

NEW ADDRESS: Rt. 7, Frederick, Md. 21701

1/17/68

Dear Griscom Morgan,

Your letter of 1/12 with your memo, The Warren Report and the Truth, arrived today. I'll read the memo as soon as I can. I was a day-and a very tiring day-late getting back by train, and I was up until 4 a.m. this morning interviewing a new witness, of whom I now have six hours on tape.

I was glad to meet all of you. Particularly your father, even if I did put him to sleep! I was his admirer in New Deal days. And we stayed up rather late chatting afterwards while I fed my ulcer.

Your nephew and your father are correct. I am not a showman, by intent. When the situation requires it, as when there is competition, I reluctantly can be and am. I think it is the least desirable approach on a subject that goes to the integrity of society. And my speech was not well organized because it was not prepared. I had no time to—in fact, I never do any more. I try and gauge what the audience may be most interested in and in the question period allow them to direct the discussion where they prefer. We still cannot exhaust the subject.

In your correct comment on the Depository building you confuse the presence of people with shooting. Not a single one of the shots is consistent with any one coming from the Depository, despite Thompson's deliberate misrepresentations. In addition to what I have published, there will be more in Post Mortem. Most of all, the non-fatal shot described by the Commission could not have. There were people present (if they are not in the Hughes film, another misrepresentation). They were framing, not shooting. The last thing they'd do under these circumstances is shoot.

Your method of placing Altgens is sound. However, remember he could not have taken his picture through the concrete pillar that is so clearly visible. As I recall it, when I originally tried in my own mind to place him, the fact that he shot between the tree and the pillar presented a problem. My own feeling was that he might have been on the grass. Rather than an arbitrary point in the picture, I think this can be better accomplished by taking several points on the outer edge and drawing intersecting lines to several distances downhill, then drawing a line through their apex. Remember, this was a 105mm lens. There is distortion.

On the subject of bullets hitting the street, I expect new proofs shortly. I know the content and expect further evidence. On the basis of what I now know, I am most inclined to believe the first shot was in the front, through the neck, and then had the history quoted by Penn, Shelton, Baker, etc.

As soon as I can, I'll read your memo and return it, keeping the clipping from the National Observer. When I read of people like Sparrow being deified as "scholars", when his work is so totally lacking in that attribute, I am reminded of those also respect as scholars over their fancies and needless deliberations.

Good to meet you. Many thanks. And best regards to everyone.

Hurriedly,

Route 1, Box 275  
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387  
January 12, 1967

Dear Harold Weisberg:

Your visit to Yellow Springs was very valuable to us and was well received. My nephew, who had heard Mark Lane, commented that you are not the showman that Lane is, and my father, like others felt your talk not particularly well organized, but your spirit, your knowledge and the judicious approach to evidence free from propagandistic and overdramatization elements was valued. I did see your TV program this morning, and it was excellent. Throughout it was clear, persuasive, and you certainly had your audience with you. I would take strong exception to one thing you said, That is that nobody shot from the Depository Building. It is at least certain from Rowland's testimony that there were at least one or two conspirators in the D. Building. And there is the Craig testimony of someone leaving that area about the time the Building was released from restriction. It could have been that the man looking like Oswald had hidden after leaving the Grassy Knoll area and then made his get away, but the point of his looking like Oswald would be more significant in associating him with the D. Building and enabling him to be there without attracting attention as to a strange face.

picture

I told you I could prove that Altgens was at the farther position from the evidence within the picture. I will now describe how I went about it. A vertical line drawn in the through the lamp post beyond the right front tire of the presidential limousine down through the tire to where the tire touches the road gives an alignment that can be transferred to the map leading to Altgens' position and there intersecting the line drawn from the tree to the road under the front left wheel of the limousine, and from there to Altgens. Then with this knowledge one can test out on the map which of the road marks would be located beneath the front of the limousine. One must determine on the map the distance apart of the two wheels. Since the map on p. 243 of WW II is on a scale of one hundred feet equalling about  $1\frac{1}{4}$  inches, the right wheel of the limousine would be about five and a half feet from the road mark, or  $1/16$ th of an inch, or approximately half way between side-by-side road marks. If you will draw this out on the map you will find that lines drawn from tree and lamp post on your map through the points on the road where the front tires of the limousine must have been (approximately) will lead to an impossible convergence past the fourth road mark, but to a very appropriate convergence from the fifth road mark. This definitively proves within reasonable limits Altgens' position at the time he took this photograph. He appears to have been out on the street a little bit, adjacent to the seventh road mark.

Mr. Altgens is the father of the present name to

In terms of geometry, two verticle planes converge at the lens of the camera, each passing through one of the tire contact points at the front of the limousine, and going on, one to the tree and the other to the lamp post. These verticle planes intersect the horizontal plane of the map and can be drawn as I have suggested as two lines.

The problem of escape from the Depository Building cannot be avoided by saying that nobody shot from the sniper's nest. Rowland's testimony and Thompson's quotation from Carolyn Waither are not necessarily in conflict with each other. If there were indeed two men, they could have tried out the west as well as the east window, gotten the bullet shells in place, and have been together in so doing. There is enough evidence of such activity that the Depository Building cannot be discounted even if no bullet from it may have hit a victim.

As I ponder the matter of bullets hitting the street, and study the evidence more carefully, I see the likelihood of Penn Jones being right; that the first shot was one that hit the pavement beyond the presidential limousine and then hit the west wall of the jail. This would fit in with Kennedy's being able to say "I am hit" before he was hit in the throat and Glen Bennett to see him hit after the first shot. But the mark on the pavement from this has not been identified, so it is not positive. But there is also Royce Skelton's testimony that he not only saw a first bullet hit "the pavement to the left rear of the car" (as it rounded the corner) but after two shots he "heard another shot and saw a bullet hit the pavement. The concrete was knocked to the south away from the car. It hit the pavement in the left or middle lane." This could correspond with the bullet mark you quoted the FBI agent about in your Whitewash II.. (Skelton is in Vol 19, p. 496.) It also would correspond in that the concrete was driven southward. Mrs. Donald Baker may have observed to the south the "sparks" driven out of the street from the north side of the street. Since this is in the same general area, we may have two witnesses and the road mark relating to the same one shot from the west window of the Depository Building.

I inclose the zerox copy of the newspaper review you asked for, inserted at page 9 of what I have been writing in answer to Sparrow. I wish you would feel to use any of this as you see fit.

Sincerely,

Griscom Morgan  
Griscom Morgan