

MUTUAL BROADCASTING NETWORK

GARRISON INTERVIEW, PART 1

INTERVIEWER: Without any question, one of the most interesting things to the American public today is the investigation of the Kennedy assassination. In order to find out a little bit more about the investigation itself and the man himself, it's been our pleasure to have a chance to talk to Mr. James Garrison, the District Attorney for New Orleans, and he's with us in the studio today.

Mr. Garrison, it's a great pleasure to have you here at Mutual, on The World Today.

JAMES GARRISON: It's a pleasure to be here, Scott.

INTERVIEWER: Playboy had a very, very interesting interview in the current issue, which is on the newsstands right now, in which you've gone through a pretty careful discussion of the entire situation. I would like, if I may, to ask right off the bat, what prompted the Kennedy assassination investigation, right from the start, in your own mind?

GARRISON: Well, we happened -- we happened to stumble across

6-11-63 5771  
ENCLOSURE

the involvement of a New Orleans individual about 72 hours after the assassination by accident. And we turned him over to the -- to the FBI, and we heard nothing more from it. And then last Fall, when I happened to be in New York talking with Senator Russell Long, I found out to my surprise that he and a number of other individuals regarded the matter as not closed.

I, just like most of the people in this country, assumed that it had been looked into honestly and completely. I took it for granted. So I got curious and began looking into it, and finally started reading into the Warren Commission, and I found out that totally -- the conclusion was totally untrue, and it was not an objective, honest inquiry. It was, in effect, a carefully organized concealment of the facts.

So we started looking into it, and we found out that there were a large number of individuals involved in the assassination of the president. I might add that the Playboy article actually is -- is just one corner of it, because at the time I gave it I was unable to mention other aspects, like the involvement of some members of the Dallas police department, and some of the Minute Men in Dallas, because I still hadn't been in Dallas. Now I don't, so I'm free to talk about it.

But it is -- the Playboy article does effectively cover a corner of the story.

INTERVIEWER: You say -- you said that the Warren Commission was covering parts of this investigation.

GARRISON: It would be more accurate to say they were covering the whole thing. In other words the lone assassin theory, which the Warren Commission developed, is a complete fraud. This is why you now have elements of the United States Government, and a large part of the news establishment of the United States doing everything it can, literally desperately, to try and conceal whatever news comes from New Orleans about this, because the United States Government has in this case perpetrated a major fraud.

INTERVIEWER: Well, was this done purposely?

GARRISON: Yes, of course. The main objective was to fool the people of the United States, and I presume the rest of the world, into thinking that this was a lone assassin, a Communist oriented individual, and keep from bringing up the obvious truth, that there was a conspiracy.

In other words, I suppose you might put it this way. The objective was to keep the people of this country thinking that they were still living in the best of all possible worlds; that they were not living in a world in which the big business, Texas style, financed the assassination, as it did; in which the right wing -- paramilitary right wing elements which were financed and encouraged in their training and given weapons by the Central Intelligence Agency was involved. All these things were too embarrassing to bring out.

So somewhere along the line the decision was made by someone to conceal the truth and go along with the Dallas scenario. And the Dallas scenario of course was totally false. But the U. S.

Government has now given the seal of approval to it, and so the people of this country have been given a completely false story.

INTERVIEWER: Now you say that there were members of the Dallas police department that were involved.

GARRISON: Oh yes, it couldn't have been done effectively without it. They were involved --- some of them were involved at Dealey Plaza, others in the Oak Cliff operation, in connection with covering up the killing of Officer Tippett, and particularly in the arrest of Oswald in back of the Texes theater.

But I want to emphasize that one of the problems in talking about groups is people quite often assume you're referring to the whole group. I have no doubt that the majority of the Dallas police force are good officers, and as well intentioned as any police force in the country. But you have within the Dallas police force, you have an element, essentially the Minute Man element, the extreme militant right wing group, which is actively involved in assassination.

INTERVIEWER: Mr. Garrison, may we go back a little bit and -- I'm sure that there is a certain amount of confusion as to the sequence of events. The plot, I think as you've called it, to assassinate President Kennedy, how did it -- where did it develop, where did it start?

GARRISON: Well actually I probably gave the impression in my interview, because I was concentrating on one aspect it started in New Orleans. It actually didn't start in New Orleans. It appears to have begun in Texas. Again I have to say -- I'm about to

say that an element of big business in Dallas, Texas, big business was involved. Oil money helped finance it. There's all kinds of money coming down to finance the assassination.

But it is not the entire structure, it is just a small group within the structure. But not long after Oswald came back from Russia he was taken over by a White Russian group there, and including the White Russian group individuals who were setting him up as early as 1962. But the New Orleans part came in later, when extreme right wing individuals -- and even as I say that, to avoid misunderstanding, I am not a left wing individual. I'm pretty much middle of the road. It just happens that this was the work of a group of extreme right wing fanatics.

But the Dallas individuals, this portion of the Dallas establishment, of oil millionaires, Minute Men and so forth, and a handful of the White Russians who got control of Oswald actually started this as early as 1962. The point of moving Oswald to Dallas was really -- I mean to New Orleans, was really to de-Dallasize him, so that he would become an individual not from Dallas. He was put in New Orleans about six or seven months, a nesting place, and control was kept of him. And he was set up with some Communist appearing activity.

Now they were able to do this because employees of the Central Intelligence Agency are involved in the assassination. Again, not the management, not necessarily career agents. But nevertheless it is clear that employees of the Central Intelligence Agency were keeping control of Oswald and were persuading that he was still engaged

in CIA work, as he was in Russia.

And so he was brought to New Orleans to de-Dallasize him, so that when the time came he would not be a Dallas man.

INTERVIEWER: Well, there was a little confusion with -- that Oswald sort of perpetrated himself, wasn't there, when he -- for his Cuban -- what was he called, the outfit...?

GARRISON: Fair Play For Cuba.

INTERVIEWER: ...Fair Play For Cuba, and he gave the wrong address at one time.

GARRISON: Actually Oswald was operating out of the -- out of the office of the most conservative anti-Castro individual in New Orleans, Guy Bannister. And again, while we do not necessarily appeal to Guy Bannister personally as involved, and I want to avoid mentioning any individuals, the fact remains that there is a Minute Man aspect, and a number of Minute Man individuals involved in this.

And the first address which Lee Oswald put on his Fair Play For Cuba pamphlets was 544 Camp Street, which was the office of the anti-Castro right wing operation in New Orleans. They had to correct that. Well, by the time they corrected it you had a key there which the Warren Commission ignored. In other words, it indicated at the outset he was in the control of a militant right wing element.

INTERVIEWER: Now, also in the Playboy article you said that Fidel Castro could actually clear this whole thing up as to the source and the -- where the plot came from, and actually almost testified to the fact that the whole plot was perpetrated

with his knowledge.

GARRISON: I don't -- If I said that then I didn't make myself clear. Because remember, I think this is an accurate, well done article, but it consists of several hundred facts, and there's a problem of communication between humans. I would have to clarify that now and say, I do not think that Fidel Castro would know with precision that much about it.

I think that from his -- with his detachment -- and again I'm certainly no supporter of his, or of any Communist, but with his detachment, again, I think that he was probably able to sense what was in process when it happened.

INTERVIEWER: I see.

GARRISON: In a general way. And that's what I mean, I'm sure.

INTERVIEWER: Well going back to the New Orleans aspect of it, do you feel that in New Orleans you have the key to the entire probe, I think, if we want to call it that?

GARRISON: Well, let me see if I can answer the question this way. The only reason I would say that we have a key to it in New Orleans is because New Orleans happens to be within our jurisdiction. And we can -- we can investigate in Dallas, and we have been investigating in Dallas. Now I can even talk about Dallas without having a head cut off from my investigator. But New Orleans is simply a corner of the tapestry. And we happened to stumble across it.

And I don't claim that it was a great investigative job.

I don't think there was really an honest effort before. The FBI was not given the entire picture. The Central Intelligence Agency was concealing a large part of it and being protected. And apparently no local jurisdictions anywhere locked into it. So we stumbled across a corner of the tapestry.

But the main part is still in Dallas. I doubt that it will ever be investigated in Dallas because of the fantastic financial power of the elements of the establishment that are involved. You can't become head of the police force, and you can't become a major figure in law enforcement in Dallas without the approval of some of these very individuals who sponsored the assassination.

INTERVIEWER: Well, in Dallas itself there are still many unanswered questions, such as the -- almost the, well, excitement or battle over, was it one shot, or was it several? In your article the interview in Playboy -- you have gone with the theory that there were seven, or perhaps more men that actually fired.

GARRISON: There's no mystery about whether or not there was more than one shot. I don't think I can honestly say with precision exactly how many, because the only persons who can say exactly how many are the individuals who were doing the shooting. There would necessarily be a certain amount of confusion in such a situation.

... It is clear however that there were at least three different directions from which shooting was coming. It was coming from the Book Depository, although from a different location than the window where Oswald's supposed to be. It's quite apparent that there was no shooting from that window, and least of all Oswald. And it ap-



more likely that they were shooting from another building in the rear of either the Sheriff's Building, or more likely the Dalton Building. And above all it is clear that there were -- there was firing from the grassy knoll, and the more significant firing, and the larger amount was from the grassy knoll.

That for example is where the fatal shot came from. But again, these things are concealed by a rather simple technique. What the Warren Commission did was to call practically nobody from the area of the grassy knoll. Two-thirds of the people in Dealey Plaza heard the shooting from the grassy knoll. They were not called. Some of the people from the grassy knoll threw themselves -- from the grassy knoll area -- threw themselves down on the ground to keep from being hit. They used phrases like "a fusillade of fire coming over the stone wall." At least one of them saw the face of one of the men shooting from over the stone wall. And these people were not called before the Warren Commission because it would have ruined the scenario.

To go to another aspect, if you take the time to go through the medical testimony, before they got real control of the doctors, which took some years -- now I'm sure if you go to the different doctors they'll either say, I have no comment, or they've decided on reflection after three years and say in the official position that maybe they were wrong.

But initially you find that the doctors at Parkland Hospital had diagnosed the President's wound in the throat as being an

entrance wound, not an exit wound. So there is a frontal shot there. And then when you read the cause of death, which decision was made by Dr. McClellan a little after four in the afternoon, you read -- you find out that the fatal shot came in the President's temple. And the temple is in the front of his head, and the Book Depository is behind him. But of course these things are muted, and have never been -- are not even mentioned in the summary by the Warren Commission, because the idea is to try and make it look like it was Oswald in the rear.

INTERVIEWER: One of the things that fascinated me in the article in Playboy was the fact that so many items have been classified as top secret and placed in the National Archives.

GARRISON: For 75 years.

INTERVIEWER: For 75 years. In some of these files do you think there is more information?

GARRISON: There's no question about it. As a matter of fact you can -- you can damn near get an idea of what happened, even if you had not investigated it, by just going over the titles which were -- in other words, files are given titles at a time when the particular persons making them up aren't thinking about the concealment aspect, which is done later on by superiors. And if you go over the list of titles of files which cannot be looked at for 75 years, you can get an idea of the curious things which concern the elements of the United States Government, and which they're trying to conceal.

Now the attitude of the U. S. Government is that if you're

30 years old right now, when you're 102, you can look at these files. That is, if they do not decide 75 years from now that it has to be delayed another 75 years, which is entirely possible.

INTERVIEWER: This can be done.

GARRISON: Well, of course. I'm sure that they do not intend for any living person to see what's in these files. For example, the file entitled "The Central Intelligence Dossier on Lee Harvey Oswald," which undoubtedly would show the pre-existing relationship between Oswald and the CIA, would show he was not a Communist in any way. The CIA file on Jack Ruby, which would show that Jack Ruby was involved in a gun running operation, which is an operation that the CIA encouraged, because it was useful to it with regard to its anti-Castro activities.

One of the most interesting files, which is classified as secret, is the -- is entitled "Allegations of Private First Class Eugene Dinken." Here is a private first class, almost as low as you can get in the army, and he's made some allegations. But you cannot know what these allegations are because it might affect national security. Well these allegations are -- what these allegations were very simply was that here is an individual, a young man in the service, we found out by another route was saying that the President of the United States was probably going to be assassinated by right wing elements sooner or later, by a Minute Man element. And he was saying it so strongly that he got in trouble in the service.

A big production was made of it at the time. And when that turned out to be true, the United States Government had to keep it secret because they don't want people knowing what happened.

INTERVIEWER: Well now, Mr. Garrison, you're -- you've made, I don't know whether charges is the right word, but you have said that the government has been suppressing facts and people, and places have been kind of clouded over. Have you had anybody try and stop you from making statements like this?

GARRISON: Well, they can't directly try and stop me from making statements. They have a technical problem there because one of their objectives is to try and make this appear to be, again, the best of all possible worlds. But everything that can be done behind the scenes is being done.

For example you have the -- and everything that can be done by indirection is being done. For example, you have the Attorney General of the United States announcing within days after Shaw's -- is arrested, that Shaw has been investigated and cleared by the FBI. Well of course this was a lie. And later on the Justice Department had to admit it was a lie.

Well when they admitted it was a lie, the New York Times, which is -- which plays the game with the establishment, put it on page 64. Parenthetically, when a convict whom my office convicted announced that we had offered him herein to testify falsely, the Times put that on the front page. This is the way they play the game.

Now the -- they're doing everything they can. My phones

have been monitored for a long time. There's obviously a mail check through the Post Office about inspection of mail. But this is -- the U. S. has been doing this a long time. But it's just doing it a little stronger here. The use of the telephone company, which -- You see the telephone company, for example -- Again we have a problem throughout this whole thing about the difference between image and reality; the difference between things as they should be, as we are told they are, and as they really are.

And you have the telephone company, and you have a picture of your friendly telephone man taking a little boy across the street, or something. But in reality the telephone company, in a case like this, becomes an extension of the United States Government, of what is now a super state.

For example, the federal government does not have to tap your phone. They don't tap our phones, they monitor them. In other words, in our case for example, our lines, the private lines, office and home, of every individual connected with this case, every key witness, is -- is just thrown by attaching a connection between two terminals at the phone company into a cable that goes into a federal monitoring room, so it's all monitored. This became obvious to us early.

... But this is a standard part of the super state, whether it was Adolph Hitler, or it's Stalin. We have reached the point of being a super state. But this is -- there's more power than there should be in the federal government, and it's reached the point where the idea of democracy is -- still exists, and lip service

has to be given. It's a facade that's held up every now and then like a sign, but in reality it's fading away more and more.

INTERVIEWER: How do you conduct your business if you have these problems with the telephone and the mail? How do you conduct your investigations and get your reports without having it -- well, the cover blown?

GARRISON: Well Scott, there are two things that are true. First of all, we don't worry that much about the federal government picking up most of the details, because our attitude is that -- that hopefully sooner or later the people of the United States are going to demand an end to the fraud. And the more that the government finds out, we know exactly what happens, the harder it is going to be for them to continue to play the role of having looked into it. So to a great extent we're just going about our business, and let them pick up what they want.

With regard to sensitive matters, new areas, say the discovery of Oswald and Jack Ruby in another town, where it's not generally known they were together, details about that, or Jack Ruby and Dave Ferrie, mutual connections of theirs which we've established, that sort of thing, mutual connections of Lee Oswald and Dave Ferrie, and other people whose names I don't want to mention -- where we've established that and we don't want it to go straight to the defendant, because there's no doubt in our minds that the federal government gives whatever information it has straight to the defendant because its position is to completely protect the assassins of John Kennedy, well then we have to speak

in generalities or hold off and talk face to face.

INTERVIEWER: Ma-hm. Now you mentioned Clay Shaw before and one of the questions that I think that's in people's mind is why has it taken so long to get this trial into court?

GARRISON: Well, the reason it's taking so long is because the defense keeps filing pleadings; in other words, we can't even set the date yet. The defense makes statements every now and then, "We're ready to go to trial." And, of course, that's picked up and put in the New York Times.

They file a new pleading which means we can't set the trial. Actually I think they've reached the point where they know that this is not a laughing matter any more; they know we have a case and they're stalling in every possible way.

We can't even set it now and I wanted to go to trial in September; it's being stalled and stalled while the press of the establishment, Newsweek, the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, the National Broadcasting Company, the Columbia Broadcasting System, are pounding away, pounding away, trying to get at the potential jurors and affect their outlook; and meanwhile the case is being held off.

It's--the defense and those elements of the federal government are coordinating pretty effectively; in other words, I'd sum it up by saying the attitude of the federal government is, they have to know very well how Jack Kennedy was killed and why and they couldn't care less.

Their interest is not truth; this is a game of power; and it is to their advantage to have the man who killed Kennedy go free now because it would complicate things to have him caught; and that, of course, includes helping Shaw as much as possible.

INTERVIEWER: Well then, you're saying that Oswald actually didn't kill Kennedy.

GARRISON: Oswald never killed anybody in his life. Oswald was an employee of the Central Intelligence Agency during every day he was in Russia, apparently in connection with--he was in anti-aircraft in the Marines, you know--apparently in connection with spotting to see if the U-2's which we were using during the first part of this time in Russia, if the jet engines left vapor trails.

For example, when he's talking to Offstein at--over at Child's, a place he worked in, in Fort Worth, a place incidentally which is engaged in making government maps; it's a classified operation. Oswald worked there almost immediately when he came back.

But he mentioned to Offstein that he never saw a vapor trail all the time he was in Mirsk. He was working for the U.S. government there and he was working for the U.S. government, he thought, in New Orleans and even in Dallas. He didn't kill anyone; he was a beautiful patsy and they saw him early and said, "He's beautiful; he's just what we want."

And they used him. But he didn't kill anybody. He



... never killed Wiggatz; he didn't shoot at the President. And that's not even close, that's not even close.

But the only thing I'm curious about is, as time goes on and we show that, how is the establishment going to adjust? What is the New York Times going to do, and the Washington Post? Are they going to pretend that they never took the other position? Or are they going to pretend that nothing is happening down in New Orleans as we get convictions?

I'm waiting to see how they handle that.

INTERVIEWER: Well now, of course, I think the obvious thing to say now is that obviously you feel that all of this can be proved.

GARRISON: It has been proved. We've won this fight. It's a communication problem now. They--they are through as far as developing the proof. The fraud which was perpetrated by the United States government is exposed; there's no question about it. I can sit down with any objective person and in a little while leave no doubt in his mind about the fact that Oswald did not shoot anyone; that he was an employee of the United States; that the United States government after having him acquire the name of a Communist in its service then participated in a smear and used that to take itself off the hook and keep from being embarrassed.

I can prove it to anybody if I have a little time; I can't bring it out all publicly now because of the trial; but

get this and the place where it's carried through completely, is in Dallas; but what are you going to do when there are individuals in law enforcement in Dallas who are deeply involved in the assassination? When they are protected by a handful of millionaires who helped sponsor the thing, in the name of patriotism, in the insane sense; and when the United States government is protecting the killers of Jack Kennedy for practical reasons, who's going to prosecute them? I can't go over in Dallas and prosecute them. As a matter of fact, it's going to be a little harder to go in Dallas now that I've mentioned this aspect which we've kept quiet about.

And it's obvious that the United States government has no interest in justice or truth in this case; justice and truth are just an embarrassment: the matter's closed; we must go on to more important things.

The assassination's been ratified by the United States; they accepted it. They changed their foreign policy; they went back to the foreign policy that the sponsors of the assassination wanted; and they don't want to go into it because it's embarrassing.

But to sum this point up the fact probably is that there will be in our lifetimes no real prosecution of the sponsors and key individuals, or the assassins, because the men in the jurisdiction where it happened and where it really originated are owned, controlled, by individuals who sponsored it and they're also protected by the United

State government.

But I'm going to do this after the Shaw case. I'm going to bring out their names one by one and their involvement, no matter how powerful, no matter how rich they are and invite them to come into New Orleans to sue me. Then if they come into New Orleans to sue me, then I can prove their guilt in a civil trial.

But that's the only way I know to communicate to the people of this country what a fraud has been perpetrated.

INTERVIEWER: Mr. Garrison, if these statements that you have political ambitions for Washington from the state of Louisiana,--let's say you did get to Washington; the people voted you into Congress or into the Senate--what would be your action in Washington with regard to the assassination?

GARRISON: Scott, it's not possible for me to answer that because I have no political ambitions, least of all do I want to go to Washington. I have none whatsoever. I doubt if I would go if the opportunity presented itself; it wouldn't be that hard for me in Louisiana, to be honest about it; but I couldn't be less interested.

I happen to like what I'm doing. When I've finished what I'm doing I might go in the private practice again and have nothing to do with politics or government or reporters who presume that I've gone into this investigation for political reasons which certainly excludes you but I

How many reporters have that attitude.

And I'm more interested in private practice. I only have the interest in building the best DA's office in the country and we certainly have one of them. We've accomplished that; now when we finish doing everything we can to communicate to the people of this country the fantastic fraud that has been accomplished in the name of the United States government, with a gold eagle stamped on it, then I'm interested in going back into private practice. And Washington? I couldn't be less interested, especially with what I know now about Washington.

INTERVIEWER: Well, Mr. Garrison, going back just a shade, there have been a number of people involved in the Kennedy investigation who have died. I believe the figure is somewhere in the neighborhood of 20?

GARRISON: It's up to 35.

INTERVIEWER: 35. And one of the insurance companies said that the odds for this sort of a concentration...

GARRISON: Trillion to one.

INTERVIEWER: A trillion to one. What is your attitude toward this?

GARRISON: Well, the insurance company's right because all the deaths are not accidental but again I think this is a problem that has to be approached with balance. In my judgment, most of the deaths which are described are normal in the sense of being reasonably representative of the

average, predictable incidents.

For example, there's a heart attack here and an automobile accident there. On the other hand, there's no question about the fact that a number of the deaths are murders. For example, the man who--quote--"committed suicide" by throwing himself through a plate-glass window--did not commit suicide, he was thrown--Frank Kellian--he was thrown through the plate-glass window. His wife worked for Jack Ruby.

And a number of individuals who worked for Jack Ruby had to see too much. For example, persons involved in the assassination in New Orleans as well as individuals involved at Dealey Plaza and involved in the shooting of Tippett's have been at Jack Ruby's Carousel Club; and we've established this there.

And it wasn't that hard; this is the--this is the unbelievable part, it wasn't that hard. But anybody who was a witness to that has been--and known to be a witness--has been methodically removed, like Nancy Mooney.

Nancy Mooney was not only employed by Jack Ruby but she was privy to many of these--these happenings. Incidentally the Warren Commission Report never--the 26 volumes--never quite admits she works for Jack Ruby; but she did.

And in 1964 she was one day arrested on a minor technicality. She had an argument with a girl or something. The other girl was not arrested; she's arrested and in two hours the Dallas police announced that she'd hanged herself.

Well, she'd been removed too and the probability is that she was murdered. But there are a number of others who were murdered for practical reasons and this would continue even now except for the problem that the spotlight has been put on it. It's a little hard for the individuals who initiated this, or elements of the Central Intelligence Agency, to murder somebody now because the spotlight's on it.

You see, the U.S. government never murders anybody but the Central Intelligence Agency doesn't hesitate at anything where an objective is in sight.

But right now it's a little difficult to murder somebody because these questions have been raised.

INTERVIEWER: May I just---just stop for a second there? You said that Nancy Mooney had been taken to the Dallas police station...

GARRISON: Yes, right.

INTERVIEWER: And two hours later she was dead from hanging...

GARRISON: She was hanged with her torso or pants...

INTERVIEWER: You said this was murder. Does this...?

GARRISON: I said probably. I wasn't there. I want to be...

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, yeah. But this implies involvement from perhaps the Dallas police? I don't know, I'm asking a question.

GARRISON: Scott, individuals in the Dallas police force helped kill Jack Kennedy, why should they hesitate with Nancy Mooney? But again when I say this I have to emphasize that

there's no question about the fact that the great majority of individuals in the Dallas police force are honest, well-intentioned policemen; however, it is clear that individuals on the Dallas police force were involved in the assassination and involved in the continuing protection of the assassins and were involved in things like this.

Anybody--any American who's curious about that can go to his library and every library in the country still has a set of the Warren commission reports--unless they've removed them--and if they will read the radio log--they can look up the Sawyer exhibit which is the exhibits in--after the testimony, and the Sawyer exhibits, if they want to see the--a clear cut--the-record indication of the involvement of the Dallas police, for example, in protecting the individual killed Tippett. Tippett was killed by one of the other individuals working on the assassination plot when they just left the vicinity of a church called the Church of the Abundant Life which happens to be at the corner of Tenth and Crawford.

And the man that killed Tippett actually ran around the block, dropped his jacket off in the parking lot and went straight into the Church of the Abundant Life; it was--I can't tell you how easy it was to establish this; it's unbelievable that he went into the Church of the Abundant Life.

The time he went in there Oswald was sitting in the back of the Texas theater as instructed and he'd bought a ticket and this fiction of a man going in without buying a