

**CBS NEWS INQUIRY, "THE WARREN REPORT"—
PART III**
(Broadcast over the CBS Television Network,
June 27, 1967)

With CBS News Correspondents Walter Cronkite, Dan Rather, Mike Wallace, and KRLD-TV News Director Eddie Barker.

Executive producer: Leslie Midgley.
CRONKITE. For two nights we have been looking for answers to major questions concerning the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Sunday night we asked: Did Lee Harvey Oswald take a rifle to the Book Depository Building? Our answer was yes. Where was Oswald on the day President Kennedy was shot? In the building on the sixth floor. Was Oswald's rifle fired from the building? Yes. How many shots were fired? Most likely, three. How fast could Oswald's rifle be fired? Fast enough. What was the time span of the shots? At least as large as the Warren Commission reported? Most likely the assassin had more time, not less.

And so, we concluded Sunday night that Lee Harvey Oswald fired three shots at the motorcade. And then, last night, we began to look into the question of conspiracy. Were there others also firing at the President? We interviewed eyewitnesses. They told conflicting stories. We tested in our own investigation the critical single bullet theory and found one bullet might well have wounded both men. Captain James Humes, who conducted the autopsy on the President, broke a three-and-a-half-year silence to report that he has re-examined the X-rays and photographs and stands firm that the shots came from behind. We heard Governor Connally and heard that his recollections conform with our own reconstruction of the assassination. And we concluded that there was no second gunman.

Tonight, we look further into the question of conspiracy. Was Oswald acting alone, or was he the agent of others? Was the assassination the sole work of a twisted, discontented man, seeking a place in history? Or, were there dark forces behind Oswald?

Continuing to seek an answer to the question of whether Lee Harvey Oswald was involved in a conspiracy leads us to a second murder. Oswald was taken into custody in a movie theatre at 1:50 P.M., 80 minutes after President Kennedy was shot. But he was first charged, not with the murder of the President, but with the murder of Dallas police officer, J. D. Tippitt.

Our next question: Could Oswald have made his way to the scene of Officer Tippitt's murder?

RATHER. To solve the Tippitt killing, it is vital to reconstruct Lee Harvey Oswald's actions from the moment of the assassination to the moment of Tippitt's death. Yet for three and a half years, all news media have been barred from the Texas School Book Depository where the first critical few moments of Oswald's flight occurred. Depository officials have agreed to lift the ban for these special broadcasts and so, for the first time, we have been able to follow the path of Oswald's movements from his sniper's nest on the sixth floor.

Taking his rifle with him, Oswald went between the stacks of book cartons to the opposite corner of the sixth floor. He tucked the rifle down between stacks, and at this point probably discovered that the elevator could not be brought up, that Charles Givens, eager to see the parade, had forgotten to close the gate. So Oswald turned to the stairs and went down four flights to the second floor and to the lunchroom, there, where he was next seen at about 12:31 P.M., barely a minute and a half after his third shot.

In front of a coffee machine a policeman at gunpoint actually stopped Oswald. But Depository Superintendent Roy Truly told the officer Oswald was an employee, and Oswald was released. Free to go, Oswald apparently crossed the second floor through this office, went down the front stairs, perhaps three

minutes after the assassination, and continued out through the glass front door, well before police sealed off the Depository building.

CRONKITE. Here is how the Warren Commission reconstructed Oswald's movements after he left the Depository. He walked seven blocks down Elm Street, then took a bus on Murphy, headed for Oak Cliff. But the bus quickly became tangled in the traffic jam caused by the assassination itself. And Oswald got off, walked two blocks to Lamar, then took a cab several blocks past his rooming house on Beckley.

The Commission believes he then walked back to his apartment picked up a revolver and a lightweight jacket, and set off on foot down Beckley.

POLICE RADIO. Attention all squads. Attention all squads. The suspect in the shooting at Elm and Houston is reported to be an unknown white man, approximately 30, slender build, is possibly armed with what is thought to be a 30 calibre rifle. No further description at this time, or information. 12:45. KTB.

CRONKITE. During this period, the Dallas police radio broadcast a description of a suspect, and critics have made much of the speed with which it was sent out—just 15 minutes after the shots were fired. It asked officers to be on the lookout for a white man, slender, weighing about 165, standing about 5 feet 10 inches, in his early 30's.

Well, how did police get the description on the air in 15 minutes? Critics have questioned both the source of the description and the speed with which it was sent out. The Warren Commission admitted the source could only be guessed at. Its own guess was that it came from Howard L. Brennan, an eyewitness. The critics doubt Brennan had a good enough view of Oswald in the window to arrive at a good description. They also doubt he passed the information on to a Secret Serviceman within 10 minutes, as he later claimed.

At 1:15 P.M., 45 minutes after the assassination, the Commission Report says, Officer Tippitt stopped Oswald, whether because of the description or not will never be known, and was shot down. But did Oswald have time to get to Tenth and Patton in time for the fatal encounter with Tippitt?

RATHER. A CBS newsmen, following the Warren Commission blueprint, found that 45 minutes was ample time.

CRONKITE. The answer is yes. He could have made his way there.

Why was Officer Tippitt in Oak Cliff off his normal beat? Those who believe there was a conspiracy involving the Dallas police force have maintained that the meeting between Oswald and Tippitt was not an accident, that Tippitt may have been looking for Oswald or vice versa. They say Tippitt should not have been where he was and should not have been alone in the squad car. Eddie Barker talked to police radio dispatcher, Murray Jackson:

BARKER. Officer Jackson, a lot of critics of the Warren Report have made quite a thing out of the fact that Officer Tippitt was not in his district when he was killed. Could you tell us how he happened to be out of his district?

MURRAY JACKSON. Yes, sir, I have heard this several times since the incident occurred. He was where he was because I had assigned him to be where he was in the central Oak Cliff area. There was the shooting involving the President and we immediately dispatched every available unit to the triple underpass where the shot was reported to have come from.

I realized that we were draining the Oak Cliff area of available police officers, so if there was an emergency such as an armed robbery or a major accident to come up, we wouldn't have anybody there that would be in any close proximity to answer the call. And since J. D. was the outermost unit—

**THE CBS "WARREN REPORT"—
PART III**

MR. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have previously had printed in the Record all of the four successive broadcasts titled "The Warren Report," as produced by CBS in the last week of June. I ask unanimous consent that part of that "News Inquiry," as CBS described it, which appeared on the News television screen on June 27, may be printed in the Record. There being no objection, the report is ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

actually I had two units: 87, which was Officer Nelson, and 78, which was Officer Tippit.

BARKER. Well, now, is—you got down to the time when Officer Tippit met his death. What transpired right prior to that? Did you—were you aware of where he was all the time?

JACKSON. No, I asked him once again what his location was sometime after and to determine that he was in the Oak Cliff area, he said he was at Lancaster and Eighth, which is on the east side of Oak Cliff, on the—in the main business district. And I asked him once again, a few minutes later what his—I called him to ask him his location so I could keep track of him, where he was, in my mind, but he didn't answer.

BARKER. When did you realize that he was dead?

JACKSON. We had received a call from a citizen. They called us on the telephone and the call sheet came—came to me and there was a disturbance in the street in the 400 block of East Tenth. And I had called. I said, "78," and he didn't answer. And almost immediately to this, a citizen came in on the police radio and said, "Send me some help there's been an officer shot out here." And knowing that J. D. was the only one that should have been in Oak Cliff, my reaction was to call 78, and, of course, J. D. didn't answer. So, we asked the citizen to look at the—the number on the side of the car. This was the equipment number that determined which car, which patrol car, was to be on each assigned district, and they said that it was number 10. And since I had worked with J. D. in this particular car, well, I determined to myself that with him not answering, and the equipment number, that this was Officer Tippit.

CRONKITE. The answer to this question is that he had been sent to Oak Cliff by the police dispatcher. Opponents of the Warren Report maintain that Officer Tippit was shot, not by Oswald, but by others. Who shot Officer Tippit? Eddie Barker talked to two witnesses who were on the scene of the Tippit murder. First, Domingo Benavides, who was at the wheel of a truck across the street from the scene.

DOMINGO BENAVIDES. As I was driving down the street I seen this police car, was sitting here, and the officer was getting out of the car and apparently he'd been talking to the man that was standing by the car. The policeman got out of the car and, as he walked past the windshield of the car, where it's kind of lined up over the hood of the car, where this other man shot him. And, of course, he was reaching for his gun.

And so, I was standing there, you know, I mean sitting there in the truck, and not in no big hurry to get out because I was sitting there watching everything. This man turned from the car then, and took a couple of steps and, as he turned to walk away I believe he was unloading his gun, and he took the shells up in his hand and, as he took off, he threw them in the bushes more or less like nothing really, trying to get rid of them. I guess he didn't figure he'd get caught anyway, so he just threw them in the bushes.

But he—as he started to turn to walk away, well, he stopped and looked back at me and I don't know if he figured, well, I'll just let this poor guy go, or he had nothing to do with it, or, you know, I'm not out to kill everybody, just, you know, whoever gets in my way, I guess. I gave him enough time to get around the house. Thinking he might have went in the house, I set there for maybe a second or two and then jumped out of the truck and run . . . I don't even slow down, I seen the officer's dead. So I just walked on—got in the car and I figured that would be the fastest way—in fact, I don't know why I called him on the radio. I just figured now that it was the fastest way to—to get a police officer out.

POLICE RADIO. Hello, police operator (static), go ahead. Hello, we've got a shooting out here. Where's it at? This is the police radio. What location is it at? Between Marshalls and Beckley. It's a police officer. Somebody shot him. What—what—it's in a police car, Number 10. Hello, police operator, did you get that? Police officer, 510 East Jefferson. Thank you, 35, assist the police . . .

BARKER. Well, now, did several other people come up later?

BENAVIDES. Immediately afterwards. I mean, it was just—all I had to do was—people I asked a block away like Mr. Callaway, he come up and he says, let's go get him, or something. And then this cab pulled up right afterwards, and so Callaway went over and took the guns—the officer's gun out of his hand.

BARKER. Callaway did go after him, did he?

BENAVIDES. Yeah, Callaway took off to go try to catch him.

TED CALLAWAY. Well, Eddie, I was standing on the front porch of the used car lot that I worked on here, and all of a sudden I heard some shooting.

In fact, I heard five shots coming from the direction behind the lot, out on Tenth Street there. Well, I come running off the side of the porch and out to the sidewalk here, and I looked up the street and I saw this man run through this hedge up here on the corner. And I saw right away that he had a gun in his hand. And he continued across the street coming in this direction. So when he got right across from me over here, just, oh, about 30 yards or less, why, I called to him and just asked him, "Hey, man, what the hell's goin' on, fella?" That's just exactly what I wondered. I didn't know who it was at the time, of course. And he looked in my direction and paused, almost stopped, and said something to me but I couldn't make out what he said. But he had this pistol in his hand, carrying it in what we used to call in the Marine Corps a raised pistol position, and then he slowed down and started walking.

Then, I ran to the corner of Tenth and Patton, and when I got there, I saw this squad car parked near the curb. And then I walked around in front of the squad car and this policeman was lying in front of the squad car.

BARKER. Dom, what about those expended shells?

BENAVIDES. Well, they were looking all over the place for evidence, I guess, and taking fingerprints and what have you. So, I guessed they was going to walk off and leave them, you know, not knowing they was there. And seeing that I knew where they was at, I walked over and—and picked up a stick and picked them up and put them in a waistcoat pocket. I think I picked up two and put them in a waistcoat pocket and then, as I was walking up, I picked the other one up by hand, I believe. And I picked them up with a stick, you know, to keep from leaving fingerprints on them, because I figured they might need them.

CRONKITE. The cartridges that Benavides picked up were positively identified as being fired in Oswald's revolver. But, only one of the four lead bullets removed from Officer Tippit's body could be positively identified with that revolver by Illinois ballistics identification expert, Joseph Nicol.

NICOL. In the examination of the projectiles the tests and the—the evidence projectiles were not easily matched because of a certain mechanical problem with the weapon. The—the barrel was over-sized for the size of the ammunition used, since this was a weapon originally intended for British use, and it was reimported into America.

This means that the bullet, instead of touching on all surfaces going down the barrel, actually wobbles a little bit as it goes through the barrel. As a consequence, it is difficult to have it strike the same places every time that it goes through the barrel.

So that the—the match on the—the on the projectiles was extremely difficult.

I did find, however, that on the driving edge of the lense there were certain groups of lines which I could match on one bullet. I wasn't able to identify the others, although there was nothing to exclude them insofar as the class characteristics. All of them could have been fired in that particular weapon.

CRONKITE. One of the bullets that killed Officer Tippit was fired in Oswald's revolver. The other three could have been, according to the ballistics identification expert, Ted Callaway went to the police station that night and made a positive identification of Oswald in a line-up. But Mr. Benavides did not do so. Eddie Barker asked him if he were sure Oswald did the shooting.

BARKER. Is there any doubt in your mind that Oswald was the man you had seen shoot Tippit?

BENAVIDES. No, sir, there was no doubt at all. I could even tell you how he combed his hair and the clothes he wore and what have you, all the details. And if he had a scar on his face, I could probably have told you about it, but—you don't forget things like that.

CRONKITE. The answer to this question, despite the problem of the ballistic evidence, is that Lee Harvey Oswald shot J. D. Tippit.

What of the theory that Tippit actually knew Oswald? It's not easy to prove that someone did not know someone else. But every attempt to pin down the rumor that the two men knew each other has ended in failure. There is nothing in the circumstances surrounding Tippit's death to suggest any kind of conspiracy. Mrs. Tippit says flatly that neither she nor her husband knew Oswald. Officer Jackson was among Tippit's closest friends and had been for years. Eddie Barker put the question to him.

BARKER. Do you have any reason to believe that Officer Tippit knew Lee Harvey Oswald?

JACKSON. I don't believe there is a possible connection at all. No, I don't think that he knew Oswald.

BARKER. Did you know Oswald?

JACKSON. No, I didn't either.

RATHER. Thirty-five minutes after Officer Tippit's murder Oswald was captured in the Texas Theatre. Johnny Brewer, a shoe clerk, had spotted him in the doorway, and watched while he slipped into the theatre. Brewer spoke to the cashier. She called police.

The next 48 hours were filled with confusion. An army of newsmen jammed into the Dallas Police Building. Oswald was paraded through the halls, to and from questioning sessions.

Police Chief Jesse Curry and District Attorney Henry Wade said repeatedly they expected to prove Oswald guilty, although he maintained to the last he was not.

No record was made of his interrogation Sunday, November 24th, the mob scene continues, as Oswald is brought into the basement of the Police Building for treatment to the jail. And then, in full sight of millions of television viewers, a man named Jack Ruby surges through the crowd and shoots Lee Oswald dead.

CRONKITE. Why? A fateful meeting of deranged minds? Or some twisted conspiracy? Why did Ruby kill Oswald?

RATHER. This is the world of Jack Ruby: A world of neon and female flesh, of burlesque and grinds, and watered drinks.

Ruby operated a pair of sleazy nightclubs: The Carousel and The Vegas. In the free and easy atmosphere that seemed to characterize the boom city Ruby was also a hanger-on of the police, entertaining off-duty officers at his strip joints, often carrying sandwiches over to the Police Building for his on-duty friends.

These are some of the people of Jack Ruby's world—his roommate, a competing night club owner, and two of Jack Ruby's pals.

Mr. Weinstein, why do you think Jack Ruby shot Lee Harvey Oswald?

BARNET WEINSTEIN. I think it was on the spur of the moment, that he really wanted to make himself look like a big man. And he thought that would make him above everybody else, that the people would come up and thank him for it, that people would come around and want to meet him and want to know him, "This is the man that shot the man that shot the President."

RATHER. Why do you think Jack shot Oswald?

ALICE. Oh, I think that it was mostly an impulsive act. And Jack also, I believe, felt that so many people at the time were saying, "They ought to kill him," and this and that, that he—in my personal opinion, Jack thought this would just bring him a—a sensational amount of business, and he would just really be a hero.

RATHER. Diana, why do you think Jack shot Oswald?

DIANA. I think that he came down there just to see what was going on, and when he saw that sneer on Oswald's face—that's all it would take to snap Jack, the way Oswald's mouth was curled up, you could even see it in the picture. I think when he saw that look was when he decided to shoot him. Not when he was coming down. And I think he did it because he thought that it was a service to his country, in his way of thinking. That was the way he thought.

GEORGE SENARON. I don't believe that Jack Ruby ever took any secrets to his grave. I've been—I've been around him too long, and I've lived with him too long. And I'm certain he told the truth right up until his death. And I'll never can be—and I'll never be convinced otherwise. There is nothing he ever hid. The public knew everything he ever said, or heard.

CRONKITE. Jack Ruby was convicted of the murder of Oswald, but the conviction was reversed by an Appeals Court which held that an alleged confession should not have been admitted.

Ruby died six months ago of cancer, maintaining to the last that he was no conspirator, that he had killed Oswald out of anger and a desire to shield Jacqueline Kennedy from the ordeal of a trial at which she would have had to appear as a witness.

Dallas police had alerted the press that Oswald would be moved to the County Jail shortly after 10:00 AM on November 24th. That departure was delayed. Yet a receipt shows that Ruby was sending a money order to one of his strippers from a Western Union office across from the courthouse at 11:17 AM, when anyone premeditating murder in the courthouse by intent would already have stationed himself there. In fact, it was probably the activity around the courthouse entrance which caught Jack Ruby's eye as he left the Western Union office. Ruby was carrying a pistol because he was carrying money. He was accustomed to wander in and out of the Police Building at will.

The Oswald murder today still appears to have been not a conspiracy, but an impulse—meaningless violence born of meaningless violence.

But the most recent, most spectacular development in the Oswald case involves the C.I.A. It involves, too, the spectacular District Attorney of New Orleans, a man they call the Jolly Green Giant. It involves an arrest, hypnotism, truth serum, bribery charges, and, for the first time, an outline of a conspiracy. It certainly accounts for the recent national upsurge of suspicion concerning the conclusions of the Warren Report. And it raises a new question: Was the assassination plotted in New Orleans?

Mike Wallace reports.

Wallace, New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison quietly began his own investigation of the assassination last fall. In a sense, he picked up where the Warren Commission had left off. Warren investigators questioned a number of people in New Or-

leans after the assassination, and they failed to implicate any of them. But the more Garrison went back over old ground apparently, the more fascinated he became with the possibility that a plot to kill President Kennedy actually began in New Orleans. By the time the story of his investigation broke four months ago he seemed supremely confident that he could make a case, that he had solved the assassination.

GARRISON. Because I certainly wouldn't say with confidence that we would make arrests and have convictions afterwards if I did not know that we had solved the assassination of President Kennedy beyond any shadow of a doubt. I can't imagine that people would think that—that I would guess and say something like that rashly. There's no question about it. We know what cities were involved, we know how it was done in—in the essential respects. We know the key individuals involved. And we're in the process of developing evidence now. I thought I made that clear days ago.

WALLACE. He shocked New Orleans four months ago by arresting the socially prominent Clay Shaw, former director of the New Orleans International Trade Mart.

Garrison's charge was that Shaw had conspired with two other men to plot the assassination of President Kennedy. Garrison said Shaw had known David Ferrie, an eccentric former airline pilot who was found dead a week before Garrison had planned to arrest him. Incidentally, the coroner said Ferrie died of natural causes. But Garrison called it suicide.

He said Shaw also knew Lee Harvey Oswald; that Ferrie, Oswald, and Shaw met one night in the summer of 1963 and plotted the President's death. Clay Shaw said it was all fantastic.

SHAW. I am completely innocent of any such charges. I have not conspired with anyone, at any time, or any place, to murder our late and esteemed President John F. Kennedy, or any other individual. I have always had only the highest and utmost respect and admiration for Mr. Kennedy.

The charges filed against me have no foundation in fact or in law. I have not been apprised of the basis of these fantastic charges, and assume that in due course I will be furnished with this information, and will be afforded an opportunity to prove my innocence.

I did not know Harvey Lee Oswald, nor did I ever see or talk with him, or anyone who knew him at any time in my life.

WALLACE. A preliminary hearing for Shaw was held two weeks after his arrest. The hearing was complete with a surprise mystery witness, Perry Raymond Russo, twenty-five-year-old insurance salesman, and friend of the late David Ferrie. Through three days of intense cross-examination Russo held doggedly to his story, that he himself had been present when Shaw, Ferrie, and Oswald plotted the Kennedy assassination. Russo admitted at the hearing that he had been hypnotized three times by Garrison men.

A writer for The Saturday Evening Post said he read transcripts of what went on at those sessions. The writer suggested that Russo's entire performance at the hearing was the product of post-hypnotic suggestion. Clay Shaw was ordered held for trial. It could be months before the trial actually takes place.

Meanwhile, various news organizations have reported serious charges against Jim Garrison and his staff, alleging bribery, intimidation, and efforts to plant and/or manufacture evidence against Shaw. Last month New York Magazine said Garrison's office had tried to lure Alvin Beauboeuf, the twenty-one-year-old former friend of David Ferrie, Beauboeuf, the magazine said, was offered three thousand dollars to supply testimony

that would shore up the conspiracy charge against Shaw.

Garrison promptly released an affidavit Beauboeuf had signed. The affidavit asked no one working for Garrison had ever asked Beauboeuf to tell anything but the truth.

Subsequently, New Orleans police investigated the Beauboeuf charge and said Garrison's men had been falsely accused. But that was just the beginning. Three more bribery accusations have since come to light, two involving Louisiana prison inmates, one involving a nightclub and Turkish Bath operator. In each of those cases the charges that rewards were offered in return for allegedly false testimony or other help that would implicate Clay Shaw. We will hear Garrison's comment on those charges later in the broadcast.

Meanwhile, Garrison has gone on to include Jack Ruby in the alleged conspiracy involving Shaw and Lee Harvey Oswald. Garrison says Jack Ruby's unlisted telephone number in 1963 appears in code in address books belonging to Shaw and Oswald. He says both books note the Dallas Post Office box number 11906. Ruby's unlisted phone number was Whitehall-1 5601. And Garrison furnished a complicated formula for converting PO 11906 to WH-1 5601.

Louisiana Senator Russell Long, appearing on Face the Nation a few days later, explained how the code works.

LONG. So if you take the P and the O, and you use a telephone dial, P gives you seven, O gives you six. You add seven and six together and you get thirteen. Then you take the 19106, and you work on a A B C D E F—the A B C D E basis, so you put A—a falls—comes ahead of E. Then you put D behind C. And you reconstruct the numbers, and that—and then you subtract thirteen hundred, which you got for the P O, and that gives you Ruby's unlisted telephone number.

WALLACE. A Dallas businessman named Lee Odom had that Dallas Post Office box for a while in 1966. He said he didn't know how the number got in Oswald's address book, but he could explain how it got in Shaw's. Odom said he met Shaw when he went to New Orleans looking for a place to hold a bloodless bullfight.

ODOM. When I got to New Orleans, and I got there—it was late, and so I wanted to see what New Orleans—my first trip to New Orleans. And I went to Pat O'Brien's, and that's where I met Mr. Shaw. I was sitting, drinking at the bar, and he was sitting next to me, and I got to talking to him about the—if he thought a bullfight might go over good in—in New Orleans. And he said that he thought it would, and we introduced each other. He was in the real estate business, and said he might be able to help me. So the next day, why, we had lunch together, and tried to find out about a place to have a bullfight. Made two or three phone calls, and—we didn't find any place. So when I got ready to leave there, I give him my name and my box number, which I saw him write in his little book. And I never heard from him after that. But that's how the number got in the book.

WALLACE. The number 19106 does appear in Oswald's address book, although some say the letters in front of it are not P O, but Russian letters. No one knows when Oswald made the entry.

Garrison has expanded the scope of his charges to include not only a Shaw-Oswald-Ruby link, but the C.I.A. as well. Further, Garrison says he knows that five anti-Castro Cuban guerrillas, not Lee Harvey Oswald, killed President Kennedy. He says the C.I.A. is concealing both the names and the whereabouts of the Cubans.

In an interview with Bob Jones of WWI-TV, New Orleans, he discussed proof that the guerrillas were there at Dealey Plaza in Dallas.

GARRISON. We have even located photographs in which we can—we have found them—the men behind the grassy knoll, and the—and the stone wall, before they dropped completely out of sight. There were five of them. Three behind the stone wall, and two behind the grassy knoll. And they're not quite out of sight. And they've been located in other photographs, by process of bringing them out. Although they're not distinct enough you can make an identification from their faces.

WALLACE. This is one of the photographs Garrison is talking about, shown first with an overlay. Those roughly-drawn figures at the bottom of the page could be the men Garrison believes he sees through the little holes at the top. Now we remove the overlay to see the photograph itself—a hazy blowup of an area from a larger picture. If there are men up there behind the wall, they definitely cannot be seen with the naked eye.

I asked Garrison if he would sort it all out, if he could summarize his investigation, and put it in perspective.

GARRISON. About the New Orleans part. I don't like to sound coy, but it is impossible to talk about the New Orleans details without touching somehow on the case. And I'm not going to take any chances about reflecting on Mr. Shaw, or this case. We've worked too hard for me to ruin it by casual comment.

WALLACE. Four months ago you said that you had solved the assassination. At that time you didn't even know Perry Russo. And yet Perry Russo, it turns out, is your main witness in the preliminary hearing.

GARRISON. Right.

WALLACE. Is he still your main witness?

GARRISON. No.

WALLACE. Are there others?

GARRISON. No. There are others and I would not describe Perry Russo as the main witness. But let me say this, that the major part of our case, up to that time, was circumstantial. Again, I don't want to touch in any way on the case against the defendant, but we knew months before that the key people involved but there was no basis for moving at that time.

WALLACE. You say that Lee Harvey Oswald did not kill President Kennedy. Who, then, did kill him?

GARRISON. Well, first of all, if I knew the names of the individuals behind the grassy knoll, where we know they were and the stone wall, I certainly would not tell you, and couldn't here. There is no question about the fact they were there. There's no question in our minds what the dominant race of these individuals was. And there's no question about the motive. In the course of time we will have the names of every one of them. The reason for Officer Tippit's murder is simply this: It was necessary for them to get rid of the decoy in the case—Lee Oswald . . . Lee Oswald. Now, in order to get rid of him—so that he would not later describe the people involved in this, they had what I think is a rather clever plan. It's well-known that police officers react violently to the murder of a police officer. All they did was arrange for an officer to be sent out to Tenth Street, and when Officer Tippit arrived there he was murdered, with no other reason than that. Now, after he was murdered, Oswald was pointed to, sitting in the back of the Texas Theatre where he'd been told to wait, obviously.

Now, the idea was, quite apparently, that Oswald would be killed in the Texas Theatre when he arrived, because he'd killed a "blue-coat." That's the way the officers in New Orleans use the phrase. "He killed a blue-coat." But the Dallas police, at least the arresting Dallas police, hated them because they had, apparently, too much humanity in them, and they did not kill him.

WALLACE. All right, there is Lee Harvey Oswald at the back of the Texas Theatre—then what?

GARRISON. Well, then, notification is gotten to the police of this suspicious man in the back of the theatre, and you know the rest. But the—the Dallas police, apparently, at least the arresting police officers, had more humanity in them than the planners had in mind. And this is the first point at which the plan did not work completely. So Oswald was not killed there. He was arrested. This left a problem, because if Lee Oswald stayed alive long enough, obviously he would name names and talk about this thing that he'd been drawn into. It was necessary to kill him.

WALLACE. That's where Jack Ruby comes into the picture.

GARRISON. That's right. It was necessary for one of the people involved to kill him.

WALLACE. Mr. Garrison, obviously we're not going to try the case of Clay Shaw here on television, but some people, some journalists and others, have charged that you have tried to bribe, to hypnotize, to drug witnesses in order to prove your case against Shaw.

GARRISON. That's right. I understand that the latest—latest news by a New York Times writer is that we offered an ounce of heroin and three months' vacation to one—as a matter of fact, this is part of our incentive program for convicts. We also have six weeks in the Bahamas, and we give them some LSD to get there.

This—this—this attitude of skepticism on the part of the press is an astonishing thing to me, and a new thing to me. They have a problem with my office. And one of the problems is that we have no political appointments. Most of our men are selected by recommendations of deans of law schools. They work 9:00 to 5:00, and we have a highly professional office. I think one of the best in the country. So they're reduced to making up these fictions. We have not intimidated a witness since the day I came in office.

WALLACE. One question is asked again and again: Why doesn't Jim Garrison give his information, if it is valid information, why doesn't he give it to the Federal Government? Now that everything is out in the open the C.I.A. could hardly stand in your way again, could they? Why don't you take this information that you have and cooperate with the Federal Government?

GARRISON. Well, that would be one approach, Mike. Or I could take my files and take them up on the Mississippi River Bridge and throw them in the river. It'd be about the same result.

WALLACE. You mean, they just don't want any other solution from that in the Warren Report?

GARRISON. Well, isn't that kind of obvious? Where do you think that pressure's coming from that prevents witnesses and defendants from being brought back to our state?

WALLACE. Where is that pressure coming from?

GARRISON. It's coming from Washington, obviously.

WALLACE. For what reason?

GARRISON. Because there are individuals in Washington who do not want the truth about the Kennedy murder to come out.

WALLACE. Where are those individuals? Are they in the White House? Are they in the C.I.A.? Are they in the FBI? Where are they?

GARRISON. I think the probability is that you'll find them in the Justice Department and the Central Intelligence Agency.

WALLACE. You're asking a good many questions, but you haven't got the answers to those questions. You have a theory as to why indeed the President might have been assassinated by a group of dissidents. . . .

GARRISON. No. Your statement is incorrect. We have more than a theory. We have conversations about the assassination of the President of the United States, and it does not include only the conversation brought out at the preliminary hearing.

We have money passed, with regard to the

assassination of the President of the United States. We have individuals involved in the planning. And we can make the case completely. I can't make any more comments about the case, except to say anybody that thinks it's just a theory is going to be awfully surprised when it comes to trial.

WALLACE. Garrison says Clay Shaw used the alias Clay Bertrand, or Clem Bertrand. At Shaw's preliminary hearing Perry Russo testified that Shaw used the name Clem Bertrand the night of the alleged meeting to plot the assassination. It was obviously a crucial point in Garrison's presentation at that hearing.

But a week ago NBC said it has discovered that Clay Bertrand is not Clay Shaw. NBC said the man who uses that alias is a New Orleans homosexual, whose real name—now disclosed in the broadcast—has been turned over to the Justice Department.

CRONKITE. Garrison's problems multiplied yesterday. His chief aide, William Gurvich, who conferred recently with Senator Robert Kennedy, abruptly resigned.

Gurvich was questioned by Bill Reed, News Director of WWL-TV, New Orleans, and CBS News reporter Edward Rabel.

RABEL. Mr. Gurvich, why did you resign as Mr. Garrison's chief aide in this investigation?

GURVICH. I was very dissatisfied with the way the investigation was being conducted, and I saw no reason for the investigation—and decided that if the job of an investigator is to find the truth, then I was to find it. I found it. And this led to my resignation.

RABEL. Well, what then is the truth?

GURVICH. The truth, as I see it, is that Mr. Shaw should never have been arrested.

RABEL. Why did you decide to see Senator Robert Kennedy?

GURVICH. Ed, I went to Senator Kennedy because he was a brother of the late President Kennedy, to tell him we could shed no light on the death of his brother, and not to be hoping for such. After I told him that, he appeared to be rather disgusted to think that someone was exploiting his brother's death, and—by bringing it up, over and over again, and doing what has been done in this investigation.

REED. There's been talk of allegations, of wrong-doing, of coercion, of possible bribery on the part of investigators—of certain investigators for the District Attorney. To your knowledge, are these allegations true?

GURVICH. Unquestionably, things have happened in the District Attorney's Office that definitely warrants an investigation by the Parish Grand Jury, as well as the Federal Grand Jury.

REED. Would you say these methods were illegal?

GURVICH. I would say very illegal, and unethical.

REED. Can you give us any specifics?

GURVICH. I would rather save that for the Grand Jurors, Bill, if I may.

REED. Is this one the part of just one or two investigators, or does it involve the whole staff, or perhaps Mr. Garrison . . .

GURVICH. It involves more than two people. Reed. More than two people. Do you believe Mr. Garrison had knowledge of these activities?

GURVICH. Yeah—of course, he did. He ordered it.

REED. He ordered it.

GURVICH. He ordered it. Yes, sir.

RABEL. Why did he feel it was necessary to order such activities?

GURVICH. That I cannot explain. I am not a psychiatrist.

REED. Mr. Garrison said the C.I.A. has attempted to block his investigation . . .

GURVICH. His purpose for bringing the C.I.A. in, Bill, is this: As he put it, they can't afford to answer. He can say what he damn well pleases about that agency, and they never reply.

CRONKITE. Mr. Garrison is the only critic who has been in a position to act on his beliefs. He has brought Clay Shaw before the courts of Louisiana, and until that case is tried we cannot, with propriety, go deep into the details of the evidence, or reach any final conclusions concerning the case or the allegations concerning Clay Shaw.

Mr. Garrison's public statements, however—and there's been no shortage of them—are fair targets. They have consistently promised startling proof, but until the trial Mr. Garrison's promises remain just that, and cannot be tested.

But the whole atmosphere of his investigations, and the charges that have been made by news organizations concerning it, are not such as to inspire confidence. It may be that Garrison will finally show that there was a lunatic fringe in dark and devious conspiracy. But, so far, he has shown us nothing to link the events he alleges to have taken place in New Orleans, and the events we know to have taken place in Dallas.

Those events, events surrounding the assassination itself, we have now examined to the best of our ability. On Sunday night we considered whether Lee Harvey Oswald had shot the President. We concluded that he had. Last night we asked if there was more than one assassin. We concluded there was not, and that Oswald was a sole assassin.

Tonight we've asked if there was a conspiracy involving perhaps Officer Tippit, Jack Ruby, or others. The answer here cannot be as firm as our other answers, partly because of the difficulty, cited in the Warren Report, of proving something did not happen. But parity, too, because there remains a question as to just what Jim Garrison will produce in that New Orleans courtroom.

But on the basis of the evidence now in hand at least, we still can find no convincing indication of such a conspiracy. If we put those three conclusions together, they seem to CBS News to tell just one story—Lee Harvey Oswald, alone, and for reasons all his own, shot and killed President Kennedy. It is too much to expect that the critics of the Warren Report will be satisfied with the conclusion CBS News has reached, any more than they were satisfied with the conclusions the Commission reached.

Mark Lane, for example, the most vocal of all the critics, has a theory of his own.

BILL STOUT. If you would give us, briefly, Mr. Lane's your version of what happened there that day.

LANE. Well, I think—if I can use this model, I think the evidence indicates—of course, the car came down Main, up here, and down to Elm Street, and was approximately here when the first shot was fired. The first shot struck the President in the back of the right shoulder, according to the FBI report, and indicates therefore that it came from some place in the rear—which includes the possibility of it coming from the Book Depository Building.

The second bullet struck the President in the throat from the front, came from behind this wooden fence, high up on a grassy knoll. Two more bullets were fired. One struck the Elm—the Main Street curb, and caused some concrete, or lead, to scatter up and strike a spectator named James Tague in the face. Another bullet, fired from the rear, struck Governor Connally in the back. As the limousine moved up to approximately this point, another bullet was fired from the right front, struck the President in the head, drove him—his body, to the left and to the rear, and drove a portion of his skull backward, to the left and to the rear. At least two different directions, the result of a conspiracy.

CRONKITE. An even more elaborate account is given by William Turner, a former legislator who has become a warm supporter of District Attorney Garrison.

TURNER. Now, what happened there was that the Kennedy motorcade coming down there, the Kennedy limousine—there were shots from the rear, from either the Dallas School Book Depository Building, or the Dell Mart, or the courthouse; and there were shots from the grassy knoll. This is triangulation. There is no escape from it, if it's properly executed.

I think that the massive head wound, where the President's head was literally blown apart, came from a quartering angle on the grassy knoll. The bullet was a low velocity dum-dum mercury fulminate hollow-nose, which were outlawed by The Hague Convention, but which are used by paramilitary groups. And that the whole reaction is very consistent to this kind of weapon. That he was struck, and his head—doesn't go directly back this way, but it goes back and over this way, which would be consistent with the shot from that direction, and Newton's Law of Motion.

Now, I feel also that the escape was very simple. Number one, using a revolver or a pistol, the shells do not eject, they don't even have to bother to pick up their discharged shells. Number two, they can slip—put the gun under their coat, and when everybody comes surging up there they can just say, "He went that-a-way." Very simple. In fact, it's so simple that it probably happened that way.

CRONKITE. In the light of what we have exposed over the past three evenings, it's difficult to take such versions seriously. But unquestionably there are those who will do so, and it is their privilege.

Our own task is not yet over. We must still ask whether the Warren Commission did all that was asked of it, whether other arms of the government acted as they should have acted, whether another commission might cast new light upon the assassination. We must ask also whether there are fundamental and profound human reasons for the aura of disbelief that surrounds the Warren Report. We will deal with all those matters tomorrow night, in the last portion of this inquiry.

But this is a natural moment to pause, and to sum up what we think we have learned.

Dan, you were in Dealey Plaza on the day of the assassination. You've been back there several times since, when we did the first Warren Report, and now in recent days to prepare this report. You've been up in that window. We've looked out that window with you. But, subjectively, what is the Oswald-eye view of the assassination site?

RATHER. It was an easy shot. A much easier shot than even it looks in our pictures. The range was such, the angle was such, that it did not take an expert shot, one man, to do what the Warren Commission says was done from there.

CRONKITE. Eddie, as News Director of our esteemed affiliate, KRID-TV in Dallas, you've been right in the vortex of this thing since the moment of the assassination. What about the people of Dallas themselves? Do they agree with the Warren Commission Report?

BARKER. Walter, I think that on a cross-section basis, the percentage that had some doubt about it would be about what it would be across the country. Certainly there are people who have some doubts about it. But most of the doubters, I think, are those who come to Dallas, and who come into our newsroom, as a matter of fact. They bring a lot of questions. But so far none of them have brought any answers.

CRONKITE. That's the problem we all have, isn't it? And let me ask each of you in turn this question: Are you contented with the basic finding of the Warren Commission?

RATHER. I'm contented with the basic finding of the Warren Commission, that the

evidence is overwhelming that Oswald fired at the President, and that Oswald probably killed President Kennedy alone. I am not content with the findings on Oswald's possible connections with government agencies, particularly with the CIA. I'm not totally convinced that at some earlier time, unconnected with the assassination, that Oswald may have had more connections than we've been told about, or that have been shown. I'm not totally convinced about the single bullet theory. But I don't think it's absolutely necessary to the final conclusion of the Warren Commission Report. I would have liked more questioning, a more thorough going into Marina Oswald's background. But as to the basic conclusion, I agree.

CRONKITE. Eddie?

BARKER. I agree with it, Walter. It's too bad, of course, that Oswald didn't have his day in court. But I felt the night of November 22nd that he was the one who had shot the President, and nothing has come to light since then to change my opinion a bit.

CRONKITE. It is difficult to be totally content. Yet experience teaches all of us that any complex human event that is examined scrupulously and in detail will reveal improbabilities, inconsistencies, awkward gaps in our knowledge. Only in fiction do we find all the loose ends neatly tied. That is one of the ways we identify something as fiction.

Real life is not all that tidy. In 1943 Lieutenant John F. Kennedy came under enemy fire behind Japanese lines in the Pacific. His PT boat was destroyed. His back, already weak, was re-injured. Yet he swam three miles, towing a wounded shipmate, found shelter on an island, escaped Japanese search, encountered natives who carried messages back to American forces, crossed undetected through enemy waters as enemy planes hovered overhead, and survived to become President.

The account of his survival is full of improbabilities, coincidences, unknowns. So is the account of your life, or mine, or the life of any one of us.

Concerning the events of November 22nd, 1963, in Dealey Plaza, the report of the Warren Commission is probably as close as we can ever come now to the truth. And yet if the Warren Commission had acted otherwise three years ago, if other government agencies had done differently then, would we today be even closer to the truth?

Tomorrow we will consider not the assassination, but the work of the Commission that was appointed to study it. For the first time a member of that Commission, John J. McCloy, will publicly discuss its work and its findings. Members of the Commission staff, and one of the Commission's most persuasive critics, Edward J. Epstein, will be heard. And we will ask, although we may not be able to answer, two last questions:

Should America believe the Warren Report?

Could America believe the Warren Report? This is Walter Cronkite, with Dan Rather and Eddie Barker.

Goodnight.

ANNOUNCER. This has been the third of a series, CBS News Inquiry: "The Warren Report." The fourth part will appear tomorrow night at this same time.