

GRISCOM MORGAN
YELLOW SPRINGS, OHIO, 45387
P.O. Box 207

From after I replied 10/18

October 8, 1983

Dear Hal:

Thank you very much for your letter and its advice. Your criticism of my opening paragraph is much needed; I wanted to make the first sentence strong, which was right, but it needed to be precise and accurate, which I failed to make it. The letter has been in process; I have been seeking criticism of it and working on improving it. I think it has work to do. The chairman of the Progressive Party in New York has been impressed with it and is looking for ways in which he can put the Kennedy assassination before the public. I have sent to some of the people I sent the first copy corrections and applications which some of them have expressed appreciation for.

I thought a good deal about using Halderman's book. When the book was shown to me I expected it to be Nixon standard of character. As I read it I came to have a sense of real quality that should not be bypassed because of his involvement in a world of such evil. His "innocence"--as in assuming that the coverup of the assassination conspiracy was a coverup of Castro--its reprisal--is typical of so many decent people, and to be able to present it along with the picture of Castro's real relationship to Kennedy helps show the misconception that so many Americans have been sold on.

I conceive of my letter as one to waken certain people who are ready to read it and see the proof and the truth--as the Progressive Party chairman did. Each time I find an improvement to make it goes into each such letter I send off thereafter.

A team of assassination researchers I have been well impressed with is Alan Weberman and Robert Sibley. What do you know of them?

As a provisional modification of the first sentence in my letter the following might be in order: "

There is conclusive evidence that the assassination of President John F. Kennedy was a conspiracy engaged in by high-placed people in a number of powerful government agencies, and that major agencies of the government engaged in the coverup of the coup d'etat.

The officers of diverse agencies who gathered at the autopsy were a party for one reason or another.

I want to get other criticisms that come to your mind. I hope things are not so difficult for you these days. I have a little leeway if it could be helpful

Sincerely,

Gris

Griscom Morgan

Griscom Morgan
P. O. Box 207
Yellow Springs, OH 45387
(513) 767-1461

I am writing to call your attention to information which is crucial to the survival of this nation.

There is conclusive evidence that the assassination of President John F. Kennedy was a coup d'etat engaged in by some high placed people and groups in a number of powerful agencies of the United States government; also that some major agencies of the government have been engaged in the coverup of the coup d'etat. President Kennedy was assassinated in part because he had established a united front with Premier Nikita Khrushchev of the Soviet Union against the military hawks in their respective countries (see the evidence included at the end of this letter). Extremists in both countries then as now were intent on building nuclear weapons in preparation for a nuclear war. Kennedy and Khrushchev tried to keep these people from running the show, but it was the American militarists who took the action that set the relations between the two countries on the road to intense competition in building ever more deadly arsenals.

American hawks had a crucial part in the Kennedy assassination conspiracy. This is proved by their manner of handling the military autopsy of Kennedy's body, which was necessary to cover up the conspiracy. The recent conduct of both the Congressional Select Committee and the Department of Justice prove that this cover-up is still at work, warping and falsifying the policies of the United States government and enabling its control by the same parties that eliminated President Kennedy.

CIA control over the Congressional Committee on Assassinations began in July of 1977 when the new director, Robert Blakey, required that staff members Tannenbaum, Sprague and Groden should agree to the Director of the CIA having complete control over the CCA's decisions. The final clause of this agreement stated that if the consultant or staff person signing the agreement violated any of the secrecy sections, he could be sued; and the agreement would continue in perpetuity.

The significance of this control is made more clear when we consider President Lyndon Johnson's statement quoted by his friend Wagner Carr: "In time, when all the activities of the CIA are flushed out, then maybe the whole story of the Kennedy assassination will be known." Carr's quotation was included in the special BEC program on the assassination.

The American public has been inundated by a great amount of falsification and obfuscation about the Kennedy assassination and about Kennedy's policies. The CIA's financing of book publishing has been kept under wraps because this would expose its efforts to ensure misinformation. Character assassination and misrepresentation of President Kennedy and his policies has grossly mislead the American people. They have not been informed, for instance, that Kennedy, with General Douglas MacArthur's backing, had determined to get the United States out of Vietnam and avoid the terrible fiasco of war there - ordering the beginning of withdrawal of American troops which was immediately reversed after his assassination.

Appendix 3

The Kennedy assassination as a coup d'etat:

One ordinarily conceives of a coup d'etat as a dramatic military takeover of one party displacing another with drastic change in administrators and personnel. This would be very unpopular in the United States. But circumstances in the United States were unusual. The political antithesis within the United States was within the Democratic Party. Lyndon Johnson to some extent occupied middle ground, but wielded great power as Senate majority leader. When Kennedy chose Johnson as his vice presidential running mate his assistant Kenneth O'Donnell complained that Johnson "voted against everything you ever stood for." Kennedy answered, according to O'Donnell, "I'm 43 years old, and I'm the healthiest candidate for President in the United States. . . I'm not going to die in office. If we win, it will be by a small margin and I won't be able to live with Lyndon as leader of a small Senate majority. Did it occur to you that if Lyndon becomes the Vice President, I'll have Mike Mansfield as the Senate leader, somebody I can trust and depend on?" Later Kennedy told O'Donnell "If I had listened to you, Lyndon would be still running the Senate instead of safely tucked away.

"As Vice President, Johnson felt sidetracked and ignored, and sorely missed the patronage and power he had enjoyed when he was the majority leader in the Senate." And so did the powerful interests in and out of the government with whom Johnson had wielded his power. How obvious it was that they could have it back if Kennedy ceased to live in office! After his death his associates could be eased out and the change in policies that he wanted could be eased in without fanfare, telling the world that they were in continuity of Kennedy's policy. Johnson did not need to be a principal in the maneuvering for the coup d'etat, but to play ball with it. And the Warren Commission he appointed also played ball. Commission staff member Arlen Specter explained the way the staff was kept from doing a real job saying "The decision of the Commission was not an egregious use of their discretion. The President of the United States did not want Arlen Specter to investigate the assassination of John F. Kennedy."

Johnson had not been held in very high regard by either progressives or conservatives in Texas. In 1960 he did not show up well for the presidency. But after the assassination the public associated him with Kennedy and voted him in against Goldwater. In effect the public voted for Kennedy and got Goldwater; Goldwater praised Johnson's military policies as what he had advocated.