

"If McCarthy is nominated ... I think they will kill him in September or October." Garrison

PAUL EBERLE

(The following is an exclusive interview conducted over the telephone between New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison and myself on Thursday, July 4.)

FREE PRESS: What is the current status of the Clay Shaw case, now that the Federal Court has halted the proceedings?

J.G. There's no change. I think the Federal Courts are trying to think of reasons to justify what they call an "evidentiary hearing." If they think of any, it would have to be fictitious, because they have no jurisdiction whatsoever. But, in a sense, you've got to understand the problem of the Federal Government, because the Federal Government is so clearly involved in the assassination of John Kennedy you really can't expect them to be very enthusiastic about a trial by some independent jurisdiction. The Central Intelligence Agency participated in the assassination of John Kennedy, and the present federal administration helped them conceal the evidence. So, they are inventing new law as they go along, and they will do whatever had to be done to try to prevent the truth from coming out.

F.P. What stage of legal proceedings are you in now? Are you appealing to a higher court?

J.G. Oh no, The Federal District Court has not even made a ruling yet. I think they're just trying to think of some kind of reason to justify what they're doing.

F.P. And you have no recourse until they make a ruling, then?

J.G. No. That's right. Theoretically we have recourse, but then that would be to another federal court.

F.P. What about Bradley? Are you going to be able to get him down there for trial?

J.G. I don't know enough about what's happening there in California to make any comment. I try not to speculate where I don't have any data.

F.P. What parallels and similarities, if any, do you see between the John Kennedy assassination and those of Martin Luther King and Bobby Kennedy?

J.G. Paul, there's no mystery about what's happening. I think most of the people in the country sense it, although every magazine and all of the slick news media pretend that this is the best of all possible worlds, and that

there's nothing to worry about. What's happening is that we're in the midst of a counter-revolution, which began on Nov. 22, 1963, John Kennedy ... by an accident we elected a man as president who was concerned about the human race. Not just the human race in America, but the human race all over. And, beginning in the fall of '62 he was in effect, leading a revolution against the Cold War, which, to put it in basic terms, means a revolution in behalf of humanity against power.

The counter-revolution began on Nov. 22, 1963, when his head was torn off by this operation which was set up by the Central Intelligence Agency. The counter-revolution is continuing, that's all. They are eliminating, one by one, anyone who is a leader who is concerned about the human race, against the military power structure in the country, or anybody who is eloquent enough—anybody who stands between them and the project of war in Asia, is being eliminated, one by one. John Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Robert Kennedy ... It's a new political instrument which America really developed and basically it's the same technique. You always end up with an individual who represented the human race, against this fantastic power structure, and he ends up dead. And there is a "lone assassin." All the other differences are difference of detail.

F.P. A lone assassin with leftist leanings ...

J.G. In quotes, yes. Actually when you look at it closely enough, the "lone assassin" is a direct employee of the CIA, as Oswald was, or is a professional sharpshooter for the CIA, as was the case with Martin Luther King's assassin, although whether it was Galt or not isn't clear. I doubt that it was, but that doesn't matter, it's a detail. He appears to have been used as a decoy, but again, that's a detail.

F.P. What about Sirhan Sirhan? Whatever connections he has with the CIA seem to have been very carefully covered, or "insulated," as they call it. Do you know anything about Sirhan?

J.G. Well, I don't want to go into too much detail about that because then the district attorney and Los Angeles authorities might feel that I've interfered with their case, so I won't do that, but I'll put it in general terms. The CIA is capable of operating through

many fronts. The difference in detail in this case appears to be that the assassin is not clearly conscious of the fact that he is being used by the CIA, and is probably much more conscious of being a member of some front. For example—and I don't know if this front exists, it's an example—but let's say, "Jordanian Youth For Action," or something like that. The Central Intelligence Agency has over 500 fronts, and they have no problem in motivating individuals. It can be done by force or many other methods. The family can be killed if he doesn't act.

Undoubtedly, every pathway Robert Kennedy had to pass if he won the election in California, was covered with some individual who was going to kill him, and yet was a member of a front, and was not necessarily conscious of the fact that the front was an instrument for the Central Intelligence Agency.

The point is that in the final analysis, there are details. When Robert Kennedy won in California, this meant that he probably had the delegation from New York, he had the delegation from California, and he was well on his way to becoming the next president of the United States. It would have been between Kennedy and McCarthy. If he had continued, the real possibility was there. This power structure is not greatly different from the power structure that took control of Germany in the thirties, the Nazi power structure, except that it's much more sophisticated. And it's essentially invisible. And the one thing that they will not tolerate is a president who is concerned about the human race, and is not interested in the thrust for empire which now guides this country. If Robert Kennedy had lost in California, he'd be alive now. But having won, he would have been killed at any exit. Once he won, he had very little chance to survive.

F.P. You feel, then, that the people in power in this country are fully determined to take over the Pacific basin, and anybody who interferes or seriously threatens to interfere, is going to be killed.

J.G. Paul, they took over the country in November, 1963. I think it's obvious, and you don't have to be a military strategist to see that they intend to take over Asia. And if anybody gets in their way, he'll be killed. If there's a compromise of some sort in Viet Nam, then they'll proceed from

Laos. But whether it's the tungsten they want in China, or the airfields in China, it's obvious that their attitude is that nobody is going to stop them.

The point about John Kennedy's assassination is that he was dismantling the war machine, and he was ending the Cold War, and he said he was going to "break up the CIA into ten thousand little pieces." So they tore his head off. Because they don't intend to be broken up. The war machine is like a living organism which will not tolerate anybody getting in its way. It's like a juggernaut, sitting in the woods. And once anybody finds his way to the juggernaut, then they have to be killed, so they can't tell anybody else about it.

F.P. Do you think that McCarthy is in danger of getting zapped?

J.G. I think that McCarthy is one of the most impressive men to run for president in my time because of his uncomplicated honesty. And I think also that if he continues to develop, and continues to pick up support, and if it becomes apparent that he will become the next president, for example, if he is nominated by the Democratic Party, which I would like to see—that would be in August—then I think they will kill him in September or October ... unless he is able to solve the problem with sufficient bodyguards. Now, they have one problem there—they can't use ambushes any more. They used one with John Kennedy, firing from four points, but from now on, in order to make sure that nothing comes to the surface, they have to use the lone-assassin approach, which means that if Senator McCarthy has an effective, continuous bodyguard he can actually survive and conceivably might actually save the nation. But on the other hand there is a great danger that they may be able to dispose of him by pounding away through the media, as they are, about "violence-in-the-streets," which, of course, is a fake issue. But "violence in the streets," as a fake issue might bring in someone perhaps like Richard Nixon, who, quite apparently belongs to the same structure that we have today ... But I'll sum it up by saying, yes, if Senator McCarthy continues to develop popular support, then the Central Intelligence Agency will attempt to kill him. But it will be done again by a "lone assassin" and someone will announce almost immediately that he has "leftist leanings" or is a Marxist, or a Communist.

"If Robert Kennedy had lost, he'd be alive now. But having won, he would have been killed at any exit."

F.P. What significance do you see in Warren's resignation?
J.G. Paul, I don't know enough about that to make a comment.

F.P. What about your investigation into the John Kennedy assassination? Are you check-mated or will you continue?

J.G. We're not check-mated in the sense of stopping. To be perfectly candid, we're kind of frustrated by the effective use of power by the federal government, not merely here, where it comes to the surface, but in many other areas ... but I would sum it up by saying that the only way that they can completely stop us would be by finding a way to kill me or remove me from office. Otherwise, we won't stop. There's not that much left. All that's left are details. We found out what happened, and I know that the federal government knows that we know what happened, and it's just a matter of accumulating more details.

F.P. Have you had any direct threats or warnings that if you proceed any farther, you will be stopped from proceeding any farther, by removing you from this world?

J.G. We have had threats, but I disregard them because they are irrelevant. The people who are doing the killing, the professional assassins of our CIA don't threaten. For example, John Kennedy didn't receive any threats. The threats that we receive, and we've had some, I regard as threats from nuts. We don't pay any attention to them. The ones you have to be concerned about are the ones who don't threaten—they just kill.

F.P. What about Mark Lane's story in our paper about the two emissaries from Robert Kennedy, who approached you and said that Kennedy was aware of what happened and if elected president, intended to vigorously go after the people responsible for his brother's assassination. Could you tell us about that?

J.G. Well, that is correct, except that I would not say "emissaries," because they did not come straight from Robert Kennedy to me carrying red briefcases, or anything like that—in other words, it was a very loose liaison. I had several friends who happened to be close to him, and as a result of their occasional visits down here, it became clear that he did understand what happened, and was determined to say nothing about it until he got in a position where he could do something about it. Everything that Mark Lane says is true, essentially, except that I would not use the word "emissaries," because that implies somebody leaving with a specific mission. It was more casual than that. But otherwise, it's quite correct. There's no doubt that he had an understanding, but it appears that he said nothing about it to anybody. I think that he was a very strong-willed man, with a lot of integrity,

and he approached this in a rather unusual way. I think he decided to himself that he was going to do something about it but say nothing to anybody until the opportunity (Continued on page 14)

(Continued from page 12) came to do something. And that's why I think his apparent inaction is irrelevant. What is relevant is the fact that he understood, and I think he would have done something if he could. But they killed him first.

F.P. A few weeks ago, the Free Press ran an article by Mark Lane, before Robert Kennedy's death, saying that Robert Kennedy was remaining silent about his brother's assassination because he himself was involved in a CIA plot to assassinate Castro, which may have been used to kill President Kennedy instead. Would you care to comment on that?

J.G. I didn't see that particular statement, but there are indications that somewhere along the line, the CIA might have drawn Robert Kennedy into one of its operations so as to freeze him in a position, so that he would not be effective immediately after November 22nd, 1963. Again, I don't have enough precise detail to say any more, except to say that it's no secret that the Central Intelligence Agency continued its attempt to assassinate Fidel Castro long, long after President Kennedy had reached an understanding with Cuba, with Khrushchev, and had begun negotiations for a rapport with Castro-Cuba. The CIA was still trying to find ways to assassinate Castro. I think there is a very real likelihood that on at least one of the operations, they found a way to draw Robert Kennedy in. There are indications in at least one instance, of a meeting at Guantanamo Bay, of the intelligence group, with representatives from Washington, and if they did this, I would say this was just an intentional move to disarm Robert Kennedy so he would not be able to act too effectively after the time came to remove John Kennedy. Again, the evidence isn't very clear there because the people who have the evidence all work for the United States Government.

You always come back to the analogy of Nazi Germany. After Hitler Germany finally came to ruin, which is ultimately what happens when a government feels it has the right to lie to the people, and the right to murder and to

initiate war with no real reason ... AFTERWARD, you could find a number of Germans who could tell you what really happened, in government. But before then, you couldn't find any. We have the same situation now, because the power of the government is so strong, and their willingness to resort to murder immediately, as retaliation, is so evident, that nobody will say anything. The major instrument being used now by the United States Government for political control now actually is murder. And so, you can't get the details on things like this, and you're forced to speculate and I don't like to speculate. It's more speculative than I usually like to be, and all I can say is that there are indications that they might have drawn him in on something.

F.P. Do you plan to indict any other people in the conspiracy to assassinate John Kennedy?

J.G. I can only say this in a general way—remember that we have jurisdictional problems. All I have jurisdiction in, really, is Orleans Parish. And except in a rare case when somebody who participated in the operation came into Orleans Parish, then I don't have jurisdiction. Most of the people engaged in the operation to kill John F. Kennedy did not come into New Orleans. Although New Orleans was a city very much

involved, and we encountered a corner of the conspiracy here in which plans were discussed and some of the operation was set up, basically the operation was set up in Washington, because John F. Kennedy was killed, essentially, by the United States Government.

F.P. If you can bring Clay Shaw, or Bradley, or some other person to trial and publicly expose the role of the CIA in the assassination, do you think that even then anything can be done about it? Does anybody care?

J.G. The CIA is so powerful now that to a great extent it is autonomous. I don't know how many magazines and news media would dare to carry the truth about the CIA. I don't know how many men in Congress would dare to stand up and ask for an investigation into the CIA. The CIA is now a global force. If you were going to consider all the global forces in the world, you would have to say: America, Britain,

Russia, France, The CIA, China ... It's so powerful by itself as the clandestine partner of the industrial warfare operation, that it is in some ways more powerful than the rest of the United States ... all the other agencies combined. As a result, you have two problems. First of all, you will encounter legal problems going to trial, by intervention of the United States Government, on some pretext that they have to protect the defendant's rights ... or some other fraud. Then you would encounter physical problems; you would have either the assassination of Clay Shaw or myself, in order to end the case. And then, if somehow we surmounted those obstacles and we actually had the trial, then we encounter the problem of communications, their control of the news services, the press media. They've spent some twenty years building this up. They're in every news service, every major element of the press, and they have control. So, I really don't know if we can solve the problem of control. We're going to keep trying to. From my point of view, it's better to have no government at all than to live under a government under which truth and justice have no meaning. I would rather live in the woods and eat berries, or live in a cave, much rather than live in a government such as you had in Hitler's Germany, and such as you have in the United States today, in which truth and justice have no meaning. I'm not as confident now as I used to be, that we will be able (a) to have the trial and (b) to communicate all the facts to the 200,000,000 people we have in the country. They have such tremendous communications, in terms of ability to stop the trial, and in terms of ability to

remove individuals, and especially in terms of control of the press. But nevertheless, we are going to continue pushing, because it's a simple proposition for me — I don't think that life is worth living unless you're willing to fight for something. I would rather be John Kennedy dead than Lyndon Johnson alive. Wouldn't you?

F.P. Yes ... but it's nice to be alive.

J.G. It's nice. But it's not so important that you have to let a government like this assume such power that it begins to destroy people.

F.P. What about the average guy, what would you say to him? What can he do?

J.G. The guy on the street understands, further more, that the Warren Report was a fraud. His common sense tells him that. But somewhere along the line, apathy has developed. I think it may be that Congress had been removed from his access, perhaps by a process of taking aside individual congressmen and finding out what they wanted, whether they wanted a bridge here or a post office there. Theoretically, Congress is the solution. The man on the street knows that something is wrong, and he is represented in Washington by a congressman. Congress should take action. This is a federal problem. Actually, no intelligent man whose jurisdiction is limited to a county can pretend that he can solve the problem completely. All I can claim to be doing is to try to keep the door open until enough people in the country can see the terrible thing that is happening to America. The real solution lies in an honest, objective federal investigation. Theoretically, that can be brought about by the man on the street who recognizes something is wrong, causing Congress to act. But Congress does not act. If the man on the street can see what's wrong, as 75% by now do, then the men in Congress can see what's wrong. But they're like while the leaders of our country while the leaders of our country — at least the surviving members of the human race — are being killed, they continue to

debate about subjects like daylight saving time, and violence in the streets. So, I don't know how much Congress is in touch with reality, and that's our last hope.