

Route 1, Box 275
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387
February 20, 1967

Dear Hafold Weisberg:

Thanks for your note; I am sorry I got your dander up. I inclose a copy of a letter I wrote to the Dayton Daily News when I became aroused over its publication of Richard Warren Lewis's attack on those who have attacked the Warren Report.

It has grieved me that there is so much mutual recrimination or ill will among those working on the job. While I respect Sauvage, his comments on Mark Lane were in this vein, and I certainly feel this is true of Epstein judging from what Lewis is quoted as him as saying. But what you are quoted as saying of Epstein's work struck me the same way. Epstein has contributed a lot even if he is part of the cover-up, even if he is not anything like an authority on the assassination as so many people have assumed. The very fact that he was given access to the Warren Commission and its staff and did not come up with the hogwash that Manchester produced is a miracle, and a godsend. When my father was chairman of the TVA a comparable investigator, only with international reputation, was given access to the inside and saw there the same dangerous development that led my father to ~~resign or rather~~ protest to the Senate, but he was muzzled and his study was not published. Epstein is also clear and easy to comprehend, even if he merely says over ^{a little of} what you-all have found from hard work.

No, I had not meant that you had criticized Sauvage on the radio program. My son had only observed that your passion had made you inarticulate so far as convincing the radio audience was concerned at that particular time. He thinks well of you and this hurt him.

The New Orleans development is interesting. I hope this is the beginning of the end, but the danger is that the catspaws will take the rap and the principals will go free.

Glad to hear that you had made the public defense of Lane. I just did not know of this. I am aware of the thievery, though I had not been aware of its extent, and of Lane's character, but not of its degree. Such things are a black eye to the cause.

Best wishes,

Griscom Morgan
Griscom Morgan

Let me know how much I owe
on the balance of cost of whitewash III

Route 1, Box 275
Yellow Springs, Ohio
February 6, 1967

The Editor
The Dayton Daily News
Dayton, Ohio

Dear Sir:

*over-
statement*

The announcement of the series "Gold in the Warren Report" to be appearing in the News this week fills me with sadness. As one of the pioneers in studying the Report, and having been in close communication with some of the leaders in the study of the Kennedy Assassination, I can attest that to most of us this endeavor has been an expensive labor of love for American Democracy and for John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I personally began the study in the endeavor to defend the Warren Commission and those of its members for whom I have high regard — Justice Warren, Senator Cooper and Senator Russell. I brought my earliest findings to them in the hope that it would help them, and I was told that it was my responsibility to take them to the American public, since the Warren Commission was disbanded.

Financial reward and public acclaim have been the last purpose that would occur to those with whom I have been associated. I have sought publication for my findings in the most responsible and least remunerative journals. It was with similar motivation that my father, Arthur E. Morgan, the engineer, joined in my concern of seeking responsible publication of my findings. I had been assured by other students of the assassination that I had important contributions to make, but editors who took no exception to my argument or my writing recoiled from the implications of the evidence and expressed themselves as unqualified to publish it. It remained for the most authoritative journal in the field of the Warren Report, the Journal of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences to publish a competent study by a specialist on the subject, Jay Schwartz' article "A Legal Demurrer to the Warren Report", which appeared in the July 1966 issue of the Journal. It was not Gold that lay behind the making of this study, but scientific considerations of the profession.

Gold was not the objective or the reward of Vincent Salandria, probably the ablest research student of the Warren Report. He spent his spare time and much expense in this study. He discovered the definitive moving picture evidence that a physicist can determine both the direction and the approximate momentum of the fatal head shot that killed President Kennedy, and physicists have so testified. I challenge any of the engineers and physicists in the Dayton area to explain how President Kennedy's forehead could have moved a foot to the rear and left within a sixth of a second in consequence of a bullet fired from the rear.

11

It was not gold, but passionate love of justice that inspired veteran foreign correspondent Leo Sauvage to write his The Oswald Affair. Does your newspaper similarly indict Pulitzer Prize winning city editor Sylvan Fox for his entering the lists? Only passionate concern for the truth could justify Harold Weisberg's

(publishing at his own expense two of the best books summarizing evidence on the assassination that many publishers had praised but found they had not the courage to publish. Weisberg has not made his expenses out of this, nor did he aim to.

The only way to fight the truth is to argue in irrelevancies and make personal attacks on those who assert it. The only author who began a study of the assassination with any assurance of it being profitable is Harold Manchester, a novelist unqualified for study in forensic science.

Courageous
The outstanding work of Penn Jones, Jr., editor of the little paper that received an Elisha Parish Lovejoy award for courage in journalism is the ultimate refutation of the "Gold in the Warren Report" argument. Penn Jones exemplifies the very quality that President Kennedy depicted in his "Profiles in Courage". I would that some other newspapers had equal courage to look into and report the truth.

Sincerely,

Griscom Morgan

2/15/67

Dear Mr. Morgan,

Your sermon is misaddressed, although I appreciate the motive behind it. A sermon of thievery is better addressed to the thief than the victim. Because you are lacking in first-hand knowledge of some of the things that have happened, that you would think you are taking a middle and philosophical approach is understandable.

My public comment on Epstein and Lane is addressed to the doctrine of their work. This is not only proper but, had you the understanding of this doctrine you should, you might agree with me it is essential. This doctrine is false and evil and in neither case do I consider it is the result of accident.

On the other hand, my public defense of Lane is the only one he gets from those generally on his side of which I know. I defend him from the charge of literary scavenging, have used my own radio and TV time that I might, were my motive selfish, better have used to push my own books. I have pointed out that he alone among this country's lawyers stood and demanded to be heard when Oswald was systematically denied all his rights - and what Lane does not say - all of us with him. If you know the other side you'd know this is anything but ego and is indeed charity. I've long since run out of cheeks but always manage to find one.

I'm rather surprised that you make this comment alone of the only program Sauvage and I alone have shared, for my only comment on Lane there was a strong defense of him from a vicious attack by Louis Nizer, and again, I could have used this time for selfish purposes. I am also in entire accord with everything I recall of what Sauvage said on that show and recall nothing warranting your comment as directed to him.

Your own researches and readings should have given you a glimmer at least of the thievery, if your knowledge of other things not done in public does not. When my money is in someone else's account and mine is empty and I'm still in debt after all I've done I do not take kindly to such immature lectures based upon no knowledge. Good motive is not enough to justify them. It is only because I do behave in the way you seem to want that I have not been in court, the cases of plagiarism are that numerous. When you address some of this comment to others, please send me a copy of it. And I'd like to see you on a TV program with Mark Lane and get "teamwork" out of him. I've been through it.

I haven't time to look it up now, but I think you'll find in my Rowland chapter (Eyes So Blind) in WHITEWASH II the account of the open westernmost window on the 6th floor. My immediate problem with WHITEWASH III is its size. The present prospects are that the more I sell the more I'll lose on it. It is now about a month behind schedule because I have been continuing my ransacking of the Archive and have other writing that I cannot postpone.

Sincerely,
Harold Weisberg

We are all of us so caught up in the assassination matter that it is easy to lose perspective and temerity, and those are qualities we increasingly need.

I got so steamed up over Richard Lewis's absurd attacks over "the scavengers" that I found myself in the same condition as you were in your radio appearance with Savage.

One of the items I most want in Whitewash III is the picture showing the west window of the 6th floor department building was open at the time of the assassination. You did not mention that the current Reports accepted that none were open but the Eastern Post from which Oswald was presumed to have been shooting.

Best wishes,
Griscom Wagon

Dear Harold Weisberg:

I inclose \$5.00 for Whitewash III.

The second volume is very impressive, except for its not being clear to a person little acquainted with the subject matter. A good well written article on one of the other of the subject in the I and II volumes could bring them into focus with power and effectiveness. You cover a lot of ground with fine documentation but you have not limed, polished any one part till it would be clear to the hasty and less informed reader. This is not an objection, only an observation to go along with the tribute I pay to your work.

My son heard you with Leo Savage debate over radio. After reading Savage's and your comments on Mark Lane and Epstein -- and vice versa -- I do want to urge charity for one another in this work. Ego is hard to overcome, but it is a major enemy and hurts the cause. Each man serves a role no other could as well serve. Epstein has made a major contribution -- but yet only a fragment of the whole. Lane has, and so has Savage. And we can certainly honor Penn Tazewell and Vincent Salandria.

Feb 13 1967

Route 1 Box 275
Yellow Springs

Ohio 45387