

Garrison answers questions

(Editor's Note: At the end of Garrison's speech, Art Kevin opened a 15 minute question and answer period, which is reproduced in full below).

Q: Do you believe that anyone within the framework of the U.S. government helped plot the assassination? Why did the government hide evidence, and third, who really killed Jack Kennedy?

ANSWER: First of all, employees—a limited number—of the Central Intelligence Agency of the U.S. government are involved in the assassination. A number of them have been identified. Secondly, in my judgment, the reason that the United States government—meaning the present administration, Lyndon Johnson's administration—is obstructing the investigation—any investigation. It has concealed the true facts—to be blunt about it—to protect the individuals involved in the assassination of John Kennedy. And as to the third question, that involves names and I cannot possibly go into that at this time.

(It was pointed out that Garrison could not answer any questions regarding Clay Shaw's trial which will be coming up sometime next year.)

Q: Why the tacit approval of the Kennedy family of the Warren Commission Report?

ANSWER: I don't want to be unfair to Senator Kennedy and I think if I tried to speculate without having the facts I would be unfair. For example, the comments I made about the President were comments made as the result of specific facts that we have after months of forbearance. On the other hand, I don't know enough about President (sic) Kennedy reasons to guess. I'm curious too. I don't understand it. I don't know.

Q: How did you stumble onto the story?

ANSWER: I didn't mean it in that way. What I meant was we stumbled onto the case itself. If we had not got curious about the odd trip that David Ferrie made right into a thunderstorm all night to go ice skating in Houston, and the fact that he did not go ice skating there, if we had not seen that, and continued to be curious about that, we would not have found our way into the whole thing, because they had cutoffs and insulations of every possible kind. We just happened to find ourselves in the intermediate area right below the level of the sponsors, the finan-

ciers, and right above the level of what you might call the operating level—the people who pulled the triggers. And we stumbled into it by luck. That's what I meant—not as a result of skill.

But because we didn't let go and we kept on digging, we had other luck later on and came across the other individuals.

But if you mean that because I now bring up for the first time the fact that is very plain to us—that the President of the United States bears the responsibility—the total responsibility—for the obstructions and concealment of the development of the truth—is something that we have known for months. But I wanted to lean over backwards because it's so easy to say it and I'm sure that there'll be replies that this is a rash statement. But there's no question about it—it's an Executive Order which comes from the

President that postponed your seeing the evidence for seventy-five years. But we wanted to lean over backwards, and we have. And we've tried to get cooperation and it's become hopeless. I don't want to criticize Ramsey Clark—he's a harmless sort of little fellow who has no idea what's happening—but his father was on the Supreme Court so he's head of the Justice Department. But the responsibility is in the President's lap. The time has come to bring it out, but we have known this for some months.

Q: Mr. Garrison, you made the statement that the main function of the Warren Commission was to conceal the right-wing militants who killed the president. The Warren Commission was appointed by President Johnson and composed of people such as Chief Justice Warren whom certain right-wing groups have attacked and asked for his removal. Is it your charge that the president appointed him, among others, in order to conceal the facts of the assassination.



ANSWER: I think the function of appointing the Chief Justice was to obtain what you might call a political compromise. As a result—and I think it was an ingenious appointment—the Warren Commission's conclusions had and now have strong backing from the liberal element of the country.

At the same time, there's a certain amount of support from the conservative element because of the presence of Gerald Ford on the Commission. I think it was a major reason for the appointment.

Now I don't know, because I cannot go into the man's mind, that when he appointed the commission the week after the assassination, that this was his precise concern at the time. I think the makeup of the commission makes it quite evident that there was at that time a concern about the involvement of individuals connected with the CIA. And it might well be that during the course of the inquiry they then protective of the status quo.

The Dallas Police scenario somewhere along that time, was adopted as the official truth. I think the essential reason for the appointment of Chief Justice Warren was to obtain the support of liberals for the Warren Commission.

Q: Why would Chief Justice Warren, who has never been identified as a right winger, conceal a right wing plot?

ANSWER: I have no idea. You would have to ask Chief Justice Warren.

Q: If you criticize the government for concealing evidence, may we ask you why YOU, as a member of government, will not reveal to us the demonstrable proof that you have as to who killed President Kennedy?

ANSWER: As a prosecutor, I am not ALLOWED to reveal to you my evidence until the case comes to trial. If I were to reveal my evidence to you, in order to make you happy, and I'd love to do it, I won't be able to convict the defendant.

Q: Does that mean you are charging the defendant with the murder of the President?

ANSWER: The defendant has already been charged with conspiracy to murder the President. Yes it's written down in black and white.

Q: Was there CIA money that went into the full page ad in that Dallas paper on the day preceding the assassination?

ANSWER: The ad was in the paper on the day of the assassination. As I recall, I don't think it was CIA money for that particular ad.

Q: What did the President do to incur the wrath of the right-wing?

ANSWER: Well, suppose I just give you three things off the top of my head. What did Franklin D. Roosevelt do to incur the wrath of the right wing? Don't you realize that the militant—the extreme right wing—felt that they had another Franklin D. Roosevelt from their point of view? In my judgment (I have to say this ahead of time so you won't misunderstand) I happen to think that John Kennedy was a good president. I feel rather strongly about that. But from their point of view, here were their concerns: first of all, it was obvious that he was bringing to an end the Cuban adventure. BRINGING IT TO AN END! And that certain steps had been taken to a rapprochement, a detente with Fidel Castro. It was plain an understanding was being worked out whereby there would be no more raids, no more plans to take over Cuba.

Again in the same direction, it

was plain that the President was bringing an end to the cold war—was becoming concerned about the billions of dollars being spent for the cold war. Was thinking about the possibility of trying to understand Russia better—I don't mean that he was going to dismantle our defenses—but he was reaching for an understanding and it is quite apparent too, that he did not intend to expand the war in Vietnam. And as far as Texans are concerned, he left no doubt that he was headed directly for the 27 1/2% deduction that is something very dear to some people in Texas (Editor's note: 27 1/2% equals oil depletion allowance).

Now that's just a few for openers.

Q: Do you still feel that David Ferrie possibly did not die of natural causes and if so, why? And by what method do you think Jack Ruby met his end?

ANSWER: I don't know about Jack Ruby. I don't have enough data about his death to know and I don't want to speculate. The way that Dave Ferrie appears to have killed himself appears to be an overdose of proloid, which is nothing but an old-fashioned thyroid pill.

If you're hypo-thyroid and you have low thyroid, a thyroid deficiency, then taking taking proloid doesn't hurt you at all. It beefs up your metabolism. On the other hand, Ferrie had a serious high blood pressure problem and, if you have high blood pressure of a serious nature, and you take an overdose of proloid, it's predictable that you will have a brain aneurism—which is what Ferrie had. It leaves no evidence for the coroner to find in the usual examination except a high iodine content in the blood. No check was made of the blood content for iodine and a nearly empty bottle of proloid was found among the bottles of this man with extremely high blood pressure. This is a layman's opinion, I've talked to pathologists about it, but we don't have a medical conclusion yet. But this does appear to be the likely way in which he committed suicide.