

THE POWER CONTROL GROUP, THE  
NEW YORK TIMES AND JIM GARRISON

by Richard E. Sprague

## The New York Times

Founded in 1851

ADOLPH E. OCHS, Publisher 1896-1935  
ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER, Publisher 1935-1963  
ORVILLE DRYFOOS, Publisher 1961-1968

ARTHUR OCHS SULZBERGER  
Publisher

A. M. ROSENTHAL, Executive Editor  
SEYMOUR TOFFING, Managing Editor  
ARTHUR GELB, Deputy Managing Editor  
JAMES L. GREENFIELD, Assistant Managing Editor  
PETER MILLONES, Assistant Managing Editor  
LOUIS SILVERSTEIN, Assistant Managing Editor

MAX FRANKEL, Editorial Page Editor  
JACK ROSENTHAL, Assistant Editorial Page Editor  
CHARLOTTE CURTIS, Associate Editor

TOM WICKER, Associate Editor

## Clay Shaw's Lost Cause

The Supreme Court has ruled that the death in 1974 of Clay Shaw, a New Orleans businessman who once faced preposterous charges of conspiring to assassinate President Kennedy, also meant the death of his civil lawsuit against former District Attorney Jim Garrison. The sad result is that Mr. Garrison will not be brought to judgment for prosecutorial abuses that injured the reputation of an innocent man for a petty purpose: to build a conspiracy theory and discredit the Warren Commission.

Mr. Shaw was acquitted in 1969 after a bizarre trial at which the prosecutor produced a series of unbelievable witnesses who attempted to link the accused man to Lee Harvey Oswald. Not chastened by the verdict, District Attorney Garrison brought perjury charges against Mr. Shaw — for denying guilt on the witness stand at his trial.

At that point even the Federal courts — which had given the district attorney the benefit of assuming good faith — found bad faith and blocked the prosecution.

What has now killed the Shaw suit is a quirk in the Federal law designed to redress official infringement of individual rights. The statute is silent on whether such suits survive the death of the plaintiff. Louisiana state law, which the Supreme Court says must apply, allows such suits to proceed only on behalf of surviving relatives. Mr. Shaw, a homosexual who many think was selected for prosecution because of his vulnerability, left no survivors.

Justice Blackmun, writing for the dissenters in the 6-to-3 decision, argued for a broader reading of the Federal law, an interpretation that would better serve "the great purpose" of civil rights laws. He called for Congressional action to restore the deterrent effect of potential damage suits in such situations. He is right; cases like this, and officials like Jim Garrison, should be judged on their merits regardless of the idiosyncrasies of state laws. A judgment of sorts has come from the New Orleans voters: they have just elected Mr. Garrison to the Louisiana Court of Appeals.

The June 20, 1978 editorial column of the New York Times contained the above item about Jim Garrison and Clay Shaw. If there were any lingering doubts about the Power Control Group's influence at the Times, this editorial removed them. It is inconceivable that the regular writers of their editorial columns would, by themselves, produce such a piece. Fletcher Prouty has said that somewhere in the basement of the Pentagon or in an old building in Virginia, there are a group of writers producing this kind of editorial for all of the media controlled by the PCG.

Most of the writers, editors and owners at the Times would not even remember that Garrison brought perjury charges against Clay Shaw and that the federal courts blocked the perjury prosecution. The words in the editorial were carefully chosen with detailed knowledge and memory by the PCG specialists on Jim Garrison and Clay Shaw to attempt, once more to influence the public prior to open hearings by the Select Committee on Assassinations. Rumours have it that these hearings may begin in July or August and Garrison himself firmly believes that the Committee's findings will completely vindicate him and prove Shaw's guilt for once and for all. Thus the Times' comments are timely as always and indicate the probability of a new PCG campaign developing to discredit the Committee in advance of public hearings.

Anyone following the Shaw-Garrison case closely will recognize the distortions of fact and misleading statements in the Times editorial. For example, Shaw, as always, is portrayed as that poor, put upon, innocent and harassed businessman. Even the Times editors certainly know that Victor Marchetti has exposed Shaw's connections with the CIA, and Richard Helms' strenuous efforts to protect and defend Shaw during his trial. This image of Shaw was created for him by his PCG masters as soon as he was arrested in 1967, and has been perpetuated ever since. A small crack in the image is allowed to creep into this PCG editorial by the admission that Shaw was a homosexual. Prior to his death, and before gay rights became popular, Shaw's supporters never did admit that.

A second example is the statement that Garrison brought the perjury charges against Shaw - "for denying guilt on the witness stand at his trial" - . If A.M. Rosenthal had prepared the editorial, he would certainly not have made that kind of error. The perjury charges, as everyone knows, were for denying that Shaw had ever met or known David Ferrie. Photographs of the two men together at homosexual parties taken in 1959, coupled with the testimony of a dozen witnesses who had seen them together, would have convicted Shaw of perjury if the courts had permitted the case to go to trial.

A third example is the statement that Shaw was selected for prosecution because of his vulnerability, being a homosexual. A careful review of the trial transcript or the New Orleans Times Picayune account, which is nearly as accurate, shows that Shaw's homosexuality and the evidence about his strange habits, acquired from his home after his arrest, was never once mentioned or introduced during the trial.

Garrison had more than ten homosexual witnesses, all of whom knew Clay Shaw in his other personality and knew that Shaw and Ferrie were lovers, several of whom were also Shaw's boy friends. Garrison made a decision not to use the homosexual aspects of Shaw's life in the trial.

Perhaps the PCG is unhappy over the recent events mentioned in the editorial. The Supreme Court voted 6 to 3, for Garrison and against the Shaw estate on Shaw's suit against Garrison brought because of the perjury indictment. Garrison meantime has been elected to the Louisiana Court of Appeals after losing an election for District Attorney in the early 1970's because the PCG put up a candidate against him and financed his entire campaign.

What the Times does not point out is that the Court of Appeals is the highest court in Louisiana and a very powerful body. Jim Garrison is suddenly back in a better drivers seat, in terms of fighting the PCG, than he was when he was District Attorney. The voters of Orleans Parish in New Orleans have always known that Jim is okay and was being framed by someone. They read the New Orleans Times Picayune account of the Shaw

trial, rather than the New York Times version, and they know that Clay Shaw was guilty. They also know that Jim Garrison was innocent of pin ball machine bribery and income tax evasion charges made by the Nixon administration. All of this, plus the rumours that the Select Committee team in New Orleans has found that Jim's evidence against Shaw, Ferrie and others is solid, must be creating panic in the PCG's house.

With Jim Garrison on the Louisiana court that, in the past, always rejected his appeals, a new D.A. in New Orleans might take the bull by the horns and open prosecutory cases against the New Orleans conspirators who are still alive!

(For a fuller definition of the Power Control Group and their activities in prolonging the JFK Assassination Coverup see the privately-published book by Dick Sprague, The Taking of America 1-2-3. Copies are available from the Author at 193 Pinewood Road, Hartsdale, NY 10530. \$10.00 per copy. Limited edition of only 500 copies.)

\*\*\*\*\*



In the wake of the hugely orchestrated campaign to publicise Edward J. Epstein's Legend: the secret world of Lee Harvey Oswald, we report a bizarre development.

Just before the publication date an extensive two-part interview was conducted with Epstein by a Susana Duncan and this was originally run by New York magazine in late-February and early-March 1978. Consequently rehashed versions of this interview appeared in the British (Sunday Times), Dutch (De Haagse Post) and Italian (Epoca) press.

It is obvious that great pains - and expense - were used to propogate the Epstein myth! The ironic result is that, inasmuch as Epstein attempts to convince the public that Oswald did not act as part of a conspiracy to murder John Kennedy, the Italian magazine article has, probably inadvertently, provided us with a little gem of evidence to the contrary!

The above photograph was used to illustrate the Epstein/Duncan interview in the May 10 issue of Epoca. This rare photograph depicts the 16 year old Lee Harvey Oswald in the uniform of David Ferrie's Civil Air Patrol unit in New Orleans in 1955! To our knowledge this illustration has only ever been used in two books - Red Roses from Texas by Nerin E. Gun (1964) and Forgive my Grief Volume 4 by Penn Jones (1974). Penn Jones' opinion of its rare use is because of the explosive allegations that it produces. It obviously is NOT included as part of the illustrative material for the Epstein book!

Someone on the Art Staff of Epoca has made a helluva blunder.....

\*\*\*\*\*

Ted Gandolfo's conclusions in our last issue about Robert Blakey's attitude towards the current Congressional assassination probe are interestingly confirmed by the photograph which accompanies the article; that is, if you accept the conclusions of Nierenberg and Calero in How to read a Person like a Book, (Heinrich Hanau. 1973). The authors are specialists in "the use of Non-Verbal Communications in the Negotiating Process", and their earlier publications include The Art of Negotiating and Creative Business Negotiating.

Blakey's pose indicates an interesting syndrome of "Tightly Clenched Hands" and "Steepling" and "Hiding his Mouth".

The first of these gestures is usually a sign of suspicion and defensiveness. "Steepling" is a sign of confidence. The characteristic "steepling" pose has the elbows on the table and the forearms creating a pyramid so that the fingertips touch. Blakey's gesture is a variation on this, described by the writers as "subtle steepling". This occurs, they write, "when the hands are joined more closely..... This is frequently an indication of confidence." It also denotes smugness and egotism. The authors have a further relevant comment to make on "steepling": "Our research data indicates that the more important the executive feels he is, the higher he will hold his hands while steepling."

Blakey's "steepling" pose brings his clenched hands up so that they cover his mouth. The authors write: "Sometimes..... a person puts his elbows on a table or desk, forms a pyramid with his forearms, and holds both hands together directly in front of his mouth. He holds this position not only while talking but while listening. With very few exceptions, we have observed that such individuals were playing cat-and-mouse with their opposers until they felt it opportune to open up, at which point their hands were placed palms up or palms down on the table..... The opposers either agreed or ended the confrontation in disagreement."

\*\*\*\*\*

## The Listener

### Letters to the Editor

...../continued

1 June 1978

#### Kennedy cover-up

SIR: Although you recently published the suggestion of a correspondent to 'continue in your columns' the debate on the Kennedy assassination evoked by a BBC programme, the only subsequent discussion has been the review (*THE LISTENER*, 18 May) of Edward Jay Epstein's *Legend: The Secret World of Lee Harvey Oswald*, by Keith Kyle, who rightly believes that important problems remain unsolved. Any extensive but objective examination of the vast literature on the murder will reveal that not only the Warren Report today,

but also a majority even of its ablest critics have tended to distort or suppress items of 'evidence', the former particularly if they seemed to indicate conspiracy and the latter if not, so that it may help to sum up the key issues which, more than any fantasies, seem crucial to future investigation.

1. The ballistic and medical data, now available as relatively the hardest evidence of all, while establishing with virtual certainty that Oswald shot at the president from the Elm Street depository and at a policeman during his subsequent 'escape', does not sustain convincingly the 'lone assassin' conclusion. Distinguished forensic experts later consulted by the Rockefeller inquiry into CIA misdeeds, Dr Cyril Wecht and Dr Forrest Chapman, concluded independently that the data pointed towards two snipers firing from behind the motorcade. The suggestion that Oswald alone had time for enough shots because the bifurcated tree obscuring his aim from the depository window 'in November... had no foliage' is contradicted by the contemporary AP (Associated Press) and Wide World photos, though this is not a decisive point nor capable of verification

2. Oswald now quite definitely emerges not as an uneducated 'lone nut', but as an agent possibly a double-agent of some kind. Epstein and other recent writers have not yet completely elucidated the exact role of the KGB, especially in its apparent contacts with Oswald, his wife and other associates following his return from the Soviet Union, where his treatment had enabled him to improve his Russian —perhaps as his 'hunting' practice had raised his standard of marksmanship. The threat of retaliation for attempts on the life of Castro may indicate one motivation for the assassination, a rather more subtle countermove than the previous installation of Soviet missiles in Cuba, because there was the reasonable assurance, ever since confirmed, that even if the murderers were caught alive, the world media would automatically convince the public of what the authorities dare not completely refute—that the blame rested with the American domestic 'right wing'. At least, that is what a Russian alleged acquaintance of Oswald risked telling the US embassy in Moscow.

B. L. W. ASHTON

London E11