

Morgan: Now let me take a second here to explain something to you. I indicated earlier in the program that I'd be talking to Hal Weisberg. ... You've been reading possibly - well, I said talk to Hal Weisberg, by that I mean the guy who wrote "Whitewash I" and has been a constant critic of the findings of the Warren Commission, a man who among others is convinced that the Warren Commission was strictly superficial, it did not probe deep enough; he believes among other things that Lee Harvey Oswald did not in fact kill the late President John F. Kennedy. If you've been following the New Orleans probe - it's been I guess called that of late - Jim Garrison, the district attorney of New Orleans, has been fighting a battle down there to prove some of the things that Hal Weisberg wrote about as far back as two years ago. The New York Times, as I said a moment ago, had in a story a few weeks ago that they have now discovered that most of the information that Jim Garrison started with was taken from the writings of Hal Weisberg in his books "Whitewash I" and "Whitewash II." You might also know that just two days ago the attorney Dean Andrews who we talked with very, very briefly because he didn't want to talk that night, on the phone a few months ago, has been convicted of perjury in connection with his testimony. Briefly, he had said earlier that he knew and could identify the man known as Clay Shaw but identified earlier in his testimony before the Warren Commission as Clay Bertrand, that they were one and the same. The jury found him guilty; he has been sentenced today to 18 months; he's going to appeal the verdict. Now we're going to talk in a few minutes to Hal Weisberg, so let me ask any of you who have brief questions regarding the Warren Commission, regarding the Kennedy assassination, to call now and reserve your place on the line, so you can ask your questions of Hal Weisberg a little later on.

But before we do that I want to play an exciting tape for you. It's a tape made by a friend of mine, newsman Bob Scott of Boston, Massachusetts, with a conversation that he had a few months ago with Dean Andrews. And this was before Dean Andrews was indicted for perjury. The tape was used in the trial as part of the testimony that convicted him of perjury. Now, this is part of the conversation, the very beginning of the conversation that newsman

Bob Scott had with Dean Andrews, Jr., the New Orleans attorney and rather colorful figure who uses hip talk and jive talk and considers himself quite a big man in politics and the crime world of New Orleans. This is part of that conversation. Listen to what Dean Andrews had to say about the assassination, and I would point out to you just briefly, in case you don't know, this is the man that had been an attorney for Lee Harvey Oswald when Oswald was in New Orleans. He claimed that Oswald was a complete patsy, he had nothing to do with the assassination. Listen to this conversation.

.....

Scott: I don't know if you're aware of a story in one of your newspapers down there today, the Times-Item - States-Item, rather -

Andrews: I heard about it.

Scott: in regards to the reinvestigation or investigation by your district attorney Jim Garrison into the assassination of the President, and seeing as how you were mentioned in the Warren Commission testimony and Report we were wondering if you had all been contacted by the district attorney yet.

Andrews: Uh, well, I'd rather not make any comment. Uh, I don't know what these people are doin' or anything else. I've been - oh Lord - ever since I appeared before the Warren Commission I average about once or twice a week people seeking for interviews and I just duck 'em; nothing can come out of it, they can't bring the President back to life again, and I just don't want to get involved in it, and besides that, I like to live. If a guy can put a hole in a President he can just step on me like an ant. It's not my fight, it's somebody else's fight.

Scott: Have you ever been threatened at all?

Andrews: No, I haven't been threatened, but people seem to feel that I know more than I know. In some instances it's correct and in other instances it's wrong, and they just draw conclusions, and, uh, I duck it, to tell you the truth. The more I can get out of it, the - I just run, I mean I'm not interested in it one way or the other. I stay away from it. They all hound me and show me pictures and sit down and talk, talk, talk, and I just listen, listen, listen. When they get finished, I tell them, No comment.

Scott: Who are these people you're referring to, are they government

people or -

Andrews: Yeah, everybody. The people from Europe, the writers who have written books that have been published, researchers, cranks, - you know, the whole bit.

Scott: Has the government shown any further interest in you?

Andrews: Yeah, they watch me. Got a tap on the phone you're talking on now.

Scott: Have you ever run across this Clay Bertrand again that you talked about in the Report?

Andrews: Yeah, one time, but I wasn't able to catch him - he - I'm a little heavy and old, I can't move like I used to. He beat me. He went up the street and I couldn't catch him.

Scott: There's a statement attributed to you in the - in either the testimony or the Report, at this time it escapes me which it was - that you said there were three things that you were going to do, one of them was find Clay Bertrand and the other one was find the guy who really killed the President. Do you ^{still} feel that way?

Andrews: Heh, /"I know"? "Oh, no"?/ Daddy-0, I'm too smart to talk. Like I tell you, I like to live. Most of the answers I know, but I mean, it doesn't make any difference. I've done two of the three, let's put it that way.

Scott: Would you care to say which two?

Andrews: No (chuckles) - uh-uh.

Scott: To the best of your knowledge would you say that Jim Garrison is conducting an investigation into the assassination?

Andrews: I think Jim ought to be able to tell you that. If you call him, he'll tell you whatever he wants. His number is 822-2414.

Scott: I've already tried to contact him and he's not around right at this -

Andrews: Offhand, just what is in the newspapers and the headlines and the reputation - I know these reporters who covered the story and because this is a copyrighted story - it's not a normal thing with the media of communication taking the steps it did with the quality of people that they have - not to my own personal knowledge would I say he is conducting an investigation, but based on the reputation of the reporters who filed this story and the fact that the States-Item took the pains to copyright it, I'd say I guess he is. I wouldn't know. But if they put it in banner headlines and copyright it I would say that the Picayune and the States-Item have information which leads

them to believe they are conducting an investigation.

Scott: Has the Times-Picayune also printed the story?

Andrews: Well, the Picayune will pick it up tomorrow morning. You see, the Times-Picayune Corporation owns both the morning paper which is the Times-Picayune -

Scott I see.

Andrews: - and the evening edition. We only have one newspaper in this town. Morning and evening editions owned by the same publishing firm.

Scott: I see. Well, their reputation is pretty far and wide as far as I can recall.

Andrews: Well, the reporter is Jack Dempsey, he's been a police reporter since I've been a cub - he was a cub reporter when I was a cub attorney and that's what? almost twenty years. He knows what he's doin'. Actually, for the break that you're looking for I think you're pretty mature. There was some people down here from Boston - Carnival, let's see, Monday, the day before Mardi Gras - and they asked me the same things you're asking me, and I don't know, the - I just can't see anything that'll come out of it. What difference does it make? The guy's dead. Mess up a bunch of people, and I'm just kind of conservative, I believe in letting sleeping dog lie. All I can get out of publicity is a hole in my head and my creditors will find me and think I'm famous and want me to pay my bills, you know, which I can't do.

Scott: Do you think Lee Harvey Oswald is innocent as -

Andrews: Aaah, he never killed him, all them people know that, he ain't nothing but a decoy. Everybody knows that.

Scott: Don't you think we should officially clear his name, though?

Andrews: Oh, what difference does it make? To those who know, it makes no difference; to those who do not know, no explanation will suffice. It's - you can't win for losing in this cape /caper?/. But they know, everybody knows, all you have to be is half-way intelligent. That boy lacks three things: he lacks capability, feasibility and responsibility, and the weapon couldn't do it. They took his weapon and the best they had with the feebies couldn't lay three shots in the amount /?/ of time it had to be done, so how could he do it? He's just a patsy.

Scott: Do you think it was Lee that was in your office?

Andrews: I don't think; I know that.

Scott: What possible connection do you think he might have had with those - as the reporters say - those gay kids he came in with?

Andrews: Probably friends. He bummed with a few of 'em.

Scott: Was there ever any question that Lee was on the gay side, you might say?

Andrews: I'd say no, he was not on the gay side, but they were associates or friends and their personal problems were their own and his personal problems were his own; I don't believe the boy was gay.

Scott: That's encouraging. How about, did he - influence or pressure brought to bear on you from outside the country or from this so-called plot or anything of these other assassins?

Andrews: No.

Scott: Do you ever .. /unintelligible/ .. from them?

Andrews: Well, I'd put it this way, I practised international law a long time, I know my way around, I know what I have to do, and I do what I have to do when I have to do it. I think if there is a plot - whatever they say there is, he - the passage of time, the people involved in it grow old, when you grow old you lose nerve, and when you lose nerve you become conservative, and you just fade and you pass. That would be my guess as to whoever did what was done over in Dallas.

Scott: Do you think that in your little dealing that you had with Lee Oswald at all, that he had any connection with the CIA or the FBI?

Andrews: No. He personally, no.

Scott: OK then, Mr. Andrews, I do appreciate your talking to us.

Andrews: I wish I could, you know, go the route with you, but I ain't got nothing to win and everything to lose, you know? - like my life? - and I just enjoy breathing.

Scott: Ha ha!

Andrews: I like to chase the broads and .. /unintelligible/ .. /laughter/ .. and enjoy a few luxuries. I got a very well orderly life, you know, and I'd like it to stay that way. They, these people down here, I think, if what just listening to them and everything else is true, they'll have a lot of fun, they'll probably come close, and j-u-s-t miss. You know?

Scott: Do you really think you know the answer, though? You yourself?

Andrews: Well, let me put it this way: I can come closer than close. But I ain't even going to get that close. I'm a-goin' - if the action's north I'm goin' west - you know? These - it's a very - let me put it to you this way: it's a very fantastic, strange set of circumstances. I don't think this thing was plotted, I think the whole thing happened within 36 or 72 hours at the most; probably 36 hours.

Scott: If we ever open the investigation up again on some sort of a nationally recognized or governmental plane, will you testify before the new investigators?

Andrews: .. /unintelligible/ .. That's not what's going to do it. They done did what they had to do, and the only people not satisfied are people, historians, you know, they want to document everything and they couldn't care less who gets stepped on or what, they're looking for the Holy Grail, and if they can find it, God bless 'em. What they goin' to do with it when they find it? They let Pandora out the box and there ain't no way they can put it back in. All you can get is conjectures. The real answers - to tell you personally yes I know the guy that pulled the trigger - Man, nobody can tell you that. But nobody. But the way - I think what everybody's ticked of at is, is the way in which all this mass of information was assimilated, and it's like defining an elephant. Down on the bayou when I was a kid they told us a little story. Took four blind men to a zoo. One grabbed an elephant by the trunk, said I know what he's like, he's like a snake. Another one grabbed the elephant by the tree and said Naa - by the leg, you know? and said he's a tree, like a trunk. One walked into his belly, says you two cats are crazy, he's like a wall. One grabbed him by the tail, says no, he's like a rope. They all argued loud and long about what an elephant is but they only got one part of him, and that's the problem with the Warren Report. Nobody'll go deep enough, far enough, and strong enough, to take the entire concept, and nobody is intelligent enough or clever enough to start from, say point A to point C, with the variant factors that go in and out of it. Because they do not possess the necessary instincts and training to take all of the pieces and put it together, and that's what they yelling about the Warren Report, that the feebies didn't run this particular lead out, or the four people that talked

with Ruby, they're all dead by strange circumstances, or this or that or this or that. And the real issues in the thing get lost in the mass of the testimony; you don't even have a decent medical report because the fella did a tracheotomy or whatever-they-call-it-thing when they brought him in. But the Big Chief was dead when the first shot hit him, didn't have to pop him any more, school was out. But nobody knows which way the bullet went, north, south, east or west. Did it come from Oswald's window? Actually, I have reason to believe there were three places, and that there were two assassins and a dummy and all they caught was what they were supposed to catch, the dumbbell. The two real people, the hit and the follow-up hit - uh - you can't lay three shots, you know, the way they say they did. But you can figure Assassin A - pow! You can figure Assassin B - pow! and Assassin A - pow! and you got three shots. Nobody can tell the direction the shots come from, and all you got to do is plant something in a person's mind and if he's an alleged witness he'll seize on it and go up and say it's true. And they don't separate the stuff, you see? They leave, uh, plant a picture and come back and ask the guy if it's true, he says yes. And then you get different personality factors that .. /unintelligible/ .. what they can't get away from, no matter how they look at it, is how they caught a patsy so quick. Who leaked the information? When - do you know how to write?

Scott: Yeah.

Andrews: One day we'll write a book, if you ever down here: Who killed Cock Robin?

In subsequent questions and answers, Weisberg said he had heard the same tape, and that "I think that he really gets to the heart of the whole thing, and is quite honest in this tape, which was made the very day .. /unintelligible/ .. February 17. He wants to live. It's that simple. This is a big problem Garrison has right now with people who are afraid. It's a big problem those of us who have written have had..... I think that Andrews was an honest man at that point, I think that he was quite frank in saying that the thing that would motivate him would be his desire to live - he expressed

Harve Morgan (Dean Andrews) - 8

it better than I " Morgan asked if Andrews was merely trying to sound like a big man who was in danger. Weisberg replied: "No, not at all. When he was before the Commission he gave excellent, straightforward testimony. He was one of the few men who dared to take issue with the Commission. He argued with them about whether one man could have done the shooting. He didn't know the evidence the Commission was suppressing. That evidence proved him to be completely correct, that no one man could possibly have done the shooting. No, I think that he wanted the truth to come out, but he wants to live. It's that simple." Weisberg said, in response to another question, that he thinks Andrews told the truth when he said in the interview that he didn't know who pulled the trigger.