

New Orleans Dist. Atty. Jim Garrison said, "We are going to have to defer any further arrests" in his investigation of the Kennedy assassination, but he added that there will be other arrests later, probably before the trial of Clay L. Shaw, New Orleans businessman accused by Garrison of participating in a conspiracy to kill the late President. No date has been set for the Shaw trial. Garrison made the remarks on the radio-television program Issues and Answers.

### Judge Warns Clay Shaw Litigants

*Boston Globe* United Press International 5/30/67

NEW ORLEANS — Judge Edward A. Haggerty Jr. on Monday warned both sides that he would cite for contempt anyone who violates the guidelines he laid down for the conspiracy trial of Clay L. Shaw.

The judge hinted during the reading of his supplementary rules Monday that some persons may already be in contempt of his court. But he refused to elaborate or to clarify any points in his latest order.

Haggerty, who will hear the trial of Shaw, said he issued the supplement to his March guidelines because of the "barrage of claims and counter-claims, charges and counter-charges, by many persons who were and are directly affected by the guidelines."

Dist. Atty. Jim Garrison, who is conducting his own investigation into the assassination of President Kennedy, has charged that Shaw conspired with Lee Harvey Oswald and the late David Ferrie to murder the President. *END*

# Probe of Assassination Builds Garrison Power

New Orleans DA Hasn't Found Anything Concrete, but Becomes Politically Potent

447 415767  
BY NICHOLA  
Times Sta

NEW ORLEANS—Dist. Atty. Jim Garrison's investigation into an alleged conspiracy to assassinate President John F. Kennedy still has not turned up anything concrete but it has made the district attorney a powerful and politically potent man in Louisiana.

Even his local detractors freely admit that Garrison's political stock has taken a sharp rise since his probe came to public attention more than four months ago.

Those who dislike him and his tactics most are the first to state that judging from Garrison's record, he won't have to prove anything to be successful.

## Score Already Made

It suffices, they say, that he started the investigation and provided an official aura for doubt—previously raised mostly by writers—that the Warren Commission erred in deciding that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone and was not part of any conspiracy in shooting Mr. Kennedy.

A score of mind-boggling theories and rumors about what Garrison has or doesn't have to support his assertions that there was a conspiracy circulate and recirculate through New Orleans.

Primarily Garrison is Horatius at the bridge in the eyes of many people

here. He has raised enough unproved points, speculations and befuddling statements to increase doubts that may already have existed. And his name now is known across the nation.

The current tack of the investigation is against the Central Intelligence Agency, which Garrison asserts is withholding information about the assassination. The Warren Commission said Oswald was not an intelligence agent. Garrison says he believes otherwise.

"Garrison can back away from the investigation anytime he wants to now, because the CIA will never reply to his charges," an attorney said, "but if I know him, he probably won't."

There is reluctance—and in some cases fear—among public officials to cross swords with Garrison. Criticism is heard frequently but always in private and from officials who plead for anonymity.

## Probe Financed

For example, a group of anonymous New Orleans businessmen are financing Garrison's probe at a reported rate of \$5,000 a month. Louisiana has a law which says private funds given to public agencies must be accounted for, but no official voices have been raised to challenge Garrison on that point.

The law was enacted in 1948 when it was known as the "anti-slush fund"

act, but never has been invoked. It states that every public agency receiving private contribu-

tions shall deposit them with the state treasurer and disclose the sources of the funds, the terms under which they were received, the names of administrators of the money and the persons authorized to approve expenditures.

A New Orleans lawyer said, "Most of the public officials and even the judges are scared to death of Garrison. He's got too much voter sympathy on his side, and his investigation and its implications are too volatile."

This view is widely held and no one knows better than Louisiana politicians that Garrison's probe touches indirectly on widespread aversion in the Deep South to Chief Justice Earl Warren and the federal government.

## Subtle Change

However, Garrison's knuckles have been rapped lightly recently and this may represent some subtle change. The Legislature voted down a \$50,000 appropriation for his investigation.

A New Orleans criminal judge warned contempt citations may be issued because of the "barrage of claims and counterclaims, charges and countercharges by many persons," contrary to the guidelines he set down for the trial of prominent businessman Clay L. Shaw. A grand jury has indicted Shaw on charges of conspiracy in the assassination of the President. **END**

# The Screen: Mark Lane vs. the Warren Report

## 'Rush to Judgment' at Carnegie Hall Cinema

RUSH TO JUDGMENT; a film report based on the book by Mark Lane; directed by Emile de Antonio; produced by Mr. de Antonio and Mr. Lane and distributed by Impact Films; with Mr. Lane as interviewer. At the Carnegie Hall Cinema, Seventh Avenue and 56th Street. Running time: 116 minutes.

By BOSLEY CROWTHER

SINCE there is nothing in the film "Rush to Judgment" that hasn't already been revealed in the book of the same title, researched and written by Mark Lane, one might wonder what is the justification and what is the purpose served by this almost two-hour-long compilation of photographed interviews with close to a score of persons in connection with the assassination of President Kennedy.

The answer—or, at least, the speculation—is that this direct presentation of the testimony of eyewitnesses that might have been offered by Mr. Lane in defense of Lee Harvey Oswald, had he been permitted to do so, serves further to convince the viewer that there was evi-

dence the Warren Commission failed to assemble or neglected to evaluate in preparing its report. This dramatic materialization of witnesses before the eye and ear has much more immediacy and impact than the printed word in covering the thesis of Mr. Lane.

Not that the testimony, given by these witnesses to the questioning Mr. Lane, is likely to persuade the thoughtful viewer that Oswald did not assassinate the President or that someone else was involved. The testimony, however vivid and forcefully presented, is, at best, rather sketchy and speculative.

Several witnesses who say they were standing on the railway overpass to watch the Presidential motorcade testify that they distinctly heard shots and saw puffs of smoke appear from the area of a picket fence atop a grassy knoll opposite the building from which Oswald presumably fired. Several others who were in the area say they heard shots and saw evidence that would indicate the lethal bullets came from a direction other than that

in which Oswald presumably was.

Still others, dramatically examined before the cameras—often exactly where they stood on the fatal day—provide Mr. Lane and the viewer with personal observations that contradict or challenge the full validity of the conclusions in the Warren report. There is evidence to support the allegation that Jack Ruby was well acquainted with "more than half" the members of the Dallas police force, that he was a friend of J. D. Tippit, the policeman who was killed in a Dallas street shortly after the assassination and that many photographs and items of evidence were destroyed or mutilated by the government investigators.

Some witnesses appear substantial and creditable. Others much less so. Two or three of the interviews conducted by Mr. Lane look egregiously staged by him and Emile de Antonio, who co-produced and directed this film, which began its first public engagement in this country at the

## Interviews Contradict Official Findings

Carnegie Hall Cinema yesterday.

But the total effect of the picture is that of a good courtroom film that bombards the viewer with a loaded array of testimony and evidence. While it does not have the compact structure or the accumulating display of mounting drama of the documentary film "Point of Order," about the Senate hearings conducted by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, which Mr. de Antonio also helped to produce, it distinctly builds up an impression that the Warren Commission was lax in its investigations and that many critical questions remain to be explored officially.

If the purpose of this film is to rouse its viewers into having doubts about Oswald's total guilt—and to stimulate melodramatic speculations—then it eminently succeeds.

AMERICAN PREMIERE

## "EMINENTLY SUCCEEDS."

WKT  
JUN 15

A good court-room drama that bombards the viewer with an array of evidence. This dramatic materialization of witnesses before the eye and ear has much more immediacy and impact than the printed word. Vivid and forcefully presented.//

BOSLEY CROWTHER, NEW YORK TIMES

## "VERY COMPELLING."

Here it is, the people who actually saw something and believed that the truth never did fully reveal itself. The people are real, the incidents are there on the record. It will tend to destroy your peace of mind. A good strong job.//

ARCHER WINSTEN, NEW YORK POST

## "THE CAMERA NEVER LIES,

it is hard not to believe these eyewitness accounts. It is one thing to read written testimony but quite something else to observe witnesses' facial reactions to questions and hear testimony from their own lips. The film should win new sceptics of the Warren Commission over to

Lane's side.// KATHLEEN CARROLL,  
NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

## "FASCINATING."

An assortment of witnesses leaping out of the madness of our time and making a stranger-than-fiction mosaic. The evidence dramatically offered by Lane raises more than enough questions to necessitate a reopening of the case.// WILLIAM WOLFF, CUE



# RUSH TO JUDGMENT

Impact Films presents  
a film by Emile de Antonio and Mark Lane.

CARNEGIE HALL CINEMA

7th Ave. & 56th St. PL 7-2131

SHOW TIMES: 12:15, 2:10, 4:05, 6:00, 8:00, 10:00