

# Louisiana Purchase

Who Benefits? Whenever you sit by the fireside at night and wonder why the Louisiana state legislature voted in a way you find peculiar, ask yourself - who benefits? The vote on the Atchafalaya River Basin does at first glance seem peculiar.

The Atchafalaya Basin bill would have kept for the state any land formed in the basin from flood control projects by the Corp of Engineers. At present the land, as it is formed, goes to the private landowners who own the attached land. These landowners are not little men sitting in their shacks by the side of the Atchafalaya hoping to get a little oil on their property. The landowners are primarily large oil companies. The value of the land itself is not important. What is important is the oil and gas on the property - worth over a billion dollars in future revenues. But at stake is not only the dollars in revenue but control of the state's natural resources. Will the people through their government control resources for their own benefit or will the corporations, other governments, control the resources for the enrichment of the few individuals who control the corporations? The bill was defeated, the corporations won.

Now McKeithen and all the senators and representatives have been weeping about the state of Louisiana finances. They say there just isn't enough money to pay for the state programs. Taxes, they say, must be raised. McKeithen's tax proposals included income tax, sales tax, payroll tax, cigarettes and liquor tax, all designed to hit low income people the hardest. McKeithen withdrew his tax program and asked Garrett (Speaker of the House) and Aycock (Lieutenant governor) to appoint a committee to figure out a tax program. We need not fear that anything Garrett and Aycock, with the advice of PAR (Public Affairs Research Council), come up with will be much different from McKeithen's program.

In giving reasons for voting against the Atchafalaya bill, representatives talked a lot about the rights of private property. There is an interesting use of the concept. Landowners in the basin do not at present own the lakes out of which the new land is being formed. And the landowners are not out there filling in the lakes themselves. The land-forming is not an act of God bestowing His blessings of oil and gas on the landowners (corporations). The work is being done by the U S Corp of Engineers, a federal agency, which means the work is paid for by the people. The people pay to create land which they (through their representatives) then turn over to the corporations. The people are incredibly generous.

## Aycock & Atchafalaya

The legislators shed crocodile tears about having to put more taxes on the people of Louisiana and then they defeat the Atchafalaya bill which would have meant oil and gas revenues for the state (the people). The legislators take money from the people in taxes and then take still more in defeating the bill.

Who benefits from the defeat of the Atchafalaya bill? C.C. Aycock, the lt. governor, "actively lobbied" against the bill. He said he talked to every senator. Aycock's law firm, Aycock, Horne, Caldwell and Coleman of Franklin La. represents 4 of the large landowners in the basin. (According to Rep. Lillian Walker, 15 landowners own 85% of the land in the basin. We talked to Mrs. Walker but she wouldn't tell us who the landowners were. Would she tell one of her constituents?)

We hear that Aycock, besides representing some of the landowners, owns some of that basin property himself. Aycock, remember, is in charge of the difficult task of figuring out how to get more money from the people in taxes. And PAR, remember, is giving advice on how to get money from the people in taxes. The president of PAR is also president of Chevron Oil Co. a subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. They probably own some of that property too. - D Fife

With the tax program postponed by the Governor, the Louisiana Highway Dept. is in one hell of an interesting bind. They have \$10 million on deposit and \$38 million in debts...they also lack \$14 million in matching funds for outstanding Federally-sponsored projects.

Beginning in July, the LHD will pay estimates on a month-to-month basis as revenues are collected by the Division of Administration and forwarded to the LHD. Therefore, there will be no guarantee that these monthly revenues will be enough to pay contractors' estimates, LHD salaries, expenses, etc.

In a public-spirited move, the Associated General Contractors of America, Louisiana Highway & Heavy Construction Branch, has directed their members that "when estimates are not paid when due, AGC will consider the Department in violation of its contracts with charter members and will expect payment of 8% interest on all estimates not promptly paid." - Quote from a letter distributed to AGC members, the wk of Jn 23rd.

GARRISON SAYS: " ANY LEADER WHO SPEAKS OUT EFFECTIVELY AGAINST THE WAR . . . WILL  
BE ASSASSINATED"

LOS ANGELES (LIBERATION NEWS SERVICE) . . ( Ed. note: Following is a transcript  
of an interview of Jim Garrison by Art Kevin of WJL radio in Los Angeles)

KEVIN: Mr. Garrison, over the recent few days, Mark Lane made a statement in Boston to the effect that a couple of months before Senator Kennedy was shot and killed here in Los Angeles, as he termed them, emissaries had been in touch with you. And, apparently, he had knowledge of it - to the effect that Senator Kennedy said that he knew there were guns between him and the White House. And that, were he elected President of the United States, he was ready to prosecute these people responsible for his late brother's death. Is that a true statement by Mark Lane?

GARRISON: Yes, that's essentially true, the only thing is, I would use different words in a few senses. For example, emissaries. We had mutual friends that came down to visit from time to time and, as a result, I finally came to understand Senator Kennedy's silence. He was silent, it became apparent, because he realized the power that lay behind the forces that killed his brother.

They didn't come at the same time. One of them did, indeed, when I brought up the question of his continued silence, point it out that were these forces still active in America, the same forces that killed his brother, that Bobby Kennedy, as he put it, was very much aware that there were many guns between him and the White House. And the way he put it, I think it was Bobby Kennedy's quotation - from him.

The details about what he would have done afterwards I's rather not go into except to say essentially what Mark Lane is saying is true. We had a great deal of confidence that, not only in Senator Kennedy as a man of integrity, but we felt that he was a man that they least wanted in the White House. And that;s been demonstrated now. But the phrase "many guns between Senator Kennedy and the White House" was indeed told to me by one of his friends and appears to have originally come from him.

KEVIN: Jim, did you in any way seek contact with Senator Kennedy or did, in fact, these mutual friends come to you?

GARRISON: Well, I told them to let them know so they could let him know that I was going to lean over backwards not to seek him because there were some elements of the press, not all the press, but there were some elements of the press that had smeared me and I didn't want any of the smear to rub off on him in any case. And I recognized by then, it took me a while, but by then I recognized his problem of keeping at arm's length from this particular issue until he became President. So I made a point of not seeking it, but there was kind of, you might say, casual liaison behind the scenes. And he was very much aware, I think - at the end, that we understood his reasons for silence and at the same time, we had become more aware that he knew of this force in America which is disposing of any individuals who are opposed to the Vietnam war, our involvement with the Vietnam war, or any sort of involvement in the cold war.

KEVIN: Jim, Frank Mankiewicz, the press secretary, the national press secretary to the late Senator Kennedy is quoted now in Washington, you know, reaction to Lane's initial statement. He said, "Well, it would be hard to disprove." Is there any kind of proof, you know, other than the knowledge that you have?

GARRISON: Well, hard to disprove what?

KEVIN: Well, hard to disprove the Lane story and your corroboration of it?

GARRISON: First of all, I don't think Mark Lane would say it if it were not true. It's as simple as that. But, I can assure you that I would not, would not say it if it were not true. As a matter of fact, the statement that was made to me that Bobby Kennedy was well aware that there were many guns between him and the White House and that this is why he did not publically go into the matter of precisely what forces killed his brother until the time came later on - this was told to me at Moran's Restaurant on the 700 block of Itherville. But I mean what is this presumption of guilt, the presumption that you're a liar? Mark Lane has never lied that I know of and I certainly wouldn't bother to lie about anything like that. I think that, from what I know of Frank Mankiewicz, he's a good man, but he had nothing to do with anybody in this channel of communication. One of the men with which we had contact from time to time, it was a loose sort of contact, was from New York and another one was from New York state and outside of New York City and another one was out on the West Coast. It was a very loose sort of affair, but we had this liason.

KEVIN: Jim, may I ask you this and you know I don't want to put you on the spot in any way, shape or form and I know you realize that. However, on the record or off the record, would you allow me as a newsman to trace down, you know, some of the liaison people that you are in contact with so that the story, you know, can be more fully rounded out?

GARRISON: No. I wouldn't because it doesn't matter to me. While I'm very fond of you personally, it doesn't matter to me whether or not the story is corroborated that much. It is true and I wouldn't bother to say it if it isn't true.

I think it's a tragedy and its more of a tragedy than most people realize. This talk of violence in the streets is utterly irrelevant. The question is, what's happened to the American and the government in America? That's what's happened. Violence in the streets has nothing to do with it. But I don't want to, I wouldn't want to elaborate on it anymore because I don't want anybody to think, least of all the Kennedy family, to think we're trying to take advantage of the fact that Senator Kennedy is now among the missing.

KEVIN: Jim, a question now that I guess we can call a \$64 question, but are you prepared to say that the same elements responsible for the death of John F. Kennedy were responsible for the deaths of Senator Robert F. Kennedy and perhaps even Martin Luther King?

GARRISON: Well, you can remove the perhaps. The answer is of course except that in the case of Senator Kennedy, they apparently interposed a cover organization. I doubt if Sirhan Sirhan, since he's younger than the professional shooters they usually use and consider him apparently inexperienced as a professional shooter, which insulates the main organization. But there's no, I don't think there's any question about the fact that the same forces removed everyone. Every one of these men were humanists. They were concerned about the human race. They were not racist in the slightest way, and above all, they were opposed to the evolution of America into an imperialist empire-seeking warfare state. Which it has become, I'm afraid. And now there aren't too many, now there aren't too many leaders left to talk out loud against the war in Vietnam. They're eliminating them, one by one. Always a lone assassin.

KEVIN: Jim, in the federal court dialogue that you're having now in the Clay Shaw case in New Orleans....

GARRISON: It's no dialogue, Art. They just jerked it out of our hands before trial so we couldn't go to trial.

KEVIN: Well, the charge now that they've made, as I'm sure you're aware, is one of illegal wiretap.

GARRISON: We never do it and we haven't done with regard to Shaw. When did they say that?

KEVIN: Well, this came on a charge in New Orleans which we picked up today. It came from, you know, our contact that is working in your city of New Orleans. And the quote he gave me from the the federal judgement was, "Shaw's attorneys have charged Garrison with illegal wiretap. Rights of Shaw have been violated by the electronic intrusion of his home." In other words, the implication is that you bugged his house or his phone.

GARRISON: My staff will not even interview anybody in the office unless, they will not record an interview unless the person being interviewed knows that there is a tape recorder there and sees the wheels moving. And the reason I want him to see the wheel moving is if he wants to say something he doesn't want to go down, he can point to the machine and say, "stop it." I am adamantly against the government using these measures, but this is typical of what they've done from the beginning.

They change white into black and black into white. When a witness volunteered to take truth serum, we said well that's fine. We think it's a good idea. And we lined up doctors and they gave him truth serum and then after that, they called it drugs. Until we used it on a witness to make sure he was telling the truth to give Mr. Shaw the benefit of every possible doubt. It was called truth serum. After we used it, it was called drugging witnesses. This is the same thing. I think what they're doing here, thinking out loud, is that they don't have any real federal jurisdiction, but they perhaps have come across a case involving wiretapping and have learned that if they charge wiretapping, even though they know it's not true, they will somehow acquire federal jurisdiction. But these lawyers know better. They know that I not only don't wiretap, I'm adamantly against it. And if anybody in my office did it, he wouldn't be on the office staff anymore.

KEVIN: Jim, one final question. And this again hit the wires, United Press International wires, and it talks about the witnesses in your case against Clay Shaw. And I'm going to quote to you from the UPI copy. It says, "Three persons who once told District Attorney Jim Garrison that Clay L. Shaw was linked with Lee Harvey Oswald or with "Cuban-looking men," are known to have retracted their accusations.

GARRISON: Oh really? That's interesting. Who?

KEVIN: Seedrick and Oneida Von Raleston, itinerant artists from Orlando, Florida and Fred H. Leemans Jr. have given information to Shaw's attorneys countering their earlier statements to Garrison."

GARRISON: Well, that doesn't mean a thing. Those people we felt from the beginning were sent in by the other side because they were so unconvincing and we never intended to use them as witnesses at all. They were kind of like Gurvich. We had endless penetrations and endless appearance of different people and then they were not convincing after they gave us a statement, so we paid no more attention to them. So now, they suddenly appear and say we were witnesses for Garrison. That has no meaning. The whole thing could be solved by letting us go to trial. Why don't they let us go to trial? As we've been trying to do since last fall? Why don't they let me fall on my face? Apparently they don't want me to fall on my face. They would rather postpone the trial and just keep announcing these false statements.

In other words, it's the same power, the same power which was able to get the Warren Commission to come up with a total lie. It is now engaged in keeping Clay Shaw from going to trial. But even while he's not going to trial, they have to manufacture these falsehoods to make my office look like fool man shoe's office. We've never lost a major case and, more important than that, we've never had a case reversed because of any methods used by the office. But already, the press picking up these charges, some of the press has made us look like monsters. We wouldn't use a witness we didn't think was telling the truth nor would we consider tapping anybody's line.

KEVIN: Well, Jim, I hope...

GARRISON: Doesn't keep them from trying, from resorting to these methods.

KEVIN: I hope, Jim, anyway, that we are, you know, allowing a full airing of these charges and allowing a refutation of them, which is in the best interests of us all, as a nation and as human beings. Jim, kind of a philosophic thought just as a final question. I know that you have worked for many many months to the point of great exhaustion and I know that it's been a great personal risk through conversations that you and I have had at other times. But is the truth, the truth as you know it to be and as it exists ever going to come out in your case and in these other tragedies that have befallen us as a nation?

GARRISON: The truth was not as difficult to come across, for us to find, as it is to communicate. That's a good question. I'm answering kind of elliptically. We know the truth, I think quite precisely, but to communicate it is almost impossible because of the steady brainwashing now from the Administration, from some organs of the press. I don't know. It would be brought out at a trial, but I don't know now if we can ever get him to trial because of the forces arrayed against us and the reasons for postponing the trial, which they bring up continually.

The truth is, to put it simply, that America is - it's so damn unbelievable unless you're into it that - it begins with the time that, in a few sentences, the fact that Jack Kennedy was stopping the cold war and getting ready to dismantle the CIA. By then, the CIA was too powerful to dismantle, and it dismantled him, instead. And what I said in the two hours, the war in Vietnam was resumed, the troop buildup was resumed, whereas Jack Kennedy had brought troops back.

Any leader in this country who speaks out effectively against the war in Asia or against the continuation of the cold war machine or against the continued development of power by the military war complex, will be assassinated. And it will be announced that it was by a lone assassin. Many months ago I said even if a President was elected and he tried to stop the cold war and end Vietnam and tried to achieve genuine peace, that he'd be assassinated. And that's still true. And it's just a matter of a professional cover, which is no problem for the CIA because they work on it beforehand and then all you see is the lone assassin.

One final point I might make is - you see it already coming up to the surface in the case of Ray, the man who is charged with killing Martin Luther King, although it's still not clear that he was the professional shooter for the Central Intelligence Agency. But you can see from this pattern, that the CIA is involved in this too, just as they were with John F. Kennedy. And if you became a successful political leader and you spoke out effectively against the war in Vietnam, they'd kill you, too. But it would be announced that it was a lone assassin and evidence would be produced and most of the people in the country would never be allowed to see any of the details.

## **NOLA EXPRESS**

NEW ADDRESS

Box 2342  
New Orleans La 70116

3rd class / return requested