

FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

PROGRAM	Page One	STATION	WABC-TV and the ABC-TV Network
DATE	September 24, 1967 - 2:30 PM	CITY	New York

FULL TEXT

ANNOUNCER: 'Page One.' Channel Seven's weekly news conference, with the men and women who shape events in the metropolitan area.

On Part One today our guest is New Orleans' District Attorney, Jim Garrison.

Mr. Garrison will be interviewed by Channel Seven newsmen, John Schubeck, Milt Lewis, and John Parsons.

Here is your moderator, Bill Beutel.

BEUTEL: Good afternoon.

After the assassination of President John F. Kennedy almost four years ago the Warren Commission concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald, acting alone, shot and killed President Kennedy, firing three shots from a rifle from a window in the Texas Book Depository Building in Dallas, Texas. This explanation of the assassination of President Kennedy was officially accepted by the federal government, and by most people.

But Jim Garrison, the District Attorney of New Orleans, does not accept this explanation. Mr. Garrison believes there was a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy, that five or six shots were fired at the President, by at least four gunmen, who were assisted by several other people.

Mr. Garrison believes Lee Harvey Oswald was not a part of the conspiracy, and did not shoot President Kennedy. Mr. Garrison also says that some of the police in Dallas, Texas were a part of the conspiracy. Mr. Garrison has made arrests in connection with his investigation, and he secured an indictment against Clay Shaw of New

- 2 -

Orleans for his alleged role in the alleged conspiracy.

Jim Garrison's rather vocal disagreement with the Warren Commission's Report has raised a lot of controversy, and that's why he's our guest this afternoon on Page One.

Welcome to Page One, Mr. Garrison.

We'll begin the questioning with John Shubeck.

SHUBECK: Thank you, Bill.

Mr. Garrison, you're in the midst of what could very well be one of the most important investigations in the history of the United States.

Are you in New York in connection with this investigation? If not, what are you in the city for?

GARRISON: Well, I'm in New York for several reasons. One of them is in connection with the investigation, to go over some particulars with a film expert who's still working on the case. Another reason is in connection with the recent article in Playboy, because I have an opportunity to try and communicate some of the issues of the case. A third reason, some personal business.

SHUBECK: Did you receive any payment for the Playboy article?

GARRISON: No, and I -- I don't accept money from -- personally, from any source in connection with the investigation.

SCHUBECK: Do you think you derived any political benefit from this Playboy article?

GARRISON: Uh, political benefit? I don't think there's any political benefit for a Democrat from the south, trying to show that the Administration's position is entirely wrong in the assassination of -- furthermore, when you come from a southern state like Louisiana which is a very conservative state, and you happen to have found out that a number of the individuals involved in the assassination are Minutemen, I -- I don't think there's any political benefit anyone could picture.

But I might add, finally, it doesn't matter - because I have no interest in politics.

LEWIS: On the question of finances which you mentioned a moment ago, six - on the occasions you've gone to Las Vegas, who picked up the tab?

GARRISON: The cases I've gone to Las Vegas were when I was

- 3 -

going in connection with either a District Attorney's Conference, or business along those lines. On three different occasions when I went to the window and wanted to check out, I was told that, 'You're a guest at the Sands, all you have to do is pay the phone bills and valet, and other things.' And I've learned that, separately, that that's what they usually do with public officials. Since I don't gamble and have no other business at the Sands, I didn't regard it as significant. And don't now.

LEWIS: You don't think it compromises you in anyway, sir?

GARRISON: No, I don't think it does, because we've cleaned up every racket in the City of New Orleans without exception, and I don't have to worry about that. If I had some connection with the mob, as they say, and had to worry about it, I -- I wouldn't go there. But I don't have -- I don't have to worry about it.

LEWIS: Well, on that score, was a lieutenant of Carlos Marcello (?), who is by repute the big Mafia boss down there, did he arrange for you to stay out there?

GARRISON: Nobody ever arranged for me to stay at the Sands. The only times I've ever been there are when I, just on the spur of the moment, decide -- if I'm going to Los Angeles, or to Phoenix, I go by way of Las Vegas, and spend a few days at the Sands. No one has ever invited me. I have never been a guest of a mobster of any kind. I do not know Carlos Marcello. I have never seen him. I have no connection with him.

It makes a good news story, but it just doesn't happen to be true.

PARSONS: Mr. Garrison, you said a few moments ago that -- that while you're in New York City you're going over some pictures in connection with the probe. Can you be more specific to what you are doing here in connection with your probe?

GARRISON: There's a man who -- I presume he won't mind my mentioning his name, who's done pioneer work in connection with gathering pictures, both film and still shots, and his name is Richard Sprague. I guess he's the top expert in the country in gathering films with regard to the assassination. I'm going to be with him while I'm here.

PARSONS: Insofar as you've been with him, and you've looked over any pictures, have you discovered anything new that you can tell us about now?

GARRISON: I want to give you just an example. There's so many things. The most important things that have developed are -- are the structure, in the sense that you develop -- the timing used in the Zapruda films is based, but I can give you an example which is

- 4 -

rather interesting, if you want.

The last time we were here we located a picture taken when the police had just brought the -- the rifle out of the book depository. And they're holding it up, and it's -- you see police gathered around, a number of civilians - and it's a real interesting picture, and what makes it so interesting is that the rifle does not have a telescopic sight on it. And, of course, Oswald's did. And it was determined that this rifle had been brought out of the depository approximately five minutes after one. That's roughly twenty-five minutes before Oswald's rifle was found, in quotes.

But the -- the rifle initially brought out of the depository had no telescopic sight on it at all.

PARSONS: Have you found anything new, anything at this time, since you've been in New York ...

GARRISON: I haven't met with him yet. I haven't met with him yet.

BEUTEL: The basis of your examination will be the Zapruder film altogether?

GARRISON: No. I've been through the Zapruder film, both live and stills. I didn't mean to imply that that's what we're for. I meant that the Zapruder films turned out to be particularly valuable, because it gives a -- it is a basic reference with regard to time. In other words, it gives the time frame within which shots were fired. And from that Sprague has been able to determine almost exactly when other different pictures were taken, the Mormon picture, and the next pictures, and all the others, using the Zapruder films as a base.

BEUTEL: Your most recent charge, vis-a-vis the assassination, is that there were members of the Dallas police force involved in the assassination. Now, you didn't exactly spell that out, to my knowledge.

What were they doing in the assassination?

GARRISON: Well, Bill, in answering that, I must say, first of all, that I -- I -- it's quite clear that most of the Dallas police force consists of -- of good police officers who are not involved in any way. Having made that point, I want to say that it's been apparent for a long time that there were some individuals that were involved in what happened in Dealy Plaza, were connected with what happened to Officer Tippett, particularly with leading the police -- other police cars astray by the use of a police radio in Oak Cliff, and of course with the execution of Oswald by Jack Ruby on Sunday.

There are some police individuals involved in these actions, and

- 5 -

we've known this for some time, although while we had a man working in Dallas, it wasn't exactly why we announced ...

BEUTEL: Well, did these police individuals that you refer to, were they in on the conspiracy before the fact of the conspiracy, or did they just get in on it and do whatever they did after the conspiracy -- after the assassination?

GARRISON: No, no. No, no. No, no -- before -- before the fact. They are a part of the pre-existing structure before the fact, and these particular police officers are individuals connected with the Minutemen organization.

LEWIS: Have you -- have you discussed this conspiracy theory of yours with these officers? Have you interrogated them? Do you plan to?

GARRISON: You mean, am I going over into Dallas ...

LEWIS: Have you sent your man -- you man ...

GARRISON: ... to interrogate them? No. No.

LEWIS: Do you intend to ...

SCHUBECK: (INAUDIBLE)

GARRISON: No.

(CROSSTALK)

SCHUBECK: Well, did he talk to the policemen?

GARRISON: These individual policemen?

SCHUBECK: Yes.

GARRISON: Oh, certainly not.

LEWIS: Well, do you intend to arrest them? What do you intend to do with them ...

GARRISON: I don't intend to do anything ...

LEWIS: whoever they are?

GARRISON: ... at all at the moment, except to try and bring out some of the additional facts so other people interested in the case can have a better understanding of what happened.

SCHUBECK: Mr. Garrison, let me nail this down. Are these

Dallas policemen still members of the Dallas police force?

GARRISON: Some of them are, and some of them are not.

SCHUBECK: Well, now, by your publicizing this, don't you think you are hurting your case by letting John Smith know 'I've got an eye on you?'

GARRISON: There's no question about it, anything you do in this sort of activity has a plus factor and a minus factor and is a calculated risk. But, again, I'm interested -- I have to wear two hats in this sort of situation, because the case is not just of interest to people in New Orleans. I have to wear one as a prosecutor, so you'll find me saying nothing about Mr. Shaw, who we have to presume is innocent. On the other hand, because we have learned things that I think the country has a right to know, I try to publicize certain things that will let everybody in America know what happened, to the extent that it won't hurt the case. And this is a calculated risk in this case, but I think your point is well made.

PARSONS: Well, aren't you really saying, Mr. Garrison, that you have a feeling that some members of the Dallas police are involved, but you don't have proof? Otherwise, you would obviously arrest them.

GARRISON: No. We have -- we have proof, but I can't go in Dallas and arrest anybody. I have no arresting authority in Dallas. All I can do with regard to individuals outside the jurisdiction is, when it becomes clear at -- of their involvement at -- and is timely, I will bring it out, so that if the people in that jurisdiction want something done about it, they can do it. But I can't arrest anyone in Dallas, anymore than I can in New York.

SCHUBECK: You've made attempts in the past to bring people to the bar of justice, into your area, into your jurisdiction. Why haven't you done this in the case of the Dallas policemen?

GARRISON: Because -- for two reasons. Aren't you aware that our attempts to bring people back to the bar of justice have been unsuccessful? We have never had extradition trouble before, but we've been shown that we can't do it. Secondly, these individuals that we've tried to bring back are involved in actions in our jurisdictions. The individuals on the Dallas police force are not active in our jurisdiction. However, we have established their involvement in the assassination, so I raise the point so that if the Dallas people want to look into it they know that there's ...

(CROSSTALK)

LEWIS: Are you saying the District Attorney in Dallas would not accept your information?

- 7 -

GARRISON: I don't want to get in a fight with Henry Wade, because it accomplishes nothing. I'm simply saying that it's been quite clear for a long time that individuals of the Dallas police force who were associated with the Minutemen are involved. And anyone in Dallas, or anyone in the rest of the country, that wants to see a specific example can turn to the -- go to their library and look at the Warren Commission Exhibits. They can look at the Sawyer Exhibit, and watch the activities of car 223, in the way that car 223 pulls away from the Church of the Abundant Light where the individual who killed Tippit ran, pulls them away to the Marcellus Library, pulls them away again when they start to go back. Two Twenty-Three, whoever manned 223, it's just one example of the involvement of the Dallas police.

BEUTEL: Well, have you -- have you given Henry Wade the names - if you know the names and identity of the Dallas police - involved in Car 223, or involved in whatever other connection they might be involved in, according to your information? Have you given Henry Wade the names of these people, so that he may do something if he wants to?

GARRISON: Bill, let me -- let me save some time and give you the short answer ...

BEUTEL: Sure.

GARRISON: The Dallas Establishment, certain individuals of the Dallas Establishment, including some of the -- a few of the oil rich men who have strong control over the Dallas Establishment, are involved in the assassination of the President, and it would be a waste of time to talk to any individuals in Dallas about it. Obviously, there's no interest in their doing anything about it, and I don't propose to get in a fight with any single individual. But it's been perfectly plain for years that they consider the matter closed ...

BEUTEL: Do we hear you correctly? Did you say that there were certain oil magnates in Dallas who were a part of the assassination plot?

GARRISON: That financed it, sponsored it, yes.

BEUTEL: You haven't named those people yet ...

GARRISON: I don't propose to name any of those people until well after the Shaw trial ...

LEWIS: Well, Mr. Garrison, at the outset you said there were at least three people involved. Later on you said at least five people involved. Later on you said at least seven people involved. And now this past week you've brought in members of the Dallas police department. Number one ...

BEUTEL: And today the oil people.

- 8 -

LEWIS: ... how many members of the Dallas police department, so far as you suspect, are involved in this alleged conspiracy?

GARRISON: I will not answer your question. You see, you are concerned about specifics, and it bothers you that I know more about the case than I knew some months ago. I might learn in the next six months, as a result of our investigation, that instead of a hundred people, three hundred are involved. If so, I will tell the truth. We don't take a position and hold ourselves to it like concrete.

Furthermore, I don't think you are right in your recitation that it's been a steady progression as it's continued. From the outset, it has been obvious that there were more than three people involved in the conspiracy. There are more than three people involved in New Orleans alone. And that's been obvious.

LEWIS: You know, one of the great district attorneys of the United States, and I think you'll recognize this, is a man by the name of Frank S. Hogan. And he never tells you nothin'.

How do you expect, sir, by your making these disclosures, without naming people, how can you possibly conclude your case successfully?

GARRISON: Because I have a problem, as I said before, of communications. I disclose nothing about my case. With regard to the Shaw case my policy has been the same as Frank Hogan's. If you go through my statements to the press, you will find from the time I arrested Mr. Shaw that I have had nothing to say that would infer that he was guilty. I've said again and again that he is presumed to be innocent. All I am trying to do is get the word out that there is a problem here, the people of the country have not been told the truth. I think it's my duty to do that. I think that Frank Hogan would probably do the same thing. I don't think he's had a parallel case ...

LEWIS: I beg to differ, but you go ahead.

BEUTEL: Mr. Garrison ...

GARRISON: Well, I don't know Frank Hogan, but I don't think he's had a parallel case.

BEUTEL: Mr. Garrison, I think, growing out of Milt Lewis' question is this question - wouldn't it have been wiser, in terms of evidence, et cetera, and publicity, to have waited until you had a whole package of a case to come up with any of it, rather than come up piece by piece and run into obstacles all along the way, that prevents you from coming ...

GARRISON: It would be much wiser, it would be infinitely wiser, if we lived in a dream world, in the best of all possible worlds.

- 9 -

But this day would never have arisen ...

BEUTEL: Well, the point that Milt was making, I think, is that that is what the DA's that we in New York know would have done. Frank Hogan would, for example, have a package, and then he'd present it to a grand jury, get an indictment ...

GARRISON: No one -- no one in this case would have survived to get such a package. There would be no way in the world. By the time it was known you were working on it, it would have been interrupted. We have had every kind of obstacle conceivable, but because we burst into the spotlight before it was too late to stop us and let the public know what we were doing, it is difficult now for a major witness to be killed. It is difficult now for them to kill Shaw, and it's going to be kind of difficult for them to kill me.

BEUTEL: Well, you're saying then that your case has become easier to prosecute, to get information on, since you have put it in the bath of publicity?

GARRISON: Bill, I don't put -- again, let me distinguish. There are two things, there is our case against Shaw, about which I make no public statements. There is the assassination as a whole, which I think is -- is -- has to be publicized, the true facts, in a general way so that the people of this country will understand that a fraud has been perpetrated on them. I can't keep silent when I know this. So, those aspects of what I regard as a fraud I am trying to communicate. And one of the things I hope to accomplish by doing this is to get the federal government interested so it will again re-examine it. I've found that we get no help at all from them, but if we can get enough of the people interested, perhaps we can get the federal government to have a new investigation.

PARSONS: Mr. Garrison, speaking of obstacles, you said earlier this week that -- that you felt Senator Robert Kennedy, and I want to quote you, see if this is accurate, has done everything he could to obstruct the investigation.

Are those your words?

GARRISON: No. But in essence it's true. Let me say precisely what I said, John. What I said was -- I was asked if any individuals were obstructing our investigation, and I said that we had had quite a bit of trouble from Senator Robert Kennedy, because Walter Sheridan who is close to him made a real effort to get witnesses to leave the jurisdiction, has caused all kinds of interference. So I said, I have to conclude that Senator Robert Kennedy has made a real effort to stop the investigation. I'm not quibbling. I'm just trying to say ...

PARSONS: Well, why ...

- 10 -

GARRISON: ... I'm not sure it's all he could have done, because instead of sending one man down, he could have sent ten.

PARSONS: Why do you feel he's not helping?

GARRISON: I don't know. For example, I have nothing but a high regard for the Kennedy family. I -- I admired Jack Kennedy, and I feel strongly about him, and I think that Robert Kennedy is a competent person. But, again, when I am asked if I have had anybody making any attempts to obstruct the investigation I have to tell the truth.

Now, in this case Walter Sheridan made a real effort - in one instance offered a man, a major witness, money to move to California before the trial, and guaranteed there would be no extradition. And after he was charged, properly enough, for this, Senator Robert Kennedy came out with a statement which in effect was a testimony for the defendant.

PARSONS: Well, you're also quoted as saying that the Senator can, quote, perhaps explain better than I why his political career is so important.

Do you think it's his political career that's causing him to not help?

GARRISON: Again, I don't know the Senator, so there's no way for me to tell. All I can say is as a matter of logic it appears to me that he must have some problem resulting from the fact that he was Attorney General of the United States at the time the Warren Commission reached this untrue conclusion, and I don't know why it would bother him, but I don't see what else it would be other than politics....

PARSONS: You're dealing with the murder of his brother ...

GARRISON: Yes.

PARSONS: Do you think he would allow politics to stand in -- in the way of finding a resolution to that question?

GARRISON: Well, let me answer by saying that without any question of a doubt he is interfering with the investigation of the murder of his brother, the first valid objective competent investigation they have ever had, one which has been successful, which is not going to be a failure in any way, one which is going to produce convictions with regard to the assassination of the President of the United States, one which is already known to us, and you will know in time, as a successful investigation, and he has made a real effort to stop it.

Now, I let you be the judge.

- 11 -

PARSONS: Well, what you're saying, then, is that Senator Kennedy, by not cooperating, is in effect letting the murderers of his brother walk the streets.

GARRISON: Well, yes. That's a fair statement, yes.

LEWIS: Well, now, Mr. Garrison, has Senator Kennedy or any of his aides directly, or circuitously, ever said to you, 'Jim Garrison, why don't you lay off?'

GARRISON: They've done more than that. They've tried to torpedo the case. They didn't have to say that to me. When Sheridan came down to New Orleans, among other things, he said that he was sent down there by Robert Kennedy, and he said one of his objectives was to see that Shaw never came to trial. So it doesn't matter what he says to me when he says that.

LEWIS: Did you ever try to check that out, Mr. Garrison, as a lawyer and an investigator? Did you ever try to check that out with Senator Kennedy himself?

GARRISON: I don't have to check it out. I'm telling you facts I know. You know, you bother me. I don't think you're a very objective questioner. Of course, I've checked it out with facts down there. Do you think I'd come up here and make statements like that off the top of my head if I don't know what I'm talking about?

PARSONS: Well, why don't -- why don't you just -- since you're involved in such a sensitive area here, merely pick up the phone and try to talk with Senator Kennedy?

GARRISON: I'm not interested in talking to anybody who interferes with an investigation, which is an obviously effective one, into the death of his brother.

PARSONS: Well, you're known to be a very tough, hard-boiled DA. It's not unusual for you to pick up the phone and to call somebody you want to talk to, is it?

GARRISON: Yes, but I'm just not inclined to pick up the phone and talk to anybody who's tried to torpedo the investigation. I'm sorry, that's the way I am.

BEUTEL: Have you ever talked to Robert Kennedy?

GARRISON: No, I haven't.

LEWIS: Incidentally, mentioning politics, as was mentioned a

- 12 -

moment ago, do you put any credence on some reports that you might run on the Vice-Presidential ticket, number two to George Wallace?

GARRISON: I wouldn't run on the Vice-Presidential ticket with anyone. I wouldn't run for the United States Senate. I'm not interested in politics of any kind. I'm interested in building the best District Attorney's Office I possibly can, and then I'm going back to private practice. I have no interest in politics at all beyond my office.

BEUTEL: Mr. Garrison, a few moments ago, in response to a question from Milt Lewis, you said that he was too worried about the specifics of the case -- I've forgotten just what the subject was that he -- that he was driving at ...

LEWIS: About getting in touch with Senator Kennedy ...

BEUTEL: No, no, no. No, that was not it. It was a different -- different area altogether, but just today I talked with somebody and they said, 'Gee, you know, I'd like to believe Jim Garrison's case, because I find some certain holes in the Warren Commission's Report, but Jim Garrison hasn't been able to come up with anything to really convince me.'

Well, now, these are the kind of specifics that people are really asking for, and the fact is that you have not yet come up with specifics, but you have hinted all along the specifics are just around the corner ...

GARRISON: Would you like to know why?

BEUTEL: Yes, sir, I would.

GARRISON: Because if I come up with specifics, Mr. Shaw will have his case reversed because I brought specifics before the trial.

One of my problems in trying to communicate about the case is that I cannot in fairness talk about the evidence before the trial. So I have a problem -- I want to say, the Warren Commission is wrong. It is not even close. But I cannot talk about the Shaw case.

I'll give you an example, though, if you want something you can find in the Warren Commission itself. For example, if you -- if you go to Volume Sixteen, Commission Exhibit 38, look in Lee Oswald's notebook, and you'll find -- towards the end you'll find a phone number which begins with PE, a Ft. Worth phone number. As a matter of fact, everybody in this country can do that, because they can go to their library where they have the Warren Commission Reports, and if they look in Volume 16, Exhibit 38, and look at the PE phone number,

- 13 -

which is a Ft. Worth phone number; and then if they go to another volume which is the Armstrong Exhibits, in the Armstrong Exhibits -- and they can find that volume, because on the outside it says, 'Allen Dufuepois.' If they go in the Armstrong Exhibits, and go through the notebook of Jack Ruby -- if they go through the phone calls of Jack Ruby, rather, which is -- I'm sorry, it's another volume, if they go through the phone calls of Jack Ruby, on June the 6th they will find that Jack Ruby made two phone calls to that number, that is in Lee Oswald's notebook.

We can go on and on with examples like this ...

PARSONS: Well, do you think they were planning ...

GARRISON: ... but they -- they are -- the structure itself takes an hour to tell about. But I can give you more examples, if you want.

PARSONS: Mr. Garrison, were they planning -- was this the beginning of the conspiracy, in June?

GARRISON: No. The beginning of the conspiracy was -- was much earlier, John, and was at a higher level, involving people of much more importance ...

PARSONS: Well, I raised that only because the details of the motorcade and the planning of the trip weren't worked out until after September, and you're talking about a complicated ...

GARRISON: No, that's no -- that's no problem at all. The -- it -- the essential structure for the assassination was developed long before the specific site was developed, and it adapted itself to the site, is what happened. In other words, it was an alternate sort of thing. It could have happened in another town. Ultimately, there would have been a parade in Houston, or Ft. Worth, or something like that. And when it was finally set, the apparatus was set up.

BEUTEL: John Schubeck.

SCHUBECK: Mr. Garrison, many people have charged you with being paranoiac. What do you think about that?

GARRISON: I don't think too many people have, but I have -- once in awhile when someone takes a position which we regard as utterly ridiculous that the Warren Commission has taken, perhaps I flare back more than I should. But I don't think that the press has been greatly unfair to me, in balance. I wish that the press had been more curious about digging below the surface of the Warren

- 14 -

Commission, the assassination. But I don't think that anybody's picking on me.

I think that there is a genuine effort to interfere with the investigation, and I think that in time it will become obvious to anybody. And I suppose when occasionally I describe that, it does sound like it.

BEUTEL: Do you think Milt Lewis was picking on you?

GARRISON: No. I think he's being a good news man. But I just want to let him know once in awhile I think he's pushing too hard in an irrelevant area that ...

LEWIS: Can I push a little bit more, Mr. Garrison?

GARRISON: Why, sure you can ...

LEWIS: I'm sure you can handle it ...

GARRISON: ... if you don't mind if I push back.

LEWIS: Oh, by all means.

GARRISON: All right.

LEWIS: Now, the president of the New Orleans Metropolitan Crime Commission has urged that you be barred from a grand jury investigation of organized crime.

Why?

GARRISON: We have had trouble with the organized -- with the Metropolitan Crime Commission for several years. As a matter of fact, the Metropolitan Crime Commission is composed of really pretty good people, and sincere people. It's dominated by a managing director who was a man whom I do not consider sincere, and who's recently got into trouble by making false accusations against one of the finest members of our City Council.

Whenever they've made these periodic accusations, we have insisted on proof. We've called them before the Grand Jury, and again and again it turns out that he has no evidence, and nothing to say. And then later on there's another great announcement. So, as a result, since I am not a diplomat, I do not even answer letters from the Crime Commission. And, so, I don't have the warmest relations with the Crime Commission, although I'm conscious of the fact that most of the men are good men.

- 15 -

I understand his doing this. I think that he's probably influenced by Mr. Cohen.

Let me say this now about our investigation into -- into organized crime, which we're doing now ...

LEWIS: Is it very big down there, by the way?

GARRISON: Not too big, because they know me down there, and they know that we've cleaned up every racket.

But let me say this, and I haven't had a chance to say this before - what we did was to explain to the jury that -- which is a Louisiana law, which requires its Grand Jury advisor to be a member of the District Attorney's staff. But we said, 'Nevertheless, you pick whomever you want, and we will appoint them to our staff and they can be your advisor, anyone you name.' And they voted on it, and decided they wanted us to represent them. So, in other words, that matter is over with.

PARSONS: Are there any more arrests in connection with your alleged conspiracy due in the very near future?

GARRISON: John, not in the immediate future, but there will be in time in New Orleans. I have had -- among the education -- some of the education I've acquired in this case is that good defense lawyers can -- can sure complicate things and -- as they probably should, but we've been tremendously involved, and most of our time has been consumed answering pleadings in the Shaw case, and we just can't handle another parallel situation.

When we had the Shaw pleadings, and the Dean Andrews -- and in Dean Andrews' trial, for example, we only had one or two people investigating. So there won't be any other arrests prior to the Shaw case. After the trial, there will be others.

BEUTEL: One more question ...

LEWIS: How would you have ...

(CROSSTALK)

BEUTEL: Just a second, I'd like to ask this question - are you still absolutely convinced that you're going to blow wide open the Warren Commission Report, and show that it is absolutely false, when you get your case all put together?

GARRISON: We've already -- it's already as dead as Humty-Dumpty,

- 16 -

and there's no way for it to survive. We do have the picture of how the President was killed. We do know the names of individuals involved. And we will not lose any cases.

Is that ...

BEUTEL: That's the answer I wanted to hear, anyway.

Gentlemen, I'm sorry to interrupt, but our time is up.

Our thanks, then, to Jim Garrison, the District Attorney of New Orleans, for being our guest today on Part One of Page One.

RADIO TV REPORTS, INC.

Approved For Release 2002/06/05 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100100005-4

FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

PROGRAM Jim Garrison Interview

STATION WGLI

DATE September 22, 1967 - 6:25 P.M.

CITY Babylon, L.I.

Please note that this is an incomplete copy. The balance of the text has been requested, but has not yet arrived in this office. It will be forwarded immediately upon arrival.

MUTUAL BROADCASTING NETWORK

GARRISON INTERVIEW, PART 1

INTERVIEWER: Without any question, one of the most interesting things to the American public today is the investigation of the Kennedy assassination. In order to find out a little bit more about the investigation itself and the man himself, it's been our pleasure to have a chance to talk to Mr. James Garrison, the District Attorney for New Orleans, and he's with us in the studio today.

Mr. Garrison, it's a great pleasure to have you here at Mutual, on The World Today.

JAMES GARRISON: It's a pleasure to be here, Scott.

INTERVIEWER: Playboy had a very, very interesting interview in the current issue, which is on the newsstands right now, in which you've gone through a pretty careful discussion of the entire situation. I would like, if I may, to ask right off the bat, what prompted the Kennedy assassination investigation, right from the start, in your own mind?

GARRISON: Well, we happened -- we happened to stumble across

- 2 -

the involvement of a New Orleans individual about 72 hours after the assassination by accident. And we turned him over to the -- to the FBI, and we heard nothing more from it. And then last Fall, when I happened to be in New York talking with Senator Russell Long, I found out to my surprise that he and a number of other individuals regarded the matter as not closed.

I, just like most of the people in this country, assumed that it had been looked into honestly and completely. I took it for granted. So I got curious and began looking into it, and finally started reading into the Warren Commission, and I found out that totally -- the conclusion was totally untrue, and it was not an objective, honest inquiry. It was, in effect, a carefully organized concealment of the facts.

So we started looking into it, and we found out that there were a large number of individuals involved in the assassination of the president. I might add that the Playboy article actually is -- is just one corner of it, because at the time I gave it I was unable to mention other aspects, like the involvement of some members of the Dallas police department, and some of the Minute Men in Dallas, because I still hadn't been in Dallas. Now I don't, so I'm free to talk about it.

But it is -- the Playboy article does effectively cover a corner of the story.

INTERVIEWER: You say -- you said that the Warren Commission was covering parts of this investigation.

GARRISON: It would be more accurate to say they were covering the whole thing. In other words the lone assassin theory, which the Warren Commission developed, is a complete fraud. This is why you now have elements of the United States Government, and a large part of the news establishment of the United States doing everything it can, literally desperately, to try and conceal whatever news comes from New Orleans about this, because the United States Government has in this case perpetrated a major fraud.

INTERVIEWER: Well, was this done purposely?

GARRISON: Yes, of course. The main objective was to fool the people of the United States, and I presume the rest of the world, into thinking that this was a lone assassin, a Communist oriented individual, and keep from bringing up the obvious truth, that there was a conspiracy.

In other words, I suppose you might put it this way. The objective was to keep the people of this country thinking that they were still living in the best of all possible worlds; that they were not living in a world in which the big business, Texas style, financed the assassination, as it did; in which the right wing -- paramilitary right wing elements which were financed and encouraged in their training and given weapons by the Central Intelligence Agency was involved. All these things were too embarrassing to bring out.

So somewhere along the line the decision was made by someone to conceal the truth and go along with the Dallas scenario. And the Dallas scenario of course was totally false. But the U. S.

Government has now given the seal of approval to it, and so the people of this country have been given a completely false story.

INTERVIEWER: Now you say that there were members of the Dallas police department that were involved.

GARRISON: Oh yes, it couldn't have been done effectively without it. They were involved -- some of them were involved at Deeley Plaza, others in the Oak Cliff operation, in connection with covering up the killing of Officer Tippett, and particularly in the arrest of Oswald in back of the Texas theater.

But I want to emphasize that one of the problems in talking about groups is people quite often assume you're referring to the whole group. I have no doubt that the majority of the Dallas police force are good officers, and as well intentioned as any police force in the country. But you have within the Dallas police force, you have an element, essentially the Minute Man element, the extreme militant right wing group, which is actively involved in assassination.

INTERVIEWER: Mr. Garrison, may we go back a little bit and -- I'm sure that there is a certain amount of confusion as to the sequence of events. The plot, I think as you've called it, to assassinate President Kennedy, how did it -- where did it develop, where did it start?

GARRISON: Well actually I probably gave the impression in my interview, because I was concentrating on one aspect it started in New Orleans. It actually didn't start in New Orleans. It appears to have begun in Texas. Again I have to say -- I'm about to

say that an element of big business in Dallas, Texas, big business was involved. Oil money helped finance it. There's all kinds of monies coming down to finance the assassination.

But it is not the entire structure, it is just a small group within the structure. But not long after Oswald came back from Russia he was taken over by a White Russian group there, and including the White Russian group individuals who were setting him up as early as 1962. But the New Orleans part came in later, when extreme right wing individuals -- and even as I say that, to avoid misunderstanding, I am not a left wing individual. I'm pretty much middle of the road. It just happens that this was the work of a group of extreme right wing fanatics.

But the Dallas individuals, this portion of the Dallas establishment, of oil millionaires, Minute Men and so forth, and a handful of the White Russians who got control of Oswald actually started this as early as 1962. The point of moving Oswald to Dallas was really -- I mean to New Orleans, was really to de-Dallasize him, so that he would become an individual not from Dallas. He was put in New Orleans about six or seven months, a nesting place, and control was kept of him. And he was set up with some Communist appearing activity.

Now they were able to do this because employees of the Central Intelligence Agency are involved in the assassination. Again, not the management, not necessarily career agents. But nevertheless it is clear that employees of the Central Intelligence Agency were keeping control of Oswald and were persuading that he was still engaged

in CIA work, as he was in Russia.

And so he was brought to New Orleans to de-Dallasize him, so that when the time came he would not be a Dallas man.

INTERVIEWER: Well, there was a little confusion with -- that Oswald sort of perpetrated himself, wasn't there, when he -- for his Cuban -- what was he called, the outfit...?

GARRISON: Fair Play For Cuba.

INTERVIEWER: ...Fair Play For Cuba, and he gave the wrong address at one time.

GARRISON: Actually Oswald was operating out of the -- out of the office of the most conservative anti-Castro individual in New Orleans, Guy Bannister. And again, while we do not necessarily appeal to Guy Bannister personally as involved, and I want to avoid mentioning any individuals, the fact remains that there is a Minute Man aspect, and a number of Minute Men individuals involved in this.

And the first address which Lee Oswald put on his Fair Play For Cuba pamphlets was 544 Camp Street, which was the office of the anti-Castro right wing operation in New Orleans. They had to correct that. Well, by the time they corrected it you had a key there which the Warren Commission ignored. In other words, it indicated at the outset he was in the control of a militant right wing element.

INTERVIEWER: Now, also in the Playboy article you said that Fidel Castro could actually clear this whole thing up as to the source and the -- where the plot came from, and actually almost testified to the fact that the whole plot was perpetrated

with his knowledge.

GARRISON: I don't -- If I said that then I didn't make myself clear. Because remember, I think this is an accurate, well done article, but it consists of several hundred facts, and there's a problem of communication between humans. I would have to clarify that now and say, I do not think that Fidel Castro would know with precision that much about it.

I think that from his --with his detachment -- and again I'm certainly no supporter of his, or of any Communist, but with his detachment, again, I think that he was probably able to sense what was in process when it happened.

INTERVIEWER: I see.

GARRISON: In a general way. And that's what I mean, I'm sure.

INTERVIEWER: Well going back to the New Orleans aspect of it, do you feel that in New Orleans you have the key to the entire probe, I think, if we want to call it that?

GARRISON: Well, let me see if I can answer the question this way. The only reason I would say that we have a key to it in New Orleans is because New Orleans happens to be within our jurisdiction. And we can -- we can investigate in Dallas, and we have been investigating in Dallas. Now I can even talk about Dallas without having a head cut off from my investigator. But New Orleans is simply a corner of the tapestry. And we happened to stumble across it.

And I don't claim that it was a great investigative job.

I don't think there was really an honest effort before. The FBI was not given the entire picture. The Central Intelligence Agency was concealing a large part of it and being protected. And apparently no local jurisdictions anywhere looked into it. So we stumbled across a corner of the tapestry.

But the main part is still in Dallas. I doubt that it will ever be investigated in Dallas because of the fantastic financial power of the elements of the establishment that are involved. You can't become head of the police force, and you can't become a major figure in law enforcement in Dallas without the approval of some of these very individuals who sponsored the assassination.

INTERVIEWER: Well, in Dallas itself there are still many unanswered questions, such as the -- almost the, well, excitement or battle over, Was it one shot, or was it several? In your article -- the interview in Playboy -- you have gone with the theory that there were seven, or perhaps more men that actually fired.

GARRISON: There's no mystery about whether or not there was more than one shot. I don't think I can honestly say with precision exactly how many, because the only persons who can say exactly how many are the individuals who were doing the shooting. There would necessarily be a certain amount of confusion in such a situation.

It is clear however that there were at least three different directions from which shooting was coming. It was coming from the Book Depository, although from a different location than the window where Oswald's supposed to be. It's quite apparent that there was no shooting from that window, and least of all Oswald. And it ap-

pears likely that they were shooting from another building in the rear of either the Sherrif's Building, or more likely the Daltex Building. And above all it is clear that there were -- there was firing from the grassy knoll, and the more significant firing, and the larger amount was from the grassy knoll.

That for example is where the fatal shot came from. But again, these things are concealed by a rather simple technique. What the Warren Commission did was to call practically nobody from the area of the grassy knoll. Two-thirds of the people in Deeley Plaza heard the shooting from the grassy knoll. They were not called. Some of the people from the grassy knoll threw themselves -- from the grassy knoll area -- threw themselves down on the ground to keep from being hit. They used phrases like "a fusilade of fire coming over the stone wall." At least one of them saw the face of one of the men shooting from over the stone wall. And these people were not called before the Warren Commission because it would have ruined the scenario.

To go to another aspect, if you take the time to go through the medical testimony, before they got real control of the doctors, which took some years -- now I'm sure if you go to the different doctors they'll either say, I have no comment, or they've decided on reflection after three years and say in the official position that maybe they were wrong.

But initially you find that the doctors at Parkland Hospital had diagnosed the President's wound in the throat as being an

- 10 -

entrance wound, not an exit wound. So there is a frontal shot there. And then when you read the cause of death, which decision was made by Dr. McClellan a little after four in the afternoon, you read -- you find out that the fatal shot came in the President's temple. And the temple is in the front of his head, and the Book Depository is behind him. But of course these things are muted, and have never been -- are not even mentioned in the summary by the Warren Commission, because the idea is to try and make it look like it was Oswald in the rear.

INTERVIEWER: One of the things that fascinated me in the article in Playboy was the fact that so many items have been classified as top secret and placed in the National Archives.

GARRISON: For 75 years.

INTERVIEWER: For 75 years. In some of these files do you think there is more information?

GARRISON: There's no question about it. As a matter of fact you can -- you can darn near get an idea of what happened, even if you had not investigated it, by just going over the titles which were -- in other words, files are given titles at a time when the particular persons making them up aren't thinking about the concealment aspect, which is done later on by superiors. And if you go over the list of titles of files which cannot be looked at for 75 years, you can get an idea of the curious things which concern the elements of the United States Government, and which they're trying to conceal.

Now the attitude of the U. S. Government is that if you're

30 years old right now, when you're 102, you can look at these files. That is, if they do not decide 75 years from now that it has to be delayed another 75 years, which is entirely possible.

INTERVIEWER: This can be done.

GARRISON: Well, of course. I'm sure that they do not intend for any living person to see what's in these files. For example, the file entitled "The Central Intelligence Dossier on Lee Harvey Oswald," which undoubtedly would show the pre-existing relationship between Oswald and the CIA, would show he was not a Communist in any way. The CIA file on Jack Ruby, which would show that Jack Ruby was involved in a gun running operation, which is an operation that the CIA encouraged, because it was useful to it with regard to its anti-Castro activities.

One of the most interesting files, which is classified as secret, is the -- is entitled "Allegations of Private First Class Eugene Dinken." Here is a private first class, almost as low as you can get in the army, and he's made some allegations. But you cannot know what these allegations are because it might affect national security. Well these allegations are -- what these allegations were very simply was that here is an individual, a young man in the service, we found out by another route was saying that the President of the United States was probably going to be assassinated by right wing elements sooner or later, by a Minute Man element. And he was saying it so strongly that he got in trouble in the service.

A big production was made of it at the time. And when that turned out to be true, the United States Government had to keep it secret because they don't want people knowing what happened.

INTERVIEWER: Well now, Mr. Garrison, you're -- you've made, I don't know whether charges is the right word, but you have said that the government has been suppressing facts and people, and places have been kind of clouded over. Have you had anybody try and stop you from making statements like this?

GARRISON: Well, they can't directly try and stop me from making statements. They have a technical problem there because one of their objectives is to try and make this appear to be, again, the best of all possible worlds. But everything that can be done behind the scenes is being done.

For example you have the -- and everything that can be done by indirection is being done. For example, you have the Attorney General of the United States announcing within days after Shaw's -- is arrested, that Shaw has been investigated and cleared by the FBI. Well of course this was a lie. And later on the Justice Department had to admit it was a lie.

Well when they admitted it was a lie, the New York Times, which is -- which plays the game with the establishment, put it on page 64. Parenthetically, when a convict whom my office convicted announced that we had offered him heroin to testify falsely, the Times put that on the front page. This is the way they play the game.

Now the -- they're doing everything they can. My phones

have been monitored for a long time. There's obviously a mail check through the Post Office about inspection of mail. But this is -- the U. S. has been doing this a long time. But it's just doing it a little stronger here. The use of the telephone company, which -- You see the telephone company, for example -- Again we have a problem throughout this whole thing about the difference between image and reality; the difference between things as they should be, as we are told they are, and as they really are.

And you have the telephone company, and you have a picture of your friendly telephone man taking a little boy across the street, or something. But in reality the telephone company, in a case like this, becomes an extension of the United States Government, of what is now a super state.

For example, the federal government does not have to tap your phone. They don't tap our phones, they monitor them. In other words, in our case for example, our lines, the private lines, office and home, of every individual connected with this case, every key witness, is -- is just thrown by attaching a connection between two terminals at the phone company into a cable that goes into a federal monitoring room, so it's all monitored. This became obvious to us early.

But this is a standard part of the super state, whether it was Adolph Hitler, or it's Stalin. We have reached the point of being a super state. But this is -- there's more power than there should be in the federal government, and it's reached the point where the idea of democracy is -- still exists, and lip service

has to be given. It's a facade that's held up every now and then like a sign, but in reality it's fading away more and more.

INTERVIEWER: How do you conduct your business if you have these problems with the telephone and the mail? How do you conduct your investigations and get your reports without having it -- well, the cover blown?

GARRISON: Well Scott, there are two things that are true. First of all, we don't worry that much about the federal government picking up most of the details, because our attitude is that -- that hopefully sooner or later the people of the United States are going to demand an end to the fraud. And the more that the government finds out, we know exactly what happens, the harder it is going to be for them to continue to play the role of having looked into it. So to a great extent we're just going about our business, and let them pick up what they want.

With regard to sensitive matters, new areas, say the discovery of Oswald and Jack Ruby in another town, where it's not generally known they were together, details about that, or Jack Ruby and Dave Ferrie, mutual connections of theirs which we've established, that sort of thing, mutual connections of Lee Oswald and Dave Ferrie, and other people whose names I don't want to mention -- where we've established that and we don't want it to go straight to the defendant, because there's no doubt in our minds that the federal government gives whatever information it has straight to the defendant because its position is to completely protect the assassins of John Kennedy, well then we have to speak

in generalities or hold off and talk face to face.

INTERVIEWER: Mm-hm. Now you mentioned Clay Shaw before and one of the questions that I think that's in people's mind is why has it taken so long to get this trial into court?

GARRISON: Well, the reason it's taking so long is because the defense keeps filing pleadings; in other words, we can't even set the date yet. The defense makes statements every now and then, "We're ready to go to trial." And, of course, that's picked up and put in the New York Times.

They file a new pleading which means we can't set the trial. Actually I think they've reached the point where they know that this is not a laughing matter any more; they know we have a case and they're stalling in every possible way.

We can't even set it now and I wanted to go to trial in September; it's being stalled and stalled while the press of the establishment, Newsweek, the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, the National Broadcasting Company, the Columbia Broadcasting System, are pounding away, pounding away, trying to get at the potential jurors and affect their outlook; and meanwhile the case is being held off.

It's--the defense and these elements of the federal government are coordinating pretty effectively; in other words, I'd sum it up by saying the attitude of the federal government is, they have to know very well how Jack Kennedy was killed and why and they couldn't care less.

Their interest is not truth; this is a game of power; and it is to their advantage to have the man who killed Kennedy go free now because it would complicate things to have him caught; and that, of course, includes helping Shaw as much as possible.

INTERVIEWER: Well then, you're saying that Oswald actually didn't kill Kennedy.

GARRISON: Oswald never killed anybody in his life. Oswald was an employee of the Central Intelligence Agency during every day he was in Russia, apparently in connection with--he was in anti-aircraft in the Marines, you know--apparently in connection with spotting to see if the U-2's which we were using during the first part of this time in Russia, if the hot engines left vapor trails.

For example, when he's talking to Offstein at--over at Child's, a place he worked in, in Fort Worth, a place incidentally which is engaged in making government maps; it's a classified operation. Oswald worked there almost immediately when he came back.

But he mentioned to Offstein that he never saw a vapor trail all the time he was in Minsk. He was working for the U.S. government there and he was working for the U.S. government, he thought, in New Orleans and even in Dallas. He didn't kill anyone; he was a beautiful patsy and they saw him early and said, "He's beautiful; he's just what we want."

And they used him. But he didn't kill anybody. He

never killed Tippett; he didn't shoot at the President. And that's not even close, that's not even close.

But the only thing I'm curious about is, as time goes on and we show that, how is the establishment going to adjust? What is the New York Times going to do, and the Washington Post? Are they going to pretend that they never took the other position? Or are they going to pretend that nothing is happening down in New Orleans as we get convictions?

I'm waiting to see how they handle that.

INTERVIEWER: Well now, of course, I think the obvious thing to say now is that obviously you feel that all of this can be proved.

GARRISON: It has been proved. We've won this fight. It's a communication problem now. They---they are through as far as developing the proof. The fraud which was perpetrated by the United States government is exposed; there's no question about it. I can sit down with any objective person and in a little while leave no doubt in his mind about the fact that Oswald did not shoot anyone; that he was an employee of the United States; that the United States government after having him acquire the name of a Communist in its service then participated in a smear and used that to take itself off the hook and keep from being embarrassed.

I can prove it to anybody if I have a little time; I can't bring it out all publicly now because of the trial; but

- 19 -

genesis and the place where it's carried through completely, is in Dallas; but what are you going to do when there are individuals in law enforcement in Dallas who are deeply involved in the assassination? When they are protected by a handful of millionaires who helped sponsor the thing, in the name of patriotism, in the insane sense; and when the United States government is protecting the killers of Jack Kennedy for practical reasons, who's going to prosecute them? I can't go over in Dallas and prosecute them. As a matter of fact, it's going to be a little harder to go in Dallas now that I've mentioned this aspect which we've kept quiet about.

And it's obvious that the United States government has no interest in justice or truth in this case; justice and truth are just an embarrassment: the matter's closed; we must go on to more important things.

The assassination's been ratified by the United States; they accepted it. They changed their foreign policy; they went back to the foreign policy that the sponsors of the assassination wanted; and they don't want to go into it because it's embarrassing.

But to sum this point up the fact probably is that there will be in our lifetimes no real prosecution of the sponsors and key individuals, or the assassins, because the men in the jurisdiction where it happened and where it really originated are owned, controlled, by individuals who sponsored it and they're also protected by the United

States government.

But I'm going to do this after the Shaw case. I'm going to bring out their names one by one and their involvement, no matter how powerful, no matter how rich they are and invite them to come into New Orleans to sue me. Then if they come into New Orleans to sue me, then I can prove their guilt in a civil trial.

But that's the only way I know to communicate to the people of this country what a fraud has been perpetrated.

INTERVIEWER: Mr. Garrison, if these statements that you have political ambitions for Washington from the state of Louisiana,--let's say you did get to Washington; the people voted you into Congress or into the Senate--what would be your action in Washington with regard to the assassination?

GARRISON: Scott, it's not possible for me to answer that because I have no political ambitions, least of all do I want to go to Washington. I have none whatsoever. I doubt if I would go if the opportunity presented itself; it wouldn't be that hard for me in Louisiana, to be honest about it; but I couldn't be less interested.

I happen to like what I'm doing. When I've finished what I'm doing I might go in the private practice again and have nothing to do with politics or government or reporters who presume that I've gone into this investigation for political reasons which certainly excludes you but I

mean many reporters have that attitude.

And I'm more interested in private practice. I only have the interest in building the best DA's office in the country and we certainly have one of them. We've accomplished that; now when we finish doing everything we can to communicate to the people of this country the fantastic fraud that has been accomplished in the name of the United States government, with a gold eagle stamped on it, then I'm interested in going back into private practice. And Washington? I couldn't be less interested, especially with what I know now about Washington.

INTERVIEWER: Well, Mr. Garrison, going back just a shade, there have been a number of people involved in the Kennedy investigation who have died. I believe the figure is somewhere in the neighborhood of 20?

GARRISON: It's up to 35.

INTERVIEWER: 35. And one of the insurance companies said that the odds for this sort of a concentration...

GARRISON: Trillion to one.

INTERVIEWER: A trillion to one. What is your attitude toward this?

GARRISON: Well, the insurance company's right because all the deaths are not accidental but again I think this is a problem that has to be approached with balance. In my judgement, most of the deaths which are described are normal in the sense of being reasonably representative of the

average, predictable incidents.

For example, there's a heart attack here and an automobile accident there. On the other hand, there's no question about the fact that a number of the deaths are murders. For example, the man who--quote--"committed suicide" by throwing himself through a plate-glass window--did not commit suicide, he was thrown--Hank Kelliam--he was thrown through the plate-glass window. His wife worked for Jack Ruby.

And a number of individuals who worked for Jack Ruby had to see too much. For example, persons involved in the assassination in New Orleans as well as individuals involved at Deeley Plaza and involved in the shooting of Tippett's have been at Jack Ruby's Carrousel Club; and we've established them there.

And it wasn't that hard; this is the--this is the unbelievable part, it wasn't that hard. But anybody who was a witness to that has been--and known to be a witness--has been methodically removed, like Nancy Mooney.

Nancy Mooney was not only employed by Jack Ruby but she was privy to many of these--these happenings. Incidentally the Warren Commission Report never--the 26 volumes--never quite admits she works for Jack Ruby; but she did.

And in 1964 she was one day arrested on a minor technicality. She had an argument with a girl or something. The other girl was not arrested; she's arrested and in two hours the Dallas police announced that she'd hanged herself.

Well, she'd been removed too and the probability is that she was murdered. But there are a number of others who were murdered for practical reasons and this would continue even now except for the problem that the spotlight has been put on it. It's a little hard for the individuals who initiated this, or elements of the Central Intelligence Agency, to murder somebody now because the spotlight's on it.

You see, the U.S. government never murders anybody but the Central Intelligence Agency doesn't hesitate at anything where an objective is in sight.

But right now it's a little difficult to murder somebody because these questions have been raised.

INTERVIEWER: May I just--just stop for a second there? You said that Nancy Mooney had been taken to the Dallas police station...

GARRISON: Yes, right.

INTERVIEWER: And two hours later she was dead from hanging...

GARRISON: She was hanged with her toreador pants...

INTERVIEWER: You said this was murder. Does this...?

GARRISON: I said probably. I wasn't there. I want to be...

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, yeah. But this implies involvement from perhaps the Dallas police? I don't know, I'm asking a question.

GARRISON: Scott, individuals in the Dallas police force helped kill Jack Kennedy, why should they hesitate with Nancy Mooney? But again when I say this I have to emphasize that

there's no question about the fact that the great majority of individuals in the Dallas police force are honest, well-intentioned policemen; however, it is clear that individuals on the Dallas police force were involved in the assassination and involved in the continuing protection of the assassins and were involved in things like this.

Anybody--any American who's curious about that can go to his library and every library in the country still has a set of the Warren commission Reports--unless they've removed them--and if they will read the radio log--they can look up the Sawyer exhibit which is the exhibits in--after the testimony, and the Sawyer exhibits, if they want to see the--a clear on-the-record indication of the involvement of the Dallas police, for example, in protecting the individual killed Tippett. Tippett was killed by one of the other individuals working on the assassination plot when they just left the vicinity of a church called the Church of the Abundant Life which happens to be at the corner of Tenth and Crawford.

And the man that killed Tippett actually ran around the block, dropped his jacket off in the parking lot and went straight into the Church of the Abundant Life; it was--I can't tell you how easy it was to establish this; it's unbelievable that he went into the Church of the Abundant Life.

The time he went in there Oswald was sitting in the back of the Texas theater as instructed and he'd bought a ticket and this fiction of a man going in without buying a

STATINTL

Approved For Release 2002/06/05 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100100005-4

Approved For Release 2002/06/05 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100100005-4