

1/6/68

Dear Criscom Morgan,

This is a hasty response to your letter of 1/5, which did arrive today. I have to go to the P.O and can get it off.

This morning I spoke to Phil Donahue's producer. I will not have to get together with them until early Friday morning. He is to have called you to say that they have no objection to a meeting of whatever kind you would like, if he didn't tell you when you phoned him.

I asked him to call you for me to save the toll charge to say that if you'd like to meet me at the airport and have that much extra time, I'm on TWA Flight 532. It leaves Washington 4:30 and takes about an hour. I'll wait at the TWA counter. If you cannot get there or if we miss, I'll go to the Statler Hilton, where they are putting me up, and wait for you to come or call.

I am used to getting along on little sleep. So, as long as I get back in time for four or five hours, if my time can be worth anything to you, use it.

What you say in your letter is interesting. I'd like to discuss it. However, much as I'd like to have it happen, I anticipate there are some problems.

Looking forward,

Route 1, Box 275
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387
January 3, 1967

Dear Harold Weisberg:

Thanks for your letter of Dec. 30th. It got me straitened of a lot of confusion to be told that the Altgens photo was not at the fourth road mark after all. I see that this is true, and that means that the 255th Zaprudz would correspond with it as I had written Jim Garrison it could not have done. I do not see that the Willis photo is so final a proof as you say, since one cannot prove that it was taken after the first shot. It helps. That is why I zero'd in on the Altgens photo. I feel that the correlation between the angle of entry of the bullet in Kennedy's back is more definitive, since the 30° angle of descent from the Records Building would correspond with the 60° angle (45 to 60) indicated in the FBI report of the coronor's finding.

I also disagree with your observation in WWII that the Hughes movie proves that shooting did not take place from the "sniper's nest," for the rifleman could and would have been well out of sight at the corner. This does invalidate the use of Brannon's testimony, but it supports the testimony of those Thompson quotes.

One new idea appeared in the course of recent labors on the case. The assassins tried to ~~make~~ to make it appear that there was but one assassin. If there were three or so assassins, each would have had to coordinate his shooting so closely that there might appear to have been only three shots. That would make more understandable the strong evidence Thompson brings out for the last two shots being so close together. It would also make conceivable evidence that is accumulating in my mind that the time of the second shot, the one that hit Connolly, was the same time that the shot was fired that hit the pavement. Since it appears that that shot was in line with the west end of the D. Building, and to the left and rear of the Presidential limousine, then it would have been about the same time.

Losing the cogency of the Altgens photo with regard to the timing, and with the weak boost from Willis, some of these other evidences need to be developed.

Thompson did a good job, I feel, in adding weight to the false Oswald theory, and with it the necessary involvement of the two Latin Americans who had gone around with him and who are certainly Hall and Howard. This plays well into Garrison's case. And Thompson did agree that Lee Oswald probably was not an assassin. I suspect that Thompson was sincere. *Not having read the book I cannot judge.*

NOTE > Can I meet you at Dayton when you are there? I want to do my bit in helping with this case, and don't want to thrash around with misconceptions as I've done the past few weeks. I am eighteen miles from Dayton.

I have some data on the military forces use of the power of psychological diagnosis for political purposes and to avoid the judicial review involved in a court martial. If this is involved in Garrison's case, I'd like to contribute with it.

Finally, my wife and I would like to contribute \$50 toward the publication of your last book if it could be part of a fund raising campaign among people on your mailing list. Des this sound feasible? I might write a letter to go to people on the list suggesting this.

I feel that the revisions in conclusion such as the Altgens photo need to be included in such a last book, and that your books should not stand uncorrected by you. That weakens the case greatly. Along with such a correction there could be some final additions to counterbalance and make the case sronger with regard to the mechanics of the assassinati n.

With best wishe s,

Griscom Morgan
Griscom Morgan