

*currently
speaking*

... Jeanne Markham Keating



Epstein's New "Inquest"

The July 13, 1968 issue of THE NEW YORKER magazine has one of the most engrossing and lucid articles on the Jim Garrison investigation, which we have read.



Edward Jay Epstein who authored one of the first books of many concerning the Kennedy assassination and the subsequent Warren Commission Report critique has point by point refuted Garrison's numerous charges. The District Attorney of New Orleans who was elected to his position in 1961 has become one of this country's most controversial figures.



This column has previously stated that it seemed apparent Garrison was out to make a name for himself if not something more sinister. I believe that Epstein has proven beyond all reasonable doubt that this is not speculation but fact!



For example: despite the fact that David Ferrie had, according to the coroner's report, died of "natural causes" in this case "of a cerebral hemorrhage caused by the rupture of a blood vessel." Garrison has continued to call Ferrie's death a "suicide." The New Orleans D.A. seems completely unconcerned by facts, whether the F.B.I.'s, the C.I.A.'s or even his own.



Television, newspapers and magazines have in general been most disbelieving of Garrison's numerous contradictions. Because, as Epstein points out: "If a witness tells two contradictory stories, external evidence may make it possible to choose between them." Clay Shaw, Ferrie, and the other individuals

indicted by the Garrison New Orleans D.A.'s staff have not as yet come up with any single piece of concrete evidence, nor have they - - (the defendants had their day in court.



"The staff lawyer Wesley J. Liebeler of U.C.L.A., who was trying to clarify the incident for the Warren Commission, inquired of the C.I.A. whether a photograph showing Oswald in Mexico City did in fact exist. He never received an answer. Garrison postulated that the C.I.A. had forwarded a picture of a man who was not Oswald in that did show Oswald leaving the Cuban Embassy."



"... It seems unlikely that Garrison had any knowledge of this photograph other than what he gathered from the account of it in my book, because he repeats the details of that account, including a certain erroneous detail. As Liebeler, who originally told me the story, pointed out a few weeks after INQUEST was published, the picture in question had been taken of a man in front of the Soviet Embassy. Yet Garrison repeated the erroneous information (my own) to contrive an ominous piece of 'evidence' that was not simply 'missing' but non-existent."



Epstein lists the so-called evidence of Garrison item by item refuting with logic and intelligence the points which the New Orleans D.A. has tried to build his case upon. "Every once in a while, the evidence proves to be nonexistent and Garrison is caught in the act. For example, he stated in his PLAYBOY interview that four frames were taken of the assassination - - frames 208-211 - - were missing from the frame-by-frame reproduction of the film in the testimony and evidence published by the Warren Commission, and he went on to claim that these frames 'reveal signs of stress appearing suddenly on the back of a street sign' and to suggest that 'these signs of stress may very well have been caused by the impact of a stray bullet on the sign.'" But, as Epstein points out "frames 208-211, while missing from the Warren volumes, are not missing from a copy of the film that LIFE holds, and they reveal no signs of stress."



In reference to Garrison's theory that the C.I.A. was implicated in the assassination, Epstein reasons thusly: "... it seems highly unlikely that if the C.I.A. were indeed as sinister as Garrison alleges, it would admit in a report to the Commission that Oswald was a C.I.A. agent, especially since its re-

ports were to be read by lawyers working for the Commission who were not (as my own interviews with them demonstrate) particularly inclined to be secretive."



Mr. Epstein creates an entirely credible theory about the whys and wherefors of Garrison's so-called case. The author believes that Garrison is a paranoiac, and this writer could not agree more! He has exhibited many of the characteristics of mental disorder and delusion. But, please, do not take my word for it -- simply read the Epstein article in the July 13, 1968 issue of THE NEW YORKER. The author is far more qualified than I to debate questions relating to psychological problems. But, still we could not agree more!