

Dear Dave,

12/6/91

Thanks for the pages of Gentry's book that relate to the JFK assassination. I'll read them when I can annotate them. As you may recall, I sometimes make evaluations from slight personal experience if I consider that experience significant enough. With Gentry I begin with suspicions and if I have no independent reason to believe anything he says I won't.

He phoned me from San Francisco when he was writing the Powers books that bore Powers' name. He was interested in the imagined U-2 connection, Oswald as I recall either telling the USSR about it (he knew nothing about it) or telling them what they needed to know to shoot it down. Which they did not need from anyone. We had a long talk, I went into many particulars, he thanks ^{ed} me for taking all the time to make it clear to him and said he would not use it. And then he did, ~~it~~ to sell books. It did, too.

I think you are correct in believing that the years 1940-60 were the key to Hoover's development of real power. While it may have escalated when FDR asked him to make secret personal investigations it zoomed when Truman started his "loyalty" program that Clark Clifford told Carl Bernstein was not a security program at all.

I'm not at all sure that ~~it is~~ Hoover "cracked the radicals in State" but I do know that he was involved. And those fired were the victims of a pogrom and not in any real sense radicals. Otto Otepka or Francis McKnight and John Peurifoy did it at State. I knew the latter two.

The time period you mention also includes an enormous expansion in the amount of potential blackmail information Hoover developed in the course of the FBI's regular work.

Did I ever tell you that before then he was known as the best file clerk in the government? People knew and understood.

His power was also enhanced by the anti-American Congressional committees, McCormack/Dickstein before Dies and then in the Senate. He got great batches of information from them and in helping them had them beholden to him.

I do not know who the Los Angeles doctor you refer to at the Dallas nuthatch but from what you say he begins with a preconception and lack basic knowledge of the available information, including what ~~I~~ published and is irrefutable. And unrefuted. I am so certain he is wrong I'm not checking the copies of the autopsy pictures I have or the medical artist's rendition of them. The back wound was precisely where I position ^{ed} it from the evidence. In this regard you do not mention that he said anything about the location of the anterior neck wound. If he said the clothing was "wrong" on the back wound, he can't about the wound in the front. So, he ignores it from what you said.

Aside from Lattimer having earned his credentials by slicing a bullet like a salami and ignoring all inconsistent with his radical-right position and the fact that maybe shooting into a skull that is not ^{the same as shooting one} attached to a living set of ^{bones} nerves and muscles, there is evidence in the X-rays that refute Lattimer. I go into this, Dick Bernabei's observation, in Post

Moetem. The dispersal of 40 dust-like metal fragments in the front of the skull is 100% inconsistent with the official mythology. The alleged bullet was designed not to behave that way, in conformity with the Geneva convention on "humanitarian" warfare. It is hardened so it cannot behave that way. So Lattimer ignores the obvious, that the kind of ammo he and the government say was used could not have deposited those minute fragments, about 40 as I recall, so close to the front of the skull.

I don't know how good Lattimer is in his field, urology, but in this field he is ridiculous despite the reputation he has earned only by virtue of having said what his kind want said and that he has medical credentials. Actually, when Burke Marshall let him see the autopsy material, first at that, he was violating the letter agreement imposed on the heirs of the JFK estate by the DJ. Urologists were not included among those to be given access. (That seems to be one area in which there is no real question about JFK!)

That is quite a commission to Frechette. to do his Indian carving on a massive butternut log. He has been making 18 inch statutes and this one to be 10 feet! It is too bad that TV never got interested in him and his work, which is magnificent in addition to having traditional Indian values and information.

I had a call today from a NYPost reporter who apparently is doing some kind of Oliver Stone story. She asked me about an article he wrote for Premier Magazine of which I never heard. He must not have better availabilities if he took time for a small publication. anyway, she perceptively noted that he does not mention my name as Lardner's source even though Lardner did. Odd that he avoids any mention of my name when he knows very well that I am responsible for his present and possibly impending troubles. As I now think more and more, even calling the shot.

Hearst is doing a story but again I do not know its nature. The reporter is coming here Monday.

Lardner now understands that Stone will permit reviewers to see the movie on the 18th, or in time for the papers of the day before the movie opens. Still abnormal. There is nothing that can be stolen and unless this is part of his concept of a mystery buildup it is consistent only with The Great One fearing he'll load his britches.

Let's a call from CBS News, NY. Sending a crew here Monday. They are doing a Stone segment or story about which I know nothing. With two weeks to go.

Best,
Neil