

Západočeská univerzita v Plzni

Fakulta pedagogická

Bakalářská práce

JFK - KONSPIRAČNÍ TEORIE: PŘÍPAD JIMA

GARRISONA

Kateřina J. Musilová

Plzeň 2012

University of West Bohemia
Faculty of Education

Undergraduate Thesis
JFK CONSPIRACY: THE CASE OF JIM GARRISON
Kateřina J. Musilov

Plzeň 2012

Tato stránka bude ve svázané práci Váš původní formulář *Zadáni bak. práce*
(k vyzvednutí u sekretářky KAN)

Prohlašuji, že jsem práci vypracoval/a samostatně s použitím uvedené literatury a zdrojů informací.

V Plzni dne 28. červen 2012

.....

Kateřina J. Musilová

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, William Bradley Vice, Ph.D. for his patience, advice and support.

ABSTRACT

Musilová, Kateřina Josefina. University of West Bohemia. June, 2012. JFK Conspiracy: The Case of Jim Garrison. Supervisor: William Bradley Vice, Ph.D.

The thesis describes the investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy and the circumstances leading to it conducted by Jim Garrison and his staff. Also the most questionable aspects of the *Warren Commission Report* and the mistakes the Warren Commission had made during its investigation are described here. This work presents evidence that caused the arrest of Lee Harvey Oswald and the possibility of him being innocent. There are also decried the conclusions of Jim Garrison and the main parts of the trial with Clay Shaw who was subsequently accused of being in charge of the conspiracy that killed the President.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
1 THE WARREN COMMISSION.....	3
2 THE MOST DISCUSSED EVIDENCE OF THE WARREN COMMISSION.....	4
2.1 The Zapruder Film.....	4
2.2 The Magic Bullet.....	5
2.3 The Possibility of the Second Shooter and More Shots.....	7
2.4 The Autopsy of President Kennedy.....	10
3 LEE HARVEY OSWALD: ASSASSIN OR A PATSY?.....	12
3.1 No Fingerprints.....	12
3.2 The 1 st Class Shooting.....	13
3.3 The Bulky Package.....	13
3.4 Oswald Outside the Building.....	14
4 JACK LEON RUBY.....	14
5 GARRISON’S INVESTIGATION.....	15
5.1 The Beginning.....	15
5.2 The Second Impulse.....	16
5.3 The Key Aspects of the Investigation.....	17
5.3.1 David William Ferrie.....	17
5.3.2 The “Clay Bertrand” Theory.....	18
5.3.3 The Changed Route.....	19
5.3.4 The Neglect of the Safety Regulations.....	20
5.4 The Revelation of the Investigation.....	21
6 PRELIMINARY HEARING.....	22
6.1 Perry Raymond Russo.....	23
6.2 Vernon J. Bundy, Jr.	25
6.3 The Result of the Preliminary Hearing.....	25
7 THE ACTUAL TRIAL (<i>STATE OF LOUISIANA VERSUS CLAY SHAW</i>).....	26
7.1 The Witnesses.....	26
7.1.1 Is Clay Shaw Clay Bertrand?.....	28
7.1.2 Shaw’s Connections to David Ferrie and Lee H. Oswald.....	30

7.1.3 Defendant's side.....	32
7.2 The Most Interesting Evidence Presented.....	34
7.3 The End of the Trial.....	34
7.4 The Verdict.....	35
8 THE TRIALS AFTER THE TRIAL.....	36
9 CONCLUSION.....	38
WORKS CITED.....	41
SUMMARY IN CZECH.....	46

INTRODUCTION

The assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy is one of the most surprising, shocking and discussed events in American history. There were more than two hundred witnesses to the assassination as well as several home videos and an immense number of photographs and yet the circumstances remain unclear.

There are a few theories about what exactly happened on 22nd November 1963 in the Dealey Plaza. There is, of course, Jim Garrison's theory about C.I.A. and other intelligence agencies being involved and Clay "Bernard" Shaw being in charge. This is the only conspiracy theory to bring someone to justice for assassinating President Kennedy. G. Robert Blakey's theory uses Garrison's evidence and findings but with different results leading him to the Cuban mafia. According to James Files who claims to be the second shooter, he was hired by local crime boss Carlos Marcello, however, he also mentions connections to the C.I.A. and Lee H. Oswald. There is also a theory about French mafia being hired for the job but there is very little evidence. Probably the most controversial conspiracy theory was presented by the History Chanel in 2003. According to this theory, Lyndon B. Johnson Kennedy's vice president and the President after the assassination was in charge of the assassination with the intelligence agencies acting on his order, but there were a lot of protests against this theory and History Chanel apologized for presenting it.

Each theory has its own pros and cons but there are a few things that all of them have in common. For example, there is the fact that there must have been more than just one assassin, also they all disagree with the *Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy* (Warren Commission report) and with the exhibit 399 (the "magic" bullet) being the bullet that caused all damage. Therefore, it was not easy to choose one theory.

I was lucky because by that time there was series of documentary movies about the incident and I got to see a few of them and one in particular where I heard the name Jim Garrison for the first time. This name occurred in a documentary about conspiracies in which there were footages from old news and some shows where he made an appearance. It was obvious that the media did not like him very much which only increased my interest in the man who back then in my opinion deserved much more than ridicule.

Jim Garrison was a New Orleans district attorney in 1960s and early 1970s who unlike most Americans did not believe the official version of the assassination of J. F. Kennedy. Now, of course, most people if not all of them have the same opinion about the

Warren Commission report since it was proved so many times by so many people that this report and its conclusions are dubious. This fact was actually the reason why later the commission slightly changed the report. However, back in late 1960s the people of America did not have any reason not to believe what the government told them. Therefore, the fact that New Orleans D.A. office did not believe and even investigate something the nation considered a closed case caused a lot of trouble. Most patriotic Americans did not like someone pointing out that their own government might have lied to them. It is only understandable that these people became hostile toward Jim Garrison for suggesting that something is wrong with the government of their beloved country, after all it is in human nature to fight anybody who would come and try to change the status quo in their minds.

Until this day there are a lot of people supporting Garrison's theory as well as people against Garrison's investigation and its result and even though some of the accusations turned out to be justified they all concern mostly the matter of Clay Shaw being Clay Bertrand. However, the basic facts and findings concerning the ballistics and the witnesses are rarely questioned. Garrison was only trying to find the truth and even though he might not reveal the whole truth he worked hard to get to it. It seems a little unfair that he experienced so much criticism from both media and some of his superiors during his investigation. Even one of his best friends left him because of the direction of the investigation. He was able to overcome all difficulties and bring his case to the court. The trial was quite short and unfortunately ended to the detriment of Garrison and his investigation team. He lost his case and was again ridiculed by the media. However, he obviously made his point and he was re-elected to the office.

Although his case was over, according to him, he was still considered to be a danger for the intelligence agencies. Therefore, they tried to ruin his carrier, put him in jail and invalidate the case. Garrison did nothing wrong so it was very hard to do so. Even though Garrison proved his innocence, he did not have enough time for his re-election campaign so he was not re-elected again. Nevertheless, as a D.A. of New Orleans Jim Garrison did a lot of good for the city during his twelve years in the office, his investigation helped the future investigators of the assassination of President Kennedy and neither he nor his case should be forgotten.

There are a few authors who wrote about Garrison's investigation but they mostly repeat his words, present his evidence again and bring very little new information about the case such as William Davy or they are basically analyzing the evidence and either verify or

mostly falsify it. Therefore I decided to work mostly with Garrison's book to use the first hand information and to see the whole case and investigation from his point of view and the way he intended.

1 THE WARREN COMMISSION

On November 22, 1963 President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was murdered in Dealey Plaza during his tour. This event had shaken the whole nation and of course everyone wanted to know what exactly happened there and who is responsible for it. There had been 216 people present on Dealey Plaza that day and a lot of pictures and a few motion pictures were made by ordinary people who just wanted to see their beloved president in the motorcade.

Shortly after the assassination a commission was created on Lyndon B. Johnson's order "to evaluate all the facts and circumstances surrounding the assassination and the subsequent killing of the alleged assassin and the report its findings and conclusions" to the new President Johnson (Warren 5). Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States was established as the chairman of the Commission which gave him the right to choose other members of the Commission.

After nine months the *Warren Commission Report* was presented. It basically stated that the assassination of the President was "a random act of violence" done by "a lone assassin" ("The Coup D'Etat"). At first, people had no reason to doubt these findings, however, some of the witnesses were convinced that the conclusions are wrong and over the years that has passed since the assassination various people (including Jim Garrison) examined and analyzed some aspects of it to the point where a new commission was established to re-consider and research the events again and to present a new report.

Until this day there are still many unanswered questions and unexplained events as well as some unbelievable conclusions that do not seem to match the preceding investigation and evidence found. However, the possibility that there might have been a conspiracy to kill the President has been presented in the new report due to a stunning discovery, but that was not revealed until the next committee and early 1990's which means that back in late 1960's it was not available, therefore I am not going to analyze the matter.

Cyril H. Wecht, M.D, J.D. was a member of the House Select Committee on Assassination that re-opened the investigation of the assassination and examined the

Warren Commission's conclusions. He was and still is "one of the country's leading forensic pathologist, attorney and medical-legal consultant" (Wecht). According to Dr. Wecht, the whole *Warren Commission Report* is based on the fact that there was only one man shooting at the presidential motorcade with only three shots fired from the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository Building and if this was proved wrong there could not be the conclusion that the murder of the president was a "random act of violence" done by a "lone assassin" ("The Coup D'Etat").

2 THE MOST DISCUSSED EVIDENCE OF THE WARREN COMMISSION

2.1 The Zapruder Film

The Zapruder film is a home video made by Abraham Zapruder on the day of the assassination. He had a very good view on Elm Street since he was standing on the concrete pedestal on the Grassy Knoll. As a few other home videos this short film captures the last few seconds before the assassination and the fatal shot that hit President Kennedy in the head, however, in comparison to the other films the Zapruder film was shot from a good angle which is a reason why it later became so famous.

Marilyn Sitzman "was standing on the concrete pedestal with Abraham Zapruder," (Sitzman) she was a secretary at Zapruder's clothing company. That day she was holding her boss from behind since he suffered from vertigo and he could not stand on his own on the concrete pedestal. In her interview for documentary series *The Man Who Killed Kennedy* Mrs. Sitzman stated that there were only three shots fired which is not surprising at all but she also said that the first two came almost at the same time which match neither the official theory and its witnesses nor the conspiracy witnesses ("The Coup D'Etat"). On the other hand, for the interview with Josiah Thompson she did not mention the order of the bullets she only claimed that the bullets must have come from one direction because they all sounded almost the same "like a firecracker" (Sitzman). Mrs. Sitzman is convinced that if the other shot came from a different direction it would sound differently.

Zapruder had to give a copy of the footage to the F.B.I. to examine as an evidence and right afterwards he sold the rights for the film to *Life* magazine and the film was locked ever since. By the time of the Garrison's trial the Zapruder film was about to be shown publically for the first time. The only people allowed to see it were the F.B.I. and members of the Warren Commission but the commission did not receive the whole film from the F.B.I., in fact, two crucial frames were removed from the footage – frame 314 and

315. Without the two frames Kennedy's head seems to fall directly forwards and down which would support "the lone assassin theory," and the shot coming from behind the vehicle but actually it fell first backwards and then forwards indicating exactly the opposite. F.B.I. was asked what happened by the Warren Commission and replied that an "inadvertent printing error had occurred" (Garrison 280).

Nevertheless, there have been some speculations about the footage being altered. As anyone can see in a home video made by Maria Muchmore (also called the Muchmore film) when it is played frame by frame you can see the brake lights lighting up for a while which means the limousine had to slow down right after the President had been shot and then speed up. This is also supported by a statement of Officer Bobby Hargis who was in the motorcade on the left side of the presidential limousine. According to Officer Hargis, the car "slowed down almost to a stop" (Palamara). In the Zapruder film there is no sign of slowing down which indicates that the film might have been altered.

Still, the Zapruder Film is like a silent eyewitness of the assassination due to its good angle, in fact without this short footage probably only a few people would doubt the *Warren Commission Report*.

2.2 The Magic Bullet

The "Single Bullet Theory" is the key to the *Warren Commission Report*. It is necessary for the report since there allegedly must have been only three shots. With the first one missing completely and the last one being the fatal headshot there is only one bullet (exhibit 399) left to do all the damage. According to this theory, only one bullet caused seven injuries of President Kennedy and Governor Connally. The bullet is also often referred to as the "magic" bullet because of the strange trajectory of the projectile.

According to the Warren Commission's findings during the autopsy, there is an entrance wound "near the base of the back of President Kennedy's neck" than the bullet went slightly downwards and "exited from the front portion of the President's neck" (Warren 134). Governor Connally was hit in the back by the same bullet that "traversed the Governor's chest in a downward angle, shattering his fifth rib, and exited below the right nipple" (Warren 132), then "entered on the palm side" (Warren 133) of his right wrist "and exited on the back side" (Warren 141). The last Connally's wound allegedly caused also by the "magic" bullet was "in the left thigh approximately 5 or 6 inches above the Governor's knee" (Warren 142).

How is it possible for one bullet to do all this damage? Approximately in the middle of chapter 3 of the *Warren Commission Report* the trajectory of the “magic” bullet is examined. There are some deflections in the trajectory caused by the bones and muscles as the bullet passed through the two men. Governor Connally is examined but his testimony somehow does not match the commission’s findings. The position of the governor is talked about quite often but it is never actually said what it was. Connally testified that when he was hit his right hand was on his left leg which does not correspond neither with the Zapruder film nor the alleged trajectory of the magic bullet. Also he recalled being hit when he started to turn on his left until then he was turned to the right a little since he was looking back over his right shoulder. According to the Warren Commission, when he was turned to the right he was too far to be hit (so he must have been sitting straight) because the President was sitting on the very end of the car described as the “extreme right.” In addition Connally remembers that he turned over his shoulder because he heard the shooting and saw president raising his arms to his neck (that’s after the shot). According to the *Warren Commission Report*, Connally did not realize that he was hit until a second and a half later when the President was shot for the second time (Warren 143 – 157).

Assuming that Governor Connally was sitting in front of President Kennedy directly the bullet would have to turn upwards a little after exiting Kennedy’s body and in the mid air turn right and slightly downward again to enter Connally’s back in the right angle. In addition, Connally’s right hand would have to be close to his chest otherwise the bullet would have to take another turn down to come through the wrist and end up in Connally’s thigh. Such a trajectory is highly improbable and according to Dr. Wecht impossible (“The Coup D’Etat”). Strangely, the bullet was later found in the Parkland Hospital in a perfect condition with only a few little deformations on the base after falling out of a coat “without a drop of blood on it” (Garrison 282). How is this even possible?

Originally there was a different theory about the shooting. The original theory worked with the fact that one bullet hit the president’s head; one came through the president’s neck and another bullet hit the governor. This explanation of the wounds would be much more probable than the current one; however, a new witness appeared. James T. Tague was standing on the sidewalk at the Triple Underpass. According to Tague, he hid behind one of the pillars right after the first shot and he did not even notice his injury until deputy sheriff pointed out that there was blood at Tague’s face. Tague said that his injury

was a proof of one shot missing completely which Warren Commission did not want to hear about at first because it made their investigation harder and meant they had to come up with the “single bullet theory” to match their conclusions with the “lone assassin” concept ("The Coup D'Etat").

2.3 The Possibility of the Second Shooter and More Shots

Today many people believe that there must have been the second assassin hidden behind the fence on the grassy knoll. One of the reasons for this is the fact that shortly after the President’s fatal head shot a lot of people ran for the fence as we can see on the footage made by Orville Nix who was standing at the other side of the street opposite from Mr. Zapruder (the footage is also called the Nix film). There probably are a lot of pictures of the grassy knoll during the assassination but still many were not published since the F.B.I. collected most of the undeveloped films from nearly all the cameras of the people who were standing on Dealey Plaza that day and never returned them to their owners or only some pieces (“The Forces of Darkness”). For example Orville Nix, the author of the Nix film stated that the F.B.I. took his undeveloped film with many photos of the Grassy Knoll and returned it later but they “loose a frame here and there” (Lane).

The Warren Commission stated that “the consensus among the witnesses at the scene was that three shots were fired. However, some heard only two shots, while others testified that they heard four and perhaps as many as five or six shots” (Warren 159). The reason for its final statement that there must have been only three shots fired is based on the fact that there were “three spent cartridges” found on the sixth floor of the School Book Depository Building (Warren 159). Did anyone look anywhere else for empty cartridges?

Assuming that the Commission supposed there was only one “assassin’s lair” they would not bother with searching other locations for evidence. In fact there is no record in the *Warren Commission Report* that they would search some other alleged assassins’ lairs. Maybe they would find some other empty cartridges but that would ruin their “lone assassin theory” they were building up as James T. Taque and many others suggest.

Some witnesses even saw a smoke at the fence probably coming from a rifle, one of them being Sam M. Holland. Mr. Holland during an interview stated that he heard four shots with the third one hitting the President in his head. He also saw a “puff of smoke” coming from behind the picket fence and had “no doubt whatsoever in his mind” that the

head shot had been delivered from behind the picket fence (Holland). Jim Mars writes this about Holland and the Warren Commission in his book *Crossfire*:

Due to Holland's credibility and clear description of what he saw, the Warren Commission Report accurately stated:

According to S. M. Holland, there were four shots which sounded as though they came from the trees on the north side of Elm Street where he saw a puff of smoke.

Having mentioned the smoke in the threes, the report went on to conclude:

In contrast to the testimony of the witnesses who heard and observed shots fired from the Depository, the Commission's investigation has disclosed no credible evidence that any shots were fired from anywhere else.

The clear implication by the Warren Report is that Holland was mistaken in believing shots came from behind the wooden picket fence... (Mars 57)

As I mentioned before according to the *Warren Commission Report*, there were more people hearing more than three shots then why consider Holland's testimony a mistake if other testimonies proved it to be true? Were they all mistaken? In the interview Holland also mentions that one of the shots was not as loud as the other three which corroborates with the audio evidence revealed in the 1990's.

Assuming there were four shot with one of them sound differently the only conclusion is that the one shot has been fired from a different gun or location or both which indicates another shooter.

There is also a man called James Files, currently a prisoner convicted of an armed bank robbery and murder who claims to be the second gunman. His description of the whole incident is very interesting; however, the fact that it matches a testimony of an eyewitness is even more interesting. For the documentary movie *I Shot JFK* Files explains the circumstances of the assassination. According to Files, he was hired by the local crime boss but he also mentions being visited by a C.I.A. agent and Lee H. Oswald who "came to ask if I [Files] needed some help" with the preparations (Files). Files described the rifle he

used to fire “only one shot and one shot only” (Files), and the way he disassembled it after he delivered the fatal head shot of the President, while doing so he claimed to be wearing a railroad worker uniform.

His story matches the testimony of Ed Hoffman who has seen a second gunman on the grassy knoll. He was standing on the freeway that is above the Triple Underpass (at least that’s how I observed it in the documentary *The Man Who Killed Kennedy*). Hoffman saw actually two men, one of them being dressed ant he railroad worker and the other wearing a sort of a suit. Both men he saw were dissembling rifles and leaving the place which is basically what Files clams only he claims to be there alone which might be a cover for his possible associate.

There are again some inconsistencies though. Mr. Hoffman just like other witnesses changed his testimony several times and his original testimony for the F.B.I. stated this:

Hoffman said he was standing a few feet south of the railroad on Stemmons Freeway when the motorcade passed him taking President Kennedy to Parkland Hospital. Hoffman said he observed two white males, clutching something dark to their chests with both hands, running from the rear of the Texas School Book Depository building. The men were running north on the railroad, then turned east, and Hoffman lost sight of both of the men.

Then, the report adds, Hoffman partially retracted his story.

Approximately two hours after the above interview with Hoffman, he returned to the Dallas Office of the FBI and advised he had just returned from the spot on Stemmons Freeway where he had parked his automobile and had decided he could not have seen the men running because of a fence west of the Texas School Book Depository building. He said it was possible that he saw these two men on the fence or something else... (“Ed Hoffman: Did He See a Grassy Knoll Shooter”)

Mr. Hoffman changed his testimony “each time he is interviewed” which would make anyone to reconsider his credibility (Friedrich). On the other hand, Mr. Files has not changed his testimony but he made a mistake in his statement concerning the changed route of the presidential motorcade which I am going to analyze later in the text.

There is of course more evidence and eyewitnesses supporting the theory about more shots and shooters whose stories are similar to those already mentioned e.g. James Leon Simmons who ran to the Grassy Knoll because he saw someone there with a gun but by the time he got there, there was nobody there but there were “footprints in the mud” (Lane).

Most of the witnesses whose testimonies did not match the “lone assassin theory” were not called by the Warren Commission even though they gave their testimonies of what they saw to the F.B.I. and the police. It is possible that their testimonies were omitted or ignored by the Warren Commission on purpose just so they could conclude that “the shots which killed President Kennedy and wounded Governor Connally were fired by Lee Harvey Oswald” (Warren 53), and also that there is “no evidence that Oswald was involved with any person or group in a conspiracy to assassinate the President” (Warren 49).

2.4 The Autopsy of President Kennedy

The autopsy is probably the biggest mystery in the history of medicine. After being shot, Kennedy was taken to the Parkland Hospital for treatment. “At the press conference that followed the death of Kennedy, Perry (Dr. Malcolm Perry who treated the President) stated that he thought the throat hole looked like an entrance wound” but “when interviewed by the Warren Commission, Perry admitted he had changed his mind and now thought that” the wound might had been also the exit wound (“Primary Sources: Autopsy”).

When President Kennedy was pronounced dead at the Parkland Hospital, Dr. Paul Peters was supposed to do the autopsy but before he could do anything “the military people” took the President’s body (“The Forces of Darkness”). According to Dr. Peters, this was not standard procedure; it was common to do the autopsy at the hospital where the patient died.

The body of Kennedy was shipped to Washington where the autopsy was done late in the evening of the day of the assassination at the Bethesda Naval Hospital in Meryland.

According to Aubrey Rike who worked for O’Neal Funeral Home and who also prepared the body for the shipping, the President was wrapped in a white sheet and put into a bronze casket, “one of the most expensive” they had (Rike). However, according to Paul O’Connor, the autopsy assistant who unwrapped Kennedy’s body before the naval autopsy, President’s body arrived in a “cheap shipping casket” and in a “rubber body bag with a

zipper... the one you found people carried out of a disaster” (O’Connor). Also the body was nude and only his head was wrapped in a piece of white sheet which is obviously not the way the body was prepared at the Parkland Hospital.

What happened with the body during the flight to Washington? Was there another autopsy performed? Is that a standard procedure how to handle a corpse of the President?

Also there were a lot of people present (26 of them) at the autopsy who should not be there giving orders what to do and what not to do causing that according to Mr. O’Connor, there was “no smooth flow of a procedure” (“The Cover-Up”). Garrison also investigated the autopsy and the questionable methods used.

However, the most interesting fact about the autopsy is the documentation of it. In fact there is no documentation whatsoever except for a few photographs that can be now easily found on the internet but there are speculations about them being altered. The original photographs, x-rays or other material are missing; even the brain of the President that had been removed from the skull to be conserved was missing. According to Dr. Wecht and Mr. O’Connor, the two doctors in the charge of the autopsy were not skilled enough in forensic pathology to do the autopsy and they were under control of “sinister looking people” which Mr. O’Connor who was present describes in a great detail. (“The Cover-Up”). Also “the metal tray containing the brain [of Kennedy] and the microscopic autopsy tissue slides are no longer listed” in the National Archives in Washington, and according to Dr. Wecht, this material disappeared between the 1965 and 1966, which is inexcusable even in a normal case for the materials to be “literally taken illegally, stolen... and nobody in the U.S. government has ever accounted for these missing items” (“The Cover-Up”).

With all the original tangible materials missing and only questionable photographs being used as documentary the only thing to rely on as true evidence is the testimonies of people who had actually seen the body of the President. “For example, neurosurgery professor, Kemp Clark, MD, closely examined JFK's skull and wrote on 11/22/63, ‘There was a large wound beginning in the right occiput extending into the parietal region Much of the skull appeared gone at the brief examination...’” this was confirmed by the witnesses from the Parkland Hospital “Drs. Marion Thomas Jenkins, Malcolm Perry, Robert McClelland, Charles Carrico, Ronald Coy Jones, Gene Aiken, Paul Peters, Charles Rufus Baxter, Robert Grossman, Richard Brooks Dulaney, Fouad Bashour, and others” (Aguilar). That is more than fifty doctors and people with medical education who saw the massive exit wound on the back of the head against over twenty generals, admirals and

other military people present during the autopsy who claimed that the big exit wound was on the front of the head. Whose version is correct then?

House Select Committee on Assassinations decided that “it appears more probable that the observations of the Parkland doctors are incorrect” (Aguilar). This verification of the *Warren Commission Report* seems a little suspicious since any average person with a common sense would rather believe the doctors than the people with no medical education who needed a lone assassin shooting from behind. It is hard to tell what to think about that, it is almost as if every official report blindly has to have the same conclusion as the Warren Commission’s in order not to make the people look incompetent, as if no official commission was interested in the truth.

3 LEE HARVEY OSWALD: ASSASSIN OR A PATSY?

While in custody Oswald himself told to the press that he was a “patsy.” This statement is supported by the paraffin test which showed that Oswald did not fire a gun that day, yet Dallas Chief of Police Jesse E. Curry stated to the press that as he “understood it [the test] was positive” (Lane). Also there is an eyewitness who saw Oswald “several floors below ‘the assassin’s lair’ both just before and just after the assassination,” (Proctor) and “he not only had appeared relaxed, but was drinking a Coke which he had bought from the vending machine” (Garrison116). According to Mr. Lane’s *Rush to Judgment*, the Warren Commission found the paraffin test “completely unreliable” (Lane).

As for his personality, people in his surrounding (e.g. Ruth Paine, his landlady and a neighbor) describe him as a quite, nice guy and a loving father who had never spoke to them about communism or Marxism and they would never think of him as a person able to hurt somebody (“The Patsy”).

3.1 No Fingerprints

Another interesting fact is that there were “no fingerprints on the knob of the bolt” (Warren 123), later it was examined “through a magnifying glass and no prints found” (Warren 175). However, after sending the rifle to the F.B.I. a palmprint emerged (after Oswald’s death). It was “the right palmprint of Oswald” (Warren 177). How did the palmprint miraculously appear on the rifle if during the thorough examination through a magnifying glass there was nothing? Did F.B.I. have some special method of retrieving

fingerprints from places where there are no fingerprints? One has to wonder how hard it would be for a person to go to a morgue and put a dead man's hand on a rifle.

3.2 The 1st Class Shooting

As a part of the reconstruction of the assassination three commission experts were asked to try to redo what Oswald had done. They “failed” to do so (Lane). Was Oswald such a good shooter? According to Sergeant Nelson Delgado who served with him in the army, Oswald was a “poor shot” and he did not even care about his weapon as much as he should, he did not even clean it properly and was often punished for it (Lane).

Assuming he was not a good shooter and really wanted to kill the President would it not be much easier to shoot at the limousine while it was on the Houston Street? The shot would be easier since there would be very little or no obstacles with the target approaching not leaving. Why would he as a poor shot choose to try the hard shot through the trees and the car getting further away from him? According to Mr. Proctor, it is true that trying to shoot Kennedy on the Houston Street would apparently provide Oswald with more time and a better clear shot but “Kennedy was in a convertible, with a bullet-proof front windshield” and the car would have been really close to the Texas School Book Depository Building “for Kennedy's head and upper body to be visible out from behind the front windshield. That would give the sniper far less time to aim and get a shot off before the car was too close to the building” (Proctor).

3.3 The Bulky Package

Oswald was carrying a package wrapped in a brown paper bag to work the morning of the assassination, his Carcano rifle is supposed to have been delivered in it into the Texas School Book Depository Building. According to Marina Oswald, her husband owned a rifle and when she saw him being arrested on TV she “went quietly to the Paine's garage where the rifle had been concealed in a blanket among their other belongings. It appeared to her that the rifle was still there, although she did not actually open the blanket” (Warren 42).

Oswald had overslept the morning of the assassination and as usual he went to the nearby “residence of Mrs. Linnie Mae Randle, the sister of the man with whom Oswald drove to work – Buell Wesley Frazier” (Warren 188). “Both Linnie Randle and Wes Frazier testified that the bag was too short to hold a disassembled rifle” (Knuth), to be

precise according to Mrs. Randle, it was two feet long and 6 inches wide, while according to Mr. Fraizier, it was 24 inches long and 8 inches wide, and Oswald said he was carrying “curtain rods” in it (Warren 188). Needless to say that Carcano even disassembled is 34.8 inches long.

Assuming that the Carcano could not have been in the bulky package how did it get into the School Book Depository Building? Moreover, who moved the Carcano from the garage if it was not Oswald? Could Oswald bring the rifle to his working place any other day? Was the rifle on the assassin’s lair really Oswald’s rifle? According to the *Warren Commission Report*, Mr. Fraizier “could easily have been mistaken when he stated that Oswald held the bottom of the bag cupped in his hand with the upper end tucked into his armpit” because if he was correct in this observation the package could not possibly be longer than two feet and thus carry Oswald’s Carcano rifle (Warren 191).

3.4 Oswald Outside the Building

There is a photo made by James W. Altgens, a press photographer who took a picture of the motorcade and the crowd behind it at the time when the limousine was turning from the Houston Street to the Elm Street. In the picture there is a man standing in “the doorway” of the School Book Depository Building who looks a lot like Lee Oswald including his clothes he wore that day (Lane). Of course, it is an old photograph and it is blurry but still you can see the Lee Oswald’s look-alike standing behind the crowd. If the man really was Oswald how could he then be at the same time upstairs and preparing for the shooting? The Warren Commission had its own theory about the identity of the man. According to the Warren Commission, the man was Oswald’s co-worker Billy Lovelady, however, he had different dress than in the picture, he had “a red and white shirt buttoned to the neck and no jacket” (Lane). This does not correspond with the photo. Who was the man? If the man is really Oswald, he not only was not the lone assassin but he also did not do anything at all and he really was a patsy.

4. JACK LEON RUBY

Jack Ruby was an owner of a nightclub in Dallas. On November 24, 1963 he managed to get into the basement of Dallas Police Headquarters where he shot Oswald who died shortly afterwards.

Many investigators (including Jim Garrison) had to ask one question: How did Ruby get into the police station with a gun to shoot Oswald? There have been some speculations such as that Ruby used a press badge to get into the building and according to the Warren Commission, he got in via the Main Street ramp along with a car when the policeman was not paying attention. In fact, Ruby himself claimed that he went in this way. Also there was a possibility that one of those policemen could have let Ruby in on purpose. Dallas Chief of Police Jesse Curry stated that there were no relationships with Jack Ruby and only less than 50 police officers actually knew the name and only 12 had visited Ruby's club. This does not corroborate with the testimony of Nancy Hamilton, who worked for Ruby as a bartender in his club. According to Mrs. Hamilton, Jack Ruby was a friend to more than half of all the policemen in Dallas (which means he had approximately 600 police friends). Mrs. Hamilton also stated that all the policemen were V.I.P.'s in the club and she had to be nice to them and even "ignore other customers" in order to do so on a direct order from Ruby (Lane). She also mentioned that some of the policemen even had "their own bottle with their name on it" (Lane). If Hamilton speaks the truth and she has no reason to lie then is it possible that one of the policeman actually broke the regulations and let Ruby in? If so did the policeman knew about Ruby's gun and intentions?

There are also two witnesses who saw Ruby in the Parkland Hospital on the day of the shooting just about the time when the President was there. One of the witnesses actually knew Jack Ruby it "was Seth Kantor, a respected journalist. Kantor told the authorities he was absolutely certain he saw Ruby at Parkland Hospital" and "that they chatted briefly at the hospital that afternoon" (Griffith). Jack Ruby being in the hospital would be suspicious and he "vehemently denied having been at the hospital" thus the Warren Commission concluded that "Kantor and the other witness were mistaken" (Griffith).

5 GARRISON'S INVESTIGATION

5.1 The Beginning

Garrison knew about most of the inconsistencies and he investigated the most relevant ones. The actual investigation started nearly three years after the assassination but there also was a very short sort of an investigation straightaway.

Everything started with an argument between a private investigator and a former F.B.I. agent Guy Banister and his friend Jack Martin, a private detective. Banister hit

Martin with his gun and Martin probably in anger told to a friend about his “suspicion that David Ferrie, an associate of Guy Benister’s and a frequent habitué of his office, had driven to Dallas on the day of the assassination to serve as the “getaway” pilot for the men involved in the assassination” (Garrison 4).

This was the initial impulse for Garrison. Needless to say, by that time Oswald was still alive and for a few months before the assassination he stayed in New Orleans which gave Garrison as the D.A. of New Orleans the right to investigate the alleged assassin and his possible relationships with David Ferrie. Garrison discovered that Ferrie really went to Dallas shortly before the assassination; however, a witness confirmed that he had been seen on the day of the assassination in New Orleans meaning he could not be a “getaway” (Garrison 6).

Ferrie was brought to the D.A. Office for questioning. Garrison described it:

The more he [Ferrie] talked, the less his story held together. For example, when I asked him the reason for his departure from New Orleans only one hour following the assassination, he responded that he had driven to Houston to go ice skating. When I then asked him why he had chosen one of the heaviest thunderstorms in many years as the occasion for his ice skating trip, he had no adequate reply.

Later we would learn that at the skating ring he had never put on ice skates but he had spent his time at a pay telephone, making and receiving calls... (Garrison 6)

Garrison sent Ferrie to the police station for booking and questioning by the F.B.I. The F.B.I. let Ferrie go quickly and stated that there was no evidence against him. Garrison accepted that and let it be.

5.2 The Second Impulse

Three years later he decided to return to his investigation due to a conversation he had with The United States senator for Louisiana Russell Long who expressed this doubts of the *Warren Commission Report*. The conversation interested Garrison so much so that he was convinced that there must have been something that the Warren Commission missed.

5.3 The Key Aspects of the Investigation

The whole investigation lasted more than two years, some of the evidence revealed are less interesting than the others, some witnesses are more important than the others as well as some events that happened during the investigation are worth mentioning and some are not, therefore I have decided to present and analyze only the key aspects of the investigation.

5.3.1 David William Ferrie

David Ferrie was considered the most important figure of the case. There also was Ferrie's unmistakable appearance due to which Garrison remembered him the first time he met him long before the investigation. Garrison described Ferrie as "a raffish adventurer with a crudely cut, homemade thatch of reddish mohair, and large greasepaint eyebrows which never quite matched" (Garrison 46). He was basically the starting point for Garrison since he was "acquainted with some of the most notorious names linked to the assassination: Lee Oswald, Clay Shaw, Guy Banister, Jack Ruby, and Carlos Marcello" (Craig). Ferrie was a man of many activities "he was a pilot, and at one time a senior pilot with Eastern Airlines until he was fired for homosexual activity on the job. He was also a hypnotist, a serious researcher of the origins of cancer, amateur psychologist, and a victim of a strange disease, alopecia, which made all of his body void of hair. Anti-Castro, anti-Kennedy, and anti-Communist, Ferrie was also a bishop of the Orthodox Old Catholic Church of North America" (Craig).

Garrison was interested in his anti-Communist activity and the activity connected to the anti-Castro Cuban Revolutionary Front and a training camp for anti-Castro Cubans. He often appeared at Guy Banister's office along with Oswald and various Cubans. During questioning in the D.A. Office he told Garrison that Oswald "was there [in Banister's office] too. Sometimes he'd be meeting with Guy Banister with the door shut. Other times he'd be shooting the bull with Ferrie" (Garrison 35). According to Martin, Clay Shaw was there once as well but he was not entirely sure.

After the investigation was revealed in *The New Orleans State-Item* David Ferrie made a phone call to the D.A. Office and spoke with Lou Ivon (one of the assistant DAs). Ferrie was worried because of the article in the newspaper, he said to Mr. Ivon: "You know what this news story does to me, don't you? I'm a dead man. From here on, believe me,

I'm a dead man" (Garrison 160). The following day Ferrie called again but he was not so frightened this time and later he called again asking for help because the media had somehow found out more about the investigation and mentioned his name.

On February 22, 1967 Ferrie was found dead in his apartment along with two suicide typed notes. "The first began 'To leave this life, to me, is a sweet prospect.' The second note was brief and declared that 'when you read this I will be quite dead and no answer will be possible.'" (Craig). Garrison as well as Aaron Kohn (New Orleans Metro Crime Commission director) believed Ferrie was murdered. However, the coroner's report stated that Ferrie died of natural causes.

It is obvious that Ferrie's health was in poor condition but there is the question if Ferrie committed suicide and wrote the notes why would the coroner establish nature as the cause of death? If he died of natural causes why would he write the suicide notes? Perhaps he was in such a bad condition that he wrote the notes since he knew he was going to die soon but why would he type the notes? There were a lot of bottles with various drugs and some empty bottles were found on the table next to Ferrie's body. Garrison had a theory about pills that Ferrie might have taken (or forced to take) which would cause his death and it would appear as a natural cause. He wanted to verify it and called the coroner to check it, unfortunately he found out that "no blood samples from Ferrie's body had been retained" (Garrison 166).

5.3.2 The "Clay Bertrand" Theory

The name Clay Bertrand first appeared when Dean Adams Andrews, Jr. was about to be the attorney of Lee Harvey Oswald. He testified for the Warren Commission that he received a call from a man of this name asking him to do so. And thus the search for Clay Bertrand started. Garrison's investigation team worked hard but could not find anything. At the end of a long investigation the name Clay Shaw appeared. He was a businessman and according to Garrison (and a few people), he had a pseudonym "Bertrand." However, there is a problem.

James Kirkwood in his book *American Grotesque* sums up the changes Dean Andrews made during the time on various occasions. At first, Andrews testified for the Warren Commission that the man called Clay Bertrand was just a voice in the telephone and he never met him. Secondly, he testified to the commission that he made the name up. Then he again claimed that Clay Bertrand was real. During Garrison's trial Andrews said

he was not able to say whether Shaw was Bertrand or not and after he was accused him of perjury he changed his statement again and went back to the story that he made the name up to cover a friend who called him but who had no connection neither Oswald nor the assassination. Why would he cover him up then? Later he added that the man was Gene Davis and repeated that he did not call on the purpose. That is the sixth time he changed his story. Which version was the truth?

5.3.3 The Changed Route

The changed route of the presidential motorcade is one of the most discussed aspects of not only Garrison's investigation but also in general. Was there really a changed route? Garrison writes this in his book *On the Trail of the Assassins*:

One morning I was in my office reading and rereading a newspaper. I did not hear Frank enter.

"I have never seen you so preoccupied," said Frank.

"It's not just any paper, son," I said. "This is the front page of the *Dallas Morning News* for November 22, 1963."

"Well, what's got you so hypnotized?"

I gestured to the large diagram on the paper's front page, indicating the route of the presidential parade. "Have I ever shown you this before?" I asked.

He shook his head.

I turned the paper around facing his way so that he could read the diagram of the motorcade. It covered almost five-sixth of the front page.

"Frank," I said, "I want you to follow the parade route with me. Let's pick it up right here as it comes down Main approaching Dealey Plaza. Are you with me?"

"Yes," he said, his finger following the thick line indicating the motorcade. "And here is where it reaches Dealey Plaza . . ." He stopped.

"What's the matter?" I asked.

"This diagram indicates that the President's parade was supposed to continue on Main Street through the center of Dealey Plaza -- without even leaving Main." He stared at it in disbelief... (Garrison 117)

Garrison continued to wonder why the route was changed at the last minute and whether it was also a part of the conspiracy and why the Warren Commission ignored this fact. It would appear as if it really was a result of a conspiracy, there is one problem though, there really is not anything to ignore. Either Garrison lied deliberately or he did not remember correctly the events.

He was lying about the size of the picture of the route. It was not “almost five-sixth of the front page” it was not even a quarter of the front page it is more of one tenth of the page. In addition, the picture is so small that there really is no turn to the Elm Street simply because of the small size of the picture; however, the complete route is mentioned in text of the newspaper it is as follows:

From Love Field to Mockingbird Lane, along Mockingbird Lane that Lemmon to Turtle Creek, Turtle Creek to Cedar Springs, Cedar Springs to Harwood, Harwood to Main, Main to Houston, Houston to Elm, Elm under the Triple Underpass to Stemmons Expressway and on the Trade Mart... (“Presidential Motorcade Route”)

This is clear evidence that the route was not changed at all. Moreover, if the route was supposed to continue on Main Street and not to turn to Houston or Elm, why would be all the people standing there? It is obvious that the people knew exactly where the route is going to be otherwise they would all miss it. This is a solid enough evidence for me that there was no changed route so why did Garrison make this up? What did he try to prove with such lie? One has to wonder whether he might be lying more often throughout his investigation.

5.3.4 The Neglect of the Safety Regulations

The Secret Service was supposed to provide sufficient protection of the President; apparently they did not do a very good job this time. According to Fletcher Prouty, there is a “manual” for such situations which followed and normally a special group of specially trained people would be send to check and secure the whole area around the route but this did not happen, moreover, the “commander was specifically told he wasn’t needed” to do his job (“The Cover-Up”).

To support the statement there is a very short footage of a bad quality featuring the documentary movie *I Shot JFK*. On the video it is possible to see the very beginning of the route at Love Field and an agent called Henry Rybka who was doing the job he was supposed to do, he started to jog next to the presidential limousine to create a human shield since the “bubble” bulletproof roof of the car had been removed. But he was immediately called off by Emory Roberts, “the agent-in-charge of the Presidential Protection Detail” (Fetzer). It is clear that Rybka did not understand the reason for being called off and it is even possible to see the wordless communication which indicated mutual confusion.

Mr. Prouty also stated that there are safety rules about the unprotected presidential limousine slowing down and nobody from Secret Service would let it happen also it is clear that a lot of windows on the School Book Depository Building were opened. A standard procedure commands that such things should not happen and Prouty suggested that somebody stopped the people to do the “proper procedures” and therefore there must have been a conspiracy (“The Cover-Up”).

Also “the motorcycle escort was reduced to four, who were instructed not to ride forward of the rear wheels of the Presidential limousine. One of them observed that it was ‘the damnedest formation’ he’d ever seen. JFK’s military aide, who normally sat between the driver and the agent-in-charge, was moved to the last vehicle along with the President’s personal physician” which means the President was left out in the open (Fetzer).

There is no doubt that the procedures were broken, the question is on whose order? This came to Garrison’s mind as well and he concluded (also due to other evidence) that the U.S. intelligence agencies must have been involved in the conspiracy otherwise there would have been a proper investigation with all the evidence collected and stored carefully not losing it or destroying it on unknown purpose.

5.4 The Revelation of the Investigation

On February 17, 1967 *New Orleans State-Item* unexpectedly published an article that probably caused the death of David Ferrie. It stated:

The Orleans Parish district attorney’s office has launched an intensive investigation into the circumstances surrounding the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

The States-Item has learned that the DA's office is pouring out-of-the-ordinary sums of money into a probe of a possible assassination plot.

Dist. Atty. Jim Garrison refused to confirm or deny the existence of such an investigation or to discuss information received by the States-Item...

Trial assistants and investigators assigned to the DA have spent more than \$8,000 on unexplained travel and "investigative express" in the period since Nov. 25, 1966... (James)

Garrison was not pleased with the fact that the investigation had been revealed like this to say the least. This article was the first one of a long row of articles that criticized the case. However, due to the articles Garrison received "letters of support" which was for Garrison a sign that "public skepticism about the Warren Commission's official story was far deeper and more widespread than he realized" (Garrison 153).

This actually was not that bad, Garrison at least had a chance to present the true nature of the investigation unfortunately each time he tried his words were misinterpreted. It was as if the media wanted the public to believe that Garrison and his investigation was just a creation of Garrison's imagination rather than a credible case based on evidence.

6 PRELIMINARY HEARING

On March 14, 1967 the preliminary hearing for the potential trial with Clay Shaw started. The courtroom was filled with media but this was expected since nearly the whole investigation had been watched closely by the press. According to Garrison, he decided not to do the questioning by himself since he did not want people to think that the whole investigation and the evidence collected were done by one man. He "wanted everyone to know that this was a team effort, not some individual" so he delegated the preliminary hearing as well as the whole trial later (Garrison 175). Garrison also writes that for this examination he selected two of his assistant DA's Charles Ward and Alvin Oser. However, the truth is different. There was "an announcement on Friday [10 March 1967] by Asst. D. A. Ward that Dist. Atty. Jim Garrison would lead the state presentation at the hearing, assisted by Assistant DA's Alvin Oser and James Alcock" and so it happened (Dempsey). Why would Garrison write such statement in his book *On the Trail of the Assassins* if it was not entirely true?

This preliminary hearing differed from an ordinary one. One of the unexpected aspects of the event was the fact that there were three judges. It was a big surprise when Judge Bargert “called upon two of his colleagues Malcolm J. O’Hara and Matthew S. Braniff, to sit with him in the conducting the hearing... this marks the first time in the memory of veteran court attachés that three judges have sat on a preliminary hearing” (Dempsey). Was it really necessary? I realize that the case had been watched closely by the public and thus it was very important to show that it matters but why the three judges? In the preliminary hearing there is no jury only the judge decides whether there will be a trial or not. Can three judges decide? Does their decision need to be unanimous (usually it has to be) or is two-thirds majority enough?

6.1 Perry Raymond Russo

Perry Russo was one of the two key witnesses who gave a testimony in the preliminary hearing. He was an insurance agent from Baton Rouge, Louisiana. He knew David Ferrie and he sent a letter to Garrison’s office offering help with the case but he was ignored until provided an interview for *Baton Rouge State-Times* on February 24, 1967. According to James Alcock, the D.A. Office had never received his letter, in fact during the actual trial Mr. Alcock (or the State) should present the letter but when Mr. Dymond asked for it (Russo did not have a copy) Mr. Alcock said this:

We don't know where the letter is. I don't know of anybody in the District Attorney's Office that ever received the letter. I will, however, tonight make a diligent effort to locate it, but I think this was the same situation we were confronted with at the preliminary hearing. I don't know, I know I have never personally seen the letter and I don't know of any member of our staff that has. The interview immediately caught Garrison’s attention and thus he contacted the man... (“Testimony of Perry Raymond Russo”)

According to Garrison, Russo recognized a picture of Clay Shaw saying that he knew the man as Bertrand and he also remembered “Shaw and Ferrie engaging in a discussion of the prospective murder of John Kennedy” (Garrison 176).

Garrison's team needed to be sure Russo was not lying and also to have something to support Russo's truthfulness in court. First they "considered to use a "lie detector" test, but since such tests are highly imperfect and inadmissible in court" they rejected the idea (Garrison 177). From Garrison's point of view it is understandable. However, it is not clear for what purpose Garrison chose to use hypnosis and Sodium Pentothal (also know under the name "the serum of truth") on Russo instead. Would this not be even more inadmissible to the court? In fact, doing this only hurt the case, despite the fact that Garrison later claimed they did it also for Russo to remember the details better beside to make sure he was actually telling the truth. Was it not obvious that the defense would use this in their own advantage and eventually for discrediting the testimony with it (they suggested that some of Russo's memory was changed and memories implanted during the procedures)? Was there not a better and more credible way to make sure Russo was not lying?

The preliminary hearing with Mr. Russo was constantly interrupted by Shaw's attorney F. Irving Dymond and his objections.

Russo testified that he knew Ferrie before and he had been in both of his apartments multiple times. In the middle of September there was a party with some people in Ferrie's apartment. Later when most of them left there were only four people remaining – David Ferrie, Perry Russo who "had no ride," and men who Russo knew as "Leon Oswald" and "Clem Bertrand," Russo also mentioned that at this point "it seemed it was no longer a party" ("Preliminary Hearing Testimony of Perry Raymond Russo"). According to Russo, Ferrie started talking enthusiastically about President Kennedy and the reasons why he should be eliminated and later he even started to create a plan for the actual assassination:

...It (the discussion) centered around the fact that in the assassination attempt, they would have to use diversionary tactics and this was Ferrie's favorite expression as he walked at that time. He raised his hand, showing the triangulation of cross fire involved that would have to be required and he pointed to this finger and this finger saying that there would be three people, or at the very minimum, two involved, but necessarily three he felt, and that one of them would shoot a diversionary shot or another, maybe two, one or two, would shoot diversionary shots and the third was the intended direct hit, or the good shot. That is the way he phrased it... ("Preliminary Hearing Testimony of Perry Raymond Russo")

This was the main part of the testimony; Russo also testified that there was a discussion about getting away with the murder of the President and other matters but nothing was as straightforward.

6.2 Vernon J. Bundy Jr.

Vernon Bundy was the other Garrison's key witness to testify in the preliminary hearing. He was an African-American drug addict with a criminal record. Obviously, for anybody back in late 60's it would be very hard to believe such person unless the person would be very persuasive.

At the preliminary hearing, Bundy testified that in the summer 1963 (either June or July, he was not sure) he went to Lake Pontchartrain. According to Bundy, he was about to take drugs when a black car arrived, he was afraid that it might have been the police but it was Clay Shaw, he passed Bundy and waited for a while. In a moment Lee Harvey Oswald arrived and joined Shaw. Bundy heard Oswald saying "Well, what am I going to tell her?" and Shaw answering "Don't worry. I told you I was going to take care of it" ("Preliminary Hearing Testimony of Vernon Bundy").

Bundy also saw some sort of a money handover and some leaflets sticking out from Oswald's pocket. He later used one of the leaflets (a few of them was lying on the ground) to wrap his tools he used for taking heroin after the two men left. Bundy remembered there was the word CUBA printed on them but again he was not sure about the rest of the title on it. Could those leaflets be the leaflets Oswald was handling out in New Orleans the very same summer?

This time the examination was not interrupted as much as in Russo's case. In fact Mr. Dymond objected only once and there was no long discussion about the objection. Also Judge Malcolm V. O'Hara asked now and then but the whole testimony was much shorter than Russo's.

6.3 The Result of the Preliminary Hearing

At the end of the four-day preliminary hearing there were some arguments between the judges but finally Judge Bernard J. Bagert made this statement:

...This court finds that sufficient evidence has been presented to establish probable cause that a crime has been committed, and, further, that sufficient evidence has been presented to justify the bringing into play the further steps of the criminal process against the arrestee, Clay L. Shaw... (“Final Arguments”)

This was a small victory for Garrison and his team, just a first step toward the trial and ideally winning the case for the state.

7 THE ACTUAL TRIAL (*STATE OF LOUISIANA VERSUS CLAY SHAW*)

In Garrison’s eyes the investigation led to very surprising discoveries such as involvement of US intelligence agencies in the assassination of the president, serious violations of law during the autopsy and manipulation of the body, violation of the safety regulations for the presidential motorcade, non-matching ballistics, the fact that Lee Harvey Oswald may not have shot at all, edited photos or ignoring important eye witnesses from the crime scene and other people involved. However, because of understandable reasons for the actual trial he decided not to use all the evidence and all the witnesses and go with the theory of Oswald actually doing the shooting but not all by himself and on someone’s order. Garrison also excluded the role of C.I.A. and Secret Service because of indirect evidence and again it was reasonable all he needed was to prove the connection between the assassination and Clay Shaw through David Ferrie and Lee Harvey Oswald.

7.1 The Witnesses

After collecting and presenting enough evidence and when the case was officially opened and Clay Shaw was on March 1st 1967 arrested, Garrison and his team of investigators had to make a hard decision. They had to choose the people they will actually call in the courtroom as witnesses for the case. The safety of those people was very important for Garrison, knowing what happened to David Ferrie and that some other key witnesses were scared off or they moved away and hid, he did not want to endanger more people than was necessary. Also as an experienced attorney he knew that he cannot use anybody as a witness just because he or she would support his evidence. Garrison’s main aim was to prove Clay Shaw guilty and for doing that the most important thing to prove was the fact that there were more people shooting at Dealey and that Shaw was the man in

charge. In the end, the list of witness was reduced and even some very important ones were not used e.g. Richard Case Nagell and Julia Ann Mercer. These two people had given interesting testimonies but they were only “peripheral to the case” so there was no need to call them in (Garrison 268). What Garrison did not know is that it probably would not be a good idea to present them as witnesses since there are holes in their testimonies that he did not see back then.

Nagell was a federal intelligence agent (he did not want to tell Garrison which agency he belonged to) who contacted Garrison to provide him with some interesting information concerning the Kennedy assassination. He claimed that in 1963 (a few months before the assassination) he found out about the plan to assassinate the President and tried to warn the government and that for doing so he was sent to the federal prison (Garrison 215). However, in Dick Russell’s book *The Man Who Knew Too Much*, Nagell is described as a double agent of C.I.A. and K.G.B. who worked undercover and was supposed to stop any possible assassination but he got into the prison (by himself). His testimony toward Garrison was certainly interesting; it was not so credible though. Garrison could not possibly know that due to Nagell’s military past (beside other events that happened to him) his mental condition was not quite right and his “judgment and perception of reality was seriously disturbed” (Russell 63).

Mercer told Garrison that she saw Jack Ruby in a pick-up truck dropping a man with a *rifle* to the grassy knoll *one hour* before the assassination. Also that she went to the authorities to testify; however, later she found out that her testimony was changed now stating that she was not able to recognize the man she saw in the car. Garrison decided not to use her and he did not even provide her current name and location because he was afraid that something might happen to her (Garrison 253). Nevertheless, it is questionable whether she is credible since her testimony slightly differs each time it is presented. According to the transcript of the Dallas Police radio transmission, there really was a broken down pick-up truck on the road that Mercer probably saw *the morning* of the assassination and also at first she told the police that the man took something looking like a *rifle case* from the pick-up truck. Finally, in the interview with Henry Hurt for his book *Reasonable Doubt* she said that a young man “removed (from the pick-up truck) a *package* that she believed was a rifle wrapped in paper” *three hours* before the assassination (Hurt 115). In addition she described the young man as Lee Harvey Oswald and she also added a

few details. The question arises: Does she speak the truth and as time passes she just forgets certain things or are her words nothing but lies?

Shortly before the trial Charles Spiesel appeared ready to testify in front of the jury. Garrison was not sure about adding the new witness because of all the people who were purposely foiling the investigation and the case. Spiesel's testimony seemed too simple and direct to Garrison but Jim Alcock decided to use him after all.

Finally, On January 29, 1969, the case came to trial. The first people to testify for the Garrison's side were men from a small town called Clinton. They were called to support Bundy's testimony from the preliminary hearing. They both saw sort of a meeting in the town (just like Vernon Bundy did) which clearly connected Clay Shaw to David Ferrie and Lee Harvey Oswald.

7.1.1 Clay Shaw is Clay Bernard?

The most important fact that needed to be proven was Shaw's nickname Bertrand since a man called Clay Bertrand was with no doubt a man who arranged an attorney for Lee Harvey Oswald. Three witnesses were supposed to give their testimonies.

Mrs. Jesse Parker was "a hostess at V.I.P. room of the New Orleans International Airport" (Garrison 238). She saw Clay Shaw (with another man) signing the guestbook as "Clay Bertrand." She was also asked by F. Irving Dymond, one of defendant's attorneys, how she could be sure that the one of two gentlemen who signed the guestbook as Clay Bertrand was Mr. Shaw and not the other gentleman. She replied that "the other man had not interested me, but I had admired the defendant's 'pretty gray hair' and she'd particularly noticed his height" (Shaw was more than six feet tall) (Kirkwood 349).

To support this statement a handwriting expert Mrs. Elizabeth McCarthy was called. According to Mrs. McCarthy, "it is highly probable that Clay Shaw signed the signature Clay Bertrand" ("Testimony of Elizabeth McCarthy"). During her testimony, Mr. Dymond tried to question her qualification as a handwriting expert. He did not succeed.

The last witness to testify for the State about the matter was New Orleans Police officer Aloysius Habighorst. Garrison writes this about it:

He was the police desk officer who booked Clay Shaw after we arrested him... We instructed the court attaché to call Officer Habighorst. But before Habighorst could take the stand, Judge Haggerty suddenly ordered the jury

removed from the court. Then he informed Jim Alcock, who was questioning at the time, that he was going to rule inadmissible the fingerprint card, signed by Shaw, on which "Clay Bertrand" had been typed in the space designated for "alias." Haggerty went on to say that he would not believe whatever Officer Habighorst said, anyway... (Garrison 284)

According to Garrison and officer Habighorst, it was a standard procedure to ask for the name and alias which Habighorst did and there was no need for a lower to be present. Shaw was "greatly shaken by his arrest" and he replied "Clay Bertrand" and Habighorst typed the alias in (Garrison 282). This would connect Shaw directly to Oswald and the fact that he said it himself would also help the case to prove that the connections proved earlier were true.

One has to wonder what made Jude to say such thing about a police officer he did not know and to cancel such important evidence. Was there any indication that the police officer would lie in the court room or that he made the alias up?

However, there is a little problem with this - this is not entirely true. In fact it was assistant D.A. James Alcock who asked judge Haggerty to remove the jury since it was in accordance with the law. According to an extract of the transcript of whole incident, Officer Habighorst gave his testimony and after direct examination and the cross-examination the judge said: "Officer Habighorst violated in spirit and in effect the Miranda decision, because if he asked questions...if he did it is inadmissible because he did not forewarn Mr. Shaw of his right to remain silent... so even if Officer Habighorst is telling the truth about what he did testify to – and I doubt it very seriously... [he was interrupted and after a little argument with James Alcock he continued]... I do not believe Officer Habighorst, I do not believe him." (Reitzes).

It seems not correct for a judge to say such things, but he apparently had a reason for it. However, what was the reason for the judge not to believe Officer Habighorst; that is something to debate about. Possibly, when the officer spoke he did not sound credible or maybe the judge had some sort of a prejudice against him. Is it possible that judge Haggerty had a previous experience with Officer Habighorst so he could know for sure that he had lied before?

7.1.2 Shaw's Connections to David Ferrie and Lee H. Oswald

Another key witness who came to speak was Vernon Bundy. He had already testified in the preliminary hearing at the very beginning of the trial. He repeated his previous statements with more details and surprised everybody in the courtroom by adding a little demonstration of how exactly he could be sure that the man he saw with Lee Oswald at Lake Pontchartrain was Clay Shaw:

Standing up from the witness chair, he asked to have Clay Shaw step to the rear of the courtroom.

...“Would the gentleman approach me?” Vernon Bundy asked. (Shaw did so)... Bundy seemed satisfied and returned to the witness chair while Clay Shaw reoccupied his seat. When the courtroom had settled down Bundy said, "I watched his foot the way it twisted that day." Vernon Bundy wiggled his own foot. "This is one way I identified this man the next time I saw him." Bundy told of coming into the courtroom with an assistant district attorney and observing Shaw before he'd testified in the preliminary hearing, adding, "The twisting of his foot had frightened me that day on the seawall when I was about to cook my drugs."

Clay Shaw, because of his bad back, does have, at times, a labored, slightly stiff walk... (Kirkwood 227)

Bundy's demonstration was very convincing and ensuring that he was telling the truth.

Everything looked good after Bundy's testimony. Now Charles Spiesel was about to speak, what followed Garrison described as “the bomb that shattered our case” (Garrison 276). Spiesel testified about his trip to New Orleans in May 1963 to see his daughter. He also talked about a bar in the French Quarter where he frequently appeared. Sometime in June David Ferrie and another man with two women asked him to go with them to a party in apartment in the Dauphine and Esplanade Streets (it is approximately where Shaw lived) where they met a few more people one of them being Clay Shaw. Here is a summary of what happened next in the apartment after the man and two women who came along had left:

Spiesel: "Someone brought up the name of President Kennedy and just about everybody began to criticize him. Then someone said that 'somebody ought to kill the son of a b!'" The witness said he did not know who said those words but he claimed that at first Clay Shaw seemed "amused" at the conversation. Soon another man voiced a desire to kill the President but wondered how it could be done. According to Spiesel, the talk continued for five or six minutes, and finally it was agreed that "It would have to be done with a high-powered rifle with a telescopic sight and about a mile away." Spiesel claimed Clay Shaw entered into the conversation when the talk got around to the difficulty of the killer's getaway, at which time he discussed the possibility of flying the assassin to safety with David Ferrie... (Kirkwood 232)

Dymond cross-examined Spiesel; it was as if "he knew just what questions to ask" (Garrison 277). This might be true since Dymond started his cross-examination "with a subtle undercoating of relish in his low easy voice" (Kirkwood 239). First he asked about Spiesel's complaining about "hypnosis and psychological warfare" (Garrison 277). Spiesel answered that he had been hypnotized several times in New York, New Jersey and New Orleans between the years 1948 and 1954. He also claimed (after he was asked about it) that during those hypnoses there were some thoughts inserted in his mind that he later considered being his own. Spiesel was then asked about his paranoid behavior including fingerprinting his daughter when she went to the Louisiana State University and then again when she came back home after the semester in order to make sure that this daughter is the same one that left.

After this testimony Garrison was convinced that Spiesel was plant to sap credibility of other witnesses of offence.

The next witness would improve the jury's opinion and hopefully they would forget about Spiesel. Perry Russo was probably the most important witness whose testimony again connected Clay Shaw, David Ferrie and Lee Harvey Oswald. He repeated his previous testimony about these three men talking about details of the assassination at Ferrie's apartment which he gave during the preliminary hearing but this time he was exterminated for two days (Garrison 278).

Later, a few more witnesses were called from Dallas. They were mostly the people who were standing close the presidential motorcade the day of assassination and could testify what they saw and heard to help establish that President Kennedy was shot by more than one man and thus there was a conspiracy (Garrison 278).

7.1.3 Defendant Side

There were also witnesses for the defendant's side. Mostly they were people from Shaw's circles who were supposed to testify that Clay Shaw was a model citizen and establish his good reputation for the jury. Beside those people there were two probably the most important witnesses of the defense one of them being Lieutenant Colonel Pierre A. Finck, M.D. who was one of the three men who performed the autopsy of President Kennedy.

Dr. Finck was asked to describe the wounds on the President's neck and head and conclude the trajectory of the bullets for the jury. First he was questioned by Irvin Dymond. Fink strongly supported "the back-of-the-neck" entrance wound (although from the photos from the autopsy it is clear that the wound is significantly lower than the back of the neck) ("Testimony of Colonel Pierre A. Finck"). Dr. Finck also claimed that there must have been only one rifleman and all the bullets came from the back. After this examination assistant D.A. Alvin Oser asked Dr. Finck about the autopsy of President Kennedy, precisely about the procedure itself that was not done the way it was common. Dr. Fink defended himself with an argument that some "military people" told him not to do the autopsy the usual way. These military people were neither doctors nor pathologists yet, according to Dr. Fink, they were telling the actual doctors what they should or should not do. Dr. Finck seemed confused:

Dr. Finck: I will remind you that I was not in charge of this autopsy, that I was called--

Mr. Oser: You were a co-author of the report though, weren't you, Doctor?

Dr. Finck: Wait. I was called as a consultant to look at these wounds; that doesn't mean I am running the show.

Mr. Oser: Was Dr. Humes [leader of the autopsy] running the show?

Dr. Finck: Well, I heard Dr. Humes stating that -- he said, "Who is in charge here?" and I heard an Army General, I don't remember his name,

stating, "I am." You must understand that in those circumstances, there were law enforcement officers, military people with various ranks, and you have to co-ordinate the operation according to directions.

Mr. Oser: But you were one of the three qualified pathologists standing at that autopsy table, were you not, Doctor?

Dr. Finck: Yes, I am.

Mr. Oser: Was this Army General a qualified pathologist?

Dr. Finck: No.

Mr. Oser: Was he a doctor?

Dr. Finck: No, not to my knowledge.

Mr. Oser: Can you give me his name, Colonel?

Dr. Finck: No, I can't. I don't remember.

Mr. Oser: Do you happened to have the photographs and X-rays taken of President Kennedy's body at the time of the autopsy and shortly thereafter? Do you?

Dr. Finck: I do not have X-rays or photographs of President Kennedy with me... ("Testimony of Colonel Pierre A. Finck")

Dr. Finck's inability to answer certain questions is surprising. He was also asked about the examinations he did during the autopsy and he admitted that he did not follow the usual procedures instead he rather followed the orders given by the admirals and generals present. For example, according to the testimony of Dr. Fink, the standard procedure was to examine each wound and trace the trajectory of the bullets which was not done because the military people insisted on examining only the head wound and the trajectories were not traced at all. One has to wonder why the autopsy was not done as it should have been done especially if the corpse was the President of USA. The fact that he let all those people tell him what to do even though he knew the best what to do is also very surprising. The fact that he did not have the X-rays was, according to Garrison, expected since Dr. Nichols wanted to see them too but his request was denied just like his request to examine presidential limousine (Garrison 292).

Another witness was, to Garrison's surprise, Clay Shaw himself even though according to Garrison, he did not have to testify. After providing some information about his life, Shaw of course denied that he had ever met or talked to Lee H. Oswald, David Ferrie or Perry Raymond Russo. To most of the questions concerning these people he always answered just "No, I never have" ("Testimony of Clay L. Shaw"). For some reason he was also asked whether he had ever owned or worn a hat again with negative answers. In fact the whole testimony was full of negative answers which bring a question what was the point of it then? Shaw had already testified for the court once and it was also mostly negative answers based but this testimony actually added something to the case while this second time it was a reaction to the other testimonies and it was obvious that Shaw would deny everything otherwise there would not be any trial at all.

After Shaw's testimony there were only few other witnesses.

7.2 The Most Interesting Evidence Presented

Proving that there were more shooters was very important for Garrison's case not only because it would disprove the *Warren Commission Report* also it would support his theory and evidence collected.

Dr. John Nichols was qualified as "an expert on pathology and forensic pathology" (Garrison 281). He studied the Zapruder film and other photographs of the assassination for Garrison's case. In his testimony he stated that from the footage and other photos "it is compatible with the gunshot having been delivered from the front," ("Testimony of Dr. John Marshall Nichols"). He talked about the injuries of Kennedy and Connelly and explained thoroughly to the jury that only one bullet really could not cause such damage to both men. There must have been a shot from behind as well but also from a different angle which would indicate not just two but three assassins (just like Ferrie allegedly planned in the meeting with Oswald and Shaw).

7.3 The End of the Trial

According to the transcripts of the trial, as usual, at the end of the entire trial there were closing arguments of assistants D.A. James Alcock and Alvin E. Oser as well as closing argument of the defendant's attorney F. Irvin Dymond followed by Alcock's and Oser's rebuttals and the closing summation by Jim Garrison which he asked for.

Judge Edward Haggerty also had a speech for the jury. He emphasized that the jury should not be biased and the decision should be based only on the facts and evidence presented and that they should not and cannot take in consideration their prejudice, conjecture, public opinion, sympathy, passion or any other feeling they might have toward the defendant. Also he pointed out that their decision was very important and it might change Clay Shaw's life and he emphasized the well known phrase that the defendant "is presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt" ("Judge's Charge to the Jury"). It is probably normal that a judge has such speech every time but when the speech is read thoroughly; it is possible to see that there is too much of the expression "not guilty" in the speech.

7.4 The Verdict

The verdict was finally revealed. It was read by a clerk: "March 1, 1969, New Orleans, Louisiana. We the Jury find the defendant not guilty" ("The Verdict"). This was not surprising for Garrison and he claimed that he would continue to believe in Shaw's guilt but he also mentioned that he "did not feel vindictive toward Shaw" (Garrison 293). However, Garrison was often described as being obsessed by Shaw.

The verdict that set Clay Shaw free was like verification to the *Warren Commission Report* also it meant a lot of problems for Garrison and his carrier. *New Orleans States-Item* wrote about him an article titled *Garrison Should Resign* on March 1st in 1969:

District Attorney Jim Garrison should resign. He has shown himself unfit to hold the office of district attorney or any other office.

Mr. Garrison has abused the vast powers of his office. He has perverted the law rather than prosecuted it. His persecution of Clay L. Shaw was a perversion of the legal process such as has not been often seen.

Mr. Garrison's conspiracy case was built upon the quicksands of unreliability and in the end it did not stand up. A 12-man jury found unanimously that Mr. Shaw is innocent.

Clay L. Shaw has been vindicated, but the damage to his reputation caused by Mr. Garrison's witch hunt may never be repaired. It is all too shameful.

This travesty of justice is a reproach to the conscience of all good men and must not go unanswered. Mr. Garrison himself should now be brought to the bar to answer for his conduct. ... (“Garrison Should Resign”)

This was the first article of a long row of articles about Garrison suggesting his resignation and dishonoring him and his decisions as an attorney. Garrison decided not to resign and even ran for his re-election to the office. He lost his case, however, he obviously made his point and even though his reputation was shaken his voters believed him not the media and he was re-elected to the office of the district attorney of New Orleans (he had about 20,000 more voters than his opponent that is 53% of the votes) (Garrison 296).

The trial was over but the case of Jim Garrison did not end here.

8 THE TRIALS AFTER THE TRIAL

On June 30, 1971 Jim Garrison was arrested. He and nine other men were accused of participating in organized crime, more specifically of “accepting bribes from gamblers in New Orleans involving illegal pinball machines” (Whitney). According to Garrison, the accusations were nonsense created to discredit him in the eyes on the public and end his career as a District Attorney as well as ruin his reputation and thus make his investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy look just as untrustworthy as himself (Garrison 301). Garrison “stated to the press that he was convinced from the start of his investigation that the Federal Government would try to either kill him or put him in prison,” he had the support of the citizens of New Orleans and he “was released on \$5000 bail, although both the Metropolitan Crime Commission of New Orleans and the *States-Item* paper demanded his resignation” (Whitney).

The main evidence against Garrison was tape recordings and a “star witness” for the U.S. government Pershing Gervais a friend of Garrison’s and also his former chief investigator who is described as an arrogant “thief grafter and ruffian” with criminal past; although he was accused several times of various felonies, he was rarely found guilty (Bourg).

According to Garrison, “Gervais informed the I.R.S. agents that there was nothing he could tell them about me [Garrison] because he would not take and he could not get me to do anything illegal” (Garrison 303). However, Garrison borrowed Gervais 5000\$ at some point and that was enough to frame him. Gervais started to come to Garrison’s house

and repay him the money in smaller sums while doing so he engaged in a conversations with Garrison all the time having a interception device on him. This repaying a loan was considered to be passing money from the pinball business people and those tapes had been altered and used as evidence against Garrison during the case of *The United States of America vs. Jim Garrison, et al.* Garrison realized that “if they (the agents) had to be so downright sleazy in their attempt to develop evidence against him, then that meant that their case against him had to be pretty pathetic” (Garrison 305). This was also probably a reason why Garrison decided to speak for himself in the courtroom.

The trial started on August 20, 1973 and it “was expected to last four to six weeks,” and since the elections for the D.A. Office were on November 10 it basically meant that Garrison “would be lucky to have five or six weeks afterwards to campaign, although at least five or six months usually is necessary in New Orleans” (Garrison 305).

Beside others Dr. Luis Gerstman was an important witness in this case he was “a professor of speech and hearing science at the City University of New York” and even though there were strong objections from the United States Attorney he testified that the tapes with Garrison’s voice were altered and thus won the case for him (Garrison 317).

Unfortunately, even though the case ended well for Garrison, he did not have enough time for the re-election campaign as he predicted and his opponent won by 2,000 votes. The second and last try to get him in jail came in early 1974 after he left the Office of District Attorney. This time he was “charged with income tax evasion for the failing to pay taxes on the money I never received from the pinball people...and was again found not guilty” (Garrison 318).

This raises a few questions. If Garrison’s case with Clay Shaw was nothing but a big bubble and Shaw was totally innocent and the U.S. intelligence agencies as well why would there be such an effort to get him in jail? Garrison lost, was it really necessary to put him in jail? Why would anybody try to do so even twice if there really was absolutely nothing about the Garrison’s findings? Moreover, Gervais “stated in his interview (with Rosemary James) that he was forced to both work and lie for the Justice Department against not only Garrison but the other co-defendants” because “he was the one who could get him [Garrison]” (Whitney). Why would the Justice Department force Gervais to do such things?

Assuming there was either no or very small chance of winning the two fabricated trials why would anyone go for it? The explanation that comes to mind is that the possible

purpose of these two lame tries (or at least one really lame and one at least decent) to frame Garrison might actually be to get him out of the D.A. Office. Regardless, how long can one get re-elected? Sooner or later Garrison would quit anyway, therefore it seems there was no point other than tarnish his reputation. But then again why would anyone do this if the case did not prove anything important?

9 CONCLUSION

The public was shocked by the tragic event of November 22, 1963, that is the only fact we can be absolutely sure of. What really happened on that day, we will probably never know. Which theory is the closest to the truth? Maybe someone has already presented the correct version but we will never know for sure. It has been proven that the Warren Commission was not entirely correct and if we cannot believe the official version and the government, what and who we should believe? Unfortunately, it is a web of unanswered questions and doubts that will never be fully uncovered. Garrison always told his children to take care so they could live long enough to find the whole truth since a big part of the documentation of the Warren Commission's investigation was supposed to stay classified for seventy-five years. Still, it is uncertain whether all the information will really be revealed in the year 2035.

Many eyewitnesses changed their testimonies over the years adding some details or changing the whole testimony from scratch. Also it is impossible to find out whether it is because they are not afraid any more or because they want to draw attention. Soon there will be no witnesses to speak at all and the only evidence left would be films, photos and documents and who knows to what extent they have been altered.

Garrison was neither the first person nor the last to doubt the official version and to try to find the whole truth. He might have not used the best methods to do so and he believed so much in his investigation that he might have accidentally or unknowingly fall for the illusion of Shaw being behind it all. However, Garrison's investigation was probably the closest and the biggest investigation of the assassination going against the official report.

In my opinion, we can know for sure that some of the Warren Commission's conclusions were not correct and Garrison and others pointed out the mistakes the commission made during their investigation. On the other hand, we cannot know if the Warren Commission did not have all the evidence or they omitted certain evidence on

purpose. Also we cannot know if all the witnesses were speaking the truth as their story constantly changed more or less each time they were asked about what they saw.

Maybe Garrison did not come to the right conclusions but why did he have to be crucified for it in the media? After all, all he wanted was for the people responsible for the death of the President to come in from of a jury and pay for their evil doing. It makes me wonder why the more evidence he collected the more he was ridiculed by the media just for believing that the events of 22nd November 1963 go deeper than Lee Harvey Oswald.

Also, if there was absolutely nothing to his investigation and evidence collected why David Ferrie and others died, and why did one of Garrison's oldest friends turn against him along with the C.I.A. and F.B.I. and tried to get him in jail? People criticize the intelligence agencies all the time why Garrison had to be ridiculed by the media and betrayed by his friend?

To Summarize the Garrison's case, Garrison's investigation did not successfully prove that Shaw was Bertrand and his connections to the assassination; also the motives Shaw might have were not clearly explained. From what I could gather, Shaw was a director of the International Trade Mart in New Orleans and he allegedly was involved with Guy Banister and David Ferrie in the anti-Castro activities. Kennedy's decision not to involve in the Cuban situation could make Shaw dislike him because his decision did not support these activities. This does not seem to be a good motive of a murder but that is the only one mentioned.

In my opinion, Clay Shaw was not a model citizen and he certainly had some suspicious connections but still I do not believe he alone would create a plan to assassinate Kennedy even with the assistance of the U.S. government and intelligent agencies. However, I do believe that Garrison came close the truth by revealing the inconsistencies in the *Warren Commission Report* and the mysteries surrounding the deaths of Kennedy and Oswald and thus his case could not succeed and his reputation was ruined.

At the very beginning of my research I thought that Garrison was right with the evidence presented and that Shaw had at least something to do with the assassination although I admit there were some aspects of his theory I did not believe at all e.g. Shaw's connections to the Russian mafia. Reading through various articles, newspaper articles, testimonies and book extracts I became more and more suspicious and the opinions of mine slowly changed. The change might have been slow but it definitely was quite a big change of mind. Today, after looking into the case from different points of view and

examining the evidence, it is hard to admit that I was wrong. Garrison's lies or inaccuracies throughout his book *In the Trail of the Assassins* either in details or really big ones such as the supposedly changed route made me think about all his evidence and forced me to check it elsewhere. However, in my opinion he managed to present sufficient amount of correct information for me to believe that the Warren Commission made mistakes during its investigation. This has been later confirmed in 1990's.

Over all Garrison was a good district attorney as his voters proved by re-electing him, and latter he was a good judge, and even though after going through various aspects of the assassination and his investigation, my opinions have changed, I still believe he deserved more than a ridicule and public humiliation.

WORKS CITED

- Aguilar, Garry L. "The House Select Committee on Assassinations and the Autopsy Photographic Evidence." *The Assassination Web* 6 March 2010. Imagi-vision, Inc. Web. 31 May 2012.
- Bourg, Gene. "The Long Checkered Career of One Pershing Gervais, City Hall Report." *New Orleans State Item* 3 July 1971: 4. Web. 31 May 2012.
- Craig, John S. "Mystery of David Ferrie." *Akron Community Online Resource Network*. Web. 17 Apr. 2012.
- Dempsey, Jack. "Many Surprises Already, Shaw Preliminary Hearing Unique." *New Orleans State-Item* 11 March 1967: 1,2. Web. 19 May 2012.
- "Ed Hoffman: Did He See a Grassy Knoll Shooter?" *The Kennedy Assassination*. John McAdams. 1995 – 2012. Web. 19 May 2012.
- Fetzer, James. "Dealy Plaza Revisited: What Happened to JFK?." 23 Nov. 2009. *James Fetzer: Exposing Falsehoods and Revealing Troughs*. Web. 19 Apr. 2012.
- Files, James. Interview for *I Shot JFK* 1994. Web. 26 Mar. 2012.
- "Final Arguments." *Transcript: State of Louisiana vs. Clay L. Shaw Preliminary Hearing, March 17, 1967*. New Orleans: Deidrech & Pickett, Inc. 1967. Web. 21 May 2012.
- Friedrich, Ron. "Ed Hoffman's Changing Story." *Kennedy Assassination Chronicles* 1.2 (1995): JFK Lancer. Web. 18 May 2012.
- Garrison, Jim. *On the Trail of the Assassins*. New York: Warner Books, 1991. Print.
- "Garrison Should Resign." *New Orleans States-Item* 1 March 1969: 1. Web. 20 Apr. 2012.

- Griffith, Michael T. "Only the Facts? Eyewitness vs. Lone-Gunman Theory." *Real Issues Home Page* Michael T. Griffith. 2000 – 2009. Web. 18 Apr. 2012.
- Holland, Sam M. Interview by Mark Lane. *Interview with S. M. Holland* (1966). Web. 30 May 2012.
- Hurt, Henry. *Reasonable Doubt*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. 1986. Print.
- James, Rosemary, Jack Dempsey, and David Snyder. "Mysterious Trips Cost Large Sums." *New Orleans State-Item* 17 February 1967: 1, 6. Web. 19 Apr. 2012.
- "Judge's Charge to the Jury." *Transcript: State of Louisiana vs. Clay L. Shaw, February 28, 1969*. New Orleans: Deidrech & Pickett, Inc. 1969. Web. 12 Mar. 2012.
- Kirkwood, James. *American Grotesque: An Account of the Clay Shaw-Jim Garrison-Kennedy Assassination Trial in New Orleans*. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc. 1992. Print.
- Knuth, Magen. "The Long Brown Bag." *The Kennedy Assassination*. John McAdams. 1995 – 2012. Web. 3 Jun. 2012.
- Lane, Mark, and Emile de Antonio. *Rush to Judgment*. New York: Judgment Films Corporation, 2. June 1967. Web. 31 May 2012.
- Mars, Jim. *Crossfire: The Plot that killed Kennedy*. New York: Basic Books. 1989. Print.
- Muchmore, Maria M. *The Muchmore Film* 22 Nov. 1963. Web. 27 May 2012.
- Nix, Orville. *The Nix Film* 22 Nov. 1963. Web. 11 Apr. 2012.
- O'Conner, Paul K. Interview by Nigel Turner for "The Forces of Darkness." *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. Central Television. ITV, London. 25. Oct. 1988. Web. 25 Apr. 2012.

Palamara, Vince. "59 Witness: Delay on Elm Street." *Community Online Resource Network* 1998. Web. 30 Apr. 2012.

"Preliminary Hearing Testimony of Perry Raymond Russo." *Transcript: State of Louisiana vs. Clay L. Shaw Preliminary Hearing, March 14, 1967*. New Orleans: Deidrech & Pickett, Inc. 1967. Web. 20 May 2012.

"Preliminary Hearing Testimony of Vernon Bundy." *Transcript: State of Louisiana vs. Clay L. Shaw Preliminary Hearing, March 17, 1967*. New Orleans: Deidrech & Pickett, Inc. 1967. Web. 20 May 2012.

"Presidential Motorcade Route." *Dallas Morning News* 22 November 1963: 1,4. Web. 23 May 2012.

"Primary Sources: Autopsy." *Spartacus Educational*. John Simkin, 1997 – 2012. Web. 1 Jun. 2012.

Proctor, Grover B. "A reply to Student's Questions." *The JFK Assassinations, Articles by Dr. Grover B. Proctor, Jr.* Dr. Grover B. Proctor, Jr. 1995 – 2012. Web. 30 Apr. 2012.

Reitzes, David A. "Concealing Problems with Key Testimony." *The Kennedy Assassination*. John McAdams. 1995 – 2012. Web. 15 May 2012.

Rike, Aubrey. Interview by Nigel Turner for "The Forces of Darkness." *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. Central Television. ITV, London. 25. Oct. 1988. Web. 25 Apr. 2012.

Russell, Dick. *The Man Who Knew Too Much*. New York: Carroll & Graf. 1996. Print.

Sitzman, Marilyn. Interview by Josiah Thompson. *Six Seconds in Dallas*. New York: Random House, 1967, p. 102. Print.

“Testimony of Clay L. Shaw.” *Transcript: State of Louisiana vs. Clay L. Shaw, February 27, 1969*. New Orleans: Deidrech & Pickett, Inc. 1969. Web. 10 May 2012.

“Testimony of Colonel Pierre A. Finck.” *Transcript: State of Louisiana vs. Clay L. Shaw, February 24, 1969*. New Orleans: Deidrech & Pickett, Inc. 1969. Web. 11 Apr. 2012

“Testimony of Dr. John Marshall Nichols.” *Transcript: State of Louisiana vs. Clay L. Shaw, February 28, 1969*. New Orleans: Deidrech & Pickett, Inc. 1969. Web. 10 Apr. 2012.

“Testimony of Elizabeth McCarthy.” *Transcript: State of Louisiana vs. Clay L. Shaw, February 28, 1969*. New Orleans: Deidrech & Pickett, Inc. 1969. Web. 17 May 2012.

“Testimony of Perry Raymond Russo.” *Transcript: State of Louisiana vs. Clay L. Shaw, February 10, 1969*. New Orleans: Deidrech & Pickett, Inc. 1969. Web. 10 May 2012.

"The Coup D'Etat." *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. Central Television. ITV, London. 25. Oct. 1988. Web. 20 Feb. 2012.

“The Cover-Up.” *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. Arts & Entertainment Company. ITV. Nov. 1991. Web. 20 Apr. 2012.

"The Forces of Darkness." *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. Central Television. ITV, London. 25. Oct. 1988. Web. 25 Apr. 2012.

“The Verdict.” *Transcript: State of Louisiana vs. Clay L. Shaw, March 1, 1969*. New Orleans: Deidrech & Pickett, Inc. 1969. Web. 3 Apr. 2012.

“The Patsy.” *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*. Arts & Entertainment Company. ITV. Nov. 1991. Web. 15 Mar. 2012.

Warren, Earl and the United States Warren Commission. *The Official Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy*. LaVergne: Filibust, 2010. Print.

Wecht, Cyril H. *Cyril H. Wecht*. 2006. Web. 15 Feb. 2012.

Whitney, Peter R. “Pershing Gervais and the Attempt to Frame Jim Garrison.” *The Fourth Decade* 1.4 (1994): 3 – 7. Web. 30 May 2012.

Zapruder, Abraham. *The Zapruder Film*. 22. Nov. 1963. Web. 10 Apr. 2012.

SUMMARY IN CZECH

Práce popisuje průběh vyšetřování atentátu na prezidenta Kennedyho a okolnosti, které k němu vedly, vedené Jimem Garrisonem a jeho kolegy. Stejně tak popisuje i nezpochybňovanější aspekty *Zprávy Warrenovy komise* a chyby, kterých se Warrenova komise dopustila v průběhu jejího vyšetřování. V této práci jsou prezentovány důkazy, které vedly k zatčení Lee Harvey Oswalda, a možnost, že by Oswald mohl být nevinný. Jsou zde dále popsány závěry Jima Garrison a hlavní části soudního procesu s Clayem Shawem, který byl na základě těchto závěrů a důkazů obviněn z podílení se na konspiraci, která zabila prezidenta.