

4/4/72

Dear Gris,

In four days I'll be 59, and in the past year I have begun to feel like 79, so I'm weary, overloaded (worked until after midnight and was working again before 5) and my recollection of your question is not as clear or certain as it might be. You are right on Daniel. I think, in fact, you understate that aort. The other may have been the late Lisa Howard of ABC. I'm by no means certain, and your note of 3/31, which came today, catches me with other things on the mind.

Herewith WW.

If your letter to Schoenbrun is good -and he has independent knowledge from another critic who met him through mutual friends - he is partly hungup and won't face the realities. I think, however, that you both visualize and antagonize by such entirely unessential and seemingly paradoxical items as two-way radio. No such communication was needed and it presented unwarranted hazards.

Well, if he'd written anything different, do you think the Times would have published it?

Best,

**Griscom Morgan**

**Rt. 1, Box 275**

**Yellow Springs,**

**Ohio 45387**

March 31, 1972

Dear Hal:

I don't want to take your time to write me, but you are a good deal on my mind, and I thought you might care to see this response I just wrote to David Schoenbrun to his recent review of books on Kennedy's foreign policy in the New York Times Book Review.

I wish I could remember or find where I read that Kennedy had not only Jean Daniel, but another prominent person in process as an unofficial emissary to Castro at the time of the assassination. If you have that information I would appreciate receiving it.

My copy of your first Whitewash volume has not been returned by somebody who borrowed it, and I'd like to buy another if you have a supply available.

Best wishes,

*Gris*

Griscom Morgan

David Schoenbrun  
New York Times Book Review  
Times Square, New York

Dear Mr. Schoenbrun:

Your review of recent books on John Kennedy's foreign policy in the  
New York Times Book Review disappointed me because I  
had such a regard for your reporting on the tragedy of the  
Vietnam War, and in this case I feel you have to too large an extent  
fallen into a trap set for the unvary.

It is indeed true that John Kennedy was as you depict him -- but  
the picture to me is half truth, and a very misleading one. The  
extent of the change that was taking place in Kennedy's perspective  
is not hinted at in your review. I believe that these books you  
reviewed are at least to some extent planned for and inspired by  
the public opinion control apparatus of the administration to help  
the people feel that the Nixon government is in the main line of  
continuity of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. It is of great  
political importance to Nixon, as it earlier was to Johnson, to  
outgrow this in the public mind. But this is not true. For  
John Kennedy was deeply in the process of drastic revision and  
reconsideration of that policy, and the extent of that revision  
is reflected in the message that he sought to have passed on to  
the people in the World Peace message at the American University.  
And Castro and Khrushchev recognized the change in process is  
documented in many places, particularly in Julian Daniel's reporting  
of his role as unofficial emissary between Kennedy and Castro.  
I will inclose a copy of a letter I wrote outlining some of the  
clear evidence on this.

I am among the small circle of careful students of the three assassinations  
of Kennedy and Martin Luther King. I unearthed some of the crucial  
evidence establishing the mechanism by which the assassination took place  
through coordination by mobile radio, I established through police  
testimony that Oswald knew Jack Ruby, and so on. I take seriously  
the report by Gary Underhill (who had been "limited warfare specialist"  
and military analyst for Time Magazine), that his life was in danger,  
for he had found evidence that the far east division of the CIA was  
involved in the assassination conspiracy. Underhill's subsequent  
murder from a shot through the left rear of his head (and he was right  
handed) cannot be ascribed to suicide. Oswald showed no signs of  
mental disturbance throughout his ordeal--demonstrating sanity. In all  
eight of the documented instances of Oswald's expression of opinion  
about Kennedy his opinion had been strongly favorable to Kennedy. He  
had been working for the CIA on the U2 base in Japan. He had gotten  
a second passport to Russia (after his original "refection" on  
twenty-four-hour notice. And both the Texas attorney general and

The Miami District Attorney had testified in a secret session of the Warren Commission that their information was that Oswald had been an informer for the CIA <sup>or</sup> the FBI. The headquarters from which Oswald had distributed his pro-castro leaflets in New Orleans was a dis-fused anticastro headquarters. I could go on with such information for hours, well documented. At the heart of all this is the well documented perspective of the conspirators, their efforts to be carried out. They understood that Oswald engaged in this and would not press for military invasion of Cuba or for the CIA line, which he had become so disillusioned with.

If there is any one document that would turn one's opinion, or the other way, it would be the Miami Herald police report from one of the conspirators before the assassination telling how it would be done, and the document from the archives of the assassination, giving the FBI's own report from the informant telling, or hearing, from the conspirator after the assassination, telling from Miami, saying that it was indeed Oswald who had made no mistake in their business.

Sincerely,

WISCONSIN HOSPITAL