouldn't talk to his producer or director or anyone at the station. They had to talk to the host himself to say is it true that Mark Lane will be on your show in two days. Well, if there's no other way to find out if they can't find a TV guide and they can't tape these

programs at home, then I doubt that they'll be able to catch very many criminals, if they can't do anything -- if they can't secure information that's so obviously public. I think the point that they are consistently making is that we the federal police, the FBI, are interested in guests of that nature and what they have to say. And you ought to give some consideration to whether or not its the proper thing to have him on the air.

ROSS: I have some questions I'd like to ask Mark, but I better take the calls first. You're on the air.

MAN: This morning's Chicago Sun times there was an article...

ROSS: ON Jener -(?)?

MAN: Right, and he said that he could refute any statement in any books about the Warren Commission. I'd like Mr. Lane to comment about that.

LANE: Yes, I appeared one time with him on the Jerry Williams Show. We had a debate here in Chicago. He left one hour before he was scheduled to leave. He said he had to catch a plane but there was no plane leaving that evening at all, for the city he said he was going to. He's declined every single opportunity by network radio and television programs to debate with me since that time. I'm available, I'm here in Chicago. I'm available to debate with Mr. Jener (?) any time and place that he'd like. Any radio or television program which would have us and I think also that a number will. In fact, I'll be on the Kupcihet Show on Saturday and I was going the producer tomorrow and ask him to - or tonight - and ask him to invite Mr. Jener to come and join us so that he'll have an opportunity to make good his statements. But since he's declined every single opportunity to debate with me since our last meeting, I'm inclined to doubt that he'll be present.

MAN: Can I ask you one other thing.

LANE: Sure.

MAN: What did you think of the CBS three part series last summer on the death of President Kennedy. Did you think that was a good attempt...

LANE: It was even worse than (WORT UNCLEAF)...actually about 25% of my book deals specifically with that. Let me give you one example. I think that the CBS program was worse than the Warren Commission Report, in this sense, I wasn't present when the Warren Commission Report was put together I know that its conclusions are not accurate. So far as the CBS program is concerned, I know that they were not designed to be accurate. I know therefore that that program

was a fraudulent program. I talked with the Associate Producer, Robert Richter (?) while the program was being made, and I appeared on two of the 4 programs myself. And I'm quite familiar with how it was put together. Let me give you one example.

CBS chose the services of perhaps the best rifleman in the United States, Colonel Jim Crossman who writes for rifle magazines, and developed a very elaborate test which came fairly close to duplicating what the Commission said that Oswald did, in terms of the kind of rifle, they gave him a better rifle, more accurate and fired more quickly, but it was fairly close; and he was supposed to fire at a moving target on a track. CBS filmed his efforts, he tried several times. Oswald, according to the last known score, his analysis by the Marine Corps, his score with a rifle was, quote, "rather poor shot, close quote. They had one of the best riflemen in America try to see if he could do what Oswald allegedly did. He took the test several times, it was all filmed, on no one occasion did he fire as quickly as the Commission said Oswald did, and not on one occasion did he fire as accurately as the Commission said Oswald did. So the CBS decided to take that film, which if anything, tended to prove that Oswald could not have done what the Commission said and place it in its own archives, it's never been shown on television.

ROSS: Thank you for calling station 720. You're on the air.

WOMAN: I would like to get back to this business of registering gun. In Illinois we have probably one of the worst conservation departments that couldn't care less about the conservation of game and this has nothing to do with the objections from the riflemen's association, but just a matter of registering a shotgun, and we, for instance, have tried to get through, in the area, have tried to present to the conservation authorities here in Illinois that it would be a good idea before a license for a gun was issued or before a hunting permit was issued to know whether people actually knew gun safety...

LANE: I think they're very good ideas, since the sportsmen of Illinois have taken that position it shows that they're very responsible.

ROSS: Thank you.

ROSS: You're on the air.

MAN: Sir, I wondered if you could give me a hypothetical situation of the conspiracy in itself, I find it rather difficult to comprehend how a conspiracy could take place. I mean, from with either one man or a group of men...

LANE: Well, first let's define a conspiracy. A conspiracy is nothing more than two or more persons acting together to commit an illegal act. The shots came from two different directions, I think we have proof of a conspiracy.

MAN: OK. Now what I would like to know is could you, in your opinion, could you describe from the beginning up until Ruby -- what is your opinion, could you explain that.

LANE: I'm not quite sure I grasp the full meaning of your question.

MAN: Now -- from the first man or the first group of men, alright, could you explain how they would go about killing Kennedy.

LANE: Oh, I see, I think they would just stationed in different places; I think there were some persons in an area behind the limousine, an area which includes the book depository building, I think it's certainly possible that some shots came from the book depository building. I think it's more likely, however, that the shot s from the rear came from the Dow Textile (?) which is right next to the book depository building. There were some men, or at least one man, behind a wooden fence, high up on a grassy node which was located in front of the limousine, and when the limousine moved in between these positions, shots commenced from two different directions.

MAN: Well, you see, I own a weapon, the type that was used to kill the president, and I don't think...

LANE: You have a (NAME UNCLEAR)

MAN: Right, 765 mm., and I have one that is what I call very good shape and I find that it is absolutely impossible to fire as many rounds as they, I believe it was five...

LANE: I think at least 5 shots were fired, yes, in less than 6 seconds.

MAN: And wouldn't they -- it would be, more or less, hard to synchronize the different directions of the bullet. Wouldn't that be rather hard to do.

LANE: Well, I don't think so. If you have two different people in two different areas, or two different groups the signal could be, as soon as the car reaches this point we start to fire or you fire first and as soon as I hear the first shot, I'll start firing. I mean, there have been ambushes through history with hundreds of people involved in firing in a period of seconds. If there were enough people there's no problem in terms of getting a lot of shots off.

MAN: How many people would you estimate might be in on...

LANE: I don't know. Shots came from at least 2 directions so you have a minimum of two people.

ROSS: Thank you very much for calling in. We only have about 2 more minutes with our guest Mark Lane and a lot of morecalls coming in. So let me take one...

MAN: Two questions, one you mentioned earlier that Ramsey Clark was convinced that there more than one person involved in Dr. King...

ROSS: May I ask that you turn down your radio.

MAN: Yes, it is turned down.

LANE: Yes, I was making reference to the fact that Ramsey Clark originally said it was the act of one lone man and he was on the run and arrest would be made within hours, certainly, imminently; and in a column written by Evans and Novak, written about 7 or 8 days later, they revealed that at a Justice Department conference the questions came up as to why Ramsey Clark made those statements when they were not true, and according to the column, Clark said well I understand that they were not true but it was a contribution to national tranquility. We couldn't have riots taking place, and the best way to resolve that was to say that one man did it. In any event it seems clear that the Department of Justice has changed its position since the man who has allegedly been involved in the case - Galt or Ray as he is called now - has been charged with conspiracy to shoot Dr. King; so the Justice Department has evidentially changed its position.

MAN: Are there any legal implications as to why they would charge him with conspiracy rather than the murder or is just - or are you surmising...

LANE: It's certain that he was involved with at least one other person in either plotting the crime or in the actual execution of the crime.

ROSS: Mark, a final question. Is there one most damning, unanswered, single question as a result of you regard as the failure of the Warren Commission Report.

LANE: It would be hard to narrow it down to one. I would say that the failure of the members of the Commission and staff of the Commission including Mr Janis (?) and others, who looked at the basic medical evidence, in this case, is unforgiveable. The photographs and x-rays of the president's body, and they did not look at those documents, they have now admitted that that is true, and I understand why they did not want to publish picture of the president's body, of course, that would be in very poor taste and that should not have been done. The same position does not apply in terms of the publication of the x-rays, however, and they did publish x-rays of Governor Connolly's body. Various portions

of his body, and that was evidently not considered to be in poor taste, and there's no reason that I can think of why those x-rays are not available. All I've requested now for the last 4 and 1/2 years, is that the government permit pathologists at the leading universities in this country, leading medical schools, to examine the photographs and x-rays, not to publish them, but to examine them, and make the findings to the American people and the President of the United States as to what those medical documents show. And I think as simply as that the matter might be resolved.

FOSS: Do you think they'll do it.

LAN:E: NO, they won't do because very obviously the federal government knows what that evidence shows and its quite contrary to the positions they've taken for the last 4 and 1/2 years.

FOSS: Thank you very much. Mark Lane, author of "Rush to Judgement" and "A Citizen's Dissent."