

## **Tom Hanks, Gary Goetzman, and Bugliosi's Bungle: A Comprehensive Review of *Reclaiming History***

### **Part V-1:**

#### **Bugliosi vs. Garrison and Stone, or, How to Investigate a New Orleans Conspiracy from Pasadena**

James DiEugenio

It is with a sadness approaching trepidation that I address the part of *Reclaiming History* that deals with the investigation of New Orleans D.A. Jim Garrison, and Oliver Stone's film treatment of it in his 1991 movie *JFK*. Those feelings are one of the reasons I have delayed this installment. As I said at the beginning of this series, I like and admire Vincent Bugliosi both personally and professionally. For these reasons, amongst others, writing this critique has not been an enjoyable task. But as disappointing and unrewarding as *Reclaiming History* is, this particular chapter—90 pages in the text and 128 in the End Notes—is perhaps the low point in the volume. Clearly, something like a Jesuit strain of virus got into Bugliosi when he wrote this New Orleans chapter. It is so over-the-top, so slipshod in its presentation of facts and use of logic, so unbelievably one-sided and selective in its choice of witnesses and testimony, that it might have been written by the likes of James Kirkwood in 1969—or Dave Reitzes working for and with spooky John McAdams today. I am not engaging in hyperbole: as we will see very quickly, these are fair comparisons.

#### **V.1**

In any serious and scholarly presentation of the Garrison inquiry today, one would have to include the fact that there have been reams of documents discovered that alter the calculus of a factual database to draw from. This, of course, is why books like Kirkwood's are obsolete today. The Assassination Records Review Board (ARRB) did a good enough job in trying to secure the files of, and related to, the Garrison investigation. One source of new material was the files left behind by Garrison in the D.A.'s office, held by the man who succeeded him: Harry Connick; these are files I located myself in 1994 before the ARRB was seriously afoot. When I interviewed Connick about these five file cabinets—which I knew about from an HSCA memo—he was unaware that he held them; he had to call in an assistant to confirm that he did. The reason he was unaware of the presence of these files is quite interesting.

The reason is a man called Gary Raymond; and this is where Bugliosi begins to show his methodology about Garrison. Raymond was a former police officer who worked for Connick as an investigator for about ten years (*Probe*, July 1995). When Connick took over the office, he called Gary in and presented him with the Grand Jury testimony of all the Garrison witnesses; for example, Marina Oswald and Ruth Paine. He told Gary to destroy those records. When Raymond

hesitated on the grounds of historical significance, Connick replied with this: "Burn this sonofabitch and burn it today!" (*ibid.*) Fortunately, Raymond did not. He took the files home and kept them. But when the ARRB visited the town, Gary saw this as an opportunity to get rid of the files and give them to the public. So he called his pal and local TV reporter Richard Angelico. Angelico's employer, WDSU, eventually sent the Grand Jury transcripts to Washington—but not before Angelico broadcast a rather embarrassing TV news segment about what Connick wanted Raymond to do with the records. (We recorded the transcript in *Probe*, *ibid.*) Now, this whole tawdry episode about Connick attempting to destroy Grand Jury testimony surfaced in the media and created quite a splash in the summer of 1995. It stayed there because, when it was exposed, Connick went ballistic. He actually charged and tried both Raymond and Angelico. To secure and keep the two sets of files—the Grand Jury records and the file cabinets in his office—there followed a long legal struggle between Connick and the Justice Department. Connick fought the Justice Department for over a year before a federal court ordered him to turn the file cabinets over to the ARRB (*Probe*, Vol. 3, No. 6, p. 3). There was material in those file cabinets on interesting suspects and witnesses, like Kerry Thornley, Clyde Johnson, Emilio Santana, and Bernardo De Torres (*ibid.*, pp. 17–20). As we will see, Bugliosi ignores virtually all of it.

But there is an interesting background to the Connick versus Raymond struggle—and it makes Connick—and Bugliosi—look even worse. One of Raymond's investigative fields of specialty was pedophilia cases. After he left the office, Connick asked Gary to come back and review a case concerning a local priest. Gary reviewed all the materials, and then recommended that the D.A. prosecute the priest. But Connick chose not to act. Gary later encountered one of the poor boys that the priest had been molesting. He asked the lad if he wished to testify on the record. The boy said no, because the priest had threatened his life if he did so. Gary then wrote up a three-page memo on the incident and forwarded it to Connick's office. Still, the D.A. did not act. But Connick was angry because this memo now left a paper trail—which indicated Connick understood he was involved in a cover-up. When Gary confronted Connick with his inaction, Connick told him that the priest would not be prosecuted as long as he was the D.A. Raymond went to Angelico. The reporter did a five-day series on what became the famous Father Dino Cinel child abuse scandal. This case, and Connick's cover-up of it, foreshadowed the horrific scandal that shook the Catholic Church to its roots several years ago (*Probe*, July 1995, p. 4).

I expressed my reservations about writing this section in my prefatory remarks. In light of those remarks, the reader will not be surprised to know that not one word about Connick's role in either the attempted destruction of grand jury files or the cover up of the Dino Cinel pedophilia case is available in Bugliosi's book. Why not?

Because Bugliosi actually uses Connick as a witness against Garrison. No joke! What makes it worse is that it's the same old tired boilerplate that has been proven to be completely and utterly false: Connick tells Bugliosi that even before Garrison charged Clay Shaw, Garrison was viewed by the legal community as a four-flusher and could not make charges stick in cases he brought (Bugli-

osi, p. 1377). This is ridiculous. The truth is just about the opposite: Garrison tried many cases as an assistant D.A., and rose to be First Assistant under Malcolm O'Hara. Once he became D.A., Garrison significantly reversed the losing record of his predecessor, Richard Dowling. (For more details, see [ctka.net/reviews/mellen\\_2.html](http://ctka.net/reviews/mellen_2.html).)

Bugliosi also relates another canard in regard to Connick: he writes that Connick told him that Oliver Stone never asked about these files when the director met with him (pp. 1358–9). Question: How could Stone know about them without the HSCA document, which had not been declassified yet? But what Bugliosi does not say is that Connick has changed his story on this point. Back in 1995, for the *New York Times Magazine* (6 August 1995), Connick told propagandist Gerald Posner that he told Stone *he had the files*, and the director expressed no interest in seeing them. When Stone saw this, he accused Connick of lying. He replied in the *Times* that “I never had anything like the conversation with Harry Connick Sr. that is described in your article. And he never said anything remotely like the words he is quoted as using.” (*Probe*, September 1995, p. 15) It's pretty easy to measure who is lying here, because, as I noted above, I interviewed Connick about these files at least three years after he talked to Stone. It was my visit to his office that alerted him to the fact that he still had them. So how could he have told Stone about them if he didn't know they were there? And Bugliosi couldn't figure that out? Or is he actually trusting Gerald Posner?

Now in addition to not revealing Connick's rather repellent role in both of the above affairs—the child abuse scandal and the attempted destruction of grand jury records—Bugliosi does not tell the whole story about Connick's part in Shaw's prosecution. This is what he says about it: “Connick, who was an assistant US attorney at the time of the Shaw investigation and trial ...” (p. 1377). That's it. From this, you would not even know that Connick was stationed in New Orleans at the time of the trial. The fact is that Connick was actually part of Garrison's opposition in the Shaw trial: according to Gary Raymond, Connick sat in the courtroom every day of those proceedings, as a representative of the federal government, opposing Garrison. Connick was so wired into the Shaw case that he even sat in on preliminary interviews with FBI agents in Garrison's office, representing the FBI agents (*Probe*, September 1995, p. 16). Reportedly, he actually escorted Pierre Finck into the courtroom. Is it all just a coincidence, then, that Connick subsequently ran against Garrison for D.A.? Even if some of his backers were people like Clay Shaw and Carlos Bringuier? I don't think so. From all the above, plus more that I have left out, one could piece together the following: (1) Connick was picked to run because of his part in Shaw's defense; (2) once he won—due to the bad publicity from Garrison's two phony prosecutions which were timed for the election—it was cinched that nothing like what Garrison did would happen again; and (3) Connick would now cooperate in destroying any evidence Garrison had left behind. Which he did.

Why have I dwelled on the use of Connick? Because, later on, Bugliosi is going to do the standard anti-Garrison spin by calling many of Garrison's witnesses unreliable or shady characters—you know, kooks and nuts. He can do this because he wipes and cleans off an ugly specimen like Connick for the reader.

And after spraying Connick with Lysol, he uses this lying cover-up artist as a witness.

One of the very few sources more questionable than Connick on Jim Garrison is pseudo-journalist Hugh Aynesworth; and Bugliosi doesn't mind using him either—which is kind of shocking, mainly because the smelly trail on this self-confessed double-agent is even wider than Connick's. Let me just hit some of the lowlights. (See [ctka.net/aynesworth.html](http://ctka.net/aynesworth.html) for a longer treatment of the sordid details.) At the time of the assassination, Aynesworth was located in Dallas and working for the *Dallas Morning News*. He quickly tried to make a career out of Kennedy's murder: He was going to out-Warren-Commission the Warren Commission. Oswald's alleged shooting of Kennedy wasn't enough for Hugh. He actually tried to incriminate Oswald in an attempted murder of Richard Nixon. Well, even the Commission would not buy that one. And Hugh was also out to profit from the tragedy. Aynesworth somehow got hold of Oswald's "diary" from the Dallas Police Archives, which then began to appear throughout the country in at least three magazines. In a long FBI report on the heist, it appears that Assistant D.A. Bill Alexander pulled an inside job for his pal Aynesworth. (Bugliosi cannot reveal this FBI report because, in addition to Aynesworth, the indiscriminate Bugliosi also uses Alexander as a frequent source.) Aynesworth, his wife Paula, and Alexander supposedly split the take. The trio reportedly cut Marina out of their haul, even though Aynesworth was said to be sleeping with her at the time.

In late 1966, Aynesworth became part of *Life* magazine's secret re-entry into the JFK case. This is when he began being a stoolie to the FBI. He was hell-bent on informing Mr. Hoover of any discovery that might upset the Bureau's verdict that Oswald did it alone. On 12 December 1966 he informed the Bureau that they had uncovered a man who connected Ruby with Oswald. After Mark Lane's *Rush to Judgment* became a bestseller, he told the Bureau that Lane was a homosexual. But in his contacts with the Bureau, Hugh did something that all fake reporters do: he requested total anonymity. He did not want anyone to know he was a secret government agent.

This *Life* inquiry eventually ran into the probe being conducted by Jim Garrison, and the unwitting D.A. granted an interview request to the FBI informant masquerading as a reporter. After the interview, Aynesworth told his boss at *Life*, Hollis McCombs, that they should not let Garrison know they were playing "both sides". Recall, this is the first time he met the D.A. To understand what that phrase meant to Hugh, one must refer to an interview he did with a local Dallas TV station in 1979. On that show, he said, "I'm not saying there wasn't a conspiracy. I know most people in this country believe there was a conspiracy. I just refuse to accept it, and that's my life's work." (James DiEugenio, *Destiny Betrayed*, p. 163) I couldn't find this quote in *Reclaiming History*, even though I know Bugliosi has read my book. In light of this, Bugliosi then does something unintentionally funny. He goes ahead and quotes a reporter friend of Hugh's who says that he and Aynesworth really wanted to break the story that there was conspiracy behind the murder of President Kennedy. You know, they would be heroes and all that (p. 1113). So the author presents the true motivation

about a participant in the cover-up in the exact opposite light to that which it should be presented in. Whew.

With the Garrison investigation, Aynesworth became an informant for both the FBI and the White House (*Destiny Betrayed*, pp. 163–4). He was sending cables to Washington about his upcoming stories, and actually sending final drafts of those stories to the FBI office in Dallas. According to another local colleague, Lonnie Hudkins, Aynesworth also had ties to the CIA (Joan Mellen, *A Farewell to Justice*, p. 152). In fact, he actually applied for work for the CIA in 1964 and was referred to a recruiter (James DiEugenio and Lisa Pease, eds., *The Assassinations*, p. 25). By going through his personal reporting files, I also show that it is clear that he had CIA access, due to the incredible amount of background information he had about the witnesses and suspects in Garrison's investigation (*ibid.*, pp. 24–29). Aynesworth was supposed to be working for *Newsweek* at the time, but he was really working for Shaw's defense team, and his articles were being distributed by the CIA (William Davy, *Let Justice Be Done*, p. 133). Clearly, he was tied into certain double-agents inside the D.A.'s office, like Garrison investigator Bill Gurvich. And with their information, he went ahead and talked to certain witnesses when he knew Garrison was about to approach them. Why? He was trying to talk them out of their stories, or smearing the D.A. in advance. (And, as we shall see, probably even more.) Aynesworth was so wired into Garrison's office and Shaw's defense that he would relay his taped phone calls with prospective Garrison witnesses to defense lawyers, like Ed Wegmann (*The Assassinations*, p. 27). But Aynesworth was worse than that. One example: after Gurvich got him a purloined copy of a trial brief, Aynesworth went up to the Clinton–Jackson area to talk strong witnesses there out of their stories before the Shaw trial (*Destiny Betrayed*, p. 367). A key witness up there was Sheriff John Manchester, who identified Shaw as the driver of the car carrying David Ferrie and Lee Oswald. When the agent/reporter could not talk the local lawman out of his story, Hugh did what James Phelan and Walter Sheridan later did: he tried to bribe him with the offer of a well-paying and easy job. I rather like Manchester's reply: "I advise you to leave the area. Otherwise I'll cut you a new asshole." (Mellen, p. 235)

Recall what Bugliosi said at the beginning of his book: that he would not knowingly omit or distort anything (p. xxxix). So we are to believe that, in 21 years of research, Bugliosi could not find the following liabilities of these two witnesses:

1. Attempted destruction of Grand Jury testimony.
2. Actual destruction of D.A. records. (Connick later admitted to this: *Probe*, July 1995, p. 4.)
3. Cover-up of a child abuse ring inside the church.
4. Defiance of a federal agency, the ARRB.
5. Theft and sale of police property.

6. Suborning perjury (Aynesworth tried to get Marina to go along with the Nixon fable: *The Assassinations*, p. 26.)
7. A government agent masquerading as a reporter.
8. Witness tampering in a homicide investigation.
9. Attempted bribery of a witness in a murder case.

It's almost embarrassing for me to have to enumerate this list, because we must recall the obvious: Bugliosi is a lawyer. The above acts are not just unethical; most of them are illegal. But this is what happens to otherwise respectable people when they enter the JFK case: they pass through a Bermuda Triangle zone in which they somehow lose their balance and compass.

## V.2

Now that we know what Bugliosi is up to by using witnesses without worth, let us get back to the issue of what a real scholar would have done here. As I said, in spite of Connick, the ARRB has now made it possible to look anew at Garrison. But even though the ARRB has contributed mightily, no one will ever be able to truly evaluate the case Garrison could have mounted; and this is an issue that any responsible writer must address. Because, as illustrated above, Garrison's office was studded with double agents quite early; e.g., Gurvich and Gordon Novel. Therefore, his records were being ransacked from the beginning. And what makes this problem easy to explain is that one of the men in charge of those files was a likely infiltrator, namely, Tom Bethell. (Only John McAdams could take Bethell's diary seriously; it's about as much a "diary" as Lee Harvey Oswald's.) Garrison mentions this problem in the documentary film about him called *The Jim Garrison Tapes* (1992). He describes an investigator who came into his office with a briefcase that got larger all the time. Garrison understood after the fact—as he usually did—that he needed the bigger case to accommodate the files he was pilfering. (This is probably Bill Boxley, who we will discuss later.) So while the investigation was ongoing, Garrison was losing valuable information.

But after Shaw's trial, more information was lost. We have seen above that Connick admitted that he did destroy some files. We also know that Garrison himself lost some of these materials: he mentioned it in a letter he wrote to Zachary Sklar, who was editing his book at the time. He wrote he had stored some files in a friend's garage; but, somehow, the cabinets were stolen from the place. I also know from the late photography expert Richard Sprague that certain files that Garrison had given to Bud Fensterwald at the Assassination Archives Research Center in Washington are also gone. Sprague specifically mentioned files on the mysterious Fred Lee Crisman. Obviously, any person interested in performing a genuine evaluation of Garrison would have to conclude that such a thing is not really possible today, because of these lost materials. I would estimate that what we have today is probably about half of the records of the actual Garrison inquiry. Yet, even what we do have is pretty impressive.

But hints of what we don't have are available to us. For example, Garrison would make out what he called a "lead sheet" approximately every two weeks. On this he would enumerate new leads that came into his office that he wanted followed up. On one of those sheets he wrote down that there existed a film of Oswald with Clay Shaw. In none of the material I have seen have I ever read the follow-up report on this lead. Another very interesting record that was lost was the following: on a job application form, Oswald listed the name Jack Ruby as one of three references (FBI memo of 5 March 1967). This information was given to an FBI agent by an acquaintance whom Garrison had shown this document to. This document does not exist today. And I would be willing to bet money that once the FBI found out about it, they alerted someone like Boxley or Gurvich to steal it—just like I would be willing to wager that if the film of Oswald and Shaw existed, someone went to the person's home and said he was there to secure it for Garrison; and it then went to the Garrison desk at the CIA. (Such an office did exist; I will discuss it later.)

As I said above, any serious and scholarly treatment of Garrison today would have to incorporate all, or most, of the above facts—that is, the new documents, plus an acknowledgement of what was lost. If you include almost none of it, then you can easily be accused of having an agenda. So let us do an accounting. Bugliosi lists 297 footnotes to this 90-page chapter. But this is not entirely accurate, since a lot of the references have multiple citations; so the real number is probably closer to 360 to 370. Now, excluding things like transcripts of the Shaw trial and the preliminary hearing—which could have been attained by Bugliosi on his own—and footnotes that were multi-sourced, I counted less than 20 references to the new ARRB documents, which comes to less than 10% of the information in the chapter. In fact, Bugliosi's citations to the works of people like Patricia Lambert, James Kirkwood, Edward Epstein, and Milton Brener come to double the new document count. This tells us a great deal, of course. In fact, it's actually embarrassing to compare this ratio of new material with Bill Davy's fine book on the Garrison inquiry, *Let Justice Be Done*. Davy has more references to the new documents in his first section—focused only on David Ferrie—than Bugliosi has in his whole banal and tedious chapter. But the clincher is this: Bugliosi's chapter is ninety pages long; Davy's is eight. But you will learn more about Ferrie, Oswald, and New Orleans in those eight pages than you will in all of *Reclaiming History*.

As I alluded to above, Bugliosi's most frequently-used source is Lambert's *False Witness*. This book was soundly thrashed in *Probe*. (See [ctka.net/pr599-lambert.html](http://ctka.net/pr599-lambert.html) for more). In all the pages of his chapter, and all the accompanying so-called "source notes", Bugliosi couldn't bring himself to tell us about an important and relevant association of Patricia Lambert's: she was very close friends with James Phelan. Joan Mellen first discovered this fact; but I then had contact with Phelan's daughter after her father died: she virtually referred to Lambert as her godmother. They were that close.

Which brings us to Bugliosi's treatment of Phelan, and his lengthiest mention of me. First let me say that, comparatively speaking, I get off mildly with Bugliosi. Consider the following: "Jim DiEugenio, a sincere conspiracy theorist who thinks rationally about the Kennedy assassination from time to time ..." (End

Notes, p. 856)—which, comparatively speaking, is almost a compliment. The reason he brings me up here is because I was the first writer to go after Lambert's chum, James Phelan. Understandably, Lambert did not appreciate the writing we did on her good friend, whom she tried to picture as some kind of hero in her hatchet job on Garrison. Since Bugliosi is so reliant on her work, he has to mount his defense of Phelan also.

It is difficult to do so today, because the ARRB proved that, like Aynesworth, Phelan was an informant to the FBI on the Garrison case—which is something he always denied. In fact, after I suggested such a thing in my first book, Phelan actually wrote a letter to my publisher threatening a lawsuit. Of course, it turned out he was lying. The ARRB declassified three documents which exposed his informing to the FBI about his talks with Garrison, his turning over of Garrison documents, and, further, his rants about the D.A., and how he had to be stopped. Neither Lambert nor Bugliosi can bring themselves to admit the following: as long as the documents were classified, Phelan was willing to lie about his ties to the FBI because he felt protected. But it's actually worse than that. Because after I sent him the documents, *Phelan still tried to deny it!* I'm not kidding. He told me he was going to the Bureau to try and straighten out the whole thing. He never got back to me, so I guess he didn't straighten it out. So in addition to being a liar, Phelan was so in love with his cover story of being a real reporter that he was delusional.

Realizing he has to do damage control, Bugliosi tries to limit the extent to which Phelan was a government tool. For instance, he doesn't mention Phelan's work with the FDA on the Church of Scientology. (He has to know about this since it is in the same pages he references in his discussion of me.) It is documented that, on that government assignment, Phelan was used by the FDA through Steve Spencer, an executive at the *Saturday Evening Post*. It is also documented that Phelan then forwarded both his notes on this assignment and an interview transcript to that government agency. In this particular instance, Phelan did the same thing as he did on the JFK case: he lied about it all. He denied he knew Steve Spencer, denied he forwarded the notes on the story, and denied he forwarded the transcripts. It's slightly humorous to read about his reaction as he is exposed in all these canards (*The Assassinations*, p. 318).

But Bugliosi is not done deodorizing Phelan. I also wrote about Phelan's long association with the notorious Robert Loomis. Loomis was a fixture at Random House who, in a letter to Walt Brown, wrote that he was strongly wedded to the Krazy Kid Oswald story and would brook no dissent to that fairy tale. He then acted on these biases by commissioning books like *Special Unit Senator* on the RFK case, and Phelan's *Scandals, Scamps and Scoundrels*.

Now consider what Bugliosi does to try and diminish Loomis as a malignant figure. He notes that I refer to him as "infamous", and he writes words to the effect: Why does DiEugenio say that Loomis is infamous? Because Jim Marrs says that Loomis was CIA (End Notes, p. 856). In saying this, Bugliosi conveniently leaves out two key facts. First, that Loomis's former wife worked for counter-intelligence CIA chief James Angleton, who many believe was running Oswald and was in on the assassination. Second, he does not reveal how Marrs

knew about Loomis and the CIA. Let me explain how, since Bugliosi won't: After a debate with Gerald Posner on the Kevin McCarthy show, Marrs chatted with Posner. He asked him how he came to write *Case Closed* (a book even Bugliosi criticizes). Posner told him that Bob Loomis asked him to write it, and promised him cooperation from the CIA, which included interviews with KGB defector Yuri Nosenko. Question: How could Loomis promise that CIA cooperation, and then get him interviews with a man who was on a CIA stipend, if Loomis was not tied into the Company?

But that's not the clincher in all this. The clincher is that this information from Posner is in the same book which Bugliosi references in order to say it came from Marrs—except it's about 55 pages further ahead (*The Assassinations*, p. 369). We are to believe that Bugliosi missed it. Recall what I said earlier about Bugliosi's pledge that he would not knowingly omit or distort anything (*Reclaiming History*, p. xxxix). Somewhere along the line he forgot about it.

From here, Bugliosi then makes two curious arguments. He tries to say that somehow reporters who practice such things as being FBI informants or associating with the CIA are, firstly, not necessarily bad people; and, secondly, they would not be willing to cover up something like the murder of a president. As far as the first goes, if the author truly believes this then he and I have a real disagreement about the function of journalism. Reporters are not supposed to accept assignments from the government and then forward their notes and transcripts to Washington. They are also not supposed to inform the government on interviews they do with state officials—as Phelan did with Garrison—especially if they know that the federal government is in direct opposition to what the state official is doing. Phelan knew he was violating the canon of journalistic ethics in doing that; that is why he lied about it both before and after it was proven. Bugliosi doesn't acknowledge the lying, so he doesn't have to explain why Phelan did it.

Let us address the second point—that is, a reporter being willing to cover up the murder of a president. I already mentioned Hugh Aynesworth's attempt to bribe John Manchester up in Clinton. I also mentioned Aynesworth's pledge of making the cover-up his life's work. So that is that with Aynesworth: he is a self-admitted cover-up artist. Re Phelan: Art Kunkin covered the Shaw trial for the *L.A. Free Press*. He went to New Orleans for the trial's duration. Phelan was also there; but he wasn't covering the trial—at least, not directly. Most of the reporters there lived out of hotel rooms. Not Phelan: he was renting a house. Each evening, Phelan invited the press corps to his rented home. He would provide them with drinks and snacks. But it was not just a friendly gathering: Phelan was there to rap out what their story lines would be on the day's proceedings. Kunkin told me that he will never forget what Phelan said the day the Zapruder film was shown. The press corps was shocked: Garrison was right, it was a conspiracy. Phelan had his work cut out for him. Kunkin then sat in the rented home, dumbfounded, as Phelan pulled out a chalkboard. He then, perhaps for the first time, outlined the action of Luis Alvarez's "jet effect" to explain away what they had just seen.

Now if Bugliosi thinks that Phelan rented the house on his own, provided the refreshments out of his own pocket, and thought up the “jet effect” himself, then he probably also believes in the Easter Bunny. Phelan was not just there to cover up Kennedy’s assassination as an individual reporter; he was there to cover it up for the national media—and, through them, the entire American public. This is why many of the more interesting aspects of the Shaw trial never had any impact—for example, Pierre Finck’s testimony. And from what we know—and what Bugliosi ignores—Phelan did this for the FBI, or with the help of Bob Loomis. For Bugliosi to tap-dance around this issue of journalists as undisclosed agents is inexplicable. Did he think what Judy Miller did at the *New York Times* about the Iraq War was OK?

### V.3

If Bugliosi is willing to use witnesses like Connick and Aynesworth, and if he is going to whitewash Phelan, then we already know what this chapter is going to be like. Like the discredited and obsolete James Kirkwood (who Bugliosi actually calls Kirkland at one point), we know he is out to perform a hatchet job on Garrison. It doesn’t take long to discern this. Very early, Bugliosi trots out—via Connick—the same old tired and false arguments about Garrison being an irresponsible and incompetent lawyer and D.A. But that is only half of it. Whenever someone does something like that, the other shoe has to drop—which, in this case, is the elevation into sainthood of Clay Shaw. Unbelievably, *Reclaiming History* actually calls Shaw a political liberal (p. 1348). This deception was started by Shaw himself in order to camouflage any motive he could have for participating in a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy (Kirkwood, *American Grotesque*, p. 17) It has been exposed as a deception for decades. Incredibly, Bugliosi recycles it as if it’s new.

Let’s go through the litany. In every aspect of his life, Shaw associated with either persons or organizations that were clearly conservative to reactionary. He was pals with reactionary New Orleans doctor Alton Ochsner, that friend to Latin American dictators who was also a prime backer of Ed Butler’s right-wing propaganda mill, INCA. INCA was located a block and a half from Shaw’s International Trade Mart (ITM). (New Orleans writer Arthur Carpenter confirmed this to me—and there is actually a photo at the New Orleans Public Library of the two talking in Shaw’s office.) Tommy Baumler later became a New Orleans attorney, but as a young man was one of many youths who worked for Guy Banister. In a 1981 interview, he stated that the New Orleans intelligence network was made up of Clay Shaw, Guy Banister, and ONI officer Guy Johnson (William Davy, *Let Justice be Done*, p. 41). The ITM, where Shaw worked for seventeen years, was a privately-managed company whose goal was to encourage globalization of Latin American trade markets. William Gaudet was a longtime CIA asset who published a propaganda sheet called *Latin American Report*. Gaudet was furnished with a virtually rent-free office in the ITM (Arthur Carpenter’s Ph.D. dissertation, “Gateway to the Americas,” p. 172). The ITM’s sister organization was International House. This was a world-wide globalization network that was more politically oriented, as opposed to the ITM’s economic emphasis. International House was a creation of the Rockefeller empire, and later

allied itself with Morgan Guaranty Trust (Davy, p. 76). In fact, when ITM opened in 1948—with Shaw as managing director—the main speaker was William McChesney Martin, then a supervisor of the Rockefeller family's trust fund (*ibid.*, p. 77). Further in this regard, Shaw was also a member of the New Orleans chapter of the Foreign Policy Association (FPA). This was another Rockefeller-backed internationalist type of group. They invited CIA Deputy Director Charles Cabell to address the International House in April 1961. Clay Shaw, as program director of the FPA, personally introduced Cabell for this speaking engagement (*ibid.*, p. 90).

On a more personal level, Shaw was a friend of Hjalmar Schacht, the notorious wizard whose financial schemes helped finance Hitler's Third Reich. He was tried at Nuremberg, but his sentence was voided by John McCloy (DiEugenio, p. 216). Shaw was also friendly with the Borghese family, which contemplated a right-wing coup in Italy with the help of the Paladin Group, which was run by legendary former Nazi commando and CIA mercenary Otto Skorzeny (*ibid.*).

Does this sound liberal to Bugliosi? No—and that's why he doesn't tell the reader about any of it. And what is incredible about this enumeration is that (1) I could easily make it much longer; and (2) I have not even touched on Shaw's intelligence career or his ties to people like David Ferrie—which, of course, Bugliosi tries to deny.

Shaw began that intelligence career in the Army during World War II. This was under General Charles Thrasher, and the unit was called Special Operations Section, or SOS (Davy, p. 73). When he returned to New Orleans after the War, Shaw became a friend of Ted Brent, a self-made millionaire and "Queen Bee" of the local homosexual underground (*ibid.*, p. 75). It was Brent who became Shaw's benefactor in moving him up the business world in New Orleans, first at Mississippi Shipping Company, and then at the ITM. It was at this phase of his career that Shaw's association with the CIA began. As Jim Garrison once noted, the CIA used Mississippi Shipping as a conduit for intelligence gathering in Latin America. Further, from 1952–55, Shaw employed as the ITM's public relations director a man named David Baldwin. Baldwin was a CIA asset who once used Priscilla Johnson's agency, North American Newspaper alliance, as a cover (*ibid.*, p. 77). At this time, Shaw began to work as a CIA overseas informant in both Eastern Europe and in Latin America. This phase of his career lasted—officially, at least—from late 1948 to 1956. Why do I add the phrase "officially, at least"? Because the CIA, in their own words, considered Shaw such an important and valued asset that they created a 'Y' file for him. Bill Davy discovered a handwritten note in the Agency's declassified files saying that one of those files was destroyed (Davy, p. 200).

Now what does our esteemed prosecutor have to say about all of the above? He does not mention Shaw's work in military intelligence at all. There is no mention of Brent or Baldwin. There is no mention of the destruction of Shaw's CIA file. He does mention Shaw's eight-year CIA informant status—but he does the same thing that Robert Blakey's House Select Committee on Assassinations did: he says that Shaw was one of over 100,000 Americans who were routinely interviewed by the CIA on their return from abroad (End Notes, p. 809). The prob-

lem with this is that Shaw was *not routinely debriefed* after he returned from abroad; he was *briefed* before he left. He then filed written reports on both the political and economic climates in places like Peru. The intricacies of these reports are well beyond the scope of any routine business traveler. And, in fact, Shaw conferred with very high officials to garner this valuable information; for instance, while in Nicaragua, Shaw spoke to both the Minister of Finance, and the President; while in Argentina, he spoke with the Minister of Public Works (Davy, p. 198). Few routine businessmen have that kind of access.

How does Bugliosi deal with the next step in Shaw's CIA career, namely, his service on the Board of Directors of Permindex? In large part, he actually uses Shaw's own words as quoted in an interview he did in *Penthouse* in 1969 (End Notes, p. 812). This would be rather questionable on its own; but it's actually worse, because Bugliosi does not tell the reader two important things about this interview. Firstly, it was conducted by James Phelan—who, of course, was not going to ask Shaw any tough questions. Secondly, Shaw lied in this interview: Phelan asked him if he had ever been associated with the CIA; Shaw said no. Even Phelan later admitted to me that this was a lie on Shaw's part. Bugliosi doesn't even mention it.

Bugliosi even stoops to using Max Holland's essay about the whole Permindex episode being a creation of the KGB and how they fooled Garrison with it (*ibid.*, p. 813). In a face-to-face debate, Holland's essay was completely eviscerated by Gary Aguilar at the Assassination Archives and Research Center Conference in 2004. This conference would have been easy for Bugliosi to watch, since the DVD set has been on sale since 2005. If you view this exchange, Holland is so outmatched that, if it had been a prizefight, the referee would have called it a TKO to save Holland from further punishment. But Bugliosi can use it, since he is in an empty courtroom.

Bugliosi is intent on removing any trace that Permindex was any kind of CIA front group, because that would strongly indicate that Shaw was a CIA operative. (He essentially admits that this is his strategy in the End Notes: p. 810.) This is hard to do today; and the only way to do it is by the author again violating his pledge about not omitting or distorting anything. For instance, when the announcement of Permindex was first made in Switzerland in late 1956, its principal financial backing was to come from a local banker named Hans Seligman. But as the investigation proceeded, it became clear that the real backer was J. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation. Why was this kept under wraps? Because this bank had been closely associated with Allen Dulles and the CIA for decades. Allen Dulles's connections to the Schroder banking family went back to the '30s when his law firm, Sullivan and Cromwell, first began representing them through him (Peter Grose, *Gentleman Spy*, pp. 102, 111, 265). Later, Dulles was the bank's General Counsel. In fact, when Dulles became CIA Director, Schroder's was a repository for a 50-million-dollar contingency fund that Dulles controlled personally (*Destiny Betrayed*, p. 371). And the bank's founder—Baron Kurt von Schroeder—was associated with the Third Reich, specifically Heinrich Himmler (Davy, p. 97). The furor over this hidden association grew so large in Switzerland that the project moved to Rome. Shaw says in his *Penthouse* interview that he only grew interested in the project when

it switched to Italy (End Notes, p. 812)—which was in October 1958. Yet a State Department cable dated 9 April 1958 says that Shaw showed great interest in Permindex *from the outset*.

One can understand his interest by looking at the Board of Directors: there were bankers who had been tied up with fascist governments; people who worked the Jewish refugee racket during World War II; a former member of Mussolini's cabinet; and the son-in-law of Hjalmar Schacht, Shaw's friend. These people would all appeal to the very conservative Shaw. There were at least four international newspapers that exposed the bizarre activities of Permindex while it was in Rome. One issue was the mysterious source of funding: no one knew where it was coming from or going to. Another was that its activities reportedly included assassination attempts on French Premier Charles DeGaulle—which would make sense, since the founding member of Permindex, Ferenc Nagy, was a close friend of Jacques Soustelle, who was a leader of the OAS, a group of former French generals who broke with DeGaulle over his Algerian policy. They later made several attempts on DeGaulle's life, to which the CIA was privy (Davy, p. 99). This—the connection between the OAS and CIA—was one of the points that Holland unsuccessfully tried to attack.

Bugliosi does mention that Shaw listed his directorship of Permindex in his *Who's Who in the Southwest* entry up until the 1963–64 edition. He does not say that his entry never appeared after that—which is interesting, because the next edition came out after Kennedy's assassination. Bugliosi also writes that no Permindex member was ever convicted of any crime or prosecuted (End Notes, p. 811)—which is probably due to the fact that the shadowy corporation fled both Italy and Switzerland when the charges were really heating up.

To clearly characterize Shaw's association with Permindex, let me note a witness who would know about it, since it was his job to ascertain such things; let's use a very credible observer with his guard down: New Orleans FBI agent Regis Kennedy. As Bill Davy notes, Shaw's association with the Permindex organization lasted about five years. In 1967, after Permindex had moved to South Africa, a Garrison informant reported that Regis Kennedy had confirmed that "Shaw was a CIA agent who had done work, of an unspecified nature, over a five-year span in Italy." (Davy, p. 100) This is an almost perfect match all the way around: in time, in location, and in Shaw's true association.

Case closed.

#### V.4

Since Bugliosi makes a silly attempt at whitewashing Shaw's true politics and deep ties into the CIA, it is natural that he also attempts to follow in Lambert's fatuous steps with regards to David Ferrie and Oswald. He actually tries to say that they didn't know each other (p. 1397). I'm not kidding. He actually tries to wish away the photo that surfaced in the 1990s of Oswald with Ferrie at a Civil Air Patrol (CAP) picnic (*ibid.*). He then writes something that is really shocking: he tries to imply—through some tricky, lawyerly wording—that prior to the dis-

covery of this photo, there had only been one witness who placed Oswald together with Ferrie in the CAP, namely, Ed Voebel (*ibid.*).

This is what I meant when I wrote that I had to put off composing this part of the review. Bugliosi must know that what he is doing here is not just wrong, but misleading. Anthony Summers wrote a good book on the JFK case called (at that time) *Conspiracy*. It was published in 1980, which is way before the photo surfaced, and before the ARRB started declassifying the secret files. Summers then wrote that six witnesses testified that Oswald and Ferrie were in the CAP together (Summers, p. 302). And all Bugliosi had to do was interview the HSCA investigators in New Orleans—L. J. Delsa or Bob Buras—and he would have found out that the total was even more than that. This inexplicable failure may explain his reluctance to use the files of Jim Garrison, because already back in 1967 Garrison had seven witnesses who attested to this fact (Garrison Memorandum of 18 April 1967).

Bugliosi also tries to use the Gerald Posner canard about Ferrie being expelled from the CAP squadron; in other words, there might be some question about whether or not Oswald was actually in Ferrie's squadron, or if Ferrie was just hanging around his old squad while the photo was taken (Bugliosi, *ibid.*). This particular technique reminds me of Posner's cheap trick in *Case Closed* of not telling the reader that the Clinton incident took place in two cities—Clinton and Jackson—and not just one. As Peter Vea discovered many years ago, Ferrie was expelled from the squadron at Lakefront Airport, and then started his own non-chartered squadron at Moisant Airport. This fact is established in an FAA report on Ferrie from 1963 (Davy, p. 6). The documentary record indicates that Oswald first met Ferrie at Lakefront for some classes and then actually joined the CAP at Ferrie's breakaway Moisant squadron in 1955.

The best accumulation of testimony establishing this fact is by John Armstrong in his interesting biography called *Harvey and Lee*. He spends four pages quoting the testimony of the witnesses who state that Oswald was in Ferrie's CAP squad (Armstrong, pp. 122-5). This includes the student who first got Oswald interested in joining the CAP, Fred O'Sullivan. O'Sullivan says that Ferrie left the Lakefront squad and started his own squad at Moisant. Another witness Armstrong quotes is the man who took the picnic photo of Ferrie with Oswald, Chuck Francis (*ibid.*, p. 125). (Armstrong quotes Francis as saying he actually testified about this to the FBI, along with the fact that he had photographed the two together.) Another CAP witness is Jerry Paradis, who was interviewed back in 1978 by the HSCA. Paradis stated, "I specifically remember Oswald. I can remember him clearly, and Ferrie was heading the unit then. I'm not saying that they may have been there together. I'm saying it was a certainty." (*Probe*, Vol. 5, No. 5, p. 15) In addition to printing this HSCA document in *Probe*, we also printed the HSCA testimony of Anthony Atzenhoffer, who said, "I can't recall seeing the two of them together. I don't have that detailed a memory. But I'm sure they were there together at the same time." (*ibid.*, p. 16)

Need more? In 1964, Ferrie himself told Thomas Clark, a friend who worked at his filling station, that he was Oswald's instructor in the CAP (Armstrong, p. 125). But the capper in all this is the following: Almost everyone knows that

Ferrie was hectically looking for his library card in the wake of the assassination. He visited Oswald's landlady, Jessie Garner, to see if Oswald had left it behind (*Destiny Betrayed*, p. 204). He even visited a neighbor of Oswald's, Doris Eames, to inquire whose card Oswald was using at the library that summer (*Probe, op. cit.*, p. 17). Clearly, Ferrie was frantic about preventing any linkage between himself and Oswald after the assassination (which, in a case that was not so politically charged, Bugliosi would use his favorite prosecutor's term: Ferrie was exhibiting "consciousness of guilt".)

But Ferrie was not just trying to prevent a linkage between the two through his library card—which he had apparently let Oswald borrow that summer; he was also trying to stop then what ultimately occurred in the '90s, namely, the exposure of a CAP photo of he and Oswald. How do we know this? Because Ferrie called a former CAP student of his, named Roy McCoy, right after the murder of Kennedy. McCoy wasn't home at the time, so Ferrie talked to his wife. He asked her about any photos that Roy might have from his Civil Air Patrol days when Ferrie was in charge of their squadron. This FBI report, dated 27 November 1963, then includes the following statement: "Ferrie also asked Mrs. McCoy whether the name of Oswald was familiar to her." Later, Roy McCoy naturally concluded that Ferrie was trying to find any photos of Oswald's CAP days, to prevent any association between him and the instructor (*Probe, op. cit.*).

What Bugliosi tries to do here inevitably sounds like Posner in his pile of rubbish, *Case Closed*, when he wrote the following: "There is no credible evidence that Oswald knew ... David Ferrie." (p. 148 of the hardcover edition) This is utterly and completely false—and Ferrie knew it.

Why do these authors do this? Because they understand that the CAP episode opens up a real Pandora's Box with regard to Oswald, since Ferrie had a genuine liking for, and influence over, his cadets; for instance, Ferrie led them to overnight encampments at Keesler Air Force Base in nearby Biloxi, Mississippi (Davy, p. 5). But it went even further than that: he once gave Robert Boylston a thousand dollars to attend college at Loyola in New Orleans, and never asked for it back, or even mentioned it—which was a lot of money, back then, for someone who was not wealthy (*Probe, op. cit.*, p. 16). Boylston told the HSCA that Ferrie often talked about secret orders from military intelligence. Further, as the HSCA investigators discovered, one of Ferrie's functions as a CAP instructor was to encourage and recruit young men into the Marines. And as Bill Davy interestingly points out, during Oswald's time in the CAP, his mother Marguerite "... recalled being visited by a man in uniform who she presumed was a Marine Corps recruiter. Her visitor encouraged her to allow her son Lee to quit school and join the Marines." (Davy, p. 6) Since Oswald was under-age at the time, this may have been a friend of Ferrie's impersonating a recruiter. But yet, Oswald did try and join the Marines later, even though he was under-age. He failed. But it is immediately after this that he does two rather contrary things: he starts to assiduously study his brother's Marine Corps manual, and he also starts talking to his pals Palmer McBride and William Wulf about Marxism. Hmm. Ferrie was a clear and militant right-winger; yet, we must recall, as Boylston said, Ferrie talked about getting orders from military intelligence.

Clearly, if one presents the totality of the evidence, it would indicate that Oswald's friendship with Ferrie had a powerful, perhaps crucial, effect on his life. It very likely inspired his joining the Marines and later becoming an intelligence operative—which is one reason why Posner, and now Bugliosi, try to make it all disappear. They need to maintain the Priscilla Johnson mythology of Oswald as the disaffected Commie. Sorry, Mr. Prosecutor. The sum total of the evidence indicates the opposite.

## V.5

Like Gerald Posner, Bugliosi is intent on keeping Oswald out of Guy Banister's office at 544 Camp Street (p. 1404)—and he uses Gus Russo to do it. Specifically, he uses information from the bizarre 1993 PBS *Frontline* Special on Oswald—which Russo originated and worked on. Namely, that contrary to what everyone has ever written or said, the addresses 544 Camp Street and 531 Lafayette Street did not lead to the same offices—that is, Guy Banister's. Bugliosi writes that the Camp Street entrance only went to the second floor; one had to go into the other address to get to Banister's office (*ibid.*).

Really? Then how did Bill Turner do just that back in 1967 while on assignment for *Ramparts* magazine? Years ago, Turner told me first-hand about his experience of entering both addresses, and walking up the stairs to the same small coven of offices. (By the way, Bugliosi knows Turner well; he could have called him and asked him about this, since it figures in his book, *Deadly Secrets*.) Jim Garrison made the very same discovery, which he describes in his book *On the Trail of the Assassins* (p. 24). He writes the following: "So both entrances—544 Camp and 531 Lafayette—led to the same place." Further, Turner told me that he and Garrison discussed this exact point when they met. Did both investigators have the wrong address? Now, when the news of Garrison's investigation broke worldwide, scores of reporters flew into town to talk to the D.A., and other witnesses and suspects. Many of them were hostile to Garrison from the start. I have mentioned two of them: James Phelan and Hugh Aynesworth. If what Gus Russo and Bugliosi are peddling were true, wouldn't one of these anti-Garrison reporters have easily found out about it, and written about it back in 1967? Recall, as well, that they were both tied to the FBI. Hoover despised what Garrison was doing. Wouldn't the Director have gotten the word to them if this were so?

Finally, the HSCA did an investigation of 544 Camp Street. None of the witnesses they interviewed told them this story (see HSCA, Vol. 10, App. 13). They also investigated other businesses at the address. No other office at 544 Camp Street could be associated with Oswald or recalled him being there. Now, the HSCA interviewed an interesting witness in this regard: Sam Newman. The building was called the Newman Building because Sam owned and operated it. The HSCA interviewed Newman about the people who occupied his building back in 1963 (*op. cit.*, p. 124, paragraphs 471 and 472). If anyone would have known the layout of the building, it would be the man who owned it. Yet he didn't say anything like this to the HSCA, since it's not in the report. In his 21 years of research, Bugliosi missed this?

Here comes the other problem with this piece of Russo-inspired propaganda: As noted above, no other office at 544 Camp Street recalled the presence of Oswald or had him on their roster of members (for example, there was a union office at the building)—yet there are a number of witnesses that can attest to a relationship between Oswald and Banister. Let us enumerate some of them (and this list is partial):

Banister's widow revealed that her husband's office storeroom contained a supply of the "Hands off Cuba" handbills, the type that were distributed by Oswald in the summer of 1963 (William Turner and Warren Hinckle, *Deadly Secrets*, p. 234). Banister investigator Bill Nitschke saw the same kind of literature, except in placard form. He commented: "It didn't make any sense to me how Guy got tied up to those signs." (Davy, p. 40) A college infiltrator of Banister's, George Higgenbothan, kidded his boss about sharing a building with the type of people who leaflet leftist literature on the streets. Banister snapped back with, "Cool it. One of them is mine!" (Turner and Hinckle, p. 235) In his book *The Assassination Debates*, Professor Michael Kurtz said that, as a student, he recalled seeing Banister with Oswald at a civil rights debate at a local college in New Orleans. Another employee of Banister, the aforementioned Tommy Baumber, made clear in a 1981 interview that Oswald worked for Banister (Davy, p. 303).

When I interviewed Dan Campbell in 1994, he reinforced the above. Campbell, like Higgenbothan, was another youth recruited by Banister as an infiltrator. He typified Banister's group as the worst kind of right wing fanatics. He also added a CIA connection: Banister was running guns to Alpha 66 in Miami as part of Operation Mongoose. He recalled one day that a young man with short hair and the bearing of a Marine walked into 544 Camp Street and used the phone. The next time he saw this young man, his face was on TV as the alleged murderer of President Kennedy (author's interview with Campbell, 6 September 1994). CIA asset William Gaudet once told Tony Summers that he had seen Banister talking to Oswald on the street at one time. He said specifically, "I did see Oswald discussing various things with Banister at the time, and I think Banister knew a whole lot of what was going on ...." (Summers, pp. 337-8)

Summers also talked to Delphine Roberts; in fact, he was the first person she actually opened up to. Garrison's office talked to her previously, but could get very little out of her—because, as Summers found out, Banister had sworn her to secrecy about Oswald (*ibid.*, p. 294). And since she was as conservative as he was—which was about the equivalent of American fascism—she agreed to cover up who Oswald really was. But Summers struck up a relationship with her towards the end of the HSCA: he heard that, after hesitating, she was now willing to talk—but what she was saying was not what Chief Counsel Robert Blakey wanted to hear. Bugliosi tries to slam her—via Posner—by saying she talked to Summers only for money for a TV interview.

Here is the problem for Bugliosi and Posner: Roberts revealed the Oswald-Banister connection to Tony before she did the TV interview. Before she consented to talk, she and Tony went to her lawyer's office. Her attorney, a very conservative guy, advised her not to do the TV interview, so she backed out of

the deal. Afterwards, she was standing in the foyer of her lawyer's office in the rain. Summers drove by and saw her and asked if she needed a ride. She got in the car and he started to drive her home. While stopped at a red light, without any questions asked, she began weeping. It was at this point, through her tears, that she began to talk to him about Banister and Oswald. Obviously, it was painful for her to break her pledge to her good friend Banister. Unlike what Bugliosi and Posner try to peddle, there was no money involved in the revelation of this information. Later, when Summers began to put together a documentary, he saw her again and she did an on-camera interview for a fee—which was standard for everyone on that program, since Tony had interviewed them before and knew what they would say (personal communication with Summers in 2009). Another way Bugliosi tries to belittle Roberts is through Posner, based on what she allegedly told Posner for his book *Case Closed*, renouncing what she told Summers (see End Notes, p. 908). (I use the word “allegedly” since there is much evidence that makes the record of Posner's interviews dubious.) As I said in the subtitle, it's clear that Bugliosi didn't go to New Orleans: if he had, he would have learned what I did from Allen Campbell. Ms. Roberts was living in a home for the aged at that time and she was suffering from old age dementia.

What did she actually tell Summers? She told him about Oswald coming into Banister's office one day, and Oswald and Banister going behind closed doors and talking. Later, Oswald actually had his own room on the second floor, stocked with pro-Castro leaflets and placards (which corroborates the above testimony of Banister's widow and Bill Nitschke). One day, Roberts walked into the office and said that she saw Oswald on the street passing out those leaflets. Banister confirmed to her, “He's with us. He's associated with this office.” (*ibid.*, p. 295) Roberts understood. “I knew there were such things as counterspies ... and the importance of such things.” (*ibid.*, p. 296) This exchange between Banister and Roberts about Oswald was confirmed by Dan's brother, Allen Campbell, who specifically recalled it (Davy, p. 40); Roberts' daughter and a photographer friend also corroborated her story (Davy, p. 39); and another secretary at 544 Camp Street, Mary Brengel, also corroborated the story. Brengel said that, on the day of the assassination, Roberts told her that Oswald has been in their office that summer. (Brengel did not recall him since he was just another face to her.) Brengel later concluded that both Banister and Roberts had some prior knowledge of the assassination (Mellen, p. 71; you can see Brengel on YouTube: [youtube.com/watch?v=-kvvIA5\\_Efw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-kvvIA5_Efw)). If you are counting, that is six points of corroboration for the “discredited” Roberts.

The last witness who puts Oswald at Banister's is Oswald himself. How? On 9 August 1963 he appeared on Canal Street in what Bill Turner once described as a bit of “guerilla theater”: he was distributing his pro-Castro literature amidst this teeming hotbed of anti-Castro resentment, and got into a physical altercation with some anti-Castro Cubans he had previously approached, seemingly sympathetically. He was subsequently arrested. While being held, he told the police to get him in contact with FBI agent Warren DeBrueys, the Spanish-speaking agent specializing in the Cuban exiles (Mellen, pp. 59–60). DeBrueys was not in. But before agent John Quigley left to see Oswald, he asked William Walter to look for a file on him. The Oswald file listed him as an infor-

mant for DeBrueys (Davy, p. 287). On one of the pamphlets Oswald presented to Quigley and the police, he himself had hand stamped the address 544 Camp Street: on Corliss Lamont's pamphlet *The Crime Against Cuba* (see Warren Commission Vol. 17, pp. 758-762). But, furthermore, the evidence suggests that Banister got this pamphlet from the CIA, and then gave it to Oswald as a prop (*Destiny Betrayed*, pp. 218-9). Oswald, who had arrived in New Orleans less than four months previous, had to have stamped it—because Banister would have never done such a thing.

In the face of all of the above, it is pure silliness to keep Oswald away from Banister: today, it is an accepted fact. Yet, unbelievably, Bugliosi actually criticizes Oliver Stone for putting Oswald at Banister's (p. 1404)—probably because he wants to distract the reader from an obvious conclusion: after Oswald left the CAP, he fulfilled what Ferrie likely inspired him to be: a military intelligence operative. Eventually he became part of the fake defector program operated jointly by ONI and the CIA (see Part II of this review, section II.6); and then when he was called back to the USA, he continued his Ferrie-inspired intelligence career, this time as an agent provocateur on the Cuban exile front working for Ferrie's pal, Guy Banister. It all makes perfect sense—too sensible and too convincing for *Reclaiming History*.

But, furthermore, there was also a connection between Clay Shaw and Banister. Everyone recalls the famous Bolton Ford incident of 1961, when two men walked into a Ford dealership in New Orleans and wanted to order ten trucks. One was named Joseph Moore and the other used the name Oswald. Guy Banister was the principal founder of the group; William Dalzell was a recruiter and treasurer. It was meant to collect funds for the CRC, an anti-Castro group that was headed by Sergio Arcacha Smith and organized by Howard Hunt (Armstrong, p. 317). Dalzell was a friend of Clay Shaw (*ibid.*). When the CRC moved from the Balter Building, where Banister's office was then located, it relocated to Clay Shaw's International Trade Mart (CIA Memorandum of 12 January 1968). More evidence of the association between Shaw and Banister is as follows: on one occasion, Banister asked an employee to get Shaw on the phone; and when he did, Banister told him to give the phone to David Ferrie (Armstrong p. 322). This illustrates that, as still another Banister employee revealed, Banister and Shaw were close associates (Davy, p. 303).

Of course, Bugliosi takes the Posnerian route and says throughout that Shaw did not use the alias of Bertrand (see, for example, End Notes, p. 887). This is more nonsense. In his book, Garrison discusses four witnesses whom his office discovered that admitted to this fact (pp. 85-6)—and he would have found more had he not shut down so many places in the French Quarter, because Joan Mellen found two more people—Rickey Planche and Barbara Bennett—who would have attested to this, but resented what Garrison had done in his campaign against the clip joints (Mellen, *Jim Garrison: His Life and Times*, p. 117). Another source Garrison developed on this issue was Thomas Breitner (Garrison memo of 23 September 1967). The FBI also knew Shaw used the name Bertrand in the homosexual underworld of the time: Lawrence Schiller, long-time FBI informant, had done his own investigation, and told the L.A. FBI office that he found five sources in that milieu who told him that Shaw was known by oth-

er names, including Bertrand (FBI memo of 22 March 1967). But even before that, the FBI had developed two sources independently who said that Shaw used the alias of Bertrand (FBI memo of 24 February 1967). Whichever way you count Schiller's statement, the number is into the double digits. This is why Dick Billings wrote in some of his early notes for *Life*, "Evidence that Shaw is actually Bertrand is popping up everywhere." (Davy, p. 302)

As declassified files reveal, even outside of Banister's office, Shaw/Bertrand and Ferrie were acquainted. One of the most interesting groups of ARRB-released files was that on Freeport Sulphur (now named Freeport McMoran). Based on these files, Lisa Pease did an absolutely scintillating two-part essay in *Probe* (Vol. 3, Nos. 3 & 4), which revealed the fact that Banister knew about a business venture which involved shipping nickel ore from Cuba to a Canadian front company. Ferrie flew an official of Freeport, along with Shaw, on an exploratory trip to organize the venture (Garrison memo of 9 October 1968). Garrison had not just a file on this, but at least two witnesses (Davy, pp. 85, 87). Gaeton Fonzi was also interested in this interesting angle, and he actually connected the enterprise to David Phillips (*ibid.*, p. 87). One can tell how potent this essay is by observing the fact that the name Freeport Sulphur is not in Bugliosi's index. In addition to this, there are at least three other witnesses in Garrison's files who connected Shaw with Ferrie: L. P. Davies, Jr., Charles Krop, and Betty Rubio (Garrison Memos of 27 and 29 March 1967; Davy pp. 185-6). And guess what? None of them are in Bugliosi's book.

As the reader can see, in spite of Bugliosi's persistent denials, we can clearly connect Ferrie, Oswald, Banister, and Shaw. And, beyond that, here and in Part II of this series, we have shown how they are all connected to the CIA. (Ferrie himself admitted he was involved in Operation Mongoose, and he trained Bay of Pigs participants at a camp supervised by David Phillips: Davy, pp. 28, 31.) Finally, we have seen how, on the outside of their activities, lurk CIA mid-level managers like Hunt and Phillips. This is anathema for *Reclaiming History*, of course—because, as I have noted in Part III of the series, Phillips—and to a lesser extent Hunt—are also involved with Oswald in Mexico City. (Journalist Tad Szulc wrote that Hunt was at the CIA's Mexico City station right before Oswald—or whoever was impersonating him—was there: *Destiny Betrayed*, p. 383.) Further, Phillips confessed to his brother, as he was dying, that he was in Dallas the day of the assassination; we have this through his brother's son, Shawn Phillips (Larry Hancock, *Someone Would Have Talked*, p. 182). Finally, James Angleton prepared a memorandum attempting to supply Howard Hunt with a cover story for him also being in Dallas that day (James DiEugenio and Lisa Pease, eds., *The Assassinations*, p. 195).

In light of all the above, it's clear why Bugliosi is in full denial overdrive: by persons, actions, and locations, from New Orleans to Mexico City to Dallas, you can piece together the outline of a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy. Later on, I will list it step by step.