THE SHREVEPORT JOURNAL
SHREVEPORT-BOSSIER CITY, LA.
May 22, 1967

Garrison Interview

Q. Mr. Garrison, what was Lee Harvey Oswald's role in this whole thing?

A. Lee Harvey Oswald was not an agent of the Central Intelligence Agency. He was, and I don't know what phrase, what secret phrase, the secret police agency uses, but he was an employee of the Central Intelligence Agency at the time he associated with anti-Castro Cubans with whom he associated. As a matter of fact, Lee Oswald's associations in the summer of 1963 in New Orleans were not merely pro-

that, that was no great surprise to us after we had gone in to it for a while. The point is he not only was not a Communist, he was an anti-Communist who was working for the CIA. Once this tragedy occurred, the CIA's attitude seemed to have been, well, President Kennedy is a casualty of the cold war. And, as to the kid, that's just one of those things. The cold war must go on. The cover must be kept.

The CIA cannot be injured and as a result there's been no prosecution of its secret. Its power has just continued unchecked, when actually its power as a result of this investigation of totalitarian police state tactics should be cut down drastically and made responsible to the people. The CIA, as I have learned from this case, I wasn't aware of it before, the CIA has infinitely more power than the Gestapo and the NKVD of Russia combined.

Q. Did Lee Harvey Oswald kill President Kennedy?

A. No. Lee Harvey Oswald did not, did not even shoot President Kennedy. He did not fire a shot from the book depository building. There's no question about that anymore at all. One of the best concept is just about right now in the position of Humpty Dumpty. It can never be really resurrected. One of the unfortunate things is that not enough of the press has done their homework, so I'm still in a position of having to defend that against those who don't want to believe that the whole truth was not brought out. But he did not touch a gun on that day. He was a decoy at first. And then he was a patsy and then he was a victim.

Q. At this point can you say if Lee Harvey Oswald did not kill the President, who did?

A. Oh, I can say who did without any question, except, and we know the group and we know some of the names of the group. But we don't know which one was standing where and we can't find out with the CIA keeping its vaults locked. They were former employees of the CIA. We managed to get the names of some of them in a way I can't describe here, but we cannot find out through any government agency where they are located now, if they are still in America, and we have a stone wall there as far as the identification of the other individuals. But I can say the rest of them are Cubans who were training in New Orleans.

Q. Mr. Garrison, what was Lee Harvey Oswald's role in this whole thing?

A. Well, I'm going to say the most important person. I don't know that's really what he was. One of the most important keys in history is an overabundance of, sometimes in the mad of chaos I will tell members of my staff to write out what a description of something is and in this case they put just said I put my name to it, so I'm responsible for an overstatement. A very important man would be a better way to describe [illegible].

His role is involved and I don't want to go into more detail because it goes into evidence that begins to tie in with the case here. In other words I feel that can talk in some generalities about the total picture and some aspects that do not touch Mr. Shaw's case. But I am not going to say anything that will reflect on Mr. Shaw or his trial, which limits me with regards to [illegible] somewhere. But Ferrie's role in the summer of '63 was in connection with, well, he was an intermediary. He was not a CIA agent for example. He did not carry a CIA card. He was, if you were to ask the CIA, 'Did David Ferrie work for you,' you would receive a very polished lie from Washington, which they [illegible] perfected and adore [illegible].

They would say we have searched our files exhaustively and we do not find that this man worked for us at anytime and there's no sign. Usually this means that he did, because the first rule of the CIA is that the end justifies the means, which is one reason it should be eliminated and reorganized, because you can't have any agency in a democracy which really believes that the end justifies the means. This is never the case. Ferrie worked for the CIA in Florida in 1961. This appears to be, as far as we can find, his initial connection. He was making flights for them.

When Oswald came and they had a special adventure planned in spite of President Kennedy's order involving Cuba, he was deeply involved in it and he was actually helping with the training. They have a problem in training in cases like that, they don't want to use members of the United States Army and the United States forces, and in this case Ferrie was involved in servicing. In a sense. With regard to what happened in Dallas, well, I would rather just say in general terms that, although there is no question about what the reason for, for it was his trip to Houston [illegible]

...security involved.

In other words, we have here a part of the federal government blocking completely the inquiry into, attempting to block the inquiry into the death of President Kennedy.

Again I want to emphasize that it is not a case of my saying now we won't be able to find out. We have found out how it happened. There is no mystery. It wasn't that complicated. The question is getting the names, the final names of some of these people, a few details to wrap it up. And we are being blocked completely by the CIA. While we have a problem of cooperation with other federal agencies at this time, it is apparent to me that the CIA is engineering this because its future, its prestige is at stake, and above all, its power. One of the things I am sure it's worried about is that Congress may begin to get curious about this monstrosity, this cancer it has developed in this country and begin to apply controls which should have been applied a long time ago.

Q. Because of this blocking effort which you prescribe to the CIA, will this in any way hinder or eliminate the possibility of your solution of the assassination?

A. No, I don't think there is anything to eliminate it. But it will slow it up. If it were not for this, if we had had the slightest cooperation of the Central Intelligence Agency there would be nothing else to investigate. In other words, the picture has become that clear. It's a sense of solving confetti. It's just sewing details which we regard as very important details. But we're not going to stop until we get them, but right now they are in effect locked in the CIA's safe.

They know the name of every man involved, and the name of the individuals who pulled the triggers from the grassy knoll and escaped. And they know that they did it because they were former employes of the CIA, while they were training in New Orleans in the summer of 1963.

Raymond Russo told a strange and startling tale about the conspiracy to kill President Kennedy. Is Perry Raymond Russo your star witness in this whole investigation?

A. Well, the question of course, is a little involved. But I can't answer to much without at least inferentially reflecting on Mr. Shaw's rights to a fair trial and I don't want to even raise the possibility of a question of having done so, but I will say that I do not regard Perry Russo as our main witness. And I'm sure that will be a definite disappointment to those gentlemen from the federal government who are working so hard to

...we know who did it, we can make arrests and get convictions. It is now 24 hours since that statement was made. Is there anything that would lead you to believe that that statement is not true now?

A. No, the only thing is, however, first of all is, sorry is a bad word. But it is nevertheless true. But let me clarify what I meant because it was presented as a gloat. As I went into the elevator, they said, "When's your next arrest." And I said, "Arrests, it may be a long time."

I don't want to talk about arrests. I first said no comment. But there will be arrests. And I said yes, there will be. Then you've solved the case? And I said we solved the case some time ago, mainly that we understood what happened and who the principal people were and it turned out to be confirmed without any question.

Well, the next thing I knew there were photographs of me, selected from some other incident, with a big smile on my face, announcing that we had solved the case. Well, it wasn't intended to be a gloat. What I meant was as to the general dimensions and as to the key people involved. And this remains true.

On the other hand, I did not dream that there would be such total obstruction by elements of the federal government where we could not get any cooperation from any federal agency, that we have our lines produced constantly. Well, not from us, any major witness, [illegible]

Again, we're so used to it that it doesn't bother us. But as a result I think that in closing out the case the final details of evidence that we want take us much longer, but we're not going to quit, we're going to get them anyway. But I'd say, that, what time is now? The Central Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States if it wants could in the next 60 minutes give us the name of every last Cuban involved in this and we can help them with a description if they have a problem of how to find the names and in 60 minutes from now the case would be completely closed. And that's how close we have been to the end for sometime, but we are blocked by this glass wall of this totalitarian, powerful agency which is worried about its power. And it's obviously worried about its power, because it's desperate.

When you try to make it

...appear that the kind of [illegible] have built up would be somebody or [illegible] them in order to try [illegible] pretty desperate. Because any trial lawyer knows there is nothing worse in a major case than a witness who is lying. There is nothing easier for a defense lawyer to [illegible] This is a conspiracy. I think obviously engineered by the CIA, to derail us and this will be exposed in time, there's no problem about that. The problem is the conspiracy they are engaged in. But again, I can summarize it by saying, of course, it was true. I'm not a perfect person by any means but I don't happen to be a liar.

What does all of this mean to you, this lack of cooperation and in certain instances and in certain instances, as you say, actual hindrance, as you say, in your investigation of the assassination?

A. The summary, what it gets down to is this, we have drifted away from our constitutional [illegible] CIA, for example, recently [illegible] as many [illegible] federal government do. A similar [illegible] the state is not a sovereignty but a [illegible] to the federal agency concerned. We think wrong and this country will not survive in the way we've known it unless we change it and the change has to begin in this case with that federal agency which has concealed the true facts of the assassination, whose employes were involved in the assassination and it knows this and that is the Central Intelligence Agency.

In the final analysis, what it comes down to is whether federal power can be allowed to be totally unconstrolled. If this is so, then we are no different than Nazi Germany or Soviet Russia. And I can't believe that that day has come. I cannot believe that it is possible for the CIA to continue to obstruct with power. As far as I'm concerned they are wasting their time with me, they can slow me down but there's no way in the world they can stop me from bringing our conclusion to this case.