

"Rush to Judgement" author Mark Lane has recently completed interviews with the jurors in the controversial Clay Shaw trial. Lane, who also wrote "A Citizen's Dissent," has reached agreement with the Free Press to publish the results of these interviews. You will want to read how each juror, on a 0 to 5 scale, rated the credibility of key witnesses, and on what basis he arrived at the rating. That's in next week's Los Angeles Free Press.

The courtroom is hushed. Throughout the trial, and since his arrest two years before, Shaw has claimed not only that he did not conspire with Ferrie and Oswald but he did not even know them. Now here's this very non-weirdo witness proving Shaw to be a liar, and in relation to an alleged co-conspirator.

Cross-examination: Mr. Tadin, When did you come to the District Attorney's office with this information? Answer: This morning! (There's an audible gasp in the courtroom. A surprise witness has appeared at the very end of the trial. As I reported several weeks ago, in one of my little "scoops" from New Orleans, an employee of the District Attorney had stolen and given to Shaw's attorney a complete list of all prosecution witnesses and the substance of their testimony. So until Nicholas Tadin the defense had been demonstrating a magical ability to cope with witnesses who had not appeared at the preliminary hearing).

The cross-examination continues in a tone of bafflement: Mr. Tadin, didn't you know that two years ago there was a preliminary hearing during which the question of Clay Shaw's relation to David Ferrie came up? Answer: Yes. Cross: Well, why didn't you come forward then? Answer: I didn't want to get involved. Cross (in a rising tone of dripping skepticism): Well, why do you want to get involved now? Answer: Well, I was watching my TV last night, saw the report of this trial, knew the truth wasn't coming out and decided to call Garrison this morning.

Cross (dripping scorn, loudly): Mr. Tadin, do you ever lie? (The courtroom is quietly tense as Mr. Tadin remains quiet for a long time. What can he say? And then he says it, perfectly). Answer: Everyone lies sometimes but I'm definitely telling the truth now. End of cross examination. A one question re-direct by Assistant D.A. Alcock: Mr. Tadin, do you ever lie under oath? Answer: No, Sir!

The judge declares a five minute

recess because it's obvious the newsmen want to get to their phones after this dramatic development. I go out into the hall and talk to Louis Ivon, Garrison's chief investigator. Did Tadin really call the office just this morning? "Yes, but we knew about him a year ago. Dozens of people at the airport have told us of seeing Shaw and Ferrie together but no one

would agree to take the witness stand until Tadin called this morning."

I get a flash of insight about what it takes to be an investigator in a case of this enormous scope. Enormous patience. Fending off kooks who will manufacture testimony to suit so they can get their names in the papers. (That's why Garrison for a long time in this case insisted that each person who volunteered information to his office be given truth serum or a lie detector test). On the other hand, the frustration of coping with the ordinary citizen who could easily convince a jury of his credibility but who "doesn't want to get involved."

The recess ends. Mrs. Tadin takes the stand and confirms her husband's testimony. She says her husband called her at work and if it wasn't for her husband's feelings she still wouldn't want to get involved. Dymond, the defense attorney, tries to take advantage of Mrs. Tadin during cross-examination: Do you do everything your husband tells you to do? She makes it very clear that her husband

can't make her perjure herself, and is excused.

So much for rebuttal witnesses three and four. Weirdos? Certainly not. The Tadin's testimony, along with the other credible witnesses who have seen Shaw together with Ferrie and/or Oswald, is going to put Shaw in jail for perjury. According to Garrison, this will hopefully encourage others

to come forward with information. Shaw, of course, can't be tried again for conspiracy because of the double jeopardy provision in American law. Garrison always stated that what he's done is lift up a small corner of a conspiracy and there is a need to tug at this corner for as long as possible and uncover as much as possible so that democracy can prevail over invisible government.

Rebuttal witness five, Dr. John Nichols, pathologist. A serious, intent man who had qualified previously as an expert in forensic pathology (the study of damaged tissue and bone to identify the cause of damage for courtroom purposes). He spoke of the difference in bone damage caused by

Mr. and Mrs. Newman, who were standing within ten feet of the former President when the fatal headshot was fired told of seeing Kennedy pushed backward and to the left as his head exploded while they scrambled to the ground to shield their position, believing that the shots were coming over their heads from the grassy knoll.

Mr. and Mrs. Phil Willis, Mary Moorman, and Wilma Bond testified and had their famous photographs put into evidence, all contributing to the sense that more than one gunman was firing in those few seconds of terror at Dealey Plaza.

And then there was Abraham Zapruder and his famous home movie of the presidential limousine as the shots were fired. The Zapruder film was shown numerous times at regular speed, in slow motion, and in a slide projection where details of bodily movement could be most readily studied. This film shows the incredibly rapid backward movement of Kennedy as his head explodes, and the only rational explanation is that there was a shot from the front after he slumped forward from a shot in the back.

(The film, and testimony, also showed that Kennedy's movement could not be explained by an acceleration of the limousine. The

limousine was slowing up, in fact, because the motorcycle officers in front stopped at the sound of the shots.)

The other explanation advanced by the supporters of the Warren Report for that sharp backward movement is that the explosion of the head caused severe internal pressures or an unusual muscular contraction which made the body move to the rear in the direction of the bullet's source... I frankly think this conclusion is searching for straws on the part of those who refuse to accept the testimony of their own eyes.

Unfortunately, most newsmen refuse to accept the testimony of their own eyes.

Unfortunately, most newsmen at the trial fell into that category. When we first saw the Z film almost everyone was stunned by the impact of what they had seen. One young newsman literally staggered down the hall saying, "I don't believe it, I don't believe it, That shot had to come from the front!" The newsmen listened to the FBI experts say the shots came exclusively from the rear. It was amazing how the Emperor was

suddenly wearing clothes again simply because the authoritative sounding of the FBI laboratory had spoken.

We have already accounted for half of the witnesses brought forward by Garrison to establish his case. At the very beginning of the trial there were a bloc of witnesses as credible as the Tadin's who placed Shaw together with Oswald and Ferrie in Clinton, Louisiana. In that there were a number of mutually reinforcing statements, they can be said to be even more credible than the Tadin's.

There was Edwin Lee McGehee, a barber from Jackson, La. who gave Lee Harvey Oswald a haircut and recommended that he see then State Rep. Reeves Morgan.

Morgan, the second witness at the trial, testified Oswald came to his house and that he recommended Oswald register to vote in East Feliciana Parish. He told Oswald that this might assist him in getting employment at the East Louisiana State Hospital.

Then John Manchester, town marshal of Clinton, La., testified that he saw a strange black Cadillac near the voter registrar's office. As many Negroes were registering for the first time, Manchester was very aware of the possibility of an incident caused by strangers. He went over to the

car, asked for identification from the man behind the wheel and was told that he was with the International Trade Mart in New Orleans. The town marshal identified Shaw in court as the driver of the car.

The registrar of voters, Henry E. Palmer, testified that Oswald came in to register. A civil rights worker Corri C. Collins testified that he saw Oswald get out of the back seat of the black car and go into the registrar's office. Collins noticed two men remain in the car and saw the town marshal walk over to them. Collins identified Shaw as the driver and Ferris as the other man in the front seat.

Another civil rights worker from the Congress of Racial Equality identified Shaw as the driver of the car and saw Oswald standing in line to register. Two women from the East Louisiana State Hospital then testified that Oswald came to the hospital to apply for a job.

This group of witnesses represented months of work in the Clinton area. These witnesses, and the Tadins, don't spell out conspiracy but they are credible enough to put

Page 7

Shaw in jail on perjury charges. When that happens, will the Times continue to speak of weird ding-a-ling witnesses or will the editorial then read that an innocent man was railroaded?

The next witness was an ex-dope addict, Vernon Bundy, who testified that he saw Shaw give some money to Oswald on the Pontchartrain Lake Front and later picked up some pro-Cuba leaflets which dropped out of Oswald's pocket... Not an ordinary citizen but he certainly didn't crumble away in a mass of contradictions as the Times would have it. Bundy identified Shaw in court and Oswald from pictures. Four policemen testified as to Oswald's activities distributing Pro-Cuba leaflets.

The next witness gets a bit weirder, but let's see how much before we give him up in sacrifice to the Times editorial office. His name is Charles Spiesel, a New York City accountant. Spiesel testified that he met Ferrie in a French Quarter bar in June 1963 and started speaking to him because he had flown with Ferrie during the war. Ferrie then took Spiesel to a party where he met Shaw and overheard a discussion

about killing President Kennedy. Shaw, who at first seemed amused by the conversation, finally asked a question about using a plane for the assassin's escape.

On cross examination, Spiesel revealed that he has large law suits against the City of New York because communists are trying to hypnotize him. He began to look a fool but Shaw's main defense attorney, Dymond, began to press the psychological advantage he had gained beyond the point of reasonable return. Dymond asked that the judge and jury see if Spiesel could locate the house where the alleged party was held.

Spiesel did so on the next day, Saturday, leading judge and jury to two identical houses both of which Shaw used to own. He couldn't quite make his mind up which house he had entered to attend the party but it was later found out that Shaw still has social friends in one of the houses and has frequently attended parties there.

This was the first parade of Mardi Gras, by a good three hours, and at the end of it Spiesel wasn't quite as weird sounding as when he started out.

We have one more witness to discuss, Perry Raymond Russo, and he is the key to the conspiracy charge against Shaw. Russo is a former friend of David Ferrie. Ferrie died in February 1967 in peculiar circumstances after Garrison began his investigation but before Clay Shaw was arrested.

Russo claims that he was at Ferrie's house in September 1963, met Shaw and Oswald there and overheard a detailed discussion of how to kill President Kennedy. There was a discussion of cross-fire, escape for the gunmen at the sacrifice of a patsy, and alibis.

Russo repeatedly said in court that he did not take the conversation very seriously. Garrison and his aides, however, say that what Russo thought about it is immaterial because everything discussed at that meeting took place, Oswald wound up at Dealey Plaza as the patsy. There was a triangulated crossfire that killed the President and all the gunmen got away except patsy Oswald. Ferrie took a mysterious trip right after the assassination to a town where he said he would be during the alleged conspiracy discussion along the way waiting at a phone in a Houston skating rink for a communication from someone. Shaw wound up on the

West Coast on November 22, where he allegedly told Oswald and Ferrie he would be. Technically, this is a conspiracy agreement for which all parties are liable.

But, dear reader, even if you are convinced that Garrison demolished the Warren Report, which I think he did in the recent trial, would you convict Shaw on the word of one young man who wasn't sure he heard an agreement. I think Garrison's office made a few mistakes in communicating with the jury, particularly along the line of motivation. We shall continue this trip next week.