

GARRISON, PITCHER SWAP DATA IN CRIME PROBES

10-26-67 5 ±

Reporter Fails in Bid to Block Subpena

BATON ROUGE, La. (AP)—Edward Grady Partin, business agent for Teamster Local No. 5, went before the East Baton Rouge grand jury today. The panel is probing organized crime in this area. Partin said in a federal court motion earlier this week that a Baton Rouge contractors' official carried a bribe offer to him. The official, James H. "Buddy" Gill, manager of the Baton Rouge industrial contractors association, denied Partin's charge.

East Baton Rouge Parish Dist. Atty. Sargent Pitcher said today he and Orleans DA Jim Garrison have "swapped information" on current grand jury probes into organized crime.

Pitcher confirmed that he and Garrison conferred yes-

terday on the probes. He said each wanted to keep the other informed on the progress of the investigation.

Both probes were sparked by Life magazine charges that organized crime is rife in Louisiana. However, Garrison contends the charges are false. The Baton Rouge jury has already returned one indictment and Pitcher has promised further action.

IN NEW ORLEANS TODAY, Life reporter David L. Chandler lost a bid in federal court to prevent Garrison from subpoenaing him to appear before the Orleans Parish Grand Jury.

Two new witnesses were scheduled to appear before the

Orleans jury this afternoon, both of them New Orleans attorneys and one a former aide to Garrison.

Subpenaed were former assistant DA Ross Scaccia, also a former assistant United States attorney, and his law partner, Lee Leonard.

There was no explanation for either subpoena. Neither has been identified with the probe before.

SCACCIA IS A 1960 GRADUATE of Tulane University Law School. Leonard was prominent in last fall's political campaign as an opponent of the constitutional amendment permitting Gov. John J. McKeithen to succeed himself.

The East Baton Rouge jury has indicted D'Alton Smith, a New Orleans contractor, on a charge of offering a bribe to a former aide of McKeithen.

The Baton Rouge jury's probe is continuing, focusing on charges by Life that an attempt was made to buy former Teamsters President Jimmy Hoffa's way out of prison.

Chandler had sought to avoid going before the Orleans jury on grounds that Garrison planned to entrap him into perjuring himself. However, today's ruling by Federal District Judge James E. Comiskey leaves him liable for subpoenaing.

Judge Comiskey said Chandler may well be subjected to a violation of the First Amendment to the Constitution regarding freedom of speech but that "the remedy then is for the plaintiff to assert his constitutional defense in the proceeding in which he is charged, if he is charged at all."

On Chandler's motion to have his attorney, Cicero Sessions, go before the jury with him, the judge said the U.S. Supreme Court has recognized the difference between the questioning of a suspect initiated by law officers and the questioning of a witness before a grand jury.

JUDGE COMISKEY denied

stories concerning organized crime in Louisiana; he will not be indicted for perjury.

Sessions told the court that Garrison wants to "lure or entrap" Chandler into perjury by having him contradict testimony of other witnesses before the grand jury or "to intimidate plaintiff into retracting his investigative portions of the aforesaid crime articles."

Sessions also introduced a letter from Garrison to an associate editor of Life which said that the Life stories were false. The letter added that as long as Chandler tells the truth "he will be treated with complete fairness and courtesy."

Chandler's request for a preliminary injunction preventing Garrison from subpoenaing him, and ordered attorneys for both Garrison and Chandler to submit briefs by Nov. 13 on Chandler's request for a three-judge federal panel to hear his case.

Assistant DA James L. Alcock told the court that if Chandler backs up the Life

Oswald Widow Sues U.S. 10-30-67 S.I.

DALLAS, Tex. (AP)—Mrs. Marina N. Oswald Porter, the widow of the man the Warren Commission named as the assassin of President John F. Kennedy, has sued the U.S. government for \$500,000 as compensation for the government's seizure of Lee Harvey Oswald's personal effects. Mrs. Porter listed more than 300 items, ranging from hunting knives to a billfold to shirts and sweaters, as having belong to Oswald at the time of his death.

NEW BOOK CHARGES OSWALD CONSPIRACY

District Attorney Jim Garrison of New Orleans has written an eight-page foreword for a new book by Harold Weisberg, "Oswald in New Orleans: Case of Conspiracy with the C.I.A."

The book is being published here today as a 404-page paperback by Canyon Books. Mr. Weisberg, who was a witness before the Orleans Parish (county) grand jury last April 28, describes activities in New Orleans by Lee Harvey Oswald, who was branded by the Warren Commission as the sole assassin of President Kennedy, and the activities of American and Cuban foes of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro.

The author of three previous books attacking the Warren Commission, Mr. Weisberg suggests the Kennedy Administration changed its anti-Castro policy in 1963 and frustrated the anti-Castro groups with a raid on a Louisiana explosives hoard and a Florida arrest in an arms-running case. He suggests that this provided a motive for would-be assassins resenting such a policy change.

"Instead of running down the men who killed John Kennedy, the U.S. Government simply ratified his execution and moved on to more important matters," Mr. Garrison charges in his foreword. "With regard to the men who actually killed him, because of their displeasure with his foreign policy, the assassination has been treated not as an offense but as a mandate for change." *ew*

'Trial of Oswald' ^{now} Opens on Broadway

BY WILLIAM GLOVER

AP Drama Critic

NEW YORK—The assassination of President Kennedy is reviewed with dubious intensity in "The Trial of Lee Harvey Oswald" at Broadway's ANTA Theater.

A speculative drama about such high historic tragedy has a built-in emotional impact. But the fact-fiction thesis is intrinsically feeble, with main theatrical excitement being provided by imaginative staging rather than word or performance.

Most of the play is a synopsis review of the events at Dallas in 1963, stressing those items in official reports that have stirred dispute in some quarters about Oswald's guilt as the killer. How many shots were fired? Where did they really come from?

Some Imagination

Then comes the imaginative contribution of authors Amram Ducovny and Leon Friedman: Oswald, saved here by twisting aside when Jack Ruby

subsequently shot him, was a dupe of conspiracy. Some Cuban freedom fanatics shot the President; Oswald was involved only as possible stoopigion for the CIA.

Peter Masterson enacts the trial defendant like a guilty conscience. Seated at side-stage throughout, he enters the performance only in the final minutes, to relate the fictional crux in a perhaps intentionally unpersuasive manner.

The main participants in the play are Clifton James, an accent-thick Southern prosecutor, and Ralph Waite, an earnest but unvivid defender. They summon 25 witnesses and experts — performed in multiple assignment by an able cast—to reprise yesterday's headline news.

As they face forward to the audience, which is left to decide Oswald's guilt or

innocence, photos, diagrams and film clips are projected on multiple screens. Nothing is left out, even representations of the President's cranial wounds.

Underscoring the display are dramatic lighting effects by Jules Fisher and a pulsing sound score devised by Joseph Raposo.

The production's high-voltage style can be credited to Tunc Yalman, for the past year artistic director of the Milwaukee Repertory Theater.

Theatrical Challenge

Examining subjects of public concern is a basic theatrical challenge. But "The Trial of Lee Harvey Oswald" confuses that responsibility with lurid pretension.

What other press critics said:

John Chapman, New York Daily News: "... My verdict is that it is a suspenseless play. The physical part of the production is the best part of the evening."

Clive Barnes, New York Times: "... I think it is wrong to use the discussion surrounding what is one of the great tragedies of the 20th century as an excuse for such a necessarily flimsy play."

Richard Watts Jr., New York Post: "... It is clearly a work for the theater that cannot be judged by the customary critical standards applied to plays ... I doubt that the documentary play makes a very persuasive case for his (Oswald's) innocence, but it serves its purpose of being thought-provoking about it."