PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

Off the Cuff WBKB-TV

June 19, 1968, - 12:00 Mindnght Chicajgo

GUESTS:

Mark Lane, author of "Rush To Judgement" and "A Citizen's Dissent"

Roy Coh, New York Attorney and Professor Law at New York Law School; Chief Counsel for the Senate Investigating Sub-Committee un-er Senator Joseph Mc Carthy

HERMAN FINE: (?) Professor of Political Science at the University of Illinois; Professor Americus at the Univerysit of Chicag; author of 24 hooks on world affairs.

CONNENTATOR:

Norman Ross

typed by: KG
trans by: "
6-25-68
1 - PAS

PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

Off The Cuff WBKB-TV

June 19, 1968 - 12:00 Midnight Chicago

FULL TEXT

P&S?

~~JOHN MADIGAN~~: What percentage of people in the country did not believe the Warren Report or a good proportion of thereof.

MARK LANE: Well, the last poll that I know of was an ABC Poll which shows that 88% disbelieve the Warren Report and believe that a conspiracy took the life of the President.

~~MADIGAN~~: Would you be under the impression that that percentage would increase as a result of Senator Kennedy's death and Martin Luther King's death?

LANE: I should think so, particularly since Sander Van Oker (?) who was the only newsman on the plane, I beleive, which brought Robert Kennedy's body from Los Angeles to New York, said when he left the plane that in private conversations on the plane, Senator Edward Kennedy and other members of the Kennedy family had said that there are faceless men who have taken the lives of these three men, the 2 Kennedys and Dr. King, we don't know who they are, he quoted Senator Edward Kennedy as saying, we don't even know who killed Jack kennedy 4 1/2 years ago, there's a suspect, Lee Oswald, but we don't even know he did it. I think that this is an indication that the death of Robert Kennedy and the death of Martin Luther King have refocused American concern on the inadequacies of the Warren Commission Report.

HERMAN FINE: Do we have any knowledge of how many of the 88% who are inprejudiced or prejudiced, whichever way you like to put it, are also knowledgeable?

LANE: WEll, I presume the vast majority of the people in this country have not read the Warren Commission Report, nevertheless, the vast majority of the people said they accepted it at the outset because Earl Warren signed it, and now there have been some...

FINE: Is that exactly what they said? Because he signed it.

LANE: Yes...

FINE: Is that exactly what they said? Because he signed it?

LANE: No , there are other reasons. The first Harris Poll that I recall on the subject, found that the majority who supported the Warren Commission Report, when asked for what piece of evidence in your minds convinces you that Oswald was a lone assassin, the majority responded, Earl Warren signed the report. That was evidently, if the polls are to be credited, that was the reason the majority who supported the report did so.

ROY COHN: You talked about a conspiracy. Did you mean there was a Left Wing conspiracy or a Right Wing conspiracy?

LANE: Well, I think that a conspiracy means two or more persons acting in concort to effect an illegal end. I think the evidence is conclusive that the shots came from two different directions. That's as far as I went...

COHN: You haven't said one was a Left Winger and the other a Right...

LANE: No, I haven't said that.

FINE: YOu mean in regard to the bullets...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

LANE: I think we all know what we are talking about. I'd like to finish the answer if I might.

First of all my position has been for some 4 years that the evidence show that shots came from two different directions. The second stage, in terms of who actually fired the shots, I thnk is a state which ha s been pioneered by the District Attorney of New Orleans and I think his evidence is extremely impressive, of course, most Americans don't know anything about it because it has not been thoroughly presented, a trial has not takenplace, there may never be a trial because the federal government has issued an injunction to prohibit...

COHN: Do you believe that it was a Left Wing Conspiracy...

LANE: What I beleive is unimportant, I think the evidence which Garrison has uncovered indicates that elements within the Central Intelligence Agency were involved in theplanning stages of the assassination of President Kennedy...

FINE: Mr Chairman...

MADIGAN: (Inaudible)

FINE: I don't know the facts, he doesn't know the facts, Mr Cohn who is very -- thoroughly outraged litigation (sic) and the credibility of evidence , probably doesn't know it, and has some skepticism -- can we get anywhere along these lines?

LANE: Well, there's no mystery about whether or not I know the facts, I can't speak for anyone else here, I have livedin New Orleans for the last 8 months, I've seen all of the files that Mr. Garrison has compiled, I've lived with most of the important witnesses in the case, and all the members of the investigating team. I think I do havesome informtion about this...

FINE: What information?

(VOICES OVERLAP)

COHN:...conclusive?

LANE: Well, of course, at this point the Grand Jury thought it was sufficient to issue an indictiment which is not proof ofanything, but three judges hearing the evidence reached the conclusion that there was sufficient evidence for them to...

COHN: Mr. Lane...

LANE: Excuse me. For them to...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

COHN: You just won't answer the question. Do you believe based on the early search that this was a Left Wing Conspiracy...

LANE: (Inaudible)

COHN: Alright, you can start smearing in a few minutes. But all I wnat to know and I think it would help the audience, do you believe, after all your study in two books, all your investigations, having read everyone's file, do you believe this to have been a Conspiracy on the part of the Left Wing, or a Conspiracy on the part of the Right Wing.

LANE: When you asked the question, I told you that the evidence showed that the Central Intelligence Agency was involved in the planning stages, if it's your beliefthat the CIA is taken over by the Communists...

COHN: The CIA planned a conspiracy which assassinated President Kennedy and that's what you're writing these books about...

LANE: No, that's not true Mr. Cohn. I believe you've not read the books, otherwise you would not say that...

COHN: I read part of the first one...

LANE: The first book makes no reference whatsoever to anyone who was involved, in the early (WORD UNCLEAR) evidence compiled by the Commission and the other evidence that the Commission's conclusions , and I said that the Commissions'

conclusion that there was a lone assassin is inaccurate and points no finger in any other direction.

MADIGAN: Gentlemen, we'll bontinue in just a moment. As you can see, we're going to have quite a discussion. We'll be back in just a moment...

* * *

MADIGAN: Well, I have here a whole series of articles. Conspiracy Runs Revolts by Students says Drew Pearson. This morning's New York Times says it is more and more evidence in conspiracy in the King killing and so on and so forth. What is your feeling about all of this, and do you feel there's a connection - Left Wing or Right Wing, the very question you were asking, between John F. Kennedy and the R.F. -- Robert Kennedy and the King killings...

COHN: First of all between the John Kennedy -- and they say I'm as good as what I read in the newspapers and my - whatever authoirity I would have to analyze some of the evidence, and having read the Warren Report, regarless what Mr. Lane says in his book about my not having read it carefully, I would say this. I do not believe there is any connection between the assassination of President Kennedy and the assassination of Senator Kennedy. The man who assassinated Senator - President Kennedy, despite what Mr. Lane might think, accept the judgement of the Warren Commission , not just because Earl Warren signed it, but because Earl Warren was one member of a Commission of distinguished Americans drawn from all fields of life with specialized training , represented by Lee Ranking the Corporation counsel of New York now. And I read the report and I think it was a thorough, documented job. It can't be perfect in every respect but I accept its premise. I think it's carefully documented and proves it.

Lee Harvey Oswald, who killed President Kennedy, was a Left Winger. He had peeviously tired to kill General Walker, who, of course,...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

COHN: Just let me answer the question.

We left a Left Winger, Lee Harvey Oswald who killed President Kennedy, he had previously tried to kill General Walker who, of course was a Right Winger.

As far as the assassin of Robrt Kennedy is concerned, he was a man who was an Arab and from what we...

LANE: Wait a minute. Has that man been tried yet? He's entitled to a fair trial without any pre-judgement.

COHN: I think...

LANE: Let that trial take place before we decide who is responsible.

COHN: I think that's fine.

The man who is alleged to have killed Senator Robert F. Kennedy, the man who all these people in the ballroom saw, and that the television and news cameras showed firing the trigger and who might possibly be someone who killed Senator Kennedy to the exclusion of other people, is an Arab who had a cause to serve totally different...

LANE: ...judging his motives...it's really unfair...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

COHN: Well, all I'm trying to do is answer Norman's question. I'm not trying to try it; I'm just showing that one man is motivated to turn out to be the Robert Kennedy killer, was motivated by one cause, an Arab Nationalism; the other was a Left Winger who previously tried to kill General Walker and was wrapped up withthe Cuban cause , and I don't see any connection -- any evidence which can (WORDS UNCLEAR) connection between the two right there.

FINE: The approach taken by Mr. Cohen is very important to us in this country for two reasons. ONe, to answer your question concerning the relatedness of the two assassinations, and the other one, in relationship to the claim of an indemid violence in this country.

Now, we only know what we read in the newspapers and what has been put before the Grand Jury so far as it's so far been divulged. And I think that those -- for answers to both of the questions, it is most important that above all in relationship to the question of the indemid violence in this country, that we make it specific causes and individual cases. All we know about this second case, mainly, Sirhan who is in custody and who is charged and is being indicted by the Grand Jury, all we know is this. That he was seen, or it is presumed that he was seen, by mvery many witnesses; it's a very, very rare case of being caught in the act, a red handed act; that the motivations, if this is the man, are pretty well established, especially because of the connection, as we've heard, between himself and his father in Jerusalem or living in Jordan. And that line of motivation, in that person, conveys nationalistic reasons. If it proves to be so, is somethng very different from either a connection with the JFK assassination and something very different from an indemid violence in this country. And I think it is necessary not to start with general propositions regarding conspiracies and

assassinations or violence, but to look for the specific case where we have evidence and will be getting more evidence; what is concrete, what can be examined, what can be cross-examined, where, I hope, that we wont have a repitition of the Jack Ruby situation with the disappearance of Oswald - where we'll have the charged person in Court so that all the evidence can come out, can be examined by his attorneys and he should have a pretty connected account of the relationship between cause and effect, motivation, and violent action.

LANE: I'm inclined to agree that the discussion in the country about general violence - although it does exist, and it is aserious problem in this country, more so than in any other country - is probably totally unrelated to this three deaths werre making reference to, I think that's true...

FINE: I'm not so sure...

LANE: Excuse me...

FINE: It may be related to JFK...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

LANE: Gentlemen, I thought we were going to have a new interruption policy, if so...

FINE: Well, I don't agree to that. YOu may interrupt me if you want to, this is a commentary not a monologue.

LANE: Well, please don't interrupt me in the middle of a sentence though, I'll try to make my sentences relatively short for you so that you can interrpt at given moments.

I think the first thing we have to do before we decide there is a connection, or there is not a connection - is evidence about who was involved in the various crimes. Of course, Mr. Cohn takes the position that Oswald was closely connected with the Pro-Castro Fair Play for Cuban Committee although he said he's read the Warren Report and I don't doubt it becasue he's said that; the Warren Commission says that it's untrue, he merely claimed that he was the President of the organization, in fact, it was a non-existent organization that had no contact with an actualyFair Play for Cubans Committee. But even more important than that, I think, is the tale found in Congressman'Ford's book. Congressman Ford was one of the seven distinguished members of the Warren Commission about whom reference has been made. And in the first chapter of his book called the Commission Gets its First Shock, he de-classified a Top Secret Document which was the transcript of the Commission's first meeting at whhh (SEVERAL WORDS UNCLEAR)...reported to the members of the Commission that very important evidence had reached him.

The two leading prosecutors in Texas, the Attorney

General of Texas Wagner Carr (?) and the Dallas District Attorney, Henry Wade (?) both cameforward with statements that Oswald was an employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. That the number assigned him by the FBI was S-179. That both of these two leading prosecutors in Texas knew when Oswald went on the payroll of the FBI, knew what his salary was, andknew that he was on the payroll when he was killed. Now they may be wrong but on -- I think the next point one has to discuss is whether or not we can get all the information we can from Sirhan because he is alive , we must therefore accept thefact that we can't get all the information because Oswald is dead.

But I think it would be good if we could get all the inforamtion about Oswald. 250 basic files in the National Archinves have been classified until September 2039 regarding the death of President Kennedy...

COHN: Inaudible.

LANE: Including a CIA report, for example...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

LANE: I'll just finish it in a moment now. (WORD UNCLEAR) document 481 classified, is a CIA report called Lee Harvey Oswald's access to U S information. I think that ought to be declassified since the Commission said Oswald had no association with any american intelligence agency, so that we could be sure at that and the other documents that have been classified...

COHN: No. Norman, you know, Mr. Lane's presentation sounds just like the type of thing he would accuse Senator Mc Carthy of - Senator Joe Mc Carthy - of doing ...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

COHN: YOu'll get a phone call from the citizens for Eugene Mc Carthy asking you to.

Now Mr. Lane says that Teddy Kennedy says Sandy Van Oker who said to somebody such...

LANE: I said that Sandy Van Oker said that Teddy Kenndy said...

COHN: That's even more so, you've added another degree of hear say to it...

LANE: No. That's exactly what I said. I heard Sandy Van Oker say it myself...

COHN: Fine...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

COHN: Teddy Kennedy says to Sandy Van Oker and you say you heard...

LANE: Be sure to say it one for movies(?).

COHN: Now you've told that.

LANE: Well, I wouldn't have to (WORDS UNCLEAR)....

COHN: Mr. Lane for someone who doesn't want to be interrupted...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

COHN: Ok. Fine. Good enough. so be it. Getting back to what I was saying: Mr. Lane says that we have this somebody says to somebody said to somebody, he says file number X30576 is still sealed; Congressman Ford says in his book that two witnesses came forward and said such and such, he doesn't tell you that it was later proved to be completely untrue...

LANE: Who said so. Who said so. It was never invesitgated by the Warren Commission. They asked Hoover, was Oswald working for you when he killed the President, and Herbert said no. That may be an investigation which would satisfy you. But I think it doesn't satisfy ...

COHN: Mr. Hoover's testimony under oath I would consider as good as your triple hearsay, yes.

LANE: I don't have anytriple hearsay. Ive come with a transcript of the Senate's publishd...

COHN: What I'm trying to say, rhater clumsily, but mabe not too clumsily under the circumstances here. Mr. Lane is going on a lot of hearsay and throwing around a lot of numbers and asking us to draw conclusions. I think he misses probably about the best point he might have, and it seems to me in the King case with the race sitation from the evidence we know about it so far with the (WORDS UNCEAR) and the various other things involving the flight -- those do indicate that there probably was in that case, there certanly must must have been in that case a particiaption of people, of more people than just one man...

LANE: A conspiracy.

COHN: I wuld say probably it does. The evidence looks like that, but a tie in between that and the assassination of either of the Kennedys just is not supported by theevidence anymore than the assassinaton of Malcolm X is tied in with them or anymore than the attempted assassination of General Walker by Lee harvey Oswald is tied in with the assassination of Robert Kennedy.

ROSS: One reason that I brought all this up is because I wonder if in retrospct, you might feel that the whole thing that happened during the Mc Carthy era and the reaction to that might not now have the opposite of its intended effect to root out subversiveness and sorforth. Because so many people have become so tired of making charges that might prove to be unsupported that will end up and have all kind of conspiracies take root and various subversive acts that we otherwise wouldn't have had happen in our country, is that possible?

COHN: Well, I suppose anything is possible. I think that might be a little of an over-generalization...

FINE: I think that perhaps from that, Roy, I think that has been in the last 8 to 10 years, rightly or wrongly, a little libation or a softening of attitudes toward the extreme left. Partly because of the Mc Carthy episode, only partly because of that, because of the lack of passage of time, and the international situation (WORDS UNCLEAR).. but generally speaking by everything we've had, everything we've read and so forth, and we've gained a general liberalization I think of attitudes in this counry. We don't want to be the first ones to come out and say , you know, we point the finger at the extreme left.

Campuses -- I've been to several campuses and I wnat to tell you this incidnet three years ago. There was a note sent down to (WORD UNCLEAR) ...these boys clubs. NOw, what should one do iwth a notice of that kind. It should be examined, it should be thought over, one could take advice on it, and yet the first reaction of some of my colleagures woud be to say, look, look what Hoover's sending down. It's relating these two boys clubs to the Communist Party, Bahey, we don't accept all that, that's all hat, you know. The Soviet Union is no longer a monolith , it's no longer stalinist, it's -- they're trying to get on with the rest of the world. And yet they still may have a heavy operation of this kind.

LANE: I don't think that a boys club would be pleased with being called moderate because that's clearly not their position, they not ...

FINE: Inaudible

LANE: I think the thing to do with a directive from Mr Hoover regarding campus activity is to throw it into the waste basket where it belongs. I think...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

FINE: Without the least consideration...

COHN: Mr. Lane's objective here is that anything J.Edgar Hoover says is automatically to be rejected, just as what he says is supposed to be accepted...

LANE: I merely say in most cases to be rejected; but any advice which he gives...

COHN: What percent would you say? Less than 40%?

LANE: ...when he had a difficult witness before him but I don't want to get into that.

I think that is first of all a question of conspiracy and whether or not these three crimes are related. Iv'e not, I don't want to make a claim at this moment; I've never said that they are related and I've not said that here and I've not said that before and I doubt that I will say it after this time unless there is some evidence tp prove that.

I do believe that these are areas which have to be thoroughly explored and I don believe that -- I am in complete agr-emment with Mr. Cohn, that the evidence regarding the death of Martin Luther King indicates that there may very well have been a conspiracy . The penetration of the Memphis radio while the assassin...

ROSS: A fascinating story...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

LANE: The fact that a man went through the whole United States...

FINE: ...within 3 days to Toronto. How did he get from Toronto to London...

COHN: And where did he get all that money from...

FINE: The three or four different faces(?)...

LANE: ... all of this information that we have and compare it with the first statement made by the Attorney General of the united States, Ramsey Clark, who flew to Memphis. "There is no conspiracy. A lone, unhappy man did it and I think that you see a problem here and that is the effort of the Federal governement to tranquilize and pacify the American people rather than to delve into the difficult areas as to whether or not a conspiracy...

FINE: Don't you think they have an explanation to the attorney General's remark?

LANE: I'd like to hear it.

FINE: Let me ask me something Mr. Lane, do you think you are always rational, or do you think that you are effected by emotions from time to time?

LANE: Yes, I'm affected by emothions, but I'm not the Attorney General...

FINE: An Attorney General is only a human being and his reservatmns isn't necessarily an attempt to pacify the public, it may be an actual abberation of judgement.

COHN: Not only that, I wouldn't say it was an abberation of judgement, I'd say the statement might still turn out to be (WORD UNCLEAR) There might be a conspiracy in that there were one or two other people helpng, but when we're using the term here, Mr. Lane, we're going a little bit beyond that. We're talking about, as I understnd it, in this context, we're not just interested in the fact that Mr. Ray's counsin or some other hater down there helped him out. We might be, I think what we're interested in here, was this political, was this something motivated by some political movement? Ther's a lot of pepple involved, was planning in advance involved or something like that, we're not if there turns out to be one pr two people who helped this man ....

LANE: Then when the Attorney General whose the head of the Department of Justice says there was no conspiracy, it was a lone man who is on the run...

COHN:..themman called his brother on the phone and said the Attorney General's a liar...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

LANE: That's not enough. That's not enough. Because you yourself have raised questions abut the funds, about -- we know he went to Toronto evidentally according to the press and there found 3 people who looked somewhat alike and somewhat like him, used their names ...

COHN: Mr. Lane, why dont we get in to basics, a little bit more than...

LANE: ...according to Scotland Yard he was using a numbered Swiss bank account

(VOICES OVERLAP)

COHN: Look instead of all -- look, I brought oup the point about King, instead of getting into the numbers and stuff like that , let's talk about basics. There seems to be one basic element that you mentioned, really suggested and so did Dr. Fine that we have not had on yet and it is this violence that's been going on at campuses and other places around the country ...

(DISCUSSION GOES ON - STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS, MINORITY OF STUDENTS INVOLVED, U.S. CONSTITUTION, ETC.)

LANE: Perhaps I should leave then, I thought we were here to discuss a couple of books and a couple of importatn questions and if I'm mistaken Mr. Ross, I'll just leave. Am In incorrect?

ROSS: I'd like to ask you the same question that I asked Mark earlier about why the rehash now...

LANE: Can I respond to what Mr. Cohn said? Is that going to be possible sometime during the program?

COHN: Do that now.

LANE: It's the position of the majority here that the points I have to make are not relavant and we're really not interested in looking at those things. I'll be happy to leave and you can carry on the discussion without me.

The fact is that I am not talking about a personal treatment. Anyone who reads the Citizen's Dissent knows that what I raise there is not the personal treatment of me, but treatment of those who have a dissenting view in this area for a long period of time who could not reach the people of this country with it, and they were all able to. Lawyers, District Attorneys, various persons who were able to raise these questions for the first time, the facts were sufficient to persuade the vast majority of people in this country. The fact is, we're not talking about vague feelings of persecution, or vague dark clouds which were with us during the 50's under the leadership of Senator Mc Carthy , we're talking about some specifics.

Let me give you one of two. I appeared upon, in 1964, on the program in New York City, WINS, the Merv Bernett Program. That was about the 3rd program, a local program, I was permitted to appear on discussing the facts, of what Iconsidered the facts, regarding the death of the President. As I left that program, two men walked in and sat down with Mr. Bernett, I was younger and more naive, I thought they were his friends, and the next moring he called me and said they were FBI agents and they questioned him closely about why I was permitted to appear to discuss the case.

Two days later I went to Philadelphia to the Red Benson Show, a local show, when I left there two men sat down there and talked with him. I met him a year later, he said they were FBI agents.

We don't have to rely upon Mr. Bernett or Mr. Red Benson at all, because in the National Archinves, available now, declassified, are FBI interviews with these two persons, with these two broadcasters and others in terms of what they said to the broadcaster and what the broadcaster said to them, based on what both men said, the FBI...

COHN: Inaudible.

LANE: The fact is that the federal police have, in my view, have absolutely no right to go from broadcaster to broadcasterm raising questions about the propriety of their judgement in terms of who should be allowed on the air.

ROSS: They're the ones who Dorothy Kilgallen told you were listening in on your mutual tleephone calls so you had to use phony names...

LANE: She suggested that we use different names. But I dn't know who the agents were and I don't know if anybody was listening. And I just what Miss Kilgallen said.

But I think it's very easy to talk about personal problems, and persecution and get away from the basic question. In a growing, more complicated society with merger upon merger, with power vested in fewer and fewer people, the role of these fewwer people in terms of controlling contact with the American people is playing an important role. And sometimes they don't exercise great discretion, I think in terms of the networks cougage not to use (WORDS UNCLEAR) ...but when self censorship is in that position, the federal police on occassion do step in and I think that's a very serious problem for people of this country. And it's not a personal problem for me. I'm very pleased withthe success of my book, I have no rancor, I have no anger, in terms of the media, but I think there's a continued problem for others...

13

COHN: I flatly question whether the FBI on this or any other occassion went to any radio or television commentator or annoncer or program director and told them not to put a certain program on thei air or asked them why he had...

LANE: Read the report...

COHN: I do not believe it.. I've heard Mr Lane say this on prior occassions, I've made the checks I wanted to make on the subject and I would say flatly it is totally untrue...

LANE: Mr Cohn you are not telling the truth. In fact I would say you are lying. If you go th the Natonal Archives... If you want to go with me down to washignton after the show I will show you the reports...

COHN: YOu told me that FBI reports in which they said we visited the network ...

LANE: I told you the two names...

COHN: And told them not to put Mr Lane...

LANE: Inaudible

COHN: Mr. Lane,you think you're about the most important guy in the country and that the whole thing is one big...

LANE: ...you don't wnat to talk about the basic principles and that's unfortunate because I think the people listening are concerned with the basic principles. ..

COHN: Well they're never going to find out if you don't give anybody else a change...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

COHN: I don't think we want to spend the program on Mr. Lane's - what he regrds as his personal problems despite what the FBI going around trying to silence everyone, despite the conspiracy,of all of the networds, media and communication. I think Mr. Lane has had as fair an opportunity to present his theais on numerous - as numerious, occassions as I've ever know anyone to have thought the American public and he's had it and that's that. It's up to them to decide whether they want ...

LANE: They've decided...

COHN: District Attorney Garrison has bought it, and the Warren Commission didnt buy it and I guess a lot of the rest of us haven't bought, and I think he's had a very fair...

LANE: Mr Cohn, are you satisifed with what the federal governemnet has done (WORD UNCLEAR) ... the garrison investigation in New Orleans.

COHN: No, I must admit to you that I'm not. I think that a man like Garrison, in a responsible position, should be allowed to occupy it with the degree of irresponsibility that he's shown...

LANE: Have you seen the evidence from the case at hand?

COHN: No , once again, in newspapers, deppite all the things they leave out, usually put in enough so that once in a while you can find out what's going on...

LANE: Inaudible

COHN: In the case of Mr. Garrisson, I don't have privy to all of his official files as you apparently have, but I'll say this, based upon what I have read, based upon what I do know about it, and based what I follow; forming my judgement as a citizen, I don't think Mr. Garrison is among the more responsible public officials.

(VOICES OVERLAP)

FINE: ...and superficially speaking , and we don't want to deny , we dont want to (WORDS UNCLEAR)...so to keep the case open , to keep the possibilities of evidence open, they put it this way...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

LANE: ...which on its first face (?) indicates that there is a conspiracy to assasssinate...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

LANE:..But in the face of that, how does one feel about the federal government issuing an injunction to prohibit Garrison from trying a man charged with conspiracy to assassinate the President...

COHN: What the judges did, and I think Mr. Lane - I know a lawyer before he became an author and is probably still both - I guess maybe I am tonight, knows that what the three judges did was follow a rule of law which,as Dr. Fine has stated, has deprived them of any real discretion in the matter, when a duly elected District Attorney and a duly constituted Grand Jury,being in the pocket of the District Attorneynas it might have been, and it does happen on occasion..

ROSS: Grand Jury - not judges?

COHN: Grand Jury I'm tlaking about. When a charge is made or when an allegation is made, thestest of that will go through the legal process, and it's not the funciton of the judges, at first glance, to throw it out ..

LANE: Unless they say there's no (WORDS UNCLEAR)... which in many cases, the case is dismissed.

COHN: ...but some judges, as a matter of policy in Court, will let the thing go over, will hold...

LANE: .. that's right some will do that, I presume,....

(VOICES OVERLAP)

COHN: I'm learning so many things from Mr. Lane tonight. Now I'm learning from Mr. Lane what the law is...

FINE: Personal bickering...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

COHN: I agree with Dr. Fine, why don't we go on to some issues?

ROSS: Back to the question I started to ask you earlier. Why so many years after those Mc Carthy hearings and so forth, revise them now. What's the reason?

(DISCUSSION GOES ON @ COHN'S BOOK "MC CARTHY")

ROSS: I read this book, oneof the questions that I -- two questions I've never had completely answered to my siaisfaction. Number one is, why would everybody from Earl Warren to the head of the FBI and all these people want to cover up, if there was a conspiracy, if there was more than one person involved in the assassination of Kennedy. And number two, above all,if there were even a possibility tht there were more to it than the lone gunman and so forth, wouldn't Robert F. Kennedy in particular, never have left it until he found out what was at the basis?

LANE: In answer to the first one, I think there are really two parts t o it. Number one, did theycover up information, if they did,why did they. The answer to the first one is clear because all one has to do is go to the National Archives and find out that the list of basic source materials relied upon by the Warren Commission are published ther. That 250 of those basic source materials have been classified until 2039, so clearly they have covered up that evidence.

q In addition, it's certain in terms of the medical evidence, the photographs and the x-rays, of President Kennedy, of his bddy, taken just before the autopsy was preformed at the hospital, are the most imporaant medical document. They show in and of themselves, obviously, whether the shots came from the front and the back or just from one directon.

The members of the Commission never even looked at the photos and the x-rays;they said so, and I think that poses questions about not only covering up evidence but looking at the most important evidence.

Not that we're not concerned with medical documents; they published in whole, for example, the dental charts showing the condition of Jack Ruby's mother's teeth in 1937...

COHN: I suggest that might have been relavent had it been charged that Ruby bit Oswld.

ROSS: You also mentioned they showed a picutre of one of the pubic hairs of Lee Harvey Oswald, but they didn't show...

LANE: Yes, but the basic evidence. They never got basic evidenc, the ynever even looked at them, and noone can look at them now. They're in the archives...

COHN: I think Norman wants to know why. What was the motive. What do youclaim the motive was.

LANE: Now, after having disucssed the facts we move into the area of speculation. That's really an area which has trampled (?) by the Warren Commission. I'd rather stay with the facts. I think the most innocent explanation that one can thnk of, as in the case of Ramsey Clark

following the death of Martin Luther King. According, I don't know if this is accurate, but I do know that Evans and Novak published a column, which they said they had insight in terms of what took place at a Justice Department Conference the week after the death of Dr. King, I don't know if its true that they did, but they are responsible journalists. They may be right, they may be wrong. They said that when asked that question by members of the Justice Department, Ramsey Clark, and asked why he made the statement which was obviously untrue, it was a lone man, he's on the run, and arrest is expected imminently. Evans and Novaks answer was, it might have been a contribution to the credibility gap, but the nation required it. There had to be a clamingeffect. We were on the verge of riot. And this is certainly the kind of proceedure that does operate with government officials and I think that's obviously the most innocent explanation one can think of in terms of the coverOup of the evidence.

In terms of the second question. About Robert Kennedy. Some two and one half months ago, Robert Kennedy sent two emmissarys to see Jim Garrison, and the emmissaries, they came at two different occassions, one on 2 1/2 months ago, alittle more than that now. And one...

COHN: I don't think I knew...

LANE: Well, it's not publicly known, Not generally. It has been said publicly.

COHN: Who said it?

LANE: I saiddit, of course, Garrison has said it and it was said before Robert Kennedy was shot. In fact, Hl read to you,the only place I know that'its been published, it's in a document - a publication called Broadcast, which you are familiar with, it's called Aman's Prophecy. It's june 10th 1968, it was actually written by Drew Pearson's partner, Jack Andersonm who was present at the time when I was on the program in Washington D.c.

"Some six 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 that there guns between Robert Kennedy and the White House. Appearing on WFAN-TV, Washington Check Point Interview Program, Mr. Lane said the sources of his information was two Kennedy aides. "I didn't say aides. I said emmissaries who visited Mr. Garrison. And the message they both brought from Robert Kennedy, they said it was from Robert Kennedy. One of them was avery dear friend of Robert Kennedy and also the only person I know who was a classmate of Jim Garrison's who knew he was close to Robert Kennedy, was that Robert Kennedy will, if elected, investigate in terms of the assassination, he will prosecute those we apprehend, but at the present time he cannot take a position becasue there

are guns between him and the White HOuse, that was the statement he made. And it's not a statement I make wit h 20/20 hindsight because I made it and six hourslater Robert Kennedy was shot. This was,according to these two emmassaries, the position that he took. But I think that the evidence is clear and it really is not related to the position of Kennedy's family , although from Sanders I know that we have some further indication of the Kennedy family positon on that assassinatoon and on the other two assassinations..

FINE: Uh...

LANE: I'd like to make one last point. The evidence I think is sufficent. I think the very best evidence in the case in terms of where the fatal shotscame from, is the motion picute films taken by an amateur photographer, Abraham Zapruder- which of course you've never seen on television on in theatre . It has just not been played anywhere. But Garrison subpoenaed it from Time Magazine, he has a very good first generation copy - I've seen it perhaps a hundred times, in his office. And he shows it very dramatically. The President's seated in the car,.some shots are fired, he grasps his throat, and he begins to fall in this direction, and then suddenly and dramatically you see the effect of thefinal shot - the fatal shot - as the bullet strikes the President's head and you see his head begin to explode he's sitting backwards and to the left. With absolute violence. And I don't think...

FINE: Proving what?

LANE: That the shot came from the right front...

FINE: Well, this is what William Manchester said...

LANE: The law of physics in operation that day.

FINE: The issue is resolved by the x-rays and photographs which were taken from every conceivable angle during the autopsy on the President's body. Because the material is unsightly, it will be unavailable until 1971. However, the (WORD UNCLEAR)...said Mr Manchester, held its concort (?) with three men who examined it before it was placed under seal. All these carried special qualifications , each was a stranger to the other two, nevertheless their accounts were identical. The x-rays show no injury wounds below the shoulder , as argued by the graduate student, Epsetein; admittedly x-rays are actually projectiles passing through soft tissue are difficult to read.

The photographs are important in this case, and reveal that the wound was in the neck, and that, sats Mr. Sparrow (?), it would seem is that...

LANE: Well, except for Manchester saying that it will be suppressed until 1972 because it's unsightly - presumably after that time it will be lessuunsightly but the x-rays of Governor Connelly's body were published in full. X-rays, of course, are not unsightly and in the original manuscript which Mr. Manchester submittd to Harper and Rowe and this has already - this is published knowledge - he said he saw the photographs and x-rays, and after he was closely questioned by an editor at Harper and Rowe, he changed it to that vague language about three persons who saw it , who were unnamed, who were unrelated to each other, didn't know each other.

So far as all the documents show in this case, the only person-so far as we know, noone's seen the photographs, we're not even sure they've been developed, they're in the archinves -- in terms of the x-rays, the only one in terms of any records available, who saw these, were the summit (?) physicians who participated in the autopsy, of course, they all knew each other because they all worked with each other, so I would have to question Mr. Manchester. And Mr. Manchester asked who the three are and he said he cannot tell.

ROSS: Would you tell at this point who the three Sentors were who, just thinking of it off hand, who wouldn't go into an investigation of Communism because -- when Sneator Joe Mc Carthy did,because they thought it was too hot to handle.

LANE: I don't know.

ROSS: I want to mention what Sandy Van Okre said, it's been mentioned two or three times now, according to the Asspciated Press or whatever, he said of Senator Edward Kennedy just after Robert Kennedy's death, "He's made, I might as well say it, he's mad, he's mad at what's happening in this country. He doesn't know whether this is the act of a single person or if this is the act of conspiracy." Of the Kennedys, "They don't know, they don't know,to put it clumsily." From him, from others on the plane, one got the impression that it was not more than that, that there's a kind ofa pattern, faceless men.

LANE: That's the phrase I heard.

ROSS: Would you say that Kennedy ..

COHN: I just wnat to mention. That's an awful lot different from the way Mr. Lane put it.

LANE: Well, there's more in terms of what was published in the New York Post and what Mr. Van Okre said on NBC, and that is that there was a discussion where Senator Edward Kennedy said, "We don't even know who killed Jack." 4 1/2 years later, we have a quote, "we have a suspect, Lee Oswald but we don't know if he did it."

(VOICES OVERLAP)

FINE:...if you've only got circumstantial evidence, isn't thatright?

COHN: If we're going to give expertise to Senator Edward Kennedy, who of course, has suffered very much in both these instances, but that still doesn't give him legal expertise on the question. ..

LANE: Of course, I quite agree with you.

COHN: The other reason, in New York on a program, Theodore Sorenson, whose credentials as a Kennedy confidant and a knowledgeable one can hardly be questioed said that he does not favor the reopening of the Warren Report in any sense, and that nothing that happened in connection with Senator robert Kennedy's death in any way causes him to alter his opinion after the careful study of the facts that the conclusions reached in the Warren Commission...

LANE: That is relavent...

(VOICES OVERLAP)

LANE: That is relavent. I don't think the position that Robert Kenneyd took or Senator Edward Kennedy takes today is relavent to the evidence. I think the evidence is relavent. I think we should not be asked to have faith in Earl Warren, J. Edgar Hoover or anyone else ...

FINE: ...the remark that you made, you said that guns stnad betwen Kennedy and the White HOuse. Well, I've got evidence at home, plenty of evidence at home, that from 1960 on I was saying he wn't live out his four years.

LANE: Well, I don't know if that's relavent.

FINE: He would not live out his four yearslon the assumption that there are many people in the country who are half epileptic, who are disturbed in mind...

COHN: And who have access to guns.

FINE: ...whove got access to guns, and...

LANE: I don't think epileptics play a part.

FINE: It may play a part. (WORDS UNCLEAR)...abberations of all kinds of neurological orgin or (WORD UNCLEAR)

disturbances can result in things of this kind. And the best will be got rid of by the worst. That was my point.

ROSS: Roy, do you,...

* * *

COHN: ...I want to hear Mr. Lane on his book, I'd like to hear him tear apart my book, ...

LANE: I don't want to tear apart your book, but I'd like to say someting if I might. Th e fact is in using the material in "A Citizen's Dissent" and (WORDS UNCLEAR)... this point was made , and it's afact that the majority of the witnesses who testified before the Warren Commission - the Commissions own witnesses - who have been shown interview reports, interviews conducted with them by agents of the FBI in the majority of cases, the witnesseses said under oath , "The FBI report is wrong. I did not see that." In vevery single case where the witness said the FBI report was wrong, the FBI report was consistent with Oswald's lone guilt, whereas what the witnesses said they said to the FBI was inconsistent. I think that raises a certain problem about that organization wants to direct that on December 9th, 1963, that Oswald did it and did it alone. Adn the FBI investigation continued for many months thereafter, and it became very clear to the agents in the field - many of them, I think, are good investigators - that they should not embarrass the bureau by turning information which would indicate that the director of the bureau was incorrect. I think that's one of the problems when someone is there for that long a period of time and exercises that complete control of any organizaiton.

ROSS: We'll come back to that last statement...

* * *