

DEAR MS. MORGAN,  
THANK YOU FOR YOUR REPLY OF DECEMBER 4. I WOULD BE VERY CURIOUS TO KNOW IF YOU CONSIDER SALANDRIA'S ANALYSIS TO BE RESPONSIBLE, I'LL SEND YOU HIS SPEECH IF YOU AN AMERICAN COUP D'ETAT  
FROM THE SAME FOLKS ARE WHO BROUGHT YOU THE BAY OF PIGS INTERESTS

by Rodger [Signature]

Thursday (Oct. 28) reported an historic WILPF conference, held in Cambridge, which invited experts to present detailed information relating to Pres. Kennedy's assassination.

For those unacquainted with information currently available, shocking documentation was given to prove that Kennedy was killed by a conspiracy; e.g., the Zapruder film of the President's death, recording the impact of a bullet originating from an area directly opposite from Oswald's location.

Vincent Salandria, a Philadelphia lawyer and early critic of the Warren Commission, then offered a profound analysis of "The Implications of the John F. Kennedy Assassination for our Society". This lengthy, carefully documented speech (available at WILPF, 15 Sellers St., Camb. for \$.60) was summarized in the above-mentioned article, but two major themes will now be presented in greater detail.

The first centers around the question of why Pres Kennedy was killed and the strategies employed. "Since Nov. 22, 1963, there has been almost endless research into the microanalytic aspects of the assassination of Pres. Kennedy.... One who takes the trouble to study the microanalytic material provided by the federal government must immediately conclude that there was a conspiracy to kill Pres. Kennedy. How foolish it was of us to dwell so long on these governmentally-supplied pacifiers, rather than to put them aside and undertake the...essen-

tial work of constructing a model of explanation which fits the data of the assassination and explains the why of it."

### Big Brother!

"In this connection it is important to note that the very agency which made that mass of detailed microanalytic evidence available to us - the federal government - contended from the first that there was no conspiracy. But, if the federal government's intelligence agencies must have known that the material which the government issued would indicate a conspiracy existed, then why did we get the evidence...? Why would the federal government on the one hand wish to provide us with data which prove a conspiracy to kill Pres. Kennedy while simultaneously contending on the other that there was no conspiracy?"

"The unvarying governmental pattern of consistently publicly supporting the lone assassin myth and equally uniformly rejecting the irrefutable conspiracy evidence was too studied to be the function of mere bureaucratic stupidity or accident. I suggest that this uniform governmental pattern did not speak to official innocence or ignorance but rather to the guilt of the government at the very highest echelons."

"I query further whether this systematic behavioral pattern when persisted in by the gov-

ernment in a reckless and apparently unskeptical manner was not meant to communicate to the citizenry what really happened to its President and what was in store for any quixotic citizens who saw fit to oppose the new rulers of our land?"

"So overwhelming and voluminous is the evidence of conspiracy provided for us by the government that we are compelled to conclude that if not they, at least a number of possible plots, were meant by the conspirators to be quasi visible.... If the killers were positioned in the highest echelons of the federal governmental apparatus, and by the assassination they had finally usurped the pinnacle of governmental power, then why did they not conceal the conspiracy? For, if they had accomplished a coup, they could have exercised their control by concealing evidence of conspiracy. But this coup was covert. The people would not have tolerated an overt coup against such a beloved man as

Pres. John F. Kennedy. Because of the covertness of the coup, I submit that the new governmental rulers were eager to reveal their work at differing levels of certainty to diverse people and at different times. Thus, they could avert a concerted counter-thrust to their illegitimate seizure of power. Democratic forces could not unite against the new illegitimate governmental apparatus. The insights of what had occurred dawned in the minds of the decent citizenry at different times and with different degrees of clarity. The transparent aspects of the conspiracy were permitted to flash signals to various elements of our population much in the fashion of spot ads slanted at different times for selected audiences. The new rulers carefully and selectively orchestrated revelations of their bloody work so as to gain ... ascendancy to absolute power. I have long felt that the killers actually preempted the assassination criticism by supplying the information they wanted revealed and also by supplying the critics whom they wanted to disclose the data. Does it not make sense that if they could perpetrate a coup and could control the press they would have endeavored to dominate likewise the assassination criticism?"

"I have heard it argued that the silence of the Kennedy family supports the single-assassin myth. But the Kennedy family knows how overwhelming and transparently clear the conspiracy evidence is. Can there be an explanation for this silence other than that the assassination was the act of the very highest pinnacle of American governmental power? The taciturnity of the Kennedy family does not and cannot speak to the lack of conspiracy evidence. Rather that evidence stands on its own merits - massively and indestructably. If we were to posit endo-a low level conspiracy, then the Kennedy family silence would indeed be inexplicable. But, is that silence of the Kennedy's - when juxtaposed against the irrefutable conspiracy evidence - not their mute acknowledgement that the assassination was perpetrated by our new rulers who possess awesome power which dwarfs that of the Kennedy family? So the silence of the Kennedy family rather than refuting a conspiracy tends to reinforce the feeling that all Americans entertain at some level of consciousness - what we sense and what the rest of the world knows - that the killing of Kennedy represented a coup d'etat."

## IT CAN'T HAPPEN HERE?

Kennedy himself did not regard a military takeover as implausible. We have an excellent articulation of his feeling on this matter in a discussion with Paul B. Fay, Jr. (as related in The Pleasure of His Company). This colloquy occurred one summer weekend in 1962 on the Honey Fitz, the Kennedy yacht. The President was asked what he thought of the possibility of a military takeover in the U.S.. Pres. Kennedy said: 'It's possible. It could happen in this country, but the conditions would have to be just right.' The conditions outlined by the President were as follows: 1. The country would have to be led by a young President. 2. There would be a Bay of Pigs. 3. Military criticism of the President would follow. 4. Then, if there were another Bay of Pigs, the military would consider overthrowing the elected establishment, and finally, 5. '...if there were a third Bay of Pigs, it could happen.'

"These conditions were approximated during the Kennedy administration. Pres. Kennedy was in fact a young President. There was a Bay of Pigs. The missile crisis which followed resulted not in the bombing of Cuba - as the military advisors had urged upon the President - but rather in a detente with Russia. This was followed by a nuclear test ban

treaty which 'the Joint Chiefs of Staff declared themselves opposed to under almost any terms.' The American University speech following his reexamination of the Vietnamese policy completely fulfilled the conditions set forth for a takeover...."

Perceiving that the Presidential assassination represented the climax of a struggle for power within the government, Salandria begins a second theme by questioning who was ultimately responsible. First listing evidence from the military autopsy to indicate the participation of the military in the assassination, he is now led by process of elimination to "the question of whether the CIA was the specific federal agency which was the prime mover in the killing of Pres. Kennedy."

"After the assassination of Pres. Kennedy, the government which had refused to act on conspiracy evidence resorted to amazingly fast action in an area where one might have anticipated a slow feeling of the way. The fact is that after the assassina-

tion key foreign policy changes were put into effect immediately."

"Pres. Kennedy saw the danger to his efforts to end the Cold War which lay in the power of the CIA. The New York Times quoted him as saying that he wished to 'splinter the CIA into 1000 pieces and scatter it to the winds.' But that purpose was never accomplished by Pres. Kennedy. The CIA is a policy-making body still. Eugene McCarthy is of this opinion: "...the CIA does play an important part in influencing foreign policy, and certainly has become an important operating arm of the executive branch in this area of government responsibility.'

## Ellsberg Suspected

Salandria now introduces a provocative theory. "At that period of time, there was a congruence of interests between the American military and the CIA. Kennedy was the enemy of both power groups at the time he was killed. Of late, with the issuance of the Pentagon Papers by a long-standing CIA agent, Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, this alliance between the CIA and the military seems to have become strained. Dr. Ellsberg was one of the exclusive Society of Fellows at Harvard with McGeorge Bundy and his brother William. When Ellsberg leaked the documents, he was employed at MIT's Center for International Studies and numbered among his colleagues Mr. William Bundy. In my assassination research, I learned that ex-CIA people who undertook work to assist the research on the Kennedy assassination invariably turned out to be present CIA people. I would urge that the public remain skeptical about Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, the ex-marine, ex-CIA, ex-hawk, ex-Kissinger aide and present fellow researcher of Mr. William Bundy at MIT. I would urge that you hold open the hypothesis that the Pentagon Papers are designed as a thrust against the military by the CIA. I suggest that there has been a falling out between both of these anti-democratic power blocs. The military is still determined to defeat Communism abroad, and the CIA is now primarily concerned with maintaining its power domestically."

"How can we accept the Pentagon Papers as an honest and complete peering into the inner workings of our government? These papers predate and postdate Nov. 22, 1963. Yet, these papers make no reference to the assassination and the enormous power and policy shift which occurred on

~~that historical day when the re-public expired. Can the purpose of the disclosures of the Pentagon Papers really be to aid the CIA non-ideological elements in our government against the right-wing, military, virulently anti-communist elements? Does not the evidence...support the concept that the Pentagon Papers were the~~

treaty which 'the Joint Chiefs of Staff declared themselves opposed to under almost any terms.' The American University speech following his reexamination of the Vietnamese policy completely fulfilled the conditions set forth for a takeover...."

Perceiving that the Presidential assassination represented the climax of a struggle for power within the government, Salandria begins a second theme by questioning who was ultimately responsible. First listing evidence from the military autopsy to indicate the participation of the military in the assassination, he is now led by process of elimination to "the question of whether the CIA was the specific federal agency which was the prime mover in the killing of Pres. Kennedy."

"After the assassination of Pres. Kennedy, the government which had refused to act on conspiracy evidence resorted to amazingly fast action in an area where one might have anticipated a slow feeling of the way. The fact is that after the assassination key foreign policy changes were put into effect immediately"

"Pres. Kennedy saw the danger to his efforts to end the Cold War which lay in the power of the CIA. The New York Times quoted him as saying that he wished to 'splinter the CIA into 1000 pieces and scatter it to the winds.' But that purpose was never accomplished by Pres. Kennedy. The CIA is a policy-making body still. Eugene McCarthy is of this opinion: "...the CIA does play an important part in influencing foreign policy, and certainly has become an important operating arm of the executive branch in this area of government responsibility."

## Ellsberg Suspected

Salandria now introduces a provocative theory. "At that period of time, there was a congruence of interests between the American military and the CIA. Kennedy was the enemy of both power groups at the time he was killed. Of late, with the issuance of the Pentagon Papers by a

long-standing CIA agent, Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, this alliance between the CIA and the military seems to have become strained. Dr. Ellsberg was one of the exclusive Society of Fellows at Harvard with McGeorge Bundy and his brother William. When Ellsberg leaked the documents, he was employed at MIT's Center for International Studies and numbered among his colleagues Mr. William Bundy. In my assassination research, I learned that ex-CIA people who undertook work to assist the research on the Kennedy assassination invariably turned out to be present CIA people. I would urge that the public remain skeptical about Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, the ex-marine, ex-CIA, ex-hawk, ex-Kissinger aide and present fellow researcher of Mr. William Bundy at MIT. I would urge that you hold open the hypothesis that the Pentagon Papers are designed as a thrust against the military by the CIA. I suggest that there has been a falling out between both of these anti-democratic power blocs. The military is still determined to defeat Communism abroad, and the CIA is now primarily concerned with maintaining its power domestically"

"How can we accept the Pentagon Papers as an honest and complete peering into the inner workings of our government? These papers predate and postdate Nov. 22, 1963. Yet, these papers make no reference to the assassination and the enormous power and policy shift which occurred on that historical day when the re-public expired. Can the purpose of the disclosures of the Pentagon Papers really be to aid the CIA non-ideological elements in our government against the right-wing, military, virulently anti-communist elements? Does not the evidence...support the concept that the Pentagon Papers were the

offerings of the CIA to enlist assistance in its intra-governmental struggle against the military?(see Newsweek, Nov. 22, 1971 pp. 28-40 reporting CIA-Helms' new authority over all military intelligence.)

## the bundy boys

"Now, let us shift our attention...to McGeorge Bundy, and his intelligence brother, William Bundy. For McGeorge Bundy's roles in the governmental apparatus before and after the assassination are worthy of study, and William Bundy's services in and out of the CIA are also of interest to us.

With the Kennedy Administra-

tion, McGeorge Bundy was in foreign policy a hard-liner who had little use for Adlai Stevenson's idealistic approach to foreign relations. McGeorge Bundy was one of the planners of the Bay of Pigs invasion. Allen Dulles was in Puerto Rico, so Richard Mervin Bissell, Jr. was the CIA's man in charge of the planning. As happenstance would have it, McGeorge Bundy, the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs, had been a student of Bissell's at Yale. He had also worked for Bissell on the Marshall Plan in 1948. Also in on that planning, as coincidence would have it, was Gen. Charles P. Cabell, the CIA's deputy director, who is brother of Mayor Earle Cabell, the Mayor of Dallas at the time of the assassination. McGeorge Bundy was in the Kennedy and early Johnson Administration - the presidential representative and key man on the Special Group which makes the key intelligence decisions for the country. It has operated as the hidden power center of the government.

As one of the planners of the Bay of Pigs, McGeorge Bundy must take some of the blame for not serving President Kennedy well and participating in the betrayal of the President in the Bay of Pigs planning operation. But, despite Bundy's complicity with the CIA, which resulted in misleading the President in the Bay of Pigs, Kennedy turned over the direction of Vietnam policy largely to Bundy, along with Rusk, McNamara and Rostow. The best we can say for McGeorge Bundy's handling of Vietnam for Pres. Kennedy was that he botched. Here is what Schlesinger said about Kennedy's feeling concerning the Vietnamese policy: 'He was somber and shaken. I had not seen him so depressed since the Bay of Pigs. No doubt he realized Viet Nam was his great failure in foreign policy, and that he had never really given it his full attention.' The announced intention of Kennedy as stated on Oct. 2, 1963 by McNamara and Taylor was to withdraw most U.S. forces from South Vietnam by the end of 1965. But that was not McGeorge Bundy's policy - and Pres. Kennedy was soon to die - and McGeorge Bundy would be carrying on his hawkish concepts in playing a key role in shaping the aggressive foreign policy of Pres. Lyndon B. Johnson."

What was McGeorge Bundy doing on the day Pres. Kennedy was dispatched? Theodore H. White in his book, The Making of the President 1964, tells us that the Presidential party on its flight back to Washington on that fateful day 'learned that there was no conspiracy, learned of the identity

of Oswald and his arrest...' This was the very first announcement of Oswald as the lone assassin. Oswald was not even charged with assassinating the President until 1:30 A.M. the next morning. The plane landed at 5:59 P.M. on the 22nd. At that time the District Attorney of Dallas, Henry Wade, was informing us that 'preliminary reports indicated more than one person was involved in the shooting....' Can there be any doubt that for any government taken by surprise by the assassination - and legitimately seeking

Continued on pg. 7

## KENNEDY

Continued from pg. 6

the truth concerning it--prior to 6:00 on the day of the assassination was too soon to know there was no conspiracy? This announcement was the first which designated Oswald as the lone assassin. Who was responsible for that announcement? That announcement came from the White House Situation Room. The Situation Room was under the personal and direct control of McGeorge Bundy."

"So, McGeorge Bundy was quite busy on Nov. 22, 1963. After having spent a good deal of time on the telephone with Pres. Johnson as Johnson was flying to Washington, he managed to be at the new President's side when Air Force One landed. He was seen with Lyndon B. Johnson when the President emerged from the South Lawn of the White House. History records that Bundy remained with Pres. Johnson to be designated by him as one of the leading hawks of the Johnson Administration."

"What was the future to hold for the U. S. following the assassination of Pres. Kennedy? What changed? The most important and immediate change following the assassination of Pres. Kennedy occurred precisely in the area of foreign policy. The Cold War warriors of the Bundy brothers' stripe gained a stranglehold on the foreign policy of the nation much in the same fashion that Allen and John Foster Dulles had in an earlier administration. Of course, to note such a change is not to prove it was a deliberate consequence of the assassination Yet, a careful examination of

foreign policy following the killing of Kennedy is required to see whether the change might have been related to the killing of the President."

"The book The Politics of Escalation in Vietnam has the following to say about the change: '... the United States had made the crucial decision to reverse the policy, announced during the last day of Pres. Kennedy's administration, of gradually withdrawing U. S. troops from South Vietnam. Was it all a coincidence that a change in policy, and a change in policy by a corresponding change in Saigon's government' That there should have been a change in Vietnamese policy so immediately after the murder of Kennedy when the external situation in Vietnam did not evoke it raises serious questions about what caused it in our internal situation. What is at stake here is the issue not of how the assassination was accomplished, but the fundamental question concerning why it was done and which elements are behind it. At issue are questions of war and peace that involve the whole of humanity. For the peace movement not to raise these questions is and has been irresponsible."

The final quarter of Salandria's speech concerned the nature of the Ford Foundation's activities under the current leadership of McGeorge Bundy. Prominent among these activities is the funding of MIT's Center for International Studies, which began in 1966.

COME TO THE

ZAPRUDER

FILM

STUD. CENTER, WEST LOUNGE

ALL DAY THURSDAY

WATCH THE REPUBLIC

DISAPPEAR BEFORE

YOUR VERY EYES!

75 SCHOOL ST.  
CAMBRIDGE, MASS. 02139



*Letters:* News clip on

MS. SYLVIA MEACHER  
302 WEST 12 ST.  
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10014

*Jennifer  
pencil  
Dec 1971*