

March 21, 1967

ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY
NOVEMBER 22, 1963, DALLAS, TEXAS

Re: Information Supplied by
Attorney Edward F. Morgan,
300 Farragut Building,
900 - 17th Street, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.

On the evening of March 20, 1967, Attorney Edward F. Morgan furnished the following information after being informed that it had been indicated he had information relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

He advised that while this covered a wide range or field, it probably arose as the result of his having made comments suggesting otherwise during conversations in which Lee Harvey Oswald was indicated as being the only person involved in the crime. He stated that he did have information pertaining to the assassination which he considered as pertinent and relevant. He said it was necessary for him in his capacity of attorney to invoke the attorney-client privilege since the information in his possession was derived as a result of that relationship. He added that it was still possible for his clients to be prosecuted. He pointed out that he was not stating or implying his clients were either directly or indirectly involved in the death of President Kennedy or could be prosecuted in that regard. However, they definitely face possible prosecution in a crime not related to the assassination of President Kennedy, but through participation in which crime they learned of information pertaining to the President's assassination. Mr. Morgan said

COPIES DESTROYED

21 JAN 11 1973

4827

ENCLOSURE

ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY
NOVEMBER 22, 1963, DALLAS, TEXAS

he represented these clients on this specific matter. He did not elaborate on when they sought his legal counsel and he indicated he could not fulfill his responsibility and identify them. He said he gave considerable thought to finding some way to make this information available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but as yet had not come up with a solution. He considered a possible waiver from his clients but decided against this because the type of protection they needed was for some competent authority to grant them complete immunity, not only from prosecution but from the publicity that would surely follow. If in the future it becomes possible to overcome all legal obstacles he will immediately make this information available to the Government and, more particularly, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

He related that when he first heard the story from his clients he did not believe it, but conducted enough inquiry to satisfy himself that they had some basis in fact for their position and he felt they were telling the truth. He pointed out he represented substantial citizens, people who loved their country and had a high regard for the then President. If their story came out now they would be damaged by the resultant publicity, and some prosecutor of the same type as District Attorney Garrison of New Orleans could conceivably attempt to initiate prosecution against them. At this point he noted that the charge against them might well be conspiracy to kill, which is a crime, and in the case of his clients the Statute of Limitations has not run.

In explaining this remark he pointed out that if he were a government investigator assigned to unravel all facets of the assassination of President Kennedy he would first concern himself with reading the newspaper articles dealing with the topic of a Castro plot. He said he would examine the Castro plot to determine precisely what bearing it had on the assassination of the President. He indicated the newspaper articles had considerable merit and were on the right track in regard to the theory of the assassination.

ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY
NOVEMBER 22, 1963, DALLAS, TEXAS

Without making any factual representations, and continuing to theorize, he went on to relate that his clients, which he again characterized as respectable citizens, were called upon by a governmental agency to assist in a project which was said to have the highest governmental approval. The project had as its purpose the assassination of Fidel Castro, Premier of Cuba. Elaborate plans involving many people were made. These plans included the infiltration of the Cuban Government and the placing of informants in key posts within Cuba. The project almost reached fruition when Castro became aware of it and arrested a number of suspects. By pressuring captured suspects he was able to learn the full details of the plot against him and decided "if that was the way President Kennedy wanted it, he too could engage in the same tactics." Castro thereafter employed teams of individuals who were dispatched to the United States for the purpose of assassinating President Kennedy. Mr. Morgan further explained that his clients, here noting that he, Morgan, was employed by more than one of those involved, obtained this information concerning Castro's dispatch of these assassins from "feed back" furnished by sources in place close to Castro, who had been initially placed there in effecting the purpose of the original project. Continuing, he said his clients were aware of the identity of some of the individuals who came to the United States for this purpose and he understood that two such individuals were now in the state of New Jersey.

Mr. Morgan further noted that one of the clients he represented was a high type individual of the Catholic faith. Morgan said he queried him as to why a person with his high ethical standard had ever become involved in such a project as the assassination of Fidel Castro. The client indicated that his conscience bothered him; however, the project was so highly patriotically motivated that this, in his mind overrode personal ethical or moral considerations. He further described how one client, when hearing the statement that Lee Harvey Oswald was the sole assassin of President Kennedy,

ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY
NOVEMBER 22, 1963, DALLAS, TEXAS

"laughs with tears in his eyes and shakes his head in apparent disagreement."

Mr. Morgan said if he were free of the attorney-client privilege to furnish full details, the information that he would be able to supply would not directly identify the alleged conspirators to kill President Kennedy. However, because of the project to kill Fidel Castro, those participating in the project whom he represents developed through feedback information that would identify Fidel Castro's counter-assassins in this country who could very well be considered suspects in such a conspiracy. Morgan pointed out that from the information available to him from his clients he could not declare or conclude that Lee Harvey Oswald could not have committed this assassination alone.

Mr. Morgan pointed out that it was inconceivable to him that an agency of the government which engages in the type of operations which he has described has not come forth to make this most important data available to the Warren Commission. He declined to identify the name of the agency but indirectly described it as the investigative agency which conducts intelligence-type investigations outside the United States.

In conclusion, Mr. Morgan reiterated that he would immediately contact the Federal Bureau of Investigation if he discovered any way to reveal the full details of this matter.

March 21, 1967

ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY
NOVEMBER 27, 1963, DALLAS, TEXAS

Re: Information Supplied by
Attorney Edward P. Morgan,
300 Ferragut Building,
903 - 17th Street, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.

On the evening of March 20, 1967, Attorney Edward P. Morgan furnished the following information after being informed that it had been indicated he had information relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

He advised that while this covered a wide range of field, it probably arose as the result of his having made comments suggesting otherwise during conversations in which Lee Harvey Oswald was indicated as being the only person involved in the crime. He stated that he did have information pertaining to the assassination which he considered as pertinent and relevant. He said it was necessary for him in his capacity of attorney to invoke the attorney-client privilege since the information in his possession was derived as a result of that relationship. He added that it was still possible for his clients to be prosecuted. He pointed out that he was not stating or implying his clients were either directly or indirectly involved in the death of President Kennedy or could be prosecuted in that regard. However, they definitely face possible prosecution in a crime not related to the assassination of President Kennedy, but through participation in which crime they learned of information pertaining to the President's assassination. Mr. Morgan said