

9/20/68 Lou, for your files. I sent you
earlier exchange. Jim, unsolicitedly, said
he'd have a quarter-page ad placed in the
papers when this story broke. As you know,
he has done nothing of the sort. I will be
hearing further, I presume. I'll keep
sending you copies because at the least I
will establish a record with Healy...An
important man once close to JFK took the
manuscript of COUP D'ETAT off with him for a
weekend. He has just written (after reading
the earlier books) that "it is quite a remark-
able paper". I expect him to do nothing.

Hal

Plum, Arw, Lowson, Allen Hulseth, Lucas

September 18, 1968

Mr. George W. Healy, Jr.
Executive Editor
The Times-Picayune
3800 Howard Avenue
New Orleans, La. 70140

Dear Mr. Healy:

Your choice of language does not encourage my feeling you are sincere in a desire to relieve the damage your inaccurate reporting has done me. We quite obviously would not agree, for example, on what you might consider "repetitious verbiage".

I would like you to correct the erroneous statements you have made.

Your papers knew I was in New Orleans when spurious papers were wrongly served on me, without any difficulty. Your papers knew that this was part of a propaganda campaign in which an effort was made to make them part. Your papers knew that I was regularly and publicly in New Orleans during this period because I was regularly and publicly in touch with your staff members. You can ask Bringuier's counsel whether any effort was made to serve me. If they say there was not, which is the case - and they knew I was there - you then know the explanation given you and published by you was false and intended to serve another purpose. I would expect you to honestly tell your readers the truth. I was not found guilty of anything and I am not, in fact, guilty of anything; specifically, I am not guilty of having libeled Bringuier and I would expect you to tell that straightforwardly to your readers, too. I was not a party to the suit because Bringuier elected not to try and make me a party to the suit, even though in the papers he filed he did use my name. This is also true of the Saga suit. I think this should be reported. Canyon had reasons for not acknowledging the validity of the suit. Two obvious ones are a matter of public record in the courts of Louisiana. First, this court was without jurisdiction because federal court had already ruled in another companion case that it alone had jurisdiction. Second, service on Canyon, by decision of federal court in New Orleans, is not service within the meaning of the law and was invalid.

If you look at Sancho Panza and see St. George, that is your myopia. However, aside from your longing to portray the incredible Bringuier as some kind of cereal-box hero, I think you owe your readers, me and the history of this period and subject a straightforward account of his frivolous litigation. There is a lucid record of it in New Orleans that is quite public. I am satisfied that Attorney William Lucas, National Bank of Commerce Building, 529-5551, will make his files available to you if this would save you time. This record is consistent with anything but what you have seen fit to publish.

Mr. Healy - 2

In closing, aside from all other issues, may I express the hope that, as a publisher who enjoys the rights of freedom in this country, you might interest yourself in how they can be denied writers and publishers with less than your resources by the simple filing of spurious suits that, at least superficially, suggest subsidy? You can read the complaint and read the passages complained against. You can thereby satisfy yourself whether on this basis alone, with the abundant law and precedent available, there is even the suggestion of a serious suit with no ulterior purpose. You will also find that I did not say what I was alleged to have said and you quoted me as having said, that what I did say was totally immune to suit and, in any event, from the official evidence cited, was not wrong. If you go this far, you might then interest yourself in another suit you found unworthy of mention, filed for the (successful) purpose of intimidating a witness. You will find that Bringuier sued Oreste Pena solely for his sworn, privileged testimony before the Warren Commission, three years after it was adduced. This joke of a lawsuit was tossed out of court, too. But I think it should become obvious to you, Mr. Healy, that things are being done with the courts in New Orleans that may not properly be done in this country.

Yours truly,

Harold Weisberg