

JUL 21 1975

The filing of this suit presented the FBI with a marvelous opportunity to prove once and for all, in open court, that its solution to the assassination of John Kennedy was factually and acceptable; that it had done its work and done it well; that with withholding of the evidence for which I'd also sued earlier did not mean that evidence disproved its solution; and that there was no reason to doubt its integrity; and perhaps above all that criticism of it, and the Warren Commission was not justified.

That I filed the suit presented it with a more dramatic opportunity for I am the senior in all ways of those critical of the official solutions, from writing and publishing the first book on the subject and many more than any other to filing the first and most of the suits to end suppression to being the only one to have worked in the field continuously from the first- even to being the oldest in years.

All the FBI need do was line its evidentiary ducks up in neat rows for all the world to see. If its work proved its case then the world would know it. While this would not have ended all question, for there are many other than related to ballistics and the shooting, it surely would have given some credibility to the official story at the time officialdom needed it. At that time there was more public discussion than there had been in years. For the first time Congress was talking about investigating the assassinations. Investigation of the FBI itself had been voted by the Congress.

It was not only the ideal public-relations time for the FBI to prove itself. It was the needed political time, with investigation pending and the mere fear of what would come out in the investigations compelling the FBI to expose some of its dirty, unwashed laundry, especially its transgressions against the law and the rights of Americans.

It was the best of possible times unless it was the worst of possible times for the FBI.

There was the ideal case and time because the court of appeals panel in the first case, before it was overturned, had directed the federal court in its remand decision to give me a full opportunity in an open hearing to go into the charges I'd made against the FBI. If these were false charges, what more dramatic a situation in ~~that~~

could there be for the FBI to prove itself and establish its honesty and integrity?

This is logical and reasonable.

It is also rhetorical because the FBI had had this kind of situation for more than a decade and had made use of not one of the many opportunities. The FBI commands attention whenever it wants attention, so it did not need situations. It creates them when it needs them or wants attention.

However, if failure to be open and truthful in the past was due to the character of the Director, there was a new director and this was a direct challenge to him, Clarence Kelley, and his integrity and honesty as well as his intentions for the FBI under his leadership.

This puts the case rhetorically because it is obvious that if the facts were as the FBI had always alleged they would never have been kept secret. They certainly would not have been suppressed once the FBI was criticized. My own criticism, in writing and in court could not have been more pointed.

That the FBI did not even try to turn the tables of its major and longest-standing critic can be only because it had no answer to the criticism, because the criticism was correct and the FBI's ~~many~~ claims were and always had been false and because the FBI knew it.

The results of the tests for which I sued are by their nature definitive. This is why the FBI and all police agencies perform the tests, not for frivolities. They are definitive proof - or definitive disproof.

Why keep the proof secret? Why not take the "hang-out road?"

As the Watergating Nixon could not so also could not the Watergated FBI.