9/18/69

Dear Gery,

Your note of the 15th, with several enclosures on False Oswalds:

Don's letter to Brookey: it would be good if he could establish any FBI policy on "all such materials as your slides would automatically have been sent to the main office". By this I mean I believe there was no policy, and whatever he could do toward establishing either that there was or was not could be helpful. I know, for example, that certain things were held in the field offices from memos saying that, yet one would have assumed these same things would have been rushed to DC as evidence. There were numerous advantages in not sending the original evidence to DC, the most obvious being it permitted substitution of an interpretation. Another is it made withholding from the WC easier. For example, there is no record of the Jack Martin footage in any WC records.

Enclosed carbon is for Don. His 9/12 to you: please believe me, Forman is a bedegreed disaster. If you doubt this, ask Bud until such a time as you can examine his court record in DC. Or, until you can see my annotated copy of his "study". These sincere people have not taken the time (him and others) to learn the fact and based on their ignorance and hopes substituted for realities, become scholars with a yearning to be published so they can, with their great intellects or their own faith in their superior intellects, as they apprraise them, solve the case or destroy the Report, etc. Forman's work si shot through with the most basic error, the most shocking ignorance. And he does such things (not unknown among modern "shcolars") as taking a source as an oracle, in his case Thompson. Link happens to be one of the more erroneous and dishonest. Building on Link's errors, Forman manufactures his own. His court appearance in Washington was an awful thing to sit through. If it didn't tell him how little he knows, nothing can. My unsolicited opinion is that he should be left alone, with the devout hope he can overcome his urge to write. If he wanted to do something worthwhile, he could organize support for those who did the work he avoided. Moreover, he is unwilling to learn where he erre. I offered to before the DC trial, by phone, and made a few gentle suggestions there. I've jeard not a word from him. His one contribution is his accurate explanation of the mobility of the scapula and what it meant in the autopsy. I know it is accurate because I got it independently from a local radiologist, as you know, and then Cyril confirmed it to me. As a matter of fact, he also knows I have already done what he suggests on the panel report, but on that, too, he is silent. You see, I had that done before that trial and told him of it there. Without really knowing what motivates him, of should I say what dominates his desires, I am filled with apprehension because of reading his treatise and having seen him on the stand...Dealing with scholars unwilling to recognize their inadequate knowledge, especially the articulate ones, is at best difficult, particularly for those who themselves are not as completely versed in the fact as they might be because their other obligations have prevented it....

The anonymous letter to you is interesting. I've had several such in the past, but not one has yielded anything...With all the exposure so many of us had in the San Jose area (especially Mark and me and the many radio/TV people out there who would have been in touch with me or hal, I wonder this person had not heard of us or gotten in touch with one of us? There are, however, several hot leads floating around in that general area, people who hickened when in touch with me by phone on call-in shows, so I know there can be good stuff.

I like your tribute to Eckhoff's resourcefulness...Hoover's neat play, with Oswald dead 11/29, Harris could not be "identical" with Oswald, isntypical... In what you sent is page 2, but not 1, of CD 71 ?), numbered "37**". Have you 1? Prob. Kemmy's report. Or, if you haven't gotten it and do. Best,