

ASSASSINATION INQUIRY COMMITTEE  
NEWSLETTER  
vol.1 no.8

BRILLIANT CHESS MOVES: GARRISON (BLACK) VS. GOVERNMENT (WHITE)

In a painstakingly developed operation toward eventual checkmate of his opponent, Garrison has maneuvered his black pieces into such a position that the powerful white queen, Clay Shaw, is in serious danger.

Now, while the government considers how best to defend its queen, Garrison broadens his attack by moving one of his bishops, assistant Numa Bertel, against a white knight, National Archives Director James Rhoads. However, in a clever blocking maneuver, the government then moves its king's rook, Attorney General Clark (subsequently sacrificed), in a side-sweep that leaves revealed a previously developed supporting operation on the part of the four king's pawns- Drs. Carnes, Fisher, Morgan and Moritz.

This move not only succeeds in temporarily protecting Rhoads, it seems to put Garrison himself on the defensive. For he now jumps backward with his black knight, assistant James Alcock, thereby momentarily freeing the white queen from attack. However, just as the government, hoping for a speedy check and possible checkmate, takes the offensive with its queen's bishop, defense attorney Irwin Dymond, Garrison suddenly jumps forward again with black knight Alcock, and the government's queen is in worse danger than before.

At this precise point in the game, the government's side substitutes a new player. It's his move.

Prescott S. Nichols

Further Federal Intervention Fails To Block Shaw Trial

Last word has it that about a half dozen jurors have been chosen thus far in the Shaw trial, this on January 25. One wondered eight short days ago whether the horse would ever make it out of the stall. At that time, a fresh blast of Federal Propaganda carried a surprising word that a panel of physicians, acting secretly 11 months ago, "confirmed the Warren Commission findings" that President Kennedy was struck by two bullets fired from above and behind, this judgment being rendered reportedly after examination of the heretofore suppressed autopsy photos and x-rays. Release of this report by Attorney General Ramsey Clark contributed nothing except further assurance of federal trep dation lest the Garrison inquiry gain access to this important evidence.

D.C. Court Judge Charles Halleck received the medical report from Clark in response to the judge's order that the Director of the National Archives appear in court and explain why he should not comply with Garrison's request for the evidence to be used in the Shaw case. The timing and circumstances of release of this report can only be interpreted as a last ditch attempt to influence Judge Halleck's decision in this matter.

The "medical report", considered substantively, is laughable. Typical is the following foolishness: "The other bullet struck the decedent's back at the right side of the base of the neck between the shoulder and the spine and emerged from the front of his neck near the midline. The possibility that this bullet might have followed a pathway other than one passing through the site of tracheotomy wound was considered. No evidence for this was found." Not one bit of evidence is presented in support of the Warren Report's key contention that a bullet passed through Kennedy's body from back to front. Just vague assurance that this is the way it happened. No data is even offered from the photos for precise localization of the back wound, only the nebulous "base of the neck" once again. This failure to honestly and accurately locate the back wound from the photos lends credence to the assertion that the back wound was lower than the wound in the front of the President's throat. The issue of wound localization was avoided because no good evi-



page 2.

dence exists to support the opposite position. Again, nothing of substance emerges save the realization that Clark employed a clumsy bluff because his back is against the wall.

Judge Halleck meanwhile gave Louisiana two weeks to gather and present evidence supporting their claim that the photos and x-rays are relevant to the Shaw proceeding, obviously a tough thing to do if you don't know what the pictures show because you haven't been allowed a viewing.

On this same January 17, Alcock stated in a press release that "since Ramsey Clark has released only a small portion of the evidence, and only that which favors the defense and the Warren Report, it is absolutely necessary that we obtain that evidence upon which the panel based their opinion of the autopsy before proceeding to trial...Therefore, I am today filing a motion requesting a continuance of this case to be re-set only after receipt by this office of all of the evidence called for in our subpoenas..."

Finally, in a brilliant move, Alcock suddenly withdrew his motion for an indefinite delay, but not before Shaw's lawyers, after stalling the case for 23 months, offered a motion calling for a speedy trial. To quote the Los Angeles Times (1/21) "Alcock's withdrawal of the motion clearly caught off balance Shaw's attorneys and Judge Edward Hagerty... For several seconds Judge Hagerty sat absolutely speechless, pursing his lips."

The defense is now neatly on record against further delay. And last word has it that about a half dozen jurors have been chosen thus far in the Shaw trial.

A. George Abbott, M.D.

#### AFFIDAVIT, STATE OF LOUISIANA, PARISH OF ORLEANS

Before me, the undersigned authority, Notary Public for the Parish of Orleans, personally came and appeared: FRED H. LEMMANS, SR., who, after being first duly sworn, did depose and say as follows:

That I am the same Fred Lemmans who appeared on the nationwide NBC telecast entitled "The J.F.K. Conspiracy: The Case of Jim Garrison" on Monday, June 19, 1967. That while appearing on this program I stated that a member of Jim Garrison's staff, one Robert E. Lee, had offered me \$2,500 for testimony to the effect that Clay Shaw used my turkish bath and that on those occasions he used the name Clay Bertrand. I further related how Mr. Garrison's office attempted to get me to identify a young white male, who accompanied Shaw to the baths, as Lee Harvey Oswald.

I now state freely and voluntarily and without any promises of reward or immunity that the statements I made on the NBC program relative to Garrison's office offering me a bribe for testimony favorable to their cause was a lie. I am making this statement after serious thought and long deliberation principally to clear the name of Robert E. Lee, former Assistant District Attorney, and the office of Jim Garrison from the false accusations that I had made. My conscience would not allow me to defame and impugn the character of Mr. Lee and the office of Jim Garrison any longer.

I would like to state the reasons for which I appeared on the NBC show and lied about my contacts with the district attorney's office. First, I received numerous anonymous threatening phone calls relative to the information that I had given Mr. Garrison. The gist of these calls was to the effect that if I did not change my statement and state that I had been bribed by Jim Garrison's office, I and my family would be in physical danger. In addition to the anonymous phone calls, I was visited by a man who exhibited a badge and stated that he was a government agent. This man informed me that the government was presently checking the bar owners in the Slidell area for possible income tax violations. This man then inquired whether I was the Mr. Lemmans involved in the Clay Shaw case. When I informed him that I was, he said that I was not smart to be involved because a lot of people that had been got hurt and that people in powerful places would see to it that I was taken care of.



One of the anonymous callers suggested that I change my statement and state that I had been bribed by Garrison's office to give him the information about Clay Shaw. He suggested that I contact Mr. Irvin Dymond, attorney for Clay L. Shaw, and tell him that I gave Mr. Garrison the statement about Shaw only after Mr. Lee offered me \$2,500. After consulting with Mr. Dymond by telephone and in person, I was introduced to Walter Sheridan, Investigative Reporter for NBC, who was then in the process of preparing the NBC show. Mr. Dymond and Mr. Sheridan suggested that I appear on the show and state what I had originally told Mr. Dymond about the bribe offer by the District Attorney's office.

I was informed by Mr. Dymond that should the District Attorney's office charge me with giving false information as a result of my repudiating the statement I had originally given them, he would see to it that I had an attorney and that a bond would be posted for me. In this connection, Mr. Dymond gave me his home and office telephone numbers and advised me that I could contact him any time of day or night should I be charged by Garrison's office as a result of my appearing on the NBC show. My actual appearance on the show was taped in the office of Aaron Kohn, managing director of the Metropolitan Crime Commission, in the presence of Walter Sheridan and Irvin Dymond.

FRED H. LEEMANS, SR.

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED BEFORE ME THIS 6th DAY OF JANUARY, 1969.

BYRON P. LEGENDRE, Notary Public

# Oswald Photo Faked

RESEARCH BY FRED T. NEWCOMB AND ROY WATSON



Fig. 1



Fig. 2

(This research was first published one month ago in the Probe, University of California at Santa Barbara, edited by Perry Adams. Mr. Adams is the author of the "Garrison Chronology", which appeared in our last Newsletter, and whose authorship was wrongly credited to Steven Jaffe in that issue. We wish to thank Perry Adams for allowing us use of the Chronology, as well as the following material, which is reprinted from Probe with the permission of Fred Newcomb, commercial artist and student of the assassination. Roy Watson is a commercial photographer.)






Fig. 3

After Oswald was arrested, one of the first things that the Dallas Police Dept. showed him was photographs of himself holding a rifle and wearing a pistol. Capt. J.W. Fritz told the Warren Commission that Oswald replied that the face was his but not the body and that he could prove it. He never had a chance to do that.

Three months later, one of the photographs appeared on the cover of Life Magazine, February 21, 1964. To most people it was damning evidence. Oswald was shown holding up two communist newspapers. Furthermore, Life somehow identified the rifle as the one the President was murdered with and the pistol as the weapon that killed Officer J.D. Tippit.

When the Warren Commission published its report in September, 1964, it claimed that Marina Oswald took these two photographs ten days before Oswald was supposed to have shot at General Edwin A. Walker. Marina told the Commission on Feb. 3, 1964, that she only recalled taking one photograph on March 31, 1963. This contradicts what she told the Secret Service on December 1, 1963 when she said she had never seen Oswald with a rifle with a telescopic sight or with a pistol. The photographs (Figs. 1&2) were allegedly found by several Dallas police officers among Oswald's belongings in the garage of Ruth Paine in Irving, Texas. The Warren Report claimed that only one negative was found. The photograph published by Life (Fig.1) is the one that lacks a negative. Prints of each photo were obtained from the National Archives. To check if they were composites, the heads were made equal in size. If the head sizes match, then the body sizes should also match. They do not (fig.3), which is photographically impossible. Therefore, heads of equal size were attached to bodies of unequal size. By scaling, one body is approximately 4" taller than the other (the weight-bearing right foot is used for measurement.). The difference is shown in a side-by-side comparison with the heads lined up (fig.3).



On body size alone, therefore, these photos are composites and were prepared by someone to incriminate Oswald. The heads, when overlaid, match exactly although the body positions have changed, which is impossible. This means that whoever falsified these pictures had only one photo of Oswald's face to use for two different body poses. The shadows around the mouth were added to give it a slightly different expression in the second use.




Fig. 4

In Fig. 5, note the line between the mouth and chin. This is not Oswald's chin. The line is in the grain of the photo; it is not a negative scratch. Further evidence for this is a side-by-side comparison in Fig. 6 with a Dallas Police mug shot of Oswald, which was made to the same scale. Oswald's chin has a cleft and is more pointed.



Fig. 5

Fig. 6



The chin is a good place photographically to join a neck to a body. There are problems in joining a head at the middle of the neck. The body had a different neck size than Oswald's. If two necks of different sizes are joined, then both sides must be retouched all the way up. Only a small amount of retouching is needed if the joining is done where the neck meets the ear.

It has been 5 years, but this is the first time anyone has spotted this deliberate falsification.



A complete set of 16 mm colored slides portraying the preceding photographic analysis is available by writing to Probe, Box 12629, UCSB, Santa Barbara, CA 93107. The preceding material can be reprinted only by the express permission of Fred Newcomb and Roy Watson. (P.S. When ordering slides, please inclose \$6 to cover costs.)

#### THE WHY OF IT ALL

One notices a different tone these days in the articles and books being written on the JFK assassination. The emphasis now is much more comprehensive and far-reaching than it used to be. Whereas the critics used to content themselves with ripping to shreds the conclusions of the Warren Report, they now try to reconstruct in totality what happened and why it happened.

The most provocative article on this subject appears in the January issue of Evergreen. It is "Why President Kennedy Was Killed" by Paris Flammond, and it is an excerpt from his book titled The Kennedy Conspiracy, which has just now been published and is in the bookstores. For the most part, Mr. Flammond, who is described by Evergreen as a "poet, prose writer, and critic, now living in New York City", merely summarizes and puts together material from other sources. For example, he relies heavily on Garrison's important interview in Playboy (Oct., 1967) for much of his discussion of the role of the Cuban exiles and the relation of the assassination to the abortive Bay Of Pigs invasion and to the Kennedy attempt for a detente with Castro. However, he also brings out new information along the way.

Regarding the efforts at detente, he mentions the strange role of intermediary that was apparently played by the late TV reporter Lisa Howard. Flammond recounts the suspicions of her former colleague, Craig Karpel, regarding the official explanation of her death (July 4, 1965) as suicide. Miss Howard seems to have become quite hostile toward Robert Kennedy sometime after the assassination of the President, and Flammond speculates that this hostility may have been the result of her getting wind of RFK's alleged role in approving a CIA plot to kill Castro which "when subsequently aborted on his orders, spun off into a second and successful plot to kill his brother."

Given the recent disclosure implicating the CIA in the Los Angeles bombings by Cuban exiles, the possibility that the JFK assassination grew out of a frustrated attempt on Castro seems quite possible. According to a Los Angeles Times report (12/31/68), a grand jury investigation has revealed that the two Cuban exiles, Cornillot and Garcia-Cardenas, received their explosives and their training in the use of same from the CIA. The original purpose of all this was, of course, for use in the Bay Of Pigs invasion. After that failed, the Cubans brought their explosives to Los Angeles for use against domestic targets. The same pattern can be applied to the assassination: Step 1, Cuban exiles trained and equipped by CIA for assassination of Castro; Step 2, Assassination attempt aborted by orders from above; Step 3, Frustrated men turn their expert training to good use in assassination of Kennedy.

It is becoming increasingly clear that after Johnson succeeded the slain Kennedy, a rather drastic change in our foreign policy took place, and not just in respect to Cuba. It is now generally known, for example, that Kennedy just before his death was initiating the first moves toward de-escalation in Viet Nam. In an article titled "Kennedy Assassinations and Political Detours" (Minority of One, November, 1968), Alfred John Ferrari tells us that "just before his assassination, the President's growing disaffection with the Green Beret experiment was suggested by his announcement of the withdrawal of one thousand counter-insurgency troops by the end of 1963 as a first step toward disengagement". (Ferrari's source is the New York Times, Nov. 1, 1963.) Johnson's reversal of this policy practically as soon as he entered office is now legion. And the same move toward greater international domination can be seen in the Dominican invasion and in other "foreign policy" moves by the Johnson administration. Ferrari catalogues some of these, as does another writer, Peter Karlen, in an unpublished article titled "Why was Kennedy Killed?" Karlen, a graduate student at the University of California, San Diego, makes a comprehensive study of Johnson's



foreign policy shifts regarding not only Cuba and Viet Nam, but also Latin America, China and the Soviet Union. (Copies of Karlen's article may be obtained by writing the AIC, sent free of charge.)

The implications of all this are obvious: President Kennedy's murder may have been planned and executed just so this reversal in the direction of US policy would take place. And by the same token, the subsequent murders of King and Robert Kennedy may have been to insure that the new direction would continue. When Flammond, in an interview recently, asked Garrison about the possible connection of the three assassinations, the New Orleans District Attorney answered:

"It's a question of how much data's available. Let me take, in order, the assassination of John Kennedy, the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, and the assassination of Robert Kennedy. In the first case, we have a great deal of data available; in the second case, there's quite a bit of data now available; in the third, there's just a little data available. However, there is enough data available in all three cases to state, as a probability, that they were all accomplished by the same force and that they were all... intelligence assassinations... These, I think, are clearly assassinations in which the Central Intelligence Agency is clearly involved. This does not mean that the command came down from the top, but it does mean that at least a major component of the CIA is now in the business of exterminating any national leaders who are opposed to the perpetuation of the Cold War, as well as to our adventures in Asia. And I think it will continue."

At the end of his article, Mr. Flammond alludes to "an incredible manuscript" which was written in Europe and, according to Flammond, "postulates a highly complex conspiracy the upper ranks of which feature major southwestern oil figures, a well-known lawman, a nationally famous attorney, a number of other prominent individuals, and, in New Orleans, Shaw, Oswald and Bamister." This "incredible manuscript" may very well be a new book called Farewell America, which, according to the New York Times (Jan. 1, 1969), was published in Liechtenstein to avoid libel suits and is causing quite a stir in Europe. Although this book can be obtained by Americans through a firm in Montreal (see AIC bibliography), I recommend that it be approached warily. The author, "James Hepburn", is apparently a pseudonym for a group comprised of "European and American researchers". It is worth noting in this regard that Flammond describes his "incredible manuscript" as emanating from Switzerland (one-time site of CIA front operation, Permindex). There is also a movie, "Farewell America" which to my knowledge has not yet been shown in this country though there was an attempt to bring it to Los Angeles for a preview recently.

All of these articles and books about the "why" and the overall "how" of the assassination need to be appraised- that is why I mention them here- but the more grandiose the theories, the more cautious should be our approach to them. Especially when the source is an anonymous group.

Prescott S. Nichols

#### HUEY LINKS KING CONSPIRACY TO CANAL STREET IN NEW ORLEANS

William Bradford Huey, recent author of two articles on James Earl Ray in Look, appeared on the "Newsmakers" program on KNBC-LA in early December. He was asked if there was any connection between the slayings of JFK and MLK and replied that he knew of at least four people who put up the money for the assassination of Dr. King. "One or two of these men were wealthy and on the extreme right. All the money, in my opinion, came from Louisiana."

Huey went on to say that there were one or more plots in Louisiana to kill President Kennedy. "There was Kennedy assassination talk in New Orleans and Kennedy assassination money being spent before he was assassinated. New Orleans is the place where the money came from to assassinate Dr. King, so there is certainly that connection between the two." Huey stated that two of the men are prominent and wealthy in New Orleans, but that their names would not be recognized in California. "I can't tell their names because if the Justice Dept. can't arrest these people, I can't charge them with having paid the money for the murder of Martin Luther King."



page 8.

In tracing Ray's movements, Huey lists the following: Ray escaped from the Missouri State Prison on April 23, 1967, with 14 years left on his sentence. He bought an old car for \$200 and drove to Montreal. He never had more than \$400 in his pocket until he met a French Canadian with blond or reddish hair, about 30 to 35 years old. This was in August, 1967. Ray's original intention was to stay in Canada and obtain a Canadian passport. However this French-Canadian acquaintance made an offer: Ray should go to Alabama, "lay low", and not commit any crimes. In return, he would receive a lot of money. Thus Ray went to Birmingham in August, 1967. In Sept., '67, a contact delivered \$3000 to him. He bought a white Mustang for \$1995; prior to this, he had never owned a car worth more than \$200. Since he wasn't working and to avoid suspicion, Ray left Birmingham and journeyed to Louisiana. While traveling, in New Orleans he was given more money and went to Mexico (Acapulco and Puerto Vallarta) where he spent \$399 a month and committed no crimes. He then went to Los Angeles, where he lived on Hollywood Blvd.

While in Louisiana prior to his Mexico trip, Ray met a contact in New Orleans on Canal Street in a restaurant. Ray was able to give Huey a precise drawing of the layout of the restaurant. According to Huey, Ray has "never missed in 15 drawings," being always able to furnish accurate descriptions of places he'd been. Students of the JFK assassination will recognize Canal Street as the spot where Garrison and Harold Weisberg stated several CIA front organizations existed. The restaurant is less than 200 yards from the place where Oswald lived, and less than 200 yards from Exchange Alley, where some 50 men from the Bay Of Pigs lived after their release from Cuba. Many of these men felt President Kennedy had betrayed them at the Bay Of Pigs. Ray's contact in the restaurant had also been a veteran of the Bay Of Pigs.

Mr. Huey pointed out that conspiracies are easy to execute. "In a conspiracy where ABC&D are involved, and A&B are putting up the money, C is a professional criminal, and D is, like Ray, a fugitive. D only knows C, and not A&B. C is his contact. C pays him to be somewhere, and if D crosses C, he simply is returned to jail or killed. A fugitive in our society is vulnerable. Once involved, he can't get out."

Huey also emphasized that "our system is simply not prepared to deal with conspiracies. Knowing something can be one thing in this country, and being able to prove it and provide the signed statement is something else."

Huey has paid \$30,000 to Ray and his lawyers for portrayal rights. His third Look article will appear on 2/18/68. His book, They Slew The Dreamer, will be published on 3/18/69. He also is planning a movie on Ray's life. So far, Huey's information has come from Ray's letters, delivered by attorney Arthur Haynes. On Nov. 11, 1968, Percy Foreman became Ray's attorney, replacing Haynes, and Foreman hasn't released any additional letters. Huey has given all of his information to Judge Battle, presiding judge in the case of James Earl Ray.

Stephen Pauley, M.D.

FORMER KING ASSISTANT CLAIMS RAY IS INNOCENT (from LA TIMES, 1/20/69)

James Bevel, a ranking figure in the SCLC, stated on January 19th that he had evidence he claimed could free James Earl Ray, accused assassin of Martin Luther King. Bevel sent a telegram to Ray in Memphis on January 18th, which read, "I would like to inform you that I would be very happy to take your case without fee. I was present on April 4th at the Lorraine Motel when Dr. King died- you have been accused of murdering him. Of course, I know you are not guilty." The 32 year old civil rights advocate said he did not volunteer his information sooner because of the shock immediately after Dr. King's slaying. "I hadn't prepared to be responsive to him", Bevel said, "But then I thought, 'Here's a man sitting here that shouldn't be here.' "...Public Defender Hugh Stanton in Memphis has refused to react to the telegram, as has Ray's attorney, Percy Foreman.

FORGIVE MY GRIEF, VOL. I STILL AVAILABLE

A number of copies of Penn Jones, Jr., important work, Forgive My Grief, Vol. I are still available at the reduced cost of \$2.00. Send requests to AIC, 4718 Saratoga Avenue, San Diego, California 92107.



Senator Stephen M. Young, D-Ohio, last week called the Pueblo affair "another huge blunder of the Central Intelligence Agency" and called for the firing of its director, Richard Helms. "The CIA should be shaken up and changed from the top down", Young told the Senate, adding that it was unfortunate that Helms is being retained by President Nixon.

"Helms should be dismissed...and a halt put to the arrogant policies and operations of the entire CIA", Young stated. The Pueblo incident, he added, "was reminiscent of the CIA's ill-conceived and planned Bay Of Pigs operation..."

#### EASON'S SUGGESTION SECONDED BY THE AIC

Jim Eason, popular communicaster at KGO Radio(San Francisco) and student of the assassinations recently has called for a massive letter writing campaign, focused on President Nixon, encouraging Nixon to seek the truth behind the spate of political murders besetting our Nation. In particular, Nixon should be urged to end federal opposition to the trial of Clay Shaw and to release all evidence now bound up in the Archives. The AIC firmly and enthusiastically endorses Mr. Eason's suggestion. We therefore urge all of our readers, each one of you, to write President Nixon today. Address all mail and wires to: President Richard M. Nixon, White House, Washington, D.C.

We also take this opportunity to thank Jim Eason publicly for the courageous position he has adopted in this matter. By his intelligent and searching approach, he has enlightened many thousands of the citizens of the West to this important issue, keeping hope alive for us all.

#### FEDERAL COURT INJUNCTIONS ON STATE CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS

Until the last decade, courts of equity refused to use the injunction to impede the enforcement of criminal law. Recent developments have undercut the basis for this noninterference due to an increasing concern over the due process to provide relief against official action interfering with the right to own and use property. In 1894, the Supreme Court held that a federal court could enjoin the initiation of criminal proceedings to enforce the invalid rate regulations fixed by a State RR. Commission. (*Reagan v. Farmers Loan & Trust Co.*, 154 U.S. 362--1894) Although many courts failed to allow injunctive relief, a substantial number of comparatively recent American cases have granted injunctions against criminal proceedings. (See "Injunctions Against Criminal Proceedings", 14 *Harvard Law Review* 293- 1900).

Although this above injunction procedure centers around statutes of states and the violation of the statute, certain unique cases have occurred which greatly expand the scope of injunctive decree in criminal proceedings.

In *United States v. Wood*, 295 F 2d772 (5th Cir., 1961), cert. denied, 369 U.S. 850 (1962), prosecution of a civil rights worker on a breach of the peace charge was enjoined. The Government, not the criminal defendant, was the plaintiff, and the interests protected were those of the Negro voters of the county who, it was feared, would be intimidated by the prosecution regardless of the outcome of the trial. Implicit in this decision was the belief that the arrest and prosecution was discriminatory enforcement of the ordinance, for neither the ordinance's validity nor its applicability was challenged.

In the *Wood* case, the defendant, A Negro from Tennessee, attempted to aid a Negro couple in registering to vote in Mississippi. He was pistol-whipped by the registrar of Walthall County after his attempt to register the two eligible voters. Shortly after this incident he was arrested for "disturbing the peace and bringing an uprising among the people." The U.S. Court of Appeals granted an injunction on the Mississippi court.

Cooper v. Hutchinson, 184 F2d119 (3rd Cir, 1950), is one of the few cases in-



page 10.

volving a petition for an injunction running directly against a court. The defendant, a state judge, had refused to allow the plaintiff's out-of-state counsel, who had already prepared and conducted part of the case, to continue to defend the plaintiff against a capital charge because the honorable counsel continued to object to evidence. The court of appeals ordered the district court to retain jurisdiction until the state appellate courts could review the action, holding open the possibility of an injunction of relief where denied by the state courts.

12/7/68 Researched and written by Ed Lechner, Jr. Law student, University of Minnesota Law School.

The AIC wishes to thank Gary Schoener for sending this paper to us. Additional copies (complete with a page of notes and references which we were unable to print) can be obtained from Gary Schoener, Box 392 Mayo Hospital, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

Further, the AIC invites comment on the paper, perhaps with special reference to the question of its applicability to the Shaw Case and federal intervention therein.

#### CLOSING NOTE

Thanks to Diane Platt, Al Rosen, Bob Dress, Andy Beauparlant, Geoff and all the rest for their untiring efforts on the behalf of our committee. Their labor has gone too little recognized for too long a time. Thank you.

We have decided to include our Kennedy Assassination Bibliography as a supplement to this issue due to the large number of requests for it thus far.

Finally, please remember that this Newsletter is supported entirely by voluntary contributions. Please donate a little if you haven't already. Thanks, again.

ASSASSINATION INQUIRY COMMITTEE  
4718 Saratoga Avenue  
San Diego, California 92107

Editors of Newsletter: A. George Abbott, M.D.  
Prescott S. Nichols  
Stephen Pauley, M.D.

January 25, 1968