I have read with great interest all the studies that have been done on the *Journal of Jean Laffite*, and the discussion, which always exists on the subject, based on the historical facts and on what is related in the journal.

I was surprised that no one, particularly anyone French, had looked seriously into the handwriting style and vocabulary used.

On reading the manuscript in French, two obvious facts appeared to me immediately:

1. The original manuscript in French was not written by a French person; this is an absolute fact and an incontestable certainty. In fact, it is absolutely impossible for a Frenchman to make such handwriting mistakes.

What is written is sometimes absolutely incomprehensible for a French person to read. There are many words [used] that do not exist in French nor in old French, in Creole, in Cajun or in Basque.

Here attached is an impressive list of these words among which some examples are significant:

- "je a ignotais rein" au lieu de "je'n'ignorais rein"
- "tres pepu" au lieu de tres peu
- "nombraise" au lieu de "nombreuse"
- "la jete da la victoire" au lieu de "la fete de la victoire"
- "firent en porte" au lieu de "firent en sorte"
- "document" au lieu de "document"
- "de grosses de mes" au lieu de "de grosses sommes"
- "les entreprises" au lieu de "les enterprises"
- "entroutes" au lieu de "entraines"
- "les pauvais" au lieu de "les pauvres"
- etc...there are nearly 300 of these mistakes.

The nature of these mistakes led me to the second conclusion.

2. The one who wrote the manuscript in French recopied a French text, and this is also an absolute certainty.

He copied a French text in which the handwriting was difficult to decipher, and this person, not knowing well the French language, transcribed what he was able to read, without being able to correct the errors.

Hence, there are long, well copied passages, which permits me to say that the Journal is made up of a mélange of a recopied French manuscript (mistakes, errors) and recopied texts taken from books or
newspapers (no mistakes).

I had some pages of the French manuscript analyzed by one of the most eminent French paleographers, Girard Panisset, the conclusions as follows:

**Badly done copy made in this century probably by an English-speaking person, knowing a little Spanish, too little educated or too confused because of the inconsistencies, copying very poorly a French manuscript, in which, on the evidence, he did not know the language, copying from books relating to the accounts of sailors and of pirates and books on philosophy and on Marxist propaganda.**

The handwriting is faltering, with fill-ins in and deleted alterations. The text was written slowly. The writer, as was evident, sought to imitate an old handwriting in which he is not familiar. Certain letters are totally different in one part from the other.

It is an affected handwriting, reflective, large and a touch lyrical which does not resemble at all the other letters of Jean Lafitte [Laffitte] where the handwriting is linear, continuous and small.

To me, the Journal is a contemporary forgery.

The other documents written by the same hand as the one who wrote the Journal, namely, the documents Le Brave and one of the two letters written to General Long (the two letters are not by the same hand) are forgeries that were introduced *a posteriori* in the American Archives.

As far as the date of the Journal is concerned, it is without doubt after 1936.

On page 193, it is written: “Trujillo, Santo Domingo” — an important error, for Trujillo in Santo Domingo is the name that was given to Port au Prince from 1936-1961. Therefore, before 1936, in Santo Domingo, the town of Trujillo did not exist.

The translators deliberately deleted the name of Trujillo, accounting for the error.

The predictions made on page 157 relating to the events of 1910-1920 are too precise to not have been known by the writer.

Without having studied the American historical facts, I have picked up on the following errors:

On page 24, it is said: Alexander was in France from 1801 to 1804 and from 1805 to 1806.; the documents in the French Archives officially certify that Dominique You from 1803 to 1809 was in Santo Domingo and Baracoa (Cuba).

On page 137 and 147: “February, 1815, we were preparing Napoleon’s escape”; impossible for Napoleon did not arrive at Saint Helene until October 16, 1815.

The author did not know France when he says, page 51: “At Dax, afterward through the mountains, we went to Bayonne”. Between
Dax and Bayonne, it is completely flat.

He did not know the origins of the names: page 211 “The name Lafitte [sic] originated on the Swiss border”—the name Lafitte originated in Gascony.

There is equally a very great quantity of incoherent phrases where there is absolutely nothing of value said, which confirms that the writer made mistakes in recopying, and, in addition, skipped words and lines in his recopying.

As for the translation of the Journal in English, it was sometimes very fanciful. There are some deliberate omissions or additions to correct certain errors which proves that there was connivance and a willing communication between author and translator in order to make the manuscript believable.

It remains to discover many mysteries about Jean Lafitte [sic] and this is what renders our research so passionate to all.

For my part, I continue my research beginning at the French Archives for it is without doubt there that there is the most to discover.

I will make my next report on the study of genealogy and, after Galveston which, in what concerns Jean Lafitte, crosses over to Cuba, then France.

* Mr. Patrick Laffite is a member from France. His paper was translated by the Secretary of the Laffite Society, Dorothy McDonald Karilanovic.

[Editor’s Note: Mr. Laffite makes some new and serious charges here among them is that the Le Brave documents is a forgery added latter. This statement is apparently made on the basis of handwriting alone. Some other members disagree. Is there a rebuttal?]