of the President's body, and still has no
doubt that all the shots struck from behind.
We concluded that in the absence of solid
evidence that there were other assassins, and
with the indications that one killer could
account for all the shots, there was no second
gunman. But, even as the only gunman, was
Oswald, as the Warren Report suggests, a
lone madman? Or was he the trigger-man
for a conspiracy to kill the President?
On Thursday, we considered such frequently
mentioned indications of conspiracy as the
murder of Officer J. D. Tippit, found that
he was legitimately ordered from his normal
patrol area as part of a redeployment of
police forces to cope with the assassination.
Found too, that a partial description of the
assassin, broadcast on police radio, could
account for Tippit's stopping Oswald.
We found the nightclub owner, Jack Ruby,
the man who killed Oswald, was a strange,
mercurial creature given to hitting first and
asking questions afterward. And none of his
closest associates would credit Ruby with
the ability to keep a secret very long.
We presented the conspiracy theories of
New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison,
thoughts which Garrison says he will present
in a court of law, but which today remain a
series of largely unsupported statements.
And we concluded that, for now at least, no
cracy theory of the assassination has
been proved.
Tonight, we turn from the assassination
to the Warren Commission itself. Having
found that the Commission's conclusions, in
the main, still stand up almost three years
after published, we now ask our fourth and
last fundamental question: Why doesn't
America believe the Warren Report?
ANNOUNCER: This is a CBS news inquiry:
"The Warren Report." Here is Walter
Cronkite.
Cronkite: Tonight, as in our preceding
reports, my colleague Dan Rather and I are
going to break this fundamental question
into subsidiary questions. For the first part
of the broadcast, we will ask: Should America
believe the Warren Report? We will explore
just how well and honestly the Warren Com-
mision operated, to what extent it deserves
belief.
The second question will be: Could
America believe the Warren Report? And
we'll try to determine whether there are
elements in the way people, and particularly
Americans, think about great events, which
would prevent their accepting the Warren
Report, however trustworthy it might be.
But this final broadcast will be different.
The questions we will ask tonight, we can
only ask. Tonight's answers will be not ours,
but yours.
Rather: As we take up whether or not
Americans should believe the Warren Report,
we'll hear first from the man who perhaps
more than any other is responsible for the
question being asked. Mark Lane, lawyer
and former New York State Assemblyman,
was the gadfly of the Warren Commission. He
demanded the right to appear before it as
a defense counsel for the dead Lee Harvey
Oswald. Refused, he began his own investi-
gation of the President's death, a study that
produced first the best selling attack on the
Warren Commission, "Rush To Judgment,"
and now a movie of the same name.
Mark Lane has lectured all over the world
on his own theories of the assassination,
theories which he spelled out for Bill Stout.
Mark Lane: There was one conclusion, one
basic conclusion that the Commission
reached. I think, which can be supported
by the facts, and that was the Commission's
conclusion that Ruby killed Oswald. But, of
course, that took place on television. It would
have been very difficult to deny that. But,
outside of that, there's not an important
conclusion which can be supported by the
facts and—and this is the problem.
And what the Commission was thinking
and what they were doing is still hidden
from us, of course. The minutes of the Commission were locked up in the National Archives and no one can see them. A vast amount of the evidence, F.B.I. tapes, C.I.A. records, and documents related to the information we should have, are also locked up in the Archives. No one can see that.

The photographs and X-rays of the President's body, taken at the autopsy in Bethesda, Maryland, in the early morning of November 23, before they were taken by Naval technicians, which in and of themselves might resolve the whole question of the President's autopsy, cannot be seen by anyone today and, in fact, not one member of the Warren Commission has seen these basic documents. In the simple case, the photographs and the X-rays. And not one lawyer for the Commission ever saw it or was curious enough to examine the most important evidence.

I think the villain was the desire of government officials to be nice, to see to it that nothing would upset the American people, that the apathy which has seized us for all of these years be maintained, that nothing would lead to a factual presentation of what happened. The American people would have been upset surely if there were any suspicion. Nothing would upset the American people as much as the American people, that they would have in fact found it.

The second level might be called the organization of misperception. This is what the Warren Commission organized in a way that prevented it from finding facts. And here my findings were that by using a part-time staff and by the Commission detaching themselves from the investigation—in other words, not actively particpating in the investigation—it raised some problems as to whether the Warren Commission's investigation went deep enough, so that if there was evidence of a conspiracy, they would have in fact found it.

The third level of my criticism concerned the evidence itself, and this concerned the problem of when the Warren Commission was come—confronted with a very complex problem, the contradiction between the F.B.I. summary report on the autopsy and the autopsy report they had in. It's the problem of whether they simply glossed over it or whether they called witnesses and made it all disappear. It's the problem of a second assassin.

RATHER: In separate interviews we asked Mr. Epstein and investigator Specter to pick seven very respectable men, men who had reputations and very high standing. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States would have no reason whatsoever to be expedient or to search for political truths. But, as Mr. Epstein decided to identify and protect against persons considered serious threats to the President, we need look no further than the Secret Service. Now, the same thing was true of the staff members when it came to protecting the President. When we serve as assistant counsel and general counsel, men were chosen from various parts of the United States who had no connection whatever with this investigation.

EPSTEIN: For example, there were rumors concerning the F.B.I. or various intelligence agencies that there were a number of memorandums where the—where— from Warren to the Secretary of the Treasury or the—by the Secret Service, indicating that their findings would not impair the efficiency or the morale of the Secret Service. Also, the question of whether there was ever any possible connection between Oswald and by connection, I mean simply meant that he was furnishing information and there were some rumors to this effect—and they, rather than the people, preferred to give it to the F.B.I. to investigate the rumors themselves. As J. Lee Rankin, their General Counsel, said, they would rather that agency clear its own skirts. Well, what this meant, of course, is that if the F.B.I. would have discretion, it did feed its discretion between Oswald and itself, the discretion of either reporting it or not reporting it.

RATHER: In separate interviews we asked Mr. Epstein and investigator Specter to pick seven very respectable men, men who had reputations and very high standing. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States would have no reason whatsoever to be expedient or to search for political truths. Now, the same thing was true of the staff members when it came to protecting the President. When we serve as assistant counsel and general counsel, men were chosen from various parts of the United States who had no connection whatever with this investigation.

EPSTEIN: For example, there were rumors concerning the F.B.I. or various intelligence agencies that there were a number of memorandums where the—where— from Warren to the Secretary of the Treasury or the—by the Secret Service, indicating that their findings would not impair the efficiency or the morale of the Secret Service. Also, the question of whether there was ever any possible connection between Oswald and by connection, I mean simply meant that he was furnishing information and there were some rumors to this effect—and they, rather than the people, preferred to give it to the F.B.I. to investigate the rumors themselves. As J. Lee Rankin, their General Counsel, said, they would rather that agency clear its own skirts. Well, what this meant, of course, is that if the F.B.I. would have discretion, it did feed its discretion between Oswald and itself, the discretion of either reporting it or not reporting it.

Now, the same thing was true of the staff members when it came to protecting the President. When we serve as assistant counsel and general counsel, men were chosen from various parts of the United States who had no connection whatever with this investigation.
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The Report, as I stated, is exactly the way it was delivered, and the way it was written.

**Cronkite:** Yet it seems to CBS news that one of the most serious errors made by the Warren Commission was its decision not to look at those photographs and X-rays, an error now compounded. For the Kennedy family agreed last year to donate them to the National Archives, but only with the condition that the pictures be locked away for 50 years, with only certain authorized government personnel allowed to see them.

Now, just to emphasize this, that those grim and tragic relics be made generally available, to be flashed across television screens and newspaper pages, to be studied, so that, in the words of the autopsy photographs, we feel must now be made available before the world, the Report, as I stated, is exactly the way it was delivered, and the way it was written.

**Cronkite:** Until now we have heard a great deal about the Warren Commission from its detractors. But what of the Warren Commission itself? Where do its seven members stand amidst this torrent of controversy over the depositions of the United States?
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WARREN REPORT ITSELF, THERE MAY BE SOMETHING ABOUT IT THAT WAS NOT IN THE REPORT'S CONCLUSION, THAT PRESIDENT KENNEDY WAS THE VICTIM OF A LONE MADMAN, AND THAT THE CRIME WAS A NATURAL ACCIDENT.

OUR FINAL QUESTION THEN: COULD AMERICA BELIEVE THE WARREN REPORT?

Dr. John Jay Lipset of Harvard is a distinguished sociologist whose book, Search for a Usable Fact, is considered a major insight into what we are and how we got that way. Dr. Lipset has no doubt that there are several things that have come up in recent years, particularly since the coming of the Cold War, something that might be called the loss of a myth. A feeling that great events cannot be explained by ordinary processes, that if anything goes wrong—whether it's a great thing, like the so-called loss of China, or a minor—something goes wrong, or the terrible fact of the assassination—cannot be explained by other historical events, but by some special standard of explanation, to be applied to the United States and the point is that this is a myth. A feeling that great events can't be explained by ordinary processes, that anything goes wrong—whether it's a great thing, like the so-called loss of China, or a minor—something goes wrong, or the terrible fact of the assassination—cannot be explained by other historical events, but by some special standard of explanation, to be applied to the United States and the point is that this is a myth. A feeling that great events can't be explained by ordinary processes, that if anything goes wrong—whether it's a great thing, like the so-called loss of China, or a minor—something goes wrong, or the terrible fact of the assassination—cannot be explained by other historical events, but by some special standard of explanation, to be applied to the United States and the point is that this is a myth. A feeling that great events can't be explained by ordinary processes, that if anything goes wrong—whether it's a great thing, like the so-called loss of China, or a minor—something goes wrong, or the terrible fact of the assassination—cannot be explained by other historical events, but by some special standard of explanation, to be applied to the United States and the point is that this is a myth. A feeling that great events can't be explained by ordinary processes, that if anything goes wrong—whether it's a great thing, like the so-called loss of China, or a minor—something goes wrong, or the terrible fact of the assassination—cannot be explained by other historical events, but by some special standard of explanation, to be applied to the United States and the point is that this is a myth. A feeling that great events can't be explained by ordinary processes, that if anything goes wrong—whether it's a great thing, like the so-called loss of China, or a minor—something goes wrong, or the terrible fact of the assassination—cannot be explained by other historical events, but by some special standard of explanation, to be applied to the United States and the point is that this is a myth. A feeling that great events can't be explained by ordinary processes, that if anything goes wrong—whether it's a great thing, like the so-called loss of China, or a minor—something goes wrong, or the terrible fact of the assassination—cannot be explained by other historical events, but by some special standard of explanation, to be applied to the United States and the point is that this is a myth. A feeling that great events can't be explained by ordinary processes, that if anything goes wrong—whether it's a great thing, like the so-called loss of China, or a minor—something goes wrong, or the terrible fact of the assassination—cannot be explained by other historical events, but by some special standard of explanation, to be applied to the United States and the point is that this is a myth. A feeling that great events can't be explained by ordinary processes, that if anything goes wrong—whether it's a great thing, like the so-called loss of China, or a minor—something goes wrong, or the terrible fact of the assassination—cannot be explained by other historical events, but by some special standard of explanation, to be applied to the United States and the point is that this is a myth. A feeling that great events can't be explained by ordinary processes, that if anything goes wrong—whether it's a great thing, like the so-called loss of China, or a minor—something goes wrong, or the terrible fact of the assassination—cannot be explained by other historical events, but by some special standard of explanation, to be applied to the United States and the point is that this is a myth.
The damage that Lee Harvey Oswald did the United States of America, the country he first denounced and then appeared to re-embrace, did not end when the shots were fired from the Texas School Book Depository. The most grievous wounds persist and there is little reason to believe that they will soon be healed.

This is Walter Cronkite. Good night.

This has been the fourth and last of a series, a CBS News Inquiry: "The Warren Report."

This broadcast has been produced under the supervision and control of CBS News.