

Excerpts from a Diary kept while working  
in the District Attorney's office during  
the investigation of Kennedy's assassination

June 25, 1967

Matt Herron, photographer for the Black Star agency in NY, worked with Jim Phelan on the Saturday Evening Post article about the New Orleans investigation. I knew Matt quite well before working on this case and saw him this afternoon at his home, 315 Pine St. There were quite a few people present. He told me that he was favorably disposed towards the investigation, and wants to see it succeed. He thinks there was a conspiracy and is a friend of and thinks along the same lines as Vincent Salandria.

He volunteered the following information regarding Jim Phelan and Perry Russo. Phelan interviewed Perry Russo in Baton Rouge after the Preliminary Hearing. Also present at this meeting was Russo's room-mate and Matt Herron.

Phelan asked Russo twice during this interview if it was true that he, Russo, had not mentioned a meeting between Shaw, Ferrie and Oswald until he came to New Orleans. According to Matt Herron, Russo agreed that he did not mention such a meeting until his arrival in N.O. Herron seemed to remember Russo saying something like "I guess not" in response to Phelan saying it not true that the meeting didn't come up until he was questioned in New Orleans. Matt Herron also said to me, "I think you've got the wrong man, Tom." He was referring to Clay Shaw, and the group of people with him seemed to be unanimous in believing that Shaw was innocent.

(March, 1969: Herron later changed his mind. I saw him in the court room on the last day of the Shaw trial with Vincent Salandria. At the end of Dymond's closing argument I saw Matt standing alone and I asked him if he believed that Clay Shaw was guilty. He simply said "Yes".)

Herron added (June 25 '67) that Phelan is "still working on the case", and that he, Phelan, would submit affidavits at the trial testifying to the above mentioned meeting. I asked Herron why Phelan was still working on the case in view of the fact that his article had been published and he said that Phelan "is interested in detective stories".

Herron also stated that it was his impression from talking to Phelan that Bill Gurvich was now collaborating with Phelan. Matt said that if called upon to testify to this meeting he will do so as he was there; however, he said he was not prepared to "put anything in writing" at this stage. He was passing this information on to me because he wants the assassination probe to be successful in its outcome.

Aug 14, 1967

Dean Andrews trial. Andrews is being charged with making 2 conflicting statements: 1. that he can't say whether or not Shaw is Bertrand, and 2. that Shaw is not Bertrand. This means that he is being charged with making a statement ~~with~~ that is in conflict with one that would lead one to suppose Shaw is not Bertrand. I.e., it looks as though the state is trying to get Dean to corroborate that Clay Shaw is not Clay Bertrand. The whole thrust of the Andrews trial is very injurious to the Clay Shaw case. I pointed this out to Jim Alcock and he said: "I know, it hurts us."

Aug 19, 1967

I talked to Alcock today; he seems to be the most intelligent, and most communicative person in the office. He said several things, some of them astonishing. First, he told me that Gene Davis had called Dean Andrews at the Hotel Dieu. I asked him how he knew that and he said that Davis had called him and admitted it. It now begins to look as though Gene Davis really is Clay Bertrand, inasmuch as anyone is. Alcock suggested that Dean might have just made up the

name Bertrand. He said there was a rumor that there had been a nurse at the Hotel Dieu while Andrews was there named Clare Bertrand, and that as far as he knew nobody checked this out.

Alcock went on to say that it was the first name "Clay" that was the initial lead as far as Clay Shaw was concerned. I suspected that this was true but this was the first time anyone in the office had admitted it. He said that Shaw had refused to take a lie detector test, and that he feared Shaw's lawyers were soon going to publicize the results of a test which he believed Shaw had taken in Illinois somewhere. He said he would like to subpoena and question Marina Oswald next. Mainly he wanted to know if Oswald was ever away at night. Alcock also said he was worried about the business about the beard.

He added that he thought the arrest of Clay Shaw was possibly a case of mistaken identity, and that he had qualms about taking the case. I mentioned that we should make a formal request of the FBI that we be allowed to see the classified FBI reports on David Ferrie. I said that otherwise there was a danger that the defense would produce them at the trial, that they would contain nothing of interest, and moreover that the defense would establish that we hadn't even requested to see them. Alcock agreed that we should do this.

#### Aug 25, 1967

I arrived in Dallas on Aug 24, and was met by Bill Boxley at the airport. We proceeded directly to Marguerite Oswald's house in Fort Worth. Boxley introduced me to her and told her that I represented the DA's office, adding that he hoped we would be able to go through the material pertaining to the assassination which she had been accumulating, and had suggested we might be interested in. (Earlier, to Boxley.) However, Mrs Oswald did not appear to welcome the suggestion, and made it clear that it wasn't going to be that easy to get her to part with her material.

She soon launched into a lengthy discourse about her personal misfortunes, explaining that she had spent a great deal of money on her own investigation, including phone bills as high as \$590 a month, and that although she had made about 200 TV appearance she had only been paid \$100 on 3 of them. She added that she had recently been wondering where the next meal was coming from and at this point momentarily broke into tears. However, she soon recovered and said, "I hold all the cards, I am the mother, you've got to bring the family into this."

Nevertheless, it was her contention that it would be unwise for her to reveal any of her significant data to us, as the best way to do it would be in a book, which she seems to want to write, (and later added would be as big as, and considerably more important than, William Manchester's book.) It soon became clear that Mrs Oswald was unable to distinguish between us and newspaper reporters, and although Boxley carefully explained to her that we represented the DA's office in a case which might exonerate her son from having fired any shots, she plainly still regarded us as reporters trying to get a story.

Mrs Oswald showed no interest whatsoever in the New Orleans investigation, and asked no questions about it, as I should have thought she might. In particular, it was striking that she at no stage inquired if we had obtained any evidence which would exonerate Lee Harvey Oswald, and it was clear that her interest was not to "clear his name", as she has maintained. She wanted to be at the trial though. "I should be at Shaw's trial, just for the prestige, have the mother there fighting for her son." She just seemed to imagine herself on the witness stand, "with Shaw", in some vague but important capacity. I told her that she could not be a witness unless she had previously told us something of sufficient importance to merit it, but she made no response.

She then went into a diatribe against reporters who had cheated her. Overall, Mrs Oswald gave us no significant information and the whole trip was a waste of time. We also saw Mrs AC Johnson at 1026 N. Beckley, and she showed us

the layout and told us that Oswald was quiet and neat, and on most days called ~~for~~ someone from the payphone in the house, speaking in a foreign language, which she since surmises was Russian. She said he would call twice and sometimes 3 times a day.

Aug 30, 1967

Critics of the Warren Report are nearly always not aware of the extensiveness of the FBI's investigation. I was in the position till I went to Dallas, and more especially the National Archives and read through their voluminous reports. Sciantra has reported the same experience as a result of his trips to Louisiana towns, and certainly Garrison must be in the same position. E.g., early in the investigation he wrote a notation on a memo to get copies of the hotel register where Oswald stayed in Mexico City, and also Dallas YMCA records. Both were published in the 26 volumes.

The NBC program seems to have misfired from a publicity point of view. Quotations from letters to Garrison:

"My heart goes out to you in your fight for justice..."

"I ask that you not be discouraged by this horrible unfortunate abomination... may God bless you."

"The poor ignorant public (me) is searching for a champion, so don't let us down. I recall Frank McGee solving the Kennedy affair on TV the first day so how could we expect any change out of him."

(Letter to NBC, copy to Garrison:) "It is evident from your recent broadcast on the Garrison investigation that your true purpose was to create a doubt about any activity which might tend to throw light on the assassination of our beloved President Kennedy."

Alcock said something about Santana the other day. Can't remember his exact words but they were to the effect that Santana was just a Cuban fisherman who happened to be in jail at the time, and knew nothing whatsoever about the assassination.

Cynical thought for the day: Ferris and Oswald are both dead. It's surprising therefore that we don't have a few witnesses who say that they knew one another as neither is around to rebut it. I think that's what Garrison wanted to get out of Brownlee. (Ferris' godson)

Sep 8, 1967

John Vols indicated how he became involved in the case. Returning from Shreveport with Garrison when G. asked him if he had seen the Esquire article about the assassination. They picked up a copy at the news stand and Garrison told him to read it. He said they only had 2 or 3 people working on the case and they were told not to say anything about it. Vols told me, which I already knew, that precautions were taken in the office not to let this leak out. They were planning to arrest people before there was any publicity about the investigation. Typists were kept in the dark: Oswald was referred to in memos as "Smith" or "Patay", and Ferris was known as "Lindberg".

Life was in on the investigation early, as was CBS. Neither was going to break the story until Garrison wanted them to.

Vols made a trip to Dallas in late January to investigate the 3125 Harlandale story mentioned by deputy Sheriff Buddy Walthers. He came back with a negative on it, which he said didn't please Garrison too much. There was a lot of kidding of Vols about this later, and when people saw him in the office they would say, "There's nothing there, chief," which was what Vols apparently had told Garrison. Vols stopped working on the case about a month after his trip to Dallas. Too many of the legal staff were getting tied up, he said.

Sep 8, 1967

Garrison told me in his office that he was sorry I was underpaid, and to make up for it he told me it was alright for me to go ahead and keep xeroxes of anything I wanted. He said he was sure I would want to write a book about my experiences "when I get back to England". Couldn't quite figure this one out. He said he also had a private file at home which he thought would be of interest to me. (March 1969): No doubt it would have been interesting, but I never did see it.)

Sep 9, 1967

Boxley back from Baton Rouge, where he was investigating "Clinton". All top secret. He was talking to Garrison about it in G's office and I got the feeling I was not welcome when I went in. Advance copy of Playboy arrived and Garrison asked me what I thought of the interview. He said: "To me, it's like the taste of water." I told him it was OK because more specific than the later revised drafts he had sent off. (He had said at one point that the great thing about the Playboy interview was that you could write the questions as well as the answers.)

I asked him how Gordon Novel became involved in the case. He thought for a moment and said Novel came in and offered to help with electronic equipment, on the proviso that they didn't implicate him as a result of what he told them. Garrison agreed to this and Novel<sup>^</sup> about the Horna burglary episode and his connections with Ferris. Garrison then found out, he said, that Novel had been taking pictures inside the DA's office and selling them to Walter Sheridan. He then reneged on his agreement with Novel.

I asked Garrison what he thought about David Lewis as a witness; he didn't seem to have much of an opinion. I then pointed out that Lewis was one of the few linking Oswald and Ferris. He didn't know this, or at least pretended not to realize it, and I then pointed out the trouble with the dates. (When David Lewis was originally interviewed in the DA's office, Dec 14, 1966, he had been quite positive that the date he saw "Lee Harvey" at Mancuso's restaurant was in 1961, when Oswald was in Russia. I was in Ivon's office with Lewis on that day, the day I was hired.) Garrison then said something about Lewis later correcting the date.

I stressed to Garrison the importance of a Ferris-Oswald link--in my opinion, I said, the most important connection in the case. He said maybe he would have to "re-evaluate" Lewis as a witness.

Sep 10, 1967 (Sunday)

Went to the office in the afternoon. Sciambra, Alcock and Garrison were there. Ivon also came later. They were discussing the "Clay Bertrand" signature found in the guest book of the VIP lounge at the airport. Also discussing the notion to quash set for tomorrow. All seemed confident as to the outcome; it would take one day and Garrison seemed to know what questions the judge would permit, (especially of Russo.)

There was a discussion of the Pizzo exhibit. I asked Garrison if he had identified the other man passing out leaflets in the picture and he said: "What do you mean, have we identified him? That's Manuel Garcia Gonzalez." He then qualified this in some way.

The role of Life magazine was discussed. Sciambra was in favor of breaking off diplomatic relations. However Garrison and Ivon are evidently in favor of "keeping channels of communications open." I pointed out it seems they must be holding back some information on Hall, Howard and Seymour, as they seem so interested in them. Sciambra said he got the impression from Boxley that Life weren't giving us everything. Problem with Life, as Sciambra pointed out, and Ivon later confirmed, is that they have a copy of our files whereas they have

given us very little.

Note: What leads was Garrison working on when he began his investigation?

1. Looking for Ferrie involvement.
2. Dean Andrews-Clay Bertrand.
3. Harlendale Street, (Dallas).
4. Mrs Sylvia Odio. (A xerox copy of her Warren Commission testimony was in Ivon's office when I went there mid Dec. 1966.)
5. Pizzo exhibit. (Ivon showed me this picture in mid Dec, pointed to the man later known as Manuel Garcia Gonzalez, and said: "That's the man we're real interested in, Tom."

Monday, Sep. 11, 1967

Mark Lane arrived, and I met him for the first time. I went into Garrison's office for something, and there was Lane quietly sitting in a corner.

Sep 12, 1967

Shaw motion to quash over. The decision by the judge is next Monday. I went out to dinner in the evening with Mark Lane and his wife Anne-Lise. Contrary to the publicised impression, I found Lane quiet, factual and thoughtful. He told me about his new book, "Mark Lane Replies". At one point I told Lane that there was a certain irony in his supporting Garrison, because he had supposedly been retained by Oswald's mother to defend (posthumously) her son, Garrison's case against Shaw, I reminded Lane, is contingent upon Oswald's guilt since Shaw is accused of conspiring with Oswald. Lane's reply was: "I have never maintained that Oswald is innocent. Nowhere in 'Rush To Judgment' do I say that Oswald is innocent."

At Felix's, Lane and I were discussing the Dean Andrews case and Lane had started to say something about Prentiss Davis when we were advised by someone sitting at the next table (very crowded together) that he was one of Shaw's lawyers—Panzeca. Had never seen him before.

Lane is playing a quiet game and not asking me any embarrassing questions!

Sep 13, 1967

Bill Turner arrived in town, and I met him at the airport. He is doing an "Award Book" on the Garrison probe. Turner stayed a full week and went through the files in the "Archives"—my office, xeroxing material and taking notes. He displays particular interest in the "paramilitary" connections in the case—Mintomen, etc.

Wednesday evening I went out to dinner with him, Boxley, and Mrs Mae Brussells. Mrs B., from Carmel, Calif. has done vast research on the Russian community in Dallas, nearly all of it a complete waste of time it seems to me. She has cross-indexed it to the point where her notes on DeMohrenschildt, for instance, are almost valueless as being more voluminous than his original testimony.

Sep 14, 1967

Mrs Brussell, Mark Lane, Bill Turner and Bill Boxley all competing with me for a place in my office. In the evening, Turner, Brussells, Boxley and I went out to Garrison's house for what he termed a brainstorming session.

Garrison more or less held the floor and discussed a wide range of topics in his inimitable way. I took the following notes. David Ferrie, he said, deposited \$7000 in his bank in November, 1963. Garrison added that Ferrie "discontinued his association with Cubans after the assassination." The head of the National States Rights Party was George Soule, and Garrison said they held a convention here in August, 1963, at the Fountainbleau Hotel. This is the same group that was talking about killing Kennedy in Miami and discovered

by the Secret Service. (The "Miami tape".) There was then something from G. about this group recently forming the Anglican Old Orthodox Catholic Church, which I couldn't quite follow. Garrison is very interested in these ad hoc church groups, mainly because Ferrie belonged to one. He sees them as covers for espionage and CIA type activity. Garrison believes that the Abundant Light Temple (or some such name) near where Tippit was shot in some way played an important role in the planning and execution of the assassination.

Garrison can sometimes talk extremely amusingly about things like this. You reach a point where, not only do you not believe what he is saying, but you realise he doesn't believe it either. You realise he is just putting on a kind of amusing performance. Often it is difficult to see the dividing line between when he means what he says and when he is joking. I remember once, one Sunday when we were holding staff meetings in the middle of the day, he started to talk to the assembled lawyers about the paramilitary operation in Dealey Plaza. I think everyone was a bit uncomfortable, sensing that Garrison believed what he was saying and that no one else did. Soon, however, he got carried away and was talking about "platoons of National Guardsmen" hiding in churches, "infantry movements", or "armored convoys" moving through Dallas, underground canteen facilities in a large dugout under Dealey Plaza, and so on. Everyone was completely broken up with laughter, which of course Garrison appreciated. He only does this when he is in a good mood.

Tonight, however, he was more serious and concluded about Ferrie: "The lines are gossamer lines, but when you find them they lead from Dave Ferrie to Nazi-ism, Fascism." He added that Ferrie's trip to Houston was "more interesting than if he had gone to Dallas." His phone records for Nov. 1963 were missing too. (Not sure if this is true. I have seen Ferrie's phone records but don't recall.)

"Reilly and Monahan were both Directors of the Crime Commission", Garrison said, and added that they worked for the Reilly Coffee Co. which employed Oswald. Garrison says that this company "is more than a coffee company."

On July 15, '63, there was an Eastern Airlines hearing in Miami regarding Ferrie. Banister testified strongly in Ferrie's favor, and, as Garrison put it, "went way beyond the call of duty". Later that week, G. explained, Oswald says to Adrian Alba: "Pretty soon I'm going to get the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow." Then on Friday he leaves the employ of Reilly.

Garrison pointed out that 544 Camp St (which Oswald had on his literature) is the same building as 531 Lafayette, Banister's address. "Guy Banister's office is the key to the case," Garrison said. He may be right. I always feel more comfortable when he talks about Banister because he seems like a good suspect. Garrison then said, "We tunelled into Dallas from the back." I'm not sure what he meant by this, however.

He said something about there being a statement from a man who says Alba took him to a Minuteman meeting. Conversation turned to the Minuteman type, and the kind of man who is nuts about guns. Garrison's comment: "They ought to get these guys and send them to Vietnam. Give them a physical on the plane." I agree.

Garrison has been doing a great deal of research into the various Ruby or Crawford notebooks published in the 26 vols, and the Oswald address book. He's quite proud of this research, and reckons he's probably the world expert in this sub-topic. (He probably is.) He says the annotation "Midland 2550" occurs in the Crawford book and "Newton 2550" in the Oswald book. Garrison suggests these are "Callsigns" on some radio frequency. (I'm not sure that G is right that both these annotations do occur, but he might be. I checked and could only find one, the Oswald one I think.)

Earlier on, (about a month ago,) a guy called Jim Hicks had come to see Garrison in his office one Saturday afternoon. He said he had been in Dealey Plaza when JFK was shot, although I recall he had 2 versions as to which side of the street he was on. This evening Garrison told us that Hicks has a drunken driving

rap hanging over his head. He now wants us to write to the D.A. in Oklahoma to get him off. This is obviously the explanation of Hicks' visit.

Garrison says he is issuing a Grand Jury subpoena for Loran Hall, and then said something about Hall possibly suing him. "He may end up living in this house," Garrison said.

Garrison is more confident these days, since the discovery of the name 'Clay Bertrand' signed in the airport VIP room guest book, dated Dec 14, 1966.

Sep 15, 1967

'Plot or Politics' by Rosemary James & Jack Wardlaw published. Can't remember anything else today.

Sep 16, 1967

Went out to dinner in the evening with Boxley and Turner, and we later met Garrison at the Boucherie, with Sciambra and girl friend. Garrison in genial mood, being recognised etc. Being introduced to girls and leaning forward embracing them in a friendly way. I mention the Phelan rumour (to the effect that there is going to be "a break in the case" later this year,) to Garrison, but he does not think the break is likely to be all that important, and in this respect he is probably right.

Sep 18, 1967

The judge ruled against the motion to quash today. At lunch with Alcock, Lane, Turner and Boxley, Jim Alcock expressed some concern over the fact that the judge appeared to be rushing to trial, and in particular regarded it as his prerogative to set the trial date because we had filed a motion for speedy trial. In Alcock's view, both the prosecution and the defense would like to have the trial delayed. At any rate, it is quite clear that he would to have the trial delayed. He is not looking forward to it at all. After the NBC attack on Garrison in June, Alcock expressed amazement at Garrison's behaviour: he now had very good grounds for requesting a continuance in the case, but what does he do? Files a motion for a speedy trial. Alcock shook his head in (slightly amused) disbelief. A. thinks the trial will either have to be late October or January, in view of the Xmas recess and the jury being locked up.

Chandler Brossard, a senior editor of 'Look' magazine is in town. He is a slightly oddball character with unconventional views; apparently a great admirer of Garrison. He is doing a 'visit piece' for 'Look'. I went to dinner with him, Boxley, Turner, Mark & Anne-Lise Lane, at Antoine's. (The tab was \$80.01, paid for by Boxley who was reimbursed by the DA's office.) There was something of an altercation between Brossard and Lane, which was still going on outside Antoine's door as we left. As I recall it, Brossard was saying what a lousy magazine 'Playboy' is, and Lane, (who has reaped benefit from it in his 'Playboy interview') disagreed. The argument escalated from then on but I didn't pay much attention.

Brossard said he thought there were only three good magazines in the country: Ramparts, The New York Review of Books, and The Realist: a very odd view for a senior editor of 'Look'.

Today Matt Herron filed a report on his negative investigation in Dallas (last January) in an attempt to establish a phone call link between Ruby and Oswald. This investigation was predicated on some information he received earlier from Penn Jones, and Herron then got a short assignment from Billings of 'Life' to check it out. Nothing came of it, however.

I finally wrote up a memo on Jerry Patrick Hemming's visit. Hemming came to see us last July, and as I had nothing about it in my diary earlier, I will put something in here. I quote from a letter I wrote to Edward Epstein, dated July 25, 1967:

"We were recently paid an unannounced visit by two Americans who were intimately connected with Cuban exile groups in the summer of 1963. One, Gerry Patrick Hemming, was even dressed in fatigues. The main purpose of their visit seemed to be to point an authoritative finger of suspicion at Hall, Howard and Seymour, (to an extent that we began to wonder if they knew that others were involved and were trying to protect them.) Gerry Patrick told me the following story which I thought might interest you.

"According to Gerry Patrick, (he usually drops the Hemming,) there were in 1963 numerous "teams" with parasilitary inclinations out to "get" Kennedy. Some of these teams had been approached by wealthy entrepreneurs of the H.L. Hunt type, (though not, I think, in fact H.L. Hunt) who were interested in seeing the job done and even provided financial assistance. Then, on November 22, 1963, Kennedy is shot down on the streets, ("Maybe Oswald got there ahead of them," Patrick commented,) and then for 2 years or so, there the story rests.

However, since all the mounting controversy of the last 12 months, a startling new development has occurred, according to Patrick. Recently, members of the "teams" have been returning to their sponsors, taking credit for the assassination, and at the same time requesting large additional sums of money so that they won't be tempted to talk about it to anyone. In turn, the sponsors have apparently been hiring Mafia figures to rid themselves of these blackmailers.

"Gerry Patrick admitted that his own association with some of these extremist groups in 1963 has recently been causing him some concern. Incidentally, this may very well be the true story behind the Del Valle murder in Miami, reported this spring in the National Enquirer."

#### Tuesday Sep 19, 1967

Effect of the Life articles on organized crime, (Life: Sep 1 & Sep 8, 1967): Garrison has instituted a grand jury investigation of organized crime, and has offered to resign if any found. Holm, he says, also should resign if none is found. On the filing front, a 'Mob' file was instituted, casually, by Garrison. It contained a memo which G. had evidently just written.

Brossard expatiating in my office about America, which he refers to as "the jerk off machine." He talks quite amusingly and much of what he says I agree with, eg. the deplorability of accepting the notion of education as a panacea. He says Americans "encapsulate experience" in such a way that the experience does not affect their lives in any way. He gave this example: if a conspiracy of top level origin to assassinate JFK was unearthed, this information would be immediately "encapsulated" and no action would result. In a country like Spain, he says, there would be a revolution.

Brossard went out to dinner in the evening at Garrison's home. Boxley and Turner had dinner at the Lanez.

#### Sep 20, 1967

Turner left in the evening and Garrison left for New York. He has some TV appearances resultant from his Playboy interview.

#### Sep 22, 1967

I had lunch with Mark Lane alone and we discussed the case more frankly than before. He admitted the uselessness of propinquity as an incriminating factor—something Garrison has been going on about and apparently sincerely believes in. Lane speculated as to the possible innocence of Clay Shaw: "Wouldn't it be something if he was innocent," or words to that effect. He gave me the impression that it was a thought which had never occurred to him

before. I told him I thought Shaw would be acquitted on the evidence I have seen. Lane said he thought there would be a "public investigation" of the probe if Shaw were acquitted. I don't think necessarily so.

Lane is quietly going through the files, (Mancuso, Sheridan, Sandra Moffett, recently,) occasionally xeroxing material. Naturally, I am concerned by Lane's presence as he could be trying to usurp my position. His position is beginning to become clearer to me: he is basically out for himself and would like to see his position vis-a-vis the Warren Commission vindicated by Garrison. I got the feeling today for the first time that he may have realized he might not be backing the right horse. He is definitely a calculator, and I feel may be prepared to take a calculated risk on the outcome of the case. (If I were in his position—best seller behind me—I would be strongly tempted to get quickly into another field.) He is clearly in a quandary: an extremely ironical position in view of Shaw's guilt depending on Oswald's.

Wrote to Paul Hoch and Popkin. Reviewed the Negell file and consider it a complete waste of Bill Martin's time and office money.

### Sen 26, 1967

The defense filed a motion for a 6 month delay in the Shaw trial, or alternatively a change in venue. Alcock, Burnes etc. are obviously pleased with this opportunity to establish a stronger case against Shaw in the interim. Alcock said that as an alternative to the judge actually ruling in their favor—an unlikely contingency—the state might file a reply which contained an exasperated preamble alluding to our desire for a speedy trial, and goes on to agree to the defense's request, for purported reason of possible reversal later on if denied. In this event, Alcock said, the judge would have to accede to the united front presented by both sets of lawyers.

Mark Lane on WVUE TV 11 o'clock news, and alleged that Life's organized crime series is in reality part of an "orchestrated attack" on Garrison, and said that they (Life) had photos, etc. which would destroy the Warren Report, but refused to publish them. (What nonsense this is. Presumably he is referring to the Zapruder film, which anyone can see in the National Archives, and segments of which have been published about three times in huge color spreads in the magazine—most particularly in an article which called for a new investigation and brought Garrison into the fray!) Lane then made an indiscreet remark about Aaron Kohn's grand jury statement—revealing that he knew what Kohn said before the grand jury, which he is not supposed to know—and also mentioned Billings, Garrison and he having dinner together. I'm afraid Lane sees things purely in terms of public relations, TV appearances etc.

### Sen 27, 1967

Garrison returns with McKeithen from New York. Apparently they were shown additional data by Life, which prompted ~~the~~ McKeithen to admit that there was organized crime in Louisiana. Everybody in the DA's office is terribly upset that McKeithen "blew his cool", as they put it. I saw Garrison in the office later on, and a few other people were there. He was really mad at McKeithen. He said, "He's got a wonderful face, he's got the face of a wagon train leader traversing the continent, but when he got back to New Orleans, this BLOB stopped off the plane." He then gave the speech he would have given if he had been Governor. I wish I had had a tape recorder because it was a tour de force. I don't remember how it went except that the first sentence went: "I don't have to APOLOGIZE for the STATE OF LOUISIANA..." After that I was just hypnotised, like everyone else in the room. I remember thinking that he would only have to make a few speeches like that and he could get elected Governor whenever he liked. I never saw Huey Long, of course,

but I imagine Garrison could have made him look like an amateur.

Monday Oct 2, 1967

In the morning my phone was put in and I arrived at work at noon. Garrison was there and he was in one of those moods when he wanted me in his office. He discussed various things. Penn Jones' new book had arrived and he was amused by the chapter headings: 'Deaths', 'More Deaths', 'Still More Deaths'. He also went over my memo on Oswald in Mexico, (he has some theory that Oswald's brother went to Mexico.) He then complained that people call him all the time and he has to "absorb their energies," as he put it, and meanwhile gets nothing done. He also wanted me to call Jones Harris re "Holms", and John Hall (a lawyer) in Tulsa re Jim Hicks.

I spoke to Jim Alcock later in the day, and he started out by expressing pessimism about the case; he complained that no-one was working on the Shaw case and we were really going to have to get down to it. He said his reply to the defense motion was such that a compromise would be arrived at as to the trial date, and he implied it had already been arranged with the judge that the trial would be in January or thereabouts.

A lead which has developed is that Tony Cox (listed in Shaw's address book) is supposed to have admitted something about Shaw's alleged involvement to a third party, and we are now trying to find Cox, so far without success. Alcock then discussed the case in general and said he was not at all looking forward to the trial. He said Shaw may in fact have used the name Bertrand, and Russo's meeting may have taken place, but he said that he doubted Shaw was really responsible for any overt act.

He repeated to me that Eugene Davis had admitted calling Dean Andrews at the Hotel Dieu, and he said he would like to question Davis further. (No development re 'Clare Bertrand' at the hospital.)

Alcock discussed Ferrie and pointed out he saw no reason to believe Ferrie was involved. I asked him if we had any witnesses other than Jack Martin or David Lewis who linked Ferrie and Oswald. He said no, and then added that Lewis was "a liar", and that anyway Martin didn't ever claim seeing Oswald and Ferrie together. (Not so. At one point, Martin did make such a claim. He might have added that it was surely more than coincidence that Martin and Lewis both came into the DA's office with matching stories on the same day, Dec 14, 1966, incidentally the date in the guest book at the VIP Lounge. Also, later on Martin and Lewis were sharing an apartment together.)

Also, Alcock pointed out that right after Ferrie was released on Nov. 25, 1963, he went straight to Oswald's apartment on Magazine Street which was, as Alcock described it, "swarming with FBI, Secret Service, police, etc." trying to find out how anyone could think he was involved with Oswald. Later on he went all over the city discussing his case, trying to find the answer to the same question. As Alcock said, a guilty man would probably have quietly left town. Maybe he was, as Garrison would put it, "disassociating," (by this he means someone who is supposedly guilty deliberately acting in an innocent manner,) but it seems awfully unlikely. I agree with Alcock's position on all of these points.

Alcock said he did not believe the defense's request for a 6 month delay indicated that they knew, or thought, that Clay Shaw was guilty, but simply that they didn't want the hassle of the trial, with witnesses to be called, the expense involved, possible homosexual disclosures, and generally the length and exhausting nature of the proceedings. He said he wasn't looking forward to it either, mainly because we had such a slim case, and were going to be hard put to it to link Shaw to any of those supposedly involved--according to Garrison's statements: Minutemen etc. Alcock said the Clinton angle "wasn't working out," and that he entirely disagreed with

Garrison's interpretation of the Tankersley episode, (Holmes exhibit in 26 volumes, which suggests that Oswald may have had a friend in New Orleans who filled out a change of address form at the Post Office.)

Alcock repeated what Garrison had already said to Epstein and myself in June—that Shaw became the suspect because they were looking for Clay Bertrand and Clay Shaw had the same first name; also Clay Bertrand was presumed to be a homosexual. Thus Shaw came to light. Garrison had said earlier to ~~Sciambra~~ Epstein and myself that Sciambra had "squeezed the quarter" looking for Clay Bertrand, but that he could not be found.

Alcock said that we should call Marina Oswald before the grand jury, and that it would look bad if we didn't. Even now it would look a bit remiss to call her at such a late date. Alcock said he thought a "buff" such as Garrison is would be only too pleased to have the opportunity to talk to the wife of the alleged assassin. Mainly, Alcock is interested in asking her if Oswald spent nights away from home.

Regarding the Thornley affidavit, prepared for Garrison at the urging of David Lifton, Alcock said he talked to John Rene Heindel the other day, and if he speaks Russian, Alcock said, "he fooled me."

Tuesday, October 3, 1967

State's reply filed re continuance and change of venue. January trial now seems likely. Garrison requests McKeithen to appear before the Grand Jury, and then subpoenas him! Alcock and Lorraine Schuler (Garrison's secretary) amazed at this, and obviously somewhat dismayed. Alcock again referred to the Playboy interview and said how wild it was. Lorraine Schuler said she wouldn't even read it. Then Alcock said that by saying outright that Oswald didn't fire a gun that day, Garrison had "pulled our overt act out from underneath us." He told Garrison this, but Garrison casually replied that: "That's just my opinion. You can argue differently in court if you want to." (Garrison is consistently and openly contemptuous of lawyers and law. I once heard him say that lawyers should be called liars. On another occasion Garrison explained that when he was in law school he learned that any case can be argued either way, according to whichever set of precedents you care to select from the law books, and that therefore the establishment of truth has got little to do with law. Ever since he realised this, he said, he lost interest in law.) As Alcock said, the one thing we could have proved was that Oswald owned the gun etc.

It is worth noting that if it is a question of either strengthening his case against Clay Shaw, or arguing against the Warren Report, the latter always has a prior claim in Garrison's mind.

To dinner in the evening at the NOAC with Garrison, Boxley, Burnes and Sciambra, later joined by Ivon and Loisel. (Alcock always does his best to avoid these gatherings.) Garrison even more confident than ever, and soon after I arrived made a startling remark to the effect that so far he had been playing it cautiously, but now he was really going to start swinging out onto the offensive. Idea of the dinner was to get us to concentrate our attention onto crucial areas--before we had been spread out "like two infantry battalions", Garrison said--but in fact not much was achieved in the course of the evening.

Garrison seems certain that General Walker and H.L. Hunt are involved in the assassination, although I am not clear on what evidence. It was agreed to give them the code names Harry and Eddie Blue (i.e. "True Blue") It was pointed out by Boxley, (real name, it emerged, is Bill Wood) that Life lost interest in us when we lost interest in the Cuban exiles--good point.

Garrison is evidently proud of the fact that he doesn't smell a

Communist conspiracy in the assassination. He repeatedly says how "we found out after two days the Communists weren't involved." His assistants look about them with deadpan expressions when he makes remarks like this, not giving anything away.

Walker's "involvement" is supposed to have something to do with the fact that he was in New Orleans on the day of the assassination, and then travelled from here to Shreveport. H.L. Hunt also has a home in Shreveport. Movements to Shreveport—Cody, Walker, Bruce Ray Carlin to N.O. and back to Fort Worth, all seen as passing messages to avoid records of long distance phone calls—this is the way Garrison likes to speculate. He gets fairly far from reality at times like this, and regards it as completely obvious that if there were ~~an~~ such a widespread and all-embracing conspiracy, no one else but him would ever have stumbled across it.

Marilyn Murret has not been checked out in New Orleans, nor has Sam Newman been asked to identify the 5'9" brown hair Spanish accent person at 544 Camp Street. (Mentioned by him in one of the Secret Service reports in the 26 volumes.) On Monday Alcock repeated how amazing it was that the other person in the Pizzo exhibit—"Manuel Garcia Gonzalez"—has never been identified

#### Thursday, October 5, 1967

Marcello brothers and Governor McKeithen appeared before the grand jury. Lunch with Matt Herron and Marta Calleja. Matt is taking pictures for Life. I spoke to Martin Waldron in the afternoon, and he told me that the New York Times had been given a lead for a possible Shaw-Ferrie link, which, he said, had not been checked out, and so he gave it to me. This concerned a man called Shaw who rented an airport somewhere with plans to fly bombing missions over Cuba. The information was dug up by some history professor called Sadler in South Carolina while doing a thesis or something like that. Alcock reached Sadler by phone but concluded that there was nothing to the lead.

(1969: this is an illustration of the kind of dishonest reporting that has been going on in the Los Angeles Free Press. In their March 21, 1969, issue they refer to (ie Art Kunkin refers to) Shaw's "possible involvement, according to information in Garrison's files, with other people from New Orleans Trade Mart in a plot to bomb Cuba in 1947 from a Florida airport rented by a "Shaw". The information in Garrison's files is simply a lead provided by a reporter from the New York Times, which was checked out and found to have no substance.)

In the evening Garrison left for Los Angeles.

#### Friday, October 6, 1967

Went with Boxley to check out lead that Oswald was employed by St. Charles (Sheraton Charles) Hotel in 1963. No Oswald or Hidell in employee files of hotel though. The story evidently derives from one Fred Willis, now employed at the Pancake House on Bourbon Street, to whom we spoke. I doubt if there is anything to it. Apparently the FBI had already checked into the possibility and no doubt would have made it known if Oswald had worked there.

As Boxley and I were driving back towards Tulane Avenue I told him about the Claire Bertrand rumor, and we discussed going into the Hotel Dieu and looking at their employee files. Decided against it though. I think we both felt that it would be somewhat embarrassing to unearth such information!

Had a call from Matt Herron and that evening we went to have drinks with David Chandler and his wife. Chandler extremely critical of Garrison, and said he hoped to see him in jail as a result of his activity. Chandler said that Garrison was a criminal and he could prove it.

Chandler said that Life was going to come out with another 'mob' story soon, which would specifically single Garrison out for attack. Then, probably after the Shaw trial, there would be another story about the assassination investigation. (1969: neither of these articles came out.) Chandler wanted to know (a) what I thought of Garrison, and (b) why I was working for him.

We asked Chandler what Billings thought about the assassination and Chandler said Billings thought there was a conspiracy. Chandler said he was writing an article for Esquire, for which the deadline was in 9 days, although he hadn't started it yet, and also a book about "the whole picture" (ie Louisiana politics) which was supposed to coincide with the Shaw trial.

I asked him why he seemed to have so much animosity towards Garrison, and he said he didn't have any personal animosity towards him, as he did towards Charles Ward, whom he described ironically as "gutsy Ward". Chandler asked me what I thought of Garrison's methods, and I asked him in respect to whom. He listed Beaubouef, Layton Martens, Sheridan, Townley etc. He said that what he objected to in the case of Beaubouef was that he was subpoenaed, and the power of the subpoena was used to interrogate him in the DA's office. Same was true of Ferrie, he said. (Not so, I believe. Ferrie was interrogated in the DA's office, but I am sure he was not subpoenaed.) I replied that it seemed to me more important to concentrate on the substance—or lack of it—in the investigation than to harp continually on methods. That was why the Phelan article was so damaging, I conceded, because it attacked the substance of the case.

I asked him why Life seemed to be singling out Louisiana for attack—wasn't the situation bad anywhere else? He admitted the situation was bad in New Jersey, also in Mass. He said that the 3rd article on La. was provoked as much as anything by the response of McKeithen & Garrison of an offer to resign if Life's charges were true. This resignation offer made it a good news story.

I said that if you legislate against certain activities, which are only marginally, if at all, "malum in se", such as gambling, then you are always going to create a breed of men who are criminals by virtue of their catering to this activity, as happened also in the case of prohibition. Chandler replied that it was not the gambling that he objected to, but the bribery and corruption which permitted it to exist, and the subsequent degeneration of officials who allow themselves to be corrupted in this way. (Which, I now agree (1969) is the whole point, although at the time I argued further with Chandler about it.)

Thursday, October 19, 1967

Garrison returned from West Coast. Little has happened during his absence. He returned determined to charge Heindel with some crime, but prudence has, I hope, prevailed. He was urged not to by, at least, Loisel, Boxley, Alcock, David Lifton and Steve Jaffe.

I completed memo on Oswald's movements while he was unemployed in New Orleans. Boxley away in Houston—doing heavens knows what, I never see any memos from Boxley. The other day I had lunch with Boxley and he told me how he came to be hired by Garrison. It was on May 1, 1967. I think he had been doing some work for the Wakenhut organisation before working for Garrison. He came right out and told Garrison that he had been employed by the CIA in the '50s—early '50s I think. Boxley also worked for a fairly covert part of the agency—maybe Plans Division or something like that. He is quite discreet about the CIA—it wouldn't pay him to be otherwise, he allows—but he insists that assassination of the President is not something that he

would outright dismiss as unthinkable as far as the CIA is concerned. In any event, Garrison accepted that Boxley was no longer working for the CIA, etc., and hired Boxley immediately. Boxley was of course grateful, and impressed by Garrison. They spent quite a bit of time talking about the CIA, and the kind of operations it gets into. Boxley began to introduce him to the espionage argot—talk about "cut-offs, safe houses" etc., and no doubt was largely responsible for getting Garrison to believe what he evidently wanted to believe: that the assassination was engineered by the CIA. The next day Boxley picked up a copy of the local paper and read in it headlines about Garrison's latest allegation, about the CIA. He was so startled that at first he thought the story was about him, and that Garrison was going to pounce on him.

I think Boxley lacks judgment, but he is a likeable and friendly person. I think he would do just about anything for Garrison.

We determined the whereabouts of Herrera, a State Department interpreter who might have been at the airport on Dec 14, 1966— date of the signature in the VIP lounge book. He lives in Arlington, Va. Questioning him could be crucial, one way or the other.

Garrison met with Melvin Belli while on the West Coast, and I think impressed him, although Belli was previously committed to the point of view—having defended Ruby—that there was no conspiracy.

#### Saturday, October 26, 1967

Garrison's intention to do something about Heindel was warded off by a concentrated effort in the office, and Alcock said he would resign if Garrison charged Heindel with perjury. Burnes continues to create the impression that he does what he is told by Garrison, merely looking for the legal means without consideration for truth or validity. Ivon and Loisel are also opposed to any action. Garrison told Loisel that he was afraid the Federal Government was looking for means to remove him from office, and he wanted to produce something new—ie Heindel—to forestall them. Alcock, Ivon and Lorraine Schuler took the view that this would be just the kind of move the Federal Govt. would be hoping Garrison would make. Also David Lifton called from L.A. and urged prudence. Garrison received an unfriendly letter from Kerry Thornley, now living in Tampa, Fla., saying he regretted his original affidavit and didn't want to have anything more to do with the case.

Further arrivals from the Mark Lane coterie: first Gary Sanders, a young engineer from San Francisco who attended Lane's class at Stanford. Gary trots around with Lane, and has even re-located. Now looking for job and apartment. Meanwhile he seems to think it ~~is~~ is his right and his business to know what is going on in the office, under the aegis of Lane, who has the entree to Garrison in every respect. Numa Bertel told me his job has been to find an office for Lane and Sanders, and that this is liable to create bad feeling in the office. I told Lane this last night, and he told me he didn't intend to move into my office, or that of any assistant DA.

The latest arrival is Steve Jaffe, from Los Angeles. He is currently Garrison's blue eyed boy, but he is unlikely to remain in that position for long as he is nothing more than a star-struck hanger-onner to famous people, majoring in movie making at UCLA. He started out as a friend of Mort Sahl, but increasingly used his friendship as a means of meeting important people. Sahl and Lane are both now unenthusiastic about him. He left today for Chicago, paving the way for Garrison's arrival there tomorrow in the 'Playboy' mansion.

We have received visits in the last week from: Roger Craig, ex-deputy sheriff in Dallas; Al Chapman, whom Penn Jones now informs Mark Lane is a member of the Klan, and furnishes nothing but useless information; a Mr. Eddows from England, and Dr. John Nichols from Kansas City.

Craig wrote to us and told us to contact him immediately. Garrison, Boxley and Lane spoke to him on Tuesday night, but so far no memos have appeared. I

gather from Lane that he did not materially add to his testimony before the Warren Commission, which he was surprised we had read. He still sticks to it, and expressed surprise that Capt. Fritz does not recall Craig talking to Oswald. I spoke to Craig briefly in Garrison's office, and he had nothing to add about Oswald's testimony.

Chapman had nothing to offer, as far as I could see, but Garrison spent the whole of Thursday afternoon and Friday morning talking to him. Chapman took some man-hole pictures behind the picket fence in Dealey Plaza in August, 1967. He said he thought the "Illuminati" were responsible for the assassination, and seemed to be trying to tie "niggers" in too, citing Euins, ~~Roland~~ and Negro man on wall, reported to him by Hudson, the Dealey Plaza ground-keeper.

On Friday afternoon Dr. Nichols finally saw Garrison, and in presence of Garrison, myself, Scimmbra, Boxley, Lane, Jaffe and Sanders, showed us his color slides. His thesis is that Kennedy could not have been shot in the neck from an angle between directly behind to 28° to right hand side of the neck. This conclusion derives from anatomical data re. bone structure of the neck, position of tracheotomy wound, angle up to TSBD thus giving entry height in back of neck, diagram of cross section of neck and size of neck bone, which CE 399 could not have penetrated. His point is that at angle of 28° or greater (thus missing the neck bone) a shot through Kennedy would have missed Connally entirely, thus disposing of the single bullet theory. Also, at 28° position the wound would have been detected at Parkland Hospital and reported. Thus Nichols leaves us with the probability that the wound was a back wound, and leaves a big  $\gamma$  mark as to the origin of the throat wound.

Nichols cites as proof that autopsy doctors did not look at autopsy photos and x-rays the fact that they spent considerable time looking for ~~the~~ a bullet in the body, which would have showed up readily in the x-rays/

Eddows, a retired English barrister who wrote a book about the Timothy Evans case, believes that the Kennedy assassination, like the Christine Keeler case, was engineered by the Russians. He regards the Denning Report in England as a whitewash, ditto the Warren Report. He believes that Clay Shaw was linked to the Steven Ward crowd in London.

On Monday had dinner with Garrison and his mother, Mark Lane and his wife Anne Lise, and Gary Sanders. Lane persuaded Garrison that it would be a good idea to go on a college lecture tour. Garrison thought the idea a good one, and said he would put the money into 'Truth & Consequences'. Apparently an engagement at New Mexico University has been tentatively arranged. Lane said that at one college he was scheduled to speak at, Rep. Gerald Ford was due to speak the week after him. Garrison said he would speak the week after Ford at the same college, and thus make a "Ford Sandwich".

Not much emerged in a rambling evening's discussion. Both Garrison and Lane were putting Sylvia Meagher down for being critical of Garrison. Expectations were high for Craig the next day, and Garrison said that if he had his pick of all the witnesses in the Dealey Plaza area to speak to, he would choose Craig. Garrison said he never finished reading Epstein's book Inquest; when he discovered that there was no "analysis" by the Warren Commission, that was enough for him. (I do not recall this being a finding of the book, nor do I quite understand what Garrison means.)

Garrison seems to regard the Warren Report as completely defunct, and tends to be impatient when further discrepancies are pointed out. Seems to think it is a waste of time and that it is now imperative to move forward constructively by pointing finger at party or parties allegedly guilty.

Mrs Garrison had little to say, but she became animated when the subject of Walter Jenkins came up, towards the end of the evening. Garrison was talking about what an impression it would make if Walter Jenkins were suddenly arrested in connection with the assassination. It would link LBJ in neatly, suggest connections with Shaw etc. Garrison's mother became really interested at this

point, and joined enthusiastically into the conversation. She started to egg Garrison on, and encouraged him to charge Jenkins in some way. "Oh, do do that Jim, I think that would be a wonderful idea." For her, as for Garrison, the dividing line between joking about something and seriously contemplating action on it seemed to be precious thin.

On Saturday (28th) Garrison talked to Eddows in my office. Eddows was inordinately impressed by the 'code'. For me it was a bizarre experience. After going through the P.O. 19106 'code', he branched out into several other variants supposedly employed by Oswald, eg a code which gives you the CIA phone number in New Orleans. Garrison's method of working this out is as follows: first he finds a series of digits or numbers in Oswald's address book (several pages are filled with scrawled figures, so there is plenty of choice) and selects a group which strikes his fancy as being encoded. He then looks up the CIA phone number in the phone book. Then, using an arbitrary method which is uniquely suited for that purpose, he translates one set of digits into the other. He also did this with the FBI phone number, but needless to say he had to use a different decoding procedure. Of course, this is not quite the way he explains it. He starts out by showing you the digits in Oswald's book, and persuades you that it is in code. Then comes the decoding 'key', which he makes sound as plausible, logical and as easy to remember as he can, (Garrison can be surprisingly persuasive on occasions like this.) Using the key, he translates the digits into a different set, and writes out the new number for you. Then, with the air of a conjuror arriving at the climax of his trick, he opens the phone book and shows you the CIA phone number. The same number!

Eddows seemed to be completely hoodwinked by this, and was tremendously impressed by the whole performance. Garrison had completely confidence in Eddows after this, and even let him keep the sheets of legal paper he had been demonstrating the variants of the code on, which I should have thought could almost have been regarded as an incriminating document of some kind. Garrison also let Eddows take away a copy of Clay Shaw's address book.

Friday, November 3, 1967

I had been boiling up for a row with Mark Lane ~~today~~ and his lieutenant Gary Sanders, and it burst today. I confronted Lane with his right to read and xerox our files--he was in the process of reading the Ferrie file when this occurred. I asked him how he felt that xeroxing the files contributed to the investigation. He kept quite calm and replied that Garrison set policy in the office, not me, and that therefore he could xerox them if he wanted to, which was I suppose a reasonable answer. I also told Lane that it was my belief he had lied to me about some information provided ~~for~~ him by David Lifton. Lifton, a friend of Wesley Liebeler in Los Angeles, had managed to get some information from Liebeler about the classified pages on David Ferrie in the National Archives. Liebeler worked on this area for the Warren Commission and had copies of the classified pages, which he read out to Lifton one evening. (He would not let Lifton have copies of them.) Lifton ran home and wrote down all he could remember. He then later met Lane and told him he had this material written down. Lane told him that he had to have it because he was on his way to New Orleans and Garrison would like to see it. Lifton gave him the material, as well as some info from some columnist. Lane says he only got the columnist material, not the other. Lifton was quite surprised to hear this, and surprised to hear that we did not have the Ferrie material in the office by now. Their stories are in flat contradiction, and there is no doubt in my mind that Lane is lying. The fact is the Ferrie material is worse than useless to Garrison, because it indicates that the FBI is not hiding anything significant about Ferrie, and thus deprives Garrison of an excuse to talk about governmental secrecy, etc. Lane is smart enough

to realise this, and no doubt decided that the best thing would be simply not to show the Lifton material to Garrison at all.

Saturday, November 4, 1967

Thought it best to tell Garrison that I had had an argument with Lane, and he treated it with vast diplomacy. He ensured, first of all, that I was alone in his office with him, to ensure that he was not confronted by any kind of consensus from the office. Garrison advised me that it was OK for Lane to xerox the files etc., because he was writing a book about the investigation. Two people had been authorised to write books about the subject, he said: Bill Turner, who was doing a quick "pocket book" on the subject; and Mark Lane, who would be doing a more leisurely "history book" on it.

I saw Lane later in the afternoon, and we more or less agreed to stop the feud. I told him, however, what it was that concerned me more than anything: some of the files, which I was supposed to be in charge of, were something of an embarrassment to me. The Ferrie file, I said, fell into this category. The Ferrie file contains no evidence that Ferrie knew Oswald, which is the relationship which the investigation was originally predicated on. The Ferrie file is, in fact, simply a report on a negative investigation. Under the circumstances then, it was somewhat embarrassing to have outsiders like Gary Sanders coming round reading the file. Lane reacted as though he appreciated my problem and then said: "Well, in future, if anyone looks at the Ferrie file, just tell them that the important material from it has been put into a confidential file somewhere." By saying this, of course, Mark Lane was acknowledging the lack of basis for the investigation.

In late afternoon Harold Weisberg arrived, and I went out to see him with Loisel, Ivon and Eckert at the Fountainbleau. We spent the afternoon bugging the next door room to Harold's, for the purpose of deciding once and for all whether people really are going through the baggage of our guests, as Harold Weisberg has claimed in the past, as also did Steve Jaffe.

In the evening met Layton Martens at the "Seven Seas". He seems like quite a nice guy, just majored in cello at USL and wants to leave state to join an orchestra in New York, but is not allowed to leave because of his perjury indictment. He does not know, he says, the basis for the indictment.

Saturday, November 11, 1967

Garrison supposedly leaving again for West Coast on Monday. Jaffe and Sanders off to Dallas filming for Steve's UCLA film project.

Saturday, November 18, 1967

Garrison left on Monday, to give an unspecified speech in Los Angeles--some group Maggie Field has rounded up. Not much happened this week: Garrison away, and Mark Lane didn't come in at all.

Saturday Evening Post advance copy (with article by Tink Thompson) arrived and caused a pleasant surprise in the office. "Boy, that's beautiful," said Lorraine Schuler, looking at the diagram showing crossfire possibility, "it makes Russo look a little bit better." Alcock commented: "Garrison will come out of this smelling like a rose. That guy has more luck than anyone I know. And I'll tell you something else about him: he's not afraid of anyone."

Gary Sanders had brought with him a copy of the complete Texas AG report on the assassination, consisting of about 20 bound volumes of reports etc. Much of it--in fact the majority--is published in the 26 volumes. However, I sent Sylvia Meagher some of the new material for her appraisal. She received it and called up mystified. Agreed to look through it, but this did not commit her in any way to support of Garrison, she stressed.

Epstein, I sense, is trying to push me for details of the case he badly needs, via an ms. he hopes I'm going to submit to his publishers. He writes

me friendly letters, and calls up quite frequently.

Monday, Dec 4, 1967

Last Thursday, a lawyer from Playboy was here, and I happened to be in Garrison's office when he asked Garrison some blunt questions about Gordon Novel and his involvement in the case. He pointed out to Garrison that he had read the Novel files, but was unable to make any headway in understanding how Novel became involved. I had found the same thing myself; the 2 Novel files are in a state of chaos, and there are no interviews with Novel in them, or really any material directly relating to Novel's connection with the office or with the probe or with the assassination. Merely contains previous offenses-- eg attempt to derail railroad train, throwing rocks at cars, etc (as a minor), and many telegrams to Marlene Mancuso which date back to the '50s. Therefore I awaited Garrison's reply with interest.

Garrison said he only saw Novel three times, the first being when he was approached by Novel with the offer to be some kind of de-bugging officer for the office. He was introduced to Garrison by Willard Robertson. Subsequently Garrison discovered, he said, that Novel had sold a photograph to NBC ( of a truck or something) and then had no further dealings with him. Novel also volunteered information about the Houma burglary, and his knowledge of Ferrie and Arcacha. Novel was due to appear before the grand jury, but fled to Ohio before he did so.

Garrison admitted to the lawyer--in response to questioning--that Novel had no connection, as far as he knew, with the assassination. That the office never was too concerned about him or interested in him, thus accounting for the paucity of information about him in the files.

The lawyer told Garrison that, in his view, there was enough discreditable material in Novel's background to make it unlikely that Novel could ever win his suit against Playboy and Garrison.

On Saturday, Garrison made statement to channel 12 TV about Warren, Johnson etc., affirming that they knowingly covered up an assassination plot.

Thursday, Dec 7, 1967

They want to start a trial file in the office, which collates the evidence to be used against Shaw at the trial. Evidently, it should be broken down into different areas: ~~ix~~ giving evidence that:

1. Shaw discussed or plotted assassination.
2. Shaw knew Oswald.
3. Shaw knew Ferrie.
4. Oswald knew Ferrie.
5. Shaw used name Clay or Clem Bertrand.
6. there was an overt act by either Shaw, Ferrie or Oswald.
7. shots were fired from 2 or more directions, in accord with Russo's testimony.

It cannot be stressed too strongly that proving Oswald innocent and proving Shaw guilty are antithetical aims. If Oswald is proven innocent, Shaw is virtually exonerated.

If Shaw is guilty of conspiracy, then Oswald must be either an actual assassin or have concurred in his own frame-up, by allowing his rifle to be taken into the TSBD etc. Moreover, the argument that Oswald should have (a) discussed assassinating the President with Shaw and Ferrie, and (b) be innocent, when he was in the building from which the shots were fired, when his gun was also in the building, and when the bullet fragments ballistically matched to that gun were found in the car of the dead President, lacks plausibility to say the least.

In fact, nobody seems to have remarked on the fact that Russo's testimony, if it is true, actually increases the likelihood that Oswald was an assassin,

since, in addition to the prior evidence against him, he is now involved in a prior discussion about the assassination.

The only way to make Shaw's guilt compatible with Oswald's innocence is to shift the overt act to Ferrie, since in that event Oswald could have been unknowingly framed, and the Shaw-Ferrie-Oswald conspiracy could still have come to fruition without Oswald knowing anything about it. However, none of Ferrie's actions seem as though they can be interpreted as an overt act, not even his trip to Texas (which did not start until after the assassination), and therefore the burden seems to fall back on Oswald.

Monday, January 15, 1968

Returned from Washington D.C. after approx 3 week visit—partly vacation partly business. The day before I left Edgar Eugene Bradley was charged with conspiracy by Garrison. The original lead on Bradley was a letter we were sent by one Thomas Thornhill, alleging that Bradley had been involved in the assassination, including a photograph of Bradley. The letter was dated in April, 1967, but nobody took any notice of it until Bill Turner found it in the files during his visit in September. Bradley was then investigated in L.A. by Turner, Boxley, and Garrison, during one of his visits to the West Coast. Garrison became persuaded that a photograph, taken in Dealey Plaza shortly after the assassination of two tramps being led away by Dallas policemen depicted Bradley. Nobody in the DA's office was prepared to fill out the Bill of Information charging Bradley, especially Alcock, but Garrison talked them into it over the phone. Garrison assured them that the case against Bradley was solid, and that we had jurisdiction in the case. Then, with extreme misgivings, charges were filed while Garrison was still away. He returned almost immediately, and was back in time to be present for the DA's office party.

One of the co-conspirators named with Bradley in the original Bill of Information was Jack Lawrence, a car salesman at Downtown Lincoln Mercury during the assassination. ~~His~~ His name was later withdrawn, however, and no co-conspirators were actually specified. I had planned to travel to Washington on Dec 21 anyway, and so when I left I suggested to Louis Ivon that while I was there I check through the National Archives for any mention of Edgar Eugene Bradley, and also try to get to see Jack Lawrence, who was last heard of in Charleston, West Virginia. Garrison apparently remained convinced that Lawrence was "involved", and Ivon agreed it would be a good idea to get more information on him in an effort to forestall Garrison from again acting rashly.

I went to the Archives while in Washington, and requested any information they may have on Bradley from their name index file, but Marion Johnson told me they had nothing. Knowing that they sometimes have reports on people which do not get listed in the name index, I then requested to see all Commission Documents originating in California, ie. FBI reports with office of origin San Francisco, Los Angeles, etc. I also checked through the El Paso files. However there was no mention of Bradley anywhere. (I did find some FBI reports on Richard Case Nagell, however, which strongly suggested that he had nothing whatsoever to do with the assassination.)

I also travelled to Charleston, West Virginia, with Lady Jean Campbell (daughter of Lord Beaverbrook and ex-husband of Norman Mailer), a correspondent for the London Evening Standard now living in New York. She had been introduced to me by Jones Harris. We visited Jack Lawrence in his house in Charleston, to cut a long story short. He persuaded both of us that he had absolutely nothing to do with the assassination.

*Insert Wednesday January 17, 1968 (next page)*

Thursday, January 25, 1968

Marina Oswald subpoenaed yesterday. Mort Sahl arrived today and gets D.A. credentials. He was recently on the Johnny Carson show and suggested to Carson that Garrison appear on his show. When Alcock heard this he said, "Is he serious?!"

When Sahl commented that he was now working as an investigator for Garrison, Alcock, who had been unaware of the fact, commented to me later, "We'll have jugglers and fire-breathers working for us soon."

Sahl looks rather weary and under the weather, haggard, lined face, from what I remember of him in Washington last May.

Saturday, January 27, 1968

Barbara Reid gave a party this evening, attended by Garrison, Mark Lane, Mort Sahl, Vince Salandria, Matt and Janine Herron, among others. Morris Brownlee and John George also there.

Sunday, January 28, 1968

This afternoon there was a rather extraordinary meeting at the NOAC. It was attended by just about everybody from the DA's office who is working on the investigation--Sciambra, Alcock, Burnes, myself, Ivon, Loisel and even Charlie Ward. We sat around a large table in a back room for some time, and then Garrison came in with Vince Salandria. Garrison said that Salandria had some remarks to address to us, and introduced Salandria as an expert on the assassination etc.

Salandria started off by telling us that we were in much better shape now than on the occasion of his earlier visit, in July. I had accompanied him around at that time, and I recall he was shown the Shaw file. He looked through it, and was rather rueful about it to me. He admitted to me that there wasn't much there. Now, however, it was a different story, or so he seemed to think. He could tell by the expressions on our faces. The case against Shaw was now looking much more solid, he told us, and we were beginning to work as a team.

He then started to urge us that the only trouble was we weren't going far enough, and he then started to work himself up into a harangue about Mibhael and Ruth Paine. "They're agents," he said, "I know they're agents. I've got the proof." He went on at some length about how he had met the Paines, and he produced some quasi-evidence suggesting they were agents etc. Then he told us to go ahead and charge the Paines—"You've got all the evidence you need." He exhorted us to charge some others too, Marina Oswald, and Allan Dulkes. Don't worry about anything, just go ahead and charge them, "the evidence is THERE!"

Garrison sat next to Salandria through all this, calmly smoking his pipe. Salandria was getting really worked up by this time, and was actually shouting at us. Someone asked him to tell us some of the evidence, and then he pulled out a few card indexes—seemingly a little annoyed at being distracted by such trivia—and then started off on his stuff about troop increases in Vietnam, the radio message to Airforce One, the same stuff he had shown me earlier on when he was working on the manuscript on WHY Kennedy was killed with his friend Tom Katen.

When he finished he was fairly attacked by several members of the staff, notably Jim Alcock and Charlie Ward. He was told that he just didn't have sufficient evidence to warrant any of his conclusions, that he didn't seem to realise that we, as a DA's office must be concerned with the law and other such niceties, etc. Garrison began to get upset at these attacks, and came to Salandria's defense. Salandria even tried to tell us that Oswald was innocent, and I pointed out to him that if you believe Russo, you have just about got to believe that Oswald is guilty. I pointed out that the evidence adduced by our investigation made it more, and not less likely, that Oswald was involved. I remember Garrison gave me a look as though to say—"What on earth is he talking about, he still doesn't understand", but I knew the whole office, apart from Garrison, was solidly behind me.

Garrison was beginning to smart by this time, and he ended the meeting

with an attempt to wrest back the initiative. He gave us a lecture about all having to pull together, that we couldn't afford to work against one another, etc. However, it was obvious that his major objective had not been accomplished. Evidently he had been trying to use Salandria to persuade us of a course of action which he wanted to take himself but knew that we would not endorse. Therefore he was hoping that we might accept it if it came from someone else, namely Salandria. But the ruse had not worked. It was evident that everyone there, with the possible exception of Sciambra—who does not stick his neck out at all when he sees it means going against what Garrison wants—thought that Salandria was something of a nut.

Wednesday, January 31, 1968

Garrison on Johnny Carson show tonight. Watched it at Matt & Janine's.

Thursday, Feb 1, 1968

Charlie Ward's comment on Garrison's appearance on TV: "He makes a good appearance of course, and he's photogenic, but what he said was a disaster."

Friday, Feb 2, 1968

Huge volume of mail beginning to descend on office in response to Garrison's appearance on the 'Tonight' show. Nearly all of it looks favorable.

Saturday, Feb 3, 1968

Thought For the Day: Why the fraternization between the judges and the DA's office? I don't see why a judge, once elected, (for a much longer term than the district attorney) should be in any way dependent upon the DA for his political survival. In any event, this fraternization is no doubt one of the worst aspects of the so-called system of justice here. I recall Judge Haggerty at the DA's office party: smiling, talking to everyone, shaking hands with anyone he didn't know and introducing himself. He reminded me more of a politician at election time than a judge at a party. I went with a French girl I had met recently, and when I told her he was the judge who was going to try the Shaw case I think she thought I was kidding her.

Monday, Feb 5, 1968

Ivon told me when I came in that Gary Sanders is to be put on the payroll @ \$400 a month. Lorraine Schuler on the vast amount of mail now arriving in the office: "All my education and training on this garbage. That isn't one tenth of it," dumping a great pile on my desk. There is no adverse mail re the Carson show. All favorable to Garrison.

Mort Sahl came in waving newspaper with Herman Deutsch favorable comment on the Carson show. No doubt about it, Sahl sees the investigation purely as a publicity struggle, and not at all in terms of the facts or truth—exactly contrary to what you would suppose. Mark Lane is the same. This would be OK if we were running, say, a TV station.

Alcock said he got a call from the California Attorney General regarding the extradition papers on Bradley. "Looks like you've got some pretty good papers," the AG said.

"Holy Mackerel!" said Alcock, "that guy ought to go back to law school. I think they're going to extradite him!"

Gungho Gary Sanders accused me of being "bad for morale" and "working against the office" when I said that I did not believe that Craig saw Oswald, and that it did not fit with other facts. I told him you cannot go into a courtroom with nothing but morale.

Tuesday, Feb 6, 1968

Motion filed by defense for Change of Venue today. Hearing for this March 5th. Alcock says trial won't be till April at least. "Good in some ways, not in others," he says.

Garrison not in office today. Called me regarding my memo on Oswald in Mexico. He still believes Oswald never went there, apparently. Strange letter from Gene Wilboon on Downtown Lincoln-Mercury stationery. He possibly puts Shaw in Dallas in Dec. 1963.

Replying to letters re 'Tonight' Show. Just about all favorable to Garrison. An interesting point re "limits of the investigation" raised by Garrison's statement on the program that only 5 are working on the case, (which has prompted many offers of assistance.) We are now limited not by manpower shortage but by physical (office size) and financial considerations.

Fourteen letters to high school/college students writing term papers and wanting information. I note they nearly all type their letters neatly, double spaced. Their overall grasp of the facts in the case tends to be poor, however. Thought: the most interesting thing about the investigation now is not the substance of it, but the public reaction to it.

Wed Feb 7, 1968

Today had row with Gary Sanders and Jody Duek. She has ensconced herself in my tiny office without so much as consulting me, and now practically gives me orders. The less said about her the better.

Garrison not in office Monday through Wednesday. ~~Garrison~~ Ivon says he is still smarting from the opposition he got from the rest of the DA's staff after the Salandria talk.

*Sanders' girl friend.*

Thursday, Feb 8, 1968

Today Marina Oswald Porter and Kerry Thornley were before the grand jury. I spoke to Marina briefly in Alcock's office before she went up to the GJ room. Her husband Kenneth Porter was with her. Marina seemed scared, timid, unwilling, unco-operative, answering in quiet monosyllables. She seems intelligent though. We did not discuss the case at all, just pleasantries. Alcock remarked to her that he had been to the same high school in Fort Worth as Oswald's brother Robert. Garrison came in and shook hands, reassured her and told her not to worry about anything. Garrison is basically not interested in Marina, but appears to be considering indicting Thornley.

In his office after the grand jury session was completed, Garrison remarked that it had been "a good day". Sciambra and others were laughing at some of the questions some members of the jury had asked. The first question the grand jury foreman asked Marina was: "Is this your first visit to New Orleans?" They also asked her some questions about what Oswald talked about at night. She said he hardly said anything. "Not even pillow talk?" she was asked.

Marina made one remark that pleased Garrison. She said the Secret Service had told her to beware of Ruth Paine "because she was a member of the CIA." However, Alcock told me later that by the way she answered—"that organisation you join..." it was evident she meant something other other than the CIA, namely the ACLU. As far as the substance of our case was concerned, Alcock said that she contributed nothing of value, and could only be a defense witness when it came to the trial. Oswald did not stay away at night, neither he nor she drove a car, she had never been to Clinton, not had ~~she~~ he, as far as she knew.

Alcock pointed out why Garrison had been reluctant to call Marina before the grand jury: because her testimony would undoubtedly be in opposition to any conspiracy theory involving Oswald. It would be hard for the Grand Jury to believe that there had been a conspiracy after talking to her,

and Garrison did not want to run the risk of exposing the GJ to this point of view. That was why he was pleased by her comment about Ruth Paine—it suggested that events may in fact have been as Garrison had portrayed them.

(1969: I never saw a transcript of Marina Oswald's testimony. Of course, Grand Jury testimony is technically secret, but the fact that Garrison largely conducted his investigation in the secrecy of the Grand Jury raises some questions about the validity of his criticisms of the Warren Commission. This would be analogous to the Warren Commission having heard testimony in closed session. It seems that Marina's testimony before the Warren Commission will go down to posterity—albeit under a great deal of criticism—but her testimony before the "Garrison Commission" will not even see the light of day. It will be analogous to one of the Commission's classified documents, which Garrison got so much mileage out of. As far as I know, nobody has ever raised this criticism of Garrison. When is he going to publish his 26 volumes?)

Friday, Feb 9, 1968

Garrison in the office today, in one of his talkative, performing moods. He kept calling me, and others, into his office on pretexts. He is also considering charging Kerry Thornley, who was also in the office today. Alcock said "He'd better not," (charge Thornley) as there was no evidence against him, with which I agree. But Garrison is hypnotized by the fact that Thornley (a) admits having met Clay Shaw. (b) showed the ms of his (first) book to Martin McCauliffe, professor at LSU who helped found Friends of Democratic Cuba—an anti-Castro outfit including Sergio Arcacha Smith, "who was involved with Oswald," according to Garrison. (c) Picked up unemployment checks at Julia St., near Camp St. (d) met Guy Banister. (e) Moved to Arlington, Va. soon after the assassination. (f) Lived at one point on Dauphine St, a couple of blocks from Clay Shaw, and one or two other points.

Thornley consistently denies having met Oswald in New Orleans in the summer of 1963. I spoke to Kerry Thornley briefly in my office late in the afternoon. He looked as though he had been in tears. He said, "Where have I met you before?" I did not recognize him from anywhere, but I knew that an English friend of mine, Warwick Reynolds, had been here in '62 and '63 and had at one point shared an apartment with Thornley on Barracks St. I had been here on and off during that period too (on vacation from school I was teaching at in Virginia,) and I told Thornley I might have met him with Warwick Reynolds. He immediately recalled Warwick, and thought it probable that that was how he recognized me. He said the publishers had printed 81,000 copies of his book, but had only sold 17,000 of them. Apparently they haven't even been trying to sell them lately, although we both agree this would be a good time. He gave us his only copy.

Garrison in rare form today. "Sooner or later, because people are lazy, you catch them out on propinquity," he said while thumbing through the city directory. What a classic remark! (Little or no attention has been given to Garrison's "Propinquity Factor" theories. However, on Feb 10 and April 7, 1967 he wrote "Part I" and "Part II" of a memorandum entitled "Time and Propinquity: Factors In Phase One" which, if the Garrison investigation is to have any historic value, will certainly be valuable documents. They are predicated on the supposition that if people live anywhere near one another, they are therefore to be suspected of being associated in some way. I need hardly say that nobody in the office takes "the propinquity factor" seriously except for Garrison himself.)

Another Garrison comment today: "I don't mind that the Government turned out to be involved, it makes the fight all the more fun!" He then started to talk about ~~the~~ "the need to move more audaciously," as he put it. Everyone in the office starts to wince when he talks like this. Garrison started to talk very amusingly about Communists. "They're like unicorns. Nobody has ever seen

one! J. Edgar Hoover might just as well start talking about unicorns. 'They're out there in the woods, more unicorns than even, we're being surrounded by them. Mr. President, we need 200 extra agents this year and a million dollar increase in our budget to control the increasing unicorn menace in this country.'" After a good performance like this--and on such occasions Garrison can be astonishingly good, brilliant one might say, he plays his part well. Does not harp on his joke, and pretends not to notice that everyone is rolling about laughing. On this occasion he just made some remark to the effect that America had gone insane worrying about Communism all the time, and then changed the subject.

He started talking about CIA "involvement", referring to his suspects as "players"--meaning Novel, Thornley, etd. Garrison said: "They get three one hundred dollar bills in the mail every week, with orders not to pay income tax. If there's ever a question raised, there's a phone call and that's the end of it."

When he picked up the phone at one point, part of the receiver fell off so he just threw it into the waste paper basket. He also came round and smashed up a chair in his office which was beginning to break. I told him about the Wall St. Journal story, ('DA on the Griddle') but it did not seem to bother him very much. He started to talk about how the CIA controls Life magazine "in sensitive areas."

Garrison observed that one day he would probably be on the cover of Time, with a group of other people under the caption "The Arrogance of Dissent". He suggested that the others would be Rap Brown, Martin Luther King, Stokeley Carmichael and Dr. Spock. He said "the arrogance of dissent" was a phrase which had been used by a Senator recently and quoted with approval in magazines.

Mort Sahl in office, and I have good rapport with him. He told me he had had run in with Jody Duek too--she telling him what to do etc. He's leaving Monday for TV show (his) in Los Angeles, with GM sponsorship. Mort is unbalanced on assassination, does not have it in proportion, and is weak, to say the least, on the facts (which do not really interest him.) I like him though, he's sensitive, observant and quick. He talked very well about the "cocktail party buffs" in Los Angeles congregating round Maggie Field, associating with show biz people etc.

Saturday, Feb 10, 1968

Went to the office in the afternoon, and Garrison was there with Dick Burnes and Louis Ivon. Garrison is planning to subpoena Allen Dulles and Gordon Novel simultaneously, with pictures in the paper of both of them smoking pipes. Question of relevance regarding Dulles raised. He left CIA long before the assassination. However it was determined that he was in CIA at the time of the Houma bunker burglary, (he left about a month after it.)

Garrison started talking about "getting our napalm on them," (those he is fighting and accusing.) He made motions with his hands and arms as though trying to cast something away from him. "They can't get it off them," he said, laughing.

Regarding President Johnson, Garrison said: "I'm probably only a cloud on the horizon for him at the moment, but if I keep on getting access to national microphones like this, I'm going to become a real thorn in his side."

I asked him what he had been about to say on the 'Tonight' Show about Robert Kennedy--the subject was changed before he got around to it. He said it would have been to the effect that John Kennedy had been our President, and what RFK has to say about it is irrelevant, especially as he says he has not read the Report. Garrison concedes that RFK is probably not as opposed to him as he has said in public statements. He agrees that RFK probably couldn't become overtly involved in the case, even if he wanted to.

Sunday, Feb 11, 1968

Went to the office in the afternoon. Garrison interviewed on film by Willem Oltmans for Dutch TV. Garrison made his usual speech about the CIA and FBI etc., and Oltmans accepted it uncritically. Oltmans has spent some time with George DeMohrenschildt and is trying to get Garrison and DeM. together. Garrison seems to be convinced that DeM. is involved in some way, and refers to him as the "project manager". However he refuses to meet him. Garrison received a friendly letter from DeM. offering to meet him either in Dallas or New Orleans, I believe. Both Billings and myself urged Garrison to see him, but he has consistently refused. I think G. is afraid that if he meets DeM. in the flesh, he will become persuaded that he is not involved, and thereby lose a suspect.

Garrison said that during the 'Tonight' Show, he turned to Carson during one of the commercial breaks and said: "I'll sing and dance for you if you like." Carson, not at all amused, didn't take it as a joke and said: "You're not going to do any singing on this show."

Ivon more communicative than usual today. He said that three weeks ago Governor McKeithen gave \$5,000 to Garrison for the investigation. He was sort of talked into it by Willard Robertson, Rault and Garrison. Ivon said that Willard Robertson has practically underwritten the investigation, and has personally donated \$25,000 or \$30,000 of his own money to "Truth or Consequences". However, Ivon does not think Robertson intends to give any more, or is unlikely to.

Ivon, like Alcock, is afraid Reagan is going to extradite Bradley. "I hope he doesn't," was Ivon's terse comment. Trouble is, Bradley's return would make the investigation open-ended, and it might be another year before Bradley's trial would come up.

Ivon talked about the power of the D.A., especially to subpoena people before the grand jury. "It's a lot of power he's got," Ivon said. "If all the D.A.'s in the country were like Garrison, things would be in chaos." Ivon is in a state of consternation, as he has been for some time, about Garrison's evidently self-destructive path. "I can't see why he would want to lay his whole career on the line like that," he said. Ivon expressed the fear that Garrison would ultimately become identified in people's minds with nuts like George Lincoln Rockwell. I told him Senator Joe McCarthy was a better analogy, except that Garrison is in a far more exposed position than McCarthy, because Garrison has a trial pending, at which he will be expected to produce his evidence, whereas McCarthy did not have that threat. Garrison these days confidently asserts that the trial is not going to take place, because the Government will block it or Shaw will be killed. But no-one in the office shares this view, which is little more than whistling in the dark. That's the difference between Alcock and Garrison; Garrison will say in a loud, confident voice, "The trial will never take place," and really sound as though he believes it. Alcock will say, "Man, I hope he's right, but frankly, I see no reason to suppose there won't be a trial."

Today Garrison has decided to renew interest in Emilio Santana, for no apparent reason. He walked around in the afternoon carrying an 8 x 11 picture of Santana, showing it to people. Ivon told Garrison: "I wish you wouldn't," (get interested in Santana again,) "We really questioned him thoroughly for three days and couldn't get anything out of him." (Ivon's polite way of telling Garrison that he doesn't believe the man is involved.) When Ivon says something like this to Garrison, Garrison will pretend to take no notice of, or ignore, what Ivon says. But it probably has its effect. In a day or two, in most cases, Garrison will have dropped the matter.

Garrison gave a copy of Santana's picture to Willem Oltmans, who is going to show it to this Dutch magician-type guy who solves crimes etc. by handling the photograph and telling you things about the person—where he is etc. Apparently he has on occasion been of value to the police. But it is just wasting time to

show him Santana's picture.

Ivon said that in the very early days of the investigation, the few who were then working on the case would stay up "in the old grand jury room" till 2 or 3 in the morning, going through files and photographs." They were especially trying to find the unidentified man in the WDSU picture, handing out leaflets with Oswald. They looked through thousands of mug shots, in hope he had an arrest record. No luck though.

Ivon said that Garrison does not react well to criticism in the press, citing the recent Wall St Journal attack. Ivon said that Garrison should expect these attacks, but he says they always seem to come as an unpleasant surprise to him.

Schweggman, "biggest money man in the state," according to Ivon, had an ad in the paper today, expressing support for Garrison.

#### Monday, Feb 12, 1968

Nothing much happened today. Garrison did not come in. (Garrison's attendance record at the office is rather peculiar. He is nearly always there on Saturday and Sunday, but during the week he will stay away if at all possible. He spends a great deal of time napping at the NOAC. I have also heard he takes Sauna baths there.) I attended part of a trial in section F in the afternoon. A narcotics case with the defendant Perry (or Terry?) Baker. Despite the fact that when the narcotics informer was asked to point to the defendant, he pointed to the law clerk sitting next to the assistant DA, Baker was found guilty by the preponderantly blue collar, red-neck, jury, and sentenced to 7 years, I believe. Horrifying. I can't help feeling that Baker made a bad tactical error when he had a bunch of attractive girls from Newcomb in the courtroom, rooting for him. Also his lawyer made a mistake when in his closing argument, he started talking about a "new morality." Hardly likely to appeal to that jury.

Answered more letters re Carson show. Many letters are from law students, all over the country, wanting to work here in the summer. I note they all assume the investigation will still be going on then. Letters from high school and college students writing term papers and wanting information. Evidently the 'Tonight' show was a huge success for Garrison, the biggest yet in the publicity struggle. Most people who write take the position: 'I seen through it. NBC is trying to discredit you again, Jim, but they didn't fool me.'

#### Tuesday, Feb 13, 1968

Bill Turner came into the office, and an interesting conference was held in Garrison's office, attended by: Charles Ward, Jim Alcock, Dick Burnes, Moo Sciambra, Numa Bertel, Lynn Loisel and myself. We were addressed by Bill Turner. Garrison was supposed to come, but called up 15 minutes beforehand to say he would not be there. Anyway, he wanted Turner to outline "CIA involvement" for us, having failed to make much impression on us with Salandria. However, once the meeting was started it was diverted from Garrison's intentions by Ward and Alcock to the much more interesting question of why Bradley was charged with conspiracy.

Since Bradley was charged no-one in the office has been able to get a very clear picture of what the evidence against Bradley is. The general feeling has been that it is very weak, but no one knows for sure. It would be impossible for Garrison to be anything but vague on the subject, and Turner, who principally worked on the case, had not been back to the office until today. Thus Charlie Ward and Jim Alcock were understandably interested in what Turner had to say, since they are in the position of having to assume a kind of legal responsibility for Garrison's actions.

Turner was obviously very much ill-at-ease at this sudden confrontation, and tried at the outset to revert to cozy speculation about the CIA. However Ward and Alcock were insistent. Basically the steps leading up to Bradley's

being charged were:

1. Discovery of letter in our files by Bill Turner in September, 1967. This letter had been sent to Mike Karmazin on April 10, 1967, by Thomas L. Thornhill. "My information concerns a man named Edgar Eugene Bradley," Thornhill wrote. "One of my witnesses will testify to the fact that Mr Bradley tried to hire him to assassinate Mr Kennedy during his 1961 campaign in Calif."

2. On Dec 18, 1967, Turner and Bill Boxley went to 6543 Fulton Ave., Van Nuys, Calif. to interview Thornhill. They found a Mrs Carol Aydelotte living there. ~~Mrs~~ She lived there with her husband and Thornhill, and was familiar with Thornhill's allegations about Bradley. Bill Turner wrote in a memorandum addressed to Mr Garrison (dated Feb 16, 1968) that "her acquaintance with Bradley covered the span of the assassination; and that he was constantly harping on the fact that someone should kill Kennedy. She believes that as a result of her knowledge of these remarks, Bradley has launched a campaign of intimidation and harassment against her, and the matter is currently pending in a civil suit in the local courts."

3. Carol Aydelotte gave Turner and Boxley the names of two people who would corroborate her story against Bradley. They were Dennis Mower of Lancaster, Calif., and the Rev. Wesley Brice, Pastor of the Hollywood Bible Presbyterian Church in North Hollywood. Turner and Boxley then interviewed Mower in Lancaster on Dec 19th. According to a memo which Boxley addressed to Mr. Garrison on the subject, "Mower confirmed that Bradley had attempted to recruit him to assassinate President Kennedy and he stated that he had reported the attempt to FBI agents Holbrook and Quinn."

4. Boxley then interviewed Rev Brice on Dec 20th, but the results of this interview were not known to Turner at the time he addressed the members of the DA's office. On the results of this interview depended whether or not there was any New Orleans jurisdiction in the matter, Turner said. (When the results of the Brice interview became known, it turned out that Brice had said nothing about New Orleans in connection with Bradley.)

As Turner explained it to us, the allegations against Bradley are as follows:

1. He attempted to get Mower to shoot at Senator Kennedy, (as he then was,) from a storm drain system in Los Angeles. Aydelotte said that at this time Bradley had the blue prints of the storm drain system of the Sears Department Store Complex and Shopping Center on Laurel Canyon Road in Van Nuys. Bradley tried to induce Mower to hide in part of this system and take a shot at Kennedy as he came by.

2. Dennis Mower corroborates this.

3. Mrs Aydelotte further alleges that later, when JFK was President, Bradley rented a hotel room in L.A. on the occasion of JFK's visit, with a good sniper's vantage point. Turner reports that Mrs Aydelotte's mother can corroborate this in some way, but apparently her mother was not interviewed.

4. Mrs Aydelotte says that Bradley is a close friend of a man named Lorenzo Pascillo, who from pictures has been identified as Loran Hall—at one time suspected of having visited Sylvia Odio with "Leon Oswald". Garrison is very interested in Hall, as is Dick Billings incidentally.

5. Aydelotte says that Bradley has sadistic tendencies. Turner noted that Bradley "beats his daughter, Jeamine Bradley, frequently and viciously."

6. A Fort Worth Star-Telegram photograph showing two men in front of the School Book Depository apparently under arrest following the assassination was shown to Mrs Aydelotte. According to Turner, "without hesitation, she pointed to the lead man and said: 'That's Gene Bradley.'"

7. Some unspecified information from Rev. Brice. Mrs Aydelotte did not know of any connections Bradley may have had with New Orleans, but according to her, "Dr. Brice may be able to help on this score." (It later turned out that Bradley had told Brice before the assassination that he had to "take a swing

through the South." Brice added that on the evening of the assassination he was at Mrs Bradley's home when Bradley called her, apparently from Dallas, but there does not seem to be any evidence for this either. (*that E.E.B. was in Dallas*)

The office staff listening quietly through these explanations by Turner. When he had finished, Charlie Ward showed him the Dallas Morning News pictures of the same two tramps being led away. The facial angle is different, and the lead man obviously is not Bradley (though clearly the same man as in the other picture.) I don't think Turner had seen this picture before, and he was undoubtedly very embarrassed by it. He hummed and hawed, but wouldn't positively say that it wasn't Bradley.

Dick Burnes then immediately pointed out that even if we had jurisdiction over Bradley, which we appeared not to, he said, there is not even any allegation of conspiracy at all in the statements of any of the witnesses Turner had mentioned. There was in fact, Burnes said, only a solicitation which was rejected. (Bradley solicited Mower.) Turner was obviously slightly put out by these virtual attacks, which must have seemed very different to him from the genial company of Garrison. I'm not surprised that Garrison didn't show up for the meeting. He probably knew something like this would happen.

In any event, it appears that—pending disclosures from Brice—we have, on the evidence as a result of which Bradley was charged:

1. No evidence that Bradley was in New Orleans.
2. Therefore no jurisdiction.
3. No evidence that Bradley was in Dallas, (disregarding photo.)
4. No evidence that Bradley conspired (legally) to assassinate JFK.
5. No evidence linking Bradley to the Dealey Plaza outcome.

Therefore there is not the slightest basis for Bradley having been charged. Everyone in the office was well aware of this after the meeting, and Bradley's arrest was universally regarded as a disaster for the office. Everything depends on Bradley not being extradited.

Since Bradley was charged I note that the following two statements have appeared in the Bradley file—which has now been re-located in Ivon's office, and is not easy to lay one's hands on:

1. A statement by Perry Russo(!), dated Dec 26, 1967, in which Russo states that he saw Bradley with David Ferrie sometime between March and October of 1963, in New Orleans.
2. A statement by Roger Craig, dated Dec 29, 1967, in which he says he either saw or apprehended Bradley in front of the Book Depository after the assassination. This information (from Craig) was included in the extradition papers re Bradley. (Note, later: Richard Sprague, one of Garrison's most ardent and uncritical admirers whose specialty has been collecting photographs of the assassination, later found a picture of Craig talking to a man in front of the TSBD who looked like Bradley, but definitely was not him, according to Sprague. Sprague, who believes that the tramp picture depicts Bradley, no doubt appreciates that Bradley cannot both be the tramp being led away, and the non-tramp conversing with Craig.)

Alcock pointed out that charging Bradley with the same crime as Shaw, and at the same time not being able to demonstrate any connection between the two conspiracies, looked really bad even if it was legally a possibility. He said he thought it would form the basis for some justifiable motions by the defense (Shaw's defense), demanding to know more details of the Bradley "conspiracy." No doubt he would be able to skirt around any such demands. What does worry him, however, is the thought that Bradley might be extradited. "Let's keep our fingers crossed," he said.

Then there is the confusion about Leslie Bradley. It turns out that there is also a Leslie Bradley, who was a pilot, and who is believed to have been in New Orleans on the day of the assassination. Also something about him having known Ferrie. But at least this is not a case of mistaken identity, as some journalists seem to think. We knew nothing of Leslie Bradley until E.E. Bradley

Bradley had been charged. All the Leslie Bradley material was dug up by journalists, and it is their hypothesis that this is a case of mistaken identity.

Wednesday, Feb 14, 1968

I asked Bill Turner when he came in if he had spoken to Garrison last night about what Rev. Brice reputedly said to Boxley on the subject of placing Bradley in New Orleans jurisdiction. Turner said he had not, and then made the following admission: that Garrison had told him the reason he was charging Bradley was a gambit in the publicity struggle<sup>more</sup> than anything else. Apparently, according to Turner, Garrison does not really believe that Bradley is guilty. Alcock unfortunately removed from the Bradley file the yellow legal sheet with Garrison's handwritten instructions re. Bradley charge, (sent by Garrison via the mails to Alcock, from L.A.) I saw it once. It began: "We've closed the circle on Bradley. He's involved, all the way... We have witnesses who place him in New Orleans too, so don't worry about jurisdiction..." (Unfortunately I did not get a copy of this.)

There is now considerable consternation in the office about Bradley, and fear lest Reagan extradite him.

Garrison not in the office today.

Jody Duek in again, trying to get the Shaw file from me. She sure has got nerve, I'll say that for her. I'm not about to give her the Shaw file, however. (Not that it's kept in my office now. It's kept in a special filing cabinet (lockable) in Louis Ivon's office. I can see it whenever I want to though.)

Martin McAuliffe came in and told us how he met Thornley at the Bourbon House--innocently, it was obvious. McAuliffe had helped found Friends of Democratic Cuba. Loisel and I interviewed him. Obviously quite an intelligent man, now teaching English I believe, or maybe was at the time he met Thornley. He described how Thornley told him he had literary ambitions, and so McAuliffe asked him to show him something. Thornley showed him his "novel" - inf fact it was not quite a novel, I think - and McAuliffe said it was pretty bad. Not much other contact with Thornley, nor did McAuliffe see Oswald in the Bourbon House or anywhere else. McAuliffe clearly worried that if says the wrong thing, he's liable to get charged himself!

Thursday, Feb 15, 1968

Thomas Edward Beckham before the grand jury today, all day. Garrison is full of high hopes, talking about "a break in the case," etc., and hopefully points to a blurry picture in front of the TSBD.

David Lewis came in and gave us some further information regarding the United Cuban Missionary Force Beckham attempted to found, and Beckham's self-styled (to Lewis) membership in the CIA. I wrote up memo on Lewis' remarks. After Beckham emerged from the grand jury, Alcock was mocking the idea that anyone could believe (as Garrison does) that "a bum like that" would be working for the CIA.

Turner related that Garrison intends to delay the Dulles subpoena until the Thornley perjury charge is issued. Turner apparently pointed out to Garrison that there was little basis for such a charge.

We discussed the leak of Garrison's medical records, the Bolden case, and the anonymous letter from the Los Angeles FBI office to Ramsey Clark, (the latter was subsequently printed in the LA Free Press.) I told Turner that Bud Fensterwald had told me in Washington over Xmas that the medical records affair was an FBI leak. Turner was interested and said he would like to "pin it down real tight" and do a story on it. The leak came out in the Chicago Tribune 3 days after the Turner-Garrison press conference in which Garrison mentioned the William Walter story. (To the effect that a telegram was sent to the FBI a few days before the assassination, or an inter-office TWX, containing a warning about

the assassination. This story about William Walter originated from a guy who came up to Mark Lane either before or after his talk at the Tulane campus. Lane got the guy's name—Walter—and his story, that he had been working as a clerk ~~for~~ in the local FBI bureau when this TWX came through, but that is all. In other words, no one ever saw a copy of the TWX. In any event, Garrison used it as an opportunity to attack the FBI—one of the rare occasions when he has attacked them, incidentally. If ~~Fensterwald~~ Fensterwald is right, the FBI immediately retaliated with the medical records. Seems plausible. Turner, who worked for the FBI, says the Chicago Tribune is frequently used by the Bureau as a "leak" organ.

Turner mentioned what is in some ways Garrison's least explicable fault: his refusal to accept help when it is offered. In some instances these offers come from a direction which Garrison has specifically indicated interest in, and therefore ought to be interested in getting help from that quarter. Turner gave the example of Robert De Pugh, the Minuteman leader. De Pugh has indicated to Turner in an interview that he accepts Garrison's thesis that renegade Minutemen are "involved" in the assassination. He would like to see Garrison, and even has names to give him. Garrison is well aware of this offer of help, but, to date at least, refuses to see De Pugh.

I told Turner of another obvious example—that of George DeMohrenschildt. Although he was Oswald's closest and virtually only friend in Dallas, and from his background might quite reasonably be suspected of having been a CIA agent, and has written to Garrison expressing a desire to talk to him, Garrison (till now) won't even answer his letter.

Another person Garrison could probably have gotten help from, if he had approached the matter tactfully, was Henry Wade, the Dallas D.A. (who, like Garrison, is a former FBI agent.) However, instead, Garrison took the first opportunity to attack Wade, and the Dallas police Dept.

A consistent pattern in this investigation has been the failure to talk to people thought to be involved before issuing a warrant for them. This is true of Shaw (only briefly interviewed by Sciambra on Dec 23, 1966) Gordon Novel, Edgar Eugene Bradley, Sergio Arcacha, Loran Hall and Lawrence Howard, (the latter two were subpoenaed as material witnesses.) My interview with Jack Lawrence was one of the few instances where we knew what the person under suspicion had to say about what he was doing, etc. Garrison fears, of course, that if you talk to these people you alert them and they somehow vanish off the map, destroy the evidence etc. I think Garrison also believes that it is a waste of time to talk to suspects, because if they are involved, they obviously aren't going to admit it, which is still not a very good argument for not talking to them.

Friday, February 16, 1968

Bill Boxley arrived back, apparently now convinced of the involvement of Jack Lawrence. Why? Because of Boxley's conversations recently with two ~~ex~~ Downtown-Lincoln Mercury ex-employees named Rozelle and Falzone. Rozelle points out that that Lawrence was hired by one Lorenz, a German (CIA etc., according to Boxley,) who is also "involved". I pointed out to Boxley that the only way we can get anything solid on Lawrence is to find the actual person who retrieved the car in Dealey Plaza. Boxley thinks it was Lorenz.

Alcock still appears outraged by the Bradley business and said he would refuse to try the case if Bradley is extradited. I get the feeling that Alcock will be leaving the office fairly soon. Dulles and Novel were subpoenaed today, and story in papers. Dulles reportedly laughed when told on phone by a reporter that Garrison had subpoenaed him.

The FBI replied to Sciambra's letter of Jan 22 regarding Reeves Morgan and the Clinton episode. Sciambra was trying to get confirmation from the FBI that Reeves Morgan had contacted the FBI in '63. The FBI reply was guarded, and gave no indication whether or not they had had prior warning of the Clinton episode.

*known about*

Saturday, February 17, 1968

Briefly went into office in afternoon and talked to Ivon, who has been away all week. Garrison just leaving when I arrived, with Sciambra, Mark Lane and Gary Sanders. No developments.

Monday, February 19, 1968

Garrison in the office bright and early today. Jim Alcock says he has papers drawn up for a perjury charge against Thornley.

I detected a distinctly cool wind today from Ivon and Steve Bordelon. What's up? Very odd reaction from Garrison regarding the statement Sanders got from Augustinovich. He is some guy Sanders has dug up from the Miami area and he apparently is prepared to testify that Oswald was somehow connected with the CIA. When Sanders' memo to Garrison on this was returned by Garrison, it had "irrelevant area" written across the front page in Garrison's hand. Although I am not exactly Sanders' best friend, I sympathise with his chagrin at this strange response. Here he is, the poor guy, doing his best to please the boss, comes up with something one would surely have predicted would have pleased Garrison, and he gets slapped down for it. My feeling is--and Alcock shares it--that even if this is unreliable information (and I have not had a chance to talk to Augustinovich) at least it is an attempt to link Oswald with the CIA, which is more than we've had before. Now that there is some evidence for Garrison's pronouncements, he promptly rejects it. I can't figure it out, except that I sense something strange: Garrison doesn't like Sanders, for some reason. I'm not sure, but I sense that Sanders comes on too strong for Garrison. Sanders turns him off in some way, and it doesn't matter what Sanders comes up with--a picture of the assassin behind the picket fence--I'm not sure G. wouldn't disregard it just to snub him.

Another oddity: Alcock is very nonchalant about the Thornley charge, whereas before he was threatening to resign if Thornley should be charged. Seems like, for some reason, he's decided to reconcile himself to it.

Barbara Reid in the office today, and Boxley spent most of the day in Garrison's office with her. Louis Ivon told Sanders to tel Jody Duek not to come in any more. Garrison came into my office in the afternoon, and politely asked if I would mind leaving for a short while, while he talked to Willard Robertson alone there. Trying to squeeze more money out of him, apparently.

Boxley being put onto the 544 Camp St--Information Council of the Americas (INCA) angle. Not a bad idea, but I doubt if we'll see much action.

Tuesday, Feb 20, 1968

Another quiet day. Worked on correspondence. Reflected that the mail is the most interesting thing coming into the office these days. I imagine it would fascinate a social scientist, and a detailed analysis of it would be book length.

Papers being drawn up on Kerry Thornley, which both Alcock and Burnes refuse to sign. There is no doubt in my mind that Thornley is completely innocent of perjury and everything else.

Ivon and Bordelon working on materila for Gordon Novel suit, and I transcribed Novel's original 'Mr. Weiss' note. Not much today.

Boxley id being put on regular assistant D.A. payroll, which will therefore allow "special investigation funds" to run further. I.e., plan is to get Boxley's salary paid by City funds. I'm paid, as usual, out of the Fines and Fees fund. (As I have been all along, with the exception of a couple of pay checks when I was in Washington, which were drawn on the J.G. Safi account--Truth or Consequences. I also got one pay check apparently drawn on Garrison's personal checking account.) Garrison says he's going to have Boxley working here from now on. "I'm not going to do Henry Wade's work for him any more," Garrison said.

Going through Oswald's note book, Garrison said: "You see, he had Chandler's

name in there, but he spelled it Crawford." This sounds like a typical piece of Garrison wishful thinking, but in this instance it might be true. Chandler admits that he did meet Oswald in N.O. when he was working for the States-Item, and Oswald very likely would have written down his name in his book, and was quite capable of writing David Crawford instead of David Chandler.

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Thornley charged with perjury today. Garrison issued a footnoted press release, with addendum, like a miniature term paper or something. He showed it to me with evident pride.

The basis for the perjury charge is straightforward. Barbara Reid says that she saw Thornley with Oswald in the Bourbon House in the summer of 1963. Thornley says he was not with Oswald at that time, and did not see him in the Bourbon House. I gather that Garrison has one other witness--Pete Diagno (sp?) but I have not seen a copy of his statement. However I note that Diagno is a friend of Moo Sciambra. I used to hang out quite often in the Bourbon House myself in the summer of 1963. I was there for parts of June, July, August and September. I recall that I used to see Diagno in there almost every day, and Barbara Reid would be there quite often too, generally with a camera slung around her neck. Sciambra would often be there as well, generally hanging around with the Diagno crowd--a rather unattractive bunch whose main topic of conversation seemed to be "broads" and betting. I would go there quite often with my English friend Warwick Reynolds. Warwick knew Thornley quite well, although I did not know that at the time, and I never saw Thornley until he was in the office the other day, as far as I can recollect. I certainly cannot recall seeing Oswald there. The Bourbon House clientele was large and varied--most of the people who actually lived in the French Quarter within a several block radius would go there at one time or another. Part of its charm was that, although it was in the center of the tourist section, tourists would almost never go in. They would poke their heads round the door, take one look and leave. I would say that if one had never known Oswald before, it would be impossible to remember him going there unless he went there regularly. And I am sure he did not. If he had been a regular customer, many of the B House regulars would remember him. As it is, my feeling is that Oswald probably never went there, and there are scarcely any other reports that he was ever in the French Quarter, which did not seem to attract him particularly.

Actually, it is inconceivable that Thornley saw Oswald at the Bourbon House, unless you are prepared to believe that he saw him, spoke to him, and did not recognise him. Because if he had seen him and recognised him, he would undoubtedly have recounted the episode before the Warren Commission, and put it in his book about Oswald. As Epstein points out, Thornley wrote a book about Oswald, which as it was, was extremely short of material about the alleged assassin.

I note that Lifton has been doing quite a bit of research on the Thornley matter.

Thursday, Feb 22, 1968

Office closed for George Washington's birthday. I went in to the office in the afternoon. As usual when the office is closed, Garrison was there. I talked to him for close to an hour in his office. Unusually, he outlined the future possibilities for the investigation. For the first time, he seems to be seeing an end to it, and he talked about the thing being over by the summer time, and talked about everyone taking vacations, etc., which he said there had not been time for up till now. Before that, however, he seems to want to charge Ed Butler (INCA--now with Patrick "Up With People" Frawley of Schick) and Carlos Bringuier. Garrison says that the conspirators--generally referred to as "they"--performed two functions with Oswald in New Orleans:

1) "Custodial", and 2) "Image-creating". By custodial he refers to "baby-sitting", generally looking after, and making sure that he behaves properly. By image creating he means preparing the ground-work for later representing Oswald as a Communist. According to Garrison, this latter role was performed largely by Thornley, Butler and Bringuier. The custodial work was done by Shaw and Ferrie, and I think Garrison regards this part of the mystery as cleared up and dealt with. The common link to all of these people is—Garrison says—the CIA.

Alcock had a confrontation with Garrison today—alone in his office. I asked Alcock what had happened when he came out. He said that he had told Garrison that he didn't believe anything Garrison was saying about the CIA etc., and that none of it could be proved in court. Alcock added, for good measure, that no-one else in the office (except Boxley) believed it either. Then Alcock said: "You know, Jim, we get disturbed when we see you listening to Boxley, giving you all that bull..."

"I've learned one thing about Boxley," Garrison replied. "He's right."

Alcock told me this as though he was exasperated by Garrison, but also as though he was amused by him. "That guy," says Alcock, shaking his head and grinning slightly, "he's something, isn't he?" Alcock went on again about "all these bums" like Beckham and Jack Martin supposedly working for the CIA.

Friday, Feb 23, 1968

Garrison did not come in. Ivon told me that Lawrence Howard was coming in to the office tomorrow with Steve Burton from the West Coast. Mark Lane in office today. He's not been in for some time.

Sunday, Feb 25, 1968

Howard in office with Steve Burton. Steve had persuaded him to come to New Orleans voluntarily, without an attorney, etc., and talk to Garrison. Howard is an immensely powerful looking man, with a great barrel chest, but is surprisingly mild in voice and manner. He also seemed quite intelligent. During the course of the afternoon (tape recorded by Louis Ivon) he persuaded Garrison that he had nothing to do with the assassination. He answered questions tactfully, and gave in to Garrison's expectation whenever it was feasible and didn't actually incriminate anyone. E.g. he would agree that the CIA undoubtedly had connections in the Miami area during the summer of 1963, but did not give us any names. He handled Garrison cleverly, I thought, and I'm sure he could have told us more, although I was also persuaded that he knew nothing whatever about the assassination. But Howard was smart enough to flatter Garrison.

Steve Burton seems an intelligent young man, definitely above the average "Assassination Inquiry Committee" type. Even Louis Ivon, who generally despises these people (too often, he has to end up giving them DA's investigator credentials,) approves of Burton.

Monday, February 26, 1968

When I arrived in the office in the morning, Steve Burton was already there, going through some of the files in my office. Evidently Ivon had let him in. Of course, most of the sensitive files (Shaw, Bradley, ~~Thornley~~ Thornley) are not there, but in Louis Ivon's office. Burton had, however, made a bee line for the next most interesting file—Ferrie (actually two files on Ferrie.) He had looked through ~~it~~ them already and was looking at something else. I started to talk to him about something and then he said: "I think it's a good idea not keeping the Shaw file here where people could see it. I notice you have got all the important material withdrawn from the Ferrie file as well." I said nothing, just vaguely nodded. Of course, he had seen the Ferrie file in

its entirety.

Tuesday, Feb 27, 1968

Office closed for Mardi Gras. I later learned from Louis Ivon that Garrison came in, as usual when no one else is there.

Wednesday, February 28, 1968

Nothing much. Answered letters. Garrison not in.

Thursday, Feb 29, 1968

Ditto.

Friday, ~~February 29~~ March 1, 1968

Lane came in and asked for material on Mays which I had previously shown to Garrison. Garrison had been unimpressed at the time, but was later persuaded otherwise by Lane, and Boxley was then sent to Miami to meet Mays. He carried a copy of Rush To Judgment in his hand to act as an identification signal. Mays originally contacted Tink Thompson, who sent Mays' letter to me. Mays also had contacted Ed Horsey in Michigan (a low grade assassination buff) and Horsey passed the information on to Lane. Mays claims to have been approached to take part in the assassination, and now wants \$25,000 to tell all.

Sunday, March 3, 1968

Did not go in to office, and Garrison is briefly out of town, but I received an alarm call from Sylvia Meagher who had heard (I think) from Tink Thompson that Garrison "no longer trusted me." I then called Thompson, and learned that this information came from Horsey, via Mark Lane.

Monday, March 4, 1968

Garrison still away. Did memo on "4900 Block, Magazine Street", at Garrison's request. Garrison believes that the 4900 block of Magazine Street is a "safe block", ie owned by the CIA, and used as a sort of parking place for agents awaiting assignments.

Tuesday, March 5, 1968

Change of Venue hearing opened. I spoke to Hoke May in the corridor of the Criminal Court Building and I expressed some interest in the 544 Camp St. affair. He told me about Bill Nitschke, an ex-FBI agent who used to hang around with Guy Banister. He said that Nitschke had been shown the WDSU picture of the unidentified man passing out the leaflets with Oswald and had identified him as having been up in Banister's office at one time. I had not heard this before, but it is of interest as it connects two of the unresolved problems about Oswald in New Orleans--the unidentified man and 544 Camp St.

Hoke May said that he and Ross Yockey had written a book about the Garrison investigation, but that he had just recently received a rejection slip from his agent in New York, saying that it would be impossible to get it published because there was basically no interest in the case among publishers. He and Yockey are now handing their material over to Mark Lane, May informs me. Very generous of them. I also briefly spoke to David Chandler, covering the hearing for Life.

In the evening Matt Herron came in and spoke to Sciambra in my office re the Phelan story. "Going over the chronology for them again, Moo?" Alcock remarked as he walked by, grinning all over his face. Sciambra now has an interesting addition to his story, which I had not heard before. That Russo, when he initially talked to Sciambra in Baton Rouge, (Feb 25, 1967) referred to the

"meeting" as a political meeting and not as a party. It was only in the sodium pentothal sessions with Chetta the the word "party" was used. Thus, Sciambra did not refer to a party in his memo. The trouble is, as Sciambra still does not seem to understand, this still does not explain why he did not refer to a political meeting in his memo. The point of the discussion with Herron was to go over--with Russo at a later date--the substance of Phelan's discussion with Russo in Baton Rouge after the Preliminary Hearing. Herron was present at this discussion.

Sciambra also said, and Herron corroborated, that when Phelan spoke to Russo in BR after the Prelim Hearing, Phelan told Russo that he had only mentioned seeing Shaw twice, and was quoted thus in Sciambra's memo. To this Russo replied, "I should have said three times." Sciambra doesn't seem to realise how damaging this reply is, if it really is what Russo said. Because if so, it means that Russo is admitting that he didn't mention the conspiracy meeting to Sciambra in Baton Rouge. If he had in fact mentioned it, and Sciambra had omitted it, Russo's logical answer to Phelan would have been, "He should have said three times."

It really seems to me that Russo did not mention the conspiracy meeting to Sciambra at Baton Rouge--all the evidence points to that conclusion. Sciambra says that the reason he did not include it in his memo was that he was so anxious to tell Garrison about it that he told him verbally at a restaurant the night he came back from Baton Rouge. I must say that is pretty hard to believe. If Phelan is right--as it looks as though he is--Sciambra would have done much better to have admitted as much. As it is, he is in a real jam, which will no doubt be evaded in legal proceedings. Of course, if Russo did not mention the conspiracy meeting the first time, then Shaw is innocent. Because Russo was the only witness they had when Shaw was arrested. All the other evidence that has been accumulated comes either after the arrest (Bundy) or after the widely publicised Preliminary Hearing (everything else.) None of this later evidence can have any validity if there was no basis for the initial arrest.

Which brings me to today's hearing. One point strongly emerged: the blatant way in which the judge continually sided with the state. If the trial itself goes this way, things do not auger too well for Shaw. I wish I knew why criminal judges apparently find it necessary to reside in the pocket of the D.A. Garrison was on the stand for hours, but little was accomplished as Haggerty sustained nearly all of the states objections. Specifically, he was not permitted to respond to the question: did the Shaw conspiracy come to fruition in Dallas? The defenses point is that Garrison, by talking publicly so much about a conspiracy, has prejudiced potential jurors' minds on an issue which remains to be proved--that there was in fact a conspiracy. The state objects to most questions on the ground that the question is only relevant if it can be shown that a potential juror has been prejudiced, and Garrison is not a potential juror.

Wednesday, March 6, 1968

Second day of hearing, which I did not attend. Defense has subpoenaed 1300 potential jurors. Mark Lane was on the stand today, and he came back and glowingly told Garrison of his replies to Dymond.

Garrison in a good mood today, full of ideas about 4900 block, Magazine. I am now starting to make duplicate files for Garrison--at his request. He believes that one day we will come into the office and find that the files have been ransacked by the CIA or whoever. Ivon concedes that this is a ridiculous idea, and reluctantly told me to go ahead and start making duplicate files. He's afraid that Garrison will show them to everyone. Ivon tipped me off to start off with unimportant files, in the hope that by the time we get

to the important ones, Garrison will have forgotten about it.

Garrison said he had raised some money from an 'industrialist' in Miami, enough to last four or five months, and says that he will give me a raise and hire someone else in Florida to work on the case.

I'm working on the Guy Banister angle of 544 Camp St., and told Garrison about it. I found that there was a memo in the files of an interview with Bill Nitschke, and he discusses various people in the WDSU picture, but according to a numbered system, and the picture with the numbers on the figures is not there. I told Garrison of the possible importance of Bill Nitschke and he said maybe he would talk to him again. Garrison seemed to have forgotten about him.

Thursday, March 7, 1968

A letter arrived from a lady in Ohio who had bought a \$750 "teletrap" from Gordon Novel—a device which is supposed to prevent phones being bugged. She complains to us that it does not work. (How does she know?) Ivon told me that the D.A. in Columbus, Ohio—Howard Johnson—is now helping us. Why? Because Gordon Novel's attorney there, Weiner, is running against him in the next D.A. election.

Bill Turner in town again, and in the evening I had dinner with him and 5 very odd friends he met through Warren Hinckle of Ramparts. Also present were Jim Garrison, and Harold Weisberg. At the end of the evening (a private room in the Rib Room of the Royal Orleans Hotel) Mark Lane also showed up. The five friends were a young English couple (not married) Mark Pepplo and Caroline X (didn't get all the last names,) a young American couple, Bill Y and Ellen Z, and another young bearded American. All were dressed more or less as beatniks. However they appeared to have unlimited money. One, Bill Y gave Garrison \$2000 cash, in \$100 bills. However that was by no means the whole story. They were talking in terms of much larger sums in an apparently serious attempt to get Garrison to run for President! They are also interested in doing a movie about Garrison, although they do not seem to have a very clear idea of what they want to do with it or how to do it. In addition, they want Jim Garrison to write a book for something called Chelsea House publishers, which I believe one of them—maybe the English girl—worked for. Garrison has been expressing interest in the idea of writing a book about the case, which I gather will be on the order of the Salandria-Katon piece: Why Kennedy was killed.

Weisberg dominated the conversation to an unpleasant extent at dinner. He hardly stopped talking or attempting to inflate his ego in some way. Spazrow, for instance—the Warden of All Souls who recently came out with a pro-Warren piece, is "afraid to debate" Weisberg. How many times have we heard this drivel from Weisberg! He annoys me more and more, he is so stupid and besides he is a compulsive collaborator with newsmen—a weakness which resulted in his suspension as a Senate investigator, as I believe Joe Pyne alleged.

The three young Americans we had dinner with (and who footed the \$100 bill) have reached the outer limits of paranoia—far worse than anything I have encountered before. They routinely book airline tickets to Europe every week—are on constant stand-by, so to speak—so that they can leave suddenly before ~~the~~ "the tanks are on the streets". Ellen, a very glum and depressing girl, told me with perfect seriousness that she hardly ever reads the papers any more, but when she does she assumes the exact opposite of what she reads to be true. Garrison is sympathetic to this kind of orientation, and he made a great impression on them, listening to them politely and agreeing with them, then adding something of his own about the CIA, etc in weighty, definitive tones. They obviously assumed that everything he said was gospel truth. Most of the time ~~he kept~~ Weisberg kept butting in, however, going on about Bringuier, Pena, etc.

What really characterizes these paranoid people, of course, is their total ignorance of the facts. None knew anything whatever about the case, admitted as much, and assumed that everything Garrison said was literally true. Paranoia, it seems is the perfect excuse for intellectual laziness: what's the point of reading about it anyway because all we are ever told is lies.

It was curious that such scruffy and young looking people should have so much money, and at one point I asked one of them, Bill Y, I believe, a question along those lines. He gave some rather vague answer about striking very lucky on the stock market.

Friday, March 8, 1968

In the morning a large body of the DA's office staff watched Mark Lane's "Rush To Judgment" at the Paris Theater on Elysian Fields. Not much to say about it except that it was a surprisingly dull film, and amateurish. We then returned to the DA's office where some of us saw rushes of Mark Lane's currently-being-made film about the Garrison investigation. We saw one part, which consisted of Garrison talking, at home, the usual stuff. Another segment consisted of Dago Garner being interviewed by Lane. Garner calmly sat there and told a story about seeing Clay Shaw with Oswald somewhere—obviously a blatant lie. In fact it was so ~~brazen~~ brazen that I involuntarily laughed out loud. This was in Garrison's office, with Garrison, Lane etc., there. I don't imagine Lane was too pleased, but honestly, <sup>using</sup> Dago Garner is going too far. Alcock has said that if it ever comes to trial he will refuse to put Garner on the stand, or if Garrison insists, he will refuse to question him.

The paranoid group was also in the office, to the consternation of everyone else—beatniks with leather jackets walking about the DA's office as though they owned the place.

Turner told me a rumor that Epstein's piece will not be published in the New Yorker because it was "too bitter". I don't believe this for one minute. Steve Jaffe called with some non-believable news about RFK running for President on a pro-Garrison ticket!! He also had some believable news: that Billings and Life are about to do an unfavorable story on the investigation.

Had supper in the evening with Bill Turner at Felix's. He's on some kind of expense account paid for by the paranoid group. They had flown him to New York, and then come down with him to New Orleans, paying all his expenses. So Turner paid the bill. He admitted that they had turned out to be something of an embarrassment to him. He thought they really were serious about trying to get Garrison to run for President. He agreed that there seemed to be some kind of a puzzle about where they got their money from, and said he did not believe the stock market story. It amused me that Turner said that they had apparently become convinced, in the course of last night's dinner, that Weisberg worked for the CIA. They had confided this in Turner today, apparently. To them, it was simply "obvious" that Weisberg was a CIA agent. Turner laughed at this, and conceded that that was going too far. Turner said he thought that Lane's second film would be better than the first, "because it contains the central character of Garrison."

Saturday, March 9, 1968

Went to office in the afternoon. Bill Boxley—whoreturned from Miami yesterday, and Bill Turner were there. Garrison gave Turner \$300 cash to give to one Jim Rose in California to come back to New Orleans and be hired as an investigator. Turner highly recommends Rose, a youngish guy with flying experience and paramilitary connections who is a fairly aggressive investigator, according to Turner. He told us some story about Rose simply burgling some guy's house when he wanted to get some information (one of the California right

wingers Garrison is interested in--may have been Stanley Drennan or someone like that.) Anyway this guy came back when Rose was right in the act of going through his house. Rose had some kind of a gun which squirts a disabling gas or fluid, fired it at the guy and escaped.

Boxley, at Garrison's request, had put a WANTED picture of the "Frenchman" in the 'Bingo' picture (the two tramps in Dealey Plaza) with an offer of a thousand dollar reward if he is found. The picture was put in the Miami News, together with a sizeable front page story. This is pretty silly of Garrison. If the guy sees his own picture all he has to do is come in and collect the money. Moreover, he would kill two of Garrison's birds with one stone, because at the same time he would be able to reveal the identity of 'Bingo', and prove that it was not Bradley. If someone from the Dallas police Dept. sees the picture, he might also be able to get the reward. Because 'Bingo' and 'Frenchman' were presumably both booked on November 22, 1963, and it ought to be possible to find out their names if you are in the Department.

I had mistakenly thought that they had put the 'Manuel Garcia Gonzalez' picture in the paper, which would have been a much better idea. I suggested this to Garrison and he thought it might be worth doing.

Boxley and Turner left, and then there was an embarrassing moment when I made some remark about "those people" being pretty crazy, referring to the paranoid group. Garrison, thinking I was referring to Boxley and Turner, disagreed. I then clarified who I was referring to, and he admitted that they had been a bit too much for him.

Garrison's outlook regarding the investigation has definitely taken a change in the last two or three weeks. He is now sick of "new leads", and doesn't want leads checked out which are not already a part of the existing structure. I think he realises the thing could go on proliferating for ever, and he apparently sees an end to it after, say, another 4 or 5 months. He seems to think that we have "made our point". It looks like Garrison is, at last, getting bored with the whole business. As for Clay Shaw, he is supremely confident that it will never come to trial. I drove him back to the N.O.A.C., where he said he would make some calls.

Sunday, March 10, 1968

Did not go in to office.

Monday, March 11, 1968

Garrison not in office. Not much happened that I recall. Chandler judgment reached in Federal Court.

Tuesday, March 12, 1968

Garrison in briefly with Gary Schoener from Minneapolis, and Mark Lane. Schoener has been collaborating with Salandria and Katen. Talked to him briefly in my office. In afternoon I read the transcript of a v. interesting interview Garrison had with Jack Martin, on Dec 14, 1966. It lays down much of the subsequent case, as he links Oswald with Ferrie, and also, obscurely, Sergio Arcacha Smith, whom Garrison evidently had not heard of until Martin mentioned him. The interview was tape recorded.

In the evening, 7-9 pm., there was a cocktail party at the Monteleone Hotel for the DA's convention being held in New Orleans this year. Arlen Specter and Garrison were both there, but they did not speak to each other, despite efforts by a New York Times reporter to get them together. Garrison stood near the center of the room, surrounded by the likes of Bordelon, and Lynn Loisel, receiving people rather grandly. I spoke to a guy from Oskaloosa, Iowa, quite young. I asked him who the DA was and he said he was. I asked him how many worked in the office and he said "I'm the only one." No sign of anyone from the Dallas office, incidentally. Specter left without even looking in Garrison's direction.

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

I located a copy of the Corliss Lamont pamphlet which Oswald had on his person when arrested here in August, 1963. It was in the N.O.P.D. Intelligence Division files. Frederick O'Sullivan brought it up from the Police Department. (He was questioned by the Warren Commission about his knowledge of Oswald, and was one of two witnesses Liebelier asked about Ferrie.) O'Sullivan showed it to Garrison—who said we would be able to use it at the trial. It has the "FPCC, 544 Camp St., N.O. La." stamp on the 39th page. I sent a xerox copy to Paul Hoch at Berkeley. He has been doing a lot of detailed research on this one point, and has tried to track down all existing copies of this pamphlet. Hoch makes an interesting point about it: the FBI got a copy from Oswald in August, 1963, and thus knew about his presumed connections with 544 Camp St three months before the assassination. There appears to have been no investigation of 544 Camp St by the FBI, despite their claim (to the Secret Service) that they had "checked this angle out thoroughly".

Weisberg still hanging around the office, driving everyone crazy. Garrison not in. Boxley has gone back to Texas.

Thursday, March 14, 1968

Today Dick Billings, associate editor of Life magazine arrived in New Orleans, having received a letter from Jim Garrison assuring him of immunity from subpoena or any other legal entanglement. In the morning Garrison came into my office and told me that Billings was arriving that afternoon, and was planning to stay for three months. I asked him what I was supposed to do if Billings came into my office. Was I to co-operate with him, as we had in the past, and show him the files? Garrison said emphatically not, and that he was now convinced that Life was now working with the Federal Govt, and that he himself wasn't even going to talk to Billings. He said he would prefer it if I didn't see Billings socially outside the office, although he added that he wasn't exactly ordering me not to.

It should be noted that a week ago we received word from the West Coast that Life was preparing an article about the case which would be published at the time of the Shaw trial, and which would cast the investigation in a derogatory light. Also, on March 11, Federal District judge James Comiskey rules that Life stringer David Chandler did not have to testify before the Orleans Parish grand jury as to his alleged knowledge of organized crime in Orleans Parish. Also today, Jim Garrison addressed the National District Attorneys Convention, and he attacked the judge's decision on the grounds that there was collusion between the Federal District court, Life magazine and the Federal Government. He added that they were engaged in a conspiracy to suppress the Zapruder film, among other things.

By way of retaliation, Garrison decided to subpoena the Zapruder film today. The subpoena was drawn up by Dick Burnes, and he requested my assistance in including some details about the actual film itself. I considered it important to clarify whether we were subpoenaing the original film, or a copy. I advised Burnes that it would be better to subpoena a first generation copy, as I was quite sure that the magazine wasn't going to take the original out of their safe for anyone, and that we would therefore have a better chance of success if we subpoenaed a copy. The matter was referred to Garrison. I went into his office, (Harold Weisberg and Moo Sciambra were in there at the time,) and again recommended that we subpoena a copy. However, Garrison was adamant that we subpoena the original. I got the impression that he hadn't thought about which copy to subpoena until I raised the question. I also got the impression that he was less concerned about getting a copy of the film to show at the trial than he was about making trouble for Life. In any event, the subpoena was drawn up in the afternoon. I discussed the matter with Jim Alcock, and he agreed that it would be better to request a copy.

I pointed out that, from the point of view of the trial, it would presumably be effective to show the film, and that we were therefore presumably concerned about the outcome of the subpoena—unlike the Dulles subpoena, for example. Alcock said it would be even better simply to ask for the film, without subpoenaing it at all, especially as Billings was coming in that very afternoon.

At 3:00 pm. Billings arrived in the office, and sat outside in the lobby, waiting to be invited in. Eventually he spoke to Jim Alcock in Alcock's office. Billings at that time advised that Life was outraged by Garrison's recent statements about them in front of a large proportion of the D.A.'s in the country, and that Life's lawyers were instituting contempt proceedings against Garrison as a result. Alcock told him of the new office policy with regard to Billings, and that they had been told not to provide him with any more information.

### Friday, March 15, 1968

Billings had still failed to reach Garrison, and he therefore came into the office again. (Garrison not in office, of course.) He spoke to Alcock and Louis Ivon on this occasion, and they told him of the subpoena of the Zapruder film, which was in fact issued today. I saw Billings briefly soon after he had met with Alcock and Ivon. He seemed depressed by his failure to make any headway; he told me he was leaving Life on April 1, 1968, with plans to be a freelance writer. We agreed to meet that evening to discuss the whole matter further.

I met Billings at 7 pm. and we discussed the whole subject of the assassination and the Garrison investigation for several hours. Clearly, his position is that he wants to write a book about the subject, and he has already approached about six publishers in New York, without receiving any encouragement. He feels that his problem is that he is unable to reach any conclusion on the subject. I am not too clear exactly what he means by this, but my guess is that because he has been out of touch with the office since about September means that he does not feel that he can make any positive statements about the validity of Garrison's case. (Later, 1969: Billings' position is clearer to me now. His problem at that time was that he was trying to justify—both to himself and to his employers,—the position he had taken with regard to the Garrison investigation; ie. he had failed to advise his editors of the weakness of the Garrison case, an oversight which was, I believe, the cause of his losing his job with the magazine. Billings held off and held off blowing the whistle on Garrison for reasons which are probably complex. Although this is speculation, my guess would be that Billings did this (a) because he thought there were genuine doubts about the assassination problem, and that Garrison might eventually hit on the solution. (b) Billings evidently had a great deal of information about Cuban exile-type plots in Miami—I mean solid evidence that such plots existed, and was hoping to see Garrison tie in these plots to the Dealey Plaza outcome. He had half the story and he was hoping Garrison would provide the other—vital—half. Boxley's remark—Life lost interest in us when we lost interest in the Cuban exiles—makes sense in this context. (c) and this is probably by no means least—Billings undoubtedly liked and admired Garrison in many ways, and probably thought that it would constitute betrayal if he informed his editors of some of the realities of the Garrison investigation. And by the end of the evening, he had convinced me that he was very well aware of the realities, probably more so than any other journalist who has worked on the case.)

In general, I feel that Billings and I share a similar position about the Warren Report. He does not believe that there was a conspiracy on the part of the government, the Warren Commission or the FBI to conceal the truth, but that a probability exists that they simply did not uncover the

the whole truth. When it came to the investigation of sensitive areas, such as Oswald's possible alliance with anti-Castro Cubans, he feels that the FBI tended to side-step the problem by not investigating it very thoroughly, for fear that it might upset their sole-assassin preconceptions. In corroboration of this, one need only point to the absence of any trace of an FBI investigation of the 544 Camp St problem. Billings argues that some of the classified FBI reports, if declassified, probably would reveal some interesting information, and he cited CD 1085, the FBI report on Cuban exile groups. Billings does not feel that the FBI knowingly would have filed any reports which indicated conspiracy without making it known, merely that these reports might inadvertantly contain such information. I agree with this position.

As for the Garrison investigation, Billings was more guarded, but I sense that he believes that, 1. Shaw is completely innocent. 2. Garrison sincerely believes everything that he says. 3. Garrison is not motivated by political ambition, but that his motives are much more complex, or, maybe, much more simple. 4. Garrison, regrettably, has too much of a butterfly approach, and instead of concentrating on a few important areas, such as Oswald's Cuban connections, hops around from storm drain theories to the Minutemen, without ever really exhausting one line of inquiry. I agree with all these assessments, including the first, in the light of what Billings told me later on in the evening.

We discussed Life's position at some length. I said that I thought it was absurd to say that the magazine was a tool of the government in view of their Nov. 1966, article (A Matter of Reasonable Doubt) and it was also unfair to accuse them of suppressing the Zapruder film. They have made it available for viewing in the National Archives (without restriction, as is the case with some of the other film in the Archives, eg. the Nix film,) they have published articles based on its contents criticising the Commission and calling for a new investigation, and, above all, they are a magazine and not a TV station or a Movie company. The only decision which they made about the film which cannot easily be interpreted as simple commercial vested interest was their refusal to let CBS show it on their "Special" on the Warren Report. Such a showing would almost certainly have enhanced rather than diminished the value of the film. I asked Billings about this and he said it was one of those rather mysterious calculations made by the businessmen in the upper echelons, which, he agreed, did not seem to make good sense.

He then said that Life has in fact been dickering with the project of making a film, utilising Zapruder and other footage which they possess, such as DCA, Dorman, Hughes, etc. However the problem has been to find a producer for it. As Billings said you cannot just splice the footage together and then show it. You have to analyse it and come to conclusions, etc., and this is precisely what no-one in the magazine wants to do, not because anyone there knows there was a conspiracy and is trying to hide it, but because it would represent a controversial entanglement which they would rather avoid. As he said, if you showed the Zapruder film to 100,000 people, 95,000 would immediately conclude that Kennedy was shot from the front. If they made such a film it would be sold to a TV station.

Billings emphasised that he had no Federal government connections. He worked closely with Garrison during the early stages of the investigation, and was sincerely hoping for some solid proof of conspiracy, which the magazine would have published if it had existed. As he said, this would have been a considerable embarrassment to the FBI and the government, and he observed that the present rift between Garrison and Life must be a source of pleasure to the FBI. Billings said that he had suspicions about the New York Times' aborted investigation, and in particular their peculiar attitude

towards Garrison. He feels that many of the news media had adopted a negative attitude towards Garrison before they had had a chance to come to a valid conclusion about his evidence. I recall that this was my impression, too. I told Billings what I knew about the New York Times story. In November, 1966, before I was working for Garrison, and, I believe, almost before the Garrison investigation began, I was in Dallas with Penn Jones. To be precise, this was on November 22, 1966, at the assassination site. At that time I met Martin Waldron of the NY Times, and he had a four or five page questionnaire of problems about the assassination he was looking into, as a part of the NY Times investigation. Most of these questions were about New Orleans, and specifically about David Ferrie. I did not see the list, but he showed it to Penn Jones. Thus, it should be emphasised, the NY Times was investigating Ferrie independently of Garrison, and possibly actually earlier than Garrison.

The next time I saw Waldron was on the day Jack Ruby died, Jan 3, 1967. Once again I was with Penn Jones, and at that time I asked him if he had made any headway with his list of questions. He told me that he had taken it to N.O. police chief Giarrusso, who had given him hardly any information. This was confirmed by Billings, who had seen a list, and I believe he said had obtained a copy of it. It had Giarrusso's answers written against the questions. Most were either "don't know", or "see Garrison" or "Garrison investigating". The odd thing is, Waldron never did go and see Garrison, not once. Garrison himself told me that he had never met Waldron, and Billings, who was obviously at that time alert to the possibility of rival papers getting onto the Garrison investigation, says that as far as he knows, Waldron never tried to see Garrison.

In addition, there is no doubt that Waldron knew a full 6 weeks before the story broke in the States-Item that Garrison was conducting an investigation of the assassination. But the NY Times never broke the story. When I met Waldron on the day Ruby died, I asked him about a remark he had made earlier to Penn Jones about a policeman who had died in New Orleans. (Penn Jones' hobby is collecting "assassination deaths".) I asked him on this occasion who this policeman was. He said, "Oh, Lieutenant Dwyer, some name like that. You ask your D.A., I'm sure he knows about it." (Dwyer is mentioned in Frederick O'Sullivan's testimony.) The fact that I was working for Garrison was a big secret at the time, or was supposed to be. I had said nothing about it to Waldron, nor, I am sure, had Penn Jones. In any event, it is curious that Waldron showed no interest in seeing Garrison, and the NY Times showed no interest in breaking the story.

(1969: At the time of the Shaw trial I asked Waldron about this. He said that, in the first place, he did try to get to see Garrison but was unable to get past his secretary, or words to that effect. Secondly, he admits that the NY Times had the story and could have broken it, but it just didn't seem that big a deal. As to how he got onto the story in the first place—and Ferrie in particular--Waldron was vague.)

Billings feels there is a possibility that Waldron has "Federal connections" of some kind, sources who supply him with information, but at the same time place him under certain constraints. I have noticed that Waldron never sets foot inside the DA's office, even though I invited him in once or twice.

Billings says he first saw Garrison on December 14, 1966, (a date which keeps cropping up.) He was alerted to the fact that Garrison was up to something by David Chandler, who in turn had been alerted by me. I had called Chandler, at the suggestion of Matt Herron, who is a friend of Chandler, and knew that Chandler knew more than most people about Garrison. (In fact he had just written a story about him for New Orleans magazine.) I wanted to know a bit more about Garrison before committing myself to working for him. (Ironically, I was worried specifically by the possibility that Garrison might be scared

off the subject if he stumbled into CIA involvement!) Chandler was alerted by my call, made a few inquiries and called Billings. I asked Billings when the investigation really began, and he ~~was~~ replied that that was, to him, one of the big mysteries of the case. He thinks it might be earlier than is realised. Garrison once told me that one of the things that got him going was the Esquire issue with articles by Sylvia Meagher and Ed Epstein. I note that no investigative report in Garrison's files is dated earlier than December, 1966, and so I conclude that the investigation did not seriously get under way until early December, although there may have been some unrecorded investigation before that. Billings feels that Garrison was in possession of important and convincing information implicating Ferrie early on in the investigation—information which he has never made available to anyone. Billings feels this because Garrison was so positive, so sure, so convincing, about Ferrie. I do not ~~feel this~~ believe this is true for a minute. Garrison has a way of being very sure and very convincing about things on precious little evidence.

We discussed some aspects of the New Orleans investigation in more detail. I said that it was important to place oneself in the position of being about to start a hypothetical investigation of the assassination in the New Orleans area, as Garrison did. What are the important things to investigate? They are, I think: 1. Who is "Clay Bertrand"? 2. Who is the unidentified man passing out leaflets with Oswald in front of the International Trade Mart? 3. How did "544 Camp St." appear on some of Oswald's literature? 4. In general, did the FBI conduct an honest and thorough investigation into Oswald's activities in New Orleans, or did they leave big gaps?

All of these points have been looked into by Garrison. The net result of his investigation has been that: 1. Clay Bertrand has been identified by Garrison as Clay Shaw, and by Dean Andrews as Gene Davis. Gene Davis seems like a better candidate as Andrews is the only person in the world who ever knew who Bertrand was, and Gene Davis admits he called Andrews at the Hotel Dieu, (although I did not tell Billings this at this time.) 2. The unidentified man with the leaflets remains unidentified, although at one point Garrison claimed that his name was 'Manuel Garcia Gonzalez'—on no evidence whatsoever, apparently. 3. No explanation has been provided as to how the Camp St address was on Oswald's literature, if we discount merely assuming that people like Guy Banister are "involved". 4. It has been concluded that the FBI's investigation was, on the whole, very thorough indeed. (Exception: Guy Banister and 544 Camp St. really do seem to have been overlooked, which, as I have remarked before, is curious when you consider that the FBI knew about this 3 months before the assassination, and of course Banister was an ex FBI man.

This does not add up to a very productive investigation, although in many ways this was not Garrison's fault. A serious and quite considerable investigation was conducted into these areas, (although I'm afraid the less said about the "Bertrand" investigation the better.) Also, Alcock, Ivon and Sciambra have all attested at different times to the efficiency of the FBI's investigation. It is hard to think of anyone of any relevance who was not interviewed by them within a week or two of the assassination. (IN fact, most were interviewed within a few days.) This has been, I am sure, a source of great disappointment to the DA's office, although Garrison himself has never admitted as much. When all the books and articles came out criticizing the Commission, I think many people in the office thought they were exploring virgin territory when they looked into Oswald's background, because these books had tended to over-emphasise the short-comings of the FBI. They gave no indication of how extensive their investigation had been. Far from finding virgin territory, they found that the FBI had been there ahead of them every

time--three years ahead of them. I don't think anyone was expecting this. I know I wasn't; it was clear that many of the people working on the investigation, such as Louis Ivon, acquired a certain sneaking respect for the FBI, as I did too.

Billings still considers the Sylvia Odio lead one of the most important in the case, and recently checked out the rumor that she is now living in Chicago with her husband. He concluded that she is not. He has spoken to Annie Odio, who promised to forward a letter from Billings to Odio, but she will not give him her address. In fact, no one has succeeded in interviewing Odio yet, or showing her pictures of possible suspects. Billings wants to talk to Odio's father, who may still be in jail, to find out if he still has the letter she wrote him before the assassination (?) referring to the alleged visit of "Leon Oswald". Billings feels that Castro may well co-operate in this project, and might even be able to furnish him with some valuable information. I gather he is toying with the idea of approaching Castro about this.

Billings and I then began to discuss the case of Clay Shaw. He told me he thought it was a bum rap, after I had broken the ice on the subject by telling him that, to me, the most serious criticism of the case that I had seen was the Phelan article. I told him that it was difficult to see any way around the problems created by that article. I said that Sciambra's latest position was to say that he omitted the conspiracy meeting from the memorandum because he told Garrison about it verbally when he returned from Baton Rouge. Garrison was having dinner in a restaurant, and Sciambra told him there. Billings then startled me by telling me that he was present at that meeting between Garrison and Sciambra. I think Billings said it was at Broussards. Billings related that Sciambra joined them later in the evening. He came in excited and told them that he had just interviewed Perry Russo in Baton Rouge. He was excited because Russo had said he had seen Shaw and Ferrie together on ~~two occasions~~ one occasion--in a car at Ferrie's gas station, and he claimed he had seen Shaw on one other occasion--at the Nashville Street wharf on the occasion of President Kennedy's visit.

Thus Billings' description of what Sciambra told Garrison on the night of Feb 25, 1967, is consistent with the controversial memorandum which Phelan attacked. No mention was made of a third meeting at which the assassination was allegedly discussed, no mention was made of Lee Harvey Oswald, nor of Clay Bertrand.

When Billings had finished telling me this, I started to say, "Well, that means that Sciambra..." when he interrupted me: "Sciambra's a liar," he said. He added that he considered that Sciambra was the most dangerous person in the office, because he was, among other things, stupid. I am forced to agree. It now looks as though there is no alternative to the clear cut conclusion that Clay Shaw is completely innocent. It is now clear that the sodium pentothal and hypnotism sessions which intervened between the meeting in Baton Rouge and Russo's testimony at the Preliminary Hearing were used not to "objectify" Russo's testimony, as Garrison claims, but to elicit it.

It is of course still conceivable to argue that the hypnotism, etc. was necessary to get Russo to recall what did in fact happen, and that he was unable to recall events through the unaided use of his memory, but this is clearly grasping at straws. The simpler hypothesis (Occam's Razor) is that his testimony was suggested to him. The transcripts of the hypnotism sessions very much bear this out, incidentally. Billings remarked that he was appalled at the extent to which Russo was "prepared" as a witness before testifying. As he said, it ought not to have been necessary, if only because Russo's original story--seeing Ferrie and Shaw together once--was by itself interesting enough. But he was finally so prepared by hypnosis, etc., that he

reached a point where he was no doubt unable to distinguish between what he had originally recalled and what had been suggested to him. (I am prepared to believe that by now Russo is genuinely unable to make this distinction.)

Billings pointed out a further conflict. When Russo first said he saw Shaw and Ferrie together at the gas station he said it was before the assassination. When Billings later interviewed Russo he had changed this to after the assassination, which was more in harmony with the facts, because Ferrie did not get the gas station (from Carlos Marcello) until '64 or '65. Billings also said that he was having dinner with Garrison, Sciambra and Russo on the night of Feb 26th, I think, and at one point the name Bertrand came up. The name meant nothing to Russo because he said, "Bertrand, who is that?" or words to that effect.

Shaw was arrested on Wednesday, March 1, 1967. Billings has a clear record of the events which led up to this arrest, and he briefly outlined them to me. (Billings evidently has a very good memory, because he was able to rattle off exact times and dates without looking anything up.) Basically, the sodium pentothal session and the hypnotism sessions intervened between the Sciambra interview and the arrest. Billings said that after Garrison heard of Russo's amplified testimony by these means, he demanded the immediate arrest of Shaw, right on the street as he came out of his house. (Shaw's house was being staked out at the time.) Garrison's assistants demurred at this, however, especially in view of the presence of a Life reporter. They insisted that Shaw be brought in to the office. Garrison acquiesced, Shaw came to the office and requested an attorney when they started talking about taking a lie detector test or sodium pentothal, or undergoing hypnotism. The lawyer arrived and he requested a delay of one day before taking the lie detector test. At this point Garrison ordered the arrest of Shaw. I had been told earlier by someone in the office that Shaw's somewhat precipitate arrest was motivated by this consideration: that if he had been allowed to return to his apartment he would undoubtedly have destroyed whatever incriminating evidence there may have been there. (Snag is, Shaw had already been brought in to the DA's office for questioning on Dec 23, 1966, and asked if he had ever used the name Clay Bertrand. Presumably he would have destroyed the evidence at that time, if there had been any.)

Thus, Billings leaves me with no alternative but to conclude that there was no basis for Shaw's arrest. I note the following three points: 1. At the time of Shaw's arrest there was only one witness against him—Perry Russo. 2. Russo's testimony is not credible when considered in the light of Phelan's and Billings' criticisms. 3. Dean Andrews, the only person who ever claimed to know who Bertrand was, says Shaw is not Bertrand, and there is no reason to assume that Andrews is "protecting" Shaw other than by making an ad hoc assumption to that effect. (~~Which~~ I notice that people who want to believe that Shaw is guilty do make this assumption.)

It seems to me important to realize that Garrison is mainly guilty of bad judgment rather than bad faith. He seems to believe sincerely that Shaw is guilty, Thornely a conspirator, the CIA planned and carried out the assassination, and that the Federal government covered it up. I once told Alcock that this was my impression of Garrison—that in mitigation one had to concede that he believed what he said. "Positively," said Alcock. "If I didn't think that I would have quit long ago."

(Later, 1969: Much of what Billings told me he repeated to Ed Epstein shortly before his article came out in the New Yorker. ~~That~~ He had shown the galleys to Billings, as he had heard that Billings was familiar with the case, and he wanted Billings to check the facts. Billings went further, and wrote a great deal of additional information in the margins, including much

of what he told me. Shortly after he got this information from Billings, Epstein called me up. He wanted to know if I knew about it, and if I considered it important. I said yes I did to both questions. Epstein was quite excited to be able to include this material at the last minute. Somehow, before the New Yorker piece came out, Sciambra had gotten word of Billings' corroboration of Phelan. (In fact, Billings wrote 5 articles for the Chicago Daily News which included some of this in a very compressed form.) I was curious to see what Sciambra's reaction was going to be. It turned out to be straightforward; Billings is a liar. Billings was not having supper with Garrison when I returned from Baton Rouge.

Thus Billings calls Sciambra a liar, and Sciambra calls Billings a liar. I don't think I need bother to say which of the two I believe.

#### Saturday, March 16, 1968

Went in to office very briefly in the afternoon and saw Dick Burnes. I heard at that time that the DA's banquet that evening had been cancelled by Garrison.

#### Monday, March 18, 1968

Dick Burnes left the office today, for position in a law firm in Alexandria or somewhere like that. As far as I know there was no undisclosed reason for his departure, although I noticed that relations between him and Garrison were never really cordial. This may just have been because Garrison knew he was leaving, however.

Andy Sciambra left for Washington to check on the VIP Room matter. He is going to interview three or four people there whose names appeared in the book. They nearly got me to do it when I was in Washington at Christmas, but I think they figured it was too likely I would come back with a "negative." Apparently Sciambra is the man they put on the job when there is any chance that a potential witness may be wavering.

Change of venue hearing proceeded. Garrison not in office.

#### Tuesday, March 19, 1968

On Monday the change of venue hearing was resumed, and 80 potential jurors have been called in the last two days. Dick Burnes has now left the office, and today his place in the court room was taken by Numa Bertel. Alcock had to prepare for tomorrow's Federal Court contempt proceeding against Garrison. Alcock says that Garrison is uninterested in the whole affair, but, as he said, unless he did something about preparing a defense, Garrison is liable to end up in jail. (Which is probably what Garrison half wants. He would then be a martyr.)

After the proceedings were over today, Bertel and Alcock and Ivon were talking about the potential jurors. Bertel made the point that you can tell in a minute what kind of a juror you have got, and what his attitude is likely to be in the case. This was my impression after a short visit to the courtroom this afternoon. Then Bertel made the remark: "Once you get into the upper economic and intellectual level, you know you've got problems." This had been my impression too, looking at it from the point of view of the prosecution.

It is a depressing reflection on the system of justice here that it is to the DA's advantage to get as stupid a jury as possible. Depressing, but no doubt true. The DA's office would be likely to adhere to this adage in all cases (and I have no doubt this applies to all DA's offices) but it is particularly true in the Shaw case. As I came out of the court room today I reflected that the best hope for Shaw is for him to get a smart jury. But he

probably won't, because not too many of the people on the jury panels seem to be bright, and the state will undoubtedly object when the bright ones come up.

The advantage ought to lie with the defense, because a man is presumed innocent until proven guilty, and thus the burden is on the state to prove its case. However, a dumb jury will tend not to notice when the state in fact has not proved its case, and therefore will be liable to find an innocent man guilty. Theoretically, the reverse problem ought also to crop up with a stupid jury--that of failing to detect that a guilty man is in fact guilty. But this would seem to be a fairly unlikely occurrence because there really is such a tremendous presumption of guilt when a man is brought to trial. (As F. Lee Bailey pointed out on TV the other day. If a man is brought to trial, he said, possibly as much as 90% of the people thereby believe that he is guilty.)

In this case an unintelligent jury will be particularly to Shaw's disadvantage. The case is unusually complex, and if the all-important evidentiary issues are clouded by such emotional events as the showing of the Zapruder film, I would estimate that Shaw is indeed likely to be convicted. Also, the overall subject of the assassination, and in particular the fact that Oswald was shot before coming to trial, makes it more likely that Shaw will be convicted. Judging from the reaction to the books on the Warren Report, etc., the American public feels that it has been deprived of something in not having an Oswald trial, and there may be a desire to make up for this loss--with a vengeance--at the Shaw trial.

Some of the Warren Commission critics, and particularly Mark Lane, have from the start adopted the notion that the proper place to arrive at the truth about the assassination is in the court-room. Now that I am beginning to learn something about court-rooms, I cannot agree with this at all. I am quite sure that the Warren Commission established far more of the truth than a court of law trying Oswald would have done, (that is assuming, of course, that Oswald's own testimony did not materially add to what he had already told in the Dallas police station.) All you can get into the court-room is material relevant to the guilt or innocence of the accused--Garrison certainly is not going to be able to use the court to air a whole body of information about the assassination that the Warren Commission did not utilize--unless it is relevant to Shaw's guilt.

It is worth noting that all of Garrison's anti-Warren Commission ammunition is taken from the 26 volumes of the Warren Report. I cannot think of any witnesses he has dug up himself who know anything about the assassination.

There is something ironical about the Zapruder film, and the uses it may be and might have been put to. Apparently it will be used at the Shaw trial to prove that Shaw was guilty. It might also very well have been used at the Oswald trial to prove that Oswald was innocent--and Oswald and Shaw are alleged to be co-conspirators. The Shaw trial: Zapruder film--shots from the front, therefore conspiracy, therefore (!) Shaw part of it. Oswald trial: Zapruder film: shots from the front, Oswald not in front, therefore Oswald innocent. For Oswald to have been acquitted by this line of argument, however, one must presume that Oswald was not a part of a conspiracy, I don't know whether this would appeal to the Warren Commission critics or not. They all want a conspiracy, but they are uncertain--or seem to be--as to whether they want Oswald to be a part of it. In fact, surely this much is certain: if there was a conspiracy, Oswald was very much a part of it.

It occurred to me today, in the aftermath of the change of venue hearing and after reflecting on the dangers of the jury system, that in one way the publicity which Shaw's lawyers have complained about may be ultimately what will save him. The press will be there in force at the trial, and ready to yell "foul" at the first opportunity. (Except the Times Picayune, no doubt.) Their presence will thereby create a certain amount of pressure in the direction

of justice. Judge, jury, and in fact everyone will tend to be on their best behaviour. I think Haggerty will just about have to be more objective at the trial than he has been recently. If Shaw is unfairly convicted (ie., convicted) then he will no doubt be glad to have the press around at that point, because at that stage accurate reporting etc. would tend to protect his interests. The press have given Garrison a great deal of free publicity, but ultimately Shaw will be much better off with the press than without one at all. I'm sure that Garrison has already been considerably inhibited by the press—he realises there is a limit to what he can get away with.

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Not much. Went to try and get brake tag, but without success.

Thursday, March 21, 1968

Garrison in not very good mood apparently, although he was not in office. A note was delivered from Garrison to Jim Alcock requesting:

- (a) Subpoena of Ruth Paine.
- (b) that Bill Gurvich be charged with theft of \$19 for taking some DA's files when he left the office last June.
- (c) Subpoena of David Chandler to testify before the grand jury as to his knowledge of the assassination, (not organised crime.)

The report from Lynn Loisel was that Garrison was annoyed about the "communication problem" in the office, and was beginning to hope that he would be removed from office. By "communication problem" he means that he is encountering some difficulty in getting members of his staff to do exactly what he wants and to agree with what he says.

Nobody in the office seems to think that charging Gurvich with theft is a good idea, and that it will just come across publicly as a piece of vindictiveness. ~~Alcock~~ Alcock says he will not ~~sign~~ sign the charge sheet. I once asked Louis Ivon how much material Gurvich had gotten from the office. He said not as much as he would have if Garrison had had his way. Ivon said that there was a regular distribution of office memos, and that Gurvich was on that distribution. Ivon was in charge of getting the xeroxing done and handing out the documents to the people concerned. However, he says, he soon realised that Gurvich probably wouldn't stay with the office for long--apparently Gurvich used to openly voice doubts about the case in front of the staff--and Ivon then decided to give Gurvich only relatively unimportant material. Ivon also is not in favor of charging Gurvich, although he is more guarded about it than Alcock.

Friday, March 22, 1968

Alcock says Garrison has been dissuaded from the move to subpoena Chandler before the grand jury. We received a reply from Palmisano to our second letter to J. Edgar Hoover. The point of our letters was to find out if the FBI were aware of the Clinton situation. One of the people Sciambra has interviewed claims that he saw Oswald in the summer of 1963 there, and that he subsequently told the FBI about this. Understandably, the office is interested to know if this is true, and if so, whether the FBI wrote a report on the substance of what the witness said. If there is an FBI report on the subject, and it is not consistent with what the man has told us, and if the defense introduce this report into evidence at the trial, the credibility of the witness would be destroyed. On the other hand, if there is no FBI report, and further, the FBI deny that this man ever talked to them, his credibility is again undermined. Thus, not to alert the FBI--and therefore possibly the defense--to this weakness, the letter was worded in such a way as not to make it clear that this person was going to testify at the trial. In any event,

Palmisano's reply was sufficiently guarded that it was impossible to determine whether or not Reeves Morgan—the guy in Clinton—had contacted the FBI. Neither did the letter indicate whether the FBI was aware of what was going on in Clinton.

Billings told me that the FBI was well aware of our interest in Clinton, and that when Sciambra went off on his trips there they were actually following him in a car. Billings seemed quite confident of this, but I'm not so sure I believe it. I remember Sciambra telling me that when he went to Clinton with Boxley, he became exhausted by Boxley constantly warning that any car that came near them was an FBI car, etc, and I suspect that Billings may have gotten his information from Boxley.

Of course, there is another reason why the office is interested to know what the FBI thinks of the Clinton episode: there is a very real (and well-grounded) suspicion that the car in Clinton, with occupants observing the voter registration line, was a Justice Department car. There is not a possibility that the defense will be able to produce a cast iron rebuttal along these lines, and Alcock, Sciambra etc. are anxious to find out if this is likely to be the case.

At any rate, there was annoyance in the office that the FBI should play with its cards so close to its chest.

Jim Rose now in town, potentially being hired as an extra investigator. Work started on drawing up subpoena for Ruth Paine.

Saturday, March 23, 1968

Mark Lane back in town, having interviewed Roy Barry in Charlottesville. Barry is a reporter (or editor) for the student newspaper at the University of Virginia. Recently Ramsay Clark spoke there and in reply to a question, said that he might have to prosecute Garrison. Lane apparently thought it worth while to get this on film and tape, although it seems like a trivial point to me. (Might be worth while if he could get Ramsay Clark to repeat it in front of the camera.)

Gary Sanders is working on the Alexander Eames nonsense (Eames lived next door to Oswald on Magazine Street.) Sanders seems to be beginning to change, referring to Garrison today as "conspiracy minded," and saying that he disagrees with Garrison that Eames represents some kind of a "control figure" over Oswald. The whole '4900 Magazine' area which Garrison is so interested in seems to be a waste of time.

Monday, March 25, 1968

? A Paris-based reporter, Jeffrey Paley, in the office today, trying to interview Garrison. He spent some time in my office reviewing a newspaper clipping file of the investigation. He works for some news service, though not one of the big ones, and his father is a big-wig in one of the TV networks—CBS I think. Obviously he is not a chip off the old block. He believes that the course of the Vietnam war may be related to the Garrison investigation. (Not the other way about.) His rationale for this somewhat extreme position has a certain logic, however: As Paley said, "If what Garrison says is true, anything is possible." Thus he wants to know if Garrison's charges have any basis in fact. He has even written a couple of articles—which appeared in papers in Pennsylvania or somewhere like that—which correlate peace talk delays and Saigon manoeuvring with postponements, etc. in the Clay Shaw trial. He showed them to me, and I reflected that Garrison would like them very much. They were forwarded to Garrison, and I believe Paley did subsequently have an interview with Garrison. However, I don't know what Garrison said, or whether he succeeded in convincing Paley. Maybe he did, because I heard later on from Jones Harris that we now had a possibly influential ally in Paley.

David Wise's article about the classified documents in the National

Archives came out in the Saturday Evening Post today. Garrison studied it with unusual attention and came into my office with a copy of the magazine. He put it down on my desk—he had underlined parts and written comments in the margin—and said, "It represents a retreat to a fortified position." (Garrison constantly makes use of military metaphors—often combined with humor.) He obviously is not entirely displeased with this article, which in some respects contradicts what he has said—eg that LBJ signed an executive order which keeps the classified documents in the Archives under lock and key—but in other respects corroborates what he has said—that there are plenty of classified documents, some with interesting-sounding titles.

Tuesday, March 26, 1968

I was walking down Royal street this evening when a cab pulled up beside me and the driver yelled at me to get in. It was Perry Russo. I got in, and he gave me a lift to the news-stand. He told me he is driving a cab because he needs the money. I asked him if people recognise him, and he said some do but most don't. He then told me a story about a passenger who got in late one night and asked to be taken to 1317 Dauphine St—next door to Clay Shaw's apartment. Russo immediately put on his dark glasses and checked the rear view mirror. He didn't know who his passenger was, and evidently he hadn't recognised Russo. Russo then asked him if he knew Clay Shaw. "Yes," the man replied. "He's been having some bad luck lately."

Zapruder film is to be forwarded to the office by Life. I am slightly surprised that they put up no legal fight at all—just simply surrendered it. no doubt they will send us a copy.

Sciambra still in Washington checking on three or four potential witnesses to the VIP Room matter. Rose was hired as an investigator and is being sent to Florida to check out the Masferrer angle—on information provided us by Lawrence Howard, as far as I can tell. (Garrison maybe feels obliged to have an investigator in Miami as he is employing funds provided by an "industrialist" in Miami. Garrison probably told the industrialist that there were plenty of leads that needed checking out in Miami, if only he had the money. Nevertheless, Masferrer seems like a waste of time.)

In reply to a question from the audience yesterday, in California, Bobby Kennedy made the remark that he had seen everything in the National Archives, and there was no indication of conspiracy. I called up AP office here to try to get exact wording. It is, after all, unlikely that Kennedy has put in the months necessary to see everything in the Archives. Still, he may be right about his conclusion.

Monday, April 1 - April 7

On Tuesday, Garrison left town—went to California for what was described to me as "an indefinite period." During this week, Judge Haggerty arrived at the decision not to change the venue for the Shaw trial. It would be hard to imagine a more predictable decision. Appealed by the defense with writs to the state Supreme Court.

Kerry Thornley arrived for arraignment for his perjury charge. He pleaded not guilty. He had no lawyer, thus making nonsense of Garrison's claim that he is protected by the CIA, as Jim Alcock pointed out.

I spent some time working on Ruth Paine's testimony, in preparation for her grand jury testimony.

On Thursday, Martin Luther King was shot in Memphis. Bobby Kennedy was to have come here this week-end, but he cancelled all his engagements. Garrison returned a day or so after King was shot, but did not come into the office, and surprised everyone by making no statements about the latest assassination. As far as I know, there has so far been no reaction from Garrison.

I stopped keeping a diary at this point, except for a couple of days at the time of the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. Shortly after the last entry here I began to feel the effects of arthritis which had started to creep up on me a couple of months earlier. Some time in the middle of April I saw a doctor, and on April 26, 1968, I flew to Washington, DC, for a short vacation.

As I recall, little enough happened in the office during that time. Garrison was not there most of the time, and made little or no comment on the Martin Luther King assassination, initially. After a while, however, he started to say that it had been planned, etc., by the same people who executed the JFK assassination. Louis Lomax, a Negro reporter, did some articles about James Earl Ray's movements, and pointed out that Ray had been in New Orleans in December, 1967, and at that time had seen some one from the International Trade Mart. I once asked Garrison if he knew who this person was, and Garrison indicated that he did. He was a bit vague about it but said that his name was Davis. However, Garrison showed no inclination to investigate the assassination as he had Kennedy's. Of course, he was getting bored by the Kennedy assassination by this time anyway. Most of the time he was not in the office, and he even stopped going in at weekends.

Sciambra returned from Washington having interviewed the people concerned with the VIP Room matter. He stayed with Weisberg, and saw the Zapruder film and slides in the National Archives. Sciambra's comment about the VIP Room witnesses when he returned was, "Well, they can't help us and they can't hurt us." By this he meant that they could not say that Shaw was there, and (presumably) they could not say that he was not there.

I spent 10 days in Washington and New York—from April 26 to May 5. While in New York I briefly saw Dick Billings again, and Sylvia Meagher. Billings—now in a different office in the Time-Life Building, advised that he would be leaving the magazine soon and going to work for a newspaper in St. Petersburg, Florida. He told me that he had fairly complete files on the Garrison investigation—up to about August, 1967. That means that he has nearly all the important material—probably the only journalist who does. However Billings has made little or no use of this material, and probably won't. He told me he had both 'Proximity Factor' memos.

I discussed the case for an hour or two with Sylvia Meagher in her apartment. She closely monitors radio, TV and newspapers, and is well aware of what is going on in the Garrison investigation. She has no illusions about it, and is more or less able to figure out the inside story for herself, unlike most people who take an interest in the assassination.

I flew back to New Orleans on Sunday, May 5, and the next day Loran Hall was in the office. I think maybe Steve Burton brought him too. Like Howard, Hall succeeded in getting Garrison to change his mind about him. It will be recalled that Hall was at one point suspected by the FBI and Warren Commission of being the man who visited Sylvia Odio before the assassination, in the company of a man who used the name 'Leon Oswald' and talked about killing Kennedy. It seemed to me that when Garrison and others were talking to Hall, they were talking about everything except how he became involved in the Odio business—never explained by the FBI. I therefore raised the question with Hall. (transcript of this portion of the Hall interview available.) Hall obliged Garrison by saying that he had been in a room with Bradley when assassinating Kennedy was discussed—quite possibly he was telling the truth. Billings came down again in a day or two. He seems to be keeping an eye on Hall, for some reason, and I think wants to take Hall to Puerto Rico, where, I believe, Sylvia Odio is supposed to be.

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Today a potential witness, Charles Fox, came into the office, and according to Jim Alcock, says he remembers seeing Oswald--whether Lee or 'Leon' I don't know--at Ferrie's apartment. Before he was interviewed, by Sciambra and Alcock, Sciambra asked me to bring him a copy of the picture of Oswald with the beard drawn in. Fox was in the CAP with Ferrie. Sciambra requesting that I bring the picture of Oswald with beard added suggests that Fox says that the man he saw in Ferrie's apartment had a beard, and thus may have been James Lewallen.

Garrison not in the office today, but much talk in the office about the depositions which Shaw's lawyers will be taking tomorrow from the assistant DA's working on the case, and to which Garrison has instructed them not to answer any questions other than "name, office rank and social security number." The possibility is, according to Alcock, they could be cited by Federal Court for contempt.

Late this evening, after the California primary, Robert Kennedy was shot in the head at the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles. I was watching television at the time, glad that he had won the primary. What a terrible and shocking thing! I called Louis Ivor at his home immediately, and he told me that "the boss" already knew about it. Jones Harris called from New York, in case I hadn't heard the news, and then I called Sylvia Meagher. She had just turned the radio on, in the middle of the night, on an impulse. She had thought he had been shot in the hip, and was shocked to hear it was the head. "This country ought to be put under trusteeship." she said. I satyed up all night and watched TV.

Wednesday, June 5, 1968

Garrison did not come into the office at all, although Sciambra said that Garrison had called him early in the morning, furious at the news, saying they would end up by killing everyone. The switchboard was jammed with calls all day. The California attorney general called in the morning twice, but did not reach Garrison, to whom he would only speak. Alcock told me later that the call was in regard to the postponement of the Bradley extradition hearing in California until June 26th. He reiterated that he is not going to take any steps--if he can avoid doing so-- to combat the apparent reluctance to extradite Bradley, since he feels we do not have a case against him.

Once again, Jack Martin started a rumour by saying that we had a picture in our files of the man held in the Kennedy shooting. Martin was in Houston at the time, and called up a few newsmen with the (incorrect) information.

Heads are shaking and disapproval is being registered in the DA's office over the shooting, but I suspect it is mainly lip-service and crocodile tears. As far as I could make out, he was really disliked in the office, being associated with people like Walter Sheridan and others who have opposed do-as-you-like, free-wheeling states right-ism. RFK's opposition to Hoffa didn't do him any good in this part of the world, either. Many of the people in the office are talking the usual nonsense, which I find it increasingly hard to stomach, about "disrespect for law and order" being engendered by recent Supreme Court rulings, which, (I suppose the argument runs,) makes the criminal feel he has a good chance of getting off scot free. (As though Sirhan spent some time in a law library before deciding to shoot Kennedy.) The real issue, of course, is the absurd simplicity with which anyone can get a gun in this country. The point is, surely, people who do insane things like this do not approach it in a rational, legalistic frame of mind.

Many people in the DA's office do not feel that stricter gun legislation is "necessarily the answer". It is surprising to hear people connected with a law enforcement agency talking like this; you would think they would know better by now. (Some do. Eg., Louis Ivon, a police sergeant, has had enough experience to know that most shootings would not occur if the assailants did not happen to have a gun in their pockets in a fit of anger, and said that he would like to see stricter gun control legislation.) But some of the law 'n order lawyers around here ought to know better, and raise a question in my mind whether they are more interested in reducing the crime rate or increasing the conviction rate.

Late in the afternoon Alcock played a tape recording of his session with Ivon when Ivon was questioned by defense lawyers. He refused to answer nearly all questions, which mostly seemed to derive from information clearly provided by Bill Gurvich—eg concerning Ferrie's seclusion in the Fountainbleau Motel, an alleged 'raid' on Ferrie's apartment while Ferrie was out at the Lakefront airport, questions about undercover agents, etc.

Alcock discussed Jack Martin starting another rumour, and said that if it hadn't been for him we would never have gotten into this investigation, because it was Martin who originally hinted that if Ferrie knew Oswald. Alcock added that another person he had no sympathy for was Dean Andrews. He said that at one time he had felt sorry for Andrews, but Andrews' bringing up the name Clay Bertrand had been responsible for the primary direction of the investigation, ie the identification of Clay Shaw as Clay Bertrand. (If Alcock feels this way about Andrews, he ought to feel it even more about Garrison, since it was Garrison who arrested Shaw, not Andrews.)

Thursday, June 6, 1968

I met Sal Panzeca in the courthouse today. He is one of Clay Shaw's lawyers; I have seen him around the building before and I have spoken to him once or twice. He talked about the depositions they had taken from members of the DA's staff and said that he wasn't surprised we weren't answering questions, but he was surprised at the letter from Garrison to his staff, ordering them to say nothing.

He seemed a bit despairing about the case, saying someone would have to "break" soon. He said they had debated calling me as well, but had decided against it. He asked me whether I would have answered their questions, and I said I didn't see how I could under the circumstances. I felt sorry for Panzeca, and Shaw, of course, since there is now no doubt in my mind that he is innocent.

I talked to Ivon about the gun laws, and he favors much stricter laws. He talked about conditions in New Orleans, saying the trouble is you only have to go to an adjacent Parish to buy an unregistered gun. Police chief Giarrusso made a statement calling for stricter legislation, as did LBJ, in an effective TV appearance which, let us hope, will do some good.

Garrison not in the office all day. Still not a word from him about the RFK shooting. Sylvia Meagher called in the evening and said that Mark Lane had made a radio appearance in Philadelphia claiming that two RFK aides had recently spoken to Garrison, and admitted that that RFK conceded that there had been a conspiracy to kill his brother, and that he would make an issue out of it if he was elected President. Sylvia wanted to know if I knew anything about this. As far as I know, this story is completely false. It can be rebutted, for one thing, by a recent Los Angeles Free Press story by Mark Lane which practically accuses RFK of complicity in hushing up the details of his brother's death. Also, I note, Lane has not been in New Orleans since I returned from Washington on May 5. Moreover, if Lane's assertion is true, it is surprising that one week ago I should have received a call from a Jo Pomerance in Connect-

icut, who said she had just been talking to Lane, and wanted me to send a Drew Pearson column very critical of RFK to the McCarthy campaign headquarters in Los Angeles, urging that I send it "special deliv", so that it would get there before the election. Thus it seems that Lane's story is an invention.

(1969: It later turned out that this story about Bobby Kennedy endorsing Garrison's position vis-a-vis his brother's death was based on the assumption that two people who had come to see Garrison in the course of the investigation were emissaries of Kennedy. One of these two was Jones Harris. For some reason, it had become a part of the folk-lore of the assassination that Jones Harris worked for Bobby Kennedy, on no evidence whatever. Later on, Jones Harris attended an assassination inquiry committee meeting in New York and repudiated Lane's story, pointing out that he was supposed to be one of the RFK aides, which, he said, he was not.

After a lapse of time, Garrison began making statements about the new Kennedy assassination, which he said was linked to the earlier one and the Martin Luther King death. These statements were based on no evidence at all, and, as far as I can tell, there is no ~~substantive~~ reason to believe that there is any truth to them.)

Monday, June 24, 1965

I met Layton Martens today, walking down the streets in the French Quarter. It will be recalled that Martens was the friend of David Ferrie who was at his house when Ferrie was arrested three days after the assassination. Martens was subsequently charged with perjury by Garrison. I asked Layton what was happening about his pending legal proceedings regarding his perjury charge. He said he had heard nothing more about it, and that it was his guess that Garrison would probably take no further action on the matter. He feels that by being charged with perjury he was conveniently eliminated as a potentially hostile witness, but that Garrison was probably not particularly interested in convicting him. Martens said that as a result of his perjury charge his draft status has been changed from IA to IY, and so he is not entirely unhappy about it.

I asked Martens what he thought about Perry Russo's story: did he believe that such a party as Russo testified to ever took place? Martens said he thought that there probably was such a party, and it was quite conceivable that people may have sat around discussing an assassination attempt, but that it was not conceivable to him that Clay Shaw would have been at such a gathering. He then went on to say that it is much more likely that instead of Oswald and Shaw being there, the real participants were James Lewallen and Guy Banister. Lewallen looks like the picture of Oswald with the beard, and Banister looked like Shaw. I was interested to hear this, as I had considered the same possibility. Moreover, Louis Ivon made a similar suggestion to me three days ago in the District Attorney's office; namely that the whole Shaw story is simply a case of mistaken identity for Banister. It is to be noted that Shaw resembles Banister in height, build, hair, and even locks. Both have a "distinctive" air about them, both dressed about the same. In addition, Banister knew Ferrie, and is a much more likely candidate for conspirator than Shaw. Everyone in the DA's office is very concerned that the defense, at the trial, might come to the conclusion that the Clinton episode, supposedly involving Shaw, Ferrie and Oswald in a car in Clinton, actually was an episode involving Banister. G. Wray Gill, who was friends with both Ferrie and Banister, owned a black Cadillac of the type which the Clinton witnesses describe, and members of the DA's staff are well aware that voter registration is just the kind of "communist" activity which Banister would have been interested in. Another point is that Alcock, Ivon, etc. realise that they could tie in Oswald and Ferrie and 544 Camp St. Ferrie

worked there, and Oswald had the address on his literature. However, they are afraid to bring it into the trial, for fear that it will reveal the Banister association as well, and thus possibly expose the case as one of mistaken identity. Thus, what is perhaps the strongest part of the case—544 Camp St—will probably not arise in the trial, for fear of damaging the effectiveness of the Clinton witnesses.

I asked Martens what he was doing for a living these days. He said that so many people had told him he was a CIA agent that he decided to go to the CIA office in New Orleans and ask for a job. He was shown into a very small office where he spoke to a fairly aged agent. He told the agent that he had been "involved" in the Garrison investigation, to which the agent replied, "We don't fool with that." (Martens wasn't sure what the man meant by that.) He told the agent he was looking for a job, and the agent said, "Well, what can you do?"

"Don't you need any spies?" Martens replied.

No reply.

Eventually he was given a form to fill out, after being told that about the only job he would be likely to get was that of a courier.

"Oh, you mean a bag man," said Martens,

No reply.

Martens said he did not fill out the form.

I told Martens that a useful thing he could do if he wanted to help Garrison would be to try to find Guy Banister's files, as he said that he had some leads as to their whereabouts, which he had never followed up. (Banister's voluminous files—5 filing cabinets full—have never been found, and might well prove to be of great interest to the case. It is quite likely that he had a file on Oswald, in view of the prominence his leafleting activities was given in the New Orleans press. Banister could hardly have failed to notice this and take an interest. Martens said that he was afraid to look for them, as he felt that the Mafia had an interest in them too, and might not want them to get into circulation. David Ferrie, Martens pointed out, had definite ties with the Mafia, eg. Carlos Marcello bought him his gas station in return for services rendered, and Ferrie also had a remarkably good memory. Thus he may well have transmitted a great deal of information to Banister, who possibly filed it. This is Martens' reasoning. He said that if Ferrie was killed, he could only have been killed by the Mafia, who might well have felt threatened when Ferrie came under investigation, even though neither he nor the Mafia had anything to do with the assassination. However, Martens feels that it is not in fact likely that Ferrie was killed, nor that the Mafia even felt threatened when they realised that Garrison was investigating Ferrie, because he feels that the Mafia realise that they can depend on Garrison not to harass them.

Martens said that he does not know why it was initially broadcast that he and not Melvin Coffey went to Texas with Ferrie and Beaubouef. Martens was at Ferrie's house on the weekend of the assassination, and knew that Ferrie had gone somewhere with his companions, but did not know where he had gone. Ferrie had told him they were going hunting. On Saturday evening G. Wray Gill came to the house, looking for Ferrie. He was all excited, saying that "the Feds" were everywhere, going through his office files, asking questions, etc. He said that specifically the rumour was that Ferrie's library card had been found on Oswald. G. Wray Gill said, "Let's hope he's not in Texas." As Ferrie had been employed by Gill as an investigator, he was understandably concerned that Ferrie should not appear to have anything to do with the assassination.

(1969: After Shaw was charged with perjury, having been acquitted on the conspiracy charge, I spoke to Layton Martens again. I pointed out to him that he was the only person the DA's office knew about who knew Ferrie and

also Shaw. Layton Martens' name occurs in Clay Shaw's address book. Martens seemed to be unaware that he thus constituted an important and hard-to-find link in Garrison's case. I pointed out to Martens that he was, therefore, one of the very few people in the city qualified on a first hand basis to express an opinion as to whether Shaw knew Ferrie. Martens said that he was certain they did not know one another. He said that he knew David Ferrie very well in the Fall of 1963, and was seeing him "three or four times a week." He said that when you get to know a man that well you get to know who his friends are, and the name Clay Shaw never came up. Martens said that the last time he saw David Ferrie was at the time of the assassination. He said that it seemed that Ferrie was "getting busted all the time" by the police, his own arrest had been precipitated by his association with Ferrie, and that it did not seem worth while to go on associating with him.

Martens said that he met Clay Shaw on Mardi Gras day, 1965. He did not know him nearly as well as Ferrie, and in fact only met him a few times. However, in the time that he knew him before the Garrison investigation began, he received no indication from Shaw that Shaw knew Ferrie. Martens says that if he had met Shaw with Ferrie in 1963 (ie before he was first introduced to him,) he feels sure that he would have remembered him, because of Shaw's striking appearance.

There was, strictly speaking, one other possible link between Shaw and Ferrie. After Ferrie's death, his phone calls for 1962 and 1963 were successfully subpoenaed by Garrison. The record of his long distance calls indicates that he called a number in Shreveport, Louisiana in 1963. When this number was traced to its owner, it was found to belong to a man whose name also crops up in Clay Shaw address. This man, a good friend of Clay Shaw, also denied that there was any reason to believe that Shaw and Ferrie knew one another.