

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM TO ABC'S ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

I S S U E S A N D A N S W E R S

SUNDAY, MAY 28, 1967

GUEST: Jim Garrison, District Attorney, Orleans Parish, La.

INTERVIEWED BY:

Bob Clark, ABC Capitol Hill Correspondent.

Tom Jarriett, ABC Atlanta Correspondent.

MR. JARRIETT: Mr. Garrison, the Warren Commission's findings on the Kennedy assassination concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone assassin, that he did not know Jack Ruby and that there was no conspiracy involved. What have you concluded happened on November 22, 1963?

MR. GARRISON: Tom, our evidence indicates that, first of all, Lee Harvey Oswald was not the lone assassin. Furthermore, he was most likely not an assassin at all.

Secondly, he did indeed know Jack Ruby and our evidence confirms that without any question. And finally, our evidence confirms that there is no question about the fact that there was a conspiracy. Unfortunately the Warren Commission was mistaken in regard to these facts.

MR. CLARK: You say, Mr. Garrison, that Lee Harvey Oswald probably was not the assassin, at all. Do you have

any evidence that would stand up in court that anyone else actually carried out the assassination and fired the fatal shots?

MR. GARRISON: Yes, we do.

MR. CLARK: Can you say anything about this evidence?

MR. GARRISON: No, I can't.

MR. CLARK: How can you conclusively rule out Oswald as the assassin in the face of rather overwhelming evidence of the Warren Report that places him at the scene of the assassination and probably in the sniper's nest?

MR. GARRISON: That is not very difficult, Bob, because there is no overwhelming evidence. As a matter of fact what was done in the Warren Commission investigation was to ignore the majority of witnesses who heard shots coming from the front and they presented -- let's see, that will be 19 witnesses who heard shots coming from the front, and the grassy knoll area, and that is where the fatal shot obviously came from.

The only one called by the Warren Commission was Mr. Zapruder and he was only asked about his camera and the time and so forth of the film. And, of course, in answering that even he pointed out that the shots came from behind him, past his shoulder towards the President. So there is no overwhelming evidence, at all. It is a matter of excluding certain things. As a matter of fact, there is very

little evidence that Lee Oswald was up on the sixth floor.

MR. GARRIET: We do know that they found a rifle with Oswald's palm print on it. They found his palm print on the sixth floor and they know this rifle was fired and they have linked this rifle to Oswald so isn't that evidence in itself that Oswald was there and firing a weapon?

MR. GARRISON: No. It is evidence that Oswald had been in possession of that weapon and it is the weapon that Oswald -- there is no question about that under the name of Hidell, and there is no question about Oswald being on the scene. But that is a long ways away from actually firing the weapon. That is something they were never able to prove and it was an assumption they made and one which fades before any objective investigation.

MR. CLARK: Well, Mr. Garrison, there were five of us in the wire service car which was the fifth car in the procession and was just moving into the intersection in front of the Texas School Book Depository when the shots were fired. All five -- and this would be the Acting White House Press Secretary and four pool reporters -- would state without the faintest shread of any doubt that three shots were fired and they were very loud and very clear and almost over our head from that area. We couldn't testify that they were fired from that sixth floor window but there is no faintest question in the minds of these five observers that three

shots were fired from that area.

MR. GARRISON: That is a good point, Bob. I will give you full credit for having heard the shots from the direction you think you heard them from. On the other hand, you have to give credit to other witnesses in Dealey Plaza who believe they heard them from the other direction. Of the one hundred and some odd witnesses in Dealey Plaza, two-thirds of them heard shots coming from the front in the grassy knoll area and only one-third are conscious of the shots coming from the back. So giving you full credit for what you heard -- and I am sure you did -- we have to also conclude that two-thirds of the witnesses heard shots coming from the front and the Warren Commission doesn't recognize that at all.

MR. JARRIET: Where do you intend to take this case from here? One man has been charged and indicted but not yet brought to trial. Where will it go from here, as far as you are concerned? Will there be other arrests, will there be other charges? If so, when?

MR. GARRISON: Let me answer the one part, first. As a result of some experiences we have had -- and I certainly don't blame the press. Naturally, they want to know about an interesting matter like this but our office was almost put out of commission as if it were bombarded by artillery. We are going to have to defer any further arrests to try and

make them at a later date, but there will be other arrests and they will probably be before the trial.

MR. CLARK: If we can get back for a moment to the question of where the shots came from, the Warren Commission did find quite conclusively and after pretty exhaustive tests, that the fatal shots and the shots that struck Governor Connolly, had to come from the rear of the motorcade. Wouldn't you agree with that?

MR. GARRISON: No. I would agree that they found it conclusively because that is the way they stated but I would not agree their tests were exhaustive. Furthermore, I think it has become obvious that they are mistaken with regard to the fatal shot having come from the rear. I think that the Warren Report in many respects unfortunately is in the position of Humpty Dumpty. It can never be put back together again. But in this particular regard, the conclusion of the report is totally indefensible. President Kennedy was obviously killed by a shot from the right front. First of all it is obvious because of the fact that a study of the Zapruder films, which were never studied by the Warren Commission before it reached that conclusion, shows that his head went back to the back and the rear as if he were hit with a baseball bat. And secondly, because the effects of the shot in other ways that I don't want to go into here, show that the shot had to come from the right front. There is simply no

question about it.

The point is, Bob, that this is one of many areas which would have come to light had there been an adversary proceeding, had there been an attorney of any kind to raise counter-questions, to cross-examine, to raise points, and these points weren't raised so I would conclude by saying that this is their conclusion but it is entirely incorrect.

MR. CLARK: Of course if you say that the Warren Report is wrong, in saying that the shots came from the rear, that they did come from the front, you are challenging the results of the autopsy and you are saying in effect that somebody for some reason falsified that autopsy, aren't you?

MR. GARRISON: Well, let me ask you, first, have you seen the autopsy?

MR. CLARK: No. The autopsy has never been made public but it was available to the Warren Commission.

MR. GARRISON: Do you know any one who has seen the autopsy?

MR. CLARK: I know the members of the Commission saw it. The point would be that you are saying that somebody, either on the Commission or involved in the autopsy, deliberately falsified that autopsy.

MR. GARRISON: No, I am saying -- I think it goes deeper than that. I am saying that if the autopsy is not available I think it is impossible for anybody to make conclusive

comments about it. The autopsy has not been made available. It is still secret. We don't really know what is in it until it is made available so how can we even argue about it? It is being kept secret. Now I think the fact that it is being kept secret raises some questions. And those are the significant questions.

MR. CLARK: Of course it wasn't kept secret from the Warren Commission.

MR. GARRISON: But it is being kept secret from the American people, and people raise questions. It was kept secret from you. It was kept secret from me. We don't know what is in it. How can we argue about it?

MR. JARRIET: You claim, sir, that both the FBI and the CIA are hampering your investigation by hiding the real assassins. If they are, what evidence do you have that they are doing this?

MR. GARRISON: Let me clarify that. The FBI is not hampering us in any specific way. I am sure that the Bureau is not enthusiastic about the fact that we disagree in a number of ways with their conclusions and I am sure there is some pride involved but the primary problem is the Central Intelligence Agency. The Central Intelligence Agency, actually, I think, has answered your question, itself, because otherwise, were they not in a position of having to hide something, Tom, they would not have to hire lawyers to

try and stop the case.

Every lawyer involved in this case, without exception, involved in the attempts to derail the investigation and to stop the case, has been connected by us with the Central Intelligence Agency.

One lawyer, Mr. Plotkin, has publicly admitted that his client worked for the Central Intelligence Agency. He has also admitted that he is being paid by the Central Intelligence Agency and every other lawyer in the case we have connected with them. With the Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Burton Cline and his alleged client, Bobuff, were flown to Washington, all expenses paid.

The point is if the Central Intelligence Agency is not involved then what on earth are they working so hard to stop the investigation for?

But to get back to an even more important point, our investigation of the activities of Lee Oswald in New Orleans showed that his associations in New Orleans during the six months he was there were not merely frequently -- were not merely most of the time, but were continually and exclusively with individuals employed by the Central Intelligence Agency. Oswald's associations were continually and exclusively with individuals engaged in anti-Castro activities. And yet this is not indicated any where in the Warren Commission. But it hits you in the face in New Orleans and there are no exceptions

to it.

MR. JARRIET: Do you believe Oswald was a CIA agent?

MR. GARRISON: No, he was not a CIA agent. He was obviously an intelligence employee of the United States government. This is so obvious that I don't see how they hid it. First of all, his associations at the time, just off the cuff. The fact -- here is a boy who went into the Marines when he was 17. He had never shown any interest in languages of any kind. He was word-blind which makes it impossible to learn languages by yourself, and that is brought out in the Warren Commission. All of a sudden he is speaking Russian fluently. Obviously through one of our Intelligence cram courses, by our armed forces.

And then he is at Subic Bay, which had at that time a CIA function, I understand. Of course, this is general knowledge. If it were private knowledge, I wouldn't feel free to comment on it. But it goes on and on.

For example, when, after all his so-called Communist activities, he wanted to get, in the summer of '63, a passport to Europe, he got it in twenty-four hours. And you couldn't do that.

(Announcement) * * *

MR. JARRIET: Mr. Garrison, you were saying that Lee Harvey Oswald, you think, was associated with the CIA in some capacity or another. Does this mean that you think

the CIA might have had a role in the assassination of President Kennedy?

MR. GARRISON: Well, Tom, in answering, let me just finish one point that I was referring to earlier. Other indications of Oswald's connection with Central Intelligence Agency is the fact that even while in the Marines while stationed at El Toro, as we know from the testimony of Nelson Delgado Terry Thornley and other individuals, even in the Warren Commission, itself, Oswald had a higher security clearance than the rest of his Marine buddies. And the indications go on and on. The telephone number of the local office of the Central Intelligence Agency is in the front of Oswald's book in a very thinly-disguised simple code to himself. And if you accumulate the associations and his conduct, there is no question about it. But I just wanted to complete that.

Now to get to your question: Of course the Central Intelligence Agency had no role in the planning or intending the assassination of President Kennedy. I think that that would be a ridiculous position for anybody to take. I certainly have never assumed that, but what clearly happened -- and we don't think employees of the Central Intelligence Agency were involved. We are going to be able to show it. What apparently happened was that this adventure which was going on in the summer of New Orleans, with regard to Cuba an anti-Castro adventure involving Latin American individuals

and involving Lee Harvey Oswald and others, backfired for some reason. Perhaps after the mission aborted, which it seems to have in early August, 1963, and the U. S. funds were withdrawn from it.

As a consequence, a spin-off, in effect, apparently occurred and President Kennedy was killed by these same individuals.

Now what the CIA did do, and I presume it rationalized this in terms of national security, it concealed from the Warren Commission, from the American people, from the President and from the world, the fact that its employees, its former employees, were involved in the assassination of the President. Now therein lies the culpability of the CIA.

MR. CLARK: Well, why would anti-Castro Cubans turn a plot to assassinate Castro if you feel this might have been involved, into a plot to assassinate President Kennedy?

MR. GARRISON: That is not hard to answer but let me say first that when I say anti-Castro Cubans I am not criticizing all Cubans and no legitimate organizations are involved but in the summer of 1963 --actually before that -- there were a number of Cuban individuals who had very strong feelings with President Kennedy. Stemming from the Bay of Pigs. Then these strong feelings became amplified with the de'tente reached with Castro and Khrushchev in the fall of 1962, in October. In the late summer of 1963, for the

first time, the administration started putting the de-
tente into specific effect and started cutting down on some
of the CIA's activities. At this time our evidence is that
the anti-Kennedy feelings of some of these Cuban individuals
and other Latin individuals became venomous and the outcome
was in what you saw in Dealey Plaza, on the 22nd of November.

MR. CLARK: Have you given specific names to the CIA
or the FBI and told them that you have evidence of an
assassination conspiracy?

MR. GARRISON: If I had any specific names, any specific
evidence, the last agency in the world to which I would
give it at this point is the Central Intelligence Agency, Bob.
It is doing everything it can to obstruct us. We have asked
them for information. For example, the picture which we
know that they took of Lee Harvey Oswald coming out of the
Cuban Embassy in Mexico City, at which time he was walking
with a known employee of the Central Intelligence Agency,
and all we receive is double-talk, so we are certainly not
going to ask them for anything. As for the Bureau, I
think we are going to get more and more cooperation from the
Bureau as they realize that we do have substantial information
about the assassination. At that time all of our informa-
tion will be made available to the Bureau but not to the CIA.

MR. JARRIET: In another area, in the Shell preliminary
hearing in New Orleans, one of the witnesses, a key witness,

testified that he was hypnotized repeatedly before he testified. Another confirmed from the witness stand that he was a dope addict with a very severe habit.

Are these the type of people that you will base your case on, people who have under-gone hypnosis and people who are on narcotics? Do you have other types of evidence or other types of witnesses that will be forthcoming?

MR. GARRISON: Let me answer your question, Tom, in two parts. First of all, I am not going to say anything about the type of witnesses or the names or the kind of witnesses we will produce at the trial, but I want to comment on the rest of your question: First of all, there is the fact -- as to the fact that we placed a witness under hypnosis, this was done to help objectify his testimony. In other words, when we heard the testimony of this witness, the first thing I said was, "I want him placed under hypnosis, I want him given sodium pentothal. I want him confirmed with regard to his statements, and I want the kind of confirmation which has a doctor present and not just police officers." So we thought we had more or less made history when we made him take hypnosis, we made him take sodium pentothal, with two reputable doctors present. We felt this made history in the sense that the prosecutor was forcing his own witnesses to objectify their testimony.

Now to my amazement I find that we are supposed to have

used these devices to some sinister end to plant ideas in the head of this witness and as a consequence we no longer bother to objectify in the way we started doing.

Now with regard to the dope addict, it is true, I would rather have a bank president or a successful lawyer -- well, not a lawyer. We have had a lot of trouble with lawyers, lately, but a successful business man. But it happens to be a fact of life that you seldome find bank presidents and successful business men sitting on the levee alone by the lake at a place where people are likely to have secret meetings. The question is, is he telling the truth or not. There are many attorneys who are brilliant liars and there are dope addicts who have never learned to lie. And that is the case, here. The question is, was he telling the truth, and the answer is, Obviously.

MR. MARRIET: A man you mentioned earlier, Alvin Bobuff, has confirmed reports that one of your investigators offered him money and a position with an airline if he would confirm certain details of an assassination plot and Bobuff later said he didn't know of any such details.

Was any such inducement made to a witness, to your knowledge?

MR. GARRISON: Yes, in a sense, but not in the sense in which they sought to imply it. This was a set-up about which I complained to the Louisiana State Bar Association

long before it became public, although I seemed to have trouble communicating that to the world at large. Bobuff[?] complained that he was unable to even tell us about the case, to my investigators, because he had no job and needed financial help. And my investigators said to him, in effect, that, Look, if you have knowledge about the case which will bring it to a conclusion and you tell the absolute truth about it, you should have no financial problems. We will get you a job with an air line. I am sure the boss can help you. But you have to pass sodium pentothal, you have to pass hypnosis and you have to pass the lie detector test."

Now this is very important because he complained during the course of this dialogue about having to take all three[?] and Lyn Loysell was insistant because at that time we were requiring it, fortunately.

Now the reason you have not seen the tape on this, the much-vaunted tape, is because they cut out the first part[?] where the insistance is made by Loysell that he take the three tests. But they made a mistake and left in it later[?] references by both Bobuff and his lawyer to the three tests he had to take. And by that time we had obtained a copy of it. So now they can't release it because they have been caught cutting a part of it out.

In summary, it is not even close to a bribe. If it were, I would remove the man from my office immediately.

We don't operate that way. No intelligent prosecutor wants a lying witness on the stand because a good defense attorney will tear him to ribbons. It was just an attempt to create the picture of a bribe.

Now what is significant is the fact that the Newsweek magazine, this crummy news magazine owned by the Washington Post, which is a mouthpiece of the administration, has never bothered to find out the truth from us. It has never made any attempt at all, and it has made it look like a bribe and I think that is unforgivable. It raises questions about the motives of this so-called news magazine.

MR. JARRIET: Was anything in the way of jobs or money offered to any other witness if he would tell the truth, or any future security? Any witness such as Russo?

MR. GARRISON: No, I know of no such other incidences. As a matter of fact, it is certainly not a pattern of the office. I would regard it in that case as an incident of enthusiasm on the part of this particular investigator who was sucked into it by the circumstances. I think it certainly not in the best manners and the best traditions of questioning a witness but I think the fact that he insisted it had to be the whole truth indicates a lack of sinister motive. Naturally I have talked to him about approaching any witness that way because of the danger of it being misunderstood but this is the only case I know of. We simply don't operate that way

and I don't think other DA's offices do, either.

MR. CLARK: One of the men who served as an attorney for Jack Ruby -- that was Sol Dan [?] said this past week, and let me quote his words to you, "It would very much appear that Mr. Garrison has improperly discharged his responsibilities. His actions appear irresponsible and not in keeping with his role as prosecutor, which is to protect the innocent as well as convict the guilty."

He is asking that you be disbarred. Is it irresponsible to make the sort of charges you have made in public before they are made in court?

MR. GARRISON: Well, Bob, I am not aware of any particular charges I have made in public, except where they have been brought out by the newspapers, or except where I have replied to some great brain like this attorney. But you are going to find that I have initiated very few charges. For example, the revelation of the investigation itself was made over my objection.

Do you have any examples in mind?

MR. CLARK: I think he is particularly concerned about your linking Oswald to Ruby.

MR. GARRISON: Ah! Let me reply. My linking Oswald with Ruby the first time publicly, was in my reply to the Associated Press last night, to his statement. We have had solid evidence for a long time that Ruby was linked with

Oswald but we have not referred to it for several reasons and one of them is that the man is dead, that he has a family left. We didn't even hint at it until this lawyer came up with this ridiculous comment. So now when you asked me earlier, when Tom did, I felt free to comment on it.

Of course, what it all adds up to is, he would love to see me disbarred because he knows I am going to connect Ruby with the conspiracy and that is going to be very easy to do.

(Announcement.) * * *

MR. JARRIET: Mr. Garrison, by comment you have made, you have cast doubt on a federal government investigative agency, the CIA. You have cast doubt on the Warren Commission's findings on the murder of a president. How would you pass judgment on yourself if in time you cannot prove what you have stated about these agencies?

MR. GARRISON: Well, to take the last part of your question first, Tom, the question will not arise because we have already proved it and we have the evidence. It is a matter of solving the problem of communication. But to any reasonable man in the United States or the world, I can prove that, tomorrow. Right now. So that problem won't arise. But even if it were to, hypothetically, my evaluation would be: at least I have made an attempt to find out the truth and so far as I know this is the first objective investigation by any official agency in the assassination.

Now again, I am not casting judgment on the Bureau because I think that a large part of the facts were withheld from the FBI by the CIA but I would conclude at least we have tried to find out the truth.

MR. JARRIET: You have passed judgment in your own mind but will you take what evidence you have into a court of public opinion and either a legislative investigation, a Congressional investigation, where your evidence can be brought out to the public?

MR. GARRISON: I will take all evidence which is relevant to our case into the courtroom. Actually what you have mentioned is the proper place for it and that is a Congressional inquiry into the CIA's activities. All of our evidence will be made available to the CIA. And if they look into it seriously there is no question in my mind but what the CIA will be reorganized. Of course, we need an intelligence operation but it will be reorganized so it has Congressional control. You cannot have in a democracy an organization which really believes that the end justifies the means and which is not responsive at all to the representatives of the people in Congress. That is what we have. And when you have that, you have a totalitarian power in your country and we have in the CIA, today, because of that.

MR. CLARK: I am sorry but our time is now just about up. It has been a pleasure having you with us as our guest on ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

0 0 0