

Still all
Barnes, Wood, Quroya, R. Lewis,

Conclusions

Throughout this book I have been critical of the press as I have of the government. This is because it has failed us and itself, ^{and} because it has ~~of~~ ~~important~~ privileged and essential function in our society. That it has in the last half of the 20 twentieth century interpreted these obligations to mean it has a license to make money and the obligation to support basic government policy in ^{neither} no excuses its failings or explains them.

With minor exception only the press has blinded itself to the truth of the fraudulence of the Report, fearing what follows. In its unanimity it sees ultimate protection. Afterward it will beat its breast. It has become the medium for the heaping on those few of us who have ~~persevered, who have tried~~ to ask the unasked questions, ^{and} to find the answers to these and those that were asked and never answered, of all the traditional slanders and libels and asserted abuses invented and perfected by certain elements of the press over the years and for this ^{high} ~~dedicated~~ purpose has devised ^{new ones.} a few more.

Even attack on the practise of the ~~new~~ "free enterprize" system is today acceptable if it serves as a means of temporarily thwarting the revelation of the essential truths. Thus it is honorable for all of the press—the newspapers, magazines and electronic media ^v to make a profit, to do what they do for "money", for their lickspittles to lick ^{isn't} For LOOK to pay \$665,000 for the Manchester dilitente Machiavellian ^{is not "scampering"} that is the unintended unofficial whitewash and ^{through it} ^{got it} for "Look" was the most uninhibited and the most successful commercialism in publishing history. ^{It is true} for Charles Roberts to be the only writer, of what is called a book because there is no other form into which it fits and to be a profit-making, eulogized, syndicated, sought-after man though he knows less about the subject than anyone else writing in the field, is more unrestrained in his employmet of the accumulated dishonest journalistic devices of the ages, and to make "money" from his tainted and futile sycophancy. ^{It is honorable and laudible} It is honorable and ^{laudible} laudatory for those who support the unsupportable position of the government

^{to} ~~and~~ wax wealthy and famous, ^{turn it,} becoming social lions and more valuable as sources of information for their employers in the process. Only those who disagree - not the major part of the late President's staff whose literary wealth comes from his murder alone; not Roberts, the only one to seek to ^{uplift} capitalize on the word "assassination" in his title, combining it with the word "truth" as though he understood its meaning, ^{not} ~~or the~~ Salinger who, from the profundity of his ignorance, wrote a glorifying introduction to it - only those who do stand to be counted and resolutely press forward in the search for more of the truth that alone can make our society viable - only we are "scavengers."

So we "scavenge," and in ^{it} ~~the scavenging~~ seek to recapture the national honor that was lost in the assassination and in its shameful "investigation." ~~So also does Jim~~
 Jim Garrison, as District Attorney of New Orleans, ^{where} ~~which is a major part of~~ so many of the people ~~and~~ ^{lived and as he and I say, plotted,} conducts his investigation, under similar attack.

The environment in which he labors is like ours. He is impeded, as we are and have been, in every conceivable way, by those who on other subjects say let "Let us see what is there". Here the stone may not be lifted for too many fear what is vile that is under it. ^{and trying to}

Despite this we have established certain ~~things and~~ facts and the requirement for the answer of additional questions. The previous list of unanswered ones is pristine, awaiting answer, like Brunhilde inside the ring of fire.

Perhaps the most shocking ^{and} ~~the most~~ incredible ^{yet} but the unassailable proof I have mustered ^{is in New Orleans,} ~~that there,~~ too, the whitewash was official, ~~was~~ intended, and until now ~~was~~ successful. There is much that is shameful in the secret history of the federal police, ^{there is nothing as bad as} but their pretense that they really conducted an investigation in ~~New Orleans~~ when they were, in fact, sheltering vermin, brooming the tracks, and engaging in the most elaborate pretenses ~~is worse.~~ ^{investigators}

were complicated with the people they should have been investigating. They bestowed "clean bills of health" like God with his blessings. They involved the honor and integrity of the Attorney General, the President and the entire nation in their last-ditch defense of their chicanery. ~~The~~

They "picked Ferrie clean".

They investigated the Shaw who says he was unaware of it and found him pure, leaving no record of his name in more than 25,000 so-called ^{interviews} reports.

They refused ^{to} follow leads and challenges thrown at them. ^{The government} misrepresented, dissembled, deceived and lied.

They debased and insulted or they toyed with and ignored those who wanted to say what they knew and could ^{say} be ~~glad~~. They played games, making a charade of the investigation of ^{the} President's murder.

They failed to call the witnesses who had to be called, ^{and} ~~and~~ ^{failed to} they did not, when they had the right witnesses on the stand, ask the obvious and necessary questions, no matter how necessary and obvious, no matter what their training, the traditions and practices of their professions, its standards and their obligations ^{and} ~~and~~ for this they demand honor and respect, approval as ^{through} ~~these~~ it is their automatic right for the monstrous thing they have done that is as awful as punishable crimes, worse than most.

They interfere with and impede in every way possible, ^{direction or} ~~By~~ ^{indirection} ~~if~~ necessary, with every effort to bring out the truth, ask the unasked questions, find the unsought and avoided witnesses and evidence, whether it be private, like the writing and circulation of a book or official, like Garrison's investigation. Against both every possible important and powerful voice, from that of the President down, has been mustered and exploited. Not to ~~answer~~ answer questions, not to speak truth or to help those who do, but to make as impossible as they can and as unpopular as a servant press can help them make all effort to ^{discover} ~~find~~ ~~out~~ and prove what really happened when John Fitzgerald Kennedy was murdered.

Why, they end their circus of handmaidens, jesters and literary lustrine wardens ask, why should this have been done, and in asking the question they face east and bow thrice, as though the asking of this question is its own answer, *and as though it hadn't happened*

Why should the eminent Chief Justice (behind whose judicial gowns and reputation ^{so} many who are scoundrels and others just wrong hide like guilty *little* boys ^{behind} ~~and~~ their mothers skirts) be party to a "conspiracy"? This is a favorite question by which those ~~askers~~ who ask it of me plant the idea that he is, which I do not ~~now~~ ^{now believe} and never have believed or even hinted at. Quite the contrary, I regard him as another and another kind of victim. These are not his friends who ask this question, nor are they his defenders or the defenders of any member of the former Commission.

Charles Roberts, that well-rewarded adult who fashions straw men and *he has won a war* in knocking them down thinks ~~and acts as though he were a man~~, put it this way: careful to attribute the words within quotation marks to an omniscient anonymous Secret Service agent (it would be comforting to know that he conducted none of the "investigations"); ~~or made none of the statements~~:

"If this is a conspiracy, it's really a big one. It's got to include the Dallas police force, the Secret Service, the FBI, all the doctors at Parkland, all those doctors at Bethesda, the entire Warren Commission, the Warren Commission staff, the Justice Department, and finally, the Attorney General, or it just won't work." *He forgets the Chairman.*

In ^a his own special character of ~~Burtas~~ ^{Marc Anthony} Roberts adds, gratuitously, "The Attorney General at that time was Robert F. Kennedy."

The measure of the real and the many other Robertses is here: he knows better than the sentiment he attributes to his unnamed Secret Service agent, and he knows or he has no excuse for writing, that as Attorney General the President's brother, I think properly, disassociated himself from active control over the investigation

of his brother's murder. In doing this he removed the one taint to it that is missing. The complaint that the investigation was dominated and directed by a vindictive, revenge-seeking brother cannot be made.

Only a man ~~is~~ lacking in integrity or knowledge or understand^{ing} can seriously ask, ~~if~~ "If this is ~~an~~ conspiracy" without saying what he means by "this". Is he referring to the assassination? To what public authority did in Dallas: To the Warren Commission and its report?

There is not now and there never has been any question about the *assassination*, ~~murder~~. The Commission proved no one man in the world could have committed it under those circumstances. It proved this redundantly and lied about its proofs, claiming ~~that~~ black is white. In so doing it proved ⁱⁿ this way, that Oswald could not have done it alone; and in the many other ~~easy~~ ways ~~it~~ dredged from its own misrepresented evidence and published in the two WHITEWASH books, proved that Oswald could have killed no one—not the President and not Policeman J.D. Tippit. If, no one man could have done the assassination, and on this the Commission's evidence is overwhelming, then there was a conspiracy. Roberts and those for whom he speaks and those he deceives or who prefer being deceived, thinking they find security in it, can say or do what they like, believe the unreality and preach it. They do not ~~in any way~~ thereby change the fact any more than the earlier ~~conspiracies~~.

What happened when Oswald was in the hands of public authority may or may not be a conspiracy. Too much of it cannot be explained in any other way on the basis of the deliberate inadequacy the Commission pretends was an investigation. Before a definitive answer can be given by those with more responsibility than the Robertses, Manchester and Merriman Smiths have, there must be more dependable information. Why the Commission staff (which includes the FBI and the Secret Service) ^{why the} did not gather it and its members did not insist upon it they

alone can say. And they should, they must.

In answering this ~~question~~ ^{as} *relates to the Commission* question it is necessary to define "Commission". If by Commission is meant the members alone, I have no doubt they were ~~never~~ ^{not} part of ~~any kind of~~ a conspiracy. My first book, ~~of~~ ^{of} which Roberts and Smith ~~claim~~ ^{claim} to have written either without having ~~done so~~ ^{need it} or what is no more flattering, ~~not~~ ^{without} having understood it, begins with ~~the~~ ^{this} statement and the reasons for it. Considering the staff as part of a conspiracy is another matter, and another kind of conspiracy. For most there can be no question. The answer is negative. Perhaps this is true of all the direct staff, those on the Commission's own payroll, although there are too many contrary indications that cannot be explained by apologies of "sloppiness" or "incompetence". Between the ~~staff~~ ^{members} and the ~~members~~ ^{staff} there is the distinction of those who are fed a pre-digested pabulum and those who do the feeding. The busy members of the Commission, when they were there - and only a sixth ~~of~~ of the hearings had as many as a single member present - took what they got and had little choice.

The question is not whether there was a conspiracy but how many there were. That there was a conspiracy to kill is beyond question. It has ~~just~~ just been lied about. It was proved in my first book, proved again in my second, and was proved ~~thereafter~~ in other ways by other writers. What Garrison is investigating is one aspect of this.

What is now needed more than any other single thing, in my opinion, is a judicial determination of fact, made by a judge and a jury. ^{Garrison} Despite the opposition and the too-many obstacles ahead of him, I welcome ~~this~~ challenge and believe that it is possible to overcome the necessary difficulties placed in his way by the law and the unnecessary ones by those with a vested interest in his failure and who are doing what they can to accomplish it.

It ~~will~~ ^{may} not be possible to address much of what I raise in this book in that proceeding because of the proper restraints of the law. And the law must work,

our society must begin to function again. It did not work and society fell apart in Dallas. It must work in New Orleans. Regardless of the outcome of the pending proceeding, it must be in accordance with the law, to the degree that Garrison powerful opposition permits. is capable and ~~WILL PERMIT~~

What can be done about the terrified witnesses who have every reason to panic and fear for their lives is a question I cannot answer. The eloquent Andrews, whose picturesque expression before the Commission is addressing reality in saying "I love to breathe". Orest Pena, having been threatened, was waylaid and beaten. Evaristo Rodriguez was threatened and then shot. Whether or not these things are related, who among those called to testified can feel otherwise. The might and majesty of the federal government and the influence of the Attorney General ~~can~~ ^{ought} better be applied to preserving the sanctity of our courts and of justice, ~~then it has been an intrusion against it.~~ ^{instead, them}

A real answer to the "why" need be made, but before that it is necessary to insist that proving the investigation and its official report are wrong is in itself a legitimate and a complete end for a writer. It is not incumbent upon me to justify my once-solitary demand for a new and fully-public investigation by doing the work of that investigation, ^{though to a large degree I have} To establish its need I need only establish the failure of ^{and that I have done.} the one that is past. ^{has} This must be an official catharsis and ultimately, if it is to recapture the respect of its own citizens and of the world, must be accompanied by the frank admission of error by the government. Our entire concept of justice is predicated upon the certain knowledge that men are human and will err. If Jesus could trust Judas, what right ~~do~~ ^{we} have to expect and demand infallibility of mortals. But the mechanism for the rectification of expected error is basic in our justice. To say that a court can err and men in government cannot is childish. So it is no more incumbent upon me to prove every element and aspect of what did happen to disprove the report than it is for the Commission's most prominent legal apologist, Louis Nizer, to ^{identify the} prove someone

who is guilty to defend his client. To insist to the contrary, as Nizer does in public, is to deny the basis of our society and its concept of right. That Nizer's claim coincides with his need to publicize his own book ~~with~~ whose ~~publication~~ ^{accomplish} ~~in the three years in the exercise of the~~ ~~mission~~ ~~is~~ ~~so~~ ~~just~~ ~~the~~ ~~same~~ ~~as~~ ~~the~~ ~~appearance~~ ~~reminded~~ ~~him~~ ~~of~~ the clarion call he had not previously heard perhaps explains it and him.

Not because it is necessary but because it is logical I have ~~here~~ already given one answer to the "why" asked by those who want no answer but use the question ^{as a pretence} ~~as~~ a public-relations, really a propaganda weapon. There had to be a ^{answer and} whitewash because of the CIA involvement. Only the CIA could get away with what ~~was~~ the characters in the story of Oswald in New Orleans dared and did, with ~~what~~ the training of Cubans for invasion of Cuba, with hauling arms across the country, and with the conspiratorial things ^{in addition} ~~that~~ were done in New Orleans and are now in court. This is the ~~the~~ CIA of the Bay Of Pigs, of the ^{Francis} Gary Powers U-2 flight, of Laos and Iraq and all over Africa and many other places. This is the CIA that could and did vest the ^{honor} ~~reputation~~ of President Eisenhower and ^{of} the country in a knowingly false cover story that it knew was ruptured before it was launched; that it knew could not succeed unless the intent was for ^{it} not to succeed, to wreck the growing detente in wrecking the Paris "Summit Conference", which it did do. This is the CIA that corrupts youth in the name of "national Security" and is praised for it. This ^{is} the CIA that is a law unto itself, that is responsive to and responsible to no one, that makes the rules and laws as it goes - that is ^{the} ~~the~~ invisible and uncontrollable government ^{of the government.}

^{remaining} There ~~is~~ in my mind a question about the nature of its involvement. ^{could have been forewarned} It seems to me possible that it ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~misreplied~~ ^{misreplied} by its mendicants and ~~was~~ then trapped by unwillingness ^{to} ~~of~~ let it be known ~~what had done this awful thing.~~ This is conjecture. Nothing else is possible because there was no investigation, because in the shameful sham ~~that is called~~ ^{an} called an investigation this is one of the to many questions not asked, not faced, a hideous skeleton dressed in the Emperor's Clothes.

Extra Space

in the Report

Nowhere is there the name of Clay Bertrand or Clay Shaw. The whitewash is solidly opaque. The Report is too delicate to refer to chains and whips and black cloaks (one of net) and to leather, or to the ritual "marriages" of ^{homosexuals} these unfortunates. Liebelser was too "thorough" to ask ^{how, where} when Andrew Andrews when and when he met Bertrand. Had he been less thorough and more lawyer he would, and he and we would have learned that this occurred ~~was~~ five years earlier, at such a "festival". Andrews, once forthright, once determined to help solve the crime of the century, actually told the New Orleans grand jury of the Commission's lawyer what Sylvia Odio and many others said of the FBI: he didn't ask the right - and the very obvious and very necessary-questions. Thus did the Commission establish "truth".

None of ^{the} ~~these~~ central figures of the ~~new~~ story of Oswald in New Orleans are in the Report. Every one and many more would have been in the Commission's supposedly definitive solution to the assassination had it conducted the investigation and analysis with which it was charged; had the FBI conducted the investigation it says it did and did not and with which it was charged; had there not been the pre-determined solution and the all-covering whitewash. Oswald's public hairs are important. Sergio Arcachio Smith is not. The total suppression of the involvement of these mysterious and unsought figures training ^{on} Cubans for ~~the~~ invasion of Cuba and running munitions across the country while making threats that the President should be killed is of no consequence. This was avoided. What shakes the earth is that Oswald was a ^{allegedly} 12 year old truant ^{an alleged} serving an early apprenticeship as a Presidential assassin.

^{are} nor the other known Cubans and their organizations ^{and associates.}

And J. Edgar Hoover said, "I myself go over these ^(reports) to see that we haven't missed anything."

Extra space

Conclusion

Nowhere in the Report is ~~Debbie~~ ^{David} W. Ferrie mentioned. Nowhere in its 900 pages is there a reference to the strange James Bond document, Lieutenant ^(now) Martello found in Oswald's wallet and "inadvertently" failed to return to him; not to the lieutenant's fixed interest in this mysterious paper ^{that is} consistent only with the establishment of an intelligence cover; not to his anxiety to get it to the Secret Service immediately, or the continuing compulsion that caused him to make a copy for himself and to thereafter give the Secret Service an additional copy and the FBI a separate one.

Captain Martello

Nowhere is there a reference to the GAP or Oswald's interest in it, ^{according} *to the index.* Wesley Liebeler could not use it to show evidence of Oswald's known non-existent rifle skill, ^{if} although he tried, so it was not mentioned at all. ^{in the index.}

Even with the clear inference that Ferrie, a pilot and the owner of a plane, could have flown Oswald to Dallas ^{in September} so that the real and not a false Lee Harvey Oswald could have appeared in Mrs. Sylvia Odio's apartment to be represented as the man who thought Kennedy should be killed and he would show how, this entire matter is not mentioned.

That Ferrie was arrested, known to Liebeler and thus to the Commission, is suppressed from the Report.

The names of Lieutenant Dwyer and ~~Officer~~ Detective O'Sullivan are not once in those 900 pages, although O'Sullivan was a witness.

Lieutenant Martello does appear once - to be used to poison the well against Oswald (page 417):

"Lieutenant Martello of the New Orleans Police testified that Oswald stated he did not speak English in his family because he did not want them to become Americanized."

Voebel, too, is mentioned, and for the same purpose (page 383): "Edward Voebel testified that 'he was more bashful about girls than anything else'." What the Report does not say is that this was in junior high school.

On the same page (middle, beginning "Two days later" and to end of par.

66 8

A not quite identical reference appears in Appendix XIII (page 679), ~~xxx~~ "Biography of Lee Harvey Oswald". Here it says, "In ~~the~~ response to the question whether he had 'any close friends in this school', he wrote, 'no'." On the same page there is reference to the Civil Air Patrol, but not indexed: "He was briefly a member of the Civil Air Patrol...occasionally he played pool or darts with his friend Edward ~~Voebel~~ Voebel."

Oddly, the same source is used to show that Oswald filled in the blank as is cited to show he said "no", Commission exhibit 1413, pp. 9-10, with the reference to the slightly contradictory quotation from page 383 being cited in the footnote on page 679.

FBI Agent Quigley's name is ~~isxxxx~~ not missing from the Report. On page 327 he is among those cited among others as having "declared, in substance, that Oswald was not an informant or agent of the FBI,..."

In an effort to explain away ~~the~~ perplexing behavior of the FBI with respect to Oswald (pp 436-7) the Report mentioned Oswald's demand of the police that an FBI agent interview you. The Report does not mention how exceedingly unusual ~~it~~ ^{to go} ^{and} was for a man ~~going out to~~ ^{get} himself arrested while handing out alleged "Fair Play For Cuba Committee" literature ^{and} after accomplishing his own arrest, ^{ing} demanded an interview with the FBI, even though he had a public record of defection to the Soviet Union and knew he had been of interest to the FBI.

This apologia for the FBI begins: (R 436, ON August, to 437)

~~Two unbelievably attempts at justification of the FBI follow. The first says, "Neither of these discrepancies nor the fact that Oswald~~

Two unbelievable and really contradictory attempts at justification of the FBI follow. The first says, "Neither these discrepancies nor the fact that Oswald had initiated the FBI interview was considered sufficiently unusual to necessitate another interview".

Then the "reasoning" of Alan H. Belmont, Assistant to the Director of the FBI is quoted: (^{to} end of quote).

The Report then states: (next paragraph)

This, of course, explains nothing and compounds the mystery while underlining the evasiveness of both the federal police and the Report. As it was precisely the point that the man Mrs. Odio had introduced to her as Oswald, the man who was going to show the Cuban refugees how easy it would be to murder President Kennedy, could not have been Oswald, ^{also} it is exactly the point

"that Oswald was unknown" ^{to} the "pro-Castro or Communist Party" circles in New Orleans. ^(That He was known to anti-Castro Cubans, which the investigation and the Report suppressed.)

All of this, again, is consistent with one thing: Oswald's establishment of what in intelligence circles is known as a "cover", his own false identity, in this case as a ~~pro-Castro~~ ^{a visa} Castroite, the cover with which he unsuccessfully sought ~~permission~~ ^{a visa} of the Cuban Mexico City consulate to ~~enter Cuba~~.

^{There is} The one additional reference to Quigley in the Report (page 439) ^{in which} once again the authors of that Report seek to shelter the FBI, Hosty, the FBI's "Oswald expert", who, according to Marina Oswald, ^{may} have interviewed her ~~husband~~ husband on an occasion not mentioned in the Report (WHITEWASH II, "Cheche acheherezada"), who did not type up his notes until after the assassination and then regarded the destruction of his original notes as normal,

lil (Begin quote from 439 indented and ^{it} with "did nothing", continuing to end of quote from Hosty.

Thus we have a Report on the assassination of President Kennedy ^h in which the arrest of a man connected with Oswald is entirely ignored and in which all of the solid, irrefutable evidence finds no reference - a case of suppression of shocking indications of the conspiracy the Commission was to conclude did not exist.

We have a Report in which there is no ^{meaningful} reference to the involvement of ^{the CIA} and the Cuban refugees, guests, ~~often mendicants~~, in our country ^{are} not mentioned.

There is, in the story I call "The False Oswald", the most obvious indications of a conspiracy to kill John F. Kennedy, the conspiracy in which, at long last and ^{and that of his associates} to his credit, New Orleans District Attorney ^{Jim} Garrison is now interested.

It is but another and more demeaning evasion for the Commission's members, staff and other apologists to pretend that the Commission did not conclude there was no conspiracy. They hide behind the evasive language characteristic of all the basic conclusions, in this case from its conclusion to the chapter entitled "Investigation of Possible Conspiracy (pages 243-374). This is the chapter in which the appearance of ^{the} "False Oswald" at Mrs. Odio's apartment is dismissed (page ~~32~~ 324) with the nonsequitur, "the Commission has concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald was not at Mrs. Odio's apartment in September of 1963". This is the chapter in the 132 pages of which the entire story of "The False Oswald" and his CIA-suggesting colleagues are ignored.

The chapter on ["]conspiracy ["] concludes ~~concludes~~ there was none. But the exact language, the cloak behind which all officials and their self-appointed defenders now seek to hide, is this:

"Based upon the investigation reviewed in this chapter, the Commission concluded that there is no ^{credible} evidence that Lee Harvey Oswald was part of a conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy."

There are two evasions here, one immediately invoked and the other in reserve, less susceptible to current employment. It is hardly likely in 1967 that the Commission can invoke in its defense the nature ~~and~~ and self-imposed

limitations of its investigation. I have already made too much of it public in my two previous books and numerous radio and TV appearances. The temporary protection is sought in this qualification "no credible evidence".

Without consideration of what is here disclosed, what was entirely known to the government and comes ~~entirely~~ from ^{its} ~~the~~ secret files, ~~of which~~ the Commission's most basic conclusions is that, in fact, there was no conspiracy. The popular phrase of ~~the~~ day was "the lone and unassisted assassin". The exact language of the opening chapter, "Summary and Conclusions" (page 19), the part of the Report also used as a press release, is "The shots which killed President Kennedy and wounded Governor Connally were fired by Lee Harvey Oswald".

There is almost nothing in the Report which is not phrased in different places in different ways, permitting the ~~attempt at~~ pretense that the Commission did conclude this or did not conclude that. But the basis of the entire whitewash of the assassination is in these two things: that Lee Harvey Oswald was the assassin, and that he was the lone assassin, with no assistance of any kind for any person or persons.

Had not the ^{CIA} story of "The False Oswald" been ignored, had not it and the story of "Oswald In New Orleans" not been suppressed from the Report, there was no possibility of even an evasion ^{or} allegation ~~that~~ there was no conspiracy.

In concluding this book, the third part of my own "Report on the Warren Report" which now will have five parts, I declare as I did in ending the first: The expected job has not been done and ~~must~~ ^{must} be, and entirely in public. No more star chambers- ^{now Dallas and Washington} back rooms in Dallas in which there is no person present besides the Commission lawyer and stenographer and the witness. This is a mechanism guaranteed to produce error and to subject ^{part} ~~subject~~ lawyers, the most honest and dedicated of whom should never be subjected to such temptations.

In the ~~best~~ absence of any issues to take to court I believe this ^{total} investigation must be an official one. I believe it must be entirely in public,

with no gamy off-the-record exchanges that include such startling events as the charge of perjury aimed at a major witness by a Commission lawyer. When there is no opposing counsel, the basis of our judicial concept and system, where the adversary system of our justice cannot operate, the least we can demand is the unrestricted admittance of the press and that part of the general public that can be accomodated.

There must be no secrets when a President has been assassinated - none for the solution of the crime and none for the integrity of our government and our society. *The president and the integrity of the country are more important than the CIA*

Where there ~~are~~ are possible criminal prosecutions, they also must be entirely open, entirely above-board, with all the rights of the accused protected and guaranteed, for these are not only the rights of all the accused, they are also the rights of all the innocent, of all of us.

Thus I welcome the investigation of New Orleans District Attorney Garrison and hope that he will pursue it as relentlessly as he has his investigations of police brutality and other denials of human rights in his juridit jurisdiction. He has already been considerably impeded and the time when he can appear before a grand jury ~~or perhaps even the chance of a grand-jury investigation may have been denied~~ by the premature disclosure of his plans and activities *and by the activities of government.* Certainly the first effect of the unwanted and unsought publicity that broke the afternoon of Friday February 17, 1967, was to warn those who might be involved. It is already public knowledge that some of the key people have disappeared, a major participant having fled the country. Others have taken the publicity as a warning to silence, to the convenient lapses of memory that "plagued" so many of the Commission's witnesses who had so much to "forget".

Thus also I have restricted this book to what is publicly available. The documents in it are secret only in the sense that the Commission failed to publish them as it should have. They are all available to qualified researchers. The government supplied all of them to me. I paid for the copying and have the

16
cancelled checks/ to prove it. I am not James Bond; I am an analyst.

And thus also I have preserved the legal rights of those who may yet be taken to court, those who may face a grand jury in the investigation and a jury of their peers in a criminal case.

Our society began to fall apart in Dallas with the systematic denial of all of his rights to Oswald. Had it not, history since then would have been different.

It must not happen ^{again!} in ~~New Orleans!~~