Dr. A.G. Abbott Assassination Inquiry Committee 4718 Saratoga Avenue San Diego, Calif. 92107

Dear Dr. Abbott.

Thank you for the bibliography and for your handwritten letter of the 20th. Your list appears to be fairly comprehensive. Without checking other sources or my bookshelf, only one omission occurs to me: The Trial of Jack Ruby, by Kaplan and Waltz. Also, yoummight indicate in your revised bibliography that item 21 (the Subject Index to the WR and the H & E) is out of print and is not available from any source, to my knowledge, except libraries.

You willbbe interested to know that I have been told that a bibliography of major articles and books on the subject, prepared by Thomas M. McDade, is to be published in a forthcoming issue of The American Book Collector—probably the September issue.

I am sorry that I do not have time to write material specially for the various Committees which have been kind enough to invite me to do so. However, I enclose copies of recent letters to Kerry Thornley and Edward Jay Epstein, which are self-explanatory and which you may quote, if you wish, in full (if you have space) or in excerpts which preserve the general sense and tone of the letters.

As you may know, articles by me have appeared in recent issues of THE MINORITY OF ONE: "Two Assassinations" in the June issue; and "wheels Within Deals" (on the abortive Texas Court of Inquiry and the relations between Texas officials and the warren Commission) in the July/August issue. An article titled "Three Assassinations" will appear in the September issue. Sections of the June article were reprinted in a newsletter similar to that of A.I.C. and you have my personal consent to publish similar excerpts from the articles, if you wish, although you will wish to obtain authorization from the editor of TMO, M. S. Arnoni, 155 Pennington Avenue, Passaic, N.J., 07055.

Apart from lack of time, I am disinclined to be drawn into the prolonged "debate" on the New Orleans "investigation." If I may be frank, I am surprised and dismayed that perceptive and sceptical persons have not long ago recognized the Garrison "probe" for the crude vaudeville it is, and impatient at the readiness of such persons to be mesmerized by some cheap lip-service by Garrison to authentic criticism of the Warren Report or by his sophomoric "liberal/leftist" posturings. Stirely it should be clear by now that his antics have had the main effect of diverting attention from the Warren Report, reversing the impact achieved (especially in the second half of 1966) by serious and scholarly attacks on the Report, and fudging the entire picture by a stream of lunatic irrelevancies, and worse. I fear that those who are still beguiled by Garrison are impervious to fact or argument, however conclusive, and that the District Attorney has already received far more attention than he merits.

Yours sincerely,