

GRISCOM MORGAN

P.O. Box 207
1031 East Hyde Road, Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

Phone 513 767-1461

Oct 21, 1979

Dear Hal:

Thanks for the "Equal Justice for All" listing of tapes for sale. I will be buying some of them. I particularly wanted to see what you had to say about the "recent developments"--particularly the House investigation. And thanks for your responses to my speculations. No, just because Penn Jones picked out or reproduced a passage from the twenty six volumes of the Warren Commission report does not invalidate the passage for me. In reading the passage about de Mohrenschild's daughter and son-in-law's telling of George's belief that the FBI was responsible for the assassination, and their concern that the father was reporting this to his friends in Haiti in a most absurd way* that stuck in my mind as peculiar for a person who should not have occasion of such a suspicion--no, conviction--immediately after the assassination. Is it irrational to latch onto a report of a conversation shortly before George's death, when he had been due to be interviewed for the investigation, that he said he had been in the streets of Dallas with Oswald at the time of the assassination? Then having a photograph of DeMohrenschild, I find that the characteristic appearance of de Mohrenschild corresponds as far as it goes to the man ^{next to Oswald} whose central part of his face is blocked out in the picture of Oswald and others on the sidewalk of Dallas during the assassination?

It may or may not be a sound suspicion or conviction on my part, but it is not in the deception or fabrication or spook book category. I appreciate the benefit of your study and special knowledge about Hugh McDonald's writing. ^{your letter} leaves me dissatisfied on one point. To me it was obvious that McDonald was ignorant about the assassination material and the evidence that such people as you have developed so carefully. That is to me irrelevant. Was it a fraud--and all-out fraud, or did McDonald write it in good faith? His ignorance of the other evidence and his accepting the idea that there was just this one assassin are to me completely irrelevant. Either he tracked down a lead he got from a friend in the CIA or he did not and he was just making a duck on spinning a tall tale of detective mystery. In that case it is indeed a fabrication and deception. I guess I must take your word on this if you did make investigation to the point of being convinced that the latter is the case and have material that is not available to me.

As for Warren, yes he was manipulated, but I don't think his self respect would have allowed him to be so manipulated as to allow Hoover to have his way completely as your theory assumes. There would be no record of his asking a quid pro quo for his going along with Hoover's line, and it is speculation one way or the other. So far as Carrington is concerned, if he got that \$50,000 figure from the McDonald book, then the "coincidence" would be explained, and if it is indeed true that McDonald is a fraud, then there is nothing to it.

I want to know what went on behind the scene in the congressional investigation, and to find out from the tape of your talk what you know about it.

with best wishes,

Gris
Griscom Morgan

* See last of the letter

The testimony relating to George De Mohrenschildt is as follows:

Mr. Liebeler: When did you first meet George Ee Mohrenschildt?

Mr. Ballen: Approximately 1955, maybe 1954

.....

Liebeler: Have you corresponded with him since the assassination?

Ballen: Yes.

.....

Ballen: (about the daughter and son-in-law of George)"the De Mohrenschildts call them Buggers.

Liebeler: While Rags and Chris stayed at your house, did you have any discussions with them as to what the De Mohrenschildts had said about the assassination?

Ballen: They were very upset that George and Jeanne were publicly stating in Port-au-Prince that the FBI had assassinated Kennedy, and that Oswald was a patsy, and we were very upset because they apparently had no basis for such a statement, and it wasn't very wise for them to be bandying about."

I call that important testimony. No, it does not connect De Mohrenschildt to the conspiracy, but when we know the relationship between Oswald and the FBI and the close friendship between Oswald and George, the statement heard from him before his death that he was in the streets of Dallas the day of the assassination-- or at the time of the assassination, connected with the Altgens photograph, is very important evidence. If George was indeed standing beside Oswald and the photo had showed him there, either George would have had to be killed or the photo had to be changed to no longer connect Oswald with George's presence. I think this is one of the many hard pieces of evidence to be dealt with. They are all of them absurdly dealt with by the "authorities". But I see no reason for leaving this out in enumerating them.