

15 Sept. 1967

Dolan: Jim Garrison is on the line, the district attorney from
New Orleans, and I'll be with him in just a moment.

.....

Good morning, Mr. Jim Garrison.

Garrison: Yes. Hi.

D: Thank you for being with us. Mr. Garrison, your article in
Playboy this month is a real eye-popper. May I ask you some specific
questions, please?

G: Sure. Go ahead.

D: Mr. Garrison, first of all, I could take so many of these I'll just
take them in random order. First of all, what made you lose your faith
in the Warren Commission Report? I understand you believed it
implicitly.

G: I believed it in the sense that I accepted it because I'd never read
it, like most Americans. I'd say the real thing that made me lose my
faith in the Warren Report was the fact that I read it, and I found out
it's full of many things which are not only impossible - it is quite
untrue and could never have happened and never did happen. But the
Warren Report is never even close to what happened.

D: Did the judges - didn't the judges in New Orleans say this was
insufficient as evidence?

G: The judges in New Orleans ruled that the Warren Report could not be
admitted in evidence because it was full of hearsay.

D: So you lost your faith in the Warren Report, and then what made you
first start to sniff out a conspiracy?

G: Well, it's obvious, actually you can see it in the Warren Report,
to tell the truth, but almost every student of the assassination who has
gone into it, whether it's Lane or Harold Weisberg or whoever it is, has
found again and again indications of a conspiracy. And the more we went
into it the more it was apparent that there was a very large conspiracy
and not only that, it was apparent that Oswald was just a patsy who was
set up, who never fired a gun that day. It's almost too obvious to -
if I enumerated some of the examples it would take an awful long time.
But I'll just give you one example: we located a picture of the assassin's
gun, as they called it, being brought down from the Book Depository, and we

found the person who took the picture, timed the picture, it was five minutes after one; this gun did not have a telescopic sight on it. This is 25 minutes before Oswald's gun was even found.

D: Good heavens!

G: It's just endless, it's not even close. In fact, it was not even a very good job at covering it up. The problem is one of communication, though. We have trouble communicating outside of the city until a magazine like Playboy takes an interest, because everything is killed on the wire, or it's - NBC mutes it down, or CBS kills it, and this big communications complex we have in this country is swinging with the establishment and they kill anything that comes up that criticizes the Warren Report.

D: Well, Mr. Garrison, why - first of all, I'd like to clear this out of the way - why would the Warren Commission, a blue-ribbon commission convened to clear up the mystery surrounding the assassination, why would they indulge in a falsehood or an evasion?

G: A lie is better, the biggest lie in the history of mankind. They did this - I don't know what you mean by blue-ribbon, this is a CIA group largely. You have John McCloy who formed (?) the OSS which became the CIA; you have Allen Dulles who is a former head of the CIA who is in effect a professional liar as head of the CIA, he was there to help see that nothing came up to embarrass the CIA, since the CIA was completely involved. There was no chance of the truth coming out from the outset. You have Richard Russell who is basically a good man but he's known in the Senate as the best friend of the CIA and he's on the Senate watchdog committee for the CIA. You had Gerald Ford who's on the watchdog committee of the House for the Central Intelligence Agency. So you had a Central Intelligence Agency group selected from the outset, so that anything that came up that might embarrass the CIA was put off to the side; and the hearings were kept secret so you never had an objective investigation at all, it just appeared to be.

D: Well, why was the CIA - why do you think the CIA was involved in the assassination of a president?

G: Former employes of the Central Intelligence Agency killed him.

D: My goodness, Mr. Garrison, that's - that's - that's an astonishing accusation.

- G: It's not even close. There's no question about it. Of course they did. The Central Intelligence Agency was - in trying to fight Cuba - was hiring every type of Nazi, Minuteman, anybody - marriages of convenience. And when this pendulum swung in our foreign policy and the President began to moderate the approach towards communism, whether it's right or not, he did, and the reaction of this Nazi element, the Minutemen, individuals from the Minutemen, are very much involved. We had on our hands a number of men who had been working for the CIA for several years, been trained by them and paid by them, and they set the President up in a kind of classic guerrilla ambush. And it isn't even close. They used radio communications, and they used a decoy, they had Oswald over here being set up for it - wasn't even close.
- D: Well, Mr. Garrison, but - now, I want to make something clear to me and to the listeners: are you saying that these men were former agents of the CIA, or were they acting for the CIA?
- G: They were - the individuals involved in the actual assassination were former employes of the Central Intelligence Agency, but it is completely necessary also that persons, who at the time of the assassination were presently on the CIA payroll, also were involved. There's no question about that either.
- D: Does this mean, then, that their superiors had knowledge of this?
- G: No, not necessarily, but it means that CIA employes are up to their nose in it and that you cannot look into it without bumping into the CIA at every turn. And the Central Intelligence Agency was, and is, determined to prevent the truth from coming out at all cost.
- D: Well, sir, was the CIA local phone number found in Oswald's notebook?
- G: Yes, as a matter of fact - yeah, but it was - a "code" is too exotic a word, it's simply scrambled. Yes, the CIA number in New Orleans is there, scrambled.
- D: Now, let me ask you this. You mention in the Playboy interview that a "babysitter" from the CIA was with Oswald in Dallas in '63. What was the purpose of this?
- G: Well, it's better to put it this way. We find that Oswald was never - the Warren Commission said he was a loner; as a matter of fact he was never alone, he was always escorted, he always had somebody more or less shepherding him, you might say, until they put him in the back of the

Texas Theater where they apparently told him to wait for orders, and at that moment he was finally alone. Until that time, he was never alone. They just - they had too beautiful a patsy and they weren't going to let him go.

D: Well, do you think - was he ever employed by the FBI or the CIA as far as you know?

G: Oswald?

D: Yeah.

G: Obviously employed by the Central Intelligence Agency. He was taught to speak Russian in the - while he was in the service. As a matter of fact you can find that in the Warren Commission; anybody that wants to take the trouble to look can get Volume 3, page 307. They tried to conceal this, the Warren Commission, but here's a United States Army officer, in this case, saying we have the record of a Russian examination taken by Oswald on February 25th, 1959. While he was in the Marines he had in his record a Russian examination; on that particular examination he did poorly. Now the average soldier does not take Russian examinations.

D: No, that's a little startling. Well, do you think he was in any way connected with the FBI?

G: Only in a limited way. It's - they might have used him in a minor way as an informant, but in no significant way. The FBI was quite clearly trying to find out what his intelligence function was from the outset, you can see the pattern of their inquiry; they know he is working in some way for the - for U.S. intelligence, but they're not sure.

D: Well, sir, did Mr. Ferrie - do you happen to know - did you say that there are 40 pages of material on Ferrie that are still kept from the eyes of the public or investigators in Washington?

G: Twenty-five are kept secret now, twenty-five.

D: I wonder why. Was he engaged in bombing Cuba?

G: I don't know precisely what he did with regard to Cuba except that he was very much involved in it. We know that he worked for the Central Intelligence Agency and he was also deeply involved with the Minutemen here. The Minuteman organization, it may have started off as some sort of idealistic thing even though I think it put too much emphasis on violence, but somewhere along the line it's been penetrated by essentially people of Nazi outlook. This is - we have a Nazi substructure in this country which is virtually invisible, but it's very, very well organized,

well financed, and this is what was really back of killing the President.

D: Do you think it extends into the government?

G: Oh, probably at the employe level here and there but not in a serious way, but it might just as well because you do have the protectors of the government covering up what happened which - right now, for example, the news establishment in the east - so they are in effect servicing the assassins. They couldn't be doing a much better job if they were the assassins themselves.

D: Mr. Garrison - would you mind holding on for just a moment, sir, I have a couple of more questions I'd like to put to you. May I have another few minutes?

G: Yeah.

D: Hold on, please, just a moment. Thank you.
... (commercial) ...

D: Mr. Garrison? Thank you very much for waiting.

Now, may I ask you about Mr. Shaw? Did Ramsey Clark say that there - did he backtrack and say there had been no FBI investigation of Shaw?

G: Ramsey Clark said that there had been an FBI investigation of Mr. Shaw and he'd been cleared; he said that when Shaw was arrested.

D: Right.

G: It wasn't true but, I mean, that's what he said.

D: Well, didn't he - didn't he later renege and back-, and ah, retract that statement?

G: Later on an official of the Justice Department some months later announced that there had been a slight error, and this was a 180-degrees mistake and it wasn't true.

D: He had not been investigated?

G: That's right.

D: Now, sir, the Saturday Evening Post article that came out three or four months ago which, in the eyes of many people who called on this program and those I've spoken with, tended to demolish your case: could you give us any explanation of why the Post came out with this piece?

G: Yes. I don't know if there was a purpose but I never even bothered to answer it before, but the man who came down here and wrote it simply was not familiar with the facts of the Warren Commission at all and had

done no work at all, it's a rather complex sort of thing, and I was shocked that the Post sent down a man who knew nothing about it. And when I asked him if he'd read certain areas and - and read the Warren Commission, he said "I haven't read anything." So he guessed and he guessed wrong, that's all, so I never took it seriously because I knew at the outset we were going to win; I knew we weren't going to lose any cases; I knew that we had the group of people who killed the President, knew how it was done, so I really don't care if somebody writes something that's entirely mistaken because in the long run they've only hurt themselves, so I didn't bother to reply. He just didn't know what it was about and he guessed wrong.

D: Well, Mr. Garrison, would you explain to me, sir, in your own words, why, if this thing goes to the heart and the core of our political system - the assassination of the President of the United States - why would our government become an accessory and try to cover up and try to protect the malefactors?

G: Who would become an accessory?

D: The government.

G: Well, the government in a sense - elements of the government have become an accessory, because they're more interested in keeping the people calm than they are in having them learn the facts. That doesn't mean the whole government is like that but we have reached a point where much of the government is like that, it's a form of fascism. The best way I can explain it is to suggest that your listeners read "1984." In other words, so much power is now involved in this thing that some people feel that if the people learn the truth they'll become restless and they'll ask too many questions, and they would rather have the people who killed Jack Kennedy loose on the streets than have it be known that the government - that individuals concerned with the government helped to participate in the cover-up. In other words, they don't care what the truth is; they're interested in something that will keep the people thinking that they're living in the best of all possible worlds. And the truth is going to be brought out because we're going to bring it out, although the national press is trying to block us in every way - Associated Press, United Press - we have a terrible problem trying to get things up the line to other people in the country. But I want to say

this, as I have the opportunity to say it, that this won't even be close; we not only aren't going to lose this, it won't even be close.

D: Mr. Garrison, one last question. Certainly this is a very, very sobering allegation that you're making. You say, in your Playboy article, that because President Kennedy was trying to effect a détente or a reconciliation with Russia and Cuba, you believe this is why he was killed.

G: We know this is why he was killed.

D: Why? What elements in our government would not wish for a détente with the second foremost power on the globe with which we could have a destructive nuclear war? Why would they resist this?

G: Let me make this clear. I don't think that elements - any serious elements in our government were involved in the assassination itself. When I say, for example, "CIA employes" I'm not referring to career CIA agents; I'm referring to these men that they use here and there temporarily. But - so I don't think the government itself was doing that, but the government, a good part of the government, has participated in the cover-up. Now, the only way to describe the organization, the group of men - several organizations, actually - that participated in the killing of the President, was to describe, to use the word Nazi. For example, Minutemen are tremendously involved. I haven't been able to say that before because we had men almost continuously in Dallas until we found out how Tippit was killed, and when we found out how Tippit was killed we felt we'd finished with our work in Dallas. But it was a Minuteman proposition. The Minutemen, if they did not begin this way, had been infiltrated by Nazis, Nazi-oriented people. As a matter of fact, you all out in California, whether you know it or not, have a great deal of Minuteman activity, or did up to 1963, and some of the individuals involved are from California, involved in the assassination of the President. And you have to understand that to these Minutemen, these particular Minutemen, the individuals of a Nazi persuasion - it's really not conservatism versus liberalism, it's these individuals that are so far militantly right-wing they may as well be left-wing - any sort of détente with communism is a form of treason; and they regarded the President as having committed treason and they're saving the country. This is the sort of intellect we were dealing with. But again, this is the type of people that tried to blow up the Statue of Liberty. The

The Dallas police force has a large percentage of Minutemen on it and they're involved in it too. I couldn't say that before, all I could do before was emphasize the fact that they used at the operating level a number of adventurers with regard to the Cuban operation. But now that our men are finished in Dallas I can say the Dallas police, most of whom are good Americans, nevertheless has a large percentage of Minutemen on them, and the Minutemen on the Dallas police, who were very much tied in with Jack Ruby, helped service the operation.

D: Well, Mr. Garrison, unhappily I'm going to have to take my leave of you. I deeply appreciate your being on the air with us and I can only wish you the best of good fortune. Would you hold on, please, for just a moment?

G: Yes.

D: Thank you very much.

That was Attorney Jim Garrison, the Jolly Green Giant so-called, the flamboyant and controversial man who says that he's going to break the case of the assassination of President Kennedy. Certainly those were some spell-binding statements, revelations perhaps, I don't know, but that was Mr. Jim Garrison. You must judge for yourself.