

Insert after line 4 on p.44

44-1

What these documents do not show and should, what perhaps explains all the gaps and omissions, the obvious things never seen, is the antecedents of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. It is so completely a creature of the CIA the CIA ordered its organization.

This is a matter of public record. It was never really a secret. Certainly it was no secret from the government that brought the CRC into existence.

Prior to the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs, the CIA was worried about the acrimonious disputes and disagreements between the major anti-Castro groups. Accordingly, on March 18, 1961, at the Skyways Motel in Miami, the CIA ordered an amalgamation between the two major groups, the Frente Revolucionario Democratico and the Movimiento Revolucionario del Pueblo. Six days later Tony Varona of the Frente and Manolo Ray (friend of Sylvia Odio's parents) of MRP signed the concord under which Jose Miro Cardona became head of the CRC.

From the first there was no pretense. The CRC was the CIA. Tracy Barnes of the CIA circulated the draft of the first CRC "manifesto" through higher echelons of the government. Arthur Schlesinger, former Presidential assistant, found it "a document so overwrought in tone and sterile in thought that it made me wonder what sort of people we were planning to send back to Havana". In "A Thousand Days", Schlesinger has lengthy passages on the CRC and its organization, domination and control by the United States Government (24jff), including his own embarrassment after the Bay of Pigs when he and A. A. Berle (who figured in the overthrow of the Vargas government in Brazil) were sent to placate the CRC leaders, held as virtual CIA captives at the abandoned airbase at Opa-Locka, near Miami.

addition to epilogue

After this book was written, after the government lost it in the mails in which ^{it} ~~he~~ was insured and sent "special handling", after the publisher who had contracted it broke his contract despite editorial liking, and after John Starr circulated it among several other publishing houses, including one that ~~was published~~ published a book that is in undisguised apology for the government and spent in promoting ^{for} and advertising ~~of~~ what cannot be justified by the expectable revenue for a dollar book, there were several developments worth noting. I present them in reverse order.

In a single week, as though by accident, NBC and CBS released "specials" on the Garrison investigation and the Warren Report. The Associated Press distributed a ^{20,000-word,} ~~six-part~~ self-styled "analysis of the Report and its critics. By this time ~~the~~ ^{these} gang-up on Garrison ~~was~~ ^{racial} full-throttle. ~~The TV shows~~ ^{these} were undisguised intrusions into a judicial proceeding, a violation of Judge Hegarty's order and of all decent journalistic standards and codes, an assault on the integrity of the jury system and ^{to} those ~~who~~ ^{to} called ~~to serve~~ as jurors in the trials, and a provocation designed to tempt Garrison into a defense that could get the case thrown out of court. All three presentations were skilled blendings of distortion, misrepresentation, selective quotation ^{different} (often about ~~other~~ matters) falsification, deception and outright lies.

It was a real campaign that NBC began June 19. ^{It} ~~was~~ ^{made me} almost part of it.

After I testified before the grand jury. ^{Richard} ~~Kenny~~ Townley, WDSU-TV

reporter working with NBC, ~~of this special~~ ~~through~~ ~~the~~ ~~show~~ ~~was~~ ~~the~~ ~~main~~ ~~reason~~ ~~for~~ ~~my~~ ~~being~~ ~~with~~ ~~him~~ ~~as~~ ~~a~~ ~~witness~~ ~~to~~ ~~it~~.

~~As~~ ^{next} as I later learned, asked to interview me, ~~then~~ invited me to

^{dinner} ~~supper~~ and then said he would introduce me to a witness who had important

information. Garrison would not see him, Townley complained. Of all the ^{dine eating} ~~places~~ ^{in the}

^{French Quarter, he chose} ~~he could have chosen for us to dine, he selected~~ Morans. Of all the people we

had to pass in going to our table, there was his boss on the show, the brain

behind it, Walter Sheridan, of ~~the~~ Department of Justice and other intelligence

connections. By another remarkable coincidence, a young woman, not Townley's wife,

who was to join us for dinner, was quite ~~always~~ late. Townley left me several

times ^{to} phone her, he said. Had she not been late, Sheridan would not have ^{been a}

^{witness to my being with Townley.} ~~me with him, a witness to it.~~

Sheridan was no stranger ~~to me~~. On March 27 I had written the executive

producer of the "special", Fred Fried, asking for a transcript of NBC's

interview with Gordon Novel, ^{earlier} referred to ~~in the text~~. I asked also for

permission to quote it. In response, Sheridan ^{Novel} phoned and then visited me. I spoke

frankly to him. He promised me a transcript of the interview. It never arrived.

Sheriden asked if I would agree to be filmed. I did. He never again mentioned it.

This accidental meeting
no doubt,
until we met, entirely by accident, of all the various setting pieces in the

French quarter. When I reminded him of the promised transcript, then but an

academic interest, for this book was written, he ~~reminded me of my agreement~~

~~As though it would be a reward, Sheridan said he would then give me~~

I don't have the transcript.
~~the transcript.~~

Parenthetically, I interject that whatever is in that transcript, or Novel,

Nbc treasurers ^{so} it highly that, with an entire anti-Garrison hour in which to air

its precious property, it did not elect to share it with its audience. It made no

mention of Novel. Possibly that self-styled hero's proclamation of his CIA

connections influenced NBC's editorial judgement. *And I later acknowledged*
employing and paying him.

Towley took me to the quaint home of a woman he described as of Madam

LaFargien knowledge of the French quarter. He stayed with me while I interviewed

her and ^{helped edit} got the information he wanted Garrison to have (he knew my book was done).

She agreed for me to return the next night with him and tape-record what she said

so I could give Garrison the tape. He then drove me to an appointment he knew I

~~had with Garrison at his home that night.~~

directly
When I asked Towley why he had not taken this information to Garrison,

Garrison

in the official investigation was an additional intrusion into it. *Odd that going along with this is NBC's connection with the CIA's manhunt and their taking him, a day or two, to McLean, Va., where the CIA's head is quartered.*

None of this is consistent with the public NBC posture, of being holier than the Pope, of being detached from it all, impartial in its everlasting quest for truth, armed as it is with but purity and virtue. Nor is it consistent with honest journalism.

It is quite consistent with actions on behalf of Washington. NBC could have served a Washington master no better had the CIA established a special foundation for it.

Another "Coincidence"

~~At that time~~ the former head of NBC was a Presidential assistant.

Also close to the President, naturally, is his Attorney General. On June 2, three months to the day after he identified Clay Shaw as Clay Bertrand, Attorney General Clark said it was a mistake.

Spoke on March 2, Clark

~~Almost~~ as soon as he ~~said he~~ knew or should have know it was a different

kind of a "mistake". ~~Almost~~ as soon as he said it and the Department of Justice *and repetitiously* specifically reaffirmed it, every official body was sorry. And almost immediately

the Department of Justice was priming reporters with the statement that Clark had erred. But no paper printed the unattributable statement that the Attorney

General didn't know what he was talking about and is the kind of Attorney General

who talks about what he doesn't know about.

The Department of Justice has ways and means of achieving low-key
publication of what it wants to ~~attract as little attention~~ ^{be as inconspicuous} as possible.

When it ~~wants~~ ^{wants} to attract attention, it shames circus advance men, witness the

sensational play ~~it~~ got on the so-called transfer to the National Archives of

everything considered by the Commission and in the possession of the government.

When Clark issued that order and that statement - his own Department of Justice

and his own head of the FBI ignore it - he made big headlines across the

entire country ~~and an equivalent attention on the electronic media.~~

~~wanted everyone to know that the Kennedy family had returned the pictures~~

~~said to be those of the autopsy, he commandeered the front page again, and~~

~~with a falsehood, that the doctors had "authenticated" the pictures, that~~

~~had never before been and therefore could not authenticate.~~

So, when it was decided that the Shaw statement had to be retracted, the
government arranged for it to get as little ^{notice} attention as possible.

First, the Attorney General held no press conference. Then, he made

formal statement, Next, there was no press release. In fact, there were

copies for distribution to the press. When I phoned and asked for one I was

7

sent a Xeroxed copy of an unsigned statement headed simply "Statement by a Department Spokesman". ~~So cherry was Justice it left all normal press references out and omitted its own name in the heading.~~

The statement, not by the Attorney General, says what I had been hearing for months ~~in~~ from the Washington and New Orleans press, but it begins with a "reason":

"Mr. Edward F. Wegmann, a lawyer in New Orleans, wrote the Department of Justice on May 24, 1967, requesting a public clarification of news stories concerning his client, Mr. Clay Shaw. He referred to an impromptu press interview of the Attorney General on March 2. This statement is in response to Mr. Wegmann's request."

How "impromptu" was the Attorney General's statement in that town in which government officials customarily arrange for the asking of questions they want asked? For that we go to the third paragraph, where the unidentified spokesman says, "The Attorney General's comment on March 2 that Mr. Shaw was involved in the investigation was based on a briefing that morning."

There is nothing like being briefed for an "impromptu" statement! After all, how "impromptu" can you be when you are the Attorney General of the United States and aching to kill an unwelcome investigation over which you have no control,

especially when it is run by a man no one can control.

But what the Attorney General had said is not that Shaw "was involved in the investigation" ~~and nothing else~~ ^{only}. His actual words, from the Department of Justice transcript attached to the statement, ~~was~~ in response to this question, "You say he was checked out and found clear, more or less?", were repeated, "That's right, That's true."

The rest of the ~~the~~ statement is self-serving, evasive, and intended to be deceptive. For example, "No evidence was ever found that Clay Shaw was ever called 'Clay Bertrand'." If, as the Attorney General said through his anonymous spokesman on June 2, Shaw was never investigated, how could he have found such evidence? The Attorney General here also ~~describes~~ ^{limits} the extent of the ~~FBI~~ investigation ~~in New Orleans~~ in these words: "The FBI investigation in New Orleans following the assassination of President Kennedy covered allegations by Dean A. Andrews, Jr. which included a reference to 'Clay Bertrand'." Now the FBI investigation, whatever its great deficiencies, certainly covered more than that. "Clay Bertrand", the statement continues, "was not identified as a real person". If he wasn't it is only because the FBI didn't even investigate the "allegations by Dean ~~A~~ Andrews, Jr." As Andrews told the grand jury, he was never asked the

right questions. He told the grand jury all about his face-to-face meeting with very ~~real~~ "real", live "Clay Bertrand" at a "fag wedding". None of the ~~documents~~

still documents not suppressed shows any questioning of Andrews, like "Do you know

Clay Shaw?" or the showing to him of a picture of Clay Shaw. Of course, if

Shaw was never investigated, he could not have been asked if he were Clay Shaw.

After it was all public, no one was about to make any identification.

As everything the government does in its pretense of investigation of the murder of the President, this dishonesty raises more questions than it ~~answers~~ *answers none.*

If the Department of Justice knew it had made a "mistake" and had ~~charged~~ charged with one of ~~the most~~ ~~serious~~ ~~crimes~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~country~~, conspiracy

to kill a President, and knew it soon, as the "leaks" that kept reaching me

indicate, why did the Attorney General, in whose hands the rights and freedoms

of all ultimately are vested, wait three months to correct such a monstrous

injustice? Why did he have to wait for prompting from Shaw's lawyer? And why did

Shaw's lawyer wait almost as long to make the request? Have we an Attorney General

who is this irresponsible, this contemptuous of the rights of Americans, who

law he upholds and enforces? What action might not have been taken against

him, as a private citizen rather than the privileged Attorney General, had

this kind of a "mistake"?

Has the Department such irresponsible unofficial spokesmen that they are
 around telling papers like the Washington Post and the New York Times "it's
 the same guy" when the Department has no reason to believe it is? Has it and the
 FBI such totally irresponsible lawyers and investigators, such terrible
 "briefers", that they lie to the Attorney General? Is the Attorney General so
 little concerned about his public posture, his integrity and that of the govern-
 ment, especially when the murder of a President is involved, that he did not
 fire forthwith whoever told him this big lie?

Clark

If he took any disciplinary action, it is not reported. There is no
 reason to believe there was ~~any~~ ^{CAUSE TO} or ~~any reason for any~~. Nobody puts soap in the
 Attorney General's mouth, even if he is one of the youngest in history.

important enough to try the attorney general

Why should anyone want to invent such a monstrous fiction, that the
 FBI investigated a man it didn't, that "he was checked out and found clear" *if*

~~he~~ he wasn't, that Shew and Bertrand ~~are~~ ^{are} identical if they are not?

And how in the world can so awful a thing go unpunished?

The papers took their cut from the government. George Lardner, who

discussed this with me on March 3, emphasized that he personally had checked with the Department after the Attorney General ~~dropped his bombshell - it was~~ ~~he~~ ~~was~~ ~~apt~~ ~~to~~ ~~say~~ ~~after~~ ~~he~~ ~~(~~ ~~threw~~ ~~his~~ ~~protective~~ ~~cloak~~ ~~/~~ ~~around~~ ~~Shaw-~~ ~~and~~ ~~had~~ ~~been~~ ~~assured~~ ~~by~~ ~~the~~ ~~Department~~ ~~that~~ ~~both~~ ~~men~~ ~~are~~ ~~the~~ ~~same.~~ ~~He~~ ~~repeated~~ ~~it~~ ~~when~~ ~~I~~ ~~asked~~ ~~him.~~ His story at that ~~time~~ ^{day} reads, "one and the same guy". He said this amounted to an acceptance of Garrison's charge that Clay Shaw and "Clay Bertrand" are one and the same. I."

But when the same George Lardner wrote the story of the retraction in the paper that is the most dedicated of ^{blind} the Commission's defenders, ~~the~~ ~~most~~ ~~uninhibited~~ ~~complaint~~ ~~against~~ ~~its~~ ~~critics,~~ ~~this~~ ~~direct~~ ~~quotation~~ ~~came~~ ~~out~~ ~~in~~ ~~other,~~ ~~weaker,~~ ~~words,~~ ~~as~~ ~~though~~ ~~George~~ ~~Lardner~~ ~~did~~ ~~not~~ ~~on~~ ~~June~~ ~~2~~ ~~have~~ ~~in~~ ~~front~~ ~~of~~ ~~him~~ ~~when~~ ~~he~~ ~~wrote~~ ~~the~~ ~~story~~ ~~he~~ ~~wrote~~ ~~March~~ ~~2.~~ ~~This~~ ~~is~~ ~~the~~ ~~way,~~ ~~with~~ ~~inside~~ ~~quotes,~~ ~~indicating~~ ~~that~~ ~~is~~ ~~false,~~ ~~direct~~ ~~quotation~~ ~~it~~ ~~came~~ ~~out~~ ~~the~~ ~~morning~~ ~~of~~ ~~June~~ ~~3:~~

"We think it's the same guy', one Department official said on March 2."

If Lardner left "we think" out in writing on March 2 he is irresponsible

if he ~~had~~ added it without cause June 2 he is dishonest.

The New York Times March 3 account of its ^{own} inquiries is ~~entirely~~
 consistent with Lardner's of the same date. Robert B. Semple, Jr. ~~wrote~~
~~to make his investigation.~~ By the time he asked the Department, it had had time to
 learn of its "mistake". His story reads:

"A Department official said tonight that his agency was convinced that
 Mr. Bertrend and Mr. Shaw were the same man and that this was the basis for
 Mr. Clark's assertions this morning."

There never was ~~any~~ need for the Attorney General to ~~have made~~ ^{make his initial}
~~statement.~~ ^{He prepared for it that morning, although there was ample reason for silence.} ^(Why? Why did he prepare to?) ^{of course} His making it served only one purpose: to help Shaw. His

~~It~~ was a highly improper federal intrusion into a state proceeding. His
 silence for three months is consistent with this. At any time during those three
 months he could - and if he had been wrong, certainly should have corrected ~~the~~
~~this great~~ injustice. He had an excellent opportunity ^{March 12} ~~ten days later~~ on "Face
 The Nation". He used that time instead to go after Garrison.

~~It is, of course, possible~~ If the Department of Justice says that Shaw's
 lawyer wrote it, then despite the Department's history, especially on this matter,
 I believe it. I would feel much more comfortable in this belief if the same
 statement assured us that this also was ~~impr~~ spontaneous, that there was nothing ^{but}

a letter from Wegmann, that there had been no discussion of it between the

(that Wegmann wrote)

that the Department had not itself suggested the letter ~~to Wegmann~~. This

be more reassuring if accompanied by some explanation from Wegmann *✓✓*

his devotion to his client's interests as expressed in such a ~~great~~ *long* delay in

asking correction of ~~the~~ *allegedly* ~~great~~ injustice done him.

It would be more consoling still if it were not for ~~two~~ *three* other things

2 First is

the most obvious possible explanation of the Department of Justice on the one

hand saying it knew Shaw and on the other saying it hadn't investigated him

is the story that appears in this book, that of Shaw's CIA connection. If the

government knew Shaw as a CIA man, did it have to investigate him? And if he

enjoyed this relationship, is that in itself not enough to explain the government's

compelling

solicitude for him, enough to jeopardize the honor and integrity of the Attorney

General and the government, enough to preclude punishment for the man who so

previously "deceived" the Attorney General and the world?

second

The ~~other thing~~ *is* another "coincidence". I have already detailed the

timing in

remarkable "coincidence" between ~~W~~ J. Edgar Hoover's "answer" of charges not

yet made but about to be in WHITEWASH II, then unpublished *✓* then also

been in publishing houses. We have the same "coincidence" here. It ~~is~~ *was* in the *last*

of day that John Starr began to show the manuscript of this book to

Other
 publishers than the one who broke his contract, the latter part of ~~my~~ ^{my} that the
 publisher had his last chance to Xerox it.

And, as the reader will recall, this book says the FBI never investigated
 Clay Shaw! *No* other book has appeared on the subject. *No* other one has been

written or could have with the contents of this one, because I conducted my own

and it is my own investigation and analysis that underlies this conclusion.

investigation. The imminent appearance of this book, with all it says and proves

of the Department of Justice, is to me a more logical if less reassuring explanation

of the strange Clark-Wegmann timing of the retraction and the request for

it.

- they are without a doubt in this market.

There is still another coincidence. Because I intend in my coming work to
 analyze Hoover's statement attempting to refute my charges in WHITEWASH II by

the simple expedient of evading them and placing his dependence ~~on~~ in a vassal

press, *when* ~~at the same time~~ I asked for the Shaw statement I asked the "department"

~~Justice~~ press office for a copy of Hoover's. Hoover has his own *publicists* ~~press office~~, to which

~~which~~ I was referred. There, after identifying myself, I was referred to and my

cell was switched to one of Hoover's special assistants. I identified the

press release I wanted and was told I would get it.

I haven't. Hoover doesn't answer my challenges that he is suppressing

what he cannot properly and legally suppress. He hasn't answered my challenge now more than a year old that he prove WHITEWASH wrong or join its demand for full and public airing of the investigation he supervised.

Hoover writes only the wrong letters. He writes some strange ones, as my book PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH: SUPPRESSED KENNEDY ASSASSINATION PICTURES proves. It ~~prints quite a few of them~~ photographically reproduces quite a few of them, for the first time in history.

The net result of this strange and continuing federal intrusion into State affairs is not to divorce Clay Shaw from the federal government, not to answer questions but to ~~raise~~ ^{create} and leave unanswered entirely new ones, not to refute CIA connection with this motley of characters in New Orleans, ~~involved in the assassination and those connected with it.~~ ^{but} and to in its own way justify my choice of title - OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS: CIA WHITEWASH.

Finally there is the most bizarre development of all, again of timing
oddly and admirably suited to the government's campaign against Garrison.

On its "special" released two weeks after the Attorney General's "retraction"
and done well before that, NBC announced it knew who the real ^{was} "Clem Bertrand" is.
To protect him, it declared, it would not make his name public. Instead, ^{NBC}
already given it to the Department of Justice. This is a rather unusual procedure,
for the Department of Justice is involved in no litigation whereas Garrison is.
Shaw is to be helped, if he is unjustly accused, it is Garrison and not Clark
Shaw would only be hurt by not informing Garrison - and by pro-
claiming this announcement
who can nolle ~~or~~ prosecute those charges. How interesting it would be to know
NBC "learned" this and when it told the Department.

Then, in the midst of all the publicity campaign against Garrison, while
the "specials" were filling the national mind, eye and ear, the one Garrison
assistant not on the public payroll, not dependant upon him for his career, the
one who conceivable could profit from spectacular disassociation from Garrison,
did just that. Private Investigator Gurvich, after first seeing Senator Robert
Kennedy who thereby abandoned a declared policy of divorcement from anything
having to do with the assassination of his brother, loudly denounced Garrison and

proclaimed Shaw's innocence, the customary prerogative of juries. He received enormous attention, especially on TV.

This, too, has unusual aspects. First, his clemency would seem to make him a candidate for a contempt citation by Judge Magerty and for a jail sentence. Then, just the previous month, I understand that when he drove Ray Marcus to the airport, he told the author of "The Bastard Bullet: A Search For Legitimacy", that we "critics" ^{are} were lost, that the odds and ^{forces} powers arrayed against us ^{are} were great and powerful. If true, this is ^{a safe} ~~the~~ way of leaving a ship he might think is sinking, ^{a means} ~~and~~ that could make him new friends and benefactors.

The tubes were still glowing with Gurvich's denunciations, the front page with the AP's syndicated whitewash, when NBC had a change of heart. The Huntley-Brinkley report of June 28 presented Lawyer Dean Andrews is still another candidate for the all-time perjury-indictment sweepstakes.

Clay Bertrand, Andrews said, ^{is} not Shaw but his own client, one Gene Davis. ^(By getting involved with Oswald and the assassination) How Davis is protected by this ^{is} is not at all clear. How Andrews protects ^{new} himself by repeated perjury, assuming this to be the truthful statement he ^{never} made it to be, ^(he had all) with no less vehemence than the previous ones, ^{is less than obvious} ~~he~~ of course, he will ~~be~~ ^{be} ~~indicted~~ ^{indicted}.

described. How he protects Shaw by this course of perjurious conduct, how he helped his own career, how he took refuge from Garrison, is something not even Andrews' ever-ready explanations can make comprehensible.

The one thing that is clear, that requires neither legal degrees nor unusual perceptiveness, is that it is stretching "coincidence" a little too far to believe that all these things just ~~all~~ happened to come at one time, just managed to fall into a prepackaged public-relations campaign of unequalled magnitude and remarkable concentration, on Garrison and those of us who have already disassembled the Warren Report and ~~scattered~~ ^{destroyed} it to those same winds ^{to which} F. Kennedy ~~said~~ ^{promised} he would scatter the pieces of the CIA.

Perhaps the title of this book should have been "Government Counterattack".

In Dallas, the case never got to a jury. The same effort is being made in New Orleans.