

6/12/68

Dear John,

Our letters crossed. Just returned from New York, where I went to address an RFK memorial meeting. I'm always behind, and each trip ends with a new stack of things waiting me. Hurriedly, NBC and a local TV station and the NYTimes covered the meeting, but there was no reporting. NBC seems to have made a sound tape of the entire thing. At one point their cameramen mounted the stage with a hand camera and carefully photographed the entire audience. There was no reporting at all. Total media silence. How meaningful are the constitutional guarantees?

It was also a shock to me to learn that literary and scholarly thievery are universal and accepted and that the man who asks about it is regarded as statist, some kind of nut. Lane is another and current example. His new book, which succeeds in the impossible (defaming publishers and libelling the media) had blatant examples. He is so unconcerned he invents fictitious footnotes to mask what he lifted from me. In one case, he even invents a non-existent source, the "index to the basic source materials" of the Commission. If he had even nodding acquaintance with the Commission's work he'd know that the greatest single handicap in using their files is the total lack of an index. Aside from this, the document he had in mind is not and cannot be his source, which is, again, WHITEWASH II. This is part of the climate, part of the explanation of how such things can happen in our land.

Yours is a fine and generous review, and I do appreciate it.

Can Bringuier, until I can catch up with a really high stack of stuff, can the willing student begin with this chore: getting every reference to any public statement or meeting by Bringuier and every reference to the Cuban Student Directorate (DRE) from the local papers, esp. if he can get access to their morgue?

I wish I could be there now. I hated to leave last time, for my work is and has been amazingly fruitful there. Aside from the work here, my two biggest problems are air fare and a place to stay. If Matt Herron is home I'll be able to stay there. But when you are broke, even \$150 is a large sum, and that is what fare comes to. There is a larger story in N.O. and La than even the Garrison office realizes, I am confident.

Returning to Bringuier, back to the Bay of Pigs, early 1961. Incidentally, he has yet to serve me in his latest frivolous suit. The last of the series, against Canyon also-he has made no effort to serve them. He and his CIA friends are again prostituting the courts. Alas, the papers and electronic media go along with it, entirely uncritically. Not one has ever asked me for any kind of comment on any of his suits, and not once has ever reported the dismissal for cause, that is, with prejudice, of his action.

This newest and I wish I could believe last assassination hits me harder because I have predicted it and others since May 1966. I discussed the RFK one a few hours before it happened, on a small TV station in Washington. It had been predicted to me in New Orleans by an RFK man two months ago. That I seem to understand what is happening is little comfort.

Thanks for the correction on Dwyer. I knew better. I guess we all hurry to much. I don't think I have ever seen a book with as many typos as Oswald in New Orleans.

Excuse the haste, and again, many thanks. Hope we can meet again soon.

Sincerely,

5830½ S. Robertson
New Orleans, La. 70118

6 June 1968

Dear Harold,

I'm sorry I didn't reply sooner to your letter, dated May 30, 1968. But I was working on that book review, that I am enclosing, and which I think you will like--though I am not certain of my accuracy. Yet, when I looked at Thompson's book--I was shocked. The point of the review, even if there are several inaccuracies, is to call attention to what you've done. I did not include the literary criticism because when I re-read ~~NEW ORLEANS~~ Oswald in New Orleans--aside from the shock which accounts for my first reaction--I really think that it was a good book. Whatever flaws it contains are minor and editorial--which reminds me: you refer to Lt. Paul Dwyer of the NOPD. I worked for Dyer--it is Dyer--but that is trivia.

and a million other points could have been used.
↓

I was talking to my chairman, Tom Preston, about Thompson's wholesale theft and deliberate lies. He said that it is not unusual in the scholarly world. I was raised in a different school, where a man's reputation depends on what he says. In fact, one whole life depends upon it.

At any rate, I hope you like the review. But, please bear in mind that my objective is to get people to read your books--study them--in the order in which they were written, and, at the same goddamn time, to make them see that there is more than what the Government is willing to admit. The review was only supposed to be 1000 words. It is closer to 3000 words. Also--Miller Williams, the editor, may want to change a word here or there. But Miller is on our side, and when he read the first draft, 7 pages long, he liked it. I reworked it, then gave it to Preston who suggested I add additional material to clarify who witnesses were, etc. He read it last night, and liked it--said it was really frightening. So. At any rate let me know what you think. Honestly.

I already have a student ready to do research if you would send a copy of Bringuier's testimony.

I think our talk helped a great deal--and I'm sure that you'll see a great many of your ideas in that review--I've been looking for one of my own--so until you get down this way again,

Sincerely yours,


John Joerg

I was going to leave the reference to Lavinia out, but Preston said to include it - even though this isn't in Oswald in N.O.
↑

P.S. The copy is yours - under separate cover.