

The action against Garrison and his co-defendants was taken within the framework of the "Organized Crime Control Act of 1970" which is a conspicuous phony - like everything else the Nixon Maladministration does or says. While purporting to be aimed at gangsters and racketeers, this mislabeled act was in fact conceived and pushed through Congress by John Mitchell's Department of Injustice for the purpose of stifling political dissent and serving as a weapon against outstanding opponents of the government's war policies, like Jim Garrison. As a matter of fact, it now seems likely that the intention to frame Garrison was a prime mover in the passage of this act by a blindfolded congress.

Organized crime never had it so good as in these happy days of the Nixon Maladministration. Even the FBI has to concede again and again, in its annual reports, that the crime rate has been going up by leaps and bounds since that great champion of law and order, Tricky Dick, coned his way into the White House.

Before we now proceed to expose the frameup of Jim Garrison in all its scabrous detail, let's take a good, hard look at the Government's "star witness" in the case, Pershing Gervais. Who is this man and why was he picked by the Department of Injustice to ruin the reputation and possibly the career of the great New Orleans populist who has been giving the felonious Washington Government so much trouble?

First of all, and unhappily, it must be said that Gervais has been a long-time close personal friend of Jim Garrison. The latter, for all his other high qualities, has never exhibited much insight in telling false friends apart from real ones and by this failure has hurt himself grievously again and again. Indeed, Garrison so misjudged Gervais - whom he had known since they served together as sergeants in the same battery of the Louisiana National Guard in the 1940s - that on Sept. 8, 1965, he publicly termed him "one of the finest men I have ever known" - one day before he had to fire the scoundrel as a grafter caught red-handed. More than two years earlier, criminal District Court judge J. Bernard Cocke had shown far better judgment when he described Gervais in court as "a thief, grafter and ruffian."

In their 1967 book "Plot or Politics?" (The Garrison Case and Its Cast), the two New Orleans reporters Rosemary James and Jack Wardlaw drew an unflattering portrait of the man whom Garrison at the time still considered a friend. The authors note that the DA, soon after his election to his first term in 1961, "named an ex-cop and pal, Pershing Gervais, as his chief investigator, a move which caused bitter antagonism in some quarters immediately and one which was to cause Garrison no end of frustration later (this almost sounds prophetic! - J.J.).

"Gervais had been discharged from the police force some years back and Police Superintendent Joseph I. Diarrusso made it clear that he didn't like the idea of his men working under a man who had been fired from the force.

"During a hot investigation in the Fifties, Gervais had testified that bribes were handed out to policemen on a weekly basis in their pay envelopes 'like a fringe benefit.'

"Gervais admitted he had taken his 'lousy \$ 21 a week,' but swore he had never 'hustled' a dime from anyone in his life. (Incidentally, in the grafters' special lingo, a 'dime' often means a thousand dollars - J.J.) Garrison vouched for his friend's integrity and so did others, but there were many people in the city who were not at all happy to see a man with Pershing's knowledge in a position of potential power.

"And, throughout Garrison's first term, he was attacked by his enemies through his Achilles Heel - Pershing (well, as you can see, that is still so today, only the nature of the enemy has changed - J.J.)

"If Klein and Williams were Garrison's top assistants, Gervais was his right hand - and it hurt Garrison when he had to cut it off..."

(to be continued in the next issue)

new Light on the Robert Kennedy Murder Fraud (ctd.)

- Q. Do you have the one envelope there, do you?"
 A. "Yes." (The envelope then is marked Exhibit 5-B).
 Q. "How many shots are there in 5-B?"
 A. "There's four."
 Q. "Four spent slugs, is that correct?"
 A. "Right."
 Q. "Do they have markings on them that are readable, so to speak?"
 A. "These markings do have - these bullets do have markings on them, yes."
 Q. "They were fired -- that gun was fired in the water tank to get those slugs?"
 A. "That's correct."
 Q. "Did you compare the markings on the test slugs in 5-B with the questioned bullet, 5-A?"
 A. "I did."
 Q. "And that bullet has been identified as having come from the body of Senator Robert Kennedy, do you understand that?"
 A. "That's correct."

Note that Deputy District Attorney Morio L. Fukuto, who questioned this witness, chose to use the conveniently vague word "body," instead of stating specifically that the bullet in question had come from Kennedy's shoulder. Had he been explicit, the question of whether this was the fatal bullet might have been raised. But explicitness was not wanted; a deliberate fraud was in the making, and so the questioning went on in an intentionally ambiguous manner:

- Q. "And from your comparison of the two bullets, were you able to form any opinion as to the bullet 5-A?"
 A. "I was."
 Q. "What is that opinion?"
 A. "That the bullet in People's 5-A here marked the bullet from Robert Kennedy (vague again with a vengeance! - J.J.) was fired in the exhibit, the revolver here, People's Exhibit Number 7 at some time. Yes, it was fired in the weapon."

At Sirhan's trial, the prosecution and the ballistics expert, Wolfer, conspired to create the impression, in the jurors' minds, that it was the fatal head bullet that had been positively identified as having come from Sirhan's revolver, making again full and effective use of vagueness, ambiguity and weasel words. This deception was successful because the police, in its Ballistics Test report, ^{stated} that this fatal bullet had been "recovered and booked as evidence" - a flagrant lie. This was the key element of the rigged evidence on the strength of which Sirhan was convicted of a murder he had tried to, but never actually managed to commit!

Could the fragment of the head bullet, which the police did have in its possession, have been identified in some other way than through a ballistics test which was clearly impossible to perform in this case? Yes, indeed. Quite apart from the fact that spectographic analysis could have been used to determine whether or not this fragment was of the same metallic composition as the nearly whole bullet that had been extracted from Robert Kennedy's shoulder, science in recent years has developed a revolutionary new method for such identification, as TL readers already know.

It is called neutron activation analysis and has two important advantages. The first is that tests may be performed without in any way mutilating, diminishing or even marking the specimens which are analyzed. Secondly, neutron activation analysis is ten times more refined than spectographic analysis; it can detect extremely minute quantities of a trace element which might not be revealed by spectographic examination alone, thus improving the chances of making a foolproof determination of the origin and history of the specimen.

(to be continued in the next issue)

Ever since its smarting defeat in the Bay of Pigs, for which it blamed President Kennedy's hesitation to wage all-out war, rather than its own conspicuous bungling, the CIA has sought to solve the Cuban problem by assassinating Fidel Castro. Fascinating details of six of these abortive attempts have been revealed by columnist Jack Anderson in a series of remarkable articles published in January 1971 in the New York Post and other papers. Anderson, whose information was drawn quite obviously from sources inside the CIA, started off his first story on the subject (NY Post, 1-18-71) with these words:

"Locked in the darkest recesses of the CIA is the story of six assassination attempts against Cuba's Fidel Castro. For 10 years, only a few key people have known the terrible secret. They have sworn never to talk. Yet we have learned the details from sources whose credentials are beyond question."

According to Anderson, the CIA assigned several of its top operatives to the continuous assignment to knock off Castro by any and all means available, which began as part of the Bay of Pigs operation and ended about the first of March, 1963. While preparations for the assassination campaign had begun during the last months of the Eisenhower Administration, all six of the actual attempts took place during the tenure of President Kennedy.

Did President Kennedy personally sanction the plot against Castro? Anderson raises this question in the second article of his series (NY Post, 1-19-71), then answers it in the negative, mainly on the basis of information supplied to him by Senator George Smathers of Florida who had been one of John F. Kennedy's closest friends. It was Smathers himself, apparently, who, in a private talk with the President, brought up the question of eliminating the present Cuban problem. Anderson also mentions, known, incidentally, that Smathers - who was also involved in shady Florida land deals and was up to his neck in the Bobby Baker scandal - was close to the CIA for years. He wasn't the kind of person who would shy away from assassination to achieve his goals.

But Kennedy was. When his unworthy friend from Florida brought up the idea, "Kennedy - to quote Anderson again - merely rolled back his eyes, recalled Smathers, as if to indicate the idea was too wild to discuss..." and, a few paragraphs down, the columnist reports:

"Smathers told us that President Kennedy seemed 'horrified' at the idea of political assassinations. 'I remember him saying,' recalled Smathers, 'that the CIA frequently did things he didn't know about, and he was unhappy about it. He complained that the CIA was almost autonomous.'

"He told me he believed the CIA had arranged to have Diem and Trujillo bumped off. He was pretty well shocked about that. He thought it was a stupid thing to do, and he wanted to get control of what the CIA was doing."

The reference to the assassination of President Diem of South Vietnam, who was killed on Nov. 1, 1963, shows that this particular conversation between Kennedy and Smathers must have taken place some time during November 1963, i.e. only a few days before the Chief Executive himself was murdered by the criminal agency which Jim Garrison has correctly described as "the most effective assassination machine in the world." The fact that President Kennedy was killed by the CIA is not yet in the official record, but the assassination of President Diem is. As a result of the publication of the "Pentagon Papers" the whole world now knows that Diem was killed by "insurgents" who were working hand in glove with the CIA command in Saigon. Thus Kennedy's realization that the CIA, acting on its own, had been behind the Diem slaying, has now been fully vindicated. If only the President had also foreseen the danger he himself was in! (to be continued in the next issue)

* For details about Sen. Smathers' involvement with Bobby Baker, see my book "The Dark Side of Lyndon B. Johnson" pp. 117-118 and following chapters.