

Dear Dave,

9/6/94

Thank for your 10/3 and its enclosures.

With regard to DeVries I add to your saying he <sup>b</sup>sloppy and ignorant that he is, as I thought I ~~detected~~ detected in his review, arrogant and self-important. On the basis of the part <sup>b</sup>s of his letter you sent I add stupid, uncritical where critical judgement is needed, and one who when he first got interested <sup>h</sup>schemed actual work for the titillation of theories.

If he read what he calls the assassination literature for the past five years without seeing that they are mutually self-destructive he is blind other than in his eyes.

He still insists that the tramps have relevance, but while demanding proof of others in a context in which none was required, as I recall it, he has yet to show that there ever was any relevance. He or anyone else. I was there when those fictions were first invented and as they were added to. There never was any reason at all to believe that they were in any way connected with the assassinat<sup>n</sup>ic and self-import<sup>ant</sup>ant dope that DeVries is he shows none.

I'm sorry that he did not tell you or if he did, you did not tell me what he said. Walt Brown told him about Gallen and C & G considering the problems I have there.

Brown never indicated anything of that to me.

I do not see how he'll learn anything factual from the books he's read about the meaning of Oswald.

He seems to regard all criticism as destructive and rules out the need of it between friends because it is helpful.

But after putting up with years of hurt to truth and with all the bull from those who are instant geniuses and consider that they know it all I may have <sup>reacted</sup> reacted strongly.

That tragedy is that they do not understand how hurtful they are, how they deceive and mislead people because they are irresponsible and ignorant and pretend to be fully-informed and experts.

Thanks and best,

Hand

David Keck  
3503 Huntingbrook Dr. Apt. 203  
Columbus, OH 43231-4937

9-21-94

Dear Mr. Keck:

Thank you for your kind letter of Sept. 13. The reason you've not seen other articles of mine is that I have only been studying assassination literature for just over five years-- but with intensity since 1991, having read over 60 books on the subject. I've been fortunate to have five book reviews on assassination literature and related subjects published in my home town press, which is a coup of sorts because Grand Rapids is very conservative and the home town of Gerald Ford and HSCA member Harold Sawyer. (An interesting aside--I was just hired to play guitar and sing at Sawyer's home next Wednesday-- do you know any good conspiracy songs?)

Thank you for filling me in on the chronology of the two versions of Case Open. I had made some assumptions and therefore misrepresented that aspect in the review, particularly by implying that Carroll & Graf probably did no editing of Case Open and that therefore Harold had ignored Posner's character assassination of Oswald. It appears that C&G edited out chunks, but did little or nothing with the parts they choose to publish. I received a call from Walt Brown who enlightened me somewhat on Carroll & Graf and Richard Gallen.

I enjoyed your review. You obviously have a great affection for Harold and your closeness to him must make it very difficult to be critical of his work. We all owe him a great debt, and I feel the same way about Sylvia Meagher. I'm glad that you touched on Harold's assault on Posner's pompous and hypocritical disinformation regarding just who and what Meagher was.

My specific areas of interest presently are: the framing of Oswald, the history of the major media's distortion and disinformation regarding all three assassinations, and the same for the academic community.

I am not familiar with these FBI documents from the late 1960's regarding the tramps-- do they attempt to name them? Does Harold analyze these documents in one of his books? Why should we trust the FBI's "investigation" of the tramps? The thing that bothers me about Harold's approach is that he categorically rules out any possible assassination role for the tramps. How or why does he know they were not involved? I'm not suggesting that they were involved. But with all the other suspicious aspects of this case, it seems foolish to rule out that possibility. It seems to me that many prominent early researchers were put in the awkward position of having to either defend or refute many ideas and theories, some of which were obviously wrong. I believe that this has led to some over-reactions and being defensive. Since the government is the custodian of the evidence, critics should be on the offensive.

Sincerely,  
Tom DeVries  
805 Kendalwood N.E.  
Grand Rapids, MI. 49505  
(616) 363-3578 (home)  
(616) 771-2745 (office-8-4 EST)

