

9/2/67

Dear Jonn,

I do have a registered trade name, Coq d'or, as it relates to chickens and farming but not restaurants! Nor fairy tales, either.

Our mail is on schedule only on Saturdays, when the carrier wants to finish early for a good weekend. This time I forgot the holiday, but he didn't! I had to get a letter off to England, where I have a verbal agreement with a small and very new publisher (a personal one with long experience in the business) on O In NO, in answer to questions about that and PW, which he will distribute there. That was all I could do before the mail left. I must confess sleeping until almost six to try and catch up from not retiring in Boston yesterday a.m. until 4:30. I guess I'm getting old. That and the frustration of finding a very flat tire at the airport, and the futility of flying ~~in~~ 600 miles is less time by half than getting a service truck to travel 2/10ths of a mile were just too much. I'm just tired!

Correction on Fulbright: both reasons.

O in NO galleys here. Lil is underlining proper names for indexing when pages are cast off. We'll then go through galleys and mark page ends, from which cards, if not prior to them made out, will be. Once we have the last page we'll also number appendix for private Xeroxed copyrighting to protect rights and have a couple of extra copies. That is already carded.

Meanwhile, a visiting helper is typing the very rough rough I did on the CBS shows and soon, unread, I'll mail a copy, as I will to several "buffs" who may make constructive suggestions (I anticipate a few I may not so construe). With this you will get the latest from end to NBC.

Before I consider going to N.O. or elsewhere I must finish the current writing on the fifth book, the ~~in~~ appendix to which is already pasted up and largely noted. I expect a few more things for it.

On Garrison's thesis, it is mine, save that he thinks all those who

appeared to be Oswald were the real article.

The books you want will go out in the next mail, Tuesday.

My offhand hunch is that Cooke knows his Hearst. Remember, basic in Popkin's writing is the assumption the real Oswald was involved. That is not the same thing as what I write. Further, by the subtleties of their own hair-splitting, they also regarded that (a la Mayer) as a reprint (he bragged that Avon is never original, a boast made unnecessary by their list), even if of a magazine article. I think it likely Berlin vetoed, hope I'm wrong.

The Los-Angeles based Citizens' Committee of Inquiry demanded fairness-doctrine time of the FCC and got turned down via an extension of the FCC's interpretation of its own rulings. I have exchanges. I think they were in too much of a hurry. Perhaps your lawyers will have an opinion based on what I have already sent on whether or not there is plagiarism within the meaning of the law. It is possible that the commentary will be typed in time to go with this.

I'm so tired I'm going to have to go back to work to wake up. That usually does it. I'll have PSPitis before Tuesday.

Sincerely,