

PENTHOUSE

PENTHOUSE INTERNATIONAL LTD., 1965 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, NY 10023-5965. 212-496-6100

April 23, 1992

Mr. Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick MD 21702

Dear Harold:

(Yes, Gefangene is the right word for prisoner.)

Thanks very much for your letter which I received today. And look what they're saying in today's N.Y.T. about JFK video release! I'm enclosing the clipping for you.

I'll let Rudi know that you're interested in reader reactions to the article.

I'm sorry to say, the tapes of the interview no longer exist. However, I still have the manuscript the typing service made for us from the tapes. I'm enclosing a copy for your files.

Best regards to Lil. Be well,

Yours,

Salvatore



He hasn't abandoned the basic idea. It's the same basic idea.

Man: Did Shaw sympathize with Anti-Castro--

Mr. Weisberg: No. Shaw was a liberal and a Kennedy supporter.

Man: Here he is shown as a big man behind the movement against Castro.

Mr. Weisberg: I don't really have any connection with that at all. I never heard that he did. All of this is foreign to the man's life. He had his own life. He lived it his way.

Man: Is it true that Garrison's Office was bugged by the FBI?

Mr. Weisberg: I don't think so. There's no indication of it in the FBI Records from New Orleans that I have.

Man: And did Garrison claim that in his book?

Mr. Weisberg: I don't remember. He may have. You know, Garrison could have said in his book that the sun rises in the west. I wouldn't believe anything else he said anymore than that. Garrison had some strange idea. He was very worried about the telephone being eavesdropped on. He did the most stupid things. For example, he would use the telephone at the New Orleans Athletic Club, where they had a switchboard and telephone operators. Any one of those operators could have been an informer for the FBI. Any one of those operators could have used a patch cord to patch the call he made into another phone.

It was amateurish to say the least. He called me up. He had Boxley call em up one night. It was a bitter cold winter night. He had to talk to me right away, and I had to get to a clear phone. He didn't want me talking on my phone. He gives me a telephone number to call, which tells anybody listening in on my phone what phones ^{to} are tapped. I would go out and the only phone I could find at this time of the night is in a shopping center. It's only a booth on the wall and the wind is whipping through that shopping center and cutting me to the quick. He kept me on the phone, and I have no recollection of what he was talking about, except it was utter nonsense. He was paranoid about that, but in an amateurish way.

Woman: It was cloak and daggers in a way?

Mr. Weisberg: Yes. In a storybook way, if that's what you mean by cloak and dagger. Yes, cloak and dagger, and storybook. I never worried about whether my phone was tapped or not, because I knew if they wanted to tap it, there was nothing I could do about it. I wasn't going to be inhibited that way. You can inhibit yourself an awful lot by fear.

Man: Stone showed Garrison as a man who is personally worrying about Kennedy's death. He sees it on his television. He hears what people in Louisiana say. "It's fine. He's shot, the blood son-of-a-bitch," and he gets a very small chance to get into the case, when he hears that Oswald has been

in New Orleans at any time, and ^{EG} Perry met him. He uses this chance to get the whole case, and to make it his case. Mr. Weisberg: Most of that is fiction. The first I heard Garrison ever talk that way about Kennedy was during the course of the conversation we had, which was not all that early. I'm sorry I didn't think of this last night, but I showed you what he was cribbing from one of my books to my face. ^{was going} He wanted ~~me~~ to give a speech, and I told him he was ^{blowing the line,} ~~nothing but lying,~~ to write it down and not to memorize but to write it. I said, "I have no objection to you using it, but I have an objection to your ruining it." I'll tell you about that in a minute. Before that time, I can't remember ever saying anything unusual about ^{him?} John Kennedy.

Woman: When was that?

Mr. Weisberg: That would have been by about April of 1968. I don't remember hearing it earlier. It could have been earlier. It could have been 1967.

Woman: Didn't he started on the crusade the day basically after Kennedy died?

Mr. Weisberg: He was a big admirer. He wound up that way. Kennedy's American University speech, he really was very moved by it. I'll tell you this story. Garrison was --- One night he invited me to come out to his home just to chat, and I did. We were in the den, and he was writing a speech that he was

to deliver at either the Southern California Press Association Meeting, Convention, Banquet, or one to the whole State, but it was in Southern California, Los Angeles. He was writing this speech, and he wanted to go over some of it with me. He read me part of it. He came to a line that he broke out ^{up} laughing ^{over} with, and he couldn't say what he wanted to say. I said, "Jim, you have photographic white-wash' and ⁷ ⁴ wouldn't be without it." I remember the line verbatim because I liked the line. After I wrote it, it sounded to me like a good line. He gave it to me and I ^{turned} put it I think on page nine of the Introduction. There was a word that reminded him of Shaw, and that's he broke up. I was talking about Lyndon Johnson and the suspicion of Lyndon Johnson in the assassination. I said, "No matter how humble his gathering of faggots, if it's as humble as he is, they would ^{Stoke} still be a witches caldron and ^{he is thought} Macbeth. The "faggots" and Shaw broke him up. So, if he liked the ^l fine, I wanted him to use it. I think it's a good line. Then we got to talking, and he said, "Who the hell was behind it?" I said, "Jim, this is something I've never talked about, because we don't know and we can't know. There's always a danger of misleading people." I had already written this epilogue for my second book, where I asked the question, "Who's Who?", and I had begun to realize that you just couldn't identify that way. So many people could have ^{seen benefit in} been part of it, and the most obvious explanation is that this crime was perpetrated

by those who wanted to change policy. They could have had any one of a number of different reasons. It could have been those who liked the ^{old} policy because they were getting the Government contracts. It could have been those inside the Government, who opposed the ^{new} policy. It could have been the people in the CIA involved in the Vietnam. The self-starters and not the agency, and they would _____ did it. It could be those who had been with the agency who were addicted to Cuban Policy or could have made it look like the Vietnamese did it. You can't begin to imagine how many people could have seen benefit in getting rid of Kennedy. But I said I would tell him this only if he didn't use it, because I didn't want it to be used and misused the way it has ^{since} been misused. That's the beginning of his talk about the Military Industrial Complex. I may be quite wrong on that. I don't know. One of the things I didn't think to give you last night is one of their charts of the assassination.

Woman: Charts?

Mr. Weisberg: Oh, Yes. Boxley and Garrison charted them all the time. The only time I've seen Garrison do it except on the yellow pad in his office which he kept was at the New Orleans Atheletic Club one day. Boxley drew up one thing that he and Garrison had discussed, and he gave it to me. (Tape garbled) then underneath that he has H.L. Hunt. He has names that mean nothing to you like Andy Anderson, who was a man that Garrison

imagined had some sinister connection with Shaw, because the man came to New Orleans to see if he could promote some bull-fights there. Shaw of course, with his -what amounts to an adjunct to the Chamber of Commerce was the natural man to go to. He was right close to the center of it, and all sorts of nonsense like that.

Man: Did Garrison in the chart say the leaders of the conspiracy are Lyndon Johnson, CIA, FBI, and he accuses the whole American Government?

Mr. Weisberg: He never accused Lyndon Johnson that I know of. I think he was pretty explicit whether or not about there being involvement of the CIA and the FBI. I think he even said these things publicly where he was careful to give the impression without literally saying that. I don't remember him saying Lyndon Johnson. He could have. I just don't remember that. He's capable of saying anything.

Man: Who could have been Mr. Hicks? Don Sutherland?

Mr. Weisberg: Is he the one who said, "It happened this way?"

Woman: He's the one who said that if he would have been there, he would have sent away to the South Pole.

Mr. Weisberg: That's Bradley. ^(Priority)

Woman: Why didn't they call him the name in the conversation between the two? Nobody ever used the name, and then if you were looking in the credits to see--

Mr. Weisberg: That is one thing that ^{Priority} Bradley says. He was sent to the South Pole so that he would ^{not} be able to prevent it. He said it before the movie. That is something that Stone takes literally from what he said, ^{that} and has no credibility at all.

Woman: But he was in charge of all the security of the moving?

Mr. Weisberg: He was not at all.

Man: The man who has seen the photograph of Oswald in a New Zealand Newspaper-

Mr. Weisberg: That's true? He says that. And he says it happened before.

Man: It couldn't have been because Oswald wasn't found yet.

Mr. Weisberg: He's wrong. He believes it, but he's wrong. He genuinely believes it but he's wrong. He's told me that. I have letters from him saying that.

Man: This is unbelievable. I don't believe this.

Mr. Weisberg: You've got the twenty four hour date-line thing that they alledge with some confusion.

Woman: Which is what he uses to back up his theory.

Man: He says four hours before Oswald was caught, his photo was printed in a New Zealand Newspaper.

Woman: What would that mean?

Mr. Weisberg: Who in his right mind would have done that?

Man: It's crazy. I don't believe it.

Woman: But, I mean this is easily enough checked out isn't it?

Man: Would the CIA make such a bloody mistake?

Mr. Weisberg: Of course not. The CIA wouldn't have used the picture in any event.

Woman: But this can be easily checked too, cannot it not?

Weisberg: Sure.

Woman: Was it?

Weisberg: Nobody paid any attention to it. It's ridiculous. This is the first time it's gotten any public attention. The guys' been saying that privately. Undoubtedly privately, he told Stone. He may have given him a copy of the same letter. He believes it. There's nothing you can do about what people believe. No matter how wrong they are, they believe it. They don't think they are wrong. If it doesn't make sense, it doesn't make any difference to them. Remember last night, I said I try to tell young people to apply these two tests. First, is it reasonable, and then is it possible. This one fails the first test. It's not reasonable.

Woman: It also fails the second one.

Man: Mr. Hicks also claims "The assassination in Dallas was a special combat division from Germany in the air over the USA."

Weisberg: That was not in the original script. I heard that. I never heard of that. What was wrong with all the soldiers they had in the United States?

Man: I wrote down a key word that Garrison said to his wife. They were always struggling and fighting because he worked too much, and she was alone. He was always running around with his ideas, and she didn't like to hear them. He said to her, "I cannot fight you and the whole world too."

Weisberg: I don't think anything like that happened, but I do think that he did spend a lot of time away from his family when they needed him, and a lot of it was nonsense that wasn't worth it. It was just socializing. His wife was a very attractive and charming woman. Very intelligent woman. Some of his children are beautiful. I played with one. The only one I remember is Jasper. I think he was the youngest. A very bright little boy.

Man: Had they been married long? Were they divorced?

Weisberg: Some time ago, but I didn't keep up with it. They were divorced. He used to run around in addition to that. I could tell you some funny stories about that.

Man: Later in the movie an FBI Special Agent Hosty felt Oswald should have been an informant. Oswald told him and should have told him, "We are going to kill Kennedy," and a telex was sent to all the FBI bureaus that an assassination in Dallas would come, and this telex was drawn back.

Weisberg: I'll tell you what that's based upon. Like everything, Mark Lane is one of these people that I told you last night, thinks that lillies are put on the earth only for him to ^{build} on. Mark was making a speech, and he was always making spech^s in New Orleans. I think it was Tulane University. Afterwards, a young man names William Walter came up to speak to Mark Lane, and he told him a story, the exact nature of which we'll never know. But, the way it came out to Mark Lane is that Walter who was working as a clerk in the FBI, while going to college to work his way through college-- The last I heard he was Vice President of a bank or President of a bank in Florida -- A telex came in warning not specifically it was going to be in Dallas, but that's an interpretation they put on it. That there was a report of a plot. It wasn't quite as specific as they make in the movie. The FBI, from Headquarters in Washington, to all their Bureaus, it would have to go to all the Bureaus, if he saw it in New Orleans, because they were ^{not} talking about New Orleans. The problem with that is that the FBI serializes all its records. They are serialized by the file clerk when they are put in the file. That's when they're entered on cards. The card has a ^{serial} material number. At the same time, it's applied to the record, and then the record is filed. ^{They are} That's ^{not} filed in chronological order, and they're filed in serial order. They can be a couple of months out of order. But, in any event,

something missing
Man: Is it true that Shaw was before Court twice?

Weisberg: He was in court for Hearings prior to the trial, I presume. I don't know, but I think he would have been. There were a number of Hearings before.

Man: The movie shows maybe one Hearing and afterwards the T.V. News Show that says Garrison has made everything wrong.

Woman: Yes. "He destroyed the reputation of one man."

Weisberg: Something like that did happen.

Man: How could you get him in court once more? The first time was such a disaster.

Weisberg: He didn't get him there. He tried to get him there, and it was thrown out. It was thrown out unceremoniously by a Federal Court. He charged Shaw with perjury.

Woman: Perjury on account of what?

Weisberg: For what he swore under oath when he testified in his own defense. I think it had to do with whether he knew Oswald or whether he knew ^{Finie} Perry. That I don't know. But the strange thing is Shaw did commit perjury, and it's understandable. Garrison didn't know it, and I didn't tell him. I didn't know it then. I found it out later. Garrison never did any investigating. False Swearing under oath. It's not just a lie. It has to be under oath and it has to be material. In other words, not on something peripheral. Garrison, as I said, never investigated ^{anything} Nixon. I was limited. I couldn't do things when I wanted to do them. So I had to do them when

it was not this, it had to do with Shaw's alibi.

it was possible. On the rental of the Trademark^{1/3} space in the new building-- Don't use this. I'm telling you. Shaw had enough suffering. This had to do with -- Do you remember ^{those} that witness ^{es} I said was so credible from Clinton, where Shaw supposedly drove Oswald to get a job in the mental hospital? Shaw's testimony was, that was not possible because he almost never left New Orleans, because ^{he had} ¹ to worry about all the space in the new building that was going ^{up.} on. It was an expensive building, and he was in charge of renting that space. I knew that probably was not true. I found out later, and I could tell you in detail if you want that it was not true. Here you have Shaw, with these very credible witnesses from Clinton, with the black man who was organizing the blacks to vote. The white people ^{who} are trying to keep them from voting. Both sides, both extremes, agreeing that a man who looked like Shaw was there with Oswald. What's he going to do about this? It was the one seemingly credible link that Garrison had. So he got up and lied about it, and I think most people would have. Whether it was true or not, they would have. So, I knew who was in charge of it from an FBI report on a picture. I asked him and when I had a chance, I interviewed this man. I didn't get to that part of the country until 1972, maybe 1973. In those days, I didn't want to spend for the long distance telephone calls, so when I was there, I called him up.

I had a tape recording of it where he said his corporation had contracted to rent that space, and that he and somebody else, and I forgot the name, but I had spoken to the other man too, they had gone down ^{from} to Memphis where they were based and it was they who were renting the space, but Shaw had nothing to do with it. There was a picture of this man coming out of the old Trademark building with what looked like a roll of blueprints under his arm and if Garrison had another interest in that picture, he paid no attention to that. When the FBI investigated that picture, I found out about this man and how to get in touch with him. Not only that, but there was a man from New Orleans with him that Garrison should have known. He was the Assistant Manager in one of the best hotels in ^{New Orleans} ~~the world~~. His name was Nick Palmisano and I remember that. He could have talked to Nick Palmisano. You see, he never was interested in investigating anything, assuming, he knew how. At this point, I don't assume he knew how.

Man: I've written down what he said, Garrison. He says to the jury, to the audience, and to the Judge, "Let's for five minutes speculate, shall we?" It's all speculation.

Weisberg: Stone added that, I'm sure.

Man: We are shown a scene from the autopsy, and there are several doctors, with the body of Kennedy, and some officials in normal suits. One of the doctors puts his finger in a wound

in the back and says, "I can feel the end of it." One of the officials says, "Stop it. It's enough now." Then the doctor says, "Who's in charge here?" An FBI man, or whatever he was says, "I am."

Weisberg: Now, let me tell you the reality and it was thorough incompetence to begin with. Dr. James James (name inaudible), a Navy Doctor who was in charge of the autopsy did stick his finger in a wound in the President's back. Forensically, that's the worst thing he could have done. His finger only went in so far, and not very far at all. Then they also used what they should have used to begin with. A steel probe. It went so far and not farther. I think maybe it was two inches, and maybe not that much. James later (?) said "The President was shot up here," but he was shot down farther. Put your hand on my shoulder blade and watch what happens. Does it move? Sure. The President was shot while he was sitting up. They had him prone on the table with this arms forward, so the bone closed off the passageway of the bullet.

Woman: That's why they couldn't get further in.

Weisberg: That's why they couldn't get further in. There was no question that wherever the bullet came from, and I'm sure it came from--

Man: Is it not usual to put one on the table with the arms forward?

Weisberg: That part is usual, but it's not usual to try and probe a wound through the shoulder without moving the shoulder. Sure, they could have put him on his side. They could have had him sitting up. I learned this by accident.

Man: Do they do it with a finger?

Weisberg: Never. I've learned that by accident. Here in Frederick from a Radiologist, he described the Scapula which is the shoulder bone as the floatingst bone in the body. As soon as I [?] said that I realized it. ^A Now, "Who is in charge here?" is not unreasonable exaggeration of something that happened during the trial. They were examining with Dr. Pierre ^{Finck} Sinc(?), who was in charge of wound bullistics for the Army at Walter ^{Reed} ~~Reade~~ Hospital. They asked him why they didn't do certain things at the autopsy, and he said, "We were told not to." They said, "By whom?" He said, "Admiral Kenney." Admiral Kenney was the Chief ^{Surgeon} ~~Sargeant~~ of the Navy. The explanation was, and I don't think it was true, "At the request of the Kennedy Family." I think these people imagined that's what the Kennedy's wanted. I don't think there's anything conspiratorial about it. You see, on the other hand, we have a written permission by Robert Kennedy to do anything ^{he} ~~we~~ wanted to do. He also told the Warren Commission they could have any records they want. He would keep nothing from them. So, anybody who is blaming the Kennedy's now for suppressing

is misdirecting their blame. There was a third part to that. We had three parts to that question?

Man: No. At the end of the movie, there is a scene shown with Oswald in the book depository. He is also shown sitting on the table, eating and drinking while the shooting, and the place where he should have shot, another man is sitting, another worker, with no Oswald around. Then finds Oswald.

"Look at this man. He must have been upstairs." A policeman comes. "Stay here. I'll take him with me." Then he leaves and all four of them go out.

Weisberg: Part of that happened, and part of it's distortion. When I say it happened, I'm giving it terms of the official story, and then I'll tell you what I think really happened. The official story is that a policeman named Marian Baker parked his motorcycle. He ran up to the building, and immediately was joined by the building Manager whose name is Roy Trudy to run up to the top of the building. He did not have the sixth floor especially in mind. He just wanted to go up to see if anybody shot from any of the windows. So they had to go from the front of the building to the back. The elevators were in the back and the stairway was in the back. The elevators were all on the fifth floor, so they ran up the steps. Trudy was ahead of Baker. Trudy was up to ^{near} the third floor, when Baker called him back. Baker looked inside an aperture about that big, and a door with a self-closer on it, so it can't

stay open, and he saw a man in there, Oswald with a coke. Trudy came back. This was on the second floor. Trudy came back, and they talked to Oswald and Trudy said, "He works here." So they went on up.

Woman: That was in there too.

Weisberg: That really happened.

Woman: It was a made up theory of what the possibilities could have been.

Weisberg: That really happened. However, you've got these problems that arise. Roy Trudy was ahead of Baker running up the steps. Oswald had to get down the steps without Trudy seeing or hearing him as he was coming up, leave alone the extra flight of steps he's doing. He has to have had to gone through the door that has a self-closure on it without Trudy seeing the door moving. Well, they re-enacted the crime. No matter how much they tried, they couldn't avoid getting Trudy and Baker to the second floor, faster then they Oswald down from the sixth floor, to the second floor. You have no idea the kind of freshman stuff they pulled. The rifle was found inside of a rectangle of boxes. The rifle was found, and I have a picture in one of my books, sitting up perfectly natural. You can't throw a rifle and have it do that. So, they had a Secret Service Agent inside the box of rectangle of books, and there's a man simulating Oswald and he handed the rifle neatly to the Secret Service man, who put it neatly in place,

and the imitation Oswald kept on running, without taking any time to open the barricade of books, and come back, and mind you, without leaving a fingerprint on any one of them.

Woman: There were no fingerprints?

Weisberg: Not one. But even then, it didn't work. So, the only thing-- There is reason to believe that Oswald was on the first floor. Besides the pictures I have, that people argue about and disagree with, and you'll see in the picture you have, of a man that looks like he's wearing Oswald's shirt on the front steps. You've got ^aMcNeil of the ^aMcNeil Lehrer Report, who was then an NBC Correspondent. He ran in and up the steps to find a phone. He has identified Oswald as the man who showed him the phone. *(on first floor)*

Woman: That then places Oswald nowhere the sixth floor at the time of the shooting. That makes him an innocent man.

Weisberg: That's true. Yes.

Man: You mean Oswald didn't shoot at all?

Weisberg: I don't think he did. I don't think he shot. You have something you mentioned about eating of a sandwich. Oswald, when questioned by the police, and we don't know what Oswald said. We know what the police said. They said he was on the first floor, eating a sandwich when Junior went past. He just said "Junior." That man was named ^{Jarman}Drummond. Junior ^{Jarman}Drummond, one of the black clerks who worked, and he was filling orders. That was not at half past twelve. That was about a quarter after twelve. So, that had nothing to do with the

crime. If it had been Oswald, he could have gone anyplace for fifteen minutes. The man that was eating up there was a different one of the black men. He had fried chicken.

Woman: That was shown too.

Weisberg: He was on the fifth floor. The bones were there, and the empty bottle was there.

Man: Was the shot at all from the building?

Weisberg: I have to be persuaded. I'm not persuaded now. I don't believe so. I'll tell you why. You must have had close to a hundred people there. It would be certain that one of them upon hearing the shot would have looked up.

Woman: Where are you saying the shot--

Weisberg: I don't know. I've always been persuaded that at least one shot came from the front. I've always felt that.

Woman: But not from that building?

Weisberg: I don't think any shot came from that building. I have no reason to believe it. You see, I take a doubting attitude to begin with. In going over all these records,

I'm asking myself, is this proof? This could be something I missed. It's something they missed. Something we have no way of knowing. All I'm saying is on the basis of what I know, I don't believe any shots came from that building.

Man: But there must have been shots from different direction.

something missing

Weisberg: It would have compelled the body forward. But, I go with the contrary. I showed you the picture of his shirt collar. The wound was above his shirt collar. The wound in the back was four inches lower or maybe more than the Warren Commission said it was. The wound in the head was four inches higher than the Warren Commission said it was. They were wrong on all of these things. They had no eye-witness to identify Oswald.

Woman: As the shooter?

Weisberg: Yes, that's right. There were no fingerprints on the rifle, where they would have been left, had he been using it to fire. There were fingerprints elsewhere. Only when the rifle was disassembled would the ^{palm print} fingerprints be there. I'm believing him when he said it's Oswald's. It's almost impossible for him to use that rifle to fire, without leaving fingerprints that could be detected.

Woman: Couldn't they be wiped off?

Weisberg: By whom?

Woman: By him.

Weisberg: No. He didn't have time to get out of there as it was. You see they still had Trudy and Baker up the steps before he could have gotten down the steps.

Woman: It was his rifle wasn't it?

Weisberg: The rifle was traced to him by handwriting. And the orders, and through a box he used. One of the mysteries

is that the Post Office can't up with the receipt for that package. But he had to sign to get that rifle. But it was to his ^{pistol} box he used, and it was under a name of Hingel, ^{dell} the name he used. In that sense, they did come up with Oswald. The handwriting looks like Oswald, but you see it's on the kind of paper which is not a sample for a handwriting expert. I assume the rifle was Oswald's. I do not assume it was used in the crime.

Woman: One can tell if a rifle or any kind of a gun has been recently fired. Was this rifle recently fired?

Weisberg: I don't remember the FBI ever having done that test. That's know^N as a swab test. What it shows is not that it has been fired recently. That's an interpretation of it. It shows whether or not the rifle had been fired since the last time it was cleaned.. I do not remember them performing that test.

Man: I don't know if you can find out in the case of a rifle. If one fires a revolver or pistol, you can find out if it's fired. They are nitrate deposits. The Dallas police performed the test the night of the Assassination on Oswald, about 8:00 that night. They made casts of his hands and of his face. His hand showed traces of Nitrate. But his face doesn't.

Woman: What does that mean?

*What was
I said?*

Weisberg: That means he didn't fire a rifle. Nitrates are very common. They come from a wide variety of sources. If he washed his hands it would have left nitrate traces. Whatever he did would have left nitrate traces. There were none on the cast of his face.

MAN: You must have them on the face if you fire a rifle?

Weisberg: A rifle would have left more on his face and nose. You begin to get the idea what Stone if he stuck to evidence?

Woman: I begin to get the idea vaguely about the vastness of the problem, because suddenly nothing seems to connect any sense anymore. Nevermind the movie. It's the realty.

Weisberg: I think--

Woman: There are no answers are there? None.

Weisberg: But I think that the explanation of this comes from one, Stone's personality. Two, his success and what he got away with, and three, what his central objective was. The central objective was to make a statement about Vietnam. This was merely a vehicle for that.

Woman: What was that statement?

Weisberg: The statement was we were wrong to be there. We had done bad things because of it. One of the bad things was to kill John Kennedy. He condemned the people who were behind our invasion and involvement in Vietnam.

Man: What do you think about Stone making this film?

Sometimes with fiction, you come nearer to the truth than with the facts. You don't have enough facts to say the truth of this case. Why does he claim to make a documentary film?

Weisberg: He doesn't use that word. He avoids that word. But he claimed he was going to record the history for the people. Tell them who killed their President, why *and how*

Man: That's documentary.

Weisberg: But he also insists it's not a documentary. If he had not used those words, I would have paid not attention to him.

Woman: Then it would just have been a bad movie.

me: There is something I forgot to mention that might interest you. In the epilogue, I forgot most of it, but one of the paragraphs was that, "The documents relating to the assassination will be locked away until the year 2039." That was in big print.

Weisberg: That has an interesting story behind it too.

Man: Just let me say something else at this point. Garrison said the same thing in court. He said, "Fifty one pages about the past of Oswald in Minsk, will be closed until 2039. Another special document that might show the background of anything will be closed until 2039," and then the epilogue.

Weisberg: I don't remember Garrison ever saying that. He may have, but I don't think so. It's been a long time since I read the transcript. Stone began by saying everything was suppressed until at least the year 2039, that the CIA had the option to keep on suppressing indefinitely (Inaudible). And I

criticized him for that because it's not true. He completely went through it. One formulation he used was that we have added everything that's come to light. Another formulation is everything that came to light in the past twenty years has been added to what Jim did, but he's always said that all the records were being suppressed. I have a young friend named Kevin Walsh, who was a Criminologist. He worked for the House Assassins Committee. He told me this story just two weeks ago. No. It was after the movie came out. He wanted to take me to the movie here in Fredericks. He was coming up to Frederick on Business. He's a private detective. He said that -- We were talking about this and about so-called suppression of the evidence. Remember this is a man who in my first letter knew that I had a quarter of a million pages. He said he had been trying to get to see Stone when he came to Washington, and he couldn't do it, because of Stone's ^{palace guard} ~~power~~ stardom. He talked about the palace guard around him. He said, "Finally, I got through." I said, "What did you want to see him for?" He said, "He's been running off at the mouth about all these suppressed records and I wanted him to talk about those that I want disclosed." A young man named Mark Allen is his associate in this. They even organized a committee to bring pressure on the Congress to disclose the records of his house committee, which, as I understand it, under existing law, has ^{to} ~~to~~ be withheld for fifty years. No special law was needed. As with the

Warren Comm-ssion, no special law was needed. Remind me to explain that to you because there are legitimate reasons. They're abused, but there are real needs. Kevin got through to Stone, and Stone saw right away that if he could get this monkey off his back, he won't talk about the other records. He talks about these records of the House Committee, and even that he doesn't handle truthfully, because Mark Allen has gotten at least 50,000 pages, and maybe as many as 100,000 pages of these records. The committee's records that came from Government Agencies, it cannot withhold. It has to let the Government Agency decide whether or not they can be disclosed. The only records the committee can ^{refuse to} disclose are the records it, itself generated, and the interest ⁱⁿ to them is not because there is going to be a smoking gun going off, but to find out, like I did with the Warren Commission how the Committee works. That's the whole story. There's nothing else to it. Stone right from the beginning is saying everything was suppressed.

Man: Are there any documents that are still secret?

Weisberg: Yes.

Man: Are they important?

Weisberg: I don't think so. They never investigated the crime itself. The Freedom of Information Act has seven broad exemptions. One has at least six sub-sections of exemptions. One of the things they may not disclose is a matter that is currently in court. That obviously is not fair. The one most

widely sued is privacy. There's the one for the closed identification of informers. There's one for national security, and there's one for secret processes. I think you can see that all of these things make sense. For example, suppose somebody came up to an FBI Agent he knew and said, "You know that son-of-a-bitch Oliver Stone? He beats his wife and he sleeps with whores." Should that record be disclosed? You see? There are all gradations of that. Even disclosing a hotel registration, might violate somebody's right to personal privacy. Suppose you have a man registered as Mr. and Mrs. when his wife is home and not in that hotel. See what I mean? So there are legitimate reasons for a lot of things withheld. These are misused. Privacy is misused. The one most often ~~mis~~ used is National Security, and secret sources. Those records of the Warren Commission that have not been disclosed, I doubt if it's as much as 5%.

Man: You of course, can be heart tell me -- You said how many so-called mysteries are not right, but you of course know the real mysteries that are not cleared up until now. What is not researched, or with normal thinking you can find out what is behind it and where the mysteries are.

Weisberg: I would say that aside from who the assassins were, what there is about Oswald that we didn't know. Senator Russell had that belief too, by the way, and he told me that. I think he was looking at it from a different point of view then ^{of}

I was, but he said, "I'm satisfied they have not told us all they know about Oswald." He told me that as we were walking from his office over to the Senate floor. The Soviets suspected that Oswald was an agent in place, or a sleeper agent. Oswald was openly anti-Soviet and the Soviet Union. In his own personal writing he said that the Russians were fast-thinking Politicians. He denounced them in various ways. He said the American Communist Party had betrayed the working class. He was not a Communist. Why are they calling him a Communist? And what was he doing there? Did he just go over there on a youthful whim or was he there on a mission of some kind? So there are a lot of mysteries of that sort.

Woman: Can we dare say that Oswald was CIA related in one way or another?

Weisberg: No, we cannot. We can say that there is grounds for suspecting he may have had some intelligence connection but certainly not on any high level.

Woman: Even that is not proof?

Weisberg: Not proof.

Man: If he was a sleeper are there any documents to prove it?

Weisberg: No. The only document we have--

Man: The documents we don't know. They may be in a secret safe of the CIA.

Weisberg: If they ever existed, you can be sure that they no longer exist. The only thing we know about that is what ^{Yuri}Uri Nosinko told the FBI when they questioned him. ^{Yuri}Uri Nosinko was a middle level KGB Official who defected. The CIA gave him a very rough time. They debated killing him. They tortured him for three years, literally. This was what he told the FBI. Until he told the FBI that, and the FBI report reached the CIA, the CIA treatment of Nosinko was princely. As soon as the CIA got the report that the Russians suspected Oswald was an American Sleeper Agent, it got to the opposite extreme. They wouldn't even make a simple payment. He couldn't have a calendar. When they saw him making a calendar out of dust, they swept up the dust.

Woman: Who?

Weisberg: The CIA ^{capture}Captain. He was confined illegally for three years. When he wanted something to read, he would read, and read, and read the literature on a toothpaste box. So they took the toothpaste box away from him, and never gave him anything in a package again. Torture on all levels, once he said that, so he knows there's no truth. (Inaudible).

Man: What I meant by talking about history were things like Oswald couldn't shoot because he hadn't enough time to get downstairs, and he couldn't shoot in this short time.

Weisberg: Those things are document^{ed}. Those things are well-documented. It's documented adequately in ^{my}the first book.

I forgot the part about the tests that were done on how fast the shooting was. I wrote the book in such great haste that a lot of things slipped my mind. But, nobody was able to duplicate the shooting. The Commission's records show that. They got the best shots they could get from the National Rifle Association. Even under better conditions, and even with an over-hauled rifle, they couldn't do it. A lot of those things are documented.

Man: So we can find it in your ^(just?) book and it still up-dates.

Weisberg: It's just as current today as it was when I wrote it. All the other things about finding and getting Oswald down, it's accurate. I even threw out an explanation about how Oswald could have gotten from the first floor, and the man who was incompetent offered an opinion on it and I still offer the opinion that he couldn't have done that. He wouldn't have done that. There's a stairway right from where he was supposed to be on the first floor, up to the second floor only. He could have gone up there and gotten in that room before Trudy and Baker got there. He got some of his own staff. The ones I remember with certainty are Jim ^{al} ~~al~~cock, one of the closest lawyers to him and the highest ^{one of} ~~one~~ on staff. Andrew Schiambra who was the most junior of them all, but ^{closest} specialist on Garrison, and Louie Ivon I think was there, the Chief Investigator. I'm not sure about that. Vincent ^{Sa} ~~Gil~~andria.

Commission
should
reference to
Garrison

Remember I told you "It takes a crook to catch a crook. It takes a nut to reach a nut." I had ^{had} Silandria there for that purpose. One nut to reach a nut. Bill Turner, an FBI Agent, who Hoover had fired, and ^{him} ~~Tom~~ Garrison, and very close friend. Turner was a very ^{un-}ethical man. He spent ten years robbing people for the FBI. He used to do what they call black-^{bag} pack job. He would go in and steal something and come out or go in and find something and come out. At least this many were there. The room was sort of an oblong room, like half of this table. I was sitting about here. ^{So} ~~So~~ Silandria was here. In other words -- I don't know where Garrison was sitting, but he was over here in this corner with the doorway to the left of him and facing where I was, there was a blackboard. He had a blackboard there. He was explaining the conspiracy from the industrial complex part. In the upper Northwest he had a rough outline of the United States. In the Upper Northwest, ^(Boeing) he put an "X" on it's face. He went down the Pacific Coast, and on the Southwest you had Lockheed: Once again, an "X". He went across and you got to New Orleans, and he put an "X" there, and was for Michouz, also a war manufacturer. He went further across the Southern part of the United States, and he said, "This is Marietta, Georgia," and he put an "X" there. " This is McDonald Douglas." I think, --but I'm not sure where New England, I'm not so sure of this, but I'm sure of the others, he put an "X" where they make submarines. I don't

remember if he had an X at Wall Street or not. But this was Garrison's idea of just the broad outline. Then of course, everybody working for these people were part of it. Every sub-contractor was part of it. Then he had people. He had the craziest idea. He had a right-winger named Fred Lee ^{C/}Krisman somehow connected with this conspiracy up at Boeing. Well, Fred Lee ^{C/}Krisman ^{did} could not resist a subpoena. He came down and testified before the grand jury, and Garrison couldn't put a thing ^{on him} ~~wrong~~. He never forgot him. Down at Lockheed, he had Eugene Bradley, another man he was going to charge with Robert Lee Perry ^{W/}. Bradley, at one time had worked for Lockheed and after all, he wasn't all that far away. He was in Southern California for only about 10 million other people with him, so that was a connection. On and on. When he got to Michou ^{d/}, he said, "Everyone of the people I was interested in got a job at Michou ^{d/}." That's an exaggeration, but some of them did. All that means is that Michou ^{d/} was hiring people. Some of these people would enter into it add ^{to} this, that. "You forgot about this." ^{Se} Gilandria, in particular-- Garrison's back was to us when he was putting things on the blackboard, and Al ^{Cook} Coughlan, would make faces in disbelief. ^{Schiambra} Schiambra the same thing. ^{Se} Gilandria was excited by it. Turner was excited by it. This is only the beginning of it. You haven't included any Military yet. You haven't begun to include all the Political prints. This is just the industrial part, and it's only the beginning of the industrial part. *(They said)*

Woman: That would mean every person over the age of twenty one is--

Weisberg: Is a central part of the conspiracy, unless he couldn't be in the Army and couldn't work. I don't know what he wants to do, and what the publication wants to do, but we could come back to my place to make a copy of one of the charts of the conspiracy if you have enough time.

Woman: Yes.

Weisberg: Rudy, we're talking about this Military Industrial Complex thing. I don't know what your magazine is going to want to do, but I've got a legible chart of one part of the conspiracy, one aspect that Boxley and Garrison put together, and if you want, we can go back to my place and make a copy of it. I would suggest if you want to do that, check out, and leave for my place now. We'll probably have to make two copies, because to begin with, I only have a ^{brand new!} second-hand machine. I gave it to ^{H. H. Hunt's} the Chief of Security Paul ^{at Therman, Jr.} ~~Rosenal~~, former FBI Agent. He immediately took it to the FBI. I got it from the FBI too. The one from the FBI didn't copy so well, and we'd have to copy that in two pieces. This is one formulation. It could be entirely different tomorrow then it was today. It had the same broad outline. They had so many conspiracies. If somebody got an idea about Fred Lee ^{Chrisman} ~~Krispin~~? Everything would change to make that idea fit. An idea about Bradley, and none of these people had nothing to do with anything, it

would change to make that fit. But I think this is so ridiculous, that it would be very, very funny, especially with the Oliver Stone movie getting attention.

Man: I don't understand, how can a man like Garrison who accuses the whole American establishment of killing the President, become a Chief Justice? He's crazy. He is not crazy. He is dangerous for the establishment.

Weisberg: You mean the Chief Justice in the movie. ^{Garrison} He was only a member of the Supreme Court. State Supreme Court in Louisiana, which is an elective office.

Woman: So he got elected?

Weisberg: Oh yes. Let me tell you a story about that It turned out to be true. I think about it, and it's actually little bit true. He once said, "You know, the biggest political asset a politician can have in Louisiana is to get caught in the wrong bed." Can you imagine that? And it's true.

It is true. If a man -- Not the women, but if a man politician. If a male politician is caught in the wrong bed that's a political ^{asset} attribute in New Orleans, in Louisiana.

Man: The idea that Garrison was more to the left side and--

Weisberg: That didn't bother them a bit. The only thing that made a difference was he was against the Federal Government. Let me tell you how well that worked for me. I went over to

St. Tam^giny Parish which is on the other side of Lake Ponchat^{train}rané, where there were more so-called Cuban training camps that never trained for anything then Garrison mentions or knew about, or that Stone mentioned if he mentioned training camps, and I wanted to get some pictures, and I was running out of time. So I went to the St. Tam^giny Parish Sheriff's Office, and I told them who I was, and I told them I had written a book critical of the Warren Report, and I was interested in learning more about these training camps, because I thought the Government had lied to us. They loved it. They said, "We'll take the pictures for you." They went out and took the pictures and mailed them to me. I was against the Government. In Louisiana that will get you anything.

Man: What about KGB theories?

Weisberg: That is the craziest one of all. Do you have this morning's Washington Post? There's a story on the inside about the rlease of the exchange of letters. Did I talk to you about these letters before that Kruschev and Kennedy wrote reaching towards peace? There's a story on the inside that bears on this. It bears a little bit on the disclosure of this correspondence. "The solution to the Cuban Missle crisis was we would not invade Cuba. What did the KGB and what did Kruschev want more? Kruschev had signed a mutual assistance pact, such as we have with so many two-bit countries. How in the hell can they defend us? What assistance was Cuba going

to give to the USSR? But Krushchev and the whole USSR was hung on this. How much face would they lose if the United States succeeds in invading Cuba or somebody else does when you're supposed to defend Cuba? How can they defend them against them? It's not possible. There's a political treaty now. They wanted nothing more than to get that Cuba problem wiped out. So why were they going to kill Kennedy?

Woman: What did they theorize that they did? The KGB knocked off Kennedy so that Kennedy and Krushchev would not play footsie. Then what?

Weisberg: You could argue that, but I don't have any reason to believe it. Those who were opposed to what Krushchev was doing, yes.

Woman: Then why didn't they knock off Krushchev?

Weisberg: That would have been more difficult, but I suppose they could have done. I suppose it's easier to knock off Krushchev than it is an American President. From the way I saw him travelling when he was in this country, he didn't have nearly the security.

Man; I have another question in this connection. If it was CIA or the CIA was involved in it, they could have had possibilities to make it like it was a KGB plot for political misuse so why didn't they?

Weisberg: Because they didn't do it. Are you beginning to see that none of these theories really stacks up to reasonableness or possibility?

Woman: So what are we left with?

Weisberg: We're left with a mystery. We don't know.

It's quite possible that one of these forces that we've included in the theory found a way of doing it and had their own way and had their own motive. We have no way of knowing. That's why I wanted you for your own understanding, whether or not you use it in your article, to have that Katzenbach memorandum so you could see the very beginning, they were not going to investigate.

Man: Do you think that any private man against the Military Industrial Complex men would have the opportunity to infiltrate the whole plot?

Weisberg: I suppose it's not impossible. I don't know. But they would have had to have had a lot of sources of information that most people wouldn't have. It was really not every-day information. A lot of people knew that Oswald had defected. It was in the papers, but how many of those people would have known that he worked for anyone? How many would have known he was going to be there that day? How many--

Woman: How long had he been working there then?

Weisberg: About five or six weeks.

Woman: It was a very recent job.

Weisberg: How many would have known for example he wouldn't be at lunch or that they could connect him with the sixth floor?

Man: What do you think the whole operation would have cost?

Weisberg: I don't know. I have no idea, but I'm sure it would be a lot of money. Assassins I've understood don't get nearly as much money as we sometimes think, but for a President, that would have been a big thing.

Man: And the whole organization making a victim must have been very expensive. All the research before.

Weisberg: That's exactly right. All of the preparation would have cost a lot of money.

Man: It means months of preparation.

Weisberg: I think in the course of this, we have probably talked about those who were behind it, but on the basis of what we know, we can't point to that. That's my objection to the whole thing, when ^(Stone) he represents as being a ^{factual} crucial account. Remember I began this discussion with Garrison by saying the most logical suspects are those who wanted to change policy. That's still very broad.

Man: Who were the Minute-Men?

Weisberg: They were an extreme right-wing para-Military group. They were very small, and very able. They were capable of violence. They were skilled. They in a sense from the other side were like your Boka Members Gang. I had a source inside the Minute-Men.

Man: Were they terrorists really?

Weisberg: I don't think they still exist, but I don't know.

Man: Did they have connections to Politicians?

Weisberg: I don't think really, no except a few minor politicians, of no consequence. They never had any real influence. I think I told you last night I had a source inside the Minute-Men and I turned them over to a Police Department I worked with so that ended my source. I got from him some of their manuals. They could begin with a bag of fertilizer and blow up a building. Things like that.

Man: Wasn't there also a theory that broke up the French Connection? French Secret Service.

Weisberg: They were connected with one thing. They were connected with booby-trapping Garrison. It certainly makes me suspicious about the CIA. Remember I mentioned the book, that Garrison had retitled to "Fairwell America?" That was clearly a ^{stark} stiff job. I met the guy who was in charge. With what he was doing, if he would have succeeded ^{it}, he would have been a Show us ^{mistake?} (Inaudible).

Man: [Inaudible]

Weisberg: Lee Odom on the ⁷ extreme ~~right-hand side~~ is the man who wanted to promote bull-fights in New Orleans. He figured in the ^(ridiculous) conspiracy, because he was connected. If I can ^{digress} ^(Perrin's) regress for a minute, here is the page in the morgue book with his death written in. You can see ^d it's handwritten and it can't be fake. Here is a copy of an investigation. This is Garrison's copy. He underlined the things.

Certainly he knew that Perin was dead. You notice FBI Dallas in the upper right-hand corner? So they're part of the conspiracy. Will Griffin was an FBI agent. He's diagonal between FBI and Andy Anderson. I've forgotten who Andy Anderson is. Will Griffin was an FBI Agent who had worked in both Dallas and New Orleans. I don't know what these phone calls refer to. You notice between Jack Ruby and the FBI there's a broken line and Rother Mell (X) is written in? Rother Mell was H.L. Hunt's Chief of Security and former FBI Agent himself. Jack Ruby I don't have to tell you about. I don't remember the connection between (Inaudible), but their place I think is something like Ruby's in Dallas. That goes between Andy Anderson and the Dallas Police. Jack Revell, he was I think a Lt. in the Intelligence Squad of the Dallas Police. Butler was a Lt. and Singletary^{is?} -- I'm not certain if Singletary^{is?} was a Captain or if he wasn't on the Police. Earl Cabell was the Mayor of Dallas. His brother was a General and a former deputy Chief of the CIA. Greg Wall was an entertainer who worked for Jack Ruby, and he connects with both Andy Anderson and Jack Ruby on this chart. Charles Cabell underneath, that was the General, and he connects with the CIA as you can see. Eva Grant, the name printed in was Jack Ruby's sister. The party photo is kind of a general thing, but it could refer to a New Orleans party of many years

ago where the two bear a resemblance to both Perry and Clay Shaw. But it was not their party. It was a television ^{party} party or something like that.

Woman: It wasn't one of those homosexual parties that he infiltrated?

Weisberg: No. Not that I know of anyway.

Woman: Andy ^{Anderson} Andrews was supposed to be in the heart of it.

Weisberg: He's the center of it, and I don't remember what he was for. This is one aspect of one of the parts of the "conspiracy." Can you believe anything like this can possibly be? You see H.L. Hunt is clear on this one. The bottom is missing. I suggest what we do is copy both of them and the other people can put them together. But with that regard, the vast military or the vast industrial part of the conspiracy, can you begin to imagine what sort of a world ^{wide} in conspiracy these people imagined? We can make copies of these.

Woman: There was a part in the movie, and I can't get it together, where Garrison stands in the middle of the street, and he looks around, and he points, "This is the FBI Headquarters."

Man: It was only symbolic, because he wanted to say it was near the house with the address. He said, "Can you imagine that a Communist is in the middle of the space where CIA, FBI, ONI."

Weisberg: Garrison knew so little about that. If you want I can get one of his books and show you the pictures. But in his book, he talks about going to Guy Banister's office after Banister was dead. The building is known as the 544 King Street Building. The side door, which he says he went in from Lafayette, he says he then took the stairs to the second floor of Banister's office. That entrance was only for Banister's office which was on the first floor. He says he's been there. ⁷⁷ The second floor ~~of~~ the stairs were ^{at} in the main entrance. It was like a house. You walked in these double doors, and there's some broad wooden steps leading up to the second floor. Even that, he doesn't know about. Garrison knew that Perin was dead, but he didn't believe it. This copy of a police report, that's from today's paper that I was talking to Gabrielle to keep. It's on the Cuban Missile Crisis. It was the Washington Post. This was the story I was telling you about, the top correspondence after the Cuban Missile Crisis and how it was solved and we were not going to invade Cuba. Some of those records are now going to be disclosed. It was on August 28, 1962 that this investigation was made of the suicide of Robert Perin, and the underlining is by Garrison.

Woman: When did you get this?

Weisberg: I got this when I was putting the case together to break up the charges he was going to file against Bradley

and Perin. They made ^{no} some investigation on it. It was simple stuff but they've never done it. Louie Ivon sent one of the investigators named Frank ^{Melochi} Palush (?) to the hospital. They got the hospital record. They had that record, so they didn't have to really work on that. This is Andrew Schiambrad's memo on the whole thing. ~~He and Bill Turner were living with Bill Garrison in California, and they convinced Garrison to indict Bradley for Howard Seymour and Jack Lawrence.~~ ^{and} (?) I told you they cut it down to two. Alcock refused to indict them. Finally, Garrison settled for Bradley in addition to Perin. Perin was the assassin up at the ^{on} Grassy Knoll (Inaudible). They killed someone instead of Perin. That was a Venezuelan Seaman, according to Garrison's story. Perin was still alive and was the Grassy Knoll Gunman. Perin was the guy who fired the fatal shot. This is also the explanation for the killing of Tippett. The reason Tippett is killed was that Nancy Perin Rich called Tippett. She was the one who was married to Perin before he killed himself. She called Tippett before she went to Texas. Tippett also knew that Robert L. Perin was the assassin and he was on the Knoll, and therefore, he had to be killed. Does it get sicker?

Man: Why was he really killed?

Weisberg: Tippett? I don't know. I'm not at all sure that it was Oswald. That's another mystery.

Woman: How did he get killed?

Weisberg: He was shot by a man they say was Oswald. This is an interview of Boxley by somebody else much later, in which he admits this for this other book I was telling you about.

Man: Had he known where Tippett was while the shooting was --

Weisberg: Only generally. He was home for lunch, and he left lunch. He was in his car. There are some reports that he stopped and then he stopped Oswald, or ostensibly Oswald at about a quarter after one.

Man: Do you know where he was at 12:30?

Weisberg: Home eating lunch, I think. This is the other report. It's one of Garrisons's investigators. I asked Ivon to have him investigated, so they went to the hospital and found out that Perin had been admitted for an over-dose of poison. So Garrison knew. His investigators got this ⁱⁿ from me. They got the morgue book from me. You can see there's no change in it. I was there from time to time, but ^{Simon} he had to live through this day-after-day. If he didn't he had no job. He was just out of law school. So much for that part of the conspiracy.

MAN: Are there other conspiracy Hearings?

WEISBERG: My God, there's that whole book. Do you ^{J.M. WARR} have "Crossfire?" I don't know if you want it, but it's available in paperback in New York. Let me get that and show

you some of the insane things. The index will show there is no listing for Phillip ^{Geraci} Duracy (?) Do you see the asterisk and these so-called mysterious deaths? A friend of Perry Russo told (Inaudible). He died of electrocution.

Man: What is that?

Weisberg: He killed himself with electricity., or was killed with electricity. There are three Phillip ^{Geraci} Duracy's with none in the index. He's of extra importance, because of the asterisk and ^{Mr +} this list of these so-called mysterious deaths. He did not know Perry Russo. He ^{not} did see Shaw and Oswald together. That was Raymond Bundy. Of the three Phillip ^{Geraci} Duracys, the one he's talking about that he knows nothing about is the youngest. He was a high school boy, and he ^{didn't} didn't know why he was important or he's mentioned in the book. These people don't care about evidence, assuming that the Warren Commission is evidence. Phillip ^{Geraci} Duracy was a Warren Commission witness, as a boy. ^{He} He doesn't know that. He knows ^{he's} he's important, so he put the Asterisk in, and he's wrong with all the things he says, and it wasn't Phillip ^{Geraci} Duracy the boy who was electrocuted, but it was his father. His father was electrocuted and I interviewed the father and the mother when Phillip was overseas in Vietnam, and I interviewed Phillip in the presence of a family lawyer, with the mother after he came back. This is a crazy book. He begins by saying, "Don't believe a word I say," and that's true. Someplace, and I don't remember where, he says, "There are no footnotes because

I lose my train of thought." That's as good an explanation as you can get. Here you have a book of 600 plus pages, and no footnotes. He got the conspiracy broken down in his own way. I never read the whole book. You notice he has Lyndon Johnson as a conspirator and Jack Ruby? J. Edgar Hoover. He breaks them down in ^{the} Daly Plaza (?) on Oswald, on Russians, on Cuban, on Mobsters, on Agents, "G" men, "Redneck", Royalmen, soldiers, military. In his own way, he has drawn many of these conspiracy theories together. But, you can't believe a word he says. But, if he says there is such a theory there undoubtedly is.

MAN: He is a journalist?

WEISBERG: He's a former journalist, yes. A former reporter for the Fort Worth paper. But, I'm sure he doesn't have any of my books. He's not interested in fact. Most of these people aren't. They just live in this Perry Mason world.

WOMAN: This gives a good idea.

WEISBERG: I think you may find more in there. ^{Wronie} -Roan (?) is going to make a list of these things. It will be too late for you. He's working on it now. I should hear from him today, on when he's going to be here. When do you think your story will go to press?

MAN: A week,

WEISBERG: He won't have it done by then. I was going to say we could send it to you. He's a History Professor in Wisconsin. Let us make these things.

Man: I would like to have a copy of this small clip on the film, on the movie.

Weisberg: H.L. Hunt was the founder of the Texas Hunt Empire, which at one time was a^{ct} fabulous wealth. There's no way of knowing how many sons he had, because he had the belief if you sired enough children, you would sire a genius. So he sired on numerous occasions. There had been some law suits about this. He was a crazy right-winger, but he had an instinct for making money. He was unscrupulous. Oh, how far right he was. Lamar Hunt, and I've forgotten the other son's name, but they had gotten themselves involved in a scandal with the silver market and wiped themselves out. That's the one we're talking about the father. He's the top of this part of the conspiracy. You see, oil is part of the Military Industrial Complex. Texas oilmen had a motive for wanting to kill Kennedy. He favored taking away the legislative authorization for 27% depletion allowance from taxes because they depleted oil. They got that great idea on oil, but they never got it on coal. That's the kind of influence the oil people had. That's just one part of the conspiracy. H.L. Hunt was only one of the many people and the industry part of this. (Inaudible) I don't want to give you Schiambra's memo, but you saw it about the role they had. You've now got enough to show that this is what they really want to do. I ask myself, How can a man consider these human beings when he has a reputation at stake and all this money at stake, and when he finds out this is

the truth, he's going to make a movie about it?

WOMAN: Do you think that Stone is going to suffer from this?

WEISBERG: I think he will suffer, and in many ways.

What a way to begin a \$40,000,000 movie.

MAN: But it's not as successful as I think Oliver Stone wanted.

WEISBERG: I'm sure it's not. The only question is will they make money or not. I think one of the problems Oliver Stone is going to have with this next project is people are going to have a lot more questions to ask before they put up money.

WOMAN: He's already working on a new project.

MR. WEISBERG: Yes, I forgot what it was, but he is.

WOMAN: Somebody is coming out with a movie now starring Danny Aiello. Jack Ruby right?

Weisberg: There is a movie being made on Jack Ruby.

WOMAN: That's the one. He's thinking of making a movie on Oswald?

Weisberg: No, I don't think so. Not Stone. He may have several things in mind that he may not be talking about what he's more likely to do. I heard last week that Mark Lane's book is being made into a movie. "Plausible Denial." There's a fraud from beginning to end. It will be a lot of commercializing and all of this is, of course commercialism and exploitation. Is there anything else you think you might

Reference to Chip Sellsby's documentary

want to copy while you're here? (Tape garbled for a few seconds.)

Researcher's notes
~~It cost him \$140,000,~~ of which he was over \$40,000 in debt,
working part-time for cable. He was working for the Discovery
Channel, and he did everything he could to raise money. He
borrowed from everybody, including his girlfriend, his family.
He would use his charge card and pay 18% interest, but he
had no other way of getting money. Finally, he got it done.
The professor took one look at it, and entered it in the
annual context. The Council on International Non-Theatrical
Events. Not movies. Plays and things like that. It won
first prize in the history division.

WOMAN: It's now available?

WEISBERG: Yes. It's available commercially. They sell
cassettes.

WOMAN: When was this done?

WEISBERG: About two years ago. *When he travelled.* He lived out of his car,
He didn't have anyplace else to live. He lived in the car and
washed where he could. The Discovery Channel offered him
\$10,000 for it, and of course that was nothing. He had all
these debts. So *Arts &* Arcson Entertainment offered him \$15,000.
So he went back to Discovery and he said, "Look, *Arts &* Arcson
Entertainment is offering me \$15,000. I'm not asking you
to give me more, but to give me what they're giving me,
and I'll give it to you." They wouldn't do it and instead,

they fired him, for not taking a \$5,000 loss. So the roads are not all easy roads, but he did a fine job and if you get it, I think you'll agree. These are no conspiracies, ~~No~~ theories *in it*

Man: What did the Kennedy family do?

Weisberg: As far as I know, nothing. They did nothing about any of this that I know about. I heard reports that Walter Sheridan who had worked for Bobby Kennedy in the Department of Justice had done some investigating and made a report to Bobby. I never saw any confirmations of it. Walter Sheridan wrote a report that Bobby would not have been able to trust. Bobby had no way of knowing that. He wrote a book about Jimmy Hoffa, for example, and he was working ^{JFL} NBC doing a documentary on Garrison when I met him.

MAN: Teddy Kennedy, is he still interested?

WEISBERG: He's never shown any interest at all.

WOMAN: Can one say that the entire Kennedy Clan were all disinterested?

WEISBERG: They distances themselves from it at least publicly. In the Post Mortum I have a chapter called ^{Hades} ~~Haiti~~'s not Camelot, which goes into the efforts of the Government to involve Bobby when he was Attorney General in endorsing the Warran^y Report even before it was written. He wouldn't do it. That gives you an idea of the pressures they were under from the government.

WOMAN: You said yesterday you were going to tell us a story about Gerald Ford being on the Warren Commission.

WEISBERG: About him doing what?

WOMAN: I don't know.

WEISBERG: I'll tell you what he did and you'll find it in the White-Wash Four. They had a man named John R. Stiles, who was ^{his} ~~Post~~ Political Associate and a lawyer.

WOMAN: He is the one with whom he co-authored.

WEISBERG: What that really means is that Stiles did it and Ford signed it. He was on the public payroll all the time he was working for Ford's Book- They called him his Warren Commission Assistant. He wrote the book, and as you will see, he edited the transcript of January 27th, which was classified top secret. It was classified top secret until they de-classified it for me in 1973. Ford's book was out in 19⁶/₆. So it was still classified. Then he made major alterations, some to favor the FBI. He sold these things commercially. They didn't make a lot of money, but sold it. Then when he was questioned by the Senate, he was appointed to be Vice President. I don't think it ever happened in our history after Agnew resigned. When he was questioned by the Senate, he said, no, he hadn't used any confidential material at any time and everything he used was public domain. This was not. This was classified top secret. So, you see, he lied about that, and I think that lie in context is perjury. Perjury is false

swearing about something that is material.

MAN: Did Lyndon Johnson leave any diaries or memorandum?

WEISBERG: I don't think so. Jerry McKnight has been getting some stuff from the Lyndon Johnson Library, and they are cooperative, but the question is, how much has been processed. I doubt that Johnson himself had any notes. These things would be in the files of Mildred Stepa~~g~~gall or in Walter Jenkins, because the Channel ^{to} 2 Johnson varied from person to person. I don't think Johnson would have spent a lot of time making notes about these things. You have one thing, that we copied yesterday, which reveals that Johnson suspected the CIA was part of the plot

WOMAN: Johnson himself?

WEISBERG: Johnson himself, according to an Assistant, Walter Jenkins, believed there was a conspiracy, and that the CIA was part of it.

WOMAN: And Johnson himself was not part of it?

WEISBERG: I don't think he was, because I have no record indicating that he could have been.

MAN: Who was CIA Director at the time?

WEISBERG: At the time, it was John McComb ^{Cove} I think. (2)

MAN: Does he know about these tapes?

WEISBERG: Yes. John McComb ^{me} may have just died. He's an older man, but he lived quite a long time after the Warren Commission.

MAN: Because he is never mentioned.

WEISBERG: I think that the man that testified was Helms. But I'm not sure. The list of Warren Commission witnesses would tell us that. I've forgotten now. I think John McComb^{ne} was appointed to replace to Allan Dullas.

MAN: Until when was Allan Dullas in there?

WEISBERG: Until the end of 196¹~~2~~. 1961 was the first year of the Kennedy Administration. In the April was the Bay of Pigs, which was an Eisenhower Administration Project and not Kennedy's. He did want to fire him right away, so after a reasonable time passed, and they had an investigation made, he was out. He didn't fire him. He just resigned. I think McComb^{ne} was still CIA Director. I know he was in October of 1962. I think when he left, he was replaced by Helms^{Then} Helms was in charge^{via} at the time of the Kennedy Assassination. He had been Deputy Director of ^{Plans} Compliance or something like that. After he got out he became a consultant, especially ^{to} under Iran. He made a lot of money out of Iran until the Khomeini revolution. He was close to the Shah.

MAN: Was he interrogated about the case? Was he questioned?

WEISBERG: Yes. Superficially, before the House Committee, and they let him get away with murder. He denied he ever working with them and that was it. (Inaudible) The FBI was in charge of the investigation.

WOMAN: After the investigation, afterwards, there are those who say that a lot of people who were in one way or another connected with the Warren Commission died mysteriously. There were too many, too quickly, too often.

WEISBERG: Did he use that in the movie?

WOMAN: Did he? No.

MAN: There were some killed people mentioned in the movie. The movie begins with Rosa --

WEISBERG: Oh, Rose ^{Cheramic} Sheremy (?). That is a strange thing, because she did predict the assassination. But, she was on dope, and she was involved in dope.

WOMAN: Was she supposed to be a psychic?

WEISBERG: No. She was supposed to have heard Jack Ruby and other people talking about this. I don't believe it, even though she said it before Kennedy was killed. Part of it happened in Louisiana, and there was a record of it. The doctor who remembered it was named ^{Weiss} Boyce, and I have a clipping on it someplace, ^{at the} before the assassination. I don't think Ruby was involved. I don't think people who are involved talk about those things in front of other people.

WOMAN: Do you think she didn't say this at all?

WEISBERG: Oh no, I think she said, but I think she was hallucinating. She was on drugs.

MAN: If it was a conspiracy, and of course if was, many people were involved. I think it must have been at least fifty or more people. After the assassination, all of them

must have been known what they had done, even if they didn't know before.

Weisberg: Some of those who took part, yes. Do you remember the attempt to kill Castro, involving the Mafia? It was the CIA's idea. The Kennedy's had nothing to do with it, but after it became public, Robert Kennedy wanted to know all about it. I had one report, but it disappeared, and I have another report. They ^{CIA} had to make an internal investigation, and they had to know the truth, because the ^{Director} Director lied, if anybody had lied to Robert Kennedy, it would have been a disaster. So, their internal investigation showed first, that only six people knew about it and second that all six were high officials of the Central Intelligence Agency. Of course, you had two guys from the Mafia, and a former FBI Agent and they knew about it. The Mafia people ^{never} had nothing and had not been told that their suspicions were correct. The records show that what they suspected, and their suspicions were correct. So you see, this was a pretty good sized conspiracy. ^{only} ~~It was~~ ~~out of the country and at least six people~~ knew about it.

MAN: In the movie it shows a meeting of I don't know what it was, some general, some CIA people, some people from Cuba, industry men. They all got together, talking about killing the President.

Weisberg: Do you really think that would happen? Do you really think people would get together and talk about it? Each one a witness against all the others? It doesn't work that way.

MAN: It's so confusing what he's doing, mixing documentary material with obviously ^{new} documentary material that he has made new, and shooting it in black and white.

Weisberg: That's one of the most common criticisms I've seen. It's really dishonest. You had no way of knowing which is real and which isn't. They tell me he used an 8 millimeter camera to shoot that, so that it wouldn't be grainy when they enlarged it, and even more grainy when it's projected. I think you're going to have to know what films are available, and what are real and what are not. Otherwise you have no way of knowing. Forget about what you have just been involved in. If somebody would tell you such a story, would you believe it? Would you believe that a man who has won three oscar^s would perpetrate this kind of a fraud and not be concerned about his own reputation, I mean to begin with. I'm sure he's concerned now. Would not be concerned about somebody exposing it as a fraud? He would not check it out to see if it were dependable, and making so many statements reflecting ignorance of the subject matter itself. (INAUDIBLE) (It was the end of tape and very garbled and defective)

The German/Dutch Penthouse edition interview

4/30/92

Because the questioning was extensive and wide-ranging over a two-day period I asked Rudi if he would be kind enough to give me the tapes when his story was published. He said he ^{would} and forgot, Gabrielle, its US representative, sent me this, prepared by a typing service. After starting to read it I decided that the transcription must have been done in Germany. It begins with paraphrase then is largely transcription. There are many errors and omissions that I suppose were inevitable because the service people lacked knowledge of the subject matter and of the names. It is not an acceptable substitute for the tapes.

In reading it in haste in odd moments over a period of several days I've made a few corrections.

My impression was that they had asked more and better questions than anyone else intending to write about Stone's JFK and for that reason as well as for those recollections I had I did want the tape.

Originally one of the editors of that edition was to have come, he could not, Rudi replaced him and then Rudi was taken ill. So the interview and the story were delayed.

1...

*emphatized
condensed*
↓

I was born in Philadelphia in April 1913 into a working class neighborhood. I went to Wilmington, Delaware, Highschool and had my first formal journalistic training in a highschool journalism class. While in college later on, I sold the occasional story to Philadelphia papers. When my father died, I went to Washington in the hope of making more money. There, both of u. working for the ^{affair} Senate Committee, I met my wife in around 1936.

Then the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, for which I had worked, made me editor and after that I freelanced magazine work and then became the Washington correspondent of Clique, the third-largest picture magazine in the country.

In 1942 I joined the Army. I was a military policeman and had been with my batallion in North Africa. Back in the U.S. I contracted the mumps and wound up in hospital for four months. Unwilling to vegetate through the rest of the war and given my investigative background I was sent to the personnel office in Washington who immediately had a job for me with the OSS. I was hired to do presentations. My first job was the Paris case. My last one was to write the secret history of the OSS. It was incomplete when I got medical discharge. It was stolen and made into the movie "OSS" with James Cagney. But they rehired me as a consultant civilian. I was transferred to the State Department with the part of the OSS that was research and analysis. From there I went to become news and special events editor of the Good Music Station in Washington (radio). In 1948 I realized my dream of becoming an independent farmer. We bought land and turned it into a successful poultry fram. (The OSS is the fore-runner of the CIA). My most successful work ⁱⁿ the OSS was on Nazi-cartells.

The poultry farm, though successful, ultimately got ruined by low-flying military helicopters. So, I sued the government on the basis that the airrights over my property were mine. I ultimately gave up the farm and , with the money that I got as

2...

settlement, bought this house. And I returned to writing.

finished paying

Then Kennedy was shot. I then tried to place my story on the assassination with my agent, but she said nobody in New York would touch anything that didn't correspond with what the government was saying. Six further efforts with other agents were unsuccessful. So, I decided to do what I used to do professionally: Wait for the Warren Commission Report and then analyse what the government had found out. My first book Whitewash is such an analysis. I wrote five more books on the subject. Basically from 1963 on I dedicated almost my entire life to the assassination. The last chickens left the farm in January of 1964.

I did not say this

My parents having come from the Ukraine, I was the first in my family to have been born in freedom. Freedom is important to me, has meaning to me. Whatever you think of what I've done, whatever it is evaluated as being worth, forme it was an opportunity to give something back to this country for what it has given to me. And my wife was with me all along the way. I couldn't have done it without her.

Stone gave the Dallas government \$ 50,000. So, they let him shoot on the grassy knoll and elsewhere and let him go through with his rigmarole of pretending to be faithful to history.

Having cast Costner in the role of Garrison, Stone had no choice but to portray him as the good guy type.

did not say this

As far as his "research" is concerned, I doubt there was any. However, he may have learned a couple of things about the assassination in the course of making the movie that he didn't know before.

or this

3...

Stone has been getting away[?] with murder for years. He wants to be known as a cinematic historian. He has learned how to manipulate the press. He sees himself as an iconoclast, as a pioneer, persecuted by the press. This time he went too far. He talks about journalists as being whores, as being paid by the CIA, as a thousand vultures, ready to pick his bones. When Lardner's story came out (Dallas in Wonderland/Washington Post) the rest of the press realized that they were right to go after Stone. The truth had come out.

On Ferrie's guilt and the Scheim book:

Ferrie, the homosexual pilot, was fired from Eastern Airlines for sex offenses against minors. It so happens that Lardner was the last person to see him alive. He had an appointment to see him for an interview at Ferrie's place at midnight. He left him at 4:00 AM and almost immediately after that an iorism (?) broke loose and Ferrie was dead.

Scheim's theory that Ferrie could've gone to Dallas, that there are two or three hours unaccounted for in his alibi, that he is one of three people who shot at Kennedy, is just that: a theory. It is baseless conjecture. The truth about Ferrie on that day I have from FBI records:

They talk about Ferrie being in court with Marcello. But, being a witness, he wasn't supposed to be in the courtroom. He was in the witness room. Regis Kennedy, the FBI agent who was with him, wrote a report that Ferrie was in the witness room. I published it in 1967. And it was only when this day in court was over, that... Ferrie and the two young men set out for Texas. They didn't leave till after the assassination! Even in Garrison's convoluted theory Ferrie wasn't on a plane till the day after. Of course, Ferrie could've had reasons for not wanting to be in New Orleans. One being that he knew Oswald. I don't know that he did, but he might've. But there is no evidence that he had a plane accessible, that he was supposed to fly one and why would somebody wait 24 hours to flee?

until
Lardner
-
Lardner

4...

He went to Galveston and Houston and did act strangely, but people do all the time. Garrison didn't bring anything to life.

On Ed Becker:

He is the FBI stool pidgeon who said that, in 1962, Marcello had talked about killing JFK according to Scheim.

Becker went from Marcello to the FBI and said nothing about such a plan. He was on FBI payroll and if there was ever something of great importance to tell the FBI, such a plan would've been it. This theory has no credibility.

In the FBI the first law is to cover the Bureau's ass, the second to cover your own. If information regarding such a plot would've reached any FBI agent, he would've reported it.

In this work there are two questions one must ask: (1) Is it reasonable and (2) is it possible? The Becker theory doesn't pass either test.

Scheim's book is not about the assassination, but about his theory that the Mafia is behind it. He then tries to convert fiction into reality. And, by the way, Ferrie was not Marcello's pilot. He worked for his lawyer.

If Scheim claims that Ferrie's connection with Marcello was very close and well-known, I never saw any connection. I tell you what the connection was. Jack Wasserman (?) was a well respected immigration lawyer in Washington (no Mafia connection). A lawyer in New Orleans, G. Ray Gill (?) who did work for Marcello and knew Ferrie (he used his office) recommended to Wasserman that they hire Ferrie as an investigator. And he approved it. It's also possible that Ferrie was involved in getting Marcello out of Guatemala, but we don't that know. And we can't ask him. He's dead.

*Kudi: Im
Anwesen
mit Raganos's
NY Post
nicht mehr
möglich!*

5...

On Garrison

Yes, Garrison at one point was accused of corruption. But he beat the rap. I don't know if he was guilty or not but he won the case. If Scheim says, the proof against him was solid, then that's nonsense. The jury acquitted him.

Garrison did not have any Mafia connections. He wasn't covering for anybody (with his suit against Shaw/Ferrie). On the contrary, if the Mafia had had any connection with the assassination, the last thing they would've wanted was for anybody to look into it in New Orleans. When Garrison was D.A. in New Orleans the Mafia had so many legitimate businesses there, they didn't take any chances. They did their crooked stuff outside of N.O. The exception was, that everybody knew that the Mafia had power and could lean on them. So they backed off. And also, Marcello's "parish" was in Jefferson. Garrison had no jurisdiction there. This has been confirmed by ^many N.O.-based journalists.

I have 250,000 pages of records here. Everybody knows that. And everybody has been here, especially for the 25th anniversary of the assassination. From all over the world. Not Scheim.

One of my stepbrothers was Ferrie's doctor. So, I know that Ferrie suffered from ^{alopecia} alopecia totalis (?) (not a hair on his body). Clay Shaw, he knew, was a well-respected man. A homosexual. A man of culture, he wrote plays and one of them was made into a movie. He was a sado-masochist (two large hooks in the bedroom ceiling and chains and whips that he tried to explain as Mardi Gras costuming).

Stone gave the co-sponsor of the Dallas Assassination Center \$ 80,000 to be his consultant ... after they foistered off on him this transparent fake: The man Ricky White ^{knows} claims that his father was one of the assassins on the grassy ^{know}. And who also allegedly murdered Tippit. (?) It was based on lies: According to

6...

Ricky his father and Tippit worked together, were friends and lived across the street from each other. None of that was true.

On Norman Mailer

He was the supporter of some of the wilder people in Washington. When a man with that kind of influence and money uses both to spread disinformation and doesn't have enough sense to know fiction from truth' (Harlot's Ghost)

On Mark Lane

His book is a sham. I've annotated his book for David Wrone (?) friend and history professor and many other books on the assassination. And there is no value to it (Plausible Denial).

There are many facts concerning the assassination. with various degrees of importance. There are medical facts, ballistic facts, and people who may or may not be telling the truth. The government never examined the body of the crime. But, anybody developing a theory has to build it around those facts. Otherwise, it has no validity.

Garrison is someone who made things up as he went along. He fooled a lot of people, including me. I never thought he'd go to court without having a solid case.

7...

On Garrison

Garrison can be brilliant, charming, erudite. I don't think he did it (book and movie) for the money. He is a great tragedy. He disgraced himself and the country.

Garrison plays Warren in the movie. Stone's sense of humor. Free publicity. It's a bit part, but assures validity.?

On Jack Ruby

Alonzo Hutkins⁴ (?), Buffalo Evening news, told ^{me} the FBI this: That it was Lonnie's idea for Ruby's lawyer to plead that Ruby thought that, if he killed Oswald,

According to the Scheim book Ruby killed Oswald so that Jackie Kennedy shouldn't have to go back to Dallas for the trial. (Weisberg has no comment on that). *Hutkins told me he suggested this to Ruby's then lawyer, Harold*

I have reliable information from Henry Wade (?), D.A. in Dallas, that Ruby^{Wade} had a letter from the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to animals (SPCA) expressing concern over his relationship with one of his dogs, Sheba. He was known to refer to her as his wife and they feared that that's the way he treated her. Also, he was known to follow^{sonilla} a young girl (puberty) explaining to people, he was just breaking her in to work for him.

What's in Ruby's demand to be taken to Washington, away from Dallas? There's nothing he could say in Washington, that he couldn't have said in Dallas. This request was no more than the emotional outpouring of a man who doesn't know what he's involved in.

*I don't think
any this*

I don't think there'd have been a difference for Ruby to be charged/sentenced as single killer or part of a conspiracy. A killer is a killer.

I don't know why he was so spooky/vague in front of the Warren Commission. The Commission should perhaps have indulged him. But

8...

transporting this man to Washington would've made him a great target for many people. It would've been an enormous problem.

Why did Ruby shoot Oswald at all? I don't know. Could've been the impulse of the moment. But, because of the logistics involved -- timing -- he could not have been part of a conspiracy. Someone from the inside would've had to contact Ruby with the new agenda and nobody did. It was not possible. Ruby was at the Western Union office. And he made no phone calls either. He was in place to shoot by mere chance.

Do I have a theory on the assassination? Because the crime has never been officially investigated and was never intended to be officially investigated there are no leads for private citizens to follow.

In 1966 or thereabouts I started to ask myself a new question: Who benefitted from the crime? If I could answer that, I figured, I could find out who was behind it. But there were too many people who benefitted. Ranging from an irate husband to a foreign power. We can use this process only to eliminate within the framework of what we know about the assassination. Only those people who knew about Oswald, his movements and where he was, could have planned it that way.

On Oswald

He presented himself as being anti-Castro, but he probably was pro-Castro. He was an anti-Communist, anti-Soviet. He denounced the American Communist Party as betrayers of the working place, and the Russian communists as fat-stinking politicians in his private writings. If he had any political beliefs he was a Trotzkiite. Orwells Animal Farm was his favorite book. He went through the motions of defecting to the Soviet Union, but he was openly anti-Soviet there. And he came back.

On Weisberg

Can I live on the money the books make? Probably not. And I don't take fees from people. I undertook an obligation when I started using the Freedom of Information Act. I feel better this way. I've had a real opportunity that most people don't have. I've been able to do something that I can genuinely think serves the

9...

interest of our nation.

If it's impaired my health I don't regret it. I've got so many things wrong with me, starting with a plastic artery from here to here (thigh), I had my heart out, they took arteries from the breast and put them in my heart, prostate operations, eye surgery and two emergency operations. Makes no difference...

Lil is a tax consultant. We both get social security. Lil has a small retirement income.

Do I feel alone in my opinions? Well, yes, I am alone in that, and I enjoy it. I wouldn't want to be associated with these people (assassination theory lovers) for anything.

10...

*Pocket did have
your
column
written
by
was
year*

Weisberg tells the story of how an editor at Pocketbooks (owned by Simon & Schuster) were eager to publish his book White-wash, but then changed their minds because it would be "like a red flag under a charging bull." He put in a word for Weisberg at Doubleday, who also turned it down for that reason.

Weisberg would still be interested in having his book(s) published elsewhere, Germany, for instance!

Harvey Morgan, former reporter from Cleveland and radio talk show host, called me one night to tell me he had a partly confirmed Mafia threat to kill Garrison.

Garrison's ^{chief} staff investigator was Louie Ivan; Boxley he paid from private funds. They were both regular members of the New Orleans ^{not Boxley} Police Department. Ivan, Sergeant, was chief investigator.

I called and told them about the threat. And I decided to notify the FBI. I got the records from the FBI of my informing them.

Steve Bordelon (?) and Lynn ^LBoisel (?) were two devoted bodyguards to Garrison. They went with Garrison and me to the airport. And this is what New Orleans security is like: Garrison, best known man in N.O., walks up to the ticket window and says "You have a ticket for me. The name is Robert Levy."

*They do
me!*

Later I learned that the two bodyguards had informed the flight crew of who Garrison really was just so that he would "get two steaks!"

This to illustrate two extremes: a threat to be taken seriously and almost comedic treatment thereof. Once a package of books was sent that Boxley ^{he} admitted dumping ^{it} into water to "deactivate the bomb." - It was just books.

One conspiracy theory they came up with included an apartment building owned by someone named Kruschevsky. Boxley figured that one empty apartment was used as a communications center. Garrison talked about Perin and Bradley as involved in this. Ivon and Sciambra talked him finally out of this idea. But he kept on with the names Perin and Bradley.

*I did
in them*

11...

*garrison &
part of
reference*

(Garrison had a report, though, that Perrin had killed himself. But he never even checked with the morgue. Or the hospital.)

I had to get Garrison off this idea. I finally did. I told a friend of mine, Vince Salandria, that I thought the CIA had penetrated Garrison's office. I made that up. And it worked.

Soon after Garrison showed me a copy of footage of a tape (which I had already seen). He claimed that the man in the picture was Clay Shaw walking past a secret door in the building he managed and which he uses to get in with nobody seeing him enter.

This was said of the best known man in New Orleans and the "secret door" was a fire door which only opens from the inside. And it wasn't Clay Shaw. All nonsense.

Q: Did Garrison indicate or accuse the Warren Commission Report?

A: No. It was inherent, but not explicit. Garrison personally criticized the Warren Report, but the judge didn't allow it as evidence.

Q: There is neither proof nor witness that says what exactly it is Shaw is supposed to have done in the movie.

A: Stone is contemptuous of his audience. He assumes these are the kinds of things they won't be sensible enough to notice. When I read the first script I thought it was ^{a penny} dreadful. A poorly done story. The movie not only is about nothing -- Shaw was acquitted! -- it says that it is about nothing. What an arrogant, insufferable bastard that is. And to think, he could've used documentation. Mine, for instance. How about using this: The man, running the Department of Justice, saying "We're not going to investigate this. We have to convince the people there was no conspiracy." (Rudi: Du has eine Xerox hierzu von irgend einem memo ?)

He started out with 12 hours of movie and cut it down to three.

There is no story, no substance, in Garrison's book. It isn't even a good novel. I don't want the movie to make money. Though the bad thing about that is, that it might prevent people to invest in controversial movies later on.

Stone changed the name of Boxley into Broussard in the movie.

12...

On Willie O'Keefe

One of Garrison's main witnesses against Shaw. Garrison visits him -- young homosexual, white -- in prison for his testimony.

Weisberg doesn't think that this happened in real life, but can't be sure.

On witnesses of the shooting

In the movie, a blond young woman (Jean Hill) tells Garrison about smoke behind the fence on the grassy knoll. And having heard six shots. The FBI tells her that she hasn't seen any smoke and that she heard no more than 3 shots.

Yes, that's how it was back then. She was a schoolteacher and together with another woman Mary Morman (?) who took polaroid pictures.

In the movie, Beverly^{O'Neil}, another female witness, claims she saw Ruby run away. When Garrison gives her copy of "her" protocol she claims her signature on it to be a fake.

I remember this woman. Beverly slept with everybody, including Oswald and Ruby. The FBI took her camera and the film. And she claimed she saw Oswald and Ruby together, and that she worked for Ruby. And God knows what else.

I don't remember any woman anywhere saying she saw Ruby run away.

On Dean Andrews

In the movie he is too afraid to even mention Shaw's name in public.

That's made up. Andrews was quite willing to talk. Because he could lie as though his life depended on it and with a straight face.

On the relationship between Ferrie and Shaw

I doubt there was any.

I said she has been changing her story

I said she has no credibility at all

13...

On the relationship Oswald and Shaw

In Clinton, Louisiana, Shaw allegedly took Oswald for a job interview to a mental hospital. The witnesses on that were very impressive, covering both political extremes. I'm surprised Stone left that out. This was one thing he could've shown as a link between these two.

On Banister and Jack Martin

Banister was a strange ultra-reactionary who did not deliver arms to Cuba and was not associated with Oswald. This story only came about when Banister's secretary/mistress got into a controversy with Banister's wife after his death over his files/estate. In the course of this she told Garrison anything he wanted to hear.

In the movie Jack Martin was eye-witness to the arms deliveries to Cuba and was therefore afraid of Banister and Banister beat him up.

^{in 1963} Jack Martin was an undependable, emotional, dishonest alcoholic. In reality, Jack Martin interested Garrison's office (not Garrison) in connection with a possible tie between Shaw and Oswald. That's all. And Banister beat him up for personal reasons. Nothing to do with what the movie says.

On Logan (Perry Russo)

According to the movie we now have three witnesses who put Shaw and Oswald together: Martin, O'Keefe and Logan.

There was no Logan. But there was a Perry Russo, whom I would not have trusted for anything. I told Garrison something he never followed up on: Russo had some of Oswald's literature. The obvious question being: Where did he get it? Did he know Oswald?

On the relationship Ferrie and Shaw

In the movie Ferrie is portrayed as being deathly afraid of Shaw.

14...

Ferrie was a crude, excessively opinionated, unappetizing man. There is no reason to assume that a cultured man like Shaw would be in the same room with him. Unless they both happened to be invited to the same party. There was no relationship. Shaw was a liberal and a Kennedy supporter.

Was Garrison's office bugged by the FBI? There's no indication of that in the FBI records that I have. Garrison was paranoid about being bugged. For instance, one night he called me and told me to get on a clear phone (public) and call him back at a certain number. Real cloak and dagger stuff. And anybody eavesdropping on our lines would've known which phone to bug next.

In the movie, Stone portrays Garrison as personally affected by Kennedy's death. When he finds out that Oswald has been in New Orleans at some time and met Ferrie, he makes the assassination his own personal cursade.

Most of that is fiction. First time I heard Garrison talk about Kennedy and the assassination was in about '67 or so and he said "Who the hell was behind it?" -- I told him what I thought: that the crime had been committed by those who wanted to change policy. And that could've been for different reasons. That's about when they came up with the idea of the military-industrial complex. And Garrison and Boxley were then drawing up charts of who this m-i complex was involved in the crime (Rudi, Du hast eine solche Kopie).

On Bradley

He would be X (Donald Sutherland) in the movie. Bradley was sent to the South Pole, but not so as not to be able to prevent the assassination. Stone takes that directly from what Fletcher Prouty says, which has no credibility at all. He was not in

15...

charge of security and the picture, he swears he saw of Oswald in a New Zealand newspaper four hours before Oswald was actually caught in the U.S., did not exist. ^{Provenly} Bradley honestly believed that's what he saw at that particular time, but it is not possible. And, at the time, nobody believed him either.

Garrison told his wife in the movie that he could "not fight the whole world and you too."

He did spend a lot of time away from his very charming, intelligent wife and his beautiful children. Much of it was socializing, not necessary therefore. And he ran around a lot on the side.

In the movie one special FBI agent Hosty claims, Oswald had told him "We're going to kill Kennedy" and that a telex was sent to all FBI bureaus of an impending assassination attempt in Dallas, but that the telex was drawn back.

*to work
would
change
what
said*

There were assassination threats against the president all the time, every day. So, such a telex would've had no more meaning than any of the other ones.

Was Shaw in court twice? Before the trial he was in court for hearings. And he was charged with perjury on, I think, whether or not he knew Oswald or Ferrie. He claimed, he didn't. The case was thrown out, but I know Shaw was indeed guilty of perjury in this case.

Scenes from the Autopsy

In the movie there's Kennedy's body and several doctors and other men. One doctor puts his finger in Kennedy's back into a wound but doesn't get in very far. And one FBI man claims to be in charge of this autopsy. *I did not say this*

In reality it was all thorough incompetence. who stuck his

16...

finger into the wound, made the worst mistake. The steel probe then didn't get in much farther. Their mistake was this: The president was shot sitting up. Now he was lying down, arms forward. In this position the shoulderblades prohibit any probe to advance far into the body.

The "Who is in charge here?" is a not unreasonable exaggeration of what happened during the trial. Dr. Pierre Fink was asked why he didn't do certain things at the autopsy. His reply: "We were told, not to. -- At the request of the Kennedy family."

I don't believe that, but I think these people imagined what the Kennedys might want. Then there's Robert Kennedy's written permission to do anything they wanted and for the Warren Commission to leave no stone unturned. The Kennedys cannot be blamed for suppressing investigations.

On Oswald and the logistics in the Book Depository

In the movie there is a scene showing Oswald in the Book Depository, sitting on a table, eating and drinking. A policeman finds him while another man is sitting where the rifle was.

This is the official story: Policeman Marion Baker, joined by the building's superintendent Roy Trudy, ran up the building immediately after the shots had been fired, just to see if the shots had come from any of the building's windows. The elevators were on the 5th floor. So they took the stairs. When Trudy was on the 3rd floor, Baker called him back to the 2nd: Behind a door he saw Oswald with a Coke. Trudy told him that this guy worked there and so they kept on going up. This really happened.

The problem was this: If Oswald had been the shooter on the 6th floor, then he would've had to get from 6 to 2 in less time than it took Trudy/Baker to get from 1 to 2. This was reenacted and never achieved.

Furthermore, the rifle was found sitting up perfectly natural inside a rectangle of boxes. With no fingerprints on either. This, too, proved impossible to reenact, given the short time they had.

17...

Then there is reason to believe that Oswald was on the first floor. McNeil of the McNeil Lehrer Report, then an NBC correspondent, ran into the building for a phone. He identified Oswald as the man who showed it to him.

I don't think Oswald shot at all. I don't think any shots at all came from the building. But I am persuaded that ^{at least} one shot did come from the front.

Did not say this way ->
See, the Warren Commission claims Kennedy's body was propelled forward. I say the contrary. They claim his wound was in a different place than it really was. They were wrong with all these things, so as for Oswald, too, they had no eye-witnesses to identify him as the shooter. There were no fingerprints on the rifle, where they should've been had he fired it (there was no time for him to wipe them off). Yes, the rifle was traced to Oswald by the order, his handwriting, and the ^{post} box he used. But one of the mysteries is that the post office never found the receipt for it that he ought to have signed had he received it. I assume the rifle was Oswalds. I do not assume it was used in the crime.

As far as nitrate deposits on Oswald are concerned, they were found on his hands but not on his face. If he had fired a rifle, they would've been on his face, too.

On Stone and his movie

There is a letter from someone (Rudi, Du hast die Kopie) saying that Stone made the movie to express what he thought about Vietnam, i.e., that we were wrong being there and that bad things happened because of it, such as killing Kennedy.

Stone avoids the word "documentary" in describing his film. He claimed that he was going to record the history for the people, tell them who killed their president and why. He insists that it is not a documentary.

In the epilogue to the movie, Stone again insists that various documents are closed until the year 2039. Which is not entirely so.

Stone also said about the film that he had added everything that's come to light since the assassination to that which Garri-

18...

son did. had done.

On opening records

Stone always maintained that all the records were suppressed. Kevin Walsh, a criminologist-friend of mine who worked for the House Assassins Committee, tried to contact Stone on account of all these "suppressed documents" he kept talking about. He wanted to discuss with him the records he wanted disclosed. Kevin and his associate, Mark Allen, actually had formed a committee to bring pressure on Congress to disclose the records of the House Committee.

Under existing law, as I understand it, the records of this House Committee as well as of the Warren Commission are withheld for 50 years anyway. But a committee cannot withhold documents that come from government agencies. Only the agency can decide whether to withhold or disclose their own records. The only records the committee can disclose are those it itself generated. ^{Allen} Kevin's got about 50,000 to 100,000 pages of House Committee records.

The interest in such records is not to find a smoking gun, but rather to see how the committee or commission or agency works.

Yes, there are still documents that are withheld, secret. The Freedom of Information Act, by which I got my 250,000 pages, has 7 exemptions. Such as a matter being currently in court, privacy, national security and so forth. These are legitimate reasons for exemption from disclosure. The as yet undisclosed records of the Warren Commission I estimate at 5%.

On some of the remaining mysteries

We don't know who the assassins were.

There is stuff we don't know about Oswald. The Soviets suspected him to be a sleeper-agent. But what was he doing over there anyway? A youthful whim? A mission of some kind? No, we cannot say that he was CIA-related. He may have had some low-level intelligence-connection. But there's no proof. If he was indeed a sleeper, and if there were any CIA documents, you may be sure they exist no longer.

19...

On the military-industrial complex

I remember a meeting with Garrison and Louie Ivan and Jim Eli-cock and others when Jim explained the conspiracy from the m-i complex viewpoint. On the blackboard he drew a rough outline of the U.S and made "x"s where Lockheed was and McDonald Douglas and Boeing etc. Perhaps one for WallStreet, too. They were all potential part of this m-i complex conspiracy. And then, of course, also their sub-contractors, And theirs. And theirs. And so on. And he hadn't even begun to include the military and the political points. They had so many conspiracy theories. It boggles the mind. And they would juggle names and people until they'd fit their scheme.

On KGB theories

Nonsense. There was correspondence between Kennedy and Kruschev to resolve the Cuba situation. They wanted nothing more ^{than} to get this problem wiped out and were working on it. So, why the hell kill Kennedy?

On Tippett

Why was Tippett killed? Who knows? That's another mystery. How was he killed? He was shot by a man they say was Oswald. During the assassination, he was home eating lunch. He left and there are reports that he stopped Oswald at about one fifteen. Who then allegedly shot him.

On the Kennedys

They didn't involve themselves much as far as I know. I heard reports that Bobby Kennedy had had Walter Sheridan, who had worked for him in the Department of Justice, make up a report. Teddy never was and still doesn't seem to be interested. The whole Kennedy Clan distanced themselves from it all.

On Lyndon B. Johnson

I have nothing indicating that Johnson could've been part of any conspiracy. So, I don't think he was involved. He himself

20...

believed that there was a conspiracy and that the CIA was involved in it. CIA director at the time was John McComb ^{Cone} (?), I think. I think he was put there to replace Allan Dulles. ^{not} When he left, Helms (?) got to be in charge of the assassination.

On predicting the crime ^{Cheramve}

Yes, there was one Rose Jeremy (?) who predicted the assassination. But she was hallucinating, she was on dope. She allegedly had heard Ruby and other people talk about it.

On planning the crime

In the movie there's a scene where several people, military, CIA, Cuban, industry and what not were in a meeting discussing killing the president.

With everybody then becoming a witness to everybody else? I find that highly unlikely.

- - -

Mr. Weisberg: That's an edited book. It's a rough draft.

Just a retyped rough draft. This fellow's name is Eugene
Probably of Pocket Books Percadis (?). There were already six people under indictment, *at Simon & Schuster &*

and he was putting Boris Shenken, who was the man who owns *Shunkin's*

and controls *poektbooks* -- I'm sorry. Simon and Schuster, which owned pocketbooks. They said, "We would love to do this

book, but Mr. Shenken says it would be a red flag under the charging bull. I said, "I can understand that. I appreciate your honesty, and I'm very sorry." He said, "We're sorry too."

The *gram Felt* Jungle was the best selling book of 1964. I'm talking about 1965. He said, "Would you like us to help you?" I said, "Sure." He said, "Okay. I'll call Doubleday for you." I would like to read it." He said, "Let me explain something to you.

We're *poektbooks*. When Doubleday wants a paperback put out, I'm the guy you deal with. I want them to do this book."

He couldn't be any nicer could he? Then he gets on the phone,

and he says, "Let me Sam Vaughn." Sam Vaughn he told me was Eisenhower/Nixon's Editor. He said, "I've got this book. We

have reasons we can't do it. It's a great book. I think you ought to look at it, and I think you ought to do it. I'll

send it over." I said, "Do you want me to take it over?"

He said, "No. That's what we have messengers for." When

they turned it down, they said, they reason was not editorial and not *easy to write up* either. These were two publishers. Big

publishers who were honest with me. If they're honest, you can't complain.

P. said we would be the ones to write the book but selling well 7/96/41

Man: If one of these great editions would give you the chance to publish all of your books on the Kennedy Assassination would you take it?

Mr. Weisberg: No. Then absolutely, I would have grabbed it. Can you imagine what the first book on the Warren Commission would have been with a major publisher behind it? (Inaudible)

Push

Man: I know Doubleday and Simon & Schuster now belong to a German company.

Mr. Weisberg: Germany, yes. If anybody wants to publish it in Germany, fine. One thing about White-Wash is that it still stacks up. If you want the basic facts of the Warren Report, that's where they are. It's the only source in the world for it. The problem is, everybody wants you to up-date it and there's a limit to how much of that I can do. I've just authorized a friend of mine to condense them all into one volume here in the United States. I don't know when he'll get it done, but he started it. It's too confusing if these books were to go on sale, except for a major publisher now, because people would come to us and go to them and we would have to mail orders to them and it would be too much of a burden.

Man: If you wouldn't mind, I could-- (inaudible)

Mr. Weisberg: I would be tickled. You know, if it weren't for an accident by mail getting intercepted, Fisher would have published White Wash in 1965. They wrote me, and I never their letters, and they finally returned the manuscript, and I never got that. That was in a time when the FBI was

intercepting the mail for the CIA.

Man: Can you give me an example of the kind of minor lies that Garrison put in his book?

Mr. Weisberg: Unless he had something in his mind, that isn't clear to the reader, it serves no purpose. He tells the story about Bill Bogsley going out to Albuquerque, New Mexico, coming in by surprise, and there's something about Bogsley packing back to New Orleans, because he doesn't want to waste that kind of money, and a little bit of mumbo ^{number} about what Bogsley was there for. Here is the real truth of what happened. About 3:00 in the morning, New Orleans time, maybe 4:00, I was staying at the Fountainbleu Hotel. The operator said she had a call for me from Mr. Harve Morgan in San Francisco, and would I take it. I said, "Ask him to wait just a minute. I will take it. I want to go to the bathroom." I didn't want to go to the bathroom. I got my tape recorder because I knew Harve Morgan, and a suction cup, ^{in my hand} and then I lit a cigar. I got back to the telephone. Harve Morgan was a former reporter from Cleveland, a fine human being, a dear friend of mine then, and he had a talk show that went off at midnight. I knew Harve wouldn't be calling me at that time in the morning unless there was something important. So, for something important, I have to a recording of it. So, what he told me he had a partly confirmed Mafia threat to kill Garrison. We talked, and I taped the whole thing. Louie Ivon was Garrison's regular

Even when supposedly a
verbatim transcript, it is not
which is omitted & some is wrong.

Chief
If
staff investigator was not Bogsley who he paid from private funds. They were all regular members of the New Orleans Police Department. Louie Ivon was a Sargeant, and he was the Chief Investigator. He had gone back to college to get a degree in Criminology and he was taking exams. Garrison was working him un-Godly hours. I said, "Oh my, I've got to call this man, and I hate to do it." I called him, and I told him what it was. We talked for a minute. He said, "I'll pick you up in a half hour." He made some telephone calls, and he picked me up in a half hour. We talked about it on the way, and he told me, I remember he said, (inaudible), and I've forgotten who else. I told him I had three things. He said, "You got any ideas?" I said, "Yes, there are three things." I've forgotten what two of them were, but one was that I call the FBI and notify the FBI. They liked that idea. We had no idea about it. We wanted the FBI to be aware of whatever else happened. Then I got the records of the FBI of my informing them. Well, that night -- I'm sorry. The night before this happened, this was early in the morning. Late afternoon, the two detectives who usually guard Garrison were named Steve Bordelon and Lynn ^LBoisel. They were intensely devoted to that man. They loved him. They took up a collection among themselves and got him a special kind of pistol with his name engraved on it. They loved the man, I've forgotten which one looked me up and said, "The boss is catching a plane, and he asked if you would care to go along with him. He wants to talk to you."

He picked me up and then he picked him up at his home and drove out to the airport. ^{He} Him and I sat in the back seat. They played Canadian Brass, which was his favorite music in the front seat. To give you an idea of what security was New Orleans Style. We pull up to the airport, and we pull up to where you get out to get in to go to the ticket windows or ticket booths, and both of them park the car, and ^JTim and I walk in by ourselves. We walk in up to the ticket desk, and Garrison, the best known man in New Orleans, all six feet six of him, walks up to the young woman, and he says, "You have a ticket for me. My name is Robert Levy." She gets the ticket for Robert Levy. ^JTim Garrison is travelling incognito? So, we wait and then these two detective come and we walk down to where the planw is going to be and we talk. Before long, they opened up the gates.

You could walk right into the plane there then. You couldn't in all places in those years, but there you could. One of the detectives said, "Wait a minute a boss. We have to check it out." ^JTim and I waited and they went in and checked it out. "Okay boss. Have a good trip." As soon as he got in and out of ear shot, they laughed and laughed. "We got the boss fixed up good." We told the hostess who he is and he's going to get two steaks."

Man: You wrote this story in one of your letters to Oliver Stone?

Mr. Weisberg: I did I think, yes. I'm giving the two extremes.

There was a threat you had to take seriously. Garrison, in the script makes a big thing about Boxley carrying a .45. It was a .38. At least in the first script, there's a big thing about identification of him as Army because it's a .45. It was a 38. Boxley knew how to use the gun, and they sent him out as a body-guard. But instead of sending him back to New Orleans, they went to Los Angeles, and lived it up for a week. The funniest part was they told the story themselves. I have where Boxley was interviewed by somebody and admitted the whole thing about the book. The package of books come, and Boxley emerges it water to deactivate the bomb. This comes out in the book the way I told you. Garrison drawing himself up to his full and indignant height, saying, "How dare you waste my money?" The purpose was served by this. I gave the two extremes, but there are many inbetween. The whole story of that Boxley, Perin thing was beyond belief. They were going to include Edgar Eugene Bradley in with the conspiracy of Perin. My recollection isn't too clear on all of this. I don't know how it happened, but the name of the man who owned the apartment house was really Kruschevsky. There was an empty apartment, and Boxley had a whole thing figured out about how this was used as a communication center for radio as well as telephones. Nobody knows what you're talking about. Anyway, the only thing that was in the empty apartment was

cigarette butts and empty beer cans. After Krushevsky was interviewed, when I forced this whole thing to an issue, there was no communication but I thought you would be interested in the name Krushevsky. It really was true. I didn't believe it. The way it worked, the two people who said they couldn't do anything with Garrison, they talked him out of everything except these two, Perin and Bradley. With Louie Ivon and Andrew Schiambra, whose nickname was Moo, he was the most junior member of the staff, and the one who most time with Garrison, and Garrison really worked him day and night. All of them. When I wanted something ^{from} I just sent one of the staff investigators out to get it for me. Garrison knew that he had a report that Perin ^{had} had killed himself. I've got the one with Garrison's marks on it. I've got a xerox of it. They never even checked the morgue book. They knew he was taken to the hospital. They never went to get a hospital report. These are simple things a child would know. That's all I needed, together with what Boxley had put on paper. Nobody ever dealt with Garrison that way. He had to fire himself or fire Boxley, and in effect, get off the case. It's more complicated than that, but this is the essence of it. I still have a carbon copy ^{of my report}, and I had to use a borrowed, broken, portable typewriter to work on. It's what I gave Schiambra. It was on a Saturday. I was staying with a friend

of mine who is a photographer. I did my typing there. He said, "Why don't you meet me at the office tomorrow? I'll read it tonight, and Vince will read it tonight. We'll let you in the office when we can get hold of you, and you can work there." Then we can call you." That's what he did. When he called me, they went to the New Orleans Atheletic Club, which Garrison used as a second office. Sometimes I think more then his office. He called me from there, and he said, "Hal, we're coming over to pick you up. You did it kid! You did it!" He said, "I'm taking you to the best Italian meal you've ever had." It was no exaggeration. His wife is that good a cook. His former wife. On the way out there, he told me what I don't believe, but I remember his exact words in his excitement. I sat in the front seat with him, and he said, "Hal, you just kept Jim Garrison from being disbarred by the Supreme Court of the United States of America." The Shaw case was before the Supreme Court. I thought of this. I was in New Orleans. I was on my way home. I said I would come back. I thought of this, and I figured, "How am I going to persuade Jim, when these people so close to him couldn't." I figured, I couldn't do it alone. But there was a real paranoid. Just as paranoid as Jim. Brilliant in some ways. Stupid in some ways. Vincent Salandria. He was ⁷authoritarian minded. He understands what other people can't see. Vince was convinced that the CIA was behind

This refers to my memoirs of WFO.

everything, including the rising of the sun. I figured, I'll take Vince. I called Vince up and I said, "Vince, I have something to talk to you about." I said, "I think the CIA has penetrated Jim's office." He said, "Do you really think so?" I said, "I think so. I'm going back to work on it, and Ivon and Schiambra asked me to, and I think it would be a good idea if you were there. I think he would want you there." He said, "Oh, yes." I said, "If we take Eastern Airlines on a certain date, I have a plane that starts in New York, and stops in Philadelphia. You can get it there. Hold two seats, and I'll get the same plane in Baltimore." I had no reason to say that, but I was trying to find, "How am I going to convince this guy," so I made it up. The one thing I was sure was the CIA had nothing to do with Boxley. They fired him for alcoholism. I knew that they would never pull that kind of a stunt of penetrating Garrison's staff with an alcoholic they fired. Besides that, I knew how Garrison had hired him. So, he and Garrison just lived it up at the New Orleans Athletic Club. They had more theories than we could probably have for the whole year. But, when he saw what I had put together, he and Schiambra got together with me. I think he still believes it was the CIA plot, but he knew it was a solid case. He's the one who persuaded Garrison. I figured if it takes crook to reach a crook, or takes crook to catch a crook, it takes a nut to reach a nut. That's the way it really was.

like a story book. There's nothing real in New Orleans, except the French Quarter. Everything else is unreal. This is exactly what it seems like. That's an exaggeration of course. There are some very good people there. A lot of people go there to quit the world. It's one of the warmer parts of the United States. It's a major city. I knew a young man who was a mathematician. He went there to quit the world. He could live there more easily. He was just satisfied to be a clerk in a book store. When his electricity was cut off by mistake, he didn't bother complaining to the Electric Company. He just got candles. His girlfriend, who was quite a character, finally got him to tell the Electric Company he paid the bill. She didn't like living in candle light. He was a gifted ^{emulator} photographer too. Do you remember who Anthony Summers is? He wrote the book, "Conspiracy." He used to be a BBC Reporter. He is working on a Biography of J. Edgar Hoover now. Tony Summers came here and three weeks later, I got a call from Jim LaSar (?) who is my lawyer and my friend and was Tony Summer's lawyer. He said, "Tony can't find his American Express Charge Card. He thinks maybe he left it up at Frederick. We thought where could he have been and he came over, and we said, "We've got it." We didn't want to mail to him. We thought it was too dangerous.

The story is about Garrison and is just beyond belief. The very day that Ivon and Schiabra, as I was

*I think that
part of what is so wrong
throughout the Memphis
situation, ~~Frankly~~ ^{Frankly} is that
the questions are omitted
and that this
appears as a
disjointed
monologue,
which it
wasn't.*

leaving to go home, asked me to see what I could do about
keeping Garrison from ~~dis~~ ^{re}charging Perin and Bradley, Garrison
had insisted I come back from New Orleans from Dallas. I was
on my way home from Dallas. So I did. My baggage got
intercepted, and I had to stop and buy a shirt and toilet goods,
on the way from the airport. It didn't even land in New Orleans.
What did I have to be there for? He had the biggest discovery
of all. I get to his office on a Saturday morning, and he's
showing me a very poor copy of the footage that remained
at WDSU, and I said, "Is this what you're talking about Jim?"
He said, "Yes. Wait until we come to it." I said, "Let me
make a suggestion then." He said, "What's that?" I said,
"This is a poor copy. I've got a good copy." He got bug-eyed.
I said, "Why don't we look at the good one?" So we did.
He said, "It's coming up now. It's coming up now." There
is the picture of a man walking down Camp Street, Magazine
Street. I've forgotten where the ~~trademark~~ ^{Trade Mark} was. He said,
"See? That's Clay Shaw." He said, "Watch. He's going to
walk past the secret door he uses to get in with nobody seeing
him." The man was ^{one of} the best-known man in New Orleans, but if
that wasn't enough, it was a fire door and only opened from the
inside, and it wasn't Clay Shaw.

Man: Where should this have been?
Mr. Weisberg: It was on the main street. It was a fire door.

It was towards Canal Street from the main entrance to the building. What did he need a secret door for?

Man: Into what building?

Mr. Weisberg: The building he managed. The Trademark^{1/2}. It was the old Trademark^{1/2} Building and has since been replaced with a skyscraper. Meanwhile, he had a young fellow there named Charles R. Steele, Jr. ~~(?)~~. Steele was the guy that Oswald had gone to an Unemployment line and said, "Come with me," and handed some leaflets for a little while, and I'll give you \$2.00," so Steele went. Garrison had never done any investigating of this. There was a time when Jessie Core ~~(?)~~ who was the publicity man for the Trademark had his own publicity office in advertising and public relations agency there. I got talking to Jessie. We got to be friends. He told me people had complained to the FBI -- (Inaudible).

Man: Is it true? Did Garrison indicate or accuse the Warren Commission Report?

Mr. Weisberg: No. It was inherent, but not explicit. Garrison himself, personally criticized the Warren Commission Report, and the Judge refused to allow it to be introduced in evidence. The lawyers tried to get it introduced as evidence. (Inaudible).

gabriel Barth - omissions referring to Stone's movie JFK
Woman: But they said it was very interesting. The people who were there were mostly very young people.

Mr. Weisberg: I think he targets them. I think he is going to reach them this way. Some were crying when the film ended.

*she and Rind's had seen PK here the night before
this part of the interview*

Some were tired. I think a lot of them were crying because of the love of Kennedy.

Woman: I always find the scene, whenever I see it in a documentary or something, I find that very emotional. However, yesterday, I was not emotionally touched. Only at one point, through the entire movie, when Bobby got shot, and his reaction to that occurred. Until then I--

Mr. Weisberg: I don't think the shooting the Bobby was in the first script I had. I don't think it was. I've forgotten. There could have been something in the script, but seriously, I paid no attention to it. He indicated he was going to do this. But I don't remember anything physically in the script about it. (Inaudible). She is ambivalent. She likes some things about it. She doesn't like some things about it. She is more informed than most of the movie goers, and she has the illusion that perhaps there can be a re-investigation now. Maybe something good will come of it. So he's been masterful in the adeptness of his lies. It is quite true when I said he can't tell the truth by accident. I wasn't exaggerating a bit.

Man: I think it's even bad as a movie, because it's boring and it's so bad. I never seen him so bad. He always speaks in the same tone and it un-nerves you.

Woman: Do you know when he starts acting? In the very final scene of the movie he starts acting.

Man: ^{Costner} He starts crying. He has tears in his eyes.

It was the only change in his face the whole film. After three hours, it was the first time he makes another face.

Mr. Weisberg: That's not like Garrison. Is that in his speech to the jury? Where does it end?

Man: There.

Mr. Weisberg: That's where it ends?

Woman: Yes. He's a desperate man.

Mr. Weisberg: For me, I would surprised if Costner didn't feel that. From what I've been reading of the things he's been quote as saying.

Man: Costner was tired. They started shooting just after he had finished Robin Hood. He was tired. He should have had a break of two or three months.

Woman: These names. All these big names you mentioned. I don't know if these names mean anything to Germany. Does Ed Asner mean anything in Germany?

Man: All these stars. Jack Lemmon. Donald Sutherland.

Mr. Weisberg: Donald Sutherland has a history of this. He used to be the brother-in-law of a close associate of ^{Mark Lane's} mine, and each one is as ^aamoral as the other. They are a particularly eloquent, passionate people, but no morals and no ethics at all. His name is Donald Fried. He and Lane commercialized an entrapment of Garrison by the French Intelligence, (Here it is ^{SDECE} (inaudible.) It was called -- The original title in Europe was called "American Burns." Garrison got them to retitle it.

He got them to retitile it "Farewell America." They actually turned out a fake book on this. It was a best seller in Europe. It was a dud over here, because it couldn't into country. It was so liablous, you can't imagine. Donald ^{Fried} Sutherland and Mark Lane cribbed that and wrote a book called "Executive Action." They stole it right from that book. "Executive Action" made a movie. Sutherland's sister was married to Fried at that time. I don't know if she's still married to him or not. Sutherland had been keyed on all of this all along. He had been a close friend of Lane's and a close friend of Fried's. They don't care what they say. As long as it condemns the Government, they're all for it. Lane's book, I just heard, which was a terrible thing, and it's being made into a movie. (*Plausible Denial*)

Woman: This last one?

Mr. Weisberg: This last one. I think once the ice is broken there will be a lot of them, but they won't be high-budget movies. They'll be low-budget movies. Not only for the business, but it seems to me that's what's going to be sensible. They're going to capitalize on all the advertising and exploitation of this one, and turn out a tee-pee as fast as they can. "~~Imp~~plausible Denial" lends itself to this.

Man: For me, the movie shows Garrison as a loser, because he doesn't know how to handle his family. His wife wants to run away. The children don't know him. He does

not talk about the family. He loses the first trial against Shaw, and the second one. He doesn't even have a link between Shaw and the conspiracy, the accusers. There is no proof nor any witness who says what Shaw should have done. The film doesn't show what Shaw should have done.

Mr. Weisberg: Are you not speaking to the contempt that Stone has for his audience? He's contemptuous^p of his audience. He assumes these are the kinds of things they won't be sensible enough to notice. Remember, I told you when I read first script, I thought it was dreadful. I thought it was a ghastly script. A bad script. I don't know anything about scripts, but the script struck me as being a very poorly done story. You see, you're pointing out some of these flaws don't exist. Over three hours, you can't have this kind of thing in there. I think the reason is they were probably worried about it.

Man: I don't know what Stone claims Shaw thought. Was he a homosexual? A businessman with a not so well-known back-ground. He knows Oswald. He knows Perin^v. No one said he had shot or he had told anyone to shoot. That he organized anything. It's no way said in the whole movie.

Woman: How could you, because let's face it, in reality the man was not guilty. He couldn't have done any of that. He didn't.

Mr. Weisberg: The strange thing is, you have a movie here -- I think you hit one of the few points, that not only is

about nothing but you're saying says it's about nothing.
That's true. What an arrogant insufferable bastard that is.
You know if he paid any attention to my letter, if he would
stop to think about it, that he said, "I have to know what
these nuts I have around me that I'm exploiting can't tell
me." He could have done a better job even within his own
format. He could have used, for example, documentation.
Some of the documents I gave you, I don't know if they're
going to interest you or not, but wouldn't it have been powerful
to have a man running the Department of Justice saying,
"We're not going to investigate this?" You have to convince
the people there was no conspiracy." That kind of thing.
Just a little bit of something like that which would have
worked in easily. As I remember, what he's saying in the
script:

Woman: So he started out with like twelve hours of a
movie, and he cut it down to three, and he was apparently in
a rush. Maybe it's a matter of being a bad cutting job.

Mr. Weisberg: I think that becomes a spiteful editing job then.
Because in making twelve hours, he certainly didn't expect
to be throwing nine hours away.

Man: A Director needs so much if he doesn't know what
he wants to tell. He doesn't have a story.

Mr. Weisberg: I think Stone himself supervised the editing.

Woman: He did it himself.

Man: He doesn't know his story. What is the story?

Mr. Weisberg: That's exactly the point. There is no story, in Garrison's book. There is not even a good novel. I don't know. Maybe it could make a novel. You see, when there's no substance to it to begin with, it says, "You've got -- That's not even a skeleton. You need more than that."

I haven't seen ~~the~~^{any} movie in so long, I have no right to offer an opinion. But I'm talking about something sensible like a book or even a magazine article. I'm glad there are so few people. I don't want it to make money. There's one bad thing about it not making money. It will discourage people who invest in movies from investing in controversial movies. I want them to learn a lesson, not to invest in a movie like this, which is so palpably dishonest. You can do controversial films and be scrupulous.

Man: The Cinema was empty.

Mr. Weisberg: I'm glad to hear that. I'm talking about Mr. George ^{an}Lodner who saw the movie and said he found it would impress people and thought it would make money. I said, "I think it's going to make money right off the bat, but I have doubts about it continuing to make money." He said, "Why do you say that?" I said, "Because of word of mouth. The word will get around that there's nothing to it." You have the younger people who are uneasy about the whole era. You --

Woman- They go in and think they're learning something.
Mr. Weisberg: Yes, and they're uneasy about the assassination.
They're uneasy about Vietnam. There's going to be an appeal
to them. And I don't think they're going to think. I think
they're going to be moot. I think it will continue to appeal
to them. Perhaps not as many as now, but it's first week
was less impressive. The first weekend was less impressive
than they had expected. It was fifth of all of the movies,
and I would have thought all of that promotion and all that
controversy and petty advertising, it would have been first.
The character Brusard at the end, the name was substituted for
Boxley. Boxley can't sue because he's dead.

Woman: Who was Brusard?

Mr. Weisberg: Wasn't there a man Brusard in it? Isn't he the
member of the staff? The lawyer who was negative and finally
the one who was an enemy?

Woman: Yes.

Man: There were so many characters and so many names.
It got confusing.

Mr. Weisberg: That's not the way it was in the original script.
He has Boxley a main character throughout the entire original
script.

Woman: What was Boxley's first name?

Mr. Weisberg: Bill. I understand he changed the name to Brusard.

Woman: Why?

Mr. Weisberg: Because he didn't want to be connected with the terrible things that I had exposed.

Man: Who is Willie O'Keefe? Garrison visits him in prisons, and he is the one who gives the first hint on Shaw.

Woman: The young boy who is homosexual.

Mr. Weisberg: That didn't happen. That was made up, and it wasn't in the original script.

Woman: There was no Willie O'Keefe in reality anywhere?

Mr. Weisberg: It didn't exist.

Woman: Or a young boy?

Mr. Weisberg: No. And, I don't remember anything in the script about Shaw visiting anybody in jail.

Woman: He was a major role, this Willie O'Keefe.

Man: He was one of the main witnesses against Shaw who is called Bertramnd at first.

Mr. Weisberg: Was he white or black?

Woman: White.

Mr. Weisberg: There was a young, black dope addict, whose name was Raymond Bundy, who was a witness. He had no credibility but Garrison put him on. He talked about seeing Shaw and Oswald go into Lake Front when Shaw gave Oswald money. It can't be him then. There are allegations that we have often heard of course about Shaw having young boys, but I've never heard of any association with any young boy, but on the other hand, I

was indifferent to that. I've been trying to find that out. It may very well have been something like that was true. I'm certain there was nothing in the script about Shaw going to jail to visit a young man.

Man: Not Shaw. Garrison.

Weisberg: Garrison? That could be. That could be. I've forgotten. I don't think so, but that could be. It could have never happened in real life. Stone made it up.

Man: There's another scene I noticed with Garrison finding out that there were witnesses who said there smoke behind the fence at ^lDaly Plaza.

Mr. Weisberg: No. It was talked about at the time, but it didn't figure in the trial. It was talked about from the very first.

Man: In the movie he researches it. He asks a blond, young woman, who tells him, "I saw smoke behind the fence. I told it to the FBI, and they told me, you haven't seen this. You have only heard three shots, and not six."

Mr. Weisberg: That's Jean Hill, and she did say that, but I don't think she said anything about smoke behind the fence. Jean Hill has a book coming out. She was a school teacher. I don't know what she is now. She was with Mary ^MMorman when Mary Morman (?) took some polaroid pictures. The Secret Service, she said did tell her that, "We have three empty shells."

There were three shots, and that's all there is to it. You didn't hear anymore." That's been known all along. Jean Hill used to be married. They still refer to her in the Dallas papers as being Jean Hill. There was only a little bit of talk then about smoke behind the fence, but he is talking about, and what he was building up to, Gary Mack wouldn't let him have. That's some work that was done on a Polaroid picture taken by Mary Morman. Two friends of mine had done the work. I have one of the two best prints of it. The Polaroid had begun to deteriorate, but the one I have is the clearest one. The other one has more contrast, and they think that because it has more contrast, it would be more effective in the enhancement process. There has been some, and there will be more. I would say that's less than ten years old or maybe ten years old. He's added that to it. It didn't exist at the time.

Man: There was another female witness? Beverly so and so?

Mr. Weisberg: This is amazing! She slept with everybody except Jesus Christ, and then got religion? She was the babushka lady, and the FBI took her camera and her film, and she saw Oswald and Ruby together, besides sleeping with each one of them. I don't know how many stories she's told.

Woman: She was a stripper?

Mr. Weisberg: She said she worked for Ruby. I don't know if she did or not.

Man: Beverly is shown with a very well situated family in a fancy house, and very luxurious, and she is the one who said she saw Ruby run away, and when Garrison shows her the protocol, she says, "That's not my handwriting. It's Fake."

Mr. Weisberg: I don't know what that could be, because I don't remember any woman in any of the records saying she saw Ruby go away. There was one woman who saw Ruby there, but she said nothing about him running, as I remember it. There is a prohibitive case to be made for Ruby being both at the Texas ^{School Book} Building and at the Hospital. There's people. By other witnesses. I believe Seth Cantor on that. He knew Jack Ruby well, and he was a good reporter. For some reason, however, He hasn't wanted anything to do with me from the very beginning.

Man: Who was Dean Andrews?

Mr. Weisberg: Dean Andrews, I knew well. He gave me one invitation I'm sorry I didn't accept. I'm a Jazz aficionado. I had an appointment to see somebody, and Dean said, "Hal, there's a cat coming down from Cincinnati and he ^{blows} uses a hot horn and we're going to go out and we're going to play a lot of hot jazz." He invited me to go with them and I'm sorry I didn't.

Man: The movie says he was so afraid of Shaw that he didn't tell his name.

Mr. Weisberg: That's made up. Nobody told Andrews to talk. Andrews was quite willing to talk. Andrews gave me the impression, because Andrews was a man who could lie with a straight face. But, Andrews gave me the very definite impression that he believed that Shaw was ^{Bertrand} (Inaudible). ^{Garrison} He sent detectives out. This was all strange to their experience. They were lost. I'm sure if this were the normal police duties, they were competent, but they were lost in this. I never knew Garrison to go after anybody when I was in New Orleans. People would come to the office, but not many of them.

They had some people who were thoroughly unqualified. A couple of friends of Jim Garrison's for example-- I mean of Mark Lane.

Man: What was the relationship between Perry and Shaw?

Mr. Weisberg: I doubt there was any, at all, ever. There's one place where it was very impressive. They talk about Clinton, Louisiana. Those witnesses were very impressive, where Oswald supposedly went to apply for a job at a mental hospital, and Shaw took him up there.

Woman: Was that in there?

Man: No.

Mr. Weisberg: That was the most ~~in~~ incredible link of any kind. Those were not only impressive witnesses, but they covered both political extremes. They covered organized ^{IN} black voters, and the people opposing them. I'm surprised he left that out. That was the one thing he had that he could have showed as a

link between Oswald and Shaw.

Woman: Maybe they said it, and they didn't show it.

Man: In the movie, the link between Oswald and Shaw the former CIA Agent died --

Mr. Weisberg: He was never a CIA Agent.

Man: And his arms deliveries to Cuba.

Mr. Weisberg: All of that was fiction.

Woman: That was fiction? Operation Mongoose didn't exist?

Mr. Weisberg: Banister (X) was a one kind of a strange ultra-reactionary, and he delivered no arms to Cuba. It was a fiction that Oswald was associated with him. That story was pulled much later and was part of a dispute over Banister's estate. Banister's Secretary, by reputation was also his mistress and was named Delphine Roberts. She would not talk to Garrison for a long time. Finally, she got into a controversy with Banister's widow over Banister's file. It was during the course of that controversy that she came out with all these far-out stories of everything Garrison wanted to hear.

Woman: So it's revenge then?

Mr. Weisberg: Nothing else places Oswald in Banister's -- in any association with Banister.

Man: The role of Jack Martin?

Mr. Weisberg: Jack Martin was a real person. They can use the name because he's dead. He was thoroughly undependable. He was very emotional. He was an alcoholic and pretty big liar. What did they say about Jack Martin?

Man: Jack Martin was beaten down by Banister.

Mr. Weisberg: He was pistol whipped, but not for the reason in the script, unless they changed the script. Banister lost his temper.

Man: And he was an eye-witness of the arms deliveries to Cuba, and for that reason was afraid of Banister.

Mr. Weisberg: That's fiction. That's not even in the book. The significance Jack Martin has in reality is that he was the one who first interested Garrison's Office, and not Garrison. He didn't talk to Garrison, but he interested Garrison's Office in the possible connection between ^{Ernie} Shaw and Oswald, and it was at the time of Assassination, and that was the basis of Garrison wanting ^{Ernie} Perry for questioning, at the time of the assassination, and other than that, he has no relevance to anything. It was a personal dispute between him and Banister, that Banister did hit him with a pistol. The rest of it is fiction.

Man: Up to now we have two witnesses against Shaw? Martin and O'Keefe? That's what it says in the movie. "My main witnesses." The third one is Logan. Does he exist?

Mr. Weisberg: No, but there was one witness he used, named Perry Russo, who was a young man.

Woman: He was mentioned.

Mr. Weisberg: I wouldn't have trusted Russo's word for anything. There was something I told Garrison that he never followed-up on. Russo had some of Oswald's literature, and I asked him to get it for me. He said he thought it was in his father's house, and his father wouldn't let him in the house. It was probably true. I would have wondered why a man was telling me this story, and out of all the people in the world, he had some of Oswald's literature. Why he didn't tell me -- If I were Garrison, why he didn't tell me he had this literature.

Woman: What literature are you referring to? What literature? What do you mean?

Mr. Weisberg: Obviously, I think he said he knew Oswald. Where did he get the literature? Under what circumstances?

Woman: Did he?

Mr. Weisberg: He had it. He admitted that. I got it from the New Orleans Newspaper. That's where Garrison could have picked it up. He showed it to a reporter. To get back to what I said, as an investigator, the [?] _____ would be immune.

Man: ^{Fewell} Was Perry afraid of Shaw?

Mr. Weisberg: They had no relationship.

Man: In one scene, Garrison questions Perry, "Tell me who he is." He said, "Oh, it's impossible. He's an untouchable man."

Mr. Weisberg: Garrison never told me any such thing. I have no reason to believe they had any connection. I don't think that because people are homosexuals, they have other major differences than most of us. I think Shaw is the kind of a man, who under no circumstances would have associated with ^{Finn}Perry. ^{Finn}Perry was crude. He was excessively opinionated about everything. He was over-bearing in a lot of ways. He wasn't very appetizing to look at. I just don't think that there's any reason to assume that a cultured man like Shaw would have been in the same room with him. I'm not saying there couldn't have been a party to which they had both been invited or something like that, but no, I don't think they had any real association. From most of what you're telling me, I don't remember from all my time in New Orleans, or any of the records I ^{read}wrote, or from anything Garrison told me. I think-- I don't remember from the script but I may be wrong on that, what I'm really hearing is that Stone did an awful lot of rewriting, because he was so terrified of the original script.

Woman: Maybe he should have just left the original script, because this is certainly not any better.

Mr. Weisberg: He's within the framework of the original script.