

F.P. interviews Mrs. Field on Warren Report 'errors'

Last week F.P. reporters Paul Eberle and Tony Anthony interviewed Mrs. Field, a noted Warren Commission critic, in her Los Angeles home (see box to right below).

FP: What is the title of your book?

MF: "The Evidence."

FP: And it was accepted by Random House and then rejected?

MF: Yes, I had a signed contract and my first advance. Then they cancelled the contract and decided not to publish it. The reason I was given was that the production costs were too great. I wanted to be fair—the book does have a production problem to a certain extent. It is totally different from any of the other books that have

(Continued on page 24)

(Continued from page 1)

been written on this case because it is not written in narrative. It's not an essay. I have taken the ten first conclusions in the Warren Report, and I've put at the head of each page the stated conclusion. Then I've taken the actual testimony, the FBI reports, the secret service reports, the commission exhibits, diagrams, and juxtaposed them against the stated conclusion to show that the evidence in no situation really supports the conclusion that they arrived at. Each page is what I call a panoply and it's graphic: the statement, and then the evidence and pictures which address themselves to that statement. I've gone through the whole first ten conclusions. FBI reports, doctors' handwritten notes, printed testimony... all these present a problem in production. However, I do not really accept their excuse because they were in consultation with a production man in New York, and he was so excited about the book that he said, "I will waive my fee, and take it in royalties, because I believe it is an important book..." Then they still told me that there was a production problem. At that point I felt that I really couldn't accept that as a valid excuse.

FP: Have any new witnesses and new evidence emerged in the case?

MF: Well, when you say "anything new," I don't know how much you know now, up to this point. I understand that there are several important witnesses that have turned up recently. I don't know who they are, and I can't tell you anything about that, but I have talked to Mark Lane, and he's indicated that they have talked to some extremely interesting witnesses recently. You know the story about Roger Craig don't

Who is Maggie Field?

Since November 22, 1963, Marjorie Field has spent many thousands of hours in painstaking study of the available documentation on the assassination of President Kennedy. On that date, she began to accumulate what by now has become a massive private research library.

In the fall of 1964, with the release of the Warren Report and the twenty-six volumes of Hearings and Exhibits, the primary focus of her work became an exhaustive examination of the crucial data in these books. There are perhaps no more than two or three other people in the country who have undertaken so extensive

a study of this documentary evidence. The thoroughness of her research is such that she has long since been recognized as being second to none in her knowledge of this historic material.

"we'll have further verification of the story and I'll do what I can." So he called me back in about three and a half hours, after spending all that time with Craig, and the story was absolutely verified. So I called a friend of mine in San Francisco to get the story out there and in the meantime I called Steve Burton and told him, and he got it in the Free Press....

FP: How many people who knew Oswald or Ruby have died under suspicious circumstances?

MF: Well, Penn Jones feels there are between twenty-four and thirty. Dean Andrews in New Orleans says, "Twenty-four, Hell! There are sixty!"

FP: It has frequently been said that President Kennedy's death warrant was signed the day he refused to give air cover for the Bay of Pigs invasion. And others say that Kennedy was planning to dump Johnson in 1964, which was a threat to the oil trusts and the 27 1/2 percent depletion allowance. Which, if any of these theories do you lean toward?

MF: I think that these are not necessarily separate and distinct goals. In other words there was a common denominator. This man was a danger to these various groups that had one common denominator and that was anti-communism—so-called—and the big profits from the cold war have to be connected with the oil industry and the aircraft industry and all these powerful combinations. The anti-Castro Cubans and the racists all had one thing in common in wanting to eliminate President Kennedy because he was a very real threat to them, they felt. It's very difficult to explain when people say, to me, well now it's charged that the FBI was involved in this, and the CIA, and the Secret Service, the right wing of Dallas and the anti-Castro Cubans, they say, it can't be ALL of these people. Well certainly it can't be ALL of these people, but what all of these people have in common is their fervent desire to cut this man down and not let him be re-elected.

FP: As Sahl says, "He must have been a good president because there were so many people

for United States city is charging Lyndon Johnson, our president, with deliberately concealing evidence from the American people. That evidence belongs to you and me and all of us. And not one word about that speech (Garrison's L.A. speech) appeared in the daily press in this city. Not one word. No, I think on the fifth or sixth day, they found out what his assumed name was at the hotel, and at the very end of the column they spoke about the speech. But all of the impact was missing.

FP: Why do the major newspapers treat this with total silence? When Garrison stood before the newsmen of Southern California and stated that Oswald was a CIA man, and that the assassins were CIA men, and that the government knows that the men who killed Kennedy are still at large, this is sensational news. Why do they black it out?

MF: I can't answer that question for you except to say that anybody that has ever made charges of that nature, whether it was Mark Lane or Harold Weisberg, or Penn Jones or any of the critics, never had any newspaper coverage at all. And one after the other has said that the autopsy evidence is absolutely invalid. Where are the autopsy pictures? Why have all these people died? There is nobody to go to get answers to these questions.

When the members of the commission feel finally challenged and compelled into making a statement, they say, "Let them name the assassins. We have found no evidence." This is their answer.

To answer you about the press, I can only tell you that they have consistently been delinquent in their responsibility to the people. And it was when Jim Garrison said, "I need your help," in this constant news blackout, I sensed they didn't really believe him—and I knew what was going to happen; I knew they were going to look, the next day, just as you had done, day after day, to see if this was covered. It wasn't until they really saw for themselves that this enormous charge that he levelled at President Johnson was totally ignored, that they finally became convinced, and then the news media began to use his speech on the radio, on KHJ, and

(Continued on page 29)

(Continued from page 24)
KLAC. It finally got through.

FP: It's interesting to note that both Hearst and the Chandlers are good friends of President Johnson. In fact Hearst, who has

MF: It figures. He's doing exactly what they want him to do. He's escalating the war that they want.

FP: I had the feeling, in talking with a lot of the working radio and TV newsmen at the Garrison speech, that many of them really wanted to do something on Garrison, but didn't dare.

MF: That's this terrible fear factor. A lot of these people have well-paid jobs, they have families, and they're not going to rock the boat.

FP: And they don't want to hear about this, and they want to believe it's all just a shuck.

MF: Exactly. There are two standard questions that we have thrown at us all the time. One has diminished now, and that was: "Are you going to tell me that Earl Warren, the darling of the liberals, is covering up for a right wing plot?" Well, now they're not saying this quite so much any more, but still, now they say "Bobby Kennedy? Bobby Kennedy who loved his brother? Why in God's name would he go along with such a thing?"

FP: Mort Sahl says he'd rather be president than find out who killed his brother.

MF: Mort Sahl, in my opinion, is the most brilliant commentator—the most incisive, the most humorous. People are saying he isn't funny any more. He's as funny as ever! They're saying he's crazy. Well, it's comfortable for them to say he's crazy because he attacks their conscience and their guilt.

FP: Why do you think, as Sahl does, that the right wing was behind the assassination?

MF: Between August, 1963, and October, 1963, Kennedy actually withdrew a thousand troops from Vietnam. He not only publicly stated this—it was happening! He was doing many things that the right wing forces in this country did not like! He was going to have a detente with Castro. He was re-examining our China policy. He succeeded in making the nuclear test ban treaty. He was going to do something about the 27 1/2 per cent oil depletion allowance. My god, this man was a threat to ALL of these people.

FP: Garrison seems to think

to extradite three very important witnesses.

You've seen both of the major networks, NBC and CBS immediately mount campaigns to discredit Garrison's case. You've seen Newsweek, and Phelan's article in the Saturday Evening Post, mounted against him to vilify him. You've seen every responsible

(Continued on page 33)

(Continued from page 32) columnist, virtually say that man is a charlatan. Why? All of the establishment press has gone down the line to vilify Garrison or to make him to appear as a charlatan.

FP: Is Garrison optimistic about getting those witnesses into court?

MF: Not at all.

FP: These witnesses who Garrison hasn't been able to have extradited—what was their involvement? And who are they?

MF: Well, one of them is Sergio Arcacia Smith, who was the head of a very virulent anti-Castro group in New Orleans. He was in Dallas and lives there, and Governor Connally has refused to extradite him. Sandra Moses was a girlfriend of Gordon Novel. Gordon Novel is a self-confessed CIA operative. He's had the most publicity.

FP: How is he linked to the assassination plot?

MF: He was a friend of David Ferrie.

FP: Why wasn't David Ferrie protected better?

MF: Well, I understand that Garrison's men were watching him, and that George Lardner, from one of the newspapers, was staying with Ferrie, night and day. And it was during the four hours from the time that he left, until he was to return, that Ferrie died. Isn't that a strange coincidence, that David Ferrie suddenly dies ... and that Jack Ruby dies just a week before his second trial was to begin?

I think the important thing is that the Grand Jury bound Clay Shaw over for trial. The defense tried to have the trial quashed, but they failed. They had about thirty reasons why he should not have to stand trial, and none of them stood

know nothing about this. This is all a bunch of garbage."

FP: Why was Oswald chosen as the patsy?

MF: He was a perfect, perfect patsy! How many people in Dallas have defected to the Soviet Union? He was a kind of misfit. He had the reputation of being a Marxist. He fit the picture perfectly—to say nothing of the fact that he was working in the key building, on that day.

FP: Why was Officer Tippitt killed?

MF: This is an area where we can only have speculation, I think it's one of the great mysteries of the Kennedy assassination, Tippitt's involvement. Something went wrong, obviously. He was a very good friend of Ruby's. We know from the evidence that Oswald didn't kill Tippitt, just as we know from the evidence that Oswald couldn't have killed the President.

FP: Didn't witnesses say that there were two men who killed Tippitt, and neither looked like Oswald?

MF: You mean Warren Reynolds? He did not identify Oswald as the Tippitt killer. And then, two months later, he was shot in the head; and when he recovered, he changed his mind and said that it was Oswald.

FP: Have you gone to Dallas?

MF: No, and I'm beginning to think now that I should have, because so many people say, "How can you really think you are knowledgeable if you've never interviewed a witness directly. But my area of the case dealt primarily with the government's case, and I felt that I didn't have to move outside of that door as long as I had those twenty-six volumes there, in order to do what I had to do. There are other critics who have dealt with other areas. I have tried to deal with the whole case as much as possible. Other critics have dealt with specific areas. For example, Ray Marcus has dealt with the shots and the trajectories and bullet 399 and the direction of the shots and the number of the shots, and the position of the President at various frames, and the Zapruder films.

crime. We just can't. The threat is too great. There are forces in this country who have gotten away with this thing, and will strike again. And not any one of us is safe. When a man can be picked up in the street and charged with two murders that he didn't commit, and be consigned to history as the assassin, it can happen to any one of us. And this is where it's at!

FP: Someone has stated that one of the shots came from the rear, and that it was fired from the Dallas Sheriff's Dept. Building. Is there any substance to this?

MF: Well, in Thompson's new book, he says that at least one of the rear shots came from either the records building or the Sheriff's building. I would tend to agree, from what I know. But I've never speculated on that. The only thing that I have ever addressed myself to is the guilt of Oswald. And all the evidence shows that Oswald could not have committed either of those crimes.

FP: What about Oswald's trip from the book depository to his rooming house—do you agree with the Warren Commission's conclusion?

MF: It's absurd, and a more absurd story is the trip he is supposed to have taken from the rooming house to the scene of the Tippitt murder. David Bielen, one of the staff lawyers re-enacted that, time-wise, and it took him 17 3/4 minutes to do it. Now, the commission tells us that Oswald was still standing on Zang's Blvd., across the street from his rooming house at about 1:04, and the first reports of Tippitt's death, according to a man named Boley, who looked at his watch when he saw a dead officer lying in the street, and he was the first one to go to Tippitt's car and report this to the police radio, says it was 1:10.

FP: There must be somebody with a conscience on the Dallas Police that will eventually speak up, like the ones who ran towards the grassy knoll...

MF: Look at Roger Craig. He spoke up and look what happened.

FP: Does Garrison know who

(Continued from page 33)
when such a concerted effort has been made to prevent a case from coming to trial?

FP: Who planned the assassination? The CIA? The FBI?

MF: A researcher, such as myself, who concerns himself primarily with the evidence in the twenty six volumes of hearings and exhibits, is not in a position to name the architects of the conspiracy. But it is clear to me, as a result of my four years of study, that powerful forces were involved, but the commission invariably failed to follow up leads.

Everything in the volumes points to conspiracy! And nobody but a small group of people like myself have read these books. People aren't interested in them. They don't even know where they can buy them. Most people don't even know there are twenty-six volumes! And even worse, quite

apart from the volumes, few people have even read the single book called the Warren Report. This apathy reflects itself in two ways. There are those who say they believe the Warren Report, usually without having read it, and those who say, well, sure, it was a conspiracy, but so what... he's dead. What's the difference who killed him ... it's past history, and we can't bring him back. And you hear this from intelligent people! They don't make the link between what happened on that day, and what's happening today. Just look at the situation we are in today! And who is running this country today, and who has been running it ever since November 22, 1963?