

FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

PROGRAM Issues and Answers

STATION WMAL-TV
ABC Network

DATE May 23, 1967 1:30 P. M.

CITY Washington, D. C.

FULL TEXT

ANNOUNCER: "...a sensational investigation of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. He has challenged the Warren Commission Report. He has said that Lee Harvey Oswald did not kill President Kennedy.

"He has charged that the CIA is hiding the real assassin.

"What is the truth? What evidence does he have?"

"From New York City the American Broadcasting Company brings you 'Issues and Answers.'

"New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison will be interviewed by ABC Capitol Hill correspondent Bob Clark and ABC News Atlanta correspondent Tom Jarriel."

JARRIEL: "Mr. Garrison, the Warren Commission findings on the Kennedy assassination concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone assassin, that he did not know Jack Ruby, and that there was no conspiracy involved.

"What have you concluded happened on November 22nd, 1963?"

GARRISON: "Tom, our evidence indicates that, first of all, Lee Harvey Oswald was not the lone assassin. Furthermore, was most likely not an assassin at all. Secondly, that he -- he did indeed know Jack Ruby, and our evidence confirms that without any question. And finally our evidence confirms that there is no question about the fact that there was a conspiracy. Unfortunately, the Warren Commission was mistaken with regard to these facts."

ENCLOSURE
ENCLOSURE ATTACHED

"You say, Mr. Garrison, that Lee Harvey Oswald probably was not in at all.

"Do you have any evidence that would stand up in court -- in court that anyone else actually carried out the assassination and fired the fatal shot?"

John F. Kennedy

REC-9

62-109060-5353

JUN 7 1967

62-109060

5/6-2

GARRISON: "Yes, we do."

CLARK: "Can you say anything about this evidence?"

GARRISON: "No, I can't."

CLARK: "Well, how can you conclusively rule out Oswald as the assassin in the face of rather overwhelming evidence from the Warren Report that places him at the scene of the assassination and probably in the sniper's nest?"

GARRISON: "That's not very difficult, Bob, because there is no overwhelming evidence. As a matter of fact, what was done in the Warren Commission investigation was to ignore the majority of witnesses who heard shots coming from the front, and they presented — let's see, that'll be 19 witnesses who heard shots coming from the front and the Grassy Knoll area, and that's where the fatal shot obviously came from.

"The only one called by the Warren Commission was Mr. Zapruder, and he was only asked about his camera and the time and so forth of the film. And in the course of answering that, even he pointed out that the shots came from behind him, past his shoulder towards the President. So there is no overwhelming evidence at all. It's a matter of excluding certain things.

"As a matter of fact, there's very little evidence that Lee Oswald was up on the sixth floor."

JARRIEL: "We do know that they found a rifle with Oswald's palm print on it. They found his palm print on the sixth floor, and they know this rifle was fired...."

GARRISON: "Yes."

JARRIEL: "...and they have linked this rifle to Oswald, so isn't that evidence in itself that Oswald was there and firing a weapon?"

GARRISON: "No, it's evidence that Oswald had been in possession of that weapon, that it is the weapon that Oswald ordered. There's no question about that, under the name of Hidel, and there's no question about Oswald being on the scene, but that's a long ways away from actually firing the weapon. That's something that they were never able to prove and it was an assumption that they made, and one which fades before any objective investigation."

CLARK: "Well, Mr. Garrison, there were five of us in the wire service car which was the fifth car in the procession, and was just moving into the intersection in front of the Texas School Book Depository when the shots were fired. All five, and this would be the Austin White House Press Secretary and four pool reporters, would state

GARRISON: "Now, let me clarify that. The FBI is not hampering us in any specific way. I am sure that the Bureau is not enthusiastic about the fact that we disagree in a number of ways with their conclusions. And I'm sure there's some pride involved, but the — the primary problem is the Central Intelligence Agency."

"The Central Intelligence Agency, actually, I think, has answered your question itself, because otherwise, were they not in a position of having to hide something, Tom, they would not have to hire lawyers to try and stop the case. The — every lawyer involved in this case, without exception, involved in the attempts to derail the investigation, to stop the case, has been connected by us with the Central Intelligence Agency."

"One lawyer, Mr. Fleckin, has publicly admitted that his client worked for the Central Intelligence Agency. He has also admitted that he is being paid by the Central Intelligence Agency, and every other lawyer in the case we have connected with them, with the Central Intelligence Agency."

"Mr. Burton Klein and his alleged client Boba (?) were flown to Washington, all expenses paid."

"The point is, if the Central Intelligence Agency is not involved, then what on earth are they working so hard to stop the investigation for?"

"But to get back to the even more important point, our investigation of the activities of Lee Oswald in New Orleans show that his associations in New Orleans during the six months he was there were not merely frequently, were not merely most of the time, but were continually and exclusively with individuals employed by the Central Intelligence Agency."

"Oswald's associations were continually and exclusively with individuals engaged in anti-Castro activities, and yet this is not indicated anywhere in the Warren Commission, but it hits you in the face in New Orleans, and there are no exceptions to it."

JERRIEL: "Do you believe Oswald was a CIA agent or...."

GARRISON: "No, he was not a CIA agent. He was obviously an intelligence employee of the United States government. This — this is so obvious that I don't see how they hid it. First of all, his associations at the time, just off the cuff, the fact, here's a boy who went into the Marines when he was 17. He'd never shown any interest in languages of any kind. He was word blind which makes it impossible to learn languages by yourself, and that's brought out in the Warren Commission."

"All of a sudden he's speaking Russian fluently. Obviously through one of our intelligence cover courses by our own forces. And then he's at a Soviet base which has — had at that time a CIA function, I understand. Of course, this is general knowledge. If it were private knowledge, I wouldn't feel free to comment on it. But it goes on and on."

6

"For example, when, after his so-called communist activities, he wanted to get in December of 1963 a passport to Europe, he got it in 24 hours. And you couldn't do that."

CLARK: "If we can take a brief pause here, we'll be back in a moment with more 'Issues and Answers.'"

JARRIEL: "Mr. Garrison, you were saying that Lee Harvey Oswald, you think, was associated with the CIA in some capacity or another. Does this mean that you think the CIA might have had a role in the assassination of President Kennedy?"

GARRISON: "Well, Tom, in answering, just let me finish one point I was referring to earlier. Other — other indications of Oswald connections with the Central Intelligence Agency are the fact that even while in the Marines, when stationed at El Toro, as we know from the testimony of Nelson Delgado (?), Cary Thornley (?) and other individuals, even the Warren Commission itself, Oswald had a higher security clearance than the rest of his Marine buddies.

"And it — the indications go on and on. The telephone number of the local office of the Central Intelligence Agency is in the front of Oswald's book and very thinly disguised, simple code to himself, and if you accumulate the associations of his conduct, there's no question about it. But I just wanted to complete that, now to get to your question.

"Of course, the Central Intelligence Agency had no role in the planning or intending the assassination of President Kennedy. I — I think that that would be ridiculous position for anybody to take. I certainly have never shown that, but what clearly happened, and we don't — we don't think employees of the Central Intelligence Agency were involved. We're going to be able to show it.

"What apparently happened was that this adventure which was going on in the summer in New Orleans with regard to Guba, an anti-Castro venture involving Latin American individuals, and involving Lee Harvey Oswald and others, backfired for some reason, perhaps after the mission aborted, which it seems to have in early August, 1963, and the U. S. funds were withdrawn from it.

"As a consequence, a spinoff, in effect, apparently occurred and President Kennedy was killed by these same individuals. Now, what the CIA did do, and I presume it rationalized this in terms of national security, it concealed from the Warren Commission, from the American people, from the President and from the world, the fact

"Now, that is the end — therein lies the culpability of the CIA."

CLARK: "Well, why would anti-Castro Cubans turn a plot to assassinate Castro, if you feel this might have been involved, into a plot to assassinate President Kennedy?"

GARRISON: "That's not hard to answer, but let me say first, that when I say anti-Castro Cubans, I'm not criticizing all Cubans, and no legitimate organizations are involved, but in the summer of '63, actually before that, there were a number of Cuban individuals who had very strong feelings about President Kennedy, stemming from the Bay of Pigs, and these strong feelings became amplified with the detente reached with Castro and Khrushchev in the fall of 1962 in October.

"In the last summer of '63, for the first time, the Administration started putting the detente and the specific office and started cutting down on some of the CIA's activities. At this time our evidence is that the feelings, anti-Kennedy feelings of some of these — Cuban individuals and other Latin individuals, became venomous, and the outcome was in what you saw in Dealey Plaza on the 22nd of November."

CLARK: "Have you given specific names to the CIA or the FBI and told them that you have evidence of an assassination conspiracy?"

GARRISON: "If I had any specific names, any specific evidence, the last agency in the world which I would give it at this point, is the Central Intelligence Agency, Bob. It's doing everything it can to obstruct us. We have asked them for information. For example, the picture which we know that they took of Leo Harvey Oswald coming out of the Cuban embassy in Mexico City, when — at which time he was walking with a known employee of the Central Intelligence Agency, and all we receive is double talk. So, we're certainly not going to ask them for anything.

"As for the Bureau, I think that we're going to get more and more cooperation from the Bureau as they realize that we do have substantial information about the — about the assassination. At that time, all of our information will be made available to the Bureau. But not to the CIA."

JARVIS: "In another area. In the Shaw preliminary hearing in New Orleans, one of the witnesses, a key witness, testified that he was testified repeatedly before he testified. Another confirmed from the witness stand that he was a dope addict with a very severe habit. These — are these the type of people that you will have your ears on, people who have undergone hypnosis and people who are on narcotics? Do you have other type of evidence or other type of witnesses that will be forthcoming?"

GARRISON: "Let me answer your question, Tom, in two parts. First of all, I'm not going to say anything about the type of witnesses or the names or the kinds of witnesses we will produce at the trial. But I want to comment on the rest of your question.

"First of all is the fact that — is the fact that we need a witness under hypnosis. This was done to help objectify his testimony. In other words, when we heard the testimony of this witness, the first thing I said was, I want him placed under hypnosis — hypnosis — I want him given sodium pentathol. I want him confirmed with regard to his statements and I want the kind of confirmation which has a doctor present and not just police officers.

"So, we thought we had more or less made history when we made him take hypnosis, that we made him take sodium pentathol with two reputable doctors present. We felt that this made history in the sense that a prosecutor was forcing his own witnesses to objectify their testimony.

"Now, to my amazement I find that we are supposed to have used these devices to some sinister end to plant ideas in the head of this witness, and as a consequence, we no longer bother to objectify in the way we started doing.

"Now, with regard to the dope addict, it's true, I would rather have a bank president or a successful lawyer. Well, not a lawyer. We've had a lot of trouble with lawyers lately, but a successful businessman. But it happens to be a fact of life that you seldom find bank presidents and successful businessmen sitting on the levy alone by the lake at a place where people are liable to have secret meetings.

"The question is, is he telling the truth or not. There are many attorneys who are brilliant liars, and there are dope addicts who have never learned to lie. And that's the case here. The question is, was he telling the truth, and the answer is obviously."

JARRIEL: "The man you mentioned earlier, Alvin Boboeuf (?), has confirmed reports that one of your investigators offered him money and a position with an airline if he would confirm certain details of an assassination plot, and Boboeuf later said he didn't know of any such details.

"Was any such inducement made to a witness in — to your knowledge?"

GARRISON: "Yes, in a sense, but not in the sense in which they sought to imply it. This was a set up about which I complained to the Louisiana State Bar Association long before it became public, although I — I seem to have trouble communicating that to the world at large. Boboeuf complained that he was unable to even tell us about the case, to my investigators, because he had no job and needed financial help. And my investigators said to him, in effect, that, look, if you have knowledge about the case which will bring it to a conclusion, and you tell the absolute truth about it, you should have no financial problems. We will get you a job with an airline. I'm sure the boss can help you. But you have to pass sodium pentathol. You have to pass hypnosis, and you have to pass a lie detector test.

"Now, this is very important, because he complained during the course of this dialog about having to take all three, and Lindloy Zell (?) was insistent because, at that

time we were required, fortunately.

"Now, the reason you have not seen the tape on this, the much wanted tape, is because they cut out the first part where the insistence is made by Loy Zell that he take the three tests, but they made a mistake and left in it later references by both Bobocuf and his lawyer to the three tests he had to take. And by that time we had obtained a copy of it. So, now they can't release it, because they've been caught, cutting a part of it out."

"In summary, it's not even close to a bribe. If it were, I would remove the man from my office immediately. We don't operate that way. No — no intelligent prosecutor wants a lying witness on the stand, because a good defense attorney will tear him to ribbons. It was just an attempt to create the picture of a bribe."

"Now, what is of significance is the fact that the Newsweek magazine, this crummy news magazine owned by The Washington Post, which is a mouthpiece for the Administration, has never bothered to find out the truth from us. It's never made any attempt at all, and it's made it look like a bribe. And I think that's unforgivable. It raises questions about the — the motives of this so-called news magazine."

JARRIEL: "Was anything in the way of jobs or money offered to any other witness if he would tell the truth, or any future security. Any witness, such as Russo (?)."

GARRISON: "No, I know of no such other incidents. As a matter of fact, it's certainly not a pattern of the office. I would regard it, in that case, as an incident of enthusiasm on the part of this particular investigator who was sucked into it by the circumstances, I think, certainly, not in the best manners and the best traditions of questioning a witness, but I think the fact that he insisted it had to be the whole truth indicates a lack of sinister motive. Naturally, I've talked to him about this, approaching any witness that way because of his being misunderstood. But this is the only case I know of. We simply don't operate that way, and I don't think other DA's offices do either."

CLARK: "One of the men who served as an attorney for Jack Ruby, this was Saul Dan (?) said this past week, and let me quote his words to you, it would very much appear that Mr. Garrison has improperly discharged his responsibility. His actions appear irresponsible and not in keeping with his role as prosecutor, which is to protect the innocent as well as convict the guilty."

"He's asking that you be disbanded. Is it irresponsible to make the sort of charges that you have made in public before they are made in court?"

GARRISON: "Well, Bob, I'm not aware of any particular charges I've made in public except where they've been brought out by the newspapers or except where I have

replied to some great brain like this attorney, but you're going to find that I've initiated very few charges. For example, the revelation of the investigation itself was made over my objection.

"Do you have any examples in mind?"

JARRIEL: "I think he's particularly concerned about your linking Oswald to Ruby."

GARRISON: "Ah, let me reply. My linking Oswald with Ruby the first time publicly was in my reply to the Associated Press last night to his statement. We have had solid evidence for a long time that Ruby was linked with Oswald, but we have not referred to it for several reasons. And one of them is that the man is dead, that he has a family left. We didn't even hint at it until this lawyer came up with this ridiculous comment. So, now when you asked me earlier, when Tom did, I felt free to comment on it.

"Of course, what it all adds up to is he would love to see me disbarred because he knows I'm going to connect Ruby with a conspiracy, and that's going to be very easy to do."

CLARK: "If we can take another short pause, we'll be back in just a moment with some final 'Issues and Answers.'"

JARRIEL: "Mr. Garrison, by the comments you've made, you've cast doubt on a Federal government investigative agency, the CIA. You've cast doubt on the Warren Commission's findings on the murder of a President.

"How would you pass judgment on yourself if in time you cannot prove what you have stated about these agencies?"

GARRISON: "Well, to take the last part of your question first, Tom, the question will not arise because we have already proved it and we have the evidence. It's a matter of solving the problem of communication. But to any reasonable man in the United States or the world I can prove that tomorrow, right now. So, that problem won't arise. But even if it were to, hypothetically, my — my evaluation would be at least I have made an attempt to find out the truth and as far as I know this is the first objective investigation by any official agency in the assassination.

"Now, again, I'm not casting judgment on — on the Bureau, because I think

at least we have tried to find out the truth."

JARRIEL: "You've passed judgment in your own mind, but will you take what evidence you have into a court of public opinion, in either a legislative investigation, a Congressional investigation, where your evidence can be brought out to the public?"

GARRISON: "I will take all evidence which is relevant to our case into the court room. Actually, what you have mentioned is the proper place for it, and that is a Congressional inquiry into the CIA's activities. All of our evidence will be made available to the CIA, and if they looked into it seriously, there's no question in my mind, but what the CIA will be reorganized. Of course, we need an intelligence operation, but will be reorganized so it has Congressional controls. You cannot have in a democracy an organization which really believes that the end justifies the means, and which is not responsive at all to the representatives of the people in Congress.

"That's what we have, and when you have that, you have a totalitarian power in your country, and we have in the CIA today, because of that."

CLARK: "I'm sorry, but our time is now just about up.

"It has been a pleasure having with you -- having us -- having you with us as our guest on 'Issues and Answers.'"

GARRISON: "My pleasure."

ANNOUNCER: "'Issues and Answers' has been a presentation of ABC News."