

Enclosed with letter  
7/4/8/69

A turning point in my feelings about the Clay Shaw case, and my opinion as to his guilt or innocence, came after a lengthy discussion with Richard Billings, then an associate editor of Life magazine. That discussion took place on March 15, 1968. Until that point I felt it extremely unlikely that the meeting as described by Russo had taken place. After the discussion I felt certain that it had not taken place, and that Shaw was therefore certainly innocent.

Rather than go into the details of my talk with Billings, I will include here a 5 page synopsis of the meeting and events surrounding it, which was written shortly after I met Billings. In summary, Billings completely corroborated Phelan's story as to the sequence of events surrounding Russo's preparation as a witness, and Billings concluded by dismissing Andrew Sciambra "a liar".

I then continued to work in the D.A.'s office, and nothing new developed which would lead me to suppose that Clay Shaw was guilty. Sometime in June, 1968, Jim Alcock and Louis Ivon were discussing the Clay Shaw case, and they requested me to prepare a memorandum about the case. Alcock had in his office a file entitled "The trial File" which contained memoranda pertaining to interviews with potential witnesses in the case. Many of these memos were already contained in a filing cabinet in my office. (This filing cabinet contained nearly all the files in the case, with the exception of a few "sensitive" files, such as those on Clay Shaw, Kerry Thornley, and others who had been charged by Garrison.) However, Alcock's file contained all these memos in one place. These memos were left in my office while I worked up the memo entitled "The Clay Shaw Case".

After the long-hand version of this memo was completed, it was given to Lorraine Schular, (Garrison's personal secretary) to type. She typed it up and returned the typed version plus the long-hand one to me for xeroxing and distribution. I tore up the hand written version and then made several xerox copies of the original. The original I gave back to Lorraine Schular to give to Mr. Garrison, and one copy each was given to Jim Alcock and Andrew Sciambra. Possibly also one was given to Louis Ivon, possibly not. He was subsequently unable to find it amongst his files, whereas Sciambra's and Alcock's copies were found. I kept one copy myself. At no point was I asked specifically how many copies I had made, or whether I had kept one for myself. I kept my copy in a drawer in my desk. After completing the memo, Alcock's file entitled "The trial File" was returned to Alcock's office.

The memorandum which I wrote was addressed to: Jim Garrison and Jim Alcock. From: Tom Bethell. Re: Clay Shaw Case. Date: sometime in late June, 1968. (The date of course was exact, but I cannot remember what it was.)

Sometime in August, 1968, I met Salvatore Panzeca when I was coming into the Criminal Court Building. I had spoken to him several times before, and had indicated sympathy for his cause. At one point he had asked me if we were planning to use Russo on the witness stand, and I said that I thought so. He therefore had reason to believe I might be sympathetic to him. At this meeting, I told him—a propos of what I can't remember—that I believed that Clay Shaw was innocent. He then asked me if I would be prepared to help them and I said yes. He suggested that I go out and have lunch with him, and we went out together to his car, which was parked right outside. We drove around but couldn't find anywhere suitable to eat, and meanwhile he asked me a few questions and I gave him a few names of

potential witnesses, such as Spiessel, Breitner, and I also mentioned Clinton. Panzeca was obviously trying to memorize these names, and I remember being rather appalled that he obviously didn't know about them, and hadn't heard them before. I had thought, in view of the attention focussing on the case, and that many people including newsmen were sympathetic to Shaw, that somehow much of this must have leaked back to the defense. I was particularly surprised that he appeared not to know about the Clinton area. I then decided that I would do more to help the defense than just mention a few names, and I told Panzeca that I had fairly recently written a memo listing witnesses who would be used, and I offered to give it to him that evening.

I then went back to work, and when I went home that evening I took the memo home with me in my brief case. Panzeca called me at the appointed hour and I met him outside the apartment. (My bell doesn't work.) He came up to my apartment and we talked very briefly. I again re-iterated that I was convinced that Shaw was innocent. I then gave him the memorandum. I expressed some concern as to who would see it, and he said he would re-type it. He then tore the top off the first page of the memo and threw it away. He said he would have to tell the Wegmann brothers where he got the memo from, but said that no-one else would know about it. I was not offered anything for this. When I later gave a statement to the D.A.'s office concerning this, the precise wording on this point was:

"I was not offered and did not receive any remuneration, financial or otherwise, for this."

Panzeca then put the memo in his pocket and left.

Sometime after giving this information, towards the end of August, I decided that I could not go on working in the D.A.'s office. I had previously spoken on the telephone with Clay Felker, editor of New York Magazine in New York, and it appeared that there was a chance I might be able to get a job working for that magazine. I therefore told members of the DA's office that I wanted to go to New York to look for a job, and Ivon agreed to let me take about a week off. I went to New York and met Clay Felker, but he explained to me that they were not at that time in a position to hire me as they were really only interested in hiring girls for staff positions, mainly to do fashion writing etc.

I therefore returned to New Orleans, and had by that time decided anyway that the best thing for me to do would be to complete my book on George Lewis--a project I have been involved in for two years or more.

I returned to the DA's office and told them that I foresaw that there might be a lengthy period during which I would have little or nothing to do, and I therefore suggested that I resign. I also told them that I wanted to work on the Lewis book. This suggestion was made to Louis Ivon. About a day later Ivon told me that he had mentioned my proposal to Jim Alcock, who had come up with a compromise solution. I saw Alcock, and he suggested that I work 3 days a week for \$300 a month. I decided to accept this compromise. The next day he told me that he thought a better solution would be 2 days a week for \$200 a month. I agreed to this. I then started to work 2 days a week, coming in on Tuesdays and Thursdays. This arrangement started on Sep 1, 1968.

Little happened for the next four months. Ivon, under whom I worked, gave me very little to do, and I saw Garrison not more than once or twice during this period. At one point during this time, Panzeca called me again, at my apartment, and asked me if I would meet him that evening. This was very shortly after the Supreme Court decision not to stop the trial. We met at the Cafe Du Monde, and then drove off in his car. He

page 3

asked me if I knew of any more witnesses in the case, and I said I did not. He also asked me if I knew who would be trying the case for the state, and I said I thought it would mainly be handled by Jim Alcock. He mentioned the Supreme Court decision, and we both agreed that it would have been the best thing for all parties if they had stopped the prosecution. I remember also telling Panzeca at this time that I believed Clay Shaw to be innocent not only in fact but also morally—and in this respect I contrasted Shaw's case with Edgar Eugene Bradley, also charged by Garrison with conspiracy. I explained to Panzeca that whereas I did not believe that Bradley had had anything whatsoever to do with the assassination, there was in his case at least some fairly credible evidence that he had wanted to have Kennedy killed, and may have at one stage even solicited someone to kill him. In Shaw's case, however, it did not look as though there was any evidence that he was even anti-Kennedy. Therefore, I said, the charge against him was particularly unjustified. ~~in~~

During this meeting, Panzeca told me that they were now going to have to start investigating the witnesses who were listed in the memo. He said this would be done as discreetly as possible. I asked him if they had found out anything about Charles Speisel and he said that all they had been able to determine was that he was something of a nut, and seemed reluctant to believe that he would be used as a witness.

A day or two before Christmas I left for Washington, with Ivon's approval, for a short vacation, which I spent with 2 English journalist friends. (I had stayed with them in 1967 when working in the National Archives for Garrison.) George Lewis died on Dec 31, and I returned to New Orleans on Jan 1, 1969.

The next significant event occurred on approximately Wednesday, Jan 8th. It may have been the day before or the day after. This was the day that members of the DA's office were first aware that there had been a leak in the case. I was in Alcock's office on some other business—just the two of us,—when he said: "You haven't been talking to anyone have you?" I said "what do you mean?" He said "They've been talking to our witnesses, Gurvich and Aynesworth are up there in Clinton right now talking to our witnesses. You don't know anything about that do you?" I said I didn't. He seemed to accept this and said he believed the leak may have originated with Bill Boxley, who had been publicly fired about a month earlier by Garrison and accused of being a CIA agent. I said that I supposed Boxley could have been a logical possibility; Alcock said however that even though Boxley had been fired he didn't think he would have done it, as he "worshipped" Garrison. I agreed.

Later on in the day the subject came up again when I was again in Alcock's office for some incidental reason. This time Ivon was also there. Ivon asked me casually if I remembered James Hardiman. I was a bit confused by this because I honestly couldn't recall who he was, except that he was something to do with the Shaw case. He said, "The postman?" I then remembered who he meant. He added that the defense had also contacted him. Again I said I didn't know anything about it. He then asked me if I could remember who had received copies of "The trial file". This was an earlier memo I had written which was similar to the Clay Shaw file memo given to Panzeca, but it didn't list all of the witnesses in the later one. I said I thought it had gone to the usual distribution—Garrison, Alcock, Ivon and Sciambra. I said I did not have a copy of that memo, which was correct. That day, Ivon had a copy of that memo out on his desk, and he had obviously been studying it, considering it a likely source of the leak. He had compl-

page 4

etely forgotten about the second memorandum which I had written. Some time later that day I also saw Andrew Sciambra, and he told me there had been a leak in the office. "Of course, you know who it was, don't you," he said. I said "Who?" He said "Bill Boxley." He reminded me that Boxley had known about the Clinton witnesses, and had gone to Clinton with him as an investigator.

While I was talking to Ivon and Alcock earlier, Ivon said: "They've even got copies of our statements." I said "Statements!" this time in genuine surprise. I asked him how he knew that they had statements, and he said that one or two of the Clinton witnesses had called up the office, and had said they had been shown copies of their statements by Gurvich and Aynesworth. He obviously was at a loss to understand how the statements could have gotten out, as they had been closely guarded in a locked file in Ivon's office.

At that time I was working on some of the "Dealey Plaza" aspects of the trial, mainly under the direction of Al Oser and Jim Alcock. I was coming to work every day, owing to the proximity of the trial. One thing I was working on, I recall, was trying to locate Buell Wesley Frazier in Irving, Texas. To this end we had solicited the assistance of the Irving and Dallas Police Dept. (as a last resort, it seemed. Later when I saw Garrison in his office on January 21, he told me that they had had very good co-operation from the Dallas police in getting the Dealey Plaza witnesses lined up, and I wondered why he hadn't sought that co-operation before instead of accusing the Dept. of being conspirators.)

I came in the next day, and they were still talking about the leak. Once again I saw Jim Alcock in his office, and this time he was even more concerned. "They've even contacted our boy in New York," he said. "—Charles Speisel." I again expressed surprise. Ivon came in and made some remark about their "going right down the list" of witnesses, although he didn't elaborate on which list he was talking about.

Alcock was really worried. "They're looking right down our throat," he said. "This could be a disaster. I tell you, we could be looking at a directed verdict in this case." I think he also said something about this would depend on whether Russo cracked or not. Also, some time on this day, (which would be most probably Thursday, January 9th,) Alcock started to talk about a Grand Jury investigation of the leak. He said he "hated to do it," because of the shortage of time, but he said that if there was time, he would try to institute an investigation next week, which would have been the last week before the trial. He said something about "getting Newsweek" before the grand jury to find out where they had gotten the information from. I saw Sciambra again later on that day and he said the same thing.

That night, after leaving the office, I called Panzeca at his office. I told him that they were aware of the leak, and that apparently the defense even had copies of our statements. He said they had statements, but implied that they came from earlier on in the investigation, and reminded me that someone else had left the DA's office earlier on, (strongly implying Gurvich.) I asked Panzeca what I should do if I was asked to take a polygraph and he suggested that I "indignantly refuse to take it." He reminded me that he had not told anyone of the source of the leak. (The substance of this conversation was included in the first statement I gave the DA's office (dated Jan 17th 1969), but only very briefly mentioned in the second.) The question of whether or not the defense had statements was of course of interest to me, as it might have indicated two leaks. Subsequently, when Ivon was aware of the document I had given the defense, he told me he was "satisfied" that nothing else had leaked out, and he

page 4

said he did not believe they had copies of our statements.

I have no specific recollections of what happened on the next day, Friday, Jan 10th; some of the aforementioned episodes could in fact have happened on this date. Garrison himself was not in the office at all this week, and I believe was still recovering from the flu. There had earlier been some talk about my possibly going to Dallas the coming week with Al Oser, in preparation for the Dealey Plaza part of the trial. However I noticed that by now they had seemed to have cooled off on the idea of my going. One episode I do recall, which occurred either on the Friday, or the following Monday (Jan 13th.). Bill Boxley had called Jim Alcock at his home asking him whether he was going to get his final pay check, and at that time Alcock asked him whether he had given any information either to Newsweek or the defense. Boxley had said no, Alcock said, and that he had sounded as though he was telling the truth. They were still talking about a Grand Jury investigation at this stage.

I did not go into the office over the weekend. Before leaving the office that evening I asked Louis Ivon if he wanted me to come in. He said he would call me if he needed me for anything, but he didn't call.

I came in on Monday, and this was the day Alcock made a statement to the press and TV to the effect that there had been a leak in the office. (Date confirmed from newspapers.) In his speech, he said that the leak could only have come from four people, which I remember thinking was correct, and I had come to the same conclusion. (Actually, the number is five if you include Garrison; the other 4: Ivon, Alcock, Sciambra and myself. Strictly speaking, one of the secretaries could also have been a suspect. In fact, at one point—I think on Monday the 13th—Ivon speculated about this to me. He said it could have been "one of the girls", but thought it unlikely because he didn't think any of them could have "put all the information together.")

Also on Monday, Garrison finally came into the office. He was walking down the corridor when he saw me in my office and made a point of coming in. He said: "You've probably heard, we've been the victims of a professional operation." He was referring to the leak, and to the fact that in his mind, it was carried out by Bill Boxley, whom he now obviously felt justified in having fired, and he clearly regarded the leak as corroboration of his allegation that Boxley was a CIA agent. (Privately, if not publicly, he had also been accusing Bill Turner of Ramparts of being an FBI agent, and I think he also regarded Turner as one of the people who had carried out the "operation" on him.) Garrison was very cordial towards me. The purpose of his visit was to say that in view of this leak, they were now going to have to place much more emphasis on the Dealey Plaza part of the trial. He told me that he thought Sylvia Meagher's book "Accessories After The Fact" probably contained some material which Al Oser was not familiar with about Dealey Plaza, and he wanted me to bring anything of interest in the book to Oser's attention. I reminded him at that stage of Judge Haggerty's recent announcement that "the Warren Report is not on trial", and I said I wondered if any of this material was going to be admissible. He said: "Oh I don't think there will be any problem there." As always, he seemed calm and relaxed, and not too concerned about anything. I certainly did not get the impression that he regarded me as the source of the leak—on the contrary, he made it clear that he thought it was done by someone else.

Television cameras were brought into Alcock's office in the afternoon, and he made his statement. Then, close to 5 pm., as Alcock and Ivon were leaving Alcock's office, they stopped outside my office, and in a conspicuously audible voice Ivon said: "I've got all the girls lined up to take the polygraph—" he then leaned round into my office and said: "Are you ready to take the polygraph, Tom?" I said "yes."

page 6

He added: "You have to take a couple of goof balls." He then left the office and returned a few minutes later with police investigator Freddie Williams, ostensibly on other business, and in my presence made some remark to Freddie about being ready to take the polygraph, and that all the investigators were ready to take it. I re-iterated that I was ready to take it.

At home that night I thought the matter over at some length, and concluded that it might be best for me to tell them that I was the one who gave the information. It was obvious to me that I was under considerable suspicion. Mainly, there were so few people it could have been. I also was a bit worried about the possibility of a Grand Jury investigation, and the danger of a perjury charge resulting if someone else was called and said it was me. I was also motivated by the consideration that the DA's office would obviously be embarrassed considerably if they decided to take any action against me at this stage—one week before the trial. I therefore called up Ivon, spoke to his wife, and about half an hour later Ivon called back. We agreed to meet at a cafe on Elysian Fields. This was around 9 pm.

I drove out there, and Ivon was waiting in the parking lot outside the cafe. I got into the car with him and told him that I couldn't go on telling lies any longer and that it was me who gave the information to the defense. I specified exactly what he had given and to whom. He asked me why I had given it, and I said because I believed that Clay Shaw was innocent. He asked me why I thought that and he said because I couldn't believe Russo, basing my opinion on the combined stories of Phelan and Billings. He said, "You realize it is not the job of an investigator to form an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the accused," (or words to that effect.) I said that I did realize that. He said, "I'm real sorry to hear this, Tom, because I know the boss likes you, and I know he'll be sorry to hear this. I'd rather have found out it was one of my own investigators." He then said something about me being the first one Garrison hired to work on the case.

He asked me if I was offered or received any money and I said no. He also made a point of asking me whether I had been motivated by anti-Garrison sentiments in doing this. I emphasized that this was not the case—that I had intended to help Shaw rather than hurt Garrison. He then said that he would have taken me to see Garrison then and there but that it was too late, and so he would call Alcock. After calling him, we drove off to Alcock's house. As we were driving along, he said: "You realize this could mean your job, Tom?" I said that I should have thought it would. He then said: "And you realize you could be charged?" I said that I did. At all times he treated me with politeness and courtesy, and did not use any intimidating tactics. After a delay while Alcock put some clothes on, the three of us then drove out to a nearby restaurant—whose name and location I can't remember. Alcock had evidently called Sciambra, and said he would join us soon.

At the restaurant, one of the first things they established was that the defense did not know that I had now made this confession. Having established this, they then began to discuss tactics, as to what they should do about it, if anything. They again asked me if I had received any money, and I said no. Ivon asked: "Would you be prepared to take a polygraph on that?" and I said yes, and at the same time threw down my check book on the table and said they could examine it if they wanted to. Alcock said, "Oh no, that's all right," and made some remark that he didn't believe Panzeca would have offered me money anyway. Alcock said words to the effect that "I thought we were friends," and I said as far as I was concerned we

still were friends, but that I did not believe that Clay Shaw was guilty. Alcock asked me specifically what bothered me about the case against him, and I said, "Russo." he said, "Well, I believe we've all had our doubts about Russo, but don't you believe any of the other people, such as the postman, the Clinton witnesses, etc." I said I did not. Somewhere around this time Sciambra arrived.

The discussion then centered on tactics, and Alcock said he thought it would be best if I came back to the office, and went on working there. Sciambra raised a query at this point and said that "if this ever comes out," that I had gone back to the office, "it wouldn't look too good that we treated it so lightly." They thought this one over, and partially agreed with Sciambra. At one point Ivon told Alcock that he had told me that I might lose my job, and Alcock indicated that this was obvious.

There was some discussion about Panzeca, and they almost seemed to be more annoyed at him than at me; they seemed to feel that it was "his fault." They were all well aware that I now posed a threat to them, and someone, probably Alcock said how bad it would be if I went on television at this stage. "Then we've got another Gurbich on our hands," he said.

We were there for over an hour, but I can't remember any other specific details of the conversation. The conclusion was that I would go home and they would tell Garrison tomorrow. I was to wait at home for a call, as to whether to come into the office, and if so, when. At one point I said I felt bad that I hadn't resigned and I offered to pay them the money back I had earned since August. They indicated they weren't interested in getting it back. I also said that I had been collecting some material from the office in the past, as at one point I had been interested in writing a book about the case, but that I was no longer interested in writing a book, and said they could come and get the stuff back.

Alcock in some ways seemed quite relieved, and said: "Well at least they are not entirely looking down our throats." He had thought that the defense had got copies of statements. Ivon and Alcock were unable to recall the specific memo that I had given Panzeca, and at this stage still were not sure there were two "trial file" memos. They had looked at the first one, and realised I could not be referring to that, as it did not list some of the witnesses whom they knew had already been contacted by the defense. Therefore, (I later learned) they thought I still might have been lying to them when I said I had ~~summed up~~ only given Panzeca one memo. They only believed me when they finally located a copy of the memo in question in Alcock's office.

One point they raised was why the defense would "go to Newsweek" with this information. I said it seemed obvious--they did it for financial reasons. Alcock seemed to agree that this was probably right.

Alcock and Ivon left together, and Sciambra drove me back to where my car was on Elysian Fields. On the way there I said that I very much regretted that I hadn't resigned. He said that he thought I had more to be sorry about than that. I said that there was no way I could not have given the information to the defense, and that if I had resigned I would have also given it, and so there was no way I could regret giving the information. As I recall, Sciambra made some further remarks about Newsweek and Aynesworth.

The next day I waited at home for a call, which was not forthcoming, and eventually I called the office myself and was told that Ivon and Alcock were looking for me. Ivon had been calling the wrong number. I met them both a few minutes later, on the street outside my apartment. They came up to my apartment. Ivon told me that he had "talked to the boss, and he was real sorry to hear about it. He says he doesn't want to do anything to hurt you as long as you don't do anything to hurt him. I told him you

page 8

had offered to pay the money back and he said he didn't want it back. He wanted to know if you did it to hurt him, and I told him positively not, that you did it because you believed Clay Shaw was innocent. Tom, the boss says he wants you to make a statement, as to what you did, and we want you to come on back to the office tomorrow. We'll take the statement from you, and then put it in the safe. Like I say, the boss don't want to do anything to hurt you as long as you don't hurt him."

They established that I still had not contacted the defense. Alcock went over one or two things he wanted me to work on when I went to the office--connected with the Dealey Plaza part of the trial.

Ivon re-iterated that Garrison liked me. "I'll tell you, the best thing you've got going for you are the bosses feelings for you." I then indicated to Ivon the box which contained material about the Garrison investigation, which he took. He asked me if I had anything else in my apartment, and I said no. He asked if I had a copy of the memo I gave to Panzeca, and I said no. They had been unable to find it, and obviously were still uncertain as to whether it explained the "leak". They then left, with the box of material. This was Tuesday, Jan. 14th, 1969.

That evening, Dick Sprague--an assassination "buff" who has specialised in collecting photographs of the assassination--was due to arrive at the airport from New York, and I had previously been scheduled to meet him. I was told to go ahead and meet him as planned, which I did. Sprague had brought with him some data and photographs which he was to hand over to Al Oser the next day. I did not discuss my situation with Sprague at all.

The next day I went in to the office--Jan 15--and started working in Louis Ivon's office. There were various things Oser wanted me to do, eg. looking up certain exhibits in the 26 volume Warren Report. I was also employed in xeroxing a great pile of material which Harold ("Whitewash") Weisberg had brought down with him, mainly pertaining to the JFK autopsy. (In fact, I believe this was merely the manuscript of his latest book, which he wanted to have a spare copy of.) As I recall, there was quite a bit of work to be done on this day, and Louis Ivon did not start with the taking of the statement until the next day--Wednesday, January 16th.

Ivon started taking the statement in the morning the next day. Most of the time he was alone in his office, although occasionally Alcock would come in. At this stage Alcock, Scimabra, Oser, Ward and Garrison were (supposedly) the only ones in the office who knew about my position. Ivon had specifically told me this when he had seen me at my apartment. He told me he had told Oser because I had been working on the case with him, and also Charlie Ward because he was the Chief Assistant in the office. I dictated the statement, and Ivon wrote it down on a legal pad. He almost entirely accepted my wording without revision at this stage. By this time he had found another copy of the memo I had given to Panzeca, and had told me that he was now satisfied that it completely accounted for the leak. I recall that on this day I went out to lunch and then thought of an addition to the statement which I phoned in to Ivon. It read: "At no point did I contact Newsweek Magazine or any other member or representative of the news media concerning this." This sentence was also included in the later statement.

In the afternoon a preliminary draft of this statement was typed up. It was definitely typed by Lorraine Leboef. She brought it back into Ivon's office where we were both sitting, and he had told me he had given it to her to type. (This was not the actual statement which I finally signed, but just a typed version of Ivon's handwritten copy.)

At some point on this date Alcock was in the office and I discussed the question of what I could be charged with. He said theft. I asked him what the maximum sentence could be, and he said 6 months if the property

was valued at less than \$20. I asked him how he thought they would in fact value the property. He said he didn't know but conceded that if you figured it at the investigative expense of accumulating the data on the memo, it could be valued at "thousands of dollars." When Alcock read the typed version of the statement at this stage, he expressed surprise at the recounting of the second meeting with Panzeca in the car. He hadn't known about it before, because I hadn't mentioned it on the first day when I discussed it with him and Ivon. Ivon said something about my not having given any more information at that meeting, and Alcock said, "No, but it shows a continuing relationship."

I went into the office again the next day, Friday, Jan 17. I think it was on this day that one of the first things that happened was that Ivon told me he had seen Panzeca downstairs in the Court Building. He said, "why don't you go down and talk to him, Tom. See what he says." The idea, as Ivon made clear, was to reassure Panzeca that the situation was still "normal" as far as I was concerned. I therefore went downstairs and Panzeca was in the concession stand by the Broad St. entrance. Panzeca said something to me about there being another suspect, not me. (He was referring to Boxley, as he subsequently made clear. In fact, he did have good reason to believe that Boxley was under suspicion at that time.) I reprobated my brief conversation to Ivon.

On this day there was considerable talk in the office about the statement which Ramsey Clark had made on television the night before, about the recent findings by a panel of four experts about the autopsy. Ivon several times repeated that Clark's announcement had broken into a Bob hope TV program he was watching. Alcock had by this time filed a motion for continuance, and later that day went on TV and made a strongly worded statement to the effect that they could not go to trial until they had received the JFK autopsy photos and x-rays from Washington. I asked Alcock if there would be a continuance, and he said, "Oh yes, we'll get a continuance."

My statement was completed that day. The first thing was that Ivon told me he wanted the wording changed at one point. My original wording had been: "I indicated to Panzeca that I did not believe that Clay Shaw was guilty," and this was changed to "...I was not convinced that Clay Shaw was guilty." After this change was made, the statement proper was typed up, this time, (I am almost certain,) by Lorraine Schuler. It was signed by me, witnessed by Louis Ivon, and notarised by Mike Karmazin. There were no other signatures, and ~~now~~ one else, with the possible exception of Lynn Loisel, was in the room at the time. (Loisel certainly knew about my position at this time.)

After I had completed my statement, Ivon told me there was something else he wanted to do. He explained he wanted me to call up Panzeca at his office, and gave me some instructions as to what I was to say. I can't remember what because I was hardly listening. The upshot was that I told Ivon I couldn't make the call. Alcock was also in the room when this was going on. He didn't say a word. Ivon accepted my refusal without any argument.

When I left the office that day Ivon had told me to return on Monday, and said it would be OK for me to go to the trial if I wanted to, "as I did at the Dean Andrews trial." He added that there may be a few things they would want me to do anyway. I still had my DA's credentials, and I used them frequently during the two weeks ahead to get into the court-room!

When I returned home that night the papers and the TV were full of Alcock's recent announcement about a delay in the trial, and there was widespread speculation that the trial was not going to take place. Garrison at this stage was out of town, and did not return until Monday. That evening I received a call from David Chandler, asking me if Russo had

skipped town. I said I thought not. (He was obviously trying to rationalise the latest announcement from the DA's office. Chandler did not know about my position at this stage, but I had met him a few times socially, and had indicated considerable reservations about the Garrison investigation, which accounts for why he called me.)

I recall nothing significant over the weekend, and on Monday, Jan 20, I was in the court room when Alcock made his surprise statement reversing his position and saying they were now ready to go to trial etc.

On Monday, in the office, I was put to work by Alcock on preparing a list of articles and TV programs about the case. This was completed by Monday evening, and used in the trial to question jurors with--as to their familiarity with the case. Also on this day I was paid for the two week period Jan 1 - Jan 15th. (\$100). The check was dated Jan 15th. I recall nothing else of significance on this date.

Tuesday, January 21 was the day the trial started, and the day Garrison finally showed up in the office. I managed to get ~~out~~ to see him in the morning, at about the time the first potential juror was questioned. He was alone in his office. "Did you want to see me about something?" he said, as I came in, and then said, "Yes, I guess you did." As I recall, I didn't say anything before he started talking.

"I hope you don't think that I would ever charge a man unless I believed that he was guilty," he began. I said I believed that, i.e. I believed that he did think that Clay Shaw was guilty. He paused to take this in and then went on: "I am a district attorney, and that is all I am; if I wasn't district attorney I wouldn't be anything, and I hope you realise that I take my job seriously--" words to that effect. He wasn't mad or shouting at me, he seemed to be trying to make me feel sorry for him. I noticed that he looked worse than I had ever seen him: a livid blistering tan acquired over the weekend, and his eyes were bloodshot. He made a comment about how hard he had worked on the case, "working till 3 o'clock in the morning," and he added that he had "wrecked his health" in so doing. "Thank God it's only physical and not mental," he said.

He then turned to the subject at hand and wanted to know exactly how I had "made contact" with Panzeca. He obviously had not read my statement, as Ivon later confirmed. I went into the details, and he listened with interest. He explained the harm which, in his opinion, my action had done. He said that the trouble is once witnesses have been approached by investigators from the other side, you have to spend "hundreds of hours" talking them back into their original position. (Parenthetically, it does not seem that this did result from the defense's investigation of the witnesses, i.e. all the witnesses came forward with the same story they had told before, as far as I know. (Except I don't know what happened to Connie Kaye or Thomas Breitner;) also some "talking" may have been necessary, because I know Sciambra made another emergency trip to Clinton in the week before the trial.)

Garrison then went into my feelings about Shaw. He seemed to have no quarrel with my position about Russo or my estimate of Shaw as a conspirator, (although I can't remember his exact words on this point,) "but surely you can believe that Shaw knew Oswald and Ferrie?" I said I couldn't believe that either. Why not? Because, I said, the FBI's investigation had been so thorough that Shaw and Oswald could hardly have known each other without it long ago having been in the public record. "Take the case of George deMohrenschildt," I said. I was aware that Garrison thought of Shaw as a sort of New Orleans counterpart to deMohrenschildt--a Dallas oilman who surprisingly befriended Oswald. I pointed out that it was no secret that Oswald had known deMohrenschildt. Garrison seemed exasperated by my stupidity

page 11

on this point. "Don't you realize DeMohrenschildt was a decoy, he didn't have anything to do with the assassination. I realized that the minute I saw the Federal government wanted us to believe he was involved." He conceded that DeMohrenschildt probably played some minor "custodial" role.

I pointed out that about all I could believe about Shaw was that it wouldn't exactly surprise me if it came out in the trial that at one point he had had some connection with an intelligence agency, in view of his war background and his position in the Trade Mart. I also told Garrison that I was not contending that his whole investigation was a waste of time, because there were a few points about Oswald's background and his stay in New Orleans which were of interest and had not been explained by the ~~How~~ Warren Commission. I cited the "544 Camp St" found on some pamphlets which Oswald had on his possession while in this city. Garrison seemed to concur with this, and pulled out a big chart drawn by George Eckert of the 544 Camp St. area. He also rather hesitantly injected the name "Guy Banister" into the picture, who had an office at that address. I said it was one of the big disappointments of the investigation that this interesting lead had not resulted in anything. (Which I meant sincerely: when the investigation began, I think the people working on the case thought that there was a good chance of turning up something important in Oswald's background at this address. Despite considerable investigation, however, nothing turned up.)

Garrison then got going on his theories about the 4900 block of Magazine Street, where Oswald lived. It is his contention that this was a "safe block" used more or less exclusively by CIA agents. He cited one person who lived there at the same time as Oswald and then moved to an address on Lark St., which Garrison says is a high class neighborhood; this person also had "Omnirad Corporation" against his name in the phone book, I believe. I made no comment as Garrison expounded on these theories, based on a belief that propinquity is an incriminating factor.

I volunteered that if he wanted ~~me~~ me to make a public statement, I would be prepared to do so. He said: "Well this has got to come out, it's got to come out later." He seemed to want me to make a statement publicly, but not till after the trial, I got the impression.

At this juncture Sciambra came into the office from the courtroom, where the trial had just started. He seemed to be bringing good news of some kind. "Beautiful..." he said, as he sat down. Garrison wound up his remarks to me. "Alright, thank you Tom. I'll see you later." He seemed quite cordial. This was the last time I spoke to him.