

VERY SPECIAL HOLIDAY EDITION- JIM GARRISON COMPLETELY VINDICATED.

ABSOLUTE PROOF THAT G. ROBERT BLAKEY, CHIEF COUNSEL OF THE HOUSE SELECT CONSITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS COMPLETELY, DELIBERATELY COVERED UP GARRISON'S EVIDENCE OF DIRECT C.I.A. INVOLVEMENT IN THE J.F.K. ASSASSINATION, ON ORDERS FROM HIS ACTUAL EMPLOYERS, THE C.I.A.. CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE OF THESE FACTS WAS UNCOVERED BY MYSELF, PERSONALLY, AND HAS NEVER HEEN PUBLISHED ANYWHERE BEFORE NOW, IN THIS NEWSLETTER.

I NOW HAVE CONCLUSIVE PROOF THAT THIS EVIDENCE OF DIRECT C.I.A. INVOLVEMENT IN THE CRIME WAS SUPPLIED BY JIM GARRISON TO CLIFFORD FENTON, WHO HEADED & 5-MAN INVESTIGATIVE TEAM FOR THE COMMITTEE, AND THIS CONCLUSIVE, OVERWHEIMING EVIDENCE OF DIRECT C.I.A INVOLVEMENT IN THE CRIME WAS THEN GIVEN, PERSONALLY, TO BLAKEY, WHO COMPLETELY SUPPRESSED ALL OF IT FROM THE CITIZENS OF THIS COUNTRY, INDEED, PEOPLES OF THE WHOLE WORLD !!

--- TO WIT ---

ON SEPTEMBER 20, 1986...THIS YEAR...I HAD A PHONE CONVERSATION WITH G. RUBERT DURING. BEFORE REVEALING THE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS HE SAID THEN, IN ORDER TO PUT THIS IN TOTAL OF SECURITY CIEAR PERSPECTIVE, I'LL RELATE THE FOLLOWING FIRST. "They (the Com-TADE RECORDED TADE RECORDED AND THE CONTENSION OF THE SECURITY OF THE SECURIT

former New Orleans Districti Attorney, now Judge, Jim Garrison, who had conducted his own investigation of the JFK murder in 1967, called me on the phone. We talked for half an hour.

Here are some quotes, from listening to the tape of that conversation, from Mr. Garrison. "Since I last talked to you, Ted, I've talked to the investigators that are based here in New Orleans that have just come back here from Washington, and they are very enthusiastic and they have been stimulated by the attitude up there in Washington in the increased interest in the New

······

Orleans scenario.

ê

SPECIFICALLY DISCUSSING THE ASSASSINATION: WITH CLAY SHAW AND DAVID FERRIE PRESENT ... DETAILS" | asked Garrison, "You're talking about what Perry Raymond Russo said?"

Garrison answers, "No, no, SINCE THEN. They have gone beyond that, into NEW AREAS we hadn't reached yet. We had the right people but we didn't have ALL THEIR MEETINGS ... PEOPLE PRESENT AT THE MEETINGS. I wish I could tell you of the progress they have made. IT'S PAST CONSPIRACY, IT'S PAST PRIMA FACIE, IT'S SOLID EVI-DENCE ON TAPE. I mean there's NO QUESTION ABOUT IT, but it doesn't seem to be reaching..... Blakey seems to have cotton in his ears ON PURPOSE."

Burke, a member of the Committee, informing them of the nefarious coverup practices being employed by Mr. Blakey, and that they both strongly denied that he was doing this. I also told Garrison that i had also called Congressman Christopher Dodd, also a member of the Committee, and member of the Committee, and that Mr. Dodd had told me that he hadn't seen ANY evidence of a big a set conspiracy in the JFK case, and the set of a warning to Blakey, why don't you E iust call the Chief Investigator on the JFK case and ask him if there is a that been any evidence of a of a the compiracy. By the time of the compiracy by the ti conspiracy. By the time Clifford Fenton finishes speaking, it will be about 6 hours later. That will be the end of Blakey." There were

A second s

nce was to NONE of i the twelv pressed and NONE published in the two of the HSCOA Find evidence

indication o clusive evid conspiracy. above bel filliate Now, with this in mind, we move to, as I mentioned, my conversation with Blakey, Sept. 20, this year, 1986. I employed the services of a person who, while listening to this conversation on the extension phone, wrote a verbatim account in shorthand. I began this conversation by asking Elakey about one of the assassins we have knicknamed "Frenchy". He refused to comment to my question about him. Now for the crucially important dialogue concerning House Committee investigator, Cliff Fenton, who Dick Sprague, my friend, who is the photographic genius of the case, who told me that Elakey would NEVER discuss with ANYONE in the past. The relevant dialogue follows: $\bigcirc VOTE^*$ TG- I also contacted Jim Garrison and he said that a team of investigators miniched by Cliff Fenton received, from Garrison, evidence definitely

proving a CIA conspiracy to kill Kennedy.

RB- That's false.

TG- Excuse me?

RB- That's false!

TG- That is false?

RB- Yes.

TG- Well that's what Garrison said.

RB- Well, that he said it, I don't doubt. That It's TRUE, I DENY;

TG- You deny that that's true? In other words, Fenton's team did NOT come back to the Committee with evidence from Garrison?

RB- No, we talked to Garrison ...

TG- Oh, you did?

RB- Sure, but there's no evidence that the CIA was involved.

TG- Garrison did NOT present you with that evidence?

RB- Look, er, I appreciate your calling me, but I am not available for interrogation.

TG- No, I'm just

| •. | |
|-----|---|
| RB- | I've given you all the information I'm going to. Garrison's allegation |
| | that the CIA was involved in the assassination, and that he proved it or |
| | offered evidence proving it to the Assassinations Committee is false on |
| | both grounds. |
| TG- | On both? |
| RB- | Yes. |
| TG- | Well, 18 I'm just saying what I was told by Mr. Garrison. |
| RB- | Well, I don't care WHAT Mr. Garrison said. |
| TG- | Yeah, well |
| RB- | I'm just telling you what happened. We talked to Garrison. He did NOT |
| | prove the CIA was involved, PERIOD; |
| TG- | Oh, you DID talk to him? |
| RB- | Yes, I told you that 2 minutes ago. |
| TG- | You mean Fenton's team, right? |
| RB- | YES- he talked to a number of people, including Garrison. |
| TG- | Yes, er, well, and Fenton's team, er, did they report any information |
| | from Garrison? |
| RB- | YES. |
| TG- | Was that published? |
| RB- | In part I don't know that EVERYTHING he said was published, but just |
| | about everything he said. The substance of what he said was published, yes. |
| TG- | Of what Garrison said? |
| RB- | YES! |
| TG- | Can you recall anything? |
| RB- | I am not available for interrogation. |
| TG- | No, I'm merely |
| RB- | Hey, hey! |
| TG- | Yes? |
| RB- | The comversation is over with unless you want to ask me another |
| | question on another subject matter. |
| | |

•

e destalates e

LEAR STREET, STREET, LINE ALLE

b....

TG- Er, alright, er, well the, er, I don't know what to say because, you know, I..I. RB- Well then don't say anything else but goodbye :

(HLAKEY HANGS UP ON ME AT THIS POINT)

BLAKEY, BEYOND QUESTION, OUTRIGHT LIED WHEN HE TOLD ME THAT " Just about everything he" (Gerrison) ... " said ... The substance of what he said was published, yes." As my close friend, and colleague, Richard E. Sprague told me the following day, ABSOLUTELY NOTHING about Clifford Fenton, nor his 5 man investigative team which obtained Garrison's information, nor the fact that there ever even EXISTED a Cliff Fenton investigative team sent to obtain Garrison's evidence of C I A complicity, nor ANYTHING AT ALL, EITHER ABOUT FENTON, HIS TEAM, OR WHAT GARRISON TOLD HIM/THEMABSOLUTELY NOTHING AT ALL ABOUT THIS MATTER IS TO BE FOUND IN EITHER THE 12 JFK VOLUMES OF "EVIDENCE" OR THE COMMITTEE'S FINAL REPORT !! As Sprague told me the following day after the cover-up bastard's conversation with me, "Ted, this is the very FIRST TIME EVER that Blakey has talked to ANYONE AT ALL about the Fenton team/and the Fenton Report. He has AIMAYS refused to discuss the matter with anyone before he talked to you" (me) "about it yesterday." I told Sprague, and Mark Lane and Garrison and Harold Weisberg and Mae Brussell scon thereafter that when an intelligence operative, as Elakey obviously is, continues to repeatedly tell lie after lie after lie, intermingled with the necessity to ocasionally tell the truth, to help conceal all the lies, you/one gets mixed up and slips out with the truth, because the mind of a "person" like that, completely enmeshed in the duality of roles he continually must play inexorably becomes befuddled with reality and illusion..truth and lies. That is the consequence of the intelligence operative, as was frankly admitted by C.I.A. top agent, David Atlee Phillips during a debate he had with Mark Lene in 1977 at U.C.L.A. It is my, now proveably undisputable, contention, based on what I have here above related, combined with OTHER CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE, IN DOCUMENTS I've recently obtained, that Robert Elakey was assigned by the CIA to be the chief counsel of that Committee in order to put distance between the CIA and the JFK assassination. I now have, in addition to the above-mentioned, ABSOLUTE PROOF that he was taking orders from the CTA as to how best proceed in order to accomplish his coverup assignment for the CTA !!

--And, so, Jim Garrison's assertions through these all-too-many years re the CIA being the murderers of our beloved President John F. Kennedy have proven to be, beyond question, ARSOLUTELY TRUE, as several of us long-time researchers haveknown since the news "broke" on February 18, 1967, in the New Orleans States Item newspaper that Garrison had been secretly conducting, with his small staff, a very silent investigation of the circumstances surrounding the JFX assassination. Immediately after the news "broke" the CIA laden news media began their orchestrated symphony of untruth against him. Why indeed not?? The Agency had it's dirty skirts to hide and conceal, and anyone, like Garrison, who had the courage, honesty and humanity to attempt to reveal to us all that persons employed by the CIA had killed the President had to be discredited in the eyes of the very citizens he was attempting to inform as to the TROTH in the matter. Thus far, by and large, they have indeed succeeded in not only discrediting Garrison and, in fact numerously obstructing justice in the process, but also in the discreditation of ALL of us researchers whose higher calling

u vila na mana na visana ku manaka shi kazalanda na Mana ya kana na kana na shara na shara ka sharakara g

towards_truth pre-empted the disgraceful appeals for us all to lemming-like adhere to the "mational security" while our national HONCE was at stake, not only here but internationally as well !! All of us researchers/critics of the official version relating to this case have, in the face of incredible forces employed in every possible way against us, slowly, but surely were successful in enlightening peoples of the world of the absolute, odious fraudulence perpetra by the Warren Commission. And now, inexorably, we are similarly divulging to those many, many whose quest for the entire truth in this matter remains at least partially unquenched of the much greater frand which was more recently perpetrated and perpetuated by Robert Elakey in particular, and the EMTIRE House Select Committee on Assassinations in general. As this country hurtles inevitably closer and closer to fascism and totalitarianism, the question remains implicit.—Is there yet TIME tobegin a reversal towards the ideals which originally made this country the greatest on earth, or are we doomed to live in a society, imposed upon us by those who feel and would have us feel more confortable living in a strictured fascist state??

"Those who do not learn from history are condemned to relive it"..(Santiana.) "Let justice be done though the heavens fall."..Jim Garrison.

As you many subscribers know, this newsletter is usually published bi-monthly, but because of the crucially important information contained herein, and secondly, because the holiday season is upon us now, I decided not to wait another month, so.....

My wife, Anita, and I wish to take this opportunity to express our sincerest hopes of you all and your loved ones having the Merriest of Christmases and also the happiest, healthiest and most loving of New Years.

Our love to you all.

Ted &- -Gendolfo. Anita

-PEACE-

THE MOCK "TRIAL" THAT MADE A MOCKERY OF ALL "TRIALS." ... By Ted Gendolfo, editor ...

On November 21st & 22nd, the 23d anniversary of the JFK assassination, "SHOWTIME" cable-TV, which hardly anyone in the country gets or sees, graced us with 5% hours of a complete farce called, "ON TRIAL, LEE HARVEY OSWALD." I'm certain that JFK must have turned over in his grave while this travesty was being shown. Now for my story on this: It all began when Mark Lane called me up, a month before it's showing, and asked me if I had heard about this upcoming project, no doubt it being the latest CIA contributions to "truth" in this matter. I told him I hadn't but would find out about it. To make a long story short, I spoke with Jay Larkin, the publicity man for "Showtime", and he filled me in on some details. He also sent me their 3-page press release on it. He told me that Vincent Bugliosi was the (Oswald's) prosecuting attorney and that attorney Jerry Spence, from Wyoming was the "Defense attorney." I called them both up. Are you ready for this? On the 3 occassions I and Bugliosi spoke, he said some of the most unbelieveablly ridiculous untruths about the "EVIDENCE AGAINST OSWALD", among them.. in reference to the case, that "Governor Connally was struck by a bullet in frame204 of the Zapruder film", that the paraffin tests administered to Oswald's hands and cheeks "WERE POSITIVE", among other jems of info

despite the fact that Connally is clearly observed in the film as being struck at Z frame 237, and also the fact that the parafin tests on Lee proved NEGATIVE. He also admonished me and the other long-time critics for our "limited, one-sided view of the evidence of the case." I then asked him how long he had studied the case prior to his proscopting Ommid on the show He caid

محووجي ويعجب المحصين

asked him how long he studied the case before prosecuting "Oswald" on the show. He said, "Ch. 16 about 3 months". I asked what sources he relied upon for his information. "Well, of course, the Warren Report and the House Assassinations Committee." (What more would you want, right??) Being unable to control myself any further at this point, I said/asked... "Vince, did you know that the, to me, singular bit of evidence which completely exonerates Oswald from having committed the crime is the fact that at the precise time that Lee was supposed to have been rushing down the 4 flights of stairs to make it into the 2nd floor lunchroom where he was encountered by Roy fruly and Dallas motorcycle officer, Marrion Baker less than one and a half minutes after the shots were fired, a woman named Victoria Adams and a pregnant woman friend of hers were STANDING ON THOSE STAIRS ON THE 4th FLOOR, AND MS. ADAMS TESTIFIED THAT NO ONE PASSED THEM AT THAT TIME, and that since that was the ONLY staircase in the TSBD building and that the ONLY elevator in the building was parked/situated on the 5th floor all that time, Vince, can you explain how Lee was able to reach the 2nd floor lunchroom, I mean, did he do it by the usage of osnosis or what?" Vince replied, " Ted, are you sure of that?" I told him that this information was published in Sylvia Meagher's book, "Accessories After The Fact", and also appears in one of the 26 volumes of the Warren Report. He said, "You know, that's a very strong point you have there which I'll have to do some thinking about. That's a very strong point you have there, certainly Ted " On the show, videotapes of which were hand-delivered to me by a messenger for "Showtime TV", Bugliosi said that "there is not one scintilla of evidence which exonerates Oswald, and Oswald alone, from having murdered JFK, not one. I could throw away 90% of the evidence and the remaining ten % would still be enough to convict him. If the ghost of Oswald were right here in this courtroom, even he would admit that this is true." So much for the consistently incorrect, evidence-wise, Mr. Bugliosi. Now for Jerry Spence, "O swald's

i

defense attorney, if you will. When I spoke to him by phone the following day after the last "revelatory" discussion I got from Bugliosi, he told me that "it was not my intention to try to exonerate Oswald from having committing this crime... I merely wanted to prove that there was a conspiracy..that Oswald did not act alone." (WHAT???). I asked him, "Mr. Spence, especially in a trial where the defendant is being tried for MURDER, isn't it the ONLY thing his attorney should attempt to do..to have him judged "not guilty"?? He said, "No, not when..maybe in an ordinary case, but not when there is a question of conspiracy or no conspiracy."

Need I say more about this farce?? When I spoke again to Mark Lane, he said, "What the hell is wrong with Bugliosi anyway? He's a lawyer. He knows butter than that .. that there can't ever be a trial when the defendant is dead and not there to defend himself. He knows that..incredible." And I guess that one word, "incredible" accurately sums up this travesty. Bugliosi has a great deal in common with David Belin, who served on the Warren Commission. Namely, that neither of them, to my knowledge, has EVER uttered anything about this case that is not found to be completely erroneous!! As I remarked to my colleague, Dick E. Sprague about some of the things Bugliosi told me about when we spoke, "He has a vast knowledge about abse absolutely nothing concerning the evidence." We both langhed our heads off when I told him that. The ONLY person on the "trial" who was at all familiar (quite, of couse) was the ONLY knowledgeable person who was participated was, of couse, Cyril H Wecht. He very adequately testified as a defense witness for Oswald. So the show wasn't a TOTAL loss and waste of time. Under cross-examination by Bugliosi, who called Wecht "the darling of the critical community", Wecht easily disposed of the nonsense exhibited by Bugliosi, and, as always, completely shattered the "single-bullet-theory" as he has done so often in the past. It was a pleasure for me to see and hear my friend and most knowledgeable colleague again. Wecht appeared for exactly 26 minutes, although when I spoke recently to him, he told me that he testified for 45 minutes. (Wonder why they didn't show him in entirety??) I'd love to have heard the deleted 19 minutes. One of my subscribers, in England, sent me Their, slightly different "trial" but, unfortunately, England has a different VCR system, resulting in an inability to see anything but lines of when played on our VCR's. Also, the voice was too fast, but, unlike the U.S. version, their jury reached a verdict when they decided and found Oswald "GUILTY, AS CHARGED", making me wonder who comprised that jury. But a polls taken by viewers call-ins found Lee NOT GUILITY-89% in England & 82% in the U.S. As Sprague asked me, "Ted, I'll bet our famous 3 lettered (CIA) friends paid for

this travesty." I agree. We both wondered why this was not shown on CBS, NBC or ABC-TV where many more people could/would see it?? It was, indeed, as Lane said, "A mock "trial" which made a mocker, of all"trials" P S Both Spence and Bugliosi's summations to the jury was a joke!!This "trial" to me exhibited a total unfamiliarity with anything even remotelyresembling the KNOWN BASIC EVIDENCE of the case. It was, in short, an obviously deliberate SHAM in ever way. But don't forget..Bugliosi & Spence told me they studied the case for a WHOLE 3 MONTHS. Ad-nansium. -AND THE BEAT GOES ON- Ted Gandolfo, editor.

المراجعة المراجعة المراجعة المحمد المراجعة المحمد المراجعة المراجعة المحمد المراجعة المحمد المراجعة المحمد الم