

24 JUN 68

Assassination Inquiry Committee

NEWSLETTER
vol. 1, no. 1

WHY A NEWSLETTER?

Jim Garrison, in a recent interview, a crucial portion of which is printed below, said that the truth is not so hard to come by; it is communicating it to others that is so difficult. Those of us who have just formed the Assassination Inquiry Committee in San Diego tend to agree. We think that Mr. Garrison has discovered the truth concerning the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963, and we know that he is being given very little chance to communicate this truth to his fellow citizens.

When the normal channels of communication fail us-- the national TV networks, the major newspapers, the mass-distribution magazines, the courts (yes, the courts are a vital medium of communication too)-- it is time for new channels to be opened up. Such is the conviction that lies behind the birth of this newsletter.

We intend to send this to you every couple of weeks, and in it we intend to include information compiled from such unique news services as the L.A. Free Press, the New Orleans Times-Picayune and States-Item, Ramparts magazine, and Elliot Mintz's "Looking Out" show on KPFK-FM (LA), plus whatever news we can get direct from the source, i.e. Garrison's office in New Orleans.

We also intend to offer, for what they're worth, our own comments and interpretations, not only on the assassination of President Kennedy but on the equally tragic assassinations of the past few months. We have chosen the rather general title of Assassination Inquiry Committee because we feel that we should continue to inquire into all assassinations as long as there continue to be substantial doubts about any assassination.

We invite you to join us in this enterprise.

Prescott Nichols

GARRISON INTERVIEW

The following interview with Jim Garrison was obtained via telephone by Art Kevin of KHJ News, Los Angeles. It was transcribed by Geoffrey Mogilner and is here reprinted in our effort to present all significant developments in the case as they emerge.

Q. Mr. Garrison, in the last few days, Mark Lane made a statement in Boston to the extent that a couple of months before Senator Robert Kennedy was shot and killed here in Los Angeles, as he termed them "emissaries" had been in touch with you, and apparently he had knowledge of it to the effect that Senator Kennedy said that "he knew that there were guns between him and the White House, and that were he to become elected President of the United States he would prosecute these people who were responsible for his late brother's death. Is that a true statement by Mark Lane?

A. Yes, that is essentially true; the only thing is that I would use different words in a few senses. For example, "emissaries." We had mutual friends who came down to visit from time to time. As a result, I finally came to understand Senator Kennedy's silence. He was silent, I think it became apparent, because he realized that the power that lay behind the forces that killed his brother. They (the emissaries) didn't come at

FILED
3 JUL 68

the same time. One of them did indeed when I brought up the question of his continued silence, pointed out that with these forces still active in America, that Bobby Kennedy was very much aware that there were many guns between him and the White House. The way he put it, I think it was Bobby Kennedy's quotation from him. The details about what he would have done afterwards I would rather not go into, except to say that essentially what Mark Lane is saying is true. We had a great deal of confidence, not only in Senator Kennedy as a man of integrity that they least wanted in the White House, and that has been demonstrated now. The phrase "many guns between Senator Kennedy and the White House" was indeed told to me by one of his friends and appears to have come from him.

Q. Jim, did you in any way seek contact with Senator Kennedy, or did these mutual friends in fact come to you?

A. I told them so that they could let him know that I was going to lean over backwards not to seek him, because there was some element of the press, not all the press, that had smeared me, and I didn't want any of the smear to rub off on him in any case. I recognized by then his problem of keeping at arms length from this particular issue until he became President. So I made a point of not seeking it. There was a kind of, you might call it "casual liason" behind the scenes. He was very much aware, I think, at the end that we understood his reason for silence, and at the same time we had become aware that he knew of this force in America that is disposing of any individual opposed to the Viet Nam war, our involvement in the Viet Nam war, or any sort of involvement in the cold war.

Q. Jim, Frank Mankiewicz, the press secretary of the late Senator Kennedy, is quoted in Washington in reaction to Lane's initial statement, he said, "Well, it would be hard to disprove." Is there any kind of proof other than the knowledge you have?

A. First of all, I don't think Mark Lane would say it if it were not true. It is as simple as that, and I can assure you that I would not say it if it were not true. As a matter of fact, the statement that was made to me that Bobby Kennedy was well aware, and that this is why he did not go into precisely what forces killed his brother until the time came later on, this was told to me at Moran's Restaurant on the 700 block of Hiberville. What is this presumption of guilt, the presumption that you are a liar? Mark Lane has never lied to me that I know of and I certainly wouldn't bother to lie about a thing like that. I think from what I know of Frank Mankiewicz, that he is a good man, but he had nothing to do with this channel of communication. One of the men that we had loose contact with from time to time was from New York. Another was from New York State, and another was from the West Coast. It was a loose sort of affair, but we had this liason.

Q. Jim, let me ask you this, I don't want to put you on the spot in any way, however, on the record or off the record, would you allow me as a newsman to trace down some of these liason men that you were in contact with, so that the story can be more fully rounded out?

A. No, I wouldn't. Although I am very fond of you personally, it doesn't matter to me whether the story is confirmed.

A. (cont.) It is true, and I wouldn't bother to say it if it weren't true. I don't want to have the Kennedy family feel that I or Mark is trying to capitalize in some way on Robert Kennedy's death. I think that it's a tragedy, more of a tragedy than most people realize. This talk of violence in the streets is utterly irrelevant. The question is, what has happened to America and the government in America? Violence in the street has nothing to do with it. I wouldn't want to elaborate on it any more because I wouldn't want anybody, least of all the Kennedy family, to think that we are trying to take advantage of the fact that Senator Kennedy is now among those missing.

SAN DIEGO GETS INVOLVED

The Association of Interns and Residents at University Hospital of San Diego presented the film Rush to Judgement on June 11. Following the picture, there was a panel discussion and question-and-answer period. Members of the panel were Dr. Richard Popkin, author of The Second Oswald and chairman of the Philosophy Department at UCSD; Albert E. Walkoe, distinguished member of the San Diego Bar Association and on the Board of Directors of the San Diego Legal Aid Society; Dr. George Abbott, panel moderator and resident, in surgery at University Hospital; Dr. Prescott Nichols, professor of English at San Diego State; and Jon Olson, graduate student in physics at SDS.

There was a standing-room-only crowd of over 500 people in the auditorium. The purpose of the gathering was to present evidence refuting the Warren Report and to give San Diegans an appreciation of Mr. Garrison's efforts in New Orleans. Bibliographies were distributed listing all pertinent literature dealing with the events of November 22, 1963. A plea was made for all present to write their U.S. Senators and Congressmen. Many people have written, and we urge those who haven't to do so. Ask for a re-investigation of the Warren Report, for an end to federal intervention in New Orleans, and for the trial of Clay Shaw to take place.

As Mr. Garrison so aptly stated, "If your country has ever needed you, it needs you now, more than ever before; if you can just get involved, if you can just get involved."

Stephen Pauley, M.D.

MISSING PERSONS DEPARTMENT

This column is planned as a regular part of the AIC newsletter and will concern itself with the strange departures of many men and women, all somehow connected to the drama of Dallas. As actors in a play, some with featured roles, others less prominent, they are united now by a common bond of absence. All are gone, either dead, imprisoned, or mysteriously vanished.

Gary Underhill for instance. Great-great-grandson of a Revolutionary War general, he was a CIA agent, military affairs editor of Life magazine, columnist on military affairs for several newspapers, and a familiar face in the Pentagon.

Following the execution of John F. Kennedy, Gary Underhill left his home in Washington and contacted friends in New York

City, pleading with them to hide him. Crazy with fear, he stated he knew who killed President Kennedy and feared these same forces would soon get him. Returning home to Washington after a few weeks in New York, Gary Underhill was found dead in his apartment on May 8, 1964. He had been shot through the head, from left to right. It was officially ruled suicide, even though Underhill was right-handed. Prior to his violent death, Underhill stated that forces in the CIA killed Kennedy; more specifically, those forces were described as the Far Eastern branch of the CIA, furious with Kennedy's foreign policy.

Recall that in the few months preceding Kennedy's death, our forces in Viet Nam were reduced by about two thousand men. Robert McNamara, then Secretary of Defense, stated publicly that we would soon remove our fighting men altogether, leaving the battle to Vietnamese, whom we would support with money and material only.

A second clue to the basis of CIA motivation lies in the oft-quoted Kennedy wish to "smash the CIA into a thousand pieces and throw the fragments to the wind." His aversion to the CIA was said to originate, in part at least, from the CIA sponsored Bay-of-Pigs disaster for which he publicly shouldered full responsibility. Privately he was enraged at the CIA, for it was this organization, not the Office of the President, which planned and performed the shameful debacle. In the months following the Bay-of-Pigs and preceding Kennedy's murder, numerous CIA adventures against Cuba were aborted by the Coast Guard and other federal agents, acting no doubt on orders from President Kennedy. A great discord thus emerges to furnish motive. The struggle to follow would take six seconds, culminating in the violent overthrow of an American president, an end to CIA fears of loss of autonomous power, and the inauguration of a new era of American politics.

The story of Gary Underhill has been abstracted from Forgive My Grief, in two volumes, by Penn Jones, courageous editor of the Midlothian Mirror. Mr. Jones has compiled the ~~XXXXXX~~ chilling collection of dead persons "who knew something, learned something, or said something that was supposed to have remained secret." I am indebted to Mr. Jones for this work and will draw material from it for columns to follow. Speculation concerning CIA complicity in the matter will continue until the full truth is known. We demand that the District Attorney of New Orleans be allowed to present his case in court. He states that President Kennedy was executed as the result of a conspiracy. Jim Garrison claims to know who the murderers are; we demand he be given the chance to prove his case. Unprecedented obstruction by the federal judiciary and Attorney General Ramsey Clark, blocking Garrison's case, adds fuel to our contentions of CIA involvement and federal cover-up. We demand exposure of the fraud in a court of law. We will not be silent until our just demands are met!

Next issue, the story of Rose Cherami.

A. George Abbott, M.D.

Additional copies of the complete bibliography concerning the assassination of President Kennedy are available. To obtain one, send a request to ASSASSINATION INQUIRY COMMITTEE

4718 SARATOGA AVE.
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92107

REVIEW OF ARTICLE IN RAMPARTS

Ramparts magazine has recently switched from monthly to bi-monthly in an attempt to keep up with the rapidly changing events of these cataclysmic times. But it hasn't worked. The acceleration rate of political assassinations is just too high.

Thus, we find in the June 29th issue of Ramparts an article on the assassination of King and John Kennedy that clearly was written before the assassination of Robert Kennedy and before James Earl Ray, alleged assassin of Martin Luther King, had been captured in London. Nevertheless, the article, which is by William W. Turner, a former FBI man and now a critic of the Warren Report, points out some interesting parallels between the two assassinations (let's call them K-1 and K-2) which are worth considering.

There are, for example, the strange leads, of uncertain source, that were broadcast over the police radios within minutes of each assassination: a description resembling Oswald in the first case and a description of a police chase of a white Mustang in the second. That mysterious city of New Orleans also seems to figure in both cases. In the case of K-2, the man who called himself Galt drove from Los Angeles to New Orleans several months before the assassination. Says Turner, "He made the trip in the white Mustang. The FBI has learned that Galt had a lengthy meeting with a prominent industrialist at the Provincial Motor Lodge on December 17 and 19. The industrialist is also missing, and a search is on for him." For those who are familiar with the Clay Shaw case, Louis Lomax' version of the New Orleans meeting is even more significant. Mr. Lomax, in an article appearing in the New Orleans States-Item of April 26, says that Ray (Galt) checked into the Provincial Motel but that the actual meeting took place "either inside or near the International Trade Mart."

There is one parallel in the two cases that Turner alludes to without even realizing it. Not only does New Orleans figure in both cases, but so do the three Canadian cities of Winnipeg, Montreal, and Toronto. Winnipeg is the place where a Canadian businessman named Richard Biesbrecht reported to the FBI that on February 13, 1964, he overheard two men in the airport restaurant, one of whom was the late David Ferrie, discussing "inside details" of the assassination of President Kennedy. Montreal, curiously enough, is one of the places visited by Ray in his wide-ranging travels prior to King's assassination. He is supposed to have checked into a Montreal rooming house last summer (about nine months before the assassination) under the name of Galt. Toronto, the third Canadian city, was the center of Ray's activities following the assassination. It is where all the people have turned up who fit his several aliases, including one Eric S. Galt.

However, Turner's most interesting point regarding the two assassinations is undoubtedly the amazing resemblance between a picture taken of a man at Dealy Plaza on November 22, 1963, and the artist's sketch of the King murder suspect that was released by the Memphis police shortly after that assassination. One can't help being impressed by the Ramparts blowup of the two pictures side by side. The man at Dealy Plaza is, according to Turner, "one of the men being marched by Dallas police from

the area of the Grassy Knoll to the Dallas Sheriff's Department cater-corner across the Plaza." Apparently, he is one of several who was apprehended and then immediately released. Who is this man? Where is he? He is not in the London jail, for that man bears little resemblance either to the photograph or to the sketch.

My personal conjecture on K-2 is as follows: James Earl Ray did not murder Martin Luther King. He played the role of decoy. The FBI realized this and kept him under surveillance, not planning to pick him up until he led them to the other conspirators. However, the Robert Kennedy assassination forced the government's hand; they felt they had to move in on Ray in order to calm the mood of the country. Perhaps the London trial will buy the FBI enough time so that they can find the truth in the case. Perhaps.

Prescott Nichols

THE FOLLOWING EXERPTS ARE TAKEN FROM THE NEW ORLEANS TIMES-PICAYUNE, 6/18/68, ARTICLE ENTITLED "DISMISS SHAW SUIT, GARRISON AIDE ASKS"

One of District Attorney Jim Garrison's assistants Monday asked a special three-judge federal court to dismiss without further hearing a suit filed by Clay L. Shaw seeking to block his prosecution in criminal district court on a charge of conspiring to murder President John F. Kennedy. The plea was made by assistant District Attorney James L. Alcock as the court heard arguments on four technical motions filed in connection with Shaw's suit.... Motions taken under submission include Garrison's asking dismissal of the entire Shaw suit as well as one seeking dismissal of Alcock and First Assistant DA Charles R. Ward as defendants in the suit. Also taken under submission were motions by Shaw's attorneys asking that the United States Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, be joined as a defendant in the case, and that four of Garrison's aides be compelled to answer questions asked when they appeared for depositions sought by Shaw's attorneys. United States Attorney Louis LaCour appeared in court and formally objected to inclusion of the Attorney General. Shaw's federal court suit seeks an injunction to block his prosecution by Garrison as well as a declaratory judgement holding that the Warren Commission Report is valid and binding on all courts.... It also seeks to have declared unconstitutional a number of statutes used in the Shaw prosecution, including the Louisiana conspiracy statute and the law dealing with the number of jurors in criminal cases and the number needed to concur in convictions.... In urging dismissal of the Shaw suit, Alcock claimed that the court is really considering more than just the Shaw case and hanging in the balance is the whole issue of comity between state and federal courts. He cited a number of United States Supreme Court cases in which he claimed that federal courts have historically refused to interfere in state prosecutions.... Alcock contended that as a matter of law, Shaw's suit should be dismissed without further evidentiary hearing. He claimed that there is no need for an injunction because Shaw has adequate remedies by way of a jury trial, appeals to higher state courts and by way of federal habeas corpus procedures. Alcock claimed that all defendants are inconvenienced by criminal prosecutions, but said that he could see no differ-

ence between the inconvenience to Shaw and that of any other defendant. Judge Ainsworth questioned Alcock about how much evidence would be placed before the court in the event an evidentiary hearing were held, and the assistant DA answered that he had been given to understand that Shaw's attorneys would want to place all of their evidence before the court. "Wouldn't we be trying the criminal case in federal court?" Judge Ainsworth asked. "Yes" Alcock replied...The sole purpose of the Shaw prosecution, he (Edward F. Wegman, one of Shaw's attorneys) alleged, is to provide Garrison with a vehicle through which to attack the Warren Commission. Asked by Judge Ainsworth why Garrison would have such a motive, Wegman said that he has never had the opportunity to discover it on cross examination, but that he can only "surmise" the district attorney's motives..... The first motion argued was Shaw's request that four of Garrison's aides be compelled to answer questions they refused to answer when Shaw's attorneys sought to take their depositions. Judge Heebe had ordered that they submit to the depositions, but the four (Garrison aides) refused to answer most of the questions. William Wegmann, another Shaw attorney, cited a letter from Garrison to his aides in which he told them to give no information other than their names, rank in the office, and social security numbers when at the depositions.

CLOSING NOTE

Developments in New Orleans are progressing rapidly. Many of us feel that this inquiry into John Kennedy's assassination is the paramount issue facing us today. In view of the failure of our local and national news media to furnish adequate accounts in this matter, we have undertaken an ambitious task, i.e. this newsletter, to be published frequently and distributed widely. We invite your participation in the form of letters to the editor, material you consider significant to be included in the paper, suggestions or questions. We also solicit monetary donations to support this endeavor. Thus far, all expenses have been borne by the editors; help us please by sending whatever you are able to: ASSASSINATION INQUIRY COMMITTEE
4718 Saratoga Avenue
San Diego, California, 92107

Editors of newsletter: A. George Abbott, M.D.
Prescott S. Nichols
Stephen Pauley, M.D.
Jon Olson

June 24, 1968