

"Help" to Garrison

Mark was in Europe when news of the Garrison probe broke. Despite the fact that his own work was barren on New Orleans and he had done nothing to help with the investigation as others of us had, he rushed into print with the statement, I believe from Rome, that he was hastening to New Orleans to give Garrison all he had. On New Orleans, from RTJ, that boils down to the seriously wrong information that "Clay Bertrand" is a lawyer. The only reference to him is on p.390 and reads, "... and Andrews had told the FBI on November 23 a lawyer named Clay Bertrand called to ask him to represent Oswald in Dallas." The most casual reading of Andrews' testimony, the most limited comprehension, makes clear that Bertrand is not a lawyer.

There were other tidbits of such "news", particularly on the electronic media. Then on March 28, the New Orleans States-Item carried the abrupt switch, that instead Garrison had given Lane all his information, which is, of course, the only way Mark could know about the case, having done none of the work himself. In what can in no way be considered proper conduct by a lawyer and in a way promptly seized upon by the Defense, Mark said Garrison had given him a "full outline" of his case - rather remarkable because Garrison had by then not fully developed his case, having just begun it.

"When it is presented in court it will shake this country as it has never been shaken before," Mark was quoted as saying. UPI quoted this: "They are going to be embarrassed when the jury says guilty ... The foundations of the country will be shaken when the evidence is disclosed in court." All of this in reference to the defendant alone, not a general discussion of the assassination. From a lawyer? Need one recall the Sheppard decision?

Immediately, defense counsel charged a breach of legal ethics, Judge Haggerty was quoted as agreeing "Lane's remarks are 'inflaming a public from which we must select a jury'."

Earlier, as though he had the remotest knowledge, having neither known nor written of Ferris, Lane, as the Philadelphia Inquirer put it February 24, 1967, "said in Paris the death of Ferris 'may break the case wide open'." His predictions are on a par with his knowledge.

This same story reads, "Lane said he would telephone new information on the New Orleans aspect of the assassination to Garrison." Remarkably, none of this "new information" seems to be in the reprint of RTJ, then just out, and none has been heard of since. What was "new" is the need to sell Mark's paperback edition, and that he did.

The information Mark said he would send Garrison is in its skimpiest and least accurate form in RTJ. It relates to a Mrs. Sylvia Odio, about whom he really knew nothing. The few of the FBI reports on this that he did find he did not understand.

Although there is no such indication in RTJ, Lane wrote a series of articles for the Copenhagen paper, Estrabladet, the one appearing March 31, according to Reuters, reading, "I know who fired

"Help" - 2

the fatal shot at President Kennedy. I know the forces behind the murder of the President. No doubt intending further "help" for Garrison, he also said he "was the only person apart from those on Jim Garrison's staff who had seen the extensive evidence collected in New Orleans."

He has not seen fit to let us know, in the more than a year that since then has passed - a year in which he wrote a new book and earned much money in numerous public appearances - who this murderer is, who the forces responsible are. In fact, his writing is unique in offering nothing like this.

His line, even his exact words, were soon echoed by his friend Mort Sahl, whose concept of helping the investigation is to announce on coast-to-coast TV that a comedian is one of Garrison's investigators. Sahl also told Jeremy Campbell, of the London Express - a young man dedicated to opposing the discovery and publicizing of the truth about the assassination - that he, too, knew the name of the assassin and "when Garrison tells his story, the implications will shake the country to its foundations".

- Others may have different concepts of who, rather than Garrison, is "helped" by such selfish publicity.

With this auspicious beginning, Mark gave up his teaching post at Stanford and moved to New Orleans, where he distinguished himself by doing no investigative work and picking up what he could from Garrison's files. Thus, he was soon billing himself, as in a signed article in a west-coast newsletter, the "unpaid chief investigator for D.A. Jim Garrison".

And all the time I thought that was "Gurvich"!

In the April 12 Los Angeles Free Press, he was writing about the Zapruder film and spilling the secrets of the Garrison office just as though he knew what he was talking about, as though he had done the work he so glibly presented as his, talking about the missing frames of the Zapruder film as though he had discovered them and written about them when he had the opportunity. Of the film Life gave Garrison he wrote, "An excellent first-generation color reprint was delivered to Garrison and screened by the grand jury ..." Aside from the screening, all of this, to anyone with the remotest familiarity with the Zapruder film, is false. It is not excellent, not first generation, and is not even complete. The editing of this rather crude copy is obvious. Among those Mark quotes is his adequately uninformed friend, Gary Sanders, whom he describes as "an engineer who has made an analysis of aspects of the Zapruder film ..." Gary is one of the least knowledgeable about the Zapruder film. It is not taxing reality to say he knows so little about it that, although he is, thanks to Mark, a flatfoot in New Orleans, he is not Garrison's expert on the Zapruder film. (It is, in fact, I who took that assistant district attorney to the National Archives and showed him what was entirely unknown to the Garrison office.)

Perhaps this is subject to ready explanation: Lillian Castellano, who, independently of me, also discovered the destruction of part of the Zapruder film, offered its free use to Mark. In his own superior judgment, he then excluded it from his own writing! (RTJ 66f.) He is

"Heop" - 3

truly an "expert" on "help", though it has yet to be determined how much he has "helped" Garrison. The statistics on the sale of his books, however, does show that we know he helped. Also his fees for public appearances. Aside from picking other people's brains and work, which I think we can look forward to in at least one other book, and acting as a messenger boy when a member of an audience gave him a message for Garrison, it would be nice to know just how much investigation he has done while living in New Orleans.