

2/21/68

Dear Gris and everyone,

Delay in acknowledging your mailing of the interesting piece on Sparrow is because I have been away on a longer than usual trip. Some five days, and working until 5 a.m., I haven't yet answered all the letters. I had a long and interesting interview with the most accomplished liar I have ever met, Loren Eugene Hall, in his hospital ward-about 9 hours on three days. Many other interesting and productive days and nights, including about 3 doz. radio and TV appearances. What really bothers me is that since moving I have not only not been able to move in, really, with most of our stuff still in boxes in the basement, but I haven't been able to do any more writing. Just too much other work.

Appropos of your radio theory, I have now seen what can be taken to be a walkie-talkie in a picture. It is not proven to be one, but it does look very much like one. When we have established what it is, one way or the other, I'll tell you.

Sparrow finally wrote me a snide, superior letter. The wretched character of a man and scholar will choke when he gets what I wrote 5 o'clock this a.m. I'm sorry I made the carbon on photocony paper, which, once used, cannot be photocopied so I have no spare copies. He so typifies the intellectual abdication that made all the unnecessary collateral tragedies inevitable.

If you ever get a spare copy of the forensic proceedings, I'd like to have it for my files. I've only a few press reports.

My apologies for the delay in responding, my thanks for the copies of the very good piece, and my regards to all the fine people I met when I was out there.

Sincerely,

Dear Harold Weisberg: I just read Sylvia Meagher's book, and am impressed that it in no way supersedes yours, although it does add very significantly to the literature and treatment. Hers is more easily published, yours more working paper on the ongoing investigation; hers more usual in style and treatment, appropriate for many audiences; I do wonder how much she knows your work.

- fraternally

- Griscom Morgan

Forensic Big-Wigs Critics of Warren Report

By Griscom Morgan

The authoritative "Journal of Forensic Sciences" refutes the recent widely circulated contention of John Sparrow that critics of the Warren Report on the assassination of President John F. Kennedy are creating a "stain deeper than the crime itself," recklessly exploiting the "gullibility of the American public."

By definition, the Journal's writers, if they perform their professional function at all, must be regarded as the most objective and scientific of authorities in assessing the value of the evidence submitted in the

JIM GARRISON, New Orleans district attorney, who charges there was a plot to assassinate President John F. Kennedy will be interviewed on the Johnny Carson television show (channels 2 and 5) after 11:30 tonight.

Warren Report. And Jay Schwartz, who made the legal study for the Journal, declares unqualifiedly that "The Warren Commission has failed to establish that Lee Harvey Oswald singly assassinated the President of the United States."

This conclusion is supported by the recent court decision in New Orleans that the Warren Report was "fraught with hearsay" and unacceptable as evidence. The court's decision, of course, made possible the scheduled trial of Clay Shaw in that city by New Orleans prosecutor Jim Garrison.

Charles A. McInerney, director of Pittsburgh, Pa.'s crime laboratory and editor of the Journal of Forensic Sciences' symposium on the Warren Report, wrote:

"This is a critique by panelists all of whom are well qualified in the areas explored in their discussions. In those instances where the panelists treat their subject harshly, these should be recognized as natural consequences of learned objective studies."

In spite of the Journal's assessment of the Warren Report, Time magazine of Dec. 22 devoted nearly a page to reporting John Sparrow's castigation in the London Times Literary Supplement, of "gullibility of the American public" and the critics of the Warren Report. Presumably he is also pointing a finger of criticism at the forensic scientists who found the Warren Report so unconvincing.

The National Observer summarized Mr. Sparrow's argument well when it reports that "some of those critical of the Warren Report say that other assassins shot the President from the grassy knoll while Oswald was firing from the building. 'If it is hard to believe that Oswald hit his target in two out of three quick shots,' says Mr. Sparrow, it is harder still to suppose that two men, more than 100 yards apart and unable to see or communicate with each other, could have synchronized their fire so perfectly. And it is hardest of all to imagine that conspirators would have allowed the success of their plan to depend on such a feat of synchronization."

Coordination by Radio

This would have been a sound objection two years ago when the critics of the Warren Report had neither theory nor evidence

for such coordination. But in the list of literature consulted by Mr. Sparrow in the preparation of his article there is a clear theory and evidence (now generally accepted by critics of the Warren Report) that, in Jim Garrison's words, "the assassins even kept in contact by radio."

The idea of radio communication in the assassination was discovered about two years ago and developed by the author in association with Vincent Salandria, a leading student of the assassination. As an early step in developing this theory three members of the Warren Commission were approached and it was determined by the response of one of them that the idea was new and had not been considered by the Commission. A careful, documented and dispassionate summary of the evidence relating to this theory was then submitted to a number of widely read periodicals. Their response was that it was out of their field, thus limiting its audience to people already convinced of the conspiracy theory. I had written:

"Radio control could have synchronized shooting from several locations. It would have been as simple as one man saying to others over his radio 'ready, get set, fire.' Yet nowhere was this idea presented in the Warren Report, never did it appear in the criticisms of the Report. There is evidence to support this theory."

Mr. Sparrow also ignores the Warren Commission's own evidence when he (in the National Observer's review) declares that "It is 'really impossible' to believe that conspirators would have placed a gunman in the grassy knoll 'in total ignorance of how many lookers-on, when the procession passed, would be standing nearby or perhaps occupying the place selected as his firing point.'"

"Like Telephone in His Hands"

For Lee Bowers, a responsible Warren Commission witness, testifies that a civilian automobile cruised through that area at the time required to transmit the necessary information and "the occupant had what looked like a telephone in his hand." Immediately after the assassination one of two men seen running from the wooded knoll area was described by another Warren Commission witness, J. E. Price, as carrying what looked like a "headpiece" — the visible component of portable radio communication equipment. While one must grant that use of portable radio communication is a novelty in the assassination of presidents, it is in common use by the police. Some members of the Ku Klux Klan-infiltrated Dallas police are among the prime suspects in the assassination conspiracy.

Two years ago I concluded my unpublished study of the possible role of radio communication in the assassination: "Democracy cannot survive if the people are not informed. The chance that we may be beguiled by misleading appearances of there being but one assassin may place us in peril of being more dangerously misled. If assassins have escaped undetected, the stage is set for more terrible events. It is necessary that the truth be known, even the unsettling truth of our ignorance."

Forensic Big-Wigs Critics of Warren Report

By Griscom Morgan

The authoritative "Journal of Forensic Sciences" refutes the recent widely circulated contention of John Sparrow that critics of the Warren Report on the assassination of President John F. Kennedy are creating a "stain deeper than the crime itself," recklessly exploiting the "gullibility of the American public."

By definition, the Journal's writers, if they perform their professional function at all, must be regarded as the most objective and scientific of authorities in assessing the value of the evidence submitted in the

JIM GARRISON, New Orleans district attorney, who charges there was a plot to assassinate President John F. Kennedy will be interviewed on the Johnny Carson television show (channels 2 and 5) after 11:30 tonight.

Warren Report. And Jay Schwartz, who made the legal study for the Journal, declares unqualifiedly that "The Warren Commission has failed to establish that Lee Harvey Oswald singly assassinated the President of the United States."

This conclusion is supported by the recent court decision in New Orleans that the Warren Report was "fraught with hearsay" and unacceptable as evidence. The court's decision, of course, made possible the scheduled trial of Clay Shaw in that city by New Orleans prosecutor Jim Garrison.

Charles A. McInerney, director of Pittsburgh, Pa.'s crime laboratory and editor of the Journal of Forensic Sciences' symposium on the Warren Report, wrote:

"This is a critique by panelists all of whom are well qualified in the areas explored in their discussions. In those instances where the panelists treat their subject harshly, these should be recognized as natural consequences of learned objective studies."

In spite of the Journal's assessment of the Warren Report, Time magazine of Dec. 22 devoted nearly a page to reporting John Sparrow's castigation in the London Times Literary Supplement, of "gullibility of the American public" and the critics of the Warren Report. Presumably he is also pointing a finger of criticism at the forensic scientists who found the Warren Report so unconvincing.

The National Observer summarized Mr. Sparrow's argument well when it reports that "some of those critical of the Warren Report say that other assassins shot the President from the grassy knoll while Oswald was firing from the building. 'If it is hard to believe that Oswald hit his target in two out of three quick shots,' says Mr. Sparrow, it is harder still to suppose that two men, more than 100 yards apart and unable to see or communicate with each other, could have synchronized their fire so perfectly. And it is hardest of all to imagine that conspirators would have allowed the success of their plan to depend on such a feat of synchronization."

Coordination by Radio

This would have been a sound objection two years ago when the critics of the Warren Report had neither theory nor evidence

for such coordination. But in the list of literature consulted by Mr. Sparrow in the preparation of his article there is a clear theory and evidence (now generally accepted by critics of the Warren Report) that, in Jim Garrison's words, "the assassins even kept in contact by radio."

The idea of radio communication in the assassination was discovered about two years ago and developed by the author in association with Vincent Salandria, a leading student of the assassination. As an early step in developing this theory three members of the Warren Commission were approached and it was determined by the response of one of them that the idea was new and had not been considered by the Commission. A careful, documented and dispassionate summary of the evidence relating to this theory was then submitted to a number of widely read periodicals. Their response was that it was out of their field, thus limiting its audience to people already convinced of the conspiracy theory. I had written:

"Radio control could have synchronized shooting from several locations. It would have been as simple as one man saying to others over his radio 'ready, get set, fire.' Yet nowhere was this idea presented in the Warren Report, never did it appear in the criticisms of the Report. There is evidence to support this theory."

Mr. Sparrow also ignores the Warren Commission's own evidence when he (in the National Observer's review) declares that "It is 'really impossible' to believe that conspirators would have placed a gunman in the grassy knoll 'in total ignorance of how many lookers-on, when the procession passed, would be standing nearby or perhaps occupying the place selected as his firing point.'"

"Like Telephone in His Hands"

For Lee Bowers, a responsible Warren Commission witness, testifies that a civilian automobile cruised through that area at the time required to transmit the necessary information and "the occupant had what looked like a telephone in his hand." Immediately after the assassination one of two men seen running from the wooded knoll area was described by another Warren Commission witness, J. E. Price, as carrying what looked like a "headpiece" — the visible component of portable radio communication equipment. While one must grant that use of portable radio communication is a novelty in the assassination of presidents, it is in common use by the police. Some members of the Ku Klux Klan-infiltrated Dallas police are among the prime suspects in the assassination conspiracy.

Two years ago I concluded my unpublished study of the possible role of radio communication in the assassination: "Democracy cannot survive if the people are not informed. The chance that we may be beguiled by misleading appearances of there being but one assassin may place us in peril of being more dangerously misled. If assassins have escaped undetected, the stage is set for more terrible events. It is necessary that the truth be known, even the unsettling truth of our ignorance."