

I want to focus particularly on New Orleans and outline what recent news had developed. I want to go through briefly the investigation that the Commission conducted, and tie it up as much as possible with the stuff that is coming out now from Mr. Garrison's investigation.

When the staff of the Commission was chosen the work of the staff was divided in 7 <sup>general</sup> different areas. One of them related to the *physical course of the* actual assassination itself. What actually happened that day.

*basically* That concerned firearms, identification *trajectories* for check areas and the *place-* time of the shots and that kind of thing. *Another group dealt* Grouped up with the problem of the identity of the assassin.

*of them* One dealt with the area of protection, *Presidential* the other dealt with the possible involvement with Jack Ruby in the conspiracy.

Another one dealt with Lee Harvey Oswald's activities outside *- which consisted primarily of his trip to the Soviet Union and* the United States which comprised *his trip to Mexico in the Fall* of 1963. The only other area *in which most of the conspirators* aside from Ruby and the involvement *possible* of

*of conspirators* *out-of-the-country* *comprehended* in the possible connection with Oswald's other activities was *under* confined to a *and that dealt with* great variety in which I worked on all of Oswald's con-

*- from the time he was born to* tacts and activities since the time of the assassination. There were two of us working in there, *that area* a Mr. Gener, *a lawyer in Chicago,* who has made some remarks since the assassination, which are mentioned in *Mr. Lane's book* the postscript

to his book on some other areas, some of which are not easy to com- *forgetfulness and some* bat unfortunately. I think this was unfortunate *part* for Mr. Gener and

*and myself.*

When we started to work we went through all the FBI reports *and other intelligence reports, but primarily FBI reports*

*missed formation*

that related to anything in Oswald's background, whether it would be any possible motive or a possible conspiracy. We took testimony and we requested an additional investigation from the FBI. We took testimony in 3 different places, New Orleans, in Dallas and in New York. We took testimony in New York because we did take testimony of the leaders of the Communist Party and the Q Committee and the Socialist Labor Party. *Fair Play For Cuba* *Q* *????*

*we*  
When I took a look at the New Orleans situation, we found and this is something I did myself, with all respect to Mr. *J* Gener, an older lawyer and he was running for he was president of the American Bar Association at that time. *And he was more concerned about writing letters to his lawyer friends at that time about promoting his candidate cy\*\*\* ???* *And he wasn't going to show us the air reports of which there were stacks of them. dealt - and most of the other lawyers did this* The way I ~~did this~~ *dictated* and the others ~~did too~~ *relate to David Ferrie and* going through the reports we ~~picked~~ *picked* the index cards, and I have a *batch* in my hand here, most of which came out of my own personal files.

*xxx??*  
I kept all these ~~cards~~ *cards*, and when this thing broke in New Orleans *I went back and used them and pulled these cards - xxx these xxx relate to Ferrie xxx couple that don't I was asked to remove them to here. And this refers to my alphabetical file, by name. There was a top index that we worked in too, of different topics* *cross reference to the main theme. The FBI reports were all given documents numbers. This one here is a missive document 75, which was about that thick, a whole bunch put together of the different agent's reports that were put together, and they referred to the Oswald activities of the agent in New Orleans. The commission document number, various numbers and a brief summary of what the report said about Ferrie*

*put together*  
*xxx*  
*related primarily*  
*of course,*  
And then as we started to piece things together, we went



(on the basis of both these index cards and)

back to the original reports and decided ~~which~~ of the original reports <sup>what witnesses</sup> ~~and these card~~ we would actually take testimony from, ourselves. We did not take Mr. <sup>Ferris's</sup> Berry's testimony. He didn't testify before the Commission and neither Mr. Terner <sup>or</sup> I examined him in New Orleans.

The reason we didn't <sup>for</sup> in that decision, better or worse at this point <sup>for</sup> ~~was~~ primarily my own. ~~These (?) decisions, at this point, made on the staff level - They obviously~~ <sup>would have to be, because a whole mass of FBI reports because</sup> ~~was a decision of my own, obviously we had to. Therefore the Com-~~

missioners were not sitting down there until 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning. <sup>going through those FBI reports</sup> ~~So they made a determination of what this was going to be~~ <sup>factually</sup> ~~called.~~ <sup>(witnesses were</sup> There was some particular witnesses the Commission desired <sup>was made on the staff level.</sup> ~~various reasons.~~

to call for witnesses. They of course indicated that <sup>xx??</sup> But as far as <sup>of someone like Ferris, that was made on the staff level and at</sup> the exclusion, ~~it was somewhat varied, that was~~ basically my decision. <sup>had indicated</sup>

~~And~~ The reason I decided not to call him was because the FBI <sup>was</sup> what I regarded as a very thorough examination, ~~and~~ investigation <sup>into</sup> as to what he had done at the time of the assassination, where he had been, and to look to the possibility that he had known Oswald and been connected <sup>(in any other way.)</sup> with the assassination. And on the basis of the FBI reports, it seemed to me that he didn't have anything to do with it. <sup>So he became one - his name joined</sup> But his name became join <sup>ed the</sup> to one of a thousand <sup>of</sup> other names <sup>that appeared</sup> given in the FBI reports whose testimony was not taken by the Commission.

<sup>I think at the time -</sup> I think if I had to make the judgment over again I'd probably <sup>The benefit of hindsight of course, there's the benefit of hindsight in</sup> make the same judgment without ~~deciding, and we can't take his testi-~~

<sup>as the case may be</sup> ~~mony.~~ <sup>this kind of a</sup> Fortunately or unfortunately, if a lawyer is involved in a <sup>Ferris is one of the -</sup> situation, where he doesn't have to. ~~Terry is one of Carrison's~~ <sup>had</sup> characterized as to what he meant. <sup>now</sup> And Mr. Shaw <sup>xxx??</sup> as you know has been both indicted <sup>held</sup> I guess and bound over for <sup>a</sup> his own hearings for trial on <sup>conspiracy</sup> the charges of <sup>a</sup> spying with Shaw, with <sup>preliminary</sup> Terry, rather, and

xxx

\*\*\* The Commission concluded that it couldn't develop any substantial evidence that he did.

Oswald, to assassinate the President.

Another character who was involved in this was a lawyer by the name of Dean Andrews. And we didn't take Mr. Andrews' testimony

because the FBI reports indicated that he may actually have had some contact with Oswald. ~~But~~ I don't know to this day whether he did. It

*It was quite certain the FBI reports said Forgie did not. But Andrews - IN MY OWN MIND have concluded that he had not seen Oswald. Oswald had been involved in this some ones that Oswald had been involved with 2 or 3 times to his house two or three times, in connection with some personal legal matters that had to do with his own discharge from the Marine Corps,*

his wife's immigration status and his own citizenship status. Andrews testified, and it was kind of interesting, Andrews came over a couple of times when I was in New Orleans. *I think three times.* The first two times I was there

The second time Andrews came over we would ask the Secret Service to give us notice for anyone who wanted to take testimony. The first

time he came over I had to go to Dallas or something, or I was being delayed, or something. *The people that we show he came late - I wasn't able to take his testimony. I wanted him to come on.* The second time he wouldn't come, so we had

to subpoena him. He came under subpoena. And also, in the subpoena, we asked him to bring with him any records that he might find in his office to indicate whether or not Oswald had ever been in his office.

Well Andrews came over and I took his testimony. I don't know whether any of you saw him the other night, it was a week ago

*how many, Mart Sahl, I think*  
Friday, it was kind of an amusing thing from my point of view because *he had two guys, Mr. Sahl and one of his producers, and they read* Mr. Saul read Mr. Andrews testimony. *Mr. Sahl is one of his producers and he read Andrews testimony.* Mr. Saul played my part, reading my line, and *his producer read Mr.* took Andrews' lines and I was somewhat amused to see Mr. Saul taking the part of *Wesley J. Liebeler* a West Virginia laborer. But *as I indicated,* in any event Andrews testified that Oswald had been in his office



two or three times and that there had been some people with him -  
different people all the time except there was one Mexican who <sup>looking fellow that Andrews</sup> ~~he~~

different

described as wearing a silk pongee shirt, <sup>that</sup> he was with him a couple of  
times. He <sup>xx32 that were</sup> ~~was~~ with Oswald <sup>seemed to be</sup> to become homosexuals. <sup>And</sup> This tied up

with other rumors that had developed, in the French ~~quarter~~ <sup>quarter</sup> that  
people who <sup>inhabit the quarter, in the</sup> ~~had~~ a homosexual community ~~had~~ had seen Oswald in the <sup>quarter</sup>  
court room with <sup>an assorted</sup> a sort of group of homosexuals. The FBI made a  
pretty thorough investigation <sup>in the quarter trying</sup> and tried to trace this down and they weren't  
were unable to establish the fact that Oswald had ever been there.

And there wasn't any other independent evidence that Oswald had  
any homosexual proclivities and <sup>Maria</sup> Marie Oswald testified that he

stayed pretty close to home <sup>during this period of</sup> at that time. At least he wasn't out of  
the apartment overnight. <sup>And</sup> The testimony now is that <sup>he was apparently at</sup> it was probably

one point living <sup>with Ferrie,</sup> affair which is not consistent with what Maria  
said. <sup>But again,</sup> That began <sup>d a</sup> to involvement of the judgment of course as to the credi-

bility of <sup>of Marie Oswald, and my own view on that has been that I think her</sup> what was said by Marie Oswald. The testimony is not of much weight  
unless it can be cooperated <sup>by</sup> with an independent investigation. <sup>evidence, xx32</sup> ~~It has~~  
<sup>not to give it very much weight.</sup> ~~not been confirmed as to its weight.~~ <sup>entitled to very</sup> <sup>I'd be inclined</sup>

Andrews - The interesting part of this evidence is that Oswald wanted Andrews  
to go back and see if he could go back and clear up his discharge - <sup>he received</sup>

of a bad conduct discharge

from the Marine Corp. and Andrews said - Andrews is a very interest-  
ing fellow. <sup>French-Quarter juve talk,</sup> He talks in a sort of modified way, and I must say some

of his lines were very <sup>very,</sup> amusing. <sup>He threw me</sup> At one point <sup>by</sup> he referred to some-  
thing called the Febbies. <sup>was not alert enough to discover - to understand</sup> And I asked him what the Febbies were, <sup>at first glance,</sup> so  
and he said, <sup>"How know, the Febbies"</sup> the Febbies <sup>are</sup> the FBI, and <sup>but</sup> it was possible to under-

*But his testimony was -*

stand him. He said <sup>that</sup> someone had broken into his office and ~~he~~ ruffled  
roughed through his papers and he couldn't find any papers that re-  
lated to <sup>that showed that</sup> ~~show~~ Oswald had been there. His Secretary - the FBI question-  
ed his secretary - she had no recollection of Oswald ever having  
been there. <sup>his independent -</sup> And his private investigation had a vague recollection  
that he might have been, <sup>he really couldn't</sup> but he was very unspecific about it.

*on the day of the -*

The most interesting thing about Andrews' testimony, <sup>though,</sup> was his  
statement that it was either the 22nd or 23rd, I believe it was the

23rd <sup>fairly</sup> he was in the hospital at that time with pneumonia. He was  
under very heavy sedation, he said, and sometime in the afternoon, he

was unclear as to the <sup>exact</sup> time, he received a telephone call from some-  
one <sup>from</sup> a voice that he recognized as a Clay Bertrand and this voice

asked him, Andrews, if he would represent Oswald in Dallas in con- <sup>he had only</sup>  
nection with the charges <sup>at that point. I think he had only</sup> of that had already been brought against him <sup>been charged with</sup> shooting <sup>with</sup>  
<sup>Officer Tippit.</sup>

Andrews then said that he called another lawyer in New Orleans by the  
name of Monk Zelden, <sup>Z-E-L-D-E-N-I</sup> and asked Zelden if he would represent Oswald be-

cause he, Andrews, was sick and couldn't do it. Zelden told Andrews  
at that point that he <sup>didn't</sup> wouldn't have to worry about <sup>Andrews didn't have to worry about it -</sup> him because Oswald

had been shot. <sup>This</sup> ~~it~~ was Sunday when Andrews called Zelden. <sup>And so</sup> The matter  
was dropped at that point.

When Mr. Garrison's investigation broke I <sup>what</sup> was back <sup>and reviewed</sup> to see  
what the Report said about this. And Andrews' testimony was un-  
believable standing by itself, in terms of either his inability to  
identify Clay Bertrand <sup>or -</sup> and it was unconvincing that Oswald had ever  
been in his office and it was unconvincing and unclear as to whether  
he ever received this telephone call or not because for various reasons,



One of which was the time problem, he first testified that his private Investigator was there at the hospital <sup>when</sup> at the time he got the telephone call. His private Investigator didn't remember the telephone call coming into the hospital while he was there. But the Investigator was there sometime after four o'clock on Saturday afternoon. Andrews testified <sup>that</sup> after he got the call he called his <sup>about it.</sup> secretary, and his secretary said that Andrews hadn't called him about it, as I recall. Hadn't called him at all until - if he had called it was prior to 4 o'clock <sup>prior to the</sup> the time Andrews said he got the call from Bertrand, which was supposed to be verified by <sup>(presence of the)</sup> the detective. The secretary didn't remember the call. And the report so indicates. One of the thing of course, when I sat back and thought about <sup>again, after the Garrison thing broke, cause I went out -</sup> this, the report didn't say anything about what Mr. Zelden said about this and we didn't take Mr. Zelden's testimony. <sup>in which the Bureau set him about this</sup> But I went back to my files and I found the FBI report of an interview with Mr. Zelden. And Zelden said Andrews had called him, about this. <sup>And that is not reflected in the report. And</sup> That is one of those things one can observe <sup>that about after the fact</sup> and say well <sup>you made</sup> it was a mistake. <sup>(And I suppose that I did, in that context.)</sup> And <sup>you interviewed Andrews-Zelden, rather, and we should have reflected in the</sup> we should have requested a report that Zelden said that Andrews had <sup>I have no idea what the relation ship between Andrews and Zelden is.</sup> called him. <sup>I would like to know the position of Zelden and Andrews is.</sup> Zelden is acting as Andrews' attorney. <sup>(at this point Andrews at this point has been indicted personally by the grand jury.)</sup> Apparently Zelden had said that Andrews had called him. Andrews had been indicted personally <sup>(Apparently - / now I haven't seen this in the paper, but I'm told)</sup> by the Grand Jury. Apparently I am told that the indictment doesn't <sup>but in fact</sup> relate to any of his testimony involving Oswald <sup>but</sup> relates to questions that <sup>Garrison</sup> were asked Andrews as to whether or not Andrews had <sup>going</sup> been around putting up bail, <sup>(posting bail, putting up bail. Andrews?? a whole slew of these homosexual and</sup> apparently they run off the <sup>10 of The French Quarter</sup> streets every Friday night, <sup>probably make room on the tourists, I don't know, but he goes out and he fails these people out.</sup> He does go out. He said that many people out.

times Bertrand <sup>use</sup> to call him and asked him to go <sup>and</sup> on bail ~~for~~  
~~for~~ these different homosexual <sup>out.</sup> jobs. Andrews, subsequent to all  
<sup>- to his</sup> this testimony and subsequent to the time <sup>\*\*\*??</sup> he became <sup>an</sup> Assistant  
 District Attorney <sup>of Orleans Parish - of Parish</sup> in Jefferson County which is next to <sup>Orleans Parish,</sup> Orange County,  
<sup>it's not</sup> and it is illegal for a District Attorney to go out and post bond  
 for these people that are picked up by the police, I suppose for  
 fairly obvious reasons, and I am told Garrison asked Andrews if he  
 had been going around putting up bail for the homosexuals after he  
 became Assistant District attorney, <sup>Andrews</sup> and he said, <sup>" "</sup> no that he hadn't. <sup>and</sup>  
 So there <sup>the</sup> is a purjury count <sup>apparently relates to</sup> in his testimony.

Now I had at first thought, and the impression was given in  
 the newspapers, that the reasons <sup>that</sup> Andrews was indicted for purjury,  
<sup>because</sup> is <sup>show as clay</sup> that he declined to identify Clay Bertrand, which he did do.  
 He said that he couldn't say that Shaw was Bertrand and he couldn't  
 say that Shaw wasn't Bertrand. Which goes back again to the fact  
 that when I asked him about this <sup>well,</sup> - first of all, the FBI kept after  
 him, they were looking for Clay Bertrand <sup>out</sup> through this entire <sup>period after the</sup> assassi-  
 nation, they were looking for him throughout New Orleans, and the  
 Secret Service was <sup>went through all the -</sup> too. And they did all the things the FBI <sup>usually</sup> does  
 to try to locate someone, and they <sup>were not able to</sup> couldn't find anybody <sup>by the name of</sup> that ~~know~~  
 Clay Bertrand. <sup>and</sup> Of course they kept pestering Andrews about it.  
 They <sup>d</sup> would come back in a week and say "Have you seen the guy, do  
 you know anything <sup>it, can you help us any more?"</sup> more about him" <sup>So the</sup> Finally <sup>then questioning of</sup> in the FBI report on  
 Andrews, <sup>well,</sup> ~~he~~ said Andrews finally concluded <sup>that</sup> he had made the whole  
 thing up, he was under sedation and <sup>he just, well, he just, uh, at</sup> ~~was~~ was a figment of his imma-  
 gination. <sup>Andrews</sup> But when Andrews and I took <sup>well,</sup> testimony he said that



is what I told the Febbies, because you know how it is. When they are after you they are like cancer, they are after you all the time.

*He said*  
*and he finally*

*tell them*

to ~~They can put down anything they want in the report. Just stop them bothering about it. P. But then he~~

The patient testified that subsequent to his last interview by the FBI, and <sup>prior to</sup> ~~by the time~~ <sup>(I took)</sup> ~~his testimony~~ <sup>(which was in the 3rd week of July, 1964)</sup> reached the report that he had seen Clay Bertrand in the street, in a bar. And when he walked in <sup>to</sup> the bar and saw Bertrand, he immediately went over to call the Secret Service, to get them to come down and pick this guy up. And Bertrand saw him and ran out and got away. This is the only time <sup>that</sup> Andrews had seen Bertrand subsequent to the telephone call, and the only time <sup>that</sup> he had seen him prior to that was <sup>(sometime -</sup> ~~he~~ <sup>night. He said primarily he knew Bertrand as a voice.)</sup> was not clear when. As much as a year or two prior to that, But he hadn't seen him before. He was able to

recognize him when he saw him in this bar. He told the FBI that Bertrand was about 6'1" tall <sup>(and he - I don't know - his color -</sup> and he mentioned the color of his hair. He told me that the guy he saw in the bar was 5'8" and he had a

different color hair, a <sup>completely</sup> ~~entirely~~ different description. I asked him if he could explain the apparent discrepancy between <sup>and</sup> the description he gave the FBI about Bertrand's description <sup>(what he told the</sup> ~~which was~~ <sup>Bertrand's physical characteristics - and</sup> ~~very different from~~ what he told me. And his answer was somewhat

typically <sup>that</sup> of Dean Andrews. He said <sup>and measure them. And I have</sup> look I don't ~~type out how God made~~ him. I had a picture of Dean Andrews standing there with one of these

*broads, I know, making*

~~tries at a triangulation~~ But now <sup>he is not able to</sup> ~~it is valuable that he testify one~~

way or the other ~~as to~~ whether Shaw is Bertrand. <sup>The way that - obviously,</sup> That whole sequence <sup>(I don't)</sup> would be significant if it could be pursued and legitimately developed. We were <sup>The FBI wasn't able to do it at</sup> ~~unable to do it,~~ <sup>yes</sup>

*the time,*

Because we were <sup>unable</sup> ~~unable~~ to find any indication or any evidence as to

who this Clay Bertram was. <sup>And he couldn't</sup> ~~It wasn't~~ <sup>it</sup> pursued any further in that direction. The way that <sup>Garrison</sup> ~~it~~ is apparently <sup>going to</sup> when you tie this whole thing in with Shaw, as you probably know, relates to the testimony of

this <sup>pe</sup> Harry Russo, who <sup>said</sup> will testify before the preliminary hearing <sup>at Ferris's apartment, and that Shaw and Donald and Ferris just sat there</sup> that he had been at a party with Oswald and Shaw. ~~And part of~~

<sup>toward the end part of this party of the President</sup> ~~and plotted~~

the assassination. I don't know how many of you have seen the article that James Phalen has written in the Saturday Evening Post, in the last issue or the issue before that - there is a story in the L.A.

Times about it, too. I talked with Mr Phalen after the article came out <sup>he has sent me, he said, I haven't received it yet but</sup> he lives down in Long Beach and he is going to send me copies

<sup>a</sup> of these two memorandums. ~~I haven't received them yet,~~ that he <sup>and which were mentioned in the story in the L.A. Times.</sup> talked about in the article. If Phalen's story is true, and

it is based entirely, he says, on two memos that Garrison gave to Phalen when Phalen was talking to him in Los Vegas shortly after

this whole thing broke <sup>and</sup> <sup>over</sup> Garrison <sup>came over</sup> to Los Vegas, and that I know is true <sup>a couple of other</sup> because I know people who talked to him at the time.

Phalen <sup>said</sup> ~~he~~ talked to Garrison in Los Vegas for sometime <sup>and</sup> about this late one evening and Garrison gave him these two memos

<sup>had been prepared by Max Scrambra, I think his name is (spelled) s-c-r-a-m-b-r-a, an</sup> ~~Assistant~~ <sup>these two</sup> ~~memos reflected~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~The first~~ memo reflected <sup>in</sup> a conversation that ~~Giasciabra~~

had had with Russo <sup>where Russo lives</sup> over in Baton Rouge, and in this memorandum

~~Giasciabra~~ <sup>in that-that</sup> states Russo had seen Clay Shaw on two occasions <sup>to his knowledge</sup> at his lodge. One was a parade of some sort, and another time he <sup>at</sup> <sup>I think it was a parade when Kennedy was there some years back</sup>

<sup>driving a car down</sup> saw him <sup>on</sup> the street. There is no indication in <sup>Scrambra's</sup> this first memorandum that Russo had ever seen Oswald, <sup>had</sup> ever seen <sup>Ferris</sup> Perry,

or had ever seen Shaw in their presence. <sup>now</sup> ~~I mean~~ the second document



(and he promised to provide me)

that Phelan has, ~~or~~ copies of, is a transcript of a session

that Russo had with Garrison and with ~~Giasciabra~~ <sup>m</sup> and a Dr.

Who is a hypnotist, apparently.

Fatter, and they had Russo come in and put him under hypnosis and

they first asked him - <sup>whether he's ever - They talked him - XXX</sup> (first they placed him - <sup>Fatter said, "I</sup> they said they wanted

him to visualize <sup>on which you are in Dave Ferris's apartment. And</sup> this television screen. There is a tall, white-haired

man there. And they are discussing something important. And they <sup>was still</sup>

~~were noting~~ <sup>no</sup> the reaction on Russo's part. <sup>(Fatter said)</sup> Then while Russo was

under hypnosis, ~~they said~~ I want you to visualize a meeting with

Clay Shaw, Lee Harvey Oswald, and David Perry <sup>Ferris</sup> and they are discussing

something very important, and then Russo came forth with the story,

that I had been in <sup>Ferris's apartment</sup> Portland and seen these people, and were discussing

the possibility of assassinating the President.

Now Phalen told me that he went back <sup>down to New Orleans after this. He</sup> and made copies of the

memos he got and <sup>Garrison</sup> they let him keep them over night, but ~~he had to~~

~~return them~~ the next morning, and ~~he~~ made copies of these memos.

He said Garrison <sup>had</sup> did not restrict him in any way as to their use.

DOWN TO NEW ORLEANS - PHALEN WENT BACK DOWN TO NEW ORLEANS, WENT OUT New Orleans and I went to one night

And, he went back to Garrison's house and he discussed thoroughly <sup>this problem</sup>

with Garrison, and Garrison said he was not aware that ~~Giasciabra~~ <sup>m</sup>

had not mentioned this meeting, <sup>in fact he had never</sup> But he said Phalen said he has the distinct impres-

SION THAT GARRISON HAD, IN FACT, NEVER SAID, "LOOK, WE'LL GET OUT HERE NOW, AND THEY DID. THEY CALLED ANOTHER GUY OUT TO GARRISON'S HOME, AND GARRISON ASKED HIM ABOUT IT. AND SCARABOT SAID, "WELL, LOOK, HE SAID, HE and Garrison said "Russo did mention this the first time I talked with

him but I was so busy doing a lot of other things that I just didn't

<sup>35th word</sup> read this memorandum he wrote. Mr. Phalen said to <sup>him "you know"</sup> me you remind me

of the story of the fellow who went out for a walk <sup>and came home</sup> and wrote a

little memorandum of what he found that day." And when the fellow

was out walking he found two cigarette butts and <sup>an empty</sup> a gum wrapper,

The "Star of India": And

and he came back and wrote a memorandum about what he found that day and he mentioned the two cigarette butts and the gum wrapper.

But he failed to XXXX'ST+12 OF INDIA!

AND

That is a sort of <sup>apt analogy</sup> ~~after~~ <sup>very</sup> ~~clear~~ of the

fact that Russo had mentioned this in his first interview, and it would be reasonable to expect <sup>with Sciamba</sup> ~~Mr. Giacciabra~~ <sup>that</sup> ~~would mention it~~ <sup>in the memorandum that he wrote.</sup> But

he didn't. <sup>now</sup> I notice by today's paper that Mr. Garrison has asked Mr. Phalen to come down and testify before the Grand Jury about this

whole thing. Phalen is not here now, he ~~has~~ gone back to Washington and he won't be back here for 5 weeks or so; I ~~don't~~ <sup>have no idea</sup> know what ~~he~~ <sup>his</sup> is

~~are~~ going to do. But Phalen's attitude towards this whole thing is very critical and he said if this is all the evidence Garrison has

got <sup>- he doesn't know it</sup> and he thinks that ~~there's isn't~~ any more that Garrison is going to be in serious trouble trying to relate this whole thing to Oswald

when the case come to trial. <sup>which at this point, I guess</sup> The best guess is I think that he should do it in about <sup>5 or 6</sup> 6 months. (approx.)

One of the problems <sup>this is -</sup> I have always had ~~and~~ Phalen's story is <sup>prior statements -</sup> consistent with Russo's prior public statements, <sup>television interviews, and</sup> because he had ~~told~~ reporters before he had this hypnosis session with ~~Fattor~~ <sup>et</sup> and ~~Giacc~~ <sup>et</sup> Giacciaabra.

And

he said he had never seen Lee Harvey Oswald, and didn't know anything about him, But then after the hypnosis he came forth with this story, <sup>in</sup> which ~~xxxx~~

<sup>always -</sup> A One of the things that ~~has~~ always made me somewhat suspicious of the whole thing <sup>- it - 1-1 - it is unlikely -</sup> is I know that I would not, and I think that most people that I know well would not, stand idly by and say nothing if



That was conducted by the Commission and it  
MAY BE THAT THEY WERE VERY SILENT  
- 13 - FOR OTHER REASONS. I DON'T KNOW - TALK  
TO THE FBI - THAT DEPENDS ON ONE'S OWN BACK-  
GROUND, I SUPPOSE. XXXXX

during the course of this investigation ~~that it would commit to~~  
the body of the Commission, and maybe they might talk to the FBI.

XXX - give him this ANXIETY. But I - ~~will forgive a certain amount of personal involvement,~~  
him talk to the FBI, but I don't ~~see~~ <sup>perhaps, but I can't imagine</sup> why he would be afraid to talk

to the Commission because the Commission imposed no sanctions on anybody  
witness, there ~~is~~ <sup>as far as I know</sup> never any story at that point, as far as I know.

Nobody ever suggested, ~~it~~ <sup>when they testified before the Commission,</sup> with one possible exception, ~~I can't~~ <sup>that they were within 1000 ft. or spoken</sup>  
understand why ~~Coddard~~ <sup>a guy</sup> would still sit there having knowledge of this ~~session my,~~  
and say nothing about it, I know three years after the event. There  
are a couple of other ~~points here.~~ <sup>aspects. At some point, Garrison</sup> ~~somewhere at some point here, it-~~

is going to have to attempt to tie this whole thing in with the  
events in Dallas on the 22nd. There are two ~~carbons of~~ <sup>problems with</sup> that, one of  
which relates to the actual physical evidence of what occurred at  
the time of the assassination, which is not conclusive by any means,

on the question of whether or not there might be somebody else in-  
volved <sup>at some point</sup> ~~in the conspiracy~~ to assassinate the President. The ~~state-~~ <sup>case</sup>  
~~ment~~ is not conclusive by any means because it is perfectly possible

that the other conspirators if they were there at the time with  
Oswald, or/independently, <sup>acting (at least in Dealey Plaza, or if they were in Dealey Plaza,)</sup> if they were acting somewhere else in Dallas,

that their attempt, if they were actually going to make one, to join  
Oswald in the assassination, might have been ~~avoided.~~ <sup>aborted.</sup> If there was <sup>any</sup>  
such an attempt, it seems <sup>clear</sup> to me ~~if they were actually going to make~~

~~one to join Oswald in the attempt it seems to me that it was such~~  
~~an attempt it might have been avoided.~~ If there was such an attempt  
~~it seems to be that it might have been avoided,~~ <sup>was aborted</sup> because the physical

evidence ~~relating~~ relating to the direction of the shots, the impact of

the shots on the President, is, as far as I am concerned, conclusive, absolutely conclusive, that the shots came from behind, and that no shots struck the President from any other direction. Once again, shots might have been fired from some other direction, except nobody saw them, but it is perfectly clear that no shots struck the president except from behind. That is the first problem. <sup>xxxx</sup> The second is

*- to tie Ferris & Shaw, if he is going to bring the hat on Ferris' car*  
simply to get Shaw, to get them somehow in Dallas, or ~~to~~ relate them <sup>events in</sup> somehow to Dallas, at least at some point. And, as far as I can see

at this point there are a couple of ways in which that might be done. *The first relates to Ferris' activities at the time of the assassination.*

On the afternoon of the 22nd Ferris and two friends drove from New Orleans to Houston, Texas in Ferris' station wagon. And they <sup>stayed - they</sup> went to a skating rink. And they stayed over night in a ~~motel~~, in Houston.

*Ferris* Perry told the FBI that they had just finished working with a private <sup>he was working as</sup> investigator, a Ray ~~Gill~~ <sup>by the name of Ray Gill</sup> for a lawyer, who was trying an immigration case involving a fellow named ~~Seller~~ <sup>and</sup> in that trial, which had gone

on for 18 days, ended on the 22nd. After the trial was over Ferris said he wanted to get away, <sup>get out of New Orleans, had been</sup> ~~wanted to get away,~~ and he <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ interested <sup>xxxx</sup> involved in the assassination, so of course everybody was looking <sup>to Ferris.</sup> to Perry. He

came back to New Orleans, he didn't turn himself over <sup>to the authorities</sup> immediately but <sup>something like that which is across the lake</sup> he went over to Southwestern Louisiana State College, <sup>from New Orleans</sup> ~~or somewhere like,~~

*some where and* <sup>with a friend of his,</sup> ~~that.~~ He stayed there that night, ~~and~~ came back the next day or the day after that and turned himself over to the New Orleans Police.

And he was then interviewed by the FBI while he was in the custody of the New Orleans Police department. <sup>and I don't remember the exact day,</sup> I think that was 3 or 4 days after the assassination.



And he was also interviewed at that time by <sup>Garrison's office, by</sup> the New Orleans Police Department, and twice by the FBI. <sup>and the FBI also got an aff. about from him</sup> Subsequent to that,

And the FBI ran down the possibility that he might have known <sup>WILEY THEY WERE BOTH IN THE CIVIL AIR PATROL, WHICH OSWALD APPARENTLY WAS FOR A SHORT PER</sup> Oswald <sup>before</sup> to that time, and that didn't turn out. And the

Bureau, of course, questioned the other two fellows that <sup>went</sup> were with

him and a lot of other people that knew Ferris, to try to check this thing out. <sup>One of the interesting things - one thing that fascinates me about all of this</sup> One thing they knew and I can sort of see what <sup>are two things - I can sort of</sup> the - There

<sup>see what</sup> is coming, I understand that Mr. Lane <sup>MADE A STATEMENT</sup> was saying the other day that the

New Orleans development would have a very <sup>shattering</sup> shadowy effect on the <sup>He may have been more specific than that;</sup> country. I don't know exactly what it was, but I think, at least

<sup>handling the investigation xxx</sup> if I were <sup>curious about</sup> concerned here, I would be very careful of two facts.

One, Ferris went to Guatamala twice during the month of October 1963.

Now he said the reason he went to Guatamala is because the case

he was working on involved <sup>ING THIS FELLOW</sup> his home in Marcella, apparently Marcella <sup>was</sup>

<sup>is</sup> in Guatamala, and they <sup>kept getting</sup> could get him down in Guatamala <sup>to conduct</sup> relating to

some investigation relating to <sup>the possibility that Marcella had forged</sup> a birth certificate <sup>XXXXX</sup> or something like

<sup>fascinating, of course, if Ferris</sup> that, but that is <sup>(at this time)</sup> all in the Courts while he was in Guatamala, because

Guatamala, as we all know was the <sup>trading</sup> ground for most of the Cubans <sup>anti-Castro</sup>

<sup>That was involved in the Bay of Pigs, and there was a lot of CIA activity in Guatamala xxx Ferris, et</sup> who eventually were involved in a lot of activity. Sometime prior

<sup>oh-</sup> to I can't remember the exact date, but it was I think his in-

volvement <sup>with this group</sup> terminated <sup>by</sup> somewhere around January of 1962, which was

almost <sup>two</sup> 10 years prior to the <sup>time of the</sup> assassination. He <sup>anti-Castro group</sup> was involved in the

<sup>called the -</sup> United Castro Movement in New Orleans, I think it was either the DRE

or the <sup>Some REVOLUTIONARY COUNCIL</sup> CRP Student Representative Counsel or something like that. <sup>IT WAS AN ANTI-CASTRO GROUP.</sup>

And there had been rumors about for sometime that at some point during its existence, this organization had been receiving finances

from Central Intelligence Agency, which, in a sense, wouldn't really surprise me very much because New Orleans at that time had a lot of Cubans and a lot of people that had come from Cuba <sup>and</sup> in the CIA was quite <sup>Anti-Castro</sup> frankly involved in a program of trying to recruit people to <sup>and</sup> ~~be involved in the movement.~~ <sup>ANTI-CASTRO MOVEMENT.</sup>

AND I don't know of anything that would indicate that the CIA ever had

given any money to this organization. <sup>IT IS FAIRLY CLEAR THAT</sup> They weren't giving any

<sup>that - uh - PRIOR TO THAT, BECAUSE</sup> ~~money to it at the time.~~ <sup>AFTER THE BAY OF PIGS, OR EVEN</sup> But after the organization, eventually, got

kicked out of <sup>an</sup> office, <sup>with it, at 544 Camp</sup> it was on Kent Street, in New Orleans, because

it didn't pay it's rent. <sup>The thing finally</sup> And ~~it~~ (just) disintegrated, and one of the <sup>guy</sup>

fellow <sup>is</sup> that was involved in it was a fellow <sup>is</sup> called Sergio Acotis Smith <sup>is</sup>

who was also, in connection with this in Dallas, <sup>and we hear so much</sup> ~~and we hear so much~~ <sup>one of the ways in which Mr. Garrison is trying to move.</sup>

about that. Which is another indication that this is another

<sup>if another possible - oh,</sup>

~~and~~ in connection with Perry's trip to Galveston and Houston,

it is also a fact that a fellow by the name of ~~of~~ Reck Wall, who was

a friend of Jack Ruby's, went to Galveston that weekend. <sup>And it's</sup> It is also

a fact that there was a telephone conversation between Wall and

Ruby, while Wall was in Galveston. Ruby testified that he called

Wall because he wanted to discuss with him some problems he was

having with the American Artists Guild, <sup>or variety xxx</sup> or something like that, be-

cause they were giving him a hard time because <sup>of his</sup> ~~it was~~ amateur night.

<sup>these strippers - they thought these strippers that he had really wasn't amateurs, and</sup> He thought ~~they had more amateurs that~~ they were getting after be-

cause they were <sup>breaking xxx</sup> trying to keep the Union requirements by <sup>having</sup> keeping

the amateurs and distributors. <sup>strippers (in his place?)</sup> He wanted to discuss this with Wall. <sup>xxx</sup>

Which Garrison suggests doesn't fit in with the rest of Ruby's

set that week end. He was terribly concerned with the Assassination <sup>xxx</sup>

and went around all upset about it and taking pictures of <sup>signs</sup> every-





on the ISLE OF PINES

was a political prisoner of Castro's. Mrs. Odeó was against <sup>you know, it's not gonna be NATU-</sup> ~~vals~~ <sup>when you look at it</sup> ~~get~~ <sup>that way</sup> ~~bishops~~ <sup>xxx</sup> for witnesses, although some of our outstanding bishops <sup>include</sup> were being picked for witnesses, But Mrs. Odeó had an interesting background. She left Miami, and she had been married to a fellow, <sup>er, in, ah,</sup> I guess in Miami, <sup>she left Cuba Puerto Rico.</sup> I mean in Cuba. They went to Cuba. Her husband left her and went back to <sup>Europe. xxx in Puerto Rico xxx</sup> Puerto Rico. <sup>she is 26 years old.</sup> She had 5 or 6 children. She came to Miami. <sup>you got - and</sup> And, <sup>you got about</sup> in her family itself she had 8 or 9 brothers and sisters. <sup>just (I mean) everything - they'd list it in the revolution</sup> And they were all penniless, there they were, And she was working behind the jewelry counter at Neiman Marcus, and I don't think it really set too well with her, <sup>because, you know she xxx Andale - (don't know)</sup> And I sometimes wondered if <sup>it</sup> she - <sup>and</sup> <sup>xxx also testified</sup> and it was felt by the FBI, that she also has certain psychological problems, which I don't blame her, <sup>xxxxx</sup> ~~would be~~ excusable in circumstances like that. <sup>But, ah</sup> One of her problems was that she was subjected to seizures, called Gran Mal seizures. And she was struck with one of <sup>them, xxx</sup> these at the time, <sup>wh,</sup> she first saw Oswald on television, <sup>after the assassination</sup> because she said <sup>land, ah, at that time, at work,</sup> she recognized him, <sup>and there was no question about it, she did faint,</sup> and there was no question about it, she did faint, She was hauled off to the hospital, <sup>xxx</sup> and was unconscious for 2 or 3 hours. <sup>an epileptic seizure, 1948,</sup> Something like that but it is not <sup>quite</sup> the same <sup>or out of context - lch.</sup> if you are unconscious <sup>conscious, 1948,</sup> for a long period of time.

Now, in order to try to determine whether Oswald had been there,

the Commission tried to pinpoint his precise movements throughout that period of time. On September 23rd <sup>Marina</sup> Rowena and Ruth Payne left New Orleans <sup>and drove</sup> to go to Irving Texas, <sup>along with</sup> one of Oswald's kids. <sup>we</sup> They were able to pinpoint the fact that Oswald had <sup>to have stayed</sup> stay in New Orleans until <sup>at</sup> the very latest, 8AM on September 25th, <sup>I'm always, you know</sup> And you know the Commission didn't do a <sup>Dir, there are,</sup> perfect job, <sup>(bits of inspiration that are very lawyer-like, and I think this</sup> there were certain instances where they didn't cover his investigation <sup>investigation was not very lawyer-like piece of work.</sup>

- she couldn't identify those other two men -



whereabout, this investigation was a very light piece of work.

*Because an unemployment*  
He had cashed a food compensation check, in New Orleans, at ~~I think~~ *a particular*

*Super Market,* and ~~he went back to~~ the Texas State Unemployment  
Bureau compensation check *we were able to when had been* and it was determined that check was sent to  
*and traced the movement xxx in*  
from Austin ~~through~~ the mail, *uh,*

*(I suppose the course of action here is obvious. you go back, we  
what back to the Tax Co,*