

4/28/75: MEMO RE QUESTIONS TO LEON JAWORSKI, earlier today.

Today I had the former Watergate special prosecutor sounding more like a Watergate defendant.

Jaw. spoke at the law school today before about 1,000 people, incl. press. It was to be a Q&A format. I had been formulating a question on propriety of accepting Sp. Pres. post in light of his CIA fund contacts, and wasn't even sure if I'd ask that. When it turned out that students were reluctant to ~~ASK QUESTIONS~~ ask questions at all, I figured I'd start things off. To do so, I had to leave the auditorium to get to the lower aisle where the mikes were. While I ran down there someone asked a Q about the Texas Commission of Inquiry, and when I re-entered Jaw was in the process of a long, involved, and really dishonest answer. He went on and on about how he sat in on most of the Commission's hearings, how he was convinced they were right, how one of the most persuasive things was that Marina Oswald swore her husband was guiltyand so on.

(My recollection of what happened is not precise, because it went so fast and I was horribly busy all day afterwards. It is now several hours later that I have a chance to put down my recollections).

I immediately decided I couldn't let him get away with this, so, unharmed with any documentation, I went to the mike and did the best I could. First I introduced myself as an authority on the subject, having recently published a book proving Oswald innocent. Then I said I wished to correct the erroneous statement about Marina. Her opinion of guilt was irrelevant, and furthermore, her credibility was nonexistent, illustrating by way of her statements on the rifle and rifle practice.

Jaw chimed in that he was personally present at her WC testimony, and thus had direct knowledge. I asked him what he would do about the earlier FBI and SS interviews with her, or the threats to deport her. He professed no knowledge of them, but said he was sure the WC evaluated them. I don't recall exactly how our exchange went, but this has been the general idea.

I then asked him to explain how he could have made a speech on March 19, 1964 saying Oswald was definitely guilty, when none of the evidence had even been adduced by then, or how he could write to the WC on May 8, 1964 offering to have the Hudkins story retracted when it hadn't been investigated as to whether or not it was true.

In true Watergate fashion, Jaw said he had no recollection of either the speech or the letter, and doubted he said or wrote either. I assured him he had, and we got involved in a fierce exchange on that. He threw in something to the effect how can he be expected to answer questions about things he doesn't believe are true, and I retorted that I would not frame questions based on falsehoods he was putting forth. It got really heated, and at a couple points I drew applause from the audience; at a couple points he did as well.

Finally I posed the question about CIA fund, etc, which he had earlier admitted ("Not a cent of Andersen Foundation money was used. We just allowed the CIA to use the Foundation as a conduit for its own funds." Also, this was done through NY, and he was not involved.) He did not answer the question, and simply said he would stand on his record as special prosecutor. At that point I wasn't about to challenge him.

In answering someone else's question (he got quite a few on the assass), he said he did not advocate a new investigation because he convinced that the WC did a competent, complete job, and he was not

"selling anything", an obvious reference to my book.

Several reporters came up to me, mostly local, and some of the leftwing lunatic fringe at school--one involved with Skolnick and Mae Brussel. A reporter from UPI came up to me right away and said "You should have had the documents, man. No one's gonna listen to you unless you have them." I told him that I wasn't expecting this line of questioning, otherwise I would have had them with me. He said, that's no good. Either have them there or forget it, since Jaw is a respected national figure and me an unknown with no established credentials. The guy was young and kind of a schmuck.

In talking to my friends afterwards, I discerned that, willing as people are now becoming to believe the WJ was wrong, they are not very anxious to have national heroes, such as Jaw, debunked and stood up to. I should have realized this. Most people told me I did well but could take a lesson or two in tact. Someone else (a good friend and a real joker) said he was going to buy me a muzzle.

Howard Roffman

4/28/75--addendum to Jaworski report: I forget to mention the last remark made by Jaw before I began my questioning. He addressed what he called the film alleged to show Kennedy thrown backwards when struck. He said words to the effect, "Now I don't have to tell you that if there was this important kind of photographic evidence of the murder they wouldn't have waited 10 years to develop it." It was on this point that I began my questioning, by stating that the film had been developed immediately, and is in the Commission's files, and that the crucial frames had been transposed in printing.

NR
