

District Attorney Jim Garrison

interviewed by

Bob Clark, Washington, D.C.

Tom Jarrell, Atlanta

Transcribed  
from tape of  
KGO broadcast  
TAPE NO. 38

"Issues and Answers"

ABC KGO

28 May 1967

Q -- Mr. Garrison, the Warren Commission findings on the assassination concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone assassin, that he did not know Jack Ruby, and that there was no conspiracy involved. What have you concluded happened on Nov. 22, 1963 ?

Garrison -- Tom, our evidence indicates that first of all Lee Harvey Oswald was not the lone assassin; furthermore was most likely not an assassin at all; secondly that he did indeed know Jack Ruby, and our evidence confirms that there was no question about the fact that there was a conspiracy. Unfortunately the Warren Commission was mistaken in regard to these facts.

Q -- You say, Mr. Garrison, that Lee Harvey Oswald was probably not the assassin at all. Do you have any evidence that would stand up in court that anyone else actually carried out the assassination and fired the fatal shots ?

Garrison -- Yes, we do.

Q -- Can you say anything about this evidence ?

Garrison -- No, I can't.

Q -- How can you conclusively rule out Oswald as the assassin in the face of rather overwhelming evidence from the Warren Report that places him at the scene of the assassination and probably in the sniper's nest ?

Garrison -- That's not very difficult, Bob, because there is no overwhelming evidence. As a matter of fact, what was done in the Warren Commission investigation was to ignore the majority of witnesses who heard shots coming from the front, and they presented -- let's see -- that'll be 19 witnesses who heard coming from the front -- the grassy knoll area -- and that's where the fatal shot obviously came from. The only one called by the Warren Commission was Mr. Zapruder, and he was only asked about his camera, and the time and so forth, of the film. And of course in answering that even he pointed out that the shots came from behind him, past his shoulder toward the President. So there is no overwhelming evidence at all. It's a matter of excluding certain things

-- As a matter of fact there is very little evidence that Lee Oswald was up on the sixth floor.

Q -- We do know that they found a rifle with Oswald's palm print on it; they found his palm print on the sixth floor, and they know this rifle was fired.

Garrison -- Yes.

Q -- And they have linked this rifle to Oswald. So isn't that evidence in itself that Oswald was there? And firing a weapon?

Garrison -- No. It's evidence that Oswald had been in possession of that weapon, and it is the weapon that Oswald -- there's no question about that, under the name of Hidell. And there's no question about Oswald being on the scene. But that's a long ways away from actually firing the weapon. That's something that they were never able to prove, and it's an assumption they made, and one which fades before any objective investigation.

Q -- Mr. Garrison, there were five of us in the wire service car, which was the fifth car in the procession, and were just moving into the intersection in front of the Texas School Book Depository when the shots were fired. All five -- and this would be the acting White House press secretary and four pool reporters -- would state without the faintest shred of any doubt that three shots were fired, and they were very loud and very clear and almost over our head from that area -- we couldn't testify that they were fired from that sixth floor window, but there's not faintest question in the minds of these five observers that three shots were fired from that area.

Garrison -- That's a good point, Bob. So I'll give you full credit for having heard the shots from the direction that you think you heard them from. On the other hand, you have to give credit to other witnesses in Dealey Plaza who believe they heard them from the other direction. Of the hundred and some odd witnesses in Dealey Plaza, two-thirds of them heard shots coming from the front, the grassy knoll area, and only one-third were conscious of the shots coming from the back, and the Warren Commission doesn't recognize that at all.

Q -- Where do you intend to take the case from here? One man has been charged and indicted, but not yet brought to trial. Where will it go from here as far as you're concerned? Will there be other arrests? Will there be other charges? If so, when?

Garrison -- We are going to have to defer any further arrests, to try and make them at a later time. But there will be other arrests, and they'll probably be before the trial.

Q -- If we can get back for a moment to the question of where the shots came from; the Warren Commission did find quite conclusively, after pretty exhaustive tests, that the fatal shots, and the shots that struck Governor Connally, had to come from the rear of the motorcade. Wouldn't you agree on that ?

Garrison -- No. I would agree that they found it conclusively, because that's the way they stated, but I would not agree that their tests were exhaustive. The conclusion in the Report is totally indefensible. President Kennedy was obviously killed by a shot from the right front. First of all it's obvious because of the fact that a study of the Zapruder films, which were never studied by the Warren Commission before it reached that conclusion, shows that his head went back to the back and the rear as if he were hit with a baseball bat. And secondly, because of the effects of the shot in other ways that I don't want to go into here, show that the shot had to come from the right front. There is simply no question about it. And the point is, Bob, that this is one of many areas which would have come to light had there been an adversary proceeding -- had there been an attorney of any kind to raise counter-questions, to crossexamine, raise points, and these points weren't raised. So I would conclude by saying that this is their conclusion but it is entirely incorrect.

Q -- Of course, if you say that the Warren Report is wrong in saying that the shots came from the rear, that they did come from the front, you're challenging the results of the autopsy, and you're saying in effect that somebody for some reason falsified that autopsy -- aren't you ?

Garrison -- Well, let me ask you first, have you seen the autopsy ?

Q -- No. The autopsy has never been made public but it was available to the Warren Commission.

Garrison -- Do you know anyone who has seen the autopsy ?

Q -- Oh, I know the members of the Commission, so what you're -- the point would be that you're saying that somebody, either on the Commission or involved in the autopsy, deliberately falsified that autopsy.

Garrison -- No. I'm saying -- I think it goes deeper than that. I'm saying that if the autopsy is not available, I think it is impossible for anybody to make conclusive comments about it. The autopsy has not been available; it is still secret; we don't really know what is in it until it is made available; so how can we even argue about it?

Q -- You've claimed, Sir, that both the FBI and the CIA are hampering your investigation by hiding the real assassins. If they are, what evidence do you have that they're doing it?

Garrison -- Now, let me clarify that. The FBI is not hampering us in any specific way. I'm sure the bureau is not enthusiastic about the fact that we disagree in a number of ways with their conclusions, and I'm sure that there's some pride involved. But -- the primary problem is the Central Intelligence Agency. The Central Intelligence Agency actually, I think, has answered your question itself. Otherwise, were they not in a position of having to hide something, Tom, they would not have to hire lawyers to try and stop the case. Every lawyer involved in this case, without exception -- involved in the attempts to derail the investigation and stop the case -- has been connected by us with the Central Intelligence Agency. One lawyer, Mr. Plotkin, has publicly admitted that his client worked for the Central Intelligence Agency. He has also admitted that he is being paid by the Central Intelligence Agency. And every other lawyer in the case we have connected with the Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Burton Klein, and his alleged client, Beauboeuf, were flown to Washington, all expenses paid. The point is, if the Central Intelligence Agency is not involved, then what are they working so hard to stop the investigation for? But to get back to the -- an even more important point -- our investigation of the activities of Lee Oswald in New Orleans showed that his associations in New Orleans during the six months he was there were not merely frequently -- not merely most of the time -- but were continually and exclusively with individuals employed by the Central Intelligence Agency. Oswald's associations were continually and exclusively with individuals engaged in anti-Castro activities. And yet this is not indicated anywhere in the Warren Commission. But it hits you in the face in New Orleans, and there are no exceptions to it.

Q -- Do you believe Oswald was a CIA agent, or ...?

Garrison -- No. He was not a CIA agent. He was obviously an intelligence employe of the United States government. This is so obvious

that I don't see how they hid it. First of all, his associations at the time, just off the cuff, the fact that here's a boy who went into the Marines when he was 17. He had never shown any interest in languages of any kind -- he was word-blind, which is, makes it impossible to learn languages by yourself, and that's brought out in the Warren Commission. All of a sudden he's speaking Russian fluently, obviously through one of our intelligence cram courses, by our armed forces. And then he's at Atsugi base which has -- had -- at that time, a CIA function, I understand. Of course this is general knowledge; if it were private knowledge I wouldn't feel free to comment upon it.

But it goes on and on. For example when, after all his so-called communist activities, he wanted to get, in the summer of 1963, a passport to Europe, he got it in 24 hours. And you couldn't do that.

Q -- Mr. Garrison, you were saying that Lee Harvey Oswald, you think, was associated with the CIA in some capacity or another. Does this mean that you think the CIA might have had a role in the assassination of President Kennedy?

Garrison -- Tom, in answering just let me finish one point that I was referring to earlier. Other indications of Oswald's connections with the Central Intelligence Agency are the fact that even while in the Marines, when stationed at El Toro as we know from the testimony of Nelson Delgado, Kerry Thornley and other individuals -- even the Warren Commission itself -- Oswald had a higher security clearance than the rest of his Marine buddies. The indications go on and on. The telephone number of the local office of the Central Intelligence Agency is in the front of Oswald's book, and very thinly disguised -- a simple code to himself. And if you accumulate the associations in his conduct, there's no question about it -- I just wanted to complete that. Now, to get to your question. Of course, the Central Intelligence Agency had no role in the planning or intending the assassination of President Kennedy. I think that that would be a ridiculous position for anybody to take. I certainly never assumed that. But what clearly happened: we don't THINK employees of the Central Intelligence Agency were involved -- we are going to be able to show it. Now what apparently happened was that this adventure which was going on in the summer in New Orleans with regard to Cuba -- an anti-Castro adventure involving Latin-American individuals and involving Lee Harvey Oswald and others -- backfired for some reason, perhaps after the mission aborted as it seems to have in early August 1963 and U.S. funds were withdrawn from it. As a consequence, a spin-off,

in effect, apparently occurred and President Kennedy was killed by these same individuals. Now what the CIA did do -- and I presume it rationalized this in terms of national security -- it concealed from the Warren Commission, from the American people, from the President and from the world, the fact that its employes -- its former employes -- were involved in the assassination of the President. Now that is the culp- -- therein lies the culpability of the CIA.

Q -- Well, why would anti-Castro Cubans turn a plot to assassinate<sup>e</sup> Castro -- if you feel this might have been involved -- into a plot to assassinate<sup>r</sup> President Kennedy ?

Garrison -- That's not hard to answer. But let me say first that when I say anti-Castro Cubans I'm not criticizing all Cubans. No legitimate organizations were involved. But in the summer of '63, actually before that, there were a number of Cuban individuals who had very strong feelings about President Kennedy, stemming from the Bay of Pigs. Then these strong feelings became amplified with the detente reached with Castro and Khrushchev in the Fall of 1962, in October. In the late summer of 1963, for the first time, the administration started putting the detente into specific effect and started cutting down on some of the CIA's activities. At this time, our evidence is that the feelings -- anti-Kennedy feelings of some of these Cuban individuals and other Latin individuals -- became venomous, and the outcome was what you saw in Dealey Plaza on the 22nd of November.

Q -- Have you given specific names to the CIA or the FBI and told them that you have evidence of an assassination conspiracy ?

Garrison -- If I had any specific names -- any specific evidence -- the last agency in the world which I would give it at this point is the Central Intelligence Agency, Bob. It's doing everything it can to obstruct us. We have asked them for information; for example the picture which we know that they took of Lee Harvey Oswald coming out of the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City when, at which time he was walking with a known employe of the Central Intelligence Agency -- and all we receive is doubletalk. So we're certainly not going to ask them for anything. As for the Bureau, I think that we're going to get more and more cooperation from the Bureau as they realize that we do have substantial information about the assassination. At that time, all of our information will be made available to the Bureau, but not to the CIA.

Q -- In another area, in the Shaw preliminary hearing in New Orleans, one of the witnesses, a key witness, testified that he was hypnotized repeatedly before he testified; another confirmed from the witness stand that he was a dope addict, with a very severe habit. Are these the type of people that you will base your case on -- people who have undergone hypnosis and people who are on narcotics? Do you have other type of evidence, or other type of witnesses that will be forthcoming?

Garrison -- Let me answer your question, Tom, in two parts. First of all I'm not going to say anything about the type of witnesses, or the names, or the kind of witnesses we will produce at the trial. But I want to comment on the rest of your question. First of all there's the fact that we placed a witness under hypnosis. This was done to help objectify his testimony. In other words, when we heard the testimony of this witness, the first thing I said was: I want him placed under hypnosis, I want him given sodium pentathol, I want him confirmed with regard to his statements and I want it the kind of confirmation which has a doctor present and not just police officers. So we felt that we had more or less made history when we made him take hypnosis, we made him take sodium pentathol with two reputable doctors present. We felt that this made history in the sense that a prosecutor was forcing his own witnesses to objectify their testimony. Now, to my amazement, I find that we are supposed to have used these devices to some sinister end, to plant ideas in the head of this witness. And as a consequence we no longer both<sup>er</sup> to objectify in the way we started doing. Now, with regard to the dope addict: it's true I would rather have a bank president, or a successful lawyer -- well, not a lawyer; we've had a lot of trouble with lawyers lately -- but a successful businessman. But it happens to be a fact of life that you seldom find bank president and successful businessmen sitting on the levee alone, by the lake, at a place where people are liable to have secret meetings. The question is: is he telling the truth or not? There are many attorneys who are brilliant liars, and there are dope addicts who have never learned to lie, and that's the case here. The question is: was he telling the truth? And the answer is: obviously.

Q -- The man you mentioned earlier, Alvin Beauboeuf, has confirmed reports that one of your investigators offered him money and a position with an airline if he would confirm certain details of an assassination

plot, and Beauboeuf later said he didn't know of any such details. Was any such inducement made to a witness to your knowledge ?

Garrison -- Yes, in a sense, but not in the sense that they sought to imply it. This was a setup about which I complained to the Louisiana State Bar Association long before it became public, although I seem to have trouble communicating that to the world at large. Beauboeuf complained that he was unable to even tell us about the case, to my investigators because he had no job and needed financial help. And my investigators said to him in effect that, look, if you have knowledge about the case which will bring it to a conclusion and you tell the absolute truth about it, you should have no financial problems. We will get you a job with an airline -- I'm sure the boss can help you -- but, you have to pass sodium pentathol, you have to pass hypnosis, and you have to pass the lie-detector test. Now this is very important, because he complained during the course of this dialogue about having to take all three, and Lynn Loisel was insistent, because at this time we were requiring it -- fortunately. Now the reason you have not seen the tape on this, the much-vaunted tape, is because they cut out the first part, where the insistence is made by Loisel, that he take the three tests. But they made a mistake and left in it later references by both Beauboeuf and his lawyer to the three tests he had to take. And by that time we had obtained a copy of it. So now they can't release it because they've been caught cutting a part of it out. In summary, it's not even close to a bribe. If it were, I would remove the men from my office immediately. We don't operate that way. No intelligent prosecutor wants a lying witness on the stand because a good defense attorney will tear him to ribbons. It was just an attempt to create the picture of a bribe. Now what is significant is the fact that the Newsweek magazine -- this crummy news magazine owned by the Washington Post which is a mouthpiece of the administration -- has never bothered to find out the truth from us. It's never made any attempt at all, and it's made it look like a bribe, and I think that's unforgivable. It raises questions about the motives of this so-called news magazine.

Q -- One of the men who served as an attorney for Jack Ruby -- this was Sol Dann -- said this past week, and let me quote his words to you: "It would very much appear that Mr. Garrison has improperly discharged his responsibilities. His actions appear irresponsible and not in keeping with his role as prosecutor, which is to protect the innocent as well as convict the guilty."



He's asking that you be disbarred. Is it irresponsible to make the sort of charges you have made in public before they are made in court?

Garrison -- Well Bob, I'm not aware of any particular charges I've made in public except where they've been brought out by the newspapers, or except where I've replied to some great brain like this attorney. But you're going to find that I've initiated very few charges. For example, the revelation of the investigation itself was made over my objection. Do you have any examples in mind?

Q -- I think he's particularly concerned about your linking Oswald to Ruby.

Garrison -- Ah, let me reply. My linking Oswald to Ruby the first time publicly was in my reply, to the Associated Press, to his statement. We have had solid evidence for a long time that Ruby was linked with Oswald, but we have not referred to it for several reasons, and one of them is that the man is dead, that he has a family left. We didn't even hint at it until this lawyer came up with this ridiculous comment. So now, when you asked me earlier -- when Tom did -- I felt free to comment on it. Of course, what it all adds up to is: he would love to see me disbarred because he knows I'm going to connect Ruby with a conspiracy, and that's going to be very easy to do.

Q -- Mr. Garrison, by the comment you've made, you've cast doubt on a government investigative agency, the CIA; you've cast doubt on the Warren Commission's findings on the murder of the President. How would you pass judgment on yourself if, in time, you cannot prove what you have stated about these agencies?

Garrison -- Well to take the last part of your question first, Tom, the question will not arise because we have already proved it, and we have the evidence. It's a matter of solving the problem of communication -- that to any reasonable man in the United States or the world I can prove that tomorrow, right now, ~~that~~ so that problem won't arise. But even if it were true, hypothetically, my evaluation would be that at least I have made an attempt to find out the truth, and as far as I know this is the first objective investigation by any official agency into the assassination. Now again, I'm not casting judgment on the Bureau because I think that a large part of the facts were withheld from the FBI by the CIA. But I would conclude at least we have tried to find out the truth.

Q -- You've passed judgment in your mind, but would you take what evidence you have into a court of public opinion and either a legislative investigation, a Congressional investigation, where your evidence can be brought out to the public ?

Garrison -- I will take all evidence which is relevant to our case into the courtroom. Actually, what you have mentioned is the proper place for it, and that is a Congressional inquiry into the CIA's activities. All of our evidence would -- will be made available to (sic) the CIA, and if they look into it seriously there is no question in my mind but that the CIA will be reorganized. Of course we need an intelligence operation -- but will be reorganized so it has Congressional control.

You cannot have in a democracy an organization which relly believes that the end justifies the means and which is not responsive at all to the representatives of the people, in Congress. That's what we have, and when you have that you have a totalitarian power in your country. And we have, in the CIA today, because of that.

---