Dear Dr. Morrisey, 12/19/90

Although we did mail you Post Mortem on September 29, surface mail, we will send another copy in tomorrow's mail, also surface mail.

I'm sorry you appear not to have understood some of what I wrote you, which in part could be my fault and the haste in which I write letters to be able to have some time for other things, and unwilling to understand what you do not want me to understand, having your own preconceptions that you prefer. You ask more questions that I can take time to reply to but I'll make the effort I can. In the future, if you have more than a few, would you please number each so I can respond by number rather than take the time to repeat your question?

A general comment: you appear to have accepted without question books that you should have perceived on your own are not really serious. Example: Farewell America. It was a phony, by the French spooks in SDECE. How you could as a scholar read that diatribe and not perceive that it is supposedly the solution to the JFK assassination yet its says almost nothing about it baffles me.

One of your refusals to accept what I wrote is the 1st thing you say, who do I think really did it and who managed the coverup. Whether or not you want to believe it, the assassination itself was never really investigated officially and was never intended to be. This applies also to the King, Robert Kennedy and Malcolm X assassinations. So there is no factual basis in the official records that permits any responsible guesses and if there is to be only one who will not further deceive and mislead the people I am and will be that one. There is no way we can responsibly say who did it. Period. And you just don't understand how the agencies work. It was not, as I'm sure I tried to tell you, first necessary for Hoover to call his henchmen in and lay down the coervup line. I have quite a few records that leave this without reasonable question. Its ~~first~~ last is cover the Bureau's ass, the second is cover your own. In what are clearly political cases the coverup is spontaneous, whether or not you wan't to believe it. The closest thing than can be said about this responsibly is what I began my first book by saying, the ultimate responsibility was the Warren Commission's. If you want to spend you time and money reading all the tinselled crap and avoid the factaul literature and then refuse to exercise your own critical faculties, I am not willing to spend as much time as you want when I'm almost 78 and in impaired health and would like to do other things with the time you demand. I don't want to seem to be even impolite, but you really are not reasonable. As you knowo writers of nanfiction do say what they want to say in books and you are asking me to repeat in letters what to a large degree I've said in those books and have been fairly clear on what does address some of your questions. Governments just do not work the way those who have influenced your thinking have led you to believe. The FBI, Secret Service, CIA and the military did not have to confer on how to cover up, yet all covered up. And you'll see in the executive session I referred you to that before it held its first hearing the commission was well enough aware of this.

But let us assume in terms of your thonking, that this was a conscious conspiracy. You are unable to distinguish between this conspiracy and one there undoubtedly was, to kill. Even it one assumes as you do, that both were governmental, there is neither fact nor reason to combine the two into one.

I think you torture what I said about cui bono. (I have trouble using the file cabinets and I can't take time to reread your long letter and mine but I know well enough what I've always believed and therefore what I think I said.) I said that one can eliminate candidates for assassins with this approach but in this case one cannot identify them. There are just too many forces who could have seen benefit from killing JFK and getting LBJ. So there is no point to the list of candidates you string off.

If you are indignant about what I said above, you say, "I wish I had your Post Mortem and other books," and elsewhere you tell me how may books you've gotten over the years. What kept you from getting mine as other than your addition to solving the crime with theories and the attractiveness of such books to those who read casually, unthink-

cassettes available from AARC, 918 F, NW #509, D.C. 20004

ly? You have not asked yourself such basic questions as is something reasonable, and if you decide it is, is it possible?

Livingstone and Groden are friends and their book is a big success and it is still another that deceives and misleads the grieving people. Now if you were at all familiar with that basic fact that is beyond reasonable question, and from the books I've described as crap, you can't and won't be, you'd know that the autopsy pictures and X-rays destroy the official solution. Now who in his right mind would create fakes to do that when he wanted the official solution to be believed? Livingstone has not been able either to face this question or to answer it. He can't. The same is true of Lifton's theory in a different way and the short comment I make is that it was impossible and he knew it was impossible and he hoped to accomplish what he did accomplish, enriching himself and making a name for himself. Which he continues to do with a very successful VCR cassette. If you would apply the commons sense I'm sure you have in much greater quantity that the average person you shoukd be able to see that he postulates a theory, which he really presents as unquestionable fact, that there can be successful conspiracies of thousands who preserve perpetual silence, no one of hw whom has any qualms of conscience. You should also be able to see that this conspiracy involved each and every one of JFK's most trusted, who then were with him. (While simultaneously refusing to credit the refutations of some of them after Second Best Non-Evidence appeared, like General McHugh.) I'm not going to go into all that Lifton knew and withheld from his readers but it was never possible for the conspirators to have unseen access to the corpse in the Dallas hospital or on the plane and in any event it was not possible to hide the corpse on the plane outside the casket. It was not possible to remove the corpse unseen on the other side of the plane, where as one of his alleged sources says, Manchester, there were 3,000 spectators within about 100 feet. As Manchester also states, the second ambulance was sent by LBJ's heart doctor in the fear he might have another heart attack. The second helicopter, as Lifton also know, carried the honor guard from Fort Myer and from the airport to the Navy hospital. The back gate of which that he says was used to sneak the altered corpse in was securely locked as soon as it was known that JFK's body was coming there and the guard was removed so nobody could pull rank and demand it be opened for him. And if this doesn't give you enough reason to be unwilling to believe a word Lifton wrote, how can you trust him when in the very paragraph of the FBI report that refers to an alleged surgery of the head it also says that there was no body bag and Lifton doesn't mention that. Aside from which, if you knew the literature you know that all he claims as his original derring-do was published long, long before his book was rewritten to present him as the discoverer or sex and the inventor of the wheel.

I like Fletch Prouty as a person and think as he thinks on most things. What I said was that he did make mistakes and that he errs when he starts tyring to solve the assassination by the theoretical application to it of what he says that has no factual connection.

You've gone for the nonsense that Penn Jones invented when you say, "A lot of people have been killed." Aside from the fact that most had no connection with or any way of having knowledge of the assassination, nobody was killed to silence him, none had not had an opportunity to say anything he wanted to say, some of his key ones were not even killed, and don't you ever ask yourself any questions at all? Do you think that the CIA has 80-year old kamikazes who can pick the precise moment to drive the wrong way on a divided highway to kill the cab driver who had already, on the record, destroyed the integrity of the assassination investigation? And even apologized on the record for doing it?

And if it were not for your addition to the theory-book drug you not be asking questions like about the hole in JFK's back being longer than a finger. Try to get someone to move an arm up and down and see what happens to the shoulder blade. JFK was erect when shot, prone when the foolishly and wrongly stuck a pinkie in.

I've gotten more upset at you while doing this and unless you ask questions that I've not addressed in my books I'll not respond. I think you are unreasonable to ask all these questions without reading what I've written when you know I was the first to address the Warren Report, wrote more than anyone else and in more detail, without substituting theory for fact. I do not intend to offend you and I hope wou will not think me unreasonable.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

Dr. Michael D. Morrissey
Am Rüsteberg 6
3501 Niestetal
Tel. 0561 / 52 73 27

Germany

13 Dec. 1990

Mr. Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21701
USA

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

I still haven't received your book, and there is no way to check on it. Surprising, since I order a lot of books from the States and this will be the first time one has gotten lost in the 13 years I've lived here. Would it be asking too much to ask you to send another copy?

I agree that cui bono doesn't provide any magic solutions, but it is still the first and best question to ask in any investigation of possible wrongdoing. It is never pursued adequately when the State is the accused. Most people don't even stop to consider the obvious fact that the "cost" of anything is somebody's gain. Vietnam "cost" $220 billion. The Gulf is "costing" $45 million per day. We know where the money comes from, so we talk about it only in terms of "cost." Where does it end up? We sometimes talk vaguely about the "defense industry," but so much of this is secret anyway (have you read Tim Weiner, Blank Check?) that a detailed accounting is impossible. If we could study the balance sheets of all the corporations that end up pocketing our tax money, the question cui bono would be a lot more meaningful. This is precisely what the Constitution mandates, but who cares about that?

If we do not understand how our "democratic" America can have a secret police, secret armies, and a secret government, or how a president can flout the law of the land (Constitution, War Powers Act), why we fought in Vietnam (etc.), or why we are now in the Gulf, cui bono goes a long way toward clarifying matters--if we are willing to accept the unpleasant truth. The primary beneficiaries of the Gulf crisis are 1) the oil industry and everything dependent on it, all over the world (the hitherto unprofitable oil fields in Siberia as well as Texas can now begin to be pumped, fuel prices are driving the airways into the hands of a handful of the biggest airlines, etc.); 2) the Pentagon and the defense industry, for whom Hussein is a godsend, a replacement for the Red Peril just when people were starting to talk seriously about drastic defense budget reductions.

Back to JFK. I want to respond to your letter in detail because, frankly, I find it very confusing and I cannot believe that it is a true reflection of your thinking. I wish I had Post Mortem and your other books so I would have more indication of what you do think, as opposed to what you think is crap.

I did not see the Nova show (do you know where I could get a copy of it or any of the other assassination documentaries shown in the US?), so I don't know which Dallas doctors you are referring to, what they said, or what they saw at the Archives. You say the doctors said on camera that what they saw at the Archives is what they saw in Dallas, i.e. supporting the official version. In the next sentence you say two of them (which ones?) dispute the official version. Are you saying that because there is

contradictory testimony, we cannot know which is true? If that were the case, we would never know anything. The adversarial system begins with contradictory evidence; it doesn't end there.

For my part, I really don't think it is a matter of "what I want to believe." Much more to the point is what most Americans do NOT want to believe, and therefore cannot believe. I saw and heard Dr. McClelland and Dr. Peters of Parkland Hospital describe and draw a picture of the head wound (in the British ITV film "The Men Who Killed Kennedy," in which you also appear--I presume you've seen it) which corresponds exactly to the lower drawings in Groden, p. 23 f.

You say that for the film to have been faked, the CIA would have to have known where the autopsy would be performed and be able to control everyone involved. What makes you think they did not know? Do you think they would tell us that they knew? The question of control is crucial. First of all, it eliminates every suspect in the conspiracy below the highest levels of the US government: the Mafia, anti-(or pro-) Castro Cubans, Russians, "renegade" elements of the CIA, Big Oil, Minutemen, etc. None of these groups would have been able to participate at all in the conspiracy, much less carry it off alone, without the full power of the government behind them. The second question is, could even the full power of the government carry it off? The answer stares us in the face. The mission has been accomplished, to date. Of course people can be controlled. The FBI and CIA have plenty of practice at this. True, many people were involved, but not that many would have been in a position to put two and two together or, more importantly, had any concrete evidence and the courage to make it known. And how does any one brave individual make something known, even if he dares to, and resists threats, bribery, flattery, and appeals to patriotism? (Can you imagine being prevailed upon by the highest officials in government not to endanger the "national security" of your country?) Would the big newspapers and TV networks publish your information? Even if it were published, what then?

You seem to forget that not everyone was controlled. A lot of people have been killed and a lot more have simply been ignored. If they have not been completely ignored, it has been due solely to the efforts of private researchers like you. Absolute, 100% control is not necessary: the best way to keep the lid from blowing off is to let out a little steam. But the end effect, again, stares us in the face. Quite a few people have spoken "out of control." What happens? A book or two may be published ad even sell (though the most dangerous ones, like Garrison and Groden/Livingstone and Marrs--and yours?) are not reviewed or advertised. We continue to have a mass of "contradictory evidence" and unanswered questions, with the end result--and that is what counts--that the mystery continues. That is control.

Re the body bag and casket. Why do you give the FBI more credence than Paul O'Conner? Do you believe the FBI agents who reported that there had been surgery to the top of the head and that the back wound wasn't longer than a finger (I don't have the precise reference)? Do you believe what William Webster et al. say about the CIA or what Victor Marchetti, Philip Agee, and other apostates say? Who has more reason to lie? Who has a proven record of deceit, conspiracy, violence, and collaboration with organized

crime? You say yourself the CIA is the enemy of the people. Surely you don't think the FBI is any better. You say, "The FBI agents, unless you make them part of the conspiracy, also disprove that [the casket was changed]." That is the whole point. That is what Garrison, Groden/Livingstone, Marrs, etc. are saying. Of course they are part of it--not every agent, but the ones that count. We already know how they work, from the top down, but with plausible deniability, compartmentalization, self-defined accountability ("national security") and all the rest.

My question to you is: How can you believe that anything the FBI or CIA says has any credibility at all, especially when it supports the government's case. It is more logical to seek credibility in the few things they have produced which are self-contradictory.

It seems very strange to me that you call Prouty "a first-rate and courageous person" and at the same time imply that he is a nut, if that is your implication re. his Pentagon Papers theory. Prouty, as I mentioned in my last letter, has the most comprehensive "nut" theory of all: the CIA and its allies in control of the US and the world (the subtitle of his book). Behind them are what he calls the High Cabal (Big Bucks). What he says about the PP makes good sense. Cui bono? The CIA advised "against the war" since about 1965, hence they are wise and should be listened to and have even more power in the future. At the same time, they continued fighting the war, which they began, as hard as they could (their "duty," they would say). The PP made scapegoats of Johnson and Nixon and the Pentagon, two of whom have conveniently disappeared from the scene (leaving lots of questions about the real motives behind Watergate), and one of whom (the Pentagon) is invincible. No matter how stupid they are, we still need the armed forces. It is much more difficult to make this last argument about the CIA, but thanks to the PP, it is not necessary. They come out shining like choir boys. Whether Ellsberg did this knowingly or not is not clear, but it is clear that the PP exonerated the CIA with regard to Vietnam. And where are they now--in the White House.

Your next paragraph is very confusing, because you say that the FBI field agents automatically responded to Hoover's vision that Oswald was guilty because they knew "what was and was not expected of them." But then you say: "Do you want to include the entire FBI in the conspiracy...?" You answer the question yourself: if Hoover was in on it, the whole FBI would have been in on it. Hoover may have detested the CIA, a rival (and much more powerful, since the CIA Director is also DCI) secret force, but of course he would have cooperated with them. He hated Kennedy too. Hepburn says in Farewell America that Hoover knew all about it and cooperated by simply doing nothing. That seems likely. At least, the core of the conspiracy would have to have been in the more powerful (CIA) rather than less powerful organization.

I do not agree that an autopsy would have discovered a poison or other simpler cause of death. First, the CIA has long had toxic agents that can simulate natural deaths and are totally undetectable. Secondly, you again seem to be skirting the implications of the thesis that the government itself was the perpetrator (that it was a coup d'etat). With this thesis, there need not even have been an autopsy, much less an honest one.

As for the tramps, or winos--what difference does that make? Winos don't have trimmed haircuts either. Why do you avoid the most important question, which is why they were released without any record of their testimony or identities? As for Lansdale, no one has claimed he was "the shooter." If Prouty is right, he would have been the one, or one of the ones, in charge. "What in the world would have kept him from fleeing?" you ask. Obviously, nothing did! Let me ask you: Would you have believed, in a penny dreadful, that three tramps/winos could be "arrested" under such circumstances and released without a trace, and that whoever the other people were in the photographs have never been officially identified?

I appreciate very much the time you have taken to answer my letters, and I hope you will answer this one too. I hope too that I will be able to read your books, at least Post Mortem, before long, because what you have said so far has told me more about what you do not think than what you do think. Let me ask you straight out: What is your best guess as to who did it, and more importantly, who has been managing the coverup?

Sincerely,

Michael Morrissey