

typed by:AVA 1-3-68  
trans:"  
--1-PAS

PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

Kup's Show

WBKB-TV

December 30, 1967--11:30 PM

Chicago

IRV KUPCINET: I'd like you to meet our guests now. This is Michael Ayerton returning for a second visit to our show. He's an artist, a sculptor, and author of a splendid novel titled, 'The Maze Maker.'

Next is Josiah Thompson, assistant philosophy professor at Haverford College. He has come up with an important study called, 'Six Seconds in Dallas.' A new approach to the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

This is Georgiann Geyer, Chicago Daily News foreign correspondent who has spent the last five months in Russia, Laos and Viet Nam.

Also returning to our show is James Thompson of the Northwestern University School of Law. He is also a student of the John F. Kennedy assassination.

And this is Ralph Sholleman, American born secretary to Lord Bertrand Russell, the ninety four year old convenor of the so-called war crimes tribunal whose purpose was to condemn the United States' participation in the Viet Nam war.

\*

\*

\*

THOMPSON: No, I mean to display the evidence, it would take a considerable amount of time. I mean, what one has to do, he has to bring the whole fabric of evidence together, and then try to pick a hypothesis or a theory which will explain all the evidence.

Now, my claim is the single assassin theory simply will not fit the evidence, will not fit the main contours of the evidence as we now know it. For example, the single assassin theory simply cannot explain how the Governor is hit sometimes later than the President. And how--

SHOLLMAN: Pristine bullets.

THOMPSON: Right, and how a seemingly pristine bullet can pass through two men causing seven separate wounds, smashing two large bones

and finally ending up on a stretcher completely unconnected with the care of either man.

SHOLLMAN: There wasn't any damage done to the bullet at all. I mean, the thing is a piece of--the most incredible fraud from the first to the last. It seems to me quite incredible that anyone who has the opportunity to compare the twenty six volumes published by the Commission with it's report cannot from that, simply internal evidence demonstrate total fraudulence. Some months after Kennedy was killed, some kind soul stole the files of the District Attorney of Dallas, photostated them and sent us a copy, nineteen exhibits.

Every single exhibit contradicted the official version at that time of the assassination. Paraffin tests, testimonial of Weisman(?) about the rifle, testimony of Helen Lee Marcom, their only witness at the time for the slaying of Tippett. One to one disparity. Everyplace at which you touch this report, you find that fraud. There is either suppressed evidence, distorted it or invented it. And this has been on the record now for at least three years.

THOMPSON: Is this conscious, deliberate fraud that you're talking about?

SHOLLMAN: Well, I would certainly say so.

THOMPSON: On whose part?

SHOLLMAN: On the part of the Commission.

THOMPSON: And all of its members?

SHOLLMAN: Every single one of its members.

KUPCINET: you mean the Attorney General of the United States at the time was Robert Kennedy--would sit still if you thought this was a fraud by the Warren Commission?

SHOLLMAN: You ask the wrong question.

KUPCINET: I'm asking you the right question.

SHOLLMAN: No, I'll tell you what the right question is. The right question is how the quietness, the silence of Robert Kennedy can be explained in the light of the evidence?

KUPCINET: You're saying the evidence is wrong, the evidence is right.

SHOLLMAN: Not on the evidence. Hang on. Not on the evidence.

KUPCINET: As a brother of the man, do you think he would be quiet if this was such a fraud?

THOMPSON: It's an important point that Ralph is making. I mean, you don't go and evaluate the evidence by looking at the distinguished members have looked at the evidence. You look at the evidence first. And then, on that basis, evaluate the distinguished---

KUPCINET: But, the man who was attorney of the United States was Robert Kennedy.

SHOLLMAN: And he stands judged by this silence.

KUPCINET: And you say that he would sit still if this was out and out fraud? Does that make sense to anybody?

THOMPSON: I agree that Robert Kennedy must be judged on the basis of the evidence itself and not the other way around. He remained silent and it seems to me that it's on that basis that we have to judge him.

KUPCINET: What do you mean silent because he happens to agree with the report?

SHOLLMAN: Well, he stands condemned by his silence. It's the evidence which is overwhelming.

KUPCINET: Well, it's your interpretation--

SHOLLMAN: It's not a question of interpretation.

KUPCINET: Obviously people of great stature have examined this book and say that it is accurate that Oswald was the killer.

SHOLLMAN: An appeal to the story.

KUPCINET: Let me go back to a question that you -- raised. You said that you could not in your mind convince yourself that Oswald was the slayer.

THOMPSON: No--I--

KUPCINET: Do you have any doubts about who killed Tippett?

THOMPSON: Yes, I--

KUPCINET: I mean the Officer Tippett?

THOMPSON: Yes, I have some.

KUPCINET: You don't think it was Oswald?

THOMPSON: There's no evidence.

KUPCINET: Would you rather say who saw him or followed him into the theater?

THOMPSON: Well, here is the problem, apparently the revolver slugs that were found in Tippett's body did not match the casings that were found there at the site. Some witnesses claim that two men shot Officer Tippett and made their getaway in an automobile.

The witnesses descriptions are --of Officer Tippett's assailants are in great conflict.

KUPCINET: That's the testimony of the Officer who saw the killing

and followed him into the theater, right?

THOMPSON: No, there's no policeman who saw the killing and who followed him?

KUPCINET: There's no policeman? Yes, there was. A policeman saw and followed Tippett into the theater.

THOMPSON: Not true, no.

GEORGIANN GEYER: He saw the killing.

THOMPSON: No, I'm sorry, it's simply not the case. There was no other policeman, at the site of the Tippett killing. The only policeman there was Tippett and he's dead.

KUPCINET: No, there's another policeman who either --

SHOLLMAN: Followed him into the theater--

THOMPSON: Followed him into the theater after the shooting.

KUPCINET: Followed him into the theater after the shooting. That's right. He didn't see the shooting. But, he saw them run and chased them.

THOMPSON: Well, the Texas theater is nearly a half a mile from the Tippett slaying site.

SHOLLMAN: The evidence of their so-called witness, Helen Lee Marcom, first of all, she described the assailant as short, stocky and bushy haired. She put before the Warren Commission interrogator off the record for a long period of time before she came on the record, she put a series of questions to him.

Could you identify Lee Harvey Oswald as the assailant?

No/

Did he look like anyone you've ever seen before?

No.

Could you recognize him from his face?

No.

Did he look like anyone you've ever seen before?

No. No--no--no.

Finally, was there a number two man in the line-up of Oswald's always number two.

Oh yes, number two is the one I picked/

How could you recognize him?

I couldn't. But, when I saw number two, I got a cold chill run up and down my spine. Now, that's the evidence of Mrs. Marcom. And the Warren Report put it down that she made a positive identification of Lee Harvey Oswald that constitutes fraud and it touches every aspect of the case that constitutes fraud.

KUPCINET: ...We ran a little bit long on this thing. We'll be right back.

8

\*

\*

KUPCINET: Michael, you wanted to pose a question to Mr. Shollman?

MICHAEL AYERTON: Yes, it seems to me that we circle this issue and I don't know, and certainly in the presence of such experts anything really about this except that, in a sense myth making is my business, and we aren't here purposely for the creation of a mythical situation.

In fact, almost all retrospective historical studies, are in fact a search for the creation of a satisfactory explanatory myth of the circumstances.

Now, as I get it, there are two propositions here. If Oswald was the killer, if it's possible to assume that this was the act of an individual madman and no conspiracy was involved, now speaking as it were from ignorance and also as it were from England, it never quite struck me as very likely that this was the case. I have not read the evidence. I have not read the twenty eight volumes but, I find it difficult to believe that we're now presented with a case which must in fact be a conspiracy to assassinate. If there was more than one man and more than one bullet, you haven't got a madman, you've got a situation. This poses two possibilities. A left winged conspiracy or a right winged conspiracy.

Now, one of the odd things to me is that neither of these propositions has ever satisfactorily or seriously been advanced in the United States. My own views as to which it is, I will for the moment withhold. I suspect a conspiracy. Why is it, that the United States and including apparently such prestigious organizations as Life Magazine, wish to avoid the implication that what really happened. It seems to me that the answer must be obvious. But, the conspiracy is so far-reaching and so deep that it would seriously disturb the political situation in the United States if it were revealed whether a right or a left winged conspiracy was involved.

Now, whether the Warren Commission's planning with a thought, I wouldn't know and I wouldn't comment on. But, it does seem, in terms of what has subsequently occurred, that they were at least not fulfilling their task adequately. And it sounds to me, and it looks to me and I speak as a myth maker and not a great historian, that what we're here involved in is a very careful creation of a mythical situation.

SHOLLMAN: Malcolm X had it right down when he said the chickens are coming home to roost. And I think that Malcolm knew and he put it straight: You can't have a society that sets up organizations like the CIA that kills presidents, revolutionary leaders around the world,

to engage in conspiracies to overthrow governments which conflict with U.S. corporate interests, you can't have that sort of society that sort of institutional base without the chickens coming home to roost. Basically what is involved, is that this power structure in its efforts to suppress people and movements around the world to kill leaders, to overthrow governments, turns on its own. And what is Kennedy but the expression? And how perfect that those who are so high in praise of Kennedy while in office are so completely disinterested in discovering how he was killed. In short, they did not respect the man, but his office, but the power.

THOMPSON: Why would the power structure turn on Kennedy? What had he done to turn them against him?

SHOLLMAN: Well, I think that question gets us into an area of speculation and I think that Kennedy obviously was in conflict with the CIA and sectors of the power structure. Kennedy was dealing in a number of areas unsatisfactorily from the point of view of the CIA and other agencies.

THOMPSON: For example?

SHOLLMAN: For example, the way he played the Bay of Pigs, the way he played the Cuban Revolution, the way he played oil depletion. Many reasons, for his own approach to the war in Viet Nam.

KUPCINET: Before we get too far afield, Ralph, because you're running way out of play -- far away from what we're talking about. We'll get back to that a little bit later.

\*

\*

\*

SHOLLMAN: I've read it and I've read the volumes. And you'll find in those volumes...

KUPCINET: But, here's a man whose head it. Direct your questions to him.

SHOLLMAN: He's one man who's studied it and I'm another man who's studied it. There's others who have.

THOMPSON: Tell me where to look. Okay we resolve the question by going to the evidence.

SHOLLMAN: I haven't got the page number with me unfortunately. But, I can tell you that in the report and in the drawings of that report, you find that there is a broadcast put out by a sheriff's description of Oswald, wanted in connection with the slaying of J.D. Tippett.

THOMPSON: Before Tippett was killed?

SHOLLMAN: Before--thirty one minutes before Tippett was killed.

THOMPSON: Never heard...

KUPCINET: this was a bigger conspiracy than anyone ever realized before you came along and made this statement Ralph.

SHOLLMAN: This is old hat. There's nothing new about this.

THOMPSON: But, don't you see the probæem? This conversation can go round and round and round and never advance.

KUPCINET: Because it's the word--

THOMPSON: We spin our wheels. No, because we simply have no evidence. We don't know if it came from the right or the left or the Mafia or Madam Nhu.

SHOLLMAN: Oh, dear me.

THOMPSON: We simply have no evidence. Do you have any evidence?

GEORGIANN GEYER: ...said it was a CIA conspiracy and yet there is no proof and if you start with this view of things,....

SHOLLMAN: It's simply that the agencies involved in this assassination and the Commission relied upon the report of those agencies, these are all the bodies who participated in the fraudulent suppression of evidence, the lying the distortion, all that goes into the phony Warren Report. The CIA, secret service.

KUPCINET: Do you think it's possible to have a conspiracy that involved all those people and not to be unveiled? Do you think it's possible?

SHOLLMAN: Not only do I say this, not only do I think it's possible?

KUPCINET: ...Robert Kennedy being the Attorney General and sitting still for something that was fraudulent is inconcievable to anybody.

SHOLLMAN: Maybe inconviewable to you and I don't know why. I think most white liberals are always prepared to take the government on faith and always frightened at calling it as it is. But, the fact remians...

KUPCINET: The fact is not the government, the man is the brother of the man who was slain.

SHOLLMAN: Yeah, but the brother of the man who was slain has to answer to the evidences, not to --the evidence has to answer to him.

KUPCINET: If it was fraudulent as you maintain, do you think he would sit quietly?

SHOLLMAN: That's for him to answer. Why is he sitting quietly?

KUPCINET: Because he doesn't think it's fraudulent/ Now, you're assuming it's fraudulent and he's sitting quietly. I believe it's not fraudulent and so he's sitting quietly.

SHOLLMAN: He should be ashamed and that's his crime.

(VOICES OVERLAPPING)

KUPCINET: Here, the evidence you offer has just been contradicted

by amman's who's just gone through all the studies and they believe...

SHOLLMAN: Well, he's wrong. He's wrong.

KUPCINET: He says you're wrong.

THOMPSON: Look, it seems to me that there are three questions. And (LAUGHTER) really the questions have different orders of logical priority.

The first question is what happened. And it seems to me that you have to decide that question before you can move on to decide who did it. And you're not going to make much progress on the third question, mainly, why did they do it until you know who did it.

Now, everyone wants to talk about the third question first. It was a conspiracy. What kind of a conspiracy? Ralph thinks it was the CIA. Someone wrote it was th.

SHOLLMAN: We've got the CIA, the Dallas Police and everybody else involved. I'm talking about the people who participated in the suppression of the evidence.

THOMPSON: First, you want to do this. You want to show and demonstrate how it is that the official version is a total discrepancy with the testimony of witnesses, with the material evidence and that goes right down the line.

SHOLLMAN: I disagree with that completely.

THOMPSON: Would you like to hear a non-sinister explanation as to why...?

KUPCINET: Just pause a moment for a message and we'll be right back.