

VINGENT J. SALANDRIA
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELOR AT LAW
2226 DELANCEY PLACE
PHILADELPHIA 3, PA.

LD 7-7520

August 19, 1967

Dear Sylvia,

This is to clear up what ought not get confused. You, indeed, "felt certain for a long time that Garrison had no evidence and no case." I do not feel such is the situation. I do not know whether Garrison's case against Shaw is "viable." Suffice it to say that I have told you that Garrison will prove that Shaw is Bertrand. My judgment on whether Garrison would convict Andrews has proven correct. I have reason to think that my judgment on the above-mentioned proposition is also correct.

Now, proving Shaw is Bertrand does not convict Shaw. But, Not as a juror or as a lawyer, but as a man who is given to make judgments on evidence in and out of court rooms, I feel that Bertrand was involved in some manner with the wing of the United States government which I know killed the President. I "know" the nature of the assassination because I must draw inferences from the facts of the actual assassination data; the need for motivation, and the way the United States Government acted in dealing with the assassination. There is only one sensible inference which can be drawn.

Perhaps Bertrand's role was minor. Certainly, the nature of the assassination as I see it, requires that the men who ordered it were possessors of great governmental power, and as such would have means of insulating themselves against being caught. Bertrand, therefore, was minor. But, the evidence indicates that he was involved in one of the sub plots which made up the structure of the assassination plan.

Russo and Bundy are in no way important in proving that Shaw was Bertrand. Even if they were, I would never equate Russo and Bundy with Markham and Brennan, as you do. Markham lied to me in the summers of 1964 and 1965 out of plain terror. This terror she felt while she was doing business with the F.B.I., Secret Service and Dallas Police. Brennan's lies are proved by the incontrovertible evidence. Russo and Bundy have no such powerful protectors. No such proof exists to refute the evidence of Russo and Bundy. Markham and Brennan provide lies which support a myth we know to be wrong. Russo's and Bundy's assertions support what we have to know is close to the truth. They may be, nonetheless, frauds. But they have not been proven to be so.

This represents my judgments as they are at this time.
I love you.

Love,

