

THE HARRIS SURVEY *L.G. Tm*

Warren Report Full Story?

BY LOUIS HARRIS
© 1967, Washington Post Co.

3/6/67

3 6 67
LOAT
As the debate continues, public doubts about the Warren Commission Report on the assassination of President Kennedy persist. By a 59% to 30% margin, Americans are convinced that there is more to the story.

But in a survey taken shortly before reports of new evidence uncovered by New Orleans authorities, the public expressed resignation that the whole story would never be known and little would be gained by further inquiry.

By two to one the American public is against reopening the Warren Commission investigation.

Public certainty that Lee Harvey Oswald shot the President remains at 70%. Those who believe he did voted 44 to 35% in favor of the theory that Oswald was part of a broader plot rather than acting on his own.

★

Last September and again last month a cross section of the public was asked:

From what you have read, do you feel the full story of the Kennedy assassination was reported in the Warren Commission Report, or do you think there are still a lot of unanswered questions about who killed President Kennedy and how it was done?

	Feb.'67	Sept.'66
Full story told	30%	32%
Still unanswered questions	59	54
Not sure	11	14

Of the points questioned about the Warren Report, the establishment of Oswald as the killer was most believed by the public. People were asked in both surveys:

Do you believe that Lee Harvey Oswald was the man who shot President Kennedy?

	Feb.'67	Sept.'66
Was assassin	70%	69%
Was not	7	3
Not sure	23	28

People also were asked:
Do you feel the Kennedy assassination was the work of one man or

was part of a broader plot?

	Feb.'67	Sept.'66
One man	35%	34%
Part of broader plot	44	46
Not sure	21	20

In the face of these doubts, the public stands fast in its determination not to have the Warren Commission investigation reopened.

The cross section was asked:

Do you think the Warren Commission investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy should be reopened, or would you be opposed to that?

	Total public
Should be reopened	27%
Don't reopen	58
Not sure	15

GRAND JURY OPENS HEARING ON 'PLOT'

NYT 3/10/67
2 Witnesses Subpoenaed in
Inquiry on Assassination

By GENE ROBERTS

Special to The New York Times

NEW ORLEANS, March 9—A 12-member grand jury today joined District Attorney Jim Garrison's investigation into an alleged plot that led to the assassination of President Kennedy.

The grand jury, which includes some of this city's best-known citizens, began by questioning Dean Andrews, Jr., a New Orleans area lawyer who had talked previously to both Mr. Garrison's investigators and the Warren Commission.

The jury also questioned Mrs. Josephine Hug, who once worked for Clay J. Shaw, a retired New Orleans business executive, who has been arrested and accused but not formally charged by Mr. Garrison's office of having participated in a conspiracy to kill the President.

"She has pledged her cooperation," Mrs. Hug's lawyer, James Gelpl, told newsmen, "and in furtherance of that will not be able to make any further statement."

Meanwhile, Mr. Garrison's staff declined to comment on why the grand jury had been called into the case before next Tuesday's preliminary hearing into Mr. Shaw's arrest.

This is rare legal procedure in Louisiana and the second unusual legal move Mr. Garrison's office has made since Mr. Shaw's arrest a week ago. Mr. Garrison had earlier surprised court observers here by asking for the preliminary hearing.

Usual Procedure

Normally, the district attorney files formal charges and a bill of particulars against a defendant. Then, the defendant, if he desires, can ask for a preliminary hearing in an effort to learn more about the nature of the charges against him.

When questioned about the grand jury, James Alcock, an assistant to Mr. Garrison, would say only that he doubted that Mr. Shaw would be subpoenaed before the jury, and that he was "almost 100 per cent sure" that there would be no indictments returned before Tuesday's hearing.

Mr. Andrews, the first witness

to appear before the grand jury, said in testimony before a Warren Commission staff member that a mysterious figure named "Clay Bertrand" had once sent Lee Harvey Oswald and several Latin-American homosexuals to his law office.

During testimony in July, 1964, Mr. Andrews conceded that he had told the Federal Bureau of Investigation that Mr. Bertrand was a figment of his imagination. But he contended that he had said this only because "the feebees"—his name for the F.B.I.—were on him "like the plague."

Knowledge Disclaimed

Last week, however, Sam Monk Zelden, Mr. Andrews's attorney, said his client does not know whether Clay Bertrand and Mr. Shaw are the same person—an accusation made by Mr. Garrison's office in a search warrant application last week.

Wesley J. Liebeler, a staff member of the Warren Commission, said an F.B.I. investigation had failed to produce any evidence of the existence of a Clay Bertrand.

Mr. Garrison's office contends that "Clay Shaw, alias Clay Bertrand," Oswald and "others" met in New Orleans in September, 1963, to plot the assassination of President Kennedy.

The Warren Commission concluded after 10 months of investigation that Oswald had killed President Kennedy alone and unaided and without being a part of any conspiracy. Mr. Shaw also denies any knowledge of an assassination plot.

Shaw Effort to Learn Informer's Name Fails

Judge Also Denies Bids to Block Hearing, Bar Evidence in Kennedy Death Inquiry

BY NICHOLAS C. CHRISS and JERRY COHEN

LAT-3/9/67 Times Staff Writers
NEW ORLEANS — A

criminal court judge Wednesday rejected legal maneuvers by civic leader Clay L. Shaw's attorneys to learn the identity of an informer who claims Shaw plotted President John F. Kennedy's assassination.

Judge Bernard J. Bagert also turned down a bid to block a hearing on evidence Dist. Atty. Jim Garrison says he has against Shaw and efforts to suppress the evidence itself.

Shaw appeared personally at Wednesday's court session. It was his first public appearance since his arrest exactly a week earlier. He is free on \$10,000 bond.

Tight security prevailed in the courtroom. A dozen deputies, all armed, were stationed at strategic positions.

Face Accusers

"My man," protested attorney William Wegmann, "is entitled to be faced by his accusers. We're entitled to be prepared so we won't have to shoot from the hip.

"Mr. Shaw is accused of conspiracy but we don't even know who our co-defendant is, and for a conspiracy to have occurred more than one man must be involved."

Wegmann paused, then said angrily: "We don't have to sit here and let the state run wild and make a display next Tuesday for its own benefit."

But an assistant district attorney insisted that the

hearing scheduled for Tuesday is the next logical move in Garrison's controversial investigation. Shaw "knew what he was being arrested for, he knew why he was taken to the central lockup (city jail)," the prosecutor said, contemptuously.

Booming Voice

Wegmann, a scholarly looking man with a booming voice, also asked Judge Bagert to order Garrison to spell out in a bill of particulars the specifics of the accusation against Shaw.

And he attempted to block Tuesday's hearing by saying that he and Shaw's two other lawyers were entitled to know the "reliability" of the confidential informer.

Otherwise, Wegmann claimed, Shaw was being deprived of the benefit of a fully informed, "competent counsel," his privilege under both state and federal constitutions.

He insisted that the 54-year-old civic leader's constitutional rights had been violated by the manner in which he was led to jail and handcuffed last Wednesday, not knowing

the specific nature of the charges against him.

But, one by one, Judge Bagert rejected the arguments offered by Wegmann and attorney Guy Johnson. The two, along with Wegmann's brother, Edward—Shaw's long-time attorney—sat with the retired director of the International Trade Mart in the courtroom

Wednesday.

Shaw, attired in a dark brown suit and white shirt, sat impassively. He listened intently to the arguments put forth by opposing attorneys and, on occasion, cast a glance at Judge Bagert.

Bagert rejected the three motions offered by Shaw's attorneys on the ground the information they sought would be available during Tuesday's hearing. He said he would make the determination on their arguments then.

"All these details (specific information about the informer, the charge

against Shaw and evidence against him) will be disposed of at the preliminary hearing," the judge said.

Shaw's lawyers won only a single concession Wednesday.

In pressing for information about evidence against Shaw, they asked that a list of the items taken last Wednesday night from Shaw's French Quarter carriage house after his arrest be made available to them.

These included such articles as chains, whips, lengths of rope, leather belts and a black, monk-like robe and hood, all of them described by one investigator as "the implements of fetishists."

Wegmann said the items should not remain in the district attorney's office, but that they should be placed in the custody of the court clerk "or the court itself."

Bill of Information

Judge Bagert said he would rule within 48 hours on Wegmann's request to examine the confiscated articles.

Asst. Dist. Atty. James Alcock said immediately after Wednesday's session that Shaw will not be formally charged until after Tuesday's hearing, and then in a bill of information. Such a bill may be offered in Louisiana, as well as in most states, by a prosecutor instead of an indictment.

Until such a bill is filed,

or a suspect is indicted, the kind of information Shaw's lawyers had sought Wednesday is not made available by the district attorney's office, other than what may come out during the preliminary hearing.

This is because judges have interpreted Louisiana law as providing that the defense is not entitled to a bill of particulars until after the defendant is formally charged.

Even then, defense lawyers can obtain only that evidence which a judge believes will enable them to prepare an adequate defense for their client.

It appeared almost certain Wednesday that the state's confidential informer will be produced at Tuesday's hearing.

Garrison's aides have virtually said they plan to have him testify to end skepticism about the investigation, which has aroused worldwide interest. Judge Bagert said during Wednesday's court session:

"It is my inclination now that the identity of the informant will have to be disclosed at the hearing."

U.S. Officials Discount Garrison Investigation

Check on New Orleans Inquiry Difficult as Many Kennedy Documents Are Locked Up

BY RONALD J. OSTROW

Times Staff Writer

LAT 3/8/67
WASHINGTON — Attempts to verify key elements of New Orleans Dist. Atty. Jim Garrison's probe of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy get almost nowhere in Washington.

Federal officials, including Chief Justice Earl Warren and Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark, discount Garrison's work.

Some documents that might provide information are not open to public inspection. These include roughly one-third of the materials submitted to the Warren Commission during its investigation of the assassination.

FBI Convinced

Despite Clark's statement last week that the FBI had found no connection between Clay L. Shaw and the President's murder, informed sources said privately that the FBI did not investigate the New Orleans civic leader. Shaw is the only person yet arrested by Garrison.

The sources said, however, that the FBI is convinced Shaw had nothing to do with the assassination. They give two reasons. First, these sources said, the bureau believes it checked out all persons in New Orleans that Lee Harvey Oswald had dealings with. Shaw was not among them.

Second is the Warren Commission's findings of no evidence to support the theory that Oswald was part of a conspiracy.

Clark has refused to elaborate on his statement last week, and the FBI turned down questions with a flat "no comment."

Shaw is not mentioned in the Warren Commission's 26 volumes. Nor does his name appear in those of the 1,554 supporting documents that are open to public inspection in the National Archives.

But about one-third of these documents, including many FBI investigative reports, cannot be examined.

Some bear the customary national security classification; others have been withheld because they deal with matters normally confidential—the tax records of Jack Ruby and his family, for example.

Many have been put under wraps because they contain gossip, unsubstantiated rumor or details of a personal nature that federal officials believe have no significant connection with the assassination. It is reasoned that they would thus needlessly embarrass innocent persons.