

At 7 a.m. today Mutual news carried an item to the effect that an unnamed Detroit pathologist, who had been permitted to see the autopsy film, had reported that these and Z prove there were two assassins because the 14-frame interval between the striking of the two victims did not permit the second shot from the first gun. (So what else is new?) I take this to be the pathologist who had made earlier application, and as I remember his name, it is Chapman.

This may or may not be the "good news" Robert told me I would hear in the coming month. Good news it is not. But bad it really isn't, either. The Kennedy diversion Cyril pulled, so that was not to be done again. And there was no one who could do the harm Cyril could, so that, at least for the nonce, is also past. His humumery is the kind of things that kills attention and convinces editors of the Ecclesiastesian wisdom of nothing new under the sun on the subject.

Prior to this newscast I had heard about 20 minutes from Westinghouse, Phila., KYW, continuously through the 5 a.m. news summary. No mention. Thereafter I took in the CBA radio net's 8 a.m. and WTQP all-news DC for about an hour, including the time of my walk and the writing to this point. No mention. Also, I saw nothing in the Post, which I have gone over and clipped. (WTQP beginning 8:45 a.m.)

From this it seems fair to say that Chapman and his "news" are getting little attention. Unless there is a major NYTimes story that, in turn, gets a play.

If Robert did have this in mind, the probability is that he learned of it from Policoff who, in turn, probably learned from Sylvia. If Chapman had asked say Cyril to whom to talk, Cyril would have said Sylvia and probably CTIA, neither of whom would have told me, for which I'm grateful.

Or, the self-perpetuating past imposes that past on the future and continues to kill it.

I suspect there is a below-the-level-of-consciousness guilt feeling on the part of those who have done fine work and quit and those longing to and incapable of it to limit what becomes known and thus convince themselves that they have not failed, that there really is nothing to become known.

You appear to have misread my letter. The two parts separated out from what had been originally planned as my third book are the two books there named, of which Oswald in New Orleans is but one. You have the other.

I have continued this work but lack the means of printing the work I have completed.

I look forward to reading your paper when it appears.

I will mail and insure this book the first time I can get to the post office. I expect this to be day after tomorrow.

Sincerely.

E. FORREST CHAPMAN, M.D.

259 E. HURON RIVER DRIVE
BELLEVILLE, MICH. 48111

5-16-74

Dear Sir:

Enclosed is ^{\$}21.00 for the 2 part series on "Oswald in New Orleans" which you mentioned in your letter of 4-20-74.

As yet I have made no publication of my findings at the Archives but intend to do so in the near future and will send you a copy.

Sincerely,

E. Forrest Chapman