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Since February of 1958, when we published a tripartite takeout on the beat world, the striving of youth to transcend ethical, social and artistic convention has become a far-flung and highly diversified phenomenon, often referred to as a "revolution." Some of the avant-gardesmen of 1958, however, are still on to what's happening. Herbert Gold, who authored one of the pieces in our survey of the Beats, provides us with the scathing text for The New Wave Makers, this month's portrait (with ten pages of photos by Eugene Anthony) of the self-styled Love Generation—the hippies who fight the establishment by dropping out of its constrictive mores. Gold—whose fictional evocation of the Bay City hippie scene, Peacock Dreams, appeared in last June's Playboy—claims to have witnessed not only "the first great be-in" (with his onetime fellow college student, now grand guru Allen Ginsberg) but also "the first rock-dance-light-show celebration where acid was put in the Jell-o." During recent travels in North Africa, Europe and the U.S.S.R., Gold explored the global aspects of this upheaval, on which he touches in his impressionistic prose portrait.

The Crazy One, an eloquent account of the brief, mercurial career of a magnetic, maladroit Mexican bullfighter, bears the career of a magnetic, maladroit Mexican bullfighter, bears the subject of our exclusive, explosive Playboy Interview. Garrison, whose investigation of an alleged plot to assassinate John F. Kennedy has made him a messiah to some and a madman to others, is the subject of our exclusive, explosive Playboy Interview. Garrison was quizzed by freelance writer Eric Nordau, who helped us interview Mark Lane last February.

Diverse opinions about man's mechanical servants in the age of automation are examined in Ernest Havemann's Computers—Their Scope Today and Max Gunther's Computers—Their Built-in Limitations. Havemann began work on his article the day after sending two manuscripts to his editor—a volume on birth control and a college psychology text. He found his subject "a refreshing change not only from contraceptives and conditioned reflexes but also from horse racing, the subject of my last Playboy piece" (June 1967). Gunther—author of The Sonics Boom in last May's issue—augmented his research by taking a cram course in computer programming: "I seem to have passed, and the course taught me to be happy in my career as a writer; I'd rather be almost anything than a computer programmer."

Our lead fiction, The Pop-Op Caper—a private-eye stunner that spoofs its own genre—comes from the busy pen of William F. Nolan, whose novel Logan's Run (his 15th book since 1958) was recently published by Dial. Nolan has finished a screenplay based on the book and is writing a novel about the exploits of Bart Challis, The Pop-Op Caper's hard-nosed hero. Also at work on a screenplay is Ray Russell, whose Ripples—a sci-fi tale with a surprise ending, crafted in less than a thousand words—provides us with another memorable fancy. Ray's been helping MGM adapt Washington Irving's classic Rip Van Winkle for the screen.

The lighter side of this month's Playboy includes Would You Do It for a Penny? in which Harlan Ellison and Haskell Brown describe the wiles of a young man who picks up, in addition to his victuals, a companion at his neighborhood supermarket; and Cleaner than Dirt, wherein D. G. Lloyd shows how Supreme Court rulings on prurience can work for or against lit'ry classics, real and imaginary. Burkin has been fashioning a novel while writing public-relations material for a land-investment firm; co-author Ellison—author of 15 books, more than 500 stories and articles and an upper-echelon TV and movie scriptwriter—was recently selected by Cosmopolitan, for whatever it may be worth, as one of Hollywood's four most eligible bachelors. Lloyd is a comedy writer for the Johnny Carson show and has just finished a play that he modestly claims is "being scrutinized with feverish apathy by any number (one) of producers."

Enough? Hardly. Herein are the ballot for our annual Jazz Poll, revised, renamed—it's now the Jazz and Pop Poll —and expanded this year to include the stars of superpop; Robert L. Green's Fall & Winter Fashion Forecast; the latest in leather accessories; and a guide to the gustatory glories of the English breakfast. In addition to The New Wave Makers, our pictorials include an uncensored preview of The Fox, the Mark Rydell-directed film version—starring Anne Healywood, Keir Dullea and Sandy Dennis—of D. H. Lawrence's probing tale of awakening libidos and erotic liberation; plus an unhurried rendezvous with our statuesque October Playmate, Reagan Wilson. Altogether, a tidal wave of delights from our own estimable gang of wave makers.
JIM GARRISON
a candid conversation with the embattled district attorney of New Orleans

On February 17, 1967, the New Orleans States-Item broke a story that would electrify the world—and hurl district attorney Jim Garrison into a bitter fight for his political life. An enterprising reporter, checking vouchers filed with the city by the district attorney’s office, discovered that Garrison had spent over $8000 investigating the assassination of President Kennedy. “Has the district attorney discovered valuable additional evidence,” the States-Item asked editorially, “or is he merely saving some interesting new information that will gain for him exposure in a national magazine?” Stung, Garrison counterattacked, confirming that an inquiry into Kennedy’s assassination was under way and charging that the States-Item’s “irresponsible” revelation “has now created a problem for us in finding witnesses and getting cooperation from other witnesses and in at least one case has endangered the life of a witness.”

On February 18, newsmen from all over the world converged on New Orleans to hear Garrison announce at a press conference: “We have been investigating the role of the city of New Orleans in the assassination of President Kennedy, and we have made some progress—I think substantial progress. . . What’s more, there will be arrests.” As reporters flashed news of Garrison’s statement across the world, a 45-year-old New Orleans pilot, David Ferrie, told newsmen that the district attorney had him “pegged as the getaway pilot in an elaborate plot to kill Kennedy.” Ferrie, a bizarre figure who wore a flaming-red wig, fake eyebrows and makeup to conceal burns he had suffered years before, denied any involvement in a conspiracy to kill the President. Garrison, he said, was out to frame him. Four days later, Ferrie was found dead in his shabby three-room apartment in New Orleans, ostensibly of natural causes—though he left behind two suicide notes.

The press had greeted Garrison’s initial claims about a conspiracy with a measure of skepticism, but Ferrie’s death was front-page news around the world. Garrison broke his self-imposed silence to charge that Ferrie was “a man who, in my judgment, was one of history’s most important individuals.” According to Garrison, “Mr. Ferrie was one of those individuals I had in mind when I said there would be arrests shortly. We had reached a decision to arrest him early next week. Apparently we waited too long.” But Garrison vowed that Ferrie’s death would not halt his investigation, and added, “My staff and I solved the assassination weeks ago. I wouldn’t say this if we didn’t have the evidence beyond a shadow of a doubt. We know the key individuals, the cities involved and how it was done.”

On March 1, Garrison eclipsed even the headlines from his previous press conference by announcing the arrest of Clay Shaw, a wealthy New Orleans businessman and real-estate developer, on charges of conspiring to assassinate John F. Kennedy. One of New Orleans’ most prominent citizens, Shaw was a founder and director of the city’s prestigious International Trade Mart from 1947 to 1965, when he retired to devote his time to playwriting and restoring historic homes in the old French Quarter. The day after Shaw’s arrest, Garrison declared that “Shaw was none other than Clay Bertrand,” the shadowy queen bee of the New Orleans homosexual underworld, who, according to attorney Dean Andrews’ testimony before the Warren Commission, called him the day after the assassination and asked him to rush to Dallas to defend Oswald. Shaw heatedly denied his guilt: “I never heard of any plot and I never used any alias in my life.” But New Orleans society, which had long counted Shaw one of its own, was stunned.

On March 14, a panel of three judges heard Garrison’s case in a preliminary hearing to determine if there was enough evidence against Shaw to bring him to trial. Perry Raymond Russo, a 25-year-old life-insurance salesman from Baton Rouge who had once been Ferrie’s “roommate,” testified that in mid-September of 1963, he had attended a meeting at Ferrie’s apartment where Shaw, Lee Harvey Oswald and Ferrie discussed means of assassinating the President in a
“triangulation of cross fire.” Garrison’s second witness, Vernon Bundy, a 29-year-old former narcotics addict, testified that in the summer of 1963, he saw Shaw two men of money to Lee Harvey Os- 

card on the shore of Lake Pontchar- 

train. On March 17, after a four-day hearing, Judges Malcom V. O’Hara, 

Bernard J. Banger and Matthew S. Bran- 

te ruled there was sufficient evidence to 

hold Clay Shaw for trial. Garrison’s hand 

was further strengthened on March 22, 

when a 12-member grand jury of promi- 

nent New Orleans citizens, empaneled to 

hear Garrison’s case, also ruled there 

were sufficient grounds to bring Shaw to 

court. Pending trial—which is scheduled 

to begin sometime this month—Shaw 

was allowed to go free on $10,000 bail. 

The American press remained dubious 

about Garrison’s ability to prove his 

charges in court, and domestic coverage of 

and commentary on the district attorney’s 

case thereafter was, at best, low-key. 

But as News- 


week reported on March 20, “In Europe, 

where thousands still cling to the con-

spiracy theory in spite of the Warren 

Commission’s conclusion that Lee Har-


V. Oswald acted alone . . . Garrison 

seemed to believe there were many 

involved. He told a Paris-Match reporter, 

“Every day, I receive letters and telegrams from 

all the capitals. I’ve even had six tele-

phone calls from Moscow.” One was from 

Liternaturnaya Gazeta, a prestigious Mos-

cow literary magazine, which ran an in-

terview with Garrison concluding that 

there was a conspiracy to kill Kennedy 

and that Oswald “definitely wasn’t the 

key figure in it.” 

Garrison also had his supporters in the 

U.S. Boston’s Richard Cardinal Cushing, 

father-confessor to the Kennedy family, 

said of the New Orleans probe on March 

16: “I think they should follow it through. 

. . . I never believed that the assassina-

tion was the work of one man.” And 

Representative Rome Puicinski, an 

Illinois Democrat, said: “I’m surprised 

more attention hasn’t been paid to the 

issue that Clay Shaw is going to trial for 

participating in a plot to assassinate Presi-

dent Kennedy. These aren’t nuts but 

three judges talking. It’s a new ball 

game.” Senator Russell Long of Louisi-

ana also backed up Garrison—an old po-

litical ally—contending that he was only 

doing “what a district attorney should 

do.” And perennial Warren Report critic 

Mark Lane (himself a lawyer—inter-

viewed last February), whose best-selling 

“You Rush to Judgment” helped persuade 

Garrison to launch his investigation, said 

after a conference with Garrison in New 

Orleans that the D.A.’s probe would 

“break the entire case wide open.” 

The interesting thing, however, was 

that Garrison was certainly affecting 

public opinion. A Louis Harris 
poll of May 29 revealed that 66 percent 
of the American public now believes 

there was a conspiracy to assassinate 

Kennedy, and the most proximate contributor to 

this swelling doubt is the investigation into the assassination by New Orleans 
district attorney Jim Garrison.” Even 

with public opinion on his side, Garrison 

was running into difficulties on several 

fronts by early summer. Three witnesses 

he wished to question about their com-

plicity in the assassination had fled Lo-

sianna, and he was unable to obtain their 

extradition to New Orleans—a seldom-

encountered roadblock he credits to the 

CIA, “which knows that some of its 

former employees were involved in the 

Kennedy assassination and is doing 

everything possible to frustrate my in-

vestigation.” 

Garrison was also under heavy fire 

over the improper methods allegedly em-

ployed by his staff. The most blistering 

indictment of his probe was a NBC 
television special on June 19, charging 

that Garrison’s investigators had tried to 

bribe three potential witnesses—Alvin 

Beaubouef, Miguel Torres and Fred Lee-

man—to testify against Shaw; that 

Garrison’s staff had attempted to induce a 

burglar, John Cancler, to plant false 

evidence in Clay Shaw’s home; and that 

Garrison had allowed Perry Russo and 

Vernon Bundy to testify against Shaw 

even though they had previously failed 

lie-detector tests. NBC added that its in-

vestigators had also unearthed the real “Clay Bertinell”; and though NBC didn’t 

name him, it said that he was not Clay 

Shaw. Subsequently, NBC might have 

had second thoughts about its expose, for 

the network granted Garrison an unprece-

dented 30 minutes of prime Saturday-

night time to rebut its own findings. 

Garrison charged that the three wit-

nesses who claimed his aids had tried to 

bribe them were perjurers. He also de-

nied that his office had approached John 

Cancler to burglarize Shaw’s home, and 

stated fairly that both Russo and Bundy 

had passed their polygraph tests. On the 

key point of the “real” Clay Bertinell, 

Garrison said that he knew the identity of 

the individual NBC was talking about 

and that he was definitely not the man 

who called attorney Dean Andrews to 

gain legal aid for Lee Harvey Oswald. 

Unamused—and undeterred—by all 

the charges and countercharges, Garri-

son still says, “We are going to win this 
case. . . .” But though one of his former supporters in the business community by launching a campaign against vice on Bourbon Street, charging that B-girls were merce-

naries fleecing naive tourists, had 

been highly publicized, Garrison 

cleaned up Bourbon Street himself, 

personally padlocking many honky-tonks 

and striptease clubs. But his toughest 

fight—until the current one—came in 

1962, when he announced that the 

refusal of the city’s eight criminal-court 

judges to approve funds for his in-

vestigations of organized crime “raised 

interesting questions about racketeer in-

fluences.” The judges promptly charged 

Garrison with defamation of character 

and criminal libel—and a state court 

found him $1000. Garrison appealed 

the case all the way to the Supreme 

Court, and on November 23, 1964, in a 

landmark decision on the right to criti-

cize public officials, the nation’s highest 

tribunal reversed his conviction, contain-

ing that “speech concerning public affairs 

is more than self-expression; it is the 

essence of self-government.” Never one 

to turn the other cheek, Garrison sub-

sequently employed his political influence 

in the state to unseat a number of the judges 

when they came up for re-election. 

The district attorney’s independence 

in New Orleans has been an anachronism, 

and though the police depart- 

ment tried to prosecute a bookdealer for 

selling James Baldwin’s “Another Coun-

try,” Garrison stepped in with a broad-

side against censorship and won the 

man’s release—promptly bringing down 

his head the wrath of the local White 

Citizens Council. At the end of the 

political spectrum, he has been criticized 

by the liberal American Civil Liberties 

Union, which once accused him of try-

ing to arrest “drifters” from the con-

tinent. But Negro 

leaders in the city say Garrison has been a 

fair and impartial district attorney; in
his last bid for re-election, he polled as well in the Negro precincts as he did in the white.

The years 1965 and 1966 were—by Garrison's standards—relatively quiet. His only major public controversy during this period flared up when he corresponded with Louisiana Governor John McKethen to win a pardon for a local stripper named Linda Birgerte, who had been convicted on a charge of lewd dancing. Garrison claimed it was impossible to define obscenity in literature or the arts, and argued that jailing Miss Birgerte would be a "gross miscarriage of justice." McKethen acceded to his plea and, despite cries of protest from local businessmen, the incident served to increase Garrison's popularity.

The same could hardly be said of his current probe, which has made him both a target for abuse—justified or otherwise—that has tended to obscure rather than clarify the issues involved in the investigation, and a victim of often one-sided press coverage that NBC's half-hour equal time has done little to rectify. In PLAYBOY's opinion, Garrison has not yet had the chance to present his side of the case in court or out—without explanation or editing. We feel he ought to have that chance. Toward this end, in mid-July, we approached the embattled district attorney with an impartial, open-ended interview. The 1-hour cross-examination that followed—in the midst of Garrison's round-the-clock investigation—was conducted in the living room of the two-story home he shares with his blonde wife and three young children in a tree-lined residential neighborhood of New Orleans. As the dog-tired district attorney stretched his long legs across a carafed briar pipe (a political trademark) in one hand, a vodka martini (his favorite drink) in the other, PLAYBOY interviewer Eric Norden began by asking him about the most damaging charges of his critics.

PLAYBOY: You have been accused—by the National Broadcasting Company, Newsweek, the New Orleans Metropolitan Crime Commission and your own former investigative aide William Gurvitch—of attempts to intimidate witnesses, of engaging in criminal conspiracy and of inciting to such felonies as perjury, criminal defamation and public bribery. How do you respond to these charges?

GARRISON: I've stopped beating my wife. All the changes you enumerate have been made with one purpose in mind—to place our office on the defensive and make us waste valuable time answering allegations that have no basis in fact. Also involved is a psychological by-product valuable to those who don't want the truth about Kennedy's assassination to become known: The very repetition of a charge lends it a certain credibility, since people have a tendency to believe that where there's smoke, there's fire—although I find it difficult to believe that the public will put much credence in most of the dastardly deeds I've been accused of in the past few months. Just recently, for example, the rumor went around that my staff was peddling marijuana to high school students and that one of our major witnesses had just confessed that his testimony was based on a dream induced by an overdose of LSD. We've also been accused of planning an attack on the local FBI office with guns loaded with red pepper, having stolen money from our own investigatory files and having threatened to lose one witness in the derriere with an exotic gun propelling truth-serum darts. I just hope they never find out about my involvement in the Boston Brinks robbery. I must admit, however, that I'm beginning to worry about the cumulative effect of this propaganda blitzkrieg on potential jurors for the trial of Clay Shaw. I don't know how long they can withstand the drumbeat obligato of charges exonerating the defendant and convicting the prosecutor. For months now, the establishment's artillery units have been pounding away at the two themes NBC focused on: that my office uses "improper methods" with regard to witnesses and that we don't really have a case against Mr. Shaw and he should never be brought to trial. I hope you'll give me the chance to answer each of these charges in detail; but first, let me elaborate a bit on the methods we employ in this or any other investigation. My office has been one of the most scrupulous in the country with regard to the protection of individual rights. I've been on record for years in law journals and books as championing the rights of the individual against the oppressive power of the state. My office has moved in and prevented police seizure from bookstores of books arbitrarily labeled "obscene." I intervened and managed to persuade the Louisiana legislature to remove a provision from its new code of criminal procedure that would allow judges to reach out from the bench and cite newsmen for contempt if they penned anything embarrassing to the judges. My office has investigated cases where we had already obtained convictions; and on discovering new evidence indicating that the defendant was not guilty, we've obtained a reversal of the verdict. In over five years of office, I have never had a single case reversed because of the use of improper methods—a record I'd match with any other D.A. in the country. In this particular case, I've taken unusual steps to protect the rights of the defendant and assure him a fair trial. Before we introduced the testimony of our witnesses, we made them undergo independent verification tests, including polygraph examination, truth serum and hypnosis. We thought this would be hailed as an unprecedented step in jurisprudence; instead, the press turned around and hinted that we had drugged our witnesses or given them posthypnotic suggestions to testify falsely. After arresting Mr. Shaw, we filed a motion for a preliminary hearing—proceeding that essentially operates in the defendant's favor. Such a hearing is generally requested by the defense, and it was virtually unheard of that the motion be filed by the state, which is under trial. But the grand jury charged a defendant outright, without any evaluation by a judge of the pending charges. But I felt that because of the enormity of this accusation, we should lean over backward and give the defendant every chance. A three-judge panel heard our evidence against Mr. Shaw and his attorneys' rebuttals and ordered him indicted for conspiracy to assassinate the President. And I might add here that it's a matter of record that my relationship with the judiciary of our fair city is not a Dagon-Pythias camaraderie. Once the judges had handed down their decision, we could have immediately filed a charge against the defendant just by signing it and depositing it with the city clerk—the customary method of charging a defendant. Nevertheless, out of concern for Mr. Shaw's rights, we voluntarily presented the case to a blue-ribbon grand jury. If this grand jury had failed to indict Mr. Shaw, our case would have been dealt with under the procedures and the rights that were due the defendant. But the grand jury, composed of 12 eminent New Orleans citizens, heard our evidence and indicted the defendant for participation in a conspiracy to assassinate John Kennedy. In a further effort to protect the rights of the defendant, and in the face of the endless reiterating accusation that we have no case against him—despite the unanimous verdict of the grand jury and the judges at the preliminary hearing—I have studiously refrained from making any public statement critical of the defendant or prejudging his guilt. Of course, this puts me at a considerable disadvantage when the press claims I have no case against him, because the only way I could convince them of the strength of my case is to throw open our files and let them examine the testimony of all our witnesses. Apart from the injustice such an act would do Mr. Shaw, it could get our whole case thrown out of court on the grounds that we had prejudiced the defendant's rights by pretrial publicity. So I won't fall into that particular trap, whatever the provocation. I only wish the press would allow our case to stand or fall on its merits in court. It appears that all the elements of the media that have an active interest in preventing this case from ever coming to trial at all and find it necessary to employ against me every smear device in the book. To read the press accounts of my investigation—my "circus," I should say—I'm a cross
between Al Capone and Attila the Hun, ruthlessly hounding innocent men, trampling their legal rights, bribing and threatening witnesses and generally violating every canon of legal ethics. My God, anybody who employs the kind of methods that elements of the news media attribute to me should not only not be a district attorney, he should be disbarred. This case has taught me the difference between image and reality, and the power of the mythmakers. But I know I've done everything possible to conduct this investigation with honesty and integrity and with full respect for the civil rights of the defendant. But a blanket denial of charges against me isn't going to convince anyone, so why don't we consider them one by one?

PLAYBOY: All right. The May 15th issue of Newsweek charged that two of your investigators offered David Ferrie's former roommate, Alvin Beauboeuf, $3000 and an airline job if he would help substantiate your charges against Clay Shaw. How do you answer this accusation?

GARRISON: Mr. Beauboeuf was one of the two men who accompanied David Ferrie on a mysterious trip from New Orleans to Texas on the day of the assassination, so naturally we were interested in him from the very start of our investigation. At first, he showed every willingness to cooperate with our office; but after Ferrie's death, somebody gave him a free trip to Washington. From that moment on, a change came over Beauboeuf; he refused to cooperate with us any further and he made the charges against my investigators to which you refer. Fortunately, Beauboeuf had signed an affidavit on April 12th—well after the alleged bribe offer was supposed to have been made—affirming that "no representative of the New Orleans Parish district attorney's office has ever asked me to do anything but to tell the truth. Any inference or comment by anyone to the contrary has no basis in fact." As soon as his attorney began broadcasting his charges, we asked the New Orleans police department to thoroughly investigate the matter. And on June 12th, the police department—which is not, believe me, in the pocket of the district attorney's office—released a report concluding that exhaustive investigation by the police intelligence branch had cleared my staff of every attempt to bribe or threaten Beauboeuf into giving untrue testimony. There was no mention of this report, predictably enough, in Newsweek. Let me make one thing clear, though: Like every police department and district attorney's office across the country, we have sums set aside to pay informers for valuable information—but we would never suborn perjury. This isn't because we're sainthood cutouts; it would be foolishly tempting in a frustrating case—but because we're realistic enough to know that any witness who can be bought by us can also be bought by the other side. So it's rather naive, apart from being ethically objectionable, to assume that our investigation travel around the country with bags of money trying to bribe witnesses to lie on the witness stand. We just don't operate that way.

PLAYBOY: On an NBC television special, "The J.F.K. Conspiracy: The Case of Jim Garrison," a former Turkish-bathhouse operator in New Orleans, Fred Leemans, claimed that one of your aides offered him money to testify that Clay Shaw had frequented his establishment with Lee Harvey Oswald. Do you also deny this charge?

GARRISON: Yes; and it's a perfect illustration of the point I was just making about how easy it is for the other side to buy witnesses and then charge us with our own misconduct. Mr. Leemans came to us in early May, volunteering testimony to the effect that he had often seen a man named Clay Bertrand in his bathhouse, sometimes accompanied by men he described as "Latin." In a sworn affidavit, Leemans said he had also seen a young man called Lee with Bertrand on four or five occasions—a man who fits the description of Lee Harvey Oswald. Leemans also identified the Clay Bertrand who had frequented his establishment as Clay Shaw. Now, this was important testimony, and initially we were favorably impressed with Mr. Leemans. But then we started receiving calls from him demanding money. Well, I've told you our policy on this, and the answer was a flat no. He was quiet for a while and then he called and asked if we would approve if he sold his story to a magazine, since he badly needed money. We refused to give him such approval. Apparently, the National Broadcasting Company was able to establish a warmer relationship with Mr. Leemans. In any case, he now says that he didn't really lie to us because he just "told us what he thought we wanted to hear." In any case, he was equally cooperative with NBC—although he's beginning to spread his favors around. When a reporter asked him for more information after the broadcast, Leemans refused, explaining that he was saving himself for the Associated Press, "since I want to make something out of this." I would like to make one personal remark about Mr. Leemans. I don't know if he was lying to us initially or not—but I suspect from other evidence in my possession that his statement as he first gave it was accurate—but anybody, no matter what his financial straits, who tries to make a fast buck off the assassination of John Kennedy is several rungs below the anthropoid ape on the evolutionary scale.

PLAYBOY: On this same NBC show, newsmen Frank McGee claimed that NBC investigators have discovered that your two key witnesses against Clay Shaw—Perry Russo and Vernon Bundy—both failed polygraph tests prior to their testimony before the grand jury. In the case of Russo, who claimed to have attended a meeting at David Ferrie's apartment where Shaw, Oswald and Ferrie plotted the assassination. NBC said that "Russo's answers to a series of questions indicate, in the language of the polygraph operator, 'deception criteria.' He was asked if he knew Clay Shaw. He was asked if he knew Lee Harvey Oswald. His 'yes' answer to both of these questions indicated 'deception criteria.' Did Bundy and Russo fail their lie-detector tests?

GARRISON: No. and NBC's allegations in this area are about as credible as its other charges. The men who administered both polygraph tests flatly deny that Russo and Bundy failed the test. I'll offer right now to make Russo's and Bundy's polygraph tests accessible to any reputable investigator or reporter the clay Shaw's trial begins; I can't do it before that, because I'm restrained from releasing material pertaining to Shaw's guilt or innocence. Just for your information, though, the veracity of Bundy and Russo has been affirmed not only through polygraph tests but through hypnosis and the administration of sodium amytal—truth serum. I want to make a proposition to the president of NBC: If this charge is true, then I will resign as district attorney of New Orleans. If it's untrue, however, then the president of NBC should resign. Just in case he thinks I'm kidding, I'm ready to meet with him at any time to select a mutually acceptable committee to determine once and for all the truth or falsehood of this charge. In all fairness, however, I must add that the fact Bundy and Russo passed their polygraph tests is not, in and of itself, irrefutable proof that they were telling the truth; that's why we administered the other tests. The lie detector isn't a foolproof technique. A man well rehearsed and in control of himself can master those reactions that would register on the polygraph as deception criteria and get away with blatant lies, while someone who is extremely nervous and anxiety-ridden could tell the truth and have it register as a lie. Much also depends on who administers the test, since it can easily be rigged. For example, Jack Ruby took a lie-detector test for the Warren Commission and told lie after outright lie—even little lies that could be easily checked—and yet the Warren Commission concluded that he passed the test. So the polygraph is only one weapon in the arsenal we use to verify a witness' testimony, and we have never considered it conclusive; we have always supplemented it with other augmentation to corroborate their stories.

PLAYBOY: Two convicts, Miguel Torren...
PLAYBOY: The NBC special also claimed to have discovered that "Clay, or Clem, Bertrand does exist. Clem Bertrand is not his real name. It is a pseudonym used by a homosexual in New Orleans. For his part, the real name of the man known as Clem Bertrand. His real name has been given to the Department of Justice. He is not Clay Shaw." Doesn't this undermine your entire case about Shaw?

GARRISON: Your faith in NBC's veracity is touching and indicates that the Age of Innocence is not yet over. NBC does not have the real Clay Bertrand; the man whose name NBC so melodramatically turned over to the Justice Department is that of Eugene Davis, a New Orleans bar owner, who has firmly denied under oath that he has ever used the name Clay, or Clem, Bertrand. We know from incontrovertible evidence in our possession who the real Clay Bertrand is—and we will prove it in court. But to make this whole thing a little clearer, let me tell you the genesis of the whole "Clay Bertrand" story. A New Orleans lawyer, Dean Andrews, told the Warren Commission that a few months before the assassination of President Kennedy, Lee Harvey Oswald and a group of "gay Mexicanos" came to his office and requested Andrews' aid in having Oswald's Marine Corps undesirable discharge changed to an honorable discharge; Oswald subsequently returned alone with other legal problems. Andrews further testified that the day after President Kennedy was assassinated, he received a call from Clay Bertrand, who asked him to rush to Dallas to represent Oswald. Andrews claims he subsequently saw Bertrand in a New Orleans bar, but Bertrand fled when Andrews approached him. This was intriguing testimony, although the Warren Commission dismissed it out of hand; and in 1964, Mark Lane traveled to New Orleans to speak to Andrews. He found him visibly frightened. "I'll take you to dinner," Andrews told Lane, "but I can't talk about the case. I called Washington and they told me that if I said anything, I might get a bullet in the head." For the same reason, he has refused to cooperate with my office in this investigation.

The New York Times reported on February 28th that "Mr. Andrews said he had not talked to Mr. Garrison because such talk might be dangerous, but added that he believed he was being 'tailed.'" Andrews told our grand jury that he could not say Clay Shaw was Clay Bertrand and he could not say he wasn't. But the day after NBC's special, Andrews broke his silence and said, yes, Clay Shaw is not Clem Bertrand and identified the real Clay Bertrand as Eugene Davis. The only trouble is, Andrews and Davis have known each other for years and have been seen frequent.

In each other's company. Andrews lied so often and about so many aspects of this case that the New Orleans Parish grand jury has indicted him for perjury, forgery, and giving false testimony. He's afraid to go to jail for perjury.
York. I get the impression that the majority of NBC executives probably thought I was a Pollyanna who was just trying to blunder through to the end of my two-month assignment without ever coming down here in an uncompromising search for the truth. When Sheridan overstepped himself and it became obvious that the broadcast was, to say the least, not objective, NBC real-
ized it was in a touchy position. Cooler heads prevailed and I was allowed to pre-
sent our case to the American people. For that, at least, I'm singularly grateful to Walter Sheridan.

PLAYBOY: How do you respond to the charge of your critics—including NBC—that you launched this probe for political reasons, hoping the attendant public-
licity would be a springboard to a Senate seat or to the governorship?

GARRISON: I'd have to be a terribly cyni-
cal and corrupt man to place another
human being on trial for conspiracy to
murder the President of the United
States just to gratify my political ambi-
tion. But I guess there are a lot of people
around the country, especially after
NBC's attack, who think that's just the
kind of man I am. That rather saddens
me. I'm no Albert Schweitzer, but I
could never do a thing like that. I derive
no pleasure from prosecuting a man,
even though I know he's guilty; do you
think I could sleep at night or look at
myself in the mirror in the morning if I
hounded an innocent man? You know, I
always received much more satisfaction
as a defense attorney in obtaining an ac-
quittal for a client than I ever have as a
D. A. in obtaining a conviction. All my
interests and sympathies tend to be on
the side of the individual as opposed to
the state. So this is really the worst
charge that anyone could make against
me—that in order to get my name in the paper, or to advance politically, I would
destroy another human being. This kind of
charge reveals a good deal about the
personality of the people who make it; to
impute such motives to another man is to
imply you're harboring them yourself.

PLAYBOY: For the simple reason that a
majority of NBC executives probably thought I was a Pollyanna who was just trying to
blunder through to the end of my two-
month assignment without ever coming
down here in an uncompromising search
for the truth. When Sheridan overstepped himself and it became obvious that the broadcast
was, to say the least, not objective, NBC
realized it was in a touchy position. Cooler
heads prevailed and I was allowed to present
our case to the American people. For that,
at least, I'm singularly grateful to Walter
Sheridan.

GARRISON: I'd have to be a terribly cyni-
cal and corrupt man to place another
human being on trial for conspiracy to
murder the President of the United
States just to gratify my political ambi-
tion. But I guess there are a lot of people
around the country, especially after
NBC's attack, who think that's just the
kind of man I am. That rather saddens
me. I'm no Albert Schweitzer, but I
could never do a thing like that. I derive
no pleasure from prosecuting a man,
even though I know he's guilty; do you
think I could sleep at night or look at
myself in the mirror in the morning if I
hounded an innocent man? You know, I
always received much more satisfaction
as a defense attorney in obtaining an acquit-
threw back a hypothesis that on the
side of the individual as opposed to
the state. So this is really the worst
charge that anyone could make against
me—that in order to get my name in the paper, or to advance politically, I would
destroy another human being. This kind of
charge reveals a good deal about the
personality of the people who make it; to
impute such motives to another man is to
imply you're harboring them yourself.

PLAYBOY: How do you respond to the charge of your critics—including NBC—that you launched this probe for political reasons, hoping the attendant public-
licity would be a springboard to a Senate seat or to the governorship?

GARRISON: I'd have to be a terribly cyni-
cal and corrupt man to place another
human being on trial for conspiracy to
murder the President of the United
States just to gratify my political ambi-
tion. But I guess there are a lot of people
around the country, especially after
NBC's attack, who think that's just the
kind of man I am. That rather saddens
me. I'm no Albert Schweitzer, but I
could never do a thing like that. I derive
no pleasure from prosecuting a man,
even though I know he's guilty; do you
think I could sleep at night or look at
myself in the mirror in the morning if I
hounded an innocent man? You know, I
always received much more satisfaction
as a defense attorney in obtaining an acquit-
tained to wax enthusiastic about every aspect of our case, and I have a dozen
witnesses who will testify to that effect. I
guess this was something that should have
tipped me off about Bill. Bill was always
enthusiastic, never doubtful or
cautious, even when I or one of my
staff threw out a hypothesis that on
reflection we realized was wronging. And I
began to notice how he would pick my
mind for every scrap of fact pertaining to
the case. So I grew suspicious and took him
off the sensitive areas of the investiga-
tion and relegated him to chauffeuring
and routine clerical duties. This seemed
to really bother him, and every day he
would come into my office and pump me
for information, complaining that he
wasn't being told enough about the case.
I still had nothing concrete against him
and I didn't want to be unjust, but I
guess my manner must have cooled
perceptibly, because one day about two
months before he surfaced in Washing-
ton, Bill just vanished from our sight.
And with him, I'm sorry to confess, van-
ished a copy of our master file. How do
you explain such behavior? It's possible
that Bill joined us initially for reasons
of opportunism, seeing a chance to get
in at the beginning of an earth-shaking
case, and subsequently chickened out
when he saw the implacable determina-
tion of some powerful agencies to destroy
our investigation and discredit everyone
associated with it. But I really don't be-
lieve Bill is that much of a coward. It's
also possible that those who want to
prevent an investigation learned early
what we were doing and made a decision
to plant somebody on the inside of the
investigation. Let me stress that I have no
secret documents or monitored telephone
calls to support this hypothesis; it just
seems to me the most logical explanation
for Bill's behavior. Let me put it this
way: If you were in charge of the CIA
and willing to spend scores of millions of
dollars on such secretive projects as in-
filtrating the National Stu-
dents Association, wouldn't you make an
effort to infiltrate an investigation that
could seriously damage the prestige of
your agency?

PLAYBOY: How could your probe dam-
age the prestige of the CIA and cause
them to take countermeasures against
you?

GARRISON: For the simple reason that a
number of the men who killed the Presi-
dent were former employees of the CIA
involved in its anti-Castro underground
activities in and around New Orleans.
The CIA knows their identity. So do I—
and our investigation has established this
without the shadow of a doubt. Let me
stress one thing, however: We have no
evidence that any official of the CIA was
involved with the conspiracy that led to
the President's death.
J. Garrett Underhill, that there was a conspiracy within the CIA to assassinate Kennedy?

GARRISON: I've become familiar with the case of Gary Underhill, and I've been able to ascertain that he was not the type of man to make wild or unsubstantiated charges. Underhill was an intelligence agent in World War Two and an expert on military affairs whom the Pentagon considered one of the country's top authorities on limited warfare. He was on good personal terms with the top brass in the Defense Department and the ranking officials in the CIA. He wasn't a full-time CIA agent, but he occasionally performed "special assignments" for the Agency. Several days after the President's assassination, Underhill appeared at the home of friends in New Jersey, apparently badly shaken, and charged that Kennedy was killed by a small group within the CIA. He told friends he believed his own life was in danger. We can't learn any more from Underhill, I'm afraid, because shortly afterward, he was found shot to death in his Washington apartment. The coroner ruled suicide, but he had been shot behind the left ear and the pistol was found under his left side—and Underhill was right-handed.

PLAYBOY: Do you believe Underhill was murdered to silence him?

GARRISON: I don't believe it and I don't disbelieve it. All I know is that witnesses with vital evidence in this case are certainly bad insurance risks. In the absence of further and much more conclusive evidence to the contrary, however, we must assume that the plotters were acting on their own rather than on CIA orders when they killed the President. As far as we have been able to determine, they were not in the pay of the CIA at the time of the assassination—and this is one of the reasons the President was murdered; I'll explain later what I mean by that. But the CIA could not face up to the American people and admit that its former employees had conspired to assassinate the President; so from the moment Kennedy's heart stopped beating, the Agency attempted to sweep the whole conspiracy under the rug. The CIA has spared neither time nor the taxpayers' money in its efforts to hide the truth about the assassination from the American people. In this respect, it has become an accessory after the fact in the assassination.

PLAYBOY: Do you have any conclusive evidence to support these accusations?

GARRISON: I've never revealed this before, but for at least six months, my office and home telephones—and those of every member of my staff—have been monitored. If there is as little substance to this investigation as the press and the public Government allege, why would anyone go to all that trouble? I leave it to your judgment if the monitoring of our phones is the work of the Women's Christian Temperance Union or the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce.

PLAYBOY: That's hardly conclusive evidence.

GARRISON: I'd need a book to list all the indications. But let's start with the fact that most of the attorneys for the hostile witnesses and defendants were hired by the CIA—through one or another of its covers. For example, a New Orleans lawyer representing Alvin Beaubouef, who has charged me with every kind of unethical practice except child molesting—I expect that allegation to come shortly before Shaw's trial—flew with Beaubouef to Washington immediately after my office subpoenaed him, where Beaubouef was questioned by a "retired" intelligence officer in the offices of the Justice Department. This trip was paid for, as are the lawyer's legal fees, by the CIA—in other words, with our tax dollars. Another lawyer, Stephen Plotkin, who represents Gordon Novel (another of Garrison's key witnesses), has admitted he is paid by the CIA—and has also admitted his client is a CIA agent; you may have seen that story on page 96 of The New York Times, next to ship departures. Plotkin, incidentally, sued me for $10,000,000 for defaming his client and sued a group of New Orleans businessmen financing my investigation for $50,000,000—which meant, in effect, that the CIA was suing us. As if they need the money. But my attorney filed a motion for a deposition to be taken from Novel, which meant that he would have to return to my jurisdiction to file his suit and thus be liable for questioning in the conspiracy case. Rather than come down to New Orleans and face the music, Novel dropped his suit and sacrificed a possible $60,000,000 judgment. Now, there's a man of principle; he knows there are some things more important than money.

PLAYBOY: Do you also believe Clay Shaw's lawyers are being paid by the CIA?

GARRISON: I can't comment directly on that, since it relates to Shaw's trial. But I think the clincher, as far as Washington's obstruction of our probe goes, is the consistent refusal of the Federal Government to make accessible to us any information about the roles of the CIA, anti-Castro Cuban exiles and the paramilitary right in the assassination. There is, without doubt, a conspiracy by elements of the Federal Government to keep the facts of this case from ever becoming known—a conspiracy that is the logical extension of the initial conspiracy by the CIA to conceal vital evidence from the Warren Commission.

PLAYBOY: What "vital evidence" did the CIA withhold from the Warren Commission?

GARRISON: A good example is Commission Exhibit number 237. This is a photograph of a stocky, balding, middle-aged man published without explanation or identification in the 26 volumes of the Warren Report. There's a significant story behind Exhibit number 237. Throughout the late summer and fall of 1963, Lee Oswald was shepherded in Dallas and New Orleans by a CIA "baby sitter" who watched over Oswald's activities and stayed with him. My office knows who he is and what he looks like.

PLAYBOY: Are you implying that Oswald was working for the CIA?

GARRISON: Let me finish and you can decide for yourself. When Oswald went to Mexico City in an effort to obtain a visa for travel to Cuba, this CIA agent accompanied him. Now, at this particular time, Mexico was the only Latin American nation maintaining diplomatic ties with Cuba, and leftists and Communists from all over the hemisphere traveled to the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City for visas to Cuba. The CIA, quite properly, paid a hidden movie camera in a building across the street from the embassy and filmed everyone coming and going. The Warren Commission, knowing this, had an agent legal counsel ask the FBI for a picture of Oswald and his companion on the steps of the embassy, and the FBI, in turn, filed an affidavit saying they had obtained the photo in question from the CIA. The only trouble is that the CIA supplied the Warren Commission with a phony photograph. The photograph of an "unidentified man" published in the 26 volumes is not the man who was filmed with Oswald on the steps of the Cuban Embassy, as alleged by the CIA. It's perfectly clear that the actual picture of Oswald and his companion was suppressed and a fake photo substituted because the second man in the picture was working for the CIA in 1963, and his identification as a CIA agent would have opened up a whole can of worms about Oswald's ties with the Agency. To prevent this, the CIA replaced the Warren Commission with fraudulent evidence—a pattern that repeats itself whenever the CIA submits evidence relating to Oswald's possible connection with any U.S. intelligence agency. The CIA lied to the Commission right down the line; and since the Warren Commission had no investigative staff of its own but had to rely on the FBI, the Secret Service and the CIA for its evidence, it's understandable why the Commission concluded that Oswald had no ties with American intelligence agencies.

PLAYBOY: What was the nature of these ties?

GARRISON: That's not altogether clear, at least insofar as his specific assignments are concerned; but we do have proof that Oswald was recruited by the
CIA in his Marine Corps days, when he was mysteriously schooled in Russian and allowed to go to Pravda. And shortly before his trip to the Soviet Union, we have learned, Oswald was trained as an intelligence agent at the CIA installation at Japan's Atsugi Air Force Base—which may explain why no disciplinary action was taken against him when he returned to the U.S. from the Soviet Union, even though he had supposedly deserted with top-secret information about our radar networks. The money he used to return to the U.S., incidentally, was advanced to him by the State Department.

**PLAYBOY:** In an article for Ramparts, ex-FBI agent William Turner indicated that White Russian émigré George De Mohrenschutz may have been Oswald's CIA "baby sister" in Dallas. Have you found any links between the CIA and De Mohrenschutz?

**GARRISON:** I can't comment directly on that, but George De Mohrenschutz is certainly an enigmatic and intriguing character. Here you have a wealthy, cultured White Russian émigré who travels in the highest social circles—he was a personal friend of Mrs. Hugh Auchincloss, Jackie Kennedy's mother—suddenly developing an intimate relationship with an impoverished ex-Marine like Lee Oswald. What did they discuss—last year's season at Biarritz, or how to beat the bank at Monte Carlo? And Mr. De Mohrenschutz has a penchant for popping up in the most interesting places at the most interesting times—for example, in Haiti just before a joint Cuban exile-CIA venture to topple Duvalier and use the island as a springboard for an invasion of Cuba; and in Guatemala, another CIA training ground, the day before the Bay of Pigs invasion. We have a good deal more information about Oswald's CIA contacts in Dallas and New Orleans—most of which we discovered by sheer chance—but there are still whole areas of inquiry blocked from us by the CIA's refusal to cooperate with our investigation. For public consumption, the CIA claims not to have been concerned with Oswald prior to the assassination. But one thing is certain: Despite these pious protestations, the CIA was very much aware of Oswald's activities well before the President's murder. In a potassium approach, former CIA head of the CIA's Veracity.

**PLAYBOY:** If the CIA is ready to lie even about the assassination, as you see them, do you seriously believe its dir...
PLAYBOY: Ignorance, since I had never read it: as Mark Lane says, "The only way you can believe the Report is not to have read it."

Then, in November, I visited New York City with Senator Russell Long, and when the subject of the assassination came up, he expressed grave doubts about the Warren Commission's conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone assassin. Now, this disturbed me, because here was the Majority Whip of the U.S. Senate speaking, not some publicity hound with an ideological ax to grind; and if at this late juncture he still entertained serious reservations about the Commission's determinations, maybe there was more to the assassination than met the eye. So I began reading every book and magazine article on the assassination I could get my hands on—my tombstone may be inscribed "CURIOSITY KILLED THE D.A."—and I found my own doubts growing. Finally, I put aside all other business and started to wade through the Warren Commission's own 26 volumes of supportive evidence and testimony. That was the clincher. It's impossible for anyone possessed of reasonable objectivity and a fair degree of intelligence to read those 26 volumes and not reach the conclusion that the Warren Commission was wrong in every one of its major conclusions pertaining to the assassination. For me, that was the end of innocence.

PLAYBOY: Do you mean to imply that the Warren Commission deliberately concealed or falsified the facts of the assassination?

GARRISON: No, you don't need any explanation more sinister than incompetence to account for the Warren Report. Though I didn't know it at the time, the Commission simply didn't have all the facts, and many of those they had were fraudulent, as I've pointed out—thanks to the evidence withheld and manufactured by the CIA. If you add to this the fact that most of the Commission members had already presumed Oswald's guilt and were merely looking for facts to confirm it—and in the process tranquilize the American public—you'll realize why the Commission was such a dismal failure. But in the final analysis, it doesn't make a damn bit of difference whether the Commission members were sincere patriots or moneymakers; the question is whether Lee Oswald killed the President alone and unaided; if the evidence doesn't support that conclusion—and it doesn't—a thousand honorable men sitting shoulder to shoulder along the banks of the Potomac won't change the facts.
Psychiatrists reject this proposal because rape is the act of a sadist, not of a normal man with an excess of sexual energy. What needs to be changed is his mental attitude, not his ability to have an erection; the average rapist is a man who will walk past a house of prostitution, or leave a loving wife at home, to force himself on a frightened and unwilling victim, because the creation of terror and the use of violence are the real gratifications that he seeks.

Clinical evidence shows that castration is 100-percent effective in reducing erectile potency only if performed before puberty. When the operation is performed on adults, their ability to have an erection frequently will not wane for years. Whether or not the castrated rapist retains his potency, the desired results are seldom achieved: If he is made impotent, he often shifts to nonsexual and therefore more bizarre forms of assault; if he remains potent, he becomes more vicious out of a desire for revenge against society. These conclusions have emerged from several attempts in various nations to employ this dubious "remedy," beginning as early as 1889.

To assume, finally, that castration would serve as a deterrent is to assume that the rapist has a rational mind. Many rapists act in what psychiatrists call a fugue state—scarcely aware of what they are doing, much less of what the consequences of their behavior will be. Cruel and unusual punishments will not more stop them than will eloquent preachments. "Rape will be reduced almost to extinction" only when a truly rational society is evolved, in which children's sexual attitudes are not distorted. Meanwhile, the only humane way society can protect itself from the rapist is to confine him, and the only humane way society has devised for the rapist is psychotherapy.
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and on November 19th, Presidential aide McGeorge Bundy, who was acting as an intermediary in the secret discussions, told Ambassador Atwood that the President wanted to discuss his plans for a Cuban-American détente in depth with him right after "a brief trip to Dallas." The rest is history. One of the two heads of state involved in negotiating that détente is now dead, but the survivor, Fidel Castro, said on November 23rd that the assassination was the work of "elements in the U.S. opposed to peace," and the Cuban Foreign Ministry officially charged that "the Kennedy assassination was a provocation against world peace perfectly and minutely prepared by the most reactionary sectors of the United States." Most Americans at the time, myself included, thought this was just Communist propaganda. But Castro knew what he was talking about. A few weeks after the assassination, the Cuban ambassador to the UN, Dr. Carlos Lenchaga, was instructed by Castro to begin "formal discussions" in the hope that Kennedy's peace plan would be carried on by his successor. Ambassador Atwood writes that "I informed Bundy and later was told that the Cuban exercise would be put on ice for a while—which it was and where it has been ever since." The assassins had achieved their aim.

PLAYBOY: This is interesting speculation, but isn't that all it is—speculation?

GARRISON: No, because we know enough about the key individuals involved in the conspiracy—Latin and Americans alike—to know that this was their motive for the murder of John Kennedy. First of all, you have to understand the mentality of these people. Take the Cuban exiles involved; here are men, some of whom survived the Bay of Pigs, who for years had been whipped up by the CIA into a frenzy of anti-Castro hatred and who had been solemnly assured by American intelligence agencies that they were going to liberate their homeland with American support. They had one disappointment after another—the Bay of Pigs debacle, the failure to invade Cuba during the Missile Crisis, the effective crushing of their underground in Cuba by Castro's secret police. But they kept on hoping, and the CIA kept fanning their hopes. Then they listened to Kennedy's famous speech at American University on June 10, 1963, where he really kicked off the new drive for a détente, and they heard the President of the country in which they'd placed all their hope saying we must make peace with the Communists, since "we both breathe the same air."

Well, this worries them, but the CIA continues financing and training their underground cadres, so there is still hope. And then suddenly, in the late summer of 1965, the CIA is forced by Presidential pressure to withdraw all funds and
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assistance from the Cuban exiles. Think of the impact of this, particularly on the group here in New Orleans, which had been trained for months to make an assassination attempt on Castro and then found itself coolly jettisoned by its benefactors in Washington. These adventurers were worked up to a fever pitch; and when the CIA withdrew its support and they couldn't fight Castro, they picked their next victim—John F. Kennedy. That, in a nutshell, is the genesis of the assassination. President Kennedy died because he wanted peace.

PLAYBOY: How many people do you claim were involved in this alleged conspiracy?

GARRISON: Too many for their own security. If they had let fewer men in on the plot, we might never have stumbled onto it. But let me add one additional point here. The brief account I've just given shouldn't be construed to indicate that any of the legitimate anti-Castro organizations were involved in the assassination—or that all Minutemen were implicated. Nor should the fact that there was a conspiracy from the paramilitary right be used to start a witch-hunt against conservatives in general, any more than Oswald's phony pro-Communist record should have been used to purge leftists from our national life. In this case, the very terminology of 'right' and 'left,' which is essentially an economic definition, has little validity as a description of those fanatic war lovers who were ready to assassinate a President because he worked for peace. If you go far enough to either extreme of the political spectrum, Communist or fascist, you'll find hard-eyed men with guns who believe that anybody who doesn't think as they do should be incarcerated or exterminated. The assassination was less an ideological exercise than the frenzied revenge of a sick element in our society on a man who exemplified health and decency.

PLAYBOY: You've outlined the genesis of the alleged conspiracy as you see it. Will you now tell us how it was carried out—and by whom?

GARRISON: I won't be able to name names in all instances, because we're building cases against a number of the individuals involved. But I'll give you a brief sketch of how the conspiracy was organized, and then point by point we can go into the participants we know about so far and the role we believe each played. Let me stress at the outset that what I'm going to tell you is not idle speculation; we have facts, documents and reliable eyewitness testimony to corroborate much of it—though I can't lay all this evidence before you without jeopardizing the investigation. But there are many pieces of the jigsaw puzzle still missing. Not one of the conspirators has ever confessed his guilt, so we don't yet have an "inside" view of all the pre-assassination
规划。为了填补这些空白，我必须投入一些猜测性和推理。它可能显得有些戏剧化，但你能把围棋的上面想象成一个蜘蛛网。

在中心位置的是各种操作者的集合，这些人与美国和西方欧洲的间谍机构有密切联系。其中一个是杰克·鲁比，他与德国、法国和意大利的纳粹分子发生了冲突。在这些关键人物的后面，散布着各种政治冒险家组成的网络。这个网络只在德怀特·肯尼迪的调查中，但由于我们对肯尼迪和他的连带责任的推卸，我们相信我们了解了他。

这些信息和文章可能在某些方面显得缺乏权威性，但它们的准确性和完整性却有所不同。我们对这些信息和文章的依赖表明，我们需要进一步的研究来澄清这些空白。
PLAYBOY: Are you free to discuss Oswald's role in the conspiracy?

GARRISON: Yes, but before you can understand Oswald's role in the plot, you've got to jettison the image of him as a "self-proclaimed Marxist" that the mass media inculcated in the public consciousness after his arrest on November 22nd. Oswald's professed Marxist sympathies were just a cover for his real activities. I don't believe there are any serious students of the assassination who don't recognize that Oswald's actual political orientation was extreme right wing. His associates in Dallas and New Orleans—apart from his CIA contacts—were exclusively right wing; some covert, others overt; in fact, our office has positively identified a number of his associates as neo-Nazis. Oswald would have been more at home with Mein Kampf than Das Kapital.

PLAYBOY: If Oswald wasn't a leftist, what motivation would he have had for shooting at another right-winger, Major General Edwin Walker, eight months before the assassination?

GARRISON: If he did it, his motive—which is to say the motive of those behind him—was a simple one: to ensure that after the assassination, people would ask this very question and assume that because Oswald had shot at General Walker, he must have been a left-winger. It was just another part of Oswald's cover: if you defect to Russia, pass out pro-Castro leaflets on street corners and take a pot shot at General Walker, who on earth would doubt you're a Communist? Of course, if you really look deeply into this incident, there is no real proof that Oswald was the man who did it; the whole charge rests on the unsupported testimony of Marina Oswald, after she had been threatened with deportation if she didn't "cooperate." It makes little difference, though, whether this incident was prepared in advance to create a cover for Oswald or fabricated after the assassination to strengthen his public image as a Marxist. But we've gotten ahead of ourselves. Let's backtrack a bit to fill in the background of Oswald's involvement in the conspiracy. After "defecting" to Russia, where he served as an agent for the CIA—perhaps this is where his knowledge about the U-2 became relevant—he returned to this country in June 1962, lived in Fort Worth and Dallas until April 1963, and then went to New Orleans, where he resumed his friendship with David Ferrie, whom he had met several years before when he belonged to a Civil Air Patrol unit led by Ferrie. We have evidence that Oswald maintained his CIA contacts throughout this period and that Ferrie was also employed by the CIA. In this regard, we will present in court a witness—formerly a CIA courier—who met both Ferrie and Oswald officially in their CIA connection. Parentitically, Ferrie gave his name as Ferris to this witness—a name recorded without further explanation in Jack Ruby's address book. In 1963, Ferrie and Oswald worked together closely. They were two of the organizers of the group of anti-Castro exiles and Minutemen who trained north of Lake Pontchartrain for a foray into Cuba to assassinate Castro—the venture that changed direction in the summer of 1963 and chose John Kennedy as its new victim. Toward this end—for reasons that will become clear—it became Oswald's role to establish his public identity as a Marxist. It appears that it was with this plan in mind that Oswald was sent to Mexico City in order to get a visa for travel to Cuba, where he planned to solidify his Marxist image, perhaps by making himself conspicuous with a few incendiary anti-Kennedy speeches, and then return to Dallas in time for the assassination. However, this end of the plot was frustrated because the Soviet and Cuban intelligence services apparently had Oswald pegged as an intelligence agent, and he was refused visas at both embassies. Another way in which Oswald tried to establish his procommunism was by setting up a letterhead Fair Play for Cuba Committee—of which he was the only member—and distributing on street corners leaflets praising Castro. He made two blunders here, however. First, one of the men helping him hand out leaflets was a fanatic anti-Castro Cuban exile whom we've subsequently identified from TV footage of a street incident. Second, Oswald "blew his cover" by using the wrong address for his phony New Orleans Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

PLAYBOY: Will you elaborate on this second point?

GARRISON: Yes, because this incident ties together some of the strands of the spider's web. At the time Oswald started his so-called Fair Play for Cuba Committee, two men—Hugh Ward and Guy Bannister—operated a private investigative
agency at 544 Camp Street in downtown New Orleans. There are some intriguing aspects to their operation. For one thing, Guy Bannister was one of the most militant right-wing anti-Communists in New Orleans. He was a former FBI official and his headquarters at 544 Camp Street was a clearinghouse for Cuban exile and paramilitary right-wing activities. Specifically, he allowed his office to be used as a mail drop for the anti-Castro Cuban Democratic Revolutionary Front; police intelligence records at the time reported that this group was "legitimate in nature and presumably had the unofficial sanction of the Central Intelligence Agency." It did. Bannister also published a newsletter for his clients that included virulent anti-Kennedy polemics. My office also has evidence that Bannister had intimate ties with the Office of Naval Intelligence and the CIA. Both Bannister and Ward were deeply involved in covert anti-Castro exile activities in New Orleans. Bannister in particular seemed to have had an almost messianic drive to fight communism in every country in Latin America; and he was naturally of value to Cuban exiles because of his intimate connections with American intelligence agencies. In the Ramparts article you mentioned earlier, ex-FBI agent Bill Turner revealed that both Bannister and Ward were listed in secret Minutemen files as members of the Minutemen and operatives of a group called the Anti-Communist League of the Caribbean, which was allegedly used by the CIA in the overthrow of the Guatemalan government in 1954. So, in other words, these are the last guys in the world you'd expect to find tied up with left-wing or pro-Castro activities. Right? And yet, when Lee Harvey Oswald set up his fictitious branch of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee in New Orleans, he distributed leaflets giving the committee's address as 544 Camp Street—Guy Bannister's office! Somebody must have pointed out to Oswald shortly afterward that he was endangering his cover by using this address, because he subsequently changed it to 4907 Magazine Street. But it's certainly significant that at the inception of his public role as a pro-Castro activist, Oswald was utilizing the mailbox of the most militantly conservative and anti-Communist outfit in the city. I might add that we have several witnesses who will testify in court that they saw Oswald hanging out at 544 Camp Street. I want to stress, however, that I have no evidence that Bannister and Ward were involved in the plot to kill Kennedy. Their office was a kind of way station for anti-Castro and right-wing extremists passing through New Orleans, and it's perfectly possible that they were completely unaware of the conspiracy being hatched by men like Ferric and Oswald.

PLAYBOY: Were any of the other figures...
in the alleged conspiracy connected with Bannister?

GARRISON: Yes, David Ferrie was a paid investigator for Bannister, and the two men knew each other very well. During 1962 and 1963, Ferrie spent a good deal of time at 544 Camp Street and he made a series of mysterious long-distance phone calls to Central America from Bannister's office. We have a record of those calls.

PLAYBOY: Where are Bannister and Ward now?

GARRISON: Both have died since the assassination—Bannister of a heart attack in 1964 and Ward when the plane he was piloting for New Orleans Mayor De Lesseps Morrison crashed in Mexico in 1964. De Lesseps Morrison, as it happened, had introduced Clay Shaw to President Kennedy on an airplane flight in 1965.

PLAYBOY: Do you believe there was anything sinister about the crash that killed both Morrison and Ward?

GARRISON: I have no reason to believe there was anything sinister about the crash, though rumors always spring up in a case like this. The only thing I will say is that witnesses in this case do have a habit of dying at the most inconvenient times. I understand a London insurance firm has prepared an actuarial chart on the likelihood of 20 of the people involved in this case dying within three years of the assassination—and found the odds 30 trillion to one. But I'm sure NBC will shortly discover that one of my investigators bribed the computer.

PLAYBOY: Was Oswald involved with paramilitary activists and anti-Castro Cuban exiles in Dallas, as well as in New Orleans?

GARRISON: Oh, God, yes. In fact, many of his New Orleans contacts overlap with those in Dallas. Jack Ruby, who played a key role in smuggling guns to the anti-Castro underground—on behalf of the CIA—was one of Oswald's contacts in Dallas. Furthermore, Oswald was virtually surrounded by White Russians in Dallas, some of whom were CIA employees.

Moreover, some of Oswald's anti-Castro friends from Miami and New Orleans showed up in Dallas in October of 1963. In a "Supplementary Investigation Report" filed on November 22, 1963, by Dallas policeman Buddy Walthers, an aide to Sheriff Bill Decker, Walthers stated: "I talked to Sorrels, the head of the Dallas Secret Service. I was advised that for the past few months at a house at 5128 Harlandale, some Cubans had been having meetings on the weekends and were possibly connected with the Freedom for Cuba Party of which Oswald was a member." No attention was paid to Walthers' report, and on November 26th, he complained: "I don't know what action the Secret Service has taken, but I learned today that some time between seven days before the President was shot and the day after he was shot, these Cubans moved from this house. My informant stated that subject Oswald had been to this house before." This was the last that was ever heard of the mysterious Cubans at 5128 Harlandale. A significant point in Walthers' report is his mention of the Freedom for Cuba Party. This appears to be a corruption of the anti-Castro Free Cuba Committee of which Oswald, Ferrie and a small cadre of neo-Nazi—including the man we believe was the 'second Oswald'—were members. You may remember that on the night of the assassination, Dallas D. A. Henry Wade called a press conference and at one point referred to Oswald as a member of the "Free Cuba Committee" instead of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Jack Ruby, who just happened to be there, promptly chimed in to correct him. Ruby was obviously in the jail that night on a dry run prior to his successful murder of Oswald on Sunday—a possibility the Warren Commission never bothered to consider—and could hardly have been eager to draw attention to himself. However, he must have been afraid that if the press reported Oswald as a member of the "Free Cuba Committee," somebody might begin an investigation of that group and discover its anti-Castro and ultra-right-wing orientation. And so he risked his cover to set the record straight and protect his fellow conspirators.

PLAYBOY: In regard to Oswald's role in the conspiracy, you have said that "he was a decoy at first and then he was a patsy and then he was a victim." Would you explain what you meant by that?

GARRISON: Oswald's role in the proposed assassination of Kennedy, as far as he seems to have known, was strictly political: not to fire a gun but—for reasons that may not have been explained to him by his superiors at their planning session—to establish his lifelong fides so unshakably that after the assassination, quite possibly unbeknownst to him, the President's murder would appear
to be the work of a sharpshooting left-wing fanatic and thus allow the other plotters, including the man who actually shot Kennedy, to escape police attention and flee Dallas. Though he may not have known why he was instructed to do so, this was undoubtedly why he got the job at the Texas School Book Depository Building: we've learned that one of the members of the conspiracy was in a position to learn from perfectly innocent Dallas business contacts the route of the Presidential motorcade more than a month before Kennedy's visit. The conspirators—more than probably not including Oswald—knew this would place him on the scene and convince the world that a demented Marxist was the real assassin.

PLAYBOY: Even if Oswald was unaware of his role as a decoy, didn't he suspect that he might be double-crossed by his co-conspirators?

GARRISON: We have uncovered substantial evidence that he was influenced and manipulated rather easily by his older and more sophisticated superiors in the conspiracy, and it's probable that he trusted them more than he distrusted them. But even if the opposite were true, I think he would have done what he was told.

PLAYBOY: Even if he suspected that he might be arrested and convicted as the President's assassin?

GARRISON: As I said, I don't think it's likely that he was aware of his role as a decoy. But even if he was, it's probable that he would have been given some cock-and-bull assurances about being richly rewarded and smuggled out of the country after Kennedy's death. But it's even more probable, in my opinion—if he did know the true nature of his role—that he wouldn't have felt the necessity to escape. He would have known that no jury in the world—even in Dallas—would have been able to find him guilty of the assassination on the strength of such transparently contrived circumstantial evidence.

PLAYBOY: That's debatable. But even if Oswald had been brought to trial for and acquitted of the assassination, what reason would he have had to believe that he would also be exonerated of involvement in the conspiracy—which you've admitted yourself?

GARRISON: I don't want to evade your question, but I can't answer it without compromising my investigation of a crucial new area of the conspiracy. I'm afraid I can't discuss it until we've built a solid case. I can say, however, that whatever his knowledge of his role as a decoy, he definitely didn't know about his role as a patsy until after the assassination. At 12:45 P.M. on November 22nd, the Dallas police had broadcast a wanted bulletin for Oswald—over a half hour before Tippit was shot and at a time when there was absolutely no evidence linking Oswald to the assassination. The Dallas police have never been able to explain who transmitted this wanted notice or on what evidence it was based; and the Warren Commission brushed aside the whole matter as unimportant. I think it's obvious that the conspirators tipped off the police, probably anonymously, in the hope—subsequently realized—that all attention would henceforth be focused on Oswald and the heat would be taken off other members of the plot. We have evidence that the plan was to have him shot as a cop killer in the Texas Theater "while resisting arrest." I can't go into all the details on this, but the murder of Tippit, which I am convinced Oswald didn't commit, was clearly designed to set the stage for Oswald's liquidation in the Texas Theater after another anonymous tip-off. But here the plotters miscalculated, and Oswald was not shot to death but was merely roughed up and rushed off to the Dallas jail—where, you may remember, he shouted to reporters as the police dragged him through the corridors on November 22nd: "I didn't kill anybody—I'm being made a patsy." The conspiracy had gone seriously awry and the plotters were in danger of exposure by Oswald. Enter Jack Ruby—and exit Oswald. So first Oswald was a decoy, next a patsy and finally—in the basement of the Dallas jail...
on November 24, 1963—a victim.

PLAYBOY: Even if Oswald was a scapegoat in the alleged conspiracy, why do you believe he couldn’t also have been one of those who shot at the President?

GARRISON: If there’s one thing the Warren Commission and its 26 volumes of supportive evidence demonstrate conclusively, it’s that Lee Harvey Oswald did not shoot John Kennedy on November 22, 1963. Of course, the Commission concluded not only that Oswald fired at the President but that he was a marksman, that he had enough time to fire three shots, with two hits, within 4.8 and 5.8 seconds, that his Mannlicher-Carcano was an accurate rifle, etc.—but all these conclusions are in direct contradiction of the evidence within the Commission’s own 26 volumes. By culling and coordinating that evidence, the leading critics of the Commission have proved that Oswald was not the killer; that the Mannlicher-Carcano rifle he allegedly used was about the clumsiest weapon on the market today; that its telescopic sight was loose and had to be realigned before Commission experts could fire it; that the 20-year-old ammunition he would have had to use could not have been relied on to fire accurately; that there was no nitrate on neither hand. This is a smoking a cigar, for example—tobacco contains nitrate: so if you were tested right now, you’d have nitrate on your right hand but not on your left. I’m smoking a pipe, which I interchange between my hands. I’ll have traces of nitrate on both hands but not on my cheeks. The morning of the assassination, Oswald was moving crates in a newly painted room, which was likely to have left traces of nitrate on both his hands. Now, of course, if the nitrate test had proved positive, and Oswald did have nitrate on one hand and on his cheek, that would still not constitute proof positive that he’d fired a gun, because the nitrate could have been left by a substance other than gunpowder. But the fact that he had no nitrate whatsoever on his cheek is ineluctable proof positive that he’d never fired a rifle that day. If he had washed his face to remove the nitrate before the test was administered, there would have been none on his hands either—unless he was in the habit of washing his face with gloves on. This was a sticky problem for the Warren Commission, but they resolved it with their customary aplomb. An expert was dug up who testified that in a Mannlicher-Carcano rifle, the chamber is so tight that no nitrites are emitted upon firing; and the Commission used this testimony to dismiss the whole subject. However, the inventor of the nitrate test subsequently tested the Mannlicher-Carcano and found that it did leave nitrate traces. He was not called to testify by the Warren Commission. So the nitrate test alone is incontrovertible proof that Oswald did not fire a rifle on November 22nd. We’ve also found some new evidence that shows that Oswald’s Mannlicher-Carcano was not the only weapon discovered in the Depository Building after the assassination. I recently traveled to New York for a conference with Richard Sprague, a brilliant man who’s been independently researching technical aspects of the assassination, and he showed me a previously unpublished collection of film clips from a motion picture taken of the assassination and its aftermath. Part of the film, shot shortly after one p.m., shows the Dallas police carrying the assassination weapon out of the Book Depository. They stop for the photographers and an officer holds the rifle up above his head so that the inquisitive crowd can look at it. There’s just one little flaw here: This rifle does not have a telescopic sight, and thus cannot be Oswald’s rifle. This weapon was taken from the building approximately 20 minutes before Oswald’s Mannlicher-Carcano was recovered—or planted—on the premises. To sum up: Oswald was involved in the conspiracy: shots were fired at Kennedy from the Depository but also from the grassy knoll and apparently from the Dal-Tex Building as well—but not one of them was fired by Lee Harvey Oswald. So there was not one of them from his Mannlicher-Carcano.

PLAYBOY: If Oswald didn’t shoot President Kennedy from the sixth-floor window of the Book Depository, who did?

GARRISON: Our office has developed evidence that the President was assassinated by a precision guerrilla team of at least seven men, including anti-Castro adventurers and members of the paramilitary right. Of course, the Ministry of Truth concluded—by scrupulously ignoring the most compelling evidence and carefully selecting only those facts that conformed to its preconceived thesis of a lone assassin—that “no credible evidence suggests that the shots were fired from . . . any place other than the Texas School Book Depository Building.” But anyone who takes the time to read the Warren Report will find that of the witnesses in Dealey Plaza who were able to assess the origin of the shots, almost two thirds said they came from the grassy-knoll area in front and to the right of the President limousine and not from the Book Depository, which was to the rear of the President. A number of reliable witnesses testified that they heard shots ring out from behind the picket fence and saw a puff of smoke drift into the air. Additional evidence suggesting this can be found in the Zapradner film published in Life which reveals that the President was slammed backward by the impact of a bullet; unless you abrogate Newton’s third law of motion, this means the President was shot from the front. Also—that they were contradicted later—several of the doctors at Parkland Hospital who examined the President’s neck wound contended it was an entrance wound, which would certainly tend to indicate that Kennedy was shot from the front. In the course of our investigation, we’ve uncovered additional evidence establishing absolutely that there were at least four men on the grassy knoll, at least two behind the picket fence and two or more behind a small stone wall to the right of the fence. As I reconstruct it from the still-incomplete evidence, one man fired at the President from each location while the role of his companion was to snatch up the cartridges as they were ejected. Parenthetically, a book on firearms characteristics was found in Ferrie’s apartment. It was filled with underlining and marginal notations, and the most heavily annotated section was one describing the direction and distance a cartridge travels from a rifle after ejection. Scrubbed out on a bookmark in this section, in Ferrie’s handwriting, were the figures, not mentioned in the text, “50” and “11 feet”—which indicates the possibility that Ferrie had test-fired a rifle and plotted the distance from the gunman to where the ejected cartridges would fall. But to return to the scene of the crime, it seems virtually certain that the cartridges, along with the rifles, were then thrown into the trunk of a car—parked directly behind the picket fence—which was driven out of the scene some hours after the assassination. If there had been a thorough search...
of all vehicles in the vicinity of the grassy knoll immediately after the assassination, this incriminating evidence might have been uncovered—along with the real authors of the President's murder. In addition to the assassin on the grassy knoll, at least two other men fired from behind the President, one from the Book Depository Building—not Oswald—and one, in all probability, from the Dal-Tex Building. As it happens, a man was arrested right after the assassination as he left the Dal-Tex Building and was taken away in a patrol car, but like the three other men detained after the assassination—one in the railroad yard behind the grassy knoll, one on the railroad overpass farther down the parade route, and one in front of the Book Depository Building—he then dropped out of sight completely. All of these suspects taken into custody after the assassination remain as anonymous as if they'd been detained for throwing a candy wrapper on the sidewalk. We have also located another man—in green combat fatigues—who was not involved in the shooting but created a diversionary action in order to distract people's attention from the snipers. This individual screamed, fell to the ground and simulated an epileptic fit, drawing people away from the vicinity of the knoll just before the President's motorcade reached the ambush point. So you have at least seven people involved, with four firing at the President and catching him in a crossfire—just as the assassins had planned at the meeting in David Ferrie's apartment in September. It was a precision operation and was carried out coolly and with excellent coordination; the assassins even kept in contact by radio. The President, of course, had no chance. It was an overkill operation.

As far as the actual sequence of shots goes, you'll remember that the Warren Commission concluded that only three bullets were fired at the President—one that hit just below the back of his neck, exited through his throat and then passed through Governor Connally's body; one that missed; and one that blew off a portion of the President's skull and killed him. Like most of the other conclusions of the Commission, this one contradicts both the evidence and the testimony of eyewitnesses. The initial shot hit the President in the front of the neck, as the Parkland Hospital doctors recognized—though they were later contradicted by the military physicians at the Bethesda autopsy, and by the Warren Report. The second shot struck the President in the back; the location of this wound can be verified by consulting the official autopsy report—on which the Commission based its conclusion that this bullet hit Kennedy in the back of the neck and exited from his throat—but by perusing the reports filed by two FBI agents who were present at the President's autopsy in Bethesda, Maryland. Both stated unequivocally that the bullet in question entered President Kennedy's back and did not come from his body. I also refer you to a photograph of the President's shirt taken by the FBI, and to a drawing of the President's back wound made by one of the examining physicians at Bethesda; the location of the wound in both cases corresponds exactly—more than three inches below the President's neck. Yet the Commission concluded that this wound occurred in his neck. This, of course, was to make it more believable that the same bullet had exited from the President's throat and slanted down through Governor Connally's body. Even if this bullet had entered where the Commission claims and then exited from the President's throat, it would have been possible for it to enter Governor Connally's upper back at a downward angle, exit from his lower chest, and lodge finally in his thigh—fired, as the Commission says it was, from the elevation of the sixth-floor window of the Book Depository—only if Connally had been sitting in the President's lap or if the bullet had described two 90-degree turns on its way from President Kennedy's throat to Governor Connally's back. Clearly, the President's throat wound was caused by the first shot, this one from the grassy knoll in front of the limousine; and his back wound came from the rear. I've already given you my reasons for rejecting this conclusion.

PLAYBOY: If the first bullet was fired from the front, why wasn't it found in the President's body, or somewhere in the Presidential limousine?

GARRISON: The exact nature of the President's wounds, as well as the disposition of the bullets or bullet fragments, are among the many concealed items in this case. I told you earlier about the men on the grassy knoll whose sole function we believe was to catch the cartridges as they were ejected from the assassins' rifles. We also have reason to suspect that other members of the conspiracy may have been assigned the job of removing other evidence—such as traceable bullet fragments.
that might betray the assassin. In the chaos of November 22nd, this would not have been as difficult as it sounds. We know that a bullet designated Exhibit number 399 by the Warren Commission, was planted on a stretcher in Parkland Hospital to incriminate Oswald. The Commission concluded that this bullet allegedly hit both Kennedy and Governor Connally, causing seven wounds and breaking three bones—and emerged without a dent! In subsequent ballistics tests with the same gun, every bullet was squashed completely out of shape from impact with various simulated human targets. So, if the conspirators could fabricate a bullet, they could easily conceal one. But to return to the sequence of shots: Governor Connally was struck by a third bullet—as he himself insisted, not the one that struck Kennedy in the back—also fired from the rear. A fourth shot missed the Presidential limousine completely and struck the curb along the south side of Main Street, disintegrating into fragments; the trajectory of this bullet has been plotted backward to a point of origin in the Dal-Tex Building. The fifth shot, which struck the President in the right temple, tore off the top of his skull and snapped him back into his seat—a point overlooked by the Warren Commission—had to have been fired from the grassy knoll. There is also medical evidence indicating the likelihood that an additional head shot may have been fired. The report of Dr. Robert McClelland at Parkland Hospital, for example, states that "the cause of death was due to massive head and brain injury from a gunshot wound of the left temple." And yet another shot may also have been fired; frames 208 to 211 of the Zapruder film, which were deleted from the Warren Report—presumably as irrelevant—reveal signs of stress appearing suddenly on the back of a street sign momentarily obstructing the view between the grassy knoll and the President's car. These stress signs may very well have been caused by the impact of a stray bullet on the sign. We'll never be sure about this, however, because the day after the assassination, the sign was removed and no one in Dallas seems to know what became of it. Some of the gunmen appear to have used frangible bullets, a variant of the dumdum bullet that is forbidden by the Geneva Treaty. Frangible bullets explode on impact into tiny fragments, as did the bullet that caused the fatal wound in the President's head. Of course, frangible bullets are ideal in a political assassination, because they almost guarantee massive damage and assure that no tangible evidence will remain that ballistics experts could use to trace the murder weapon. I might also mention that frangible bullets cannot be fired from a Mannlicher-Carcano, such as the Commission concludes.
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Oswald used to kill the President. The only licence of bullet was issued by the CIA for use in anti-Castro exile raids on Cuba. In summation, there were at least five or six shots fired at the President from front and rear by at least four gunmen, assisted by several accomplices, two of whom probably picked up the cartridges and one of whom created a diversion to draw people's eyes away from the grassy knoll. At this stage of events, Lee Harvey Oswald was no more than a spectator to the assassination—perhaps in a very literal sense. As the first shot rang out, Associated Press photographer James Altgens snapped a picture of the motorcade that shows a man with a remarkable resemblance to Lee Harvey Oswald—same hairline, same face shape—standing in the doorway of the Book Depository Building. Somehow or other, the Warren Commission concluded that this man was actually Billy Nolan Lovelady, an employee of the Depository, who looked very little like Oswald. Furthermore, on the day of the assassination, Oswald was wearing a white T-shirt under a long-sleeved, red-and-white-striped shirt buttoned near the neck. The Altgens photograph indicates the very real possibility that at the moment Oswald was supposed to have been crouching in the sixth-floor window of the Depository shooting Kennedy, he may actually have been standing outside the front door watching the Presidential motorcade.

PLAYBOY: Between June 25th and 29th, CBS telecast a series of four special shows revealing the findings of the network's own seven-mouth investigation of the assassination. CBS agreed with the Warren Commission's conclusion that Oswald was the assassin, that he acted alone and that only three shots were fired; but it theorized that the first shot was fired earlier than the Warren Commission believed, thus giving Oswald sufficient time to reach the Depository window and fire his subsequent shots—and thus let the Commission off the hook. The only trouble here is that the people who conducted the CBS study—like most defenders of the Warren Report—didn't do all of their homework. They forgot, or chose to ignore, that by the Commission's own admission, the bullet that missed Kennedy—the second bullet in the Commission's sequence—hit the curb on Main Street near the railroad underpass 100 yards ahead of the limousine, shattering into fragments and causing superficial wounds on the face of a bystander, James Tague. But the trajectory of any bullet fired from the sixth floor of the Depository through the branches of the oak tree is such that it could not conceivably hit within a city block of the underpass. So please excuse me if I'm not overwhelmed by the ineluctable logic of CBS' presentation. And just let me add a footnote here: CBS made a great deal out of its assumption that the blurs on Zapruder's film indicated a reflexive reaction to shots ringing out. But they never asked Zapruder about his statement to Secret Service agents after the assassination about the origin of the shots; along with the major discrepancies in the Commission's time sequence, it is the Commission's shaky chain of evidence, and CBS seems to have taken it upon its shoulders to resolve the problem by inventing a new time sequence. What they did was to have a photo analyst, Charles Wyckoff, examine the Zapruder film and find that certain frames were blurred. Wyckoff arbitrarily decided that these frames indicated the very real possibility that at some point Oswald was wearing a white T-shirt under a long-sleeved dark shirt opened halfway to his waist—the same outfit worn by the man in the doorway—but Lovelady said that on November 22nd he was wearing a long-sleeved, red-and-white-striped shirt buttoned near the neck. The Altgens photograph indicates the very real possibility that at the moment Oswald was supposed to have been crouching in the sixth-floor window of the Depository shooting Kennedy, he may actually have been standing outside the front door watching the Presidential motorcade.

PLAYBOY: To return to your own investigation of the assassination: Have you discovered the identity of any of the conspirators you say were involved in the actual shooting?

GARSON: I don't want to sound coy or evasive, but I'm afraid I can't comment on that. All I can say is that this is an ongoing case and there will be more arrests.

PLAYBOY: Let's move on to the events that followed the assassination. What reason do you have for believing that Oswald didn't shoot Officer Tippit?

GARSON: As I said earlier, the evidence we've uncovered leads us to suspect that two men, neither of whom was Oswald, were the real murderers of Tippit; we believe we have one of them identified. The critics of the Warren Report have pointed out that a number of the witnesses could not identify Oswald as the slayer, that several said the murderer was short and squat—Oswald was thin and medium height—and another said that two men were involved. The Warren Commission's own chronology of Oswald's movements also fails to allow him sufficient time to reach the scene of Tippit's murder from the Book Depository Building. The clincher, as far as I'm concerned, is that four cartridges were found at the scene of the slaying. Now, revolvers do not eject cartridges, so when someone is shot, you don't later find grazzfuli cartridges strewn over the sidewalk—but unless the murderer deliberately takes the trouble to eject them. We suspect that cartridges had been previously obtained from Oswald's .38 revolver and left at the murder site by the real killers as part of the setup to incriminate Oswald. However, somebody slipped up there. Of the four cartridges found at the scene, two were Winchester and two were Remington—but of the four bullets found in Officer Tippit's body, three were Winchester and one was a Remington! The last time I looked, the Remington-Peter Manufacturing Company was not in the habit of shipping bullets into its cartridges, nor was the Winchester-Western Manufacturing Company putting Remington bullets into its
GARRISON: The Warren Commission's conclusion was made in spite of the evidence and not because of it. To determine if Oswald's gun had fired the bullets, it was necessary to call in a ballistics expert who would be able to tell if the lines and grooves on the bullets had a relation to the barrel of the revolver. The Commission called as its witness FBI ballistics expert Cortlandt Cunningham, and he testified, after an examination of the bullets taken from Tippit's body, that it was impossible to determine whether or not these bullets had been fired from Oswald's gun. Yet, on the basis of this expert testimony, the Warren Commission concluded with a straight face that the bullets were fired not only from Oswald's gun but "to the exclusion of all other weapons." They simply chose to ignore the fact that revolvers don't eject cartridges and that the cartridges left so conveniently on the street didn't match the bullets in Tippit's body.

PLAYBOY: You mentioned earlier that a so-called "second Oswald" had impersonated the real Lee Harvey Oswald before the assassination in an attempt to incriminate him. What proof do you have of this?

GARRISON: I hesitate to use the words "second Oswald," because they tend to lend an additional fictional quality to a case that already makes Dr. No and Goldfinger look like auditors' reports. However, it is true that before the assassination, a calculated effort was made to implicate Oswald in the events to come. A young man approximating Oswald's description and using Oswald's name—we believe we have discovered his identity—engaged in a variety of activities designed to create such a strong impression of Oswald's instability and culpability in people's minds that they would recall him as a suspicious character after the President was murdered. In one instance, a man went to an auto salesroom, gave his name as Lee Oswald, test-drove a car at 80 miles an hour—Oswald couldn't drive—and, after creating an ineradicable impression on the salesman by his speeding, gratuitously remarked that he might go back to the Soviet Union and was expecting to come into a large sum of money. Perversely, the salesman who described this "second Oswald" was subsequently beaten almost to death by unknown assailants outside his showroom. He later fled Dallas and last year was found dead; it was officially declared a suicide. In another instance, this "second Oswald" visited a shooting range in Dallas and gave a virtual demonstration of marksmanship, hitting not only his own bull's-eye but the bull's-eyes of neighboring targets as well—thus leaving an unforgettable impression of his skill with a rifle. The real Oswald, of course, was a mediocre shot, and there is no evidence that he had fired a rifle since the day he left the Marines. Consequently, the fact that he couldn't hit the side of a barn had to be offset, which accounts for the tableau at the rifle range. I could go on and on recounting similar instances, but there is no doubt that there was indeed a "second Oswald." Now, the Warren Commission recognized that the individual involved in all these activities could not be Lee Oswald; but they never took the next step and inquired why these incidents of impersonation occurred so systematically prior to the assassination. As it turned out, of course, the organizers of the conspiracy needn't have bothered to go to all this trouble of laying a false trail incriminating Oswald. They should have realized, since Oswald was a "self-proclaimed Marxist," that it wasn't necessary to produce any additional evidence to convict him in the eyes of the mass media; any other facts would simply be redundant in the face of such a convincing confession of guilt.

PLAYBOY: You've given your reasons for believing that Oswald, despite his leftist "cover," was involved with the conspirators and with the CIA. Do you have any evidence indicating that he was also connected with the FBI, as some critics of the Warren Report have alleged?

GARRISON: Let me preface my answer by saying that I believe the FBI was not given the full picture of Oswald's CIA involvement. I have nothing but respect for the Bureau and feel that if it weren't for the FBI reports still available in the Commission exhibits, the door would have been closed forever. While the CIA has behaved like a cross between the Gesapo and the NKVD, the FBI has worked assiduously in many different areas and gathered facts that have proved of great value to those interested in uncovering the truth about the assassination. It isn't the FBI's fault that dozens
of its reports have been classified top secret by the FBI and it is very damaging to the agency, receiving small sums of money in return for information about left-wing activities in the Dallas-New Orleans area. But most striking is the lack of any indication of any connection between Oswald and the FBI with regard to the assassination, and that his position with the FBI was in no way analogous to his position with the CIA; the FBI retains hundreds, perhaps thousands of such informants across the country and is no more responsible for their over-all pattern of political activity than the Internal Revenue Service is responsible for the behavior of its confidential informants on tax evasion matters. Oswald's possible ties to the Bureau are never mentioned in the Warren Report, but a member of the Commission, Congressman Gerald Ford, revealed in his otherwise undistinguished book, Portrait of an Assassin, that the Commission was informed by Texas Attorney General Waggoner Carr and Dallas D. A. Henry Wade that Oswald had been employed by the FBI as an informant since September of 1962; his salary, they revealed, was $200 a month and his FBI code number was 179. The Warren Commission acted promptly on this information from two responsible Texas officials: Chief Counsel Rankin told the members of the Commission that "We have a dirty rumor that is very bad for the Commission...and it is very damaging to the agencies that are involved in it and it must be wiped out insofar as it is possible to do so by the Commission." The Commission then launched one of its typically thorough investigations: J. Edgar Hoover was asked if the alleged assassin of the President of the United States had been an employee of his; Mr. Hoover said "No"; and the Commission closed the case. If Congressman Ford hadn't developed writer's itch, we would never even have heard of the incident. Once again, the Commission made an unwise choice between tranquility and truth. There is also other evidence linking Oswald to the FBI—though, again, not in any conspiratorial context. A Dallas police investigative report dated February 17, 1964, describes a police interview with Mrs. Teofil Meller, a White Russian emigré in Dallas who had befriended Oswald and Marina. Mrs. Meller revealed, according to the report, that "she saw the book Kapital, which was written by Karl Marx, during one of these visits at Oswald's house and became very worried about it. Subject [Mr. Meller] said he checked with the FBI and they told him that Oswald was all right." So here you have this "self-proclaimed Marxist," who had defected to the Soviet Union, tried to renounce his American citizenship and was now allegedly active in pro-Castro activities, being given a clean bill of health by the FBI. It's quite possible that this clean bill of health was originally issued by the State Department, which, in reply to an FBI request for information about Oswald's activities in Russia—this was shortly after his "defection"—assured the Bureau that he was a solid citizen. So I don't see anything sinister in all of this, at least as far as the FBI is concerned. The Bureau has to obtain information on subversion and it's going to get what it needs not from Rhode scholars and divinity students but from apparently marginal figures like Lee Oswald with an entree into the political underworld.

PLAYBOY: If you see nothing sinister in the FBI's relationship with Oswald, why did you subpoena FBI agents Regis Kennedy and Warren De Brueys to testify before the New Orleans Parish grand jury?

GARRISON: Regis Kennedy is one of the FBI agents who interrogated David Ferrie in November 1963, and I hoped to learn from him what information the Bureau had elicited from Ferrie. But on the instructions of our old friend Attorney General Ramsey Clark, Kennedy refused to answer the questions put to him by the grand jury on the grounds of executive privilege. Warren De Brueys is a former FBI agent based in New Orleans who also questioned Ferrie in 1963. Between 1961 and 1963, De Brueys was involved with anti-Castro exile activities...
in New Orleans and was seen frequently at meetings of the right-wing Cuban Democratic Revolutionary Front. I'd like to find out the exact nature of De Brueys' relationship with Lee Oswald. As long as Oswald was in New Orleans, so was De Brueys. When Oswald moved to Dallas, De Brueys followed him. After the assassination, De Brueys returned to New Orleans. This may all be coincidence, but I find it interesting that De Brueys refuses to cooperate with our office—significant and frustrating, because I feel he could shed considerable light on Oswald's ties to anti-Castro groups.

PLAYBOY: On March 23, 1967, you ordered the arrest of Gordon Novel as a material witness in the conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy, and you have subsequently sought his extradition from Ohio. What role do you believe Novel played in the alleged conspiracy? GARRISON: I can't go into all aspects of Novel's activities, because we have a live case against him. Novel worked closely with David Ferrie and the anti-Castro Cuban exile. In 1961, he raided a munitions bunker in Houma, Louisiana, with David Ferrie and a prominent anti-Castro exile leader, and the weapons seized were subsequently shipped by CIA agents to the counterrevolutionaries in Cuba. He also worked for the Evergreen Advertising Agency in New Orleans, a CIA front that alerted anti-Castro agents to the date of the Bay of Pigs invasion by placing coded messages in radio commercials for Christmas trees. Novel himself was a paid employee of the CIA. As I mentioned earlier, Novel's own lawyer, Stephen Plotkin, has admitted that his client is a CIA agent. On May 23, 1967, Plotkin was quoted in the New Orleans States-Item as saying that "this client served as an intermediary between the CIA and anti-Castro Cubans in New Orleans and Miami prior to the April 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion." And that same day, the Associated Press, which has hardly served as my press agent in this case, reported that the CIA instructed to simultaneously release same number of points, including "international fraud, mysterious intelligence activities from November 1959 to date in the Southern quadrant of the U.S.A. and certain islands off Florida, seditionous treason, hot war games and cold munitions transfers, ten 1950-model Canadian surplus Vampire jet supporter fighter aircraft and certain Cuban-Anglo-French sabotage affairs of early 1961." Why did you reject his offer? GARRISON: These are all intriguing aspects of Novel's career as a U.S. intelligence agent, and I'd love to hear about them—especially his knowledge of seditions
PLAYBOY: Let's move on from Gordon Novel to Jack Ruby, who you claim murdered Oswald to "silence" him. Do you have any evidence that Ruby and Oswald knew each other?

GARRISON: Though Ruby and the Warren Report denied it vehemently, there is simply no question about it. We didn't even have to do a great deal of investigative digging: connections popped up everywhere we scratched the surface.

PLAYBOY: What evidence do you have to support your charge that Ruby was involved in anti-Castro exile activities with Oswald and Ferrie?

GARRISON: We have evidence linking Ruby not only to anti-Castro exile activities but, as with almost everyone else involved in this case, to the CIA itself. Never forget that the CIA maintains a great variety of curious alliances it feels serve its purposes. It may be hard to imagine Ruby in a trench coat, but he seems to have been as good an employee of the CIA as he was a pimp for the Dallas cops. Just let me add parenthetically that I stress the word "employee" here as opposed to "agent." The CIA employs many people in many different capacities, sometimes just on a retainer basis, and these individuals do not fall under the over-all authority of the CIA.

I have solid evidence indicating that Ruby, Ferrie, Oswald and others involved in this case were all paid by the CIA to perform certain functions: Ruby to smuggle arms for Cuban exile groups, Ferrie to train them, and to fly counterrevolutionary secret missions to Cuba, and Oswald to establish himself so convincingly as a Marxist that he would win the trust of American left-wing groups and also have freedom to travel as a spy in Communist countries, particularly Cuba. But I have reason to believe that none of them was a salaried agent operating under a direct chain of command. In this particular case—though, as with the others involved, it seems to have been unrelated to his CIA work—Ruby was up to his neck with the plotters. Our investigators have broken a code Oswald used and found Ruby's private unlisted telephone number, as of 1963, written in Oswald's notebook. The same coded number was found in the address book of another prominent figure in this case. We have further evidence linking Ruby to the conspiracy, but it involves testimony to be given in court in the future, so I can't reveal it here. On the broader point of Ruby's involvement with anti-Castro exile activity, there can be no doubt whatever. Let me refer you here to the testimony of Nancy Perrin Rich before the Warren Commission. This lady arrived in Dallas in 1961 with her husband, Robert Perrin, a gun runner and one-time narcotics smuggler and, through police intervention, secured a job as a bartender at Ruby's Carousel Club. She quit soon after and didn't see Ruby again until one night when she and her husband, as she tells it, attended a conference of anti-Castro exiles presided over by a lieutenant colonel—an Army colonel, she thought. She testified that Robert Perrin was offered $10,000 if he would run guns to the underground in Cuba, and she bagged the sum up in a suit. When Perrin demanded a cash retainer, a phony bill was made out and, shortly after, Mrs. Rich recounts, "I had the shock of my life... A knock comes on the door and who walks in but my little friend Jack Ruby... You could have knocked me over with a feather... and everybody looks like... here comes the Savior." Ruby was the CIA bag man—or paymaster—for the operation, and he left immediately after handing over a large sum in cash to the colonel. Mrs. Rich and her husband subsequently bowed out of the gun-smuggling deal, because, in her words, "I smelled an element that I did not want to have any part of." Afraid of retaliation, she and Perrin fled from Dallas and hid out in several different cities, winding up finally in New Orleans. A year later, he was found dead of arsenic poisoning. Though it would be difficult to pick a slower and more excruciating way to kill yourself, it was officially declared suicide. There are too many other instances of Ruby's anti-Castro activity to go into here. Ruby appears to have been the CIA's bag man for a wide variety of anti-Castro adventures. In this connection, let me point out that one of the documents classified top secret in the Archives is a CIA file entitled "The Activities of Jack Ruby." Perhaps this will become a Book-of-the-Month Club selection in September 2038.

PLAYBOY: Even if Ruby was associated with certain Cuban exile groups, as you claim, couldn't all of this be totally unrelated to the assassination?

GARRISON: It could be, but it isn't. As a result of our investigation, I can say, with the same certitude that I can say the sun will rise in the east tomorrow morning, that Jack Ruby was involved in the conspiracy to kill John Kennedy. Much of the evidence we've uncovered about Ruby's involvement relates to our court case against Clay Shaw, so the canon of legal ethics prevents me from broadcasting it before trial. But I will give you one bit of evidence, recently uncovered by our office, that links Ruby to the conspiracy. Four days before the assassination, on November 18th, 1963, a young woman from Dallas in whose care Chemican was thrown from a moving car on a highway outside Ennice, Louisiana. She was badly bruised and taken to the East Louisiana Hospital in Jackson, Loui-
Cut could be construed as an argument. Oswald its the Dallas assassination plot. As it was, Ruby made the best of a bad situation by rubbing out his very probably would have named names, and Jack Ruby would have been if Oswald had lived another day or so.

GARRISON: First of all, let me dispose of this concept of the "temporarily deranged man." This is a catchall term, employed whenever the real motive of a crime can't be nailed down. In the overwhelming majority of instances, the actions of human beings are the direct consequences of discernible motives. This is the fatal flaw of the Warren Report —its conclusion that the assassination of President Kennedy was the act of a temporarily deranged man, that the murder of Officer Tippit was equally meaningless and, finally, that Jack Ruby's murder of Oswald was another act of a temporarily deranged individual. It is, of course, wildly improbable that all three acts were coincidentally the aberrant acts of temporarily deranged men —although it's most convenient to view them as such, because that judgment obviates the necessity of relentlessly investigating the possibility of a conspiracy. In Jack Ruby's case, his murder of Lee Oswald was the sanest act he ever committed; if Oswald had lived another day or so, he very probably would have named names, and Jack Ruby would have been convicted as a conspirator in the assassination plot. As it was, Ruby made the best of a bad situation by rubbing out Oswald in the Dallas city jail, since this act could be construed as an argument that he was "temporarily deranged." But I differ with the assumption of your question, because, while there could have been no doubt in Ruby's mind that he would be arrested, he could very well have entertained hopes of escaping conviction. You've got to remember the atmosphere in Dallas and across the country at that time: when word was flashed to the crowd outside the jail that Oswald had been shot, they burst into wild applause. Ruby's lawyer, Tom Howard, spoke for a sizable segment of public opinion when he said, "I think Ruby deserves a Congressional Medal," and the largest-circulation newspaper in the country, the New York Daily News, editorialized after Oswald's death that "the only good murderer is a dead murderer and the only good Communist a dead Communist." In the two days between his arrest and his liquidation, Oswald had been convicted by the mass media as the President's assassin and as a Communist, and Ruby may well have felt that he would be acquitted for murdering such a universally despised figure. It turned out, of course, that he was wrong, and he became a prisoner of the Dallas police, forced over a year later to beg Earl Warren to take him back to Washington, because he wanted to tell the truth about "why my act was committed, but it can't be said here... my life is in danger here." But Ruby never got to Washington, and he's joined the long list of witnesses with vital information who have shuddered off this mortal coil.

PLAYBOY: Penn Jones, Norman Mailer and others have charged that Ruby was injected with live cancer cells in order to silence him. Do you agree?

GARRISON: I can't agree or disagree, since I have no evidence one way or the other. But we have discovered that David Ferrie had a rather curious hobby in addition to his study of cartridge trajectories: cancer research. He filled his apartment with white mice —at one point he had almost 2000, and neighbors complained—wrote a medical treatise on the subject and worked with a number of New Orleans doctors on means of inducing cancer in mice. After the assassination,
GARRISON: I refuse to accept this explanation?

PLAYBOY: You've claimed that many of the people involved in the conspiracy were "neo-Nazi" in their political orientation. What would motivate Ruby, a Jew, to work with such people?

GARRISON: Money. As far as my office has been able to determine, Jack Ruby had no strong political views of his own. Historically, of course, there have been a number of self-hating Jews who abetted their own tormentors: Adolf Hitler's mentor in Vienna, Karl Lueger, was born a Jew, and I understand that one of the leading pro-Nazis in New York City, a retired millionaire who finances anti-Jewish activity across the country, is the son of a rabbi. But I don't believe Jack Ruby falls into this category; he was just a hoodlum out for a buck. I will say—with the understanding that it's pure speculation—it's not impossible that Jack Ruby developed certain guilt feelings in prison over his role in the plot. Remember his repeated lament, "Now there will be pogroms. They will kill all the Jews."?

PLAYBOY: Let's move on from Jack Ruby to David Ferrie. Wesley Liebeler, the Warren Commission counsel who handled the New Orleans end of the inquiry, said Ferrie "was picked up shortly after the assassination and questioned by local officials of the FBI. I remember specifically doing up a substantial stack of FBI reports on Ferrie that we reviewed in order to make our determination." He states that the FBI reports on Ferrie were not included in the Commission's 26 volumes of evidence, "because it was so clear he wasn't involved." Why do you believe this explanation?

GARRISON: I think it's a lovely explanation. Now perhaps Mr. Liebeler will intercede with the Department of Justice to release 25 pages of the FBI report on Ferrie that have been classified top secret in the Archives. Then we'll all have a chance to see for ourselves how clear it is that Ferrie wasn't involved. Every scrap of evidence we've uncovered—and it hasn't been difficult to find—reveals not only the fact of his involvement but the reasons for it. His politics were ultra-right wing, as I indicated earlier, but we've been able to determine conclusively that his motivation was closer to that of the Cuban exiles on the "operative" level—a burning hatred of Fidel Castro. When Castro was guerrillas in the Sierra Maestra, Ferrie is reported to have piloted guns for him. But in 1959, when Castro started to show his Marxist colors, Ferrie appears to have felt betrayed and reacted against Castro with all the bitterness of a suitor jilted by his girl. From that moment on, he dedicated himself to Castro's overthrow and began working with exile groups to subvert Cuba and its anti-Castro exile activities. From the Bay of Pigs on, he hated Kennedy as much as he did Castro; he felt that J. F. K. had betrayed the invasion brigade by not sending in air cover. As the events I described earlier led to a détente between Russia and America, and as the CIA—under Kennedy's orders—started cracking down on the CIA-supported anti-Castro underground, Ferrie's hatred for Kennedy grew more and more obsessive. Let me add here that this isn't just speculation on my part; we have a number of reliable witnesses who were privy to Ferrie's thoughts at this period and saw his hatred of Kennedy develop into a driving force. After the assassination, as a matter of fact, something psychologically curious happened to Ferrie: He dropped out of anti-Castro exile activities, left the pay of the CIA and drifted aimlessly while his emotional problems increased to the point where he was totally dependent on huge doses of tranquilizers and barbiturates. I don't know if Ferrie ever experienced any guilt about the assassination itself; but in his last months, he was a tortured man.

PLAYBOY: After Ferrie's death, you called it "an apparent suicide," but the coroner announced that the autopsy showed death was due to a ruptured blood vessel at the base of the brain, which caused a fatal hemorrhage. Have you subsequently solved the discrepancy in your points of view?

GARRISON: Dr. Nicholas Chetta is an excellent coroner, and inasmuch as he found a total absence of traceable poisons or barbiturates in Ferrie's system, I would respect his opinion that it was a natural death. On the other hand, I can't help but lend a certain weight to two suicide notes Ferrie left in his apartment, one of which said how sweet it was to finally leave this wretched life. I suppose it could just be a weird coincidence that the night Ferrie penned two suicide notes, he died of natural causes.

PLAYBOY: Your critics have charged that your relentless investigation of Ferrie and the publicity the press gave to your charges against him induced the state of hyperesthesia that was said to have caused his fatal hemorrhage. Do you feel in any way responsible for Ferrie's death?

GARRISON: I had nothing but pity for Dave Ferrie while he was alive, and I have nothing but pity for him now that he's dead. Ferrie was a pathetic and tortured creature, a genuinely brilliant man whose twisted drives locked him into his own private hell. If I had been able to help Ferrie, I would have; but he was in too deep and he was terrified. From the moment he realized we had looked behind the façade and established that Lee Oswald was anything but a Communist, from the moment he knew we had discovered the role of the CIA and anti-Castro adventurers in the assassination, Ferrie began to crumble psychologically. So, to answer your question directly—yes, I suppose I may have been responsible for Ferrie's death. If I had left this case alone, if I had allowed Kennedy's murderers to continue to walk the streets of America unimpeded, Dave Ferrie would probably be alive today. I don't feel personally guilty about Ferrie's death, but I do feel terribly sorry for the waste of another human being. In a deeper sense, though, Dave Ferrie died on November 22, 1963. From that moment on, he couldn't save himself, and I couldn't save him. Ferrie could have quoted as his epitaph the last words of the Serb partisan leader Draja Mihailovic before Tito shot him for collaboration: "I was swept up in the gales of history."

PLAYBOY: Many of the professional critics of the Warren Commission appear to be prompted by political motives: Those on the left are anxious to prove Kennedy was murdered by a conspiracy within the establishment; and those on the right are anxious to prove the assassination was an act of "the international Communist conspiracy." Where would you place yourself on the political spectrum—right, left or center?

GARRISON: That's a question I've asked
myself frequently, especially since this investigation started and I found myself in an insidious and disillusioning battle with agencies of my own Government. I can't just sit down and add up my political beliefs like a mathematical sum, but I think, in balance, I'd turn up somewhere around the middle. Over the years, I guess I've developed a somewhat conservative attitude—in the traditional libertarian sense of conservatism, as opposed to the thumbed-screw-and-rack conservatism of the paramilitary right—particularly in regard to the importance of the individual as opposed to the state and the individual's own responsibilities to humanity. I don't think I've ever tried to formulate this into a coherent political philosophy, but at the root of my concern is the conviction that a human being is not a digit; he's not a digit in regard to the state and he's not a digit in the sense that he can ignore his fellow men and his obligations to society. I was with the artillery supporting the division that took Dachau; I arrived there the day after it was taken, when bulldozers were making pyramids of human bodies outside the camp. What I saw there has haunted me ever since. Because the law is my profession, I've always wondered about the judges throughout Germany who sentenced men to jail for picking pockets at a time when their own government was jerking gold from the teeth of men murdered in gas chambers. I'm concerned about all of this because it isn't a German phenomenon; it's a human phenomenon. It can happen here, because there has been no change and there has been no increase of understanding on the part of men for their fellow man. What worries me deeply, and I have seen it exemplified in this case, is that we in America are in great danger of slowly evolving into a proto-fascist state. It will be a different kind of fascist state from the one the Germans evolved; theirs was imposed by military force; ours, as as such signs as the swastika, because they won't be there. We won't build Dachaus and Auschwitzes; the clever manipulation of the mass media is creating a concentration camp of the mind that promises to be far more effective in keeping the populace in line. We're not going to wake up one morning and suddenly find ourselves in gray uniforms goose-stepping off to work. But this isn't the test. The test is: What happens to the individual who disents? In Nazi Germany, he was physically destroyed; here, the process is more subtle, but the end results can be the same. I've learned enough about the machinations of the CIA in the past year to know that this is no longer the dreamworld America I once believed in. The imperatives of the population explosion, which almost inevitably will lessen our belief in the sanctity of the individual human life, combined with the awesome power of the CIA and the defense establishment, seem destined to seal the fate of the America I know as a child and bring us into a new Orwellian world where the citizen exists for the state and where raw power justifies any and every immoral act. I've always had a kind of knee-jerk trust in my Government's basic integrity, whatever political blunders it may make. But I've come to realize that in Washington, deceiving and manipulating the public are viewed by some as the natural prerogatives of office. Huey Long once said, "Fascism will come to America in the name of anti-fascism." I'm afraid, based on my own experience, that fascism will come to America in the name of national security. PLAYBOY: Considering all the criticism that has come your way, would you still launch your investigation into the assassination if you had it to do over again? GARRISON: As long as the men who shot John Kennedy to death in Dallas are walking the streets of America, I will continue this investigation. I have no regrets about initiating it and I have no regrets about carrying it on to its conclusion. If it takes me 50 years to mail every one of the assassins, then I will continue this investigation for 50 years. I owe that not only to Jack Kennedy but to my country.