

NEW ADDRESS: Rt. 7, Frederick, Md. 21701::301/473-8188

12/4/67

Dear Jerry,

Be careful before you go overboard on the Thompson book. It is a skilled cop-out, a careful literary kleptomania designed to give the government a way out. It is in basic accord with every major conclusion of the report, is of conscious inaccuracy, and Thompson, in his personal appearances, is careful to describe himself as other than a "critic". Like Liebler, who is referring to what he did, personally, always refers to "the Commission" when it was wrong.

Thompson has a special dictionary compiled for professors of philosophy, whereby there can be three men who combine to do something wrong (with the word "accomplice" used in the S.E. Post condensation), but they are not "conspirators". Just two other guys who had the same idea and quite independently selected the same time and place for its implementation. To him, Oswald is still the assassin, and from that sixth-floor window (although now Itek joins LIFE, J. Edgar Hoover and the Navy Photo Lab in confirming my analysis of my personal discovery, that there is photographic proof that there was no assassin-not even a rifle-in that window at that time). Even his headlined "double head hit" is not his and not new. It required no tricky "science" to discover, for there it is in WHITENASH II, twelve months ago, on page 221. And Ray Marcus, independently, also noted it and told Thompson about it a year ago.

The government and its apologists (or other prominent figures who may be induced to say something) may now thank this brilliant scholar for showing them this one minor flaw in the Commission's work: Oswald, while still the lone assassin (for it is the first head wound that was fatal), was not alone in the shooting. Pardon the slight oversight, but cannot you see how completely correct, by the independent work of this incorruptable scholar, the government really was?

There is more, but do you need it.

The enclosed copy of a letter to the editor of the Washington "Post" is self explanatory. Usually, a large number of papers carry the longer special articles the wire-services offer. This time, I cannot find a single one that did. Nobody even needed filler anniversary time this year.

I've been to New Orleans since I saw you. Again there are people who will talk to me who will not speak to the fuzz. So, I'll be going down again soon-not for writing. Louisiana News, the only large wholesaler, refused to handle OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS- the only book with the story of what is happening there and the only one with a foreword ~~xxxx~~ by the best-known citizens of New Orleans, its controversial district attorney-without an advance indemnification of \$50,000 against non-existing law suits that it acknowledged would be only frivolous if they were to be filed. When I asked their lawyer, who I know, to specify, he picked out accurate quotation of the New York "Times", the Washington "Post" and the U.S. Attorney General! There is limited, improvised distribution (but La News considered a sale of 15,000 possible!). Isn't the first amendment wonderful, to guarantee, as it does freedom of the press?

Sincerely,