

Historians and Publishers Rewrite Our History

By Harold Weisberg

Gerald Posner likes to call himself a "Wall Street lawyer" because he spent two years doing "discovery" work for a large firm when that work did not even require a law degree and when a search of the indices discloses not a single law suit he filed in those years. This is the real Posner as reflected in his literary gimmick in which he pretends to be expert on our major political assassination when he in fact struck on the successful formula of puffing up the government's versions of those crimes with a major publisher getting him exceptional attention in all the media.

I know Posner. He and his wife spent three days going over the third of a million pages of once-suppressed records in the cases of President Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr. I obtained that factual and literary goldmine through about a dozen difficult and costly Freedom of information Act (FOIA) law suits and have always made them freely available to all writing on these subjects. The Posners used our copier and copied what they wanted. They were entirely unsupervised.

David Wrono became a dear friend of mine. He is a recently retired professor of history at the University of Wisconsin. Over the years he spent much more than three days going over those same files and copying what he wanted. When I knew what he wanted I sent copies to him in great volume.

There is no writer, scholar or lawyer who sought this same access to those same records who was not extended those same rights.

Most use has been by reporters for the major media as well as small newspapers. Reporters for some of our major newspapers have spent weeks at a time examining those records and questioning me. There have been cameras from individual TV stations and from the networks here and abroad. There has never been any charge for the time taken or in any effort to recoup what that difficult and sometimes quite lengthy litigation cost me.

And I have given it all away, with no quid pro quo, for a permanent record, a very large and in some ways unique record of these great tragedies.

Having gotten more attention than many a Hollywood star with his revision of the Kennedy assassination, Posner conceived a quickie, supposedly on the King assassination. It is not. It is a hardly disguised rehash of the official fabrication of a "solution" – of a crime that was never officially investigated – in which he did not hide from those familiar with the official evidence, what he was up to. The distinction between the two Posner commercializations is his dishonesty. It is more apparent in his King book. It is deliberate, knowing dishonesty.

Ralph E. Luker and Wrone exchanged letters in the September *The Journal of American History* (pages 768-780).

It is astounding that Luker makes no response, leave alone refutation, to any of Wrone's criticisms and it is shocking that the *Journal* printed what is no more - no better - than an ignorant diatribe from a man who is so lacking in any knowledge of the factual material that, as Wrone noted, he cites records by the FBI's acronym, which means there can be more than sixty records bearing the same number, instead of the FBI's file numbers by which it identifies its records uniquely.

Wrone's criticisms are fewer than are justified by the records.

It is conspicuous that Luker does not respond to Wrone's criticism. Instead he has a vicious, false and ignorant attack on Wrone in which he, still flaunting his subject-matter ignorance and his position for defending errant government, he includes me.

About whom he knows not a thing and about whom he is not once accurate.

Not a single time!

It is complete fabrication, his made-up defamations, and this is typical of Luker in this matter.

Not once!

What a pathetic spectacle he makes of himself and how he debases the history that is great tragedy!

That "The Organization of American Historians disclaims responsibility for statements, whether of fact or of opinion, made by contributors to *The Journal of American History*" does not eliminate the journal's responsibility for what it publishes. Especially when it is as untrue, as obviously venomous and

as ignorant as is Luker's diatribe. That the journal which calls itself *The Journal of American History* could publish such entirely unsubstantiated ignorance, mythology, fabrication and service to errant government and such nasty untruth – without even a suggestion of a single quotable source – not a single one – is in itself shocking.

It is no less shocking because it is the record of all historical publications and organizations when confronted by that most subversive of crimes, the assassination of a president.

Not one such publication or organization and not a single prominent historian has referred to that crime as what it is, a de facto coup d'etat. And that is the most subversive of crimes in a society like ours.

I read Wrone's letter about Luker, the loud-mouthed Luker who has not a single source for the poisonous defamations he wrote and the *Journal* published. Based on my knowledge, about which there will be more below, I find Wrone to be accurate and to state what should be a national concern. Of Wrone's letter, about which Luker wastes little time in establishing himself as a subject-matter ignoramus, Luker says his first words, "I am surprised that Mr. Wrone's letter finds space in the (sic) *Journal of American History*, It is a Tweedle Dud."

Because here might be those who, like Luker and find what is normal in life to be conspiratorial and because Luker writes about his glorification of the literary and historical atrocity Gerald Posner wrote and titled *Killing the Dream: James Earl and the Assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.* Here are my connections with Ray. This is abbreviated but truthful. It hides nothing, there being nothing to hide. It begins with what remains the only factual book that is publicly available (about which more also follows) on it. That is my *Frame-Up: The Martin Luther King/James Earl Ray Case*, (Outerbridge and Dienstfry, 1971.)

After my book was published I arranged for Ray to ask a wealthy lawyer friend of mine to be his counsel. The purpose of my doing this was to try to get Ray the trial he never had, to make our system work the way it is intended to work – with a public trial and a jury to decide guilt or innocence.

I did the investigating for the habeas corpus proceeding and that prevailed where those by Ray's earlier crews of lawyers did not.

3
I then did the investigating for the two weeks of evidentiary hearing in federal district court in Memphis. It was preceded by a scant two days of discovery in which we were entitled to all relevant records, the prosecution had. With me was Jim Lesar, then junior counsel and later in that long series of Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) lawsuits. Jim and I also had to prepare for that hearing because senior counsel was abroad. We divided that up into fact and law, with Jim taking the law and I the fact. I had already located and spoken to those witnesses but the time pressures on us were so great that often Jim had to question witnesses to whom he'd not spoken, questioning them from questions I'd written only a few hours before daybreak.

With one of the bases for a trial the effectiveness of counsel and with Ray's former counsel being the most sensational and successful of them all, I decided to show Percy Foreman's ineffectiveness as Ray's lawyer by in effect trying the case, making a record of the exculpatory evidence Foreman could have had and didn't. We did as a matter of fact, exculpate Ray. Exculpate is a word that Luker redefines. He limits its meaning as no dictionary does.

That we succeeded is underscored by the judge's decision. It had to be against Ray if the Judge wanted to be against Ray if the judge wanted to continue to live in and sit on the bench in the Memphis of those days. The Judge said that guilt or innocence was not before him, as they most certainly were on whether or not Ray was effectively represented by Foreman.

If this were not enough to make me familiar with the facts of the case, more than any Luker was or would be, I also included a King assassination FOIA lawsuit against the Department of Justice and its FBI. They were able to stonewall that case for about a decade. During that time they were able to persuade the judge, who has been overwhelmed by the time those cases can take, to appoint me consultant to the government, to the government I was suing! Unheard of as this was, it also was not an everyday matter for consultants to be gypped out of the promised consultant's fee, as I was. I was also gypped out of the costs of the equipment required and for which I had no other need.

When John Ray was a witness before the House of Representatives assassins committee, he wanted me to represent him, not any lawyer. I persuaded him to ask Lesar to represent him because that

representation did require knowledge of the law, I did sit at the witness table with him and Jim. When he had to file a statement with that committee dealing with the documented² he had not been given, it fell to me to file that response, I barely did finish about 2 a.m. the last day of the committee's public life. (It published in the committee's Volume eight.)

While this is far from complete, it should be enough to indicate that I knew at least as much about Ray and the King case as anyone else. Particularly Luker who, blinded by his passion as well as his subject-matter ignorance, is utterly oblivious to the spectacle he makes of himself in his letter, which is abysmally ignorant in everything he gets into.

W
Where ~~W~~rone had nailed him for "falling short of history standards," Luker tries to explain that away, by claiming he "used Lewis Carroll's language because like Holocaust-deniers, conspiracy theorists like Wrone seem to dwell somewhere on the other side of the looking glass." This is a myth, a complete fabrication, a Lukerism to pin a label that is inappropriate on Wrone and to hide Luker's own ignorance.

Including his ignorance of what Wrone had written about the assassination.

g
He does not have and he has not offered any "conspiracy" theory or any other kind. If Luker were not so grossly ignorant of the facts or the writing about the assassinations, a subject on which he pretends expertise, he'd never hand³ his own reputation on this kind of fabrication.

Luker then says, nothing omitted in quoting him, that "Responding to them can be bottomlessly unproductive." In this again, he flaunts his ignorance of both the subject matter and those "theories" which, when they exist, are mostly impossible fabrications, not based on anything read, not any kind of "theory."

This is the timeworn stratagem of attacking, instead of defending, and in his childish attack Luker is, as usual, entirely and only untrue. Neither Wrone nor I theorize either any "conspiracy" or any other kind of solution.

We'll get to more on this, too, but when Luker, profound in his spectacular ignorance skips and jumps, it is not possible to expose without that jumping and skipping with him.

Still trying to cover for Posner, who remained a subject-matter ignoramus after completing his book, Luker then writes, pretending he knew what he was saying when he wrote it, that "My review noted that conspiracies undoubtedly did occur and that Posner outlines what he believed were the most likely parameters in the King assassination."²

This is tricky language and subject to special interpretations if later wanted.

First of all, for a "theory," to be legitimate, it must be based ^{on} a fact. Otherwise it is just plain fabrication. Just made up out of nothing at all. And when there were but two individual assassinations, how in the world could Luker or his idol Posner "note" that "conspiracies undoubtedly did (sic) occur." How many conspiracies can they imagine for a single assassination? Could there be? Need there be? Or, with any care at all, could there be?

And aside from what Luker attributes to Posner's book, there are the large number of interviews, press conferences and public and radio and TV appearances Random House lined up for Posner.

I have obtained and read all I got and in none did his Posner ever hint that he believed there was any kind of conspiracy, certainly none to kill King. He was always lavish in attributing the assassination to an unassisted Ray.

From coast to coast and with a field day in Chicago.

As Luker does not realize or he'd not have written as he did, Posner had no basis at all to "outline" what Luker says Posner "believes were the most likely parameters of any conspiracy in the King assassination."

For Posner or Luker or anyone else who believes he is Sherlock Holmes reborn to "outline" those parameters," it is essential for him to know and to prove without question that Ray was the assassin. This the government did not and could not do.

There is no conspiracy with any ghost.

What Posner learned early, publishers do not want proven fact on this subject.

They want to support the government, which, they hope, will return the favor.

As it could so easily to publishers who were in need of government favors if they owned or were part of what required licensing. Like radio and TV stations.

In which some publishers were pretty big.

Including Posner's.

What Luker can possibly have had in mind, if anything real at all, he does not say or even hint at, in what he says would have been "the most likely parameters of any conspiracy in King's assassination."?

What "kind" can there be "in King's assassination" other than? Part of the conspiracy to kill, the assassination?

But with that true, then Ray was not a lone assassination and the Posner invention evaporates because then Ray would not have been the allegedly lone assassin of the government's fabrication and of Luker's copying.

Next, another of the endless Luker fabrications, and any editor should have known that without any source citation this is an obvious fabrication, a manufactured defamation:

Wrone has hired on, as an academic gofer for Harold Weisberg.

Not even as a figure of speech is there any basis for this intended and entirely false slur.

Wrone and I have been the closest of friends for more than two decades. We were drawn together by his interest in my work. That led him to invite me to his university to speak about the assassination. And that led to our close and lasting friendship. Friends and coworkers help each other and that does not make one or the other a gofer, nor it does not "hire" one by the other as this dirty-minded Luker says. It happens that I was able to give Wrone more because I had more. I did, before health reverses forced me to end that work, obtain about a third of a million pages.

Moreover, what I gave Wrone I did not give to him alone

I was the first to use FOIA to obtain improperly withheld records the government had filed as related to the assassinations.

I believed and wrote about FOIA as the most American of laws. It says that the people have the right to know what their government does, and that is the most American of beliefs, revolutionary when those greatest political thinkers of all time established this nation with its revolutionary government. So, I believed that I did not own, as one owns property, the records I got by those difficult and costly lawsuits. I believe that I, as did anyone else, own the use I made of them, but nothing else. And, as a matter of belief, from the first I have made it all freely available to anyone. Most of those who spent days, sometimes in my basement, where those I knew would write what I did not agree with. But as those great ones of this country's earliest days also believed, freedom for a free nation, to be free requires it to be fully informed, requires at that all views be heard, be accessible to those who want them.

Hundreds of people, including representatives of our and foreign governments used this archive entirely without supervision, without any questioning, unless they asked me what they wanted to ask. They also had entirely unsupervised access to our copier several of which wore out faster because of this extra use. I did not ask for payment for the copies made and if offered, I asked the government price of ten cents a page, which was considerably less than our simple copier cost us.

The Posners, for example, spent three days here. He selected the records of which he wanted copies and she made the copies.

When I obtained 330,000 pages of those originally-secret government records, what kind of "gofer" did Luker imagine Wrono could have "hired on" to be in backland Wisconsin. Or could he have been from there?

Luker defames himself with each of his endless fabrications, all of which are both nasty and false.

For not any one of which does he pretend to have any real source at all.

And he does not, cannot have any, the real reason his at least unscholarly article has and does not even pretend to have a real source.

"Hired on"? With what was I to have paid him when for much of the time I was living on my good name and ended the debt in which I lived not from any work of any kind on the assassination. They were costly and they yielded no money.

And I have given it all away, with no quid pro quo, so that, in time, it will be available to the people.

Nothing is omitted in the foregoing, quotations from Luker's baring of his own throat so that he can slice it better himself, himself and with his profound subject-matter ignorance whetted by the strength of his baseless preconception and fabrications. What follows next is what followed in his unintended self-denunciations:

... In a badly written and poorly argued book, *Case Open: The Unanswered JFK Assassination Questions* (1994), Weisberg claimed to find "hundreds of factual errors" and many violations of good historical practice – "omissions, fake map, invented 'facts,' and misrepresentations" – in Posner's book, *Case Closed: Lee Harvey Oswald and the Assassination of JFK* (1993). In this letter, Wrono hoists himself on his own petard by misrepresenting to us a fake book, Weisberg's *Whoring with History: How the Gerald Posners Protect the King Assassins*. As if, mind you, such a book existed. Searches for it on amazon.com, barnesandnoble.com, Lexis-Nexis and OCLC yield nothing. Through the looking glass, it is no longer odd to argue that in order to review a book one should, have read another, albeit an unpublished one, one. It is worse than odd however, that having found a press to publish a tedious volume of personal attack on Posner and the Kennedy assassination, Weisberg now seeks one for 472 more pages of bile on Posner and the King assassination. Someone here should "get a life."

Case Open is one of about 30 books Luker claims do riot exist. Another I did not expect to be published commercially later did appear. It is *NEVER AGAIN!* Counsel for a small publisher who published what I detested, a man who long had been a friend, asked to read them when he heard of them.

The foreword to the first of the *Whitewash* series reports more than enough of the refusal of any commercial book publisher to publish any book on the JFK assassination unless it endorsed the government's fiction. The official investigations were all fakes, with the decision to blame it all on Oswald reached as soon as he was killed and it was known there would be no trial at which the childishly incompetent official story was concocted. I have the relevant Justice, FBI, Secret Service and White house tape records, as I also do of the official decision to blame it all on the allegedly unassisted Oswald. The publisher omitted them from *NEVER AGAIN!* and I have never used any of those records merely for sensation. However, if you want them, just ask and I'll get someone to do the copying, which is a bit much for me now. I know better than to ask if you'd like an article that would use them in

facsimile in *The Journal of American History*. This grim and deeply subversive truth that is the guts of our history you and others would prefer not be recorded, not known, forgotten.)

u
c, n /
a /
I the wake of my successful heart operation of 1989, I began to fail physically. I had been limited to lifting no more than 15 pounds. It become increasingly dangerous for me to use stairs, and with much of my own work added to the third of a million pages obtained by all those FOIA lawsuits, the only place in our home for all that paper plus my own work that no longer fit in my office was in the basement.

After I fell twice, fortunately on the bottom step, I stopped going to the basement at all. With no gofer that meant hat I was pretty much cut off from all those hundreds of thousands of pages of evidence the government had and did not use.

It happened that I had need for an FBI [?] filing in one of my FOIA lawsuits. The FBI and its Department of Justice lawyers were using perjury and what amounts to its subornation in order to continue to suppress what under the law did not qualify for suppression at all. In an effort to end or at least reduce the perjury, which is a serious crime, a felony, I decided to go head to head with the FBI. I had never heard of that being done before. I could have alleged that perjury under conditions in which I'd have been immune, by having it in a lawyer's filing. But I decided to make it me or them. I executed an affidavit in which, under oath and subject to harsh penalties if I were untruthful. In it I charged the FBI with its ^{she} perjury. In which it had always been immune.

FOIA was amended in 1974. One of the key lawsuits, one the Senate used to justify returning the "investigatory files" exemption to its original meaning, ^{as meaning had} that ~~having~~ been altered by the Department and FBI when they were before judges friendly to them. This successful Justice Department operation had rewritten the law in decisions that gave it the meaning opposite the meaning of the law as enacted. The significance of my first lawsuit to have the FBI disclose its records on the scientific testing in the JFK case is in the legislative history ⁱⁿ of the Congressional Record on page S 9336, for May 30, 1974.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy, known as Teddy, the last and the youngest of the Kennedy brothers of that Kennedy family, was then the chairman. of the Judiciary Committee. That committee then handled this, as it had the original FOIA law. It is he who was seeing to it that the legislative history

would be clear. My suit is the first he mentions in seeking to clarify the record. It is at the bottom of the first of three columns of that page.

Returning to what is referred to above as Luker's slicing of his own throat, he offers his opinion that *Case Open* is "badly written and poorly argued." He is entitled to his opinion to its opinion but the reaction to what was published represents an entirely opposite opinion. In the first three months. After which it was sold out, I got about 500 letters almost all of which, for the first time in the almost 30 years since the first book on the subject, ^{from Luker} my *Whitewash* appeared differed. Almost all of those 500 letters were from a new generation, those of whom told me they had not been born when JFK was assassinated. The oldest I recall were from those who had been just entering ^{2d} high school when he was killed.

The book was written in haste and for an entirely different purpose, not for what Luker makes up, and for that he obviously had no source. Like so much in his sourceless fabrication, he just made up what he thought would serve his unprofessional and unscholarly purposes.

It is the fakers and the assorted other phonies who have always spouted what Luker here offered as his own, who have pretended, as Luker does, that they know what is true and that I do not know what I write about.

It was when I was looking for an affidavit that I filed in a later FOIA lawsuit that I found three pages of the FBI's response to my charging it with perjury. I used those three pages to again charge the FBI with perjury. In that other suit

The FBI's reply was in a legal filing called an *opposition*, in CA 75-226 in federal district court in Washington. Jim Lesar was waiting in line before the courts opened to be the first to file under the amended act we have helped to amend so it could work as the Congress intended.

I digress here for an evaluation of those lawsuits by the courts, that and even those many and some precedential lawsuits, for a story Lesar told me. They can be compared with the quoted opposite view of Luker.

Each court had clerks it assigned to cases that are filed alphabetically. The clerk who handled the cases filed by a plaintiff whose name begins with W handles all those filings. Lesar appeared at his

opening in the wall, approximating Lesar's as he reported this to me, had him telling the clerk: I have another filing in Mr. Weisberg's case,

The clerk then said to him, "long and detailed." They both laughed and the clerk added, "And thoroughly documented."

They both laughed again.

Many of those affidavits were book length. Court records, as long as they last, also write history and the extensive affidavits and detailed documentary support for them also were a record for history that I was also using FOIA to perfect.

I did not, as Luker made out, over-write the part in which I cast myself.

Remember, I had charged the FBI with perjury in a method that invited the FBI and its counsel, the Department of Justice, to charge me with perjury if I lied. But the fact is that they not only admitted their felony, that the FBI had filed perjury with the federal court to defeat me. Here are the exact words of their *Opposition*, the legal name for that particular filing. With regard to my allegation of perjury by the FBI, its *Opposition* says that "plaintiff (which I was) could make such claims (sic) ad infinitum since he is perhaps more familiar with events surrounding the investigation of President Kennedy's assassination than anyone now employed by the F.B.I." (page 3 of *Opposition*.)

In simplified and plainer English, the FBI claimed, and that judge honored its claim, that because I knew more about the assassination than the FBI did, it was justified in its perjury, in its lawlessness.

And the FBI did get away with it! Although the judge threatened Lesar and me. (I go into that with direct quotations from the transcript that include those threats in *Post Mortem*, in the sub-chapter *Through the Looking Glass* of Part IV, *The New 'New Evidence,'*" beginning on page 423).

Nothing that we knew about then happened to us, as the judge sought to make Lesar and me back off.

There were, indeed, "hundreds of factual errors" in Posner's mistitled *Case Closed*.

When my then friend, the publisher's lawyer, asked ~~me~~ to see what I had written, I then had in rough draft either six or seven chapters and I send ^{it} them to him. He and ^{publisher} Herman Graf decided those few

9
chapters made a book, but they did not tell me that. When I told them I had about eight hundred pages written and I knew they would not print that large a book. So, what I wanted was the full text retyped and that was agreed to. But when that retyping got on to, as I now recall, page 820, no more was retyped.

So, those hundreds of factual errors are real, even if to this phony, self-styled subject—matter expert that is not credible. What is attributed to Posner is real and is noted on the manuscript that is as complete as I can now make it, those more than eight hundred pages. Luker's problem is that he loves a phony and can't abide the truth.

Luker then says that the book Wrone cited, *Whoring With History*, does not exist. It and about thirty more do exist. It and they exist in limited editions only and although individual books, are all part of a very large series of books with the title, *Inside the JFK Assassination Industry*.

Luker's exact words are worth repeating:

Wrone hoists himself on his own petard by misrepresenting to us a fake book, Weisberg's *Whoring With History* ... As if, mind you, such a book existed. Searches for it ... yield nothing. Through the looking glass is no longer odd to argue that in order to review a book one should have read another, albeit an unpublished one. It is worse than odd that having found a press to publish a tedious volume of personal attack on Posner, ... Weisberg now seeks one for 472 more pages of bile ...

That book was not intended for printing then. But when it was possible for me I let others have *and use* copies.

Luker is entitled to his opinion. It is not confirmed in the extensive mail I received after *Case Open* was published. By coincidence, I having asked of those I recalled giving copies to after I was robbed when my wife and I were both hospitalized, one sociology professor friend itemized the thirteen of that series of books he had and has used.

Did I "hire" him and others to be "gofers," too?

All that razzmatazz about Luker not being able to locate a copy and his lie that the book did not exist is his dressing up his slander and the deprecation – his lies. All this phony had to do to learn whatever he claimed he wanted to learn he could have learned by phoning Wrone or me.

libel,
slander. But had he done that simple thing, he'd not have been able to use all this untruth and intended slander. So he did not do the obvious.

And then ^{he} lied.

How opposite of the truth Luker's made-up deprecation is disclosed by the record. In less than two decades after the first, the self-published *Whitewash* appeared, we had gotten more than twenty thousand letters from strangers. Although I was severely critical of the Commission and its employees and of the executive agencies and many of their employees, all named, I did not get any phone calls or letters from any one of them complaining that I dealt with them unfairly or inaccurately.

Not one!

After ten published books.

The first of which went through ten printings! (It was not as tedious to all those people as he says it was to him. *Hundreds of thousands.*)

The most conservative member of the Commission, Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia, encouraged me to his dying day. Part of one of these books Luker says did not exist is entitled *Senator Russell Dissents*. Part of the laudatory review the Senator got from the first critic and that although I then did not know of the unheard of shenanigans I report in *Senator Russell Dissents*, that review for the Senator said correctly that I agreed with him!

None of these books that are ~~printed~~ ^{written} as a record for history was written with any publisher in mind. The record of publishers on this subject is stated clearly in the first words of the first *Whitewash* and they have not only remained true, they are understated his opinion thirty-five years later.

5
After two parts of Dell rejected that first book three times, after I made a real success of it, without a penny to spend on advertising and public relations, Dell come to me for the right to reprint it as a paperback. The contract called for a first print of a quarter of a million copies. In the Dell accounting,

5
which is as phony as Luker's scholarship, Dell reprinted that edition three times – while it had half of that ~~re-time while it had half of that~~ alleged quarter of a million still unsold! Worse, by accident and from Dell, I got a copy of its fourth reprinting, ^{a printing} which was not mentioned in any accounting.

quarter of a million This unaccounted for fourth printing, according to the same Dell accountings, while half of the first printing remained unsold. Allegedly.

Dell was not in any way embarrassed when I asked them why in the world they would reprint three more times when they had more than a hundred thousand in stock. Or when they had a printing for which they made no accounting.

Rather than being *tedious*, Luker's invention, that book was Dell's only best-selling work of nonfiction, according to its monthly ads, for six months, while it robbed me of those royalties then and forever.

But the record was then clear all over again: commercial publishers did not want to print what the government did not like. But if they did, they robbed the author.

Genius that Luker would like to believe that he is, it never occurred to him that if Wrone cited page numbers, they did exist.

It is obvious that Luker could have asked me for a copy, or could have asked Wrone. But he is smart enough to know that once he started looking, what he just made up, would collapse. He had his passion and his ego to slake, his name to make. He did not want it to fall apart. 5,

It is, and it is past time to use this very appropriate word to describe the bile that Luker made up. It is a baseless lie that he just made up to say what I have written about Posner is no more than a “personal attack” on him or that I now seek a publisher. Like all of this literary filth, this desecration of book reviews when they are assigned to the ignorant or the prejudiced, it lacks any reference to any response, if any, by Posner.

My file holds not a word from him. Or from Random House. Or its counsel, particularly not a word of denial or refutation when it was used in a lawsuit against Random House.

And, when the Random House hardback was reprinted as a paperback, Posner eliminated from it some of what I had charged as plagiarism. I also referred to him as a shyster. But he did not deny that or any other uncomplimentary characterization of him. That also included his plagiarizing the errant work of a bright old boy ^{then} of ten years old!

Luker next says that "Only scholars have shown that some powerful federal agencies were hostile to King and that there may have been some degree of conspiracy in his assassination and that there was bureaucratic ineptitude in the investigation."

Again made up and again untrue.

5 There had been defamatory leaks to hurt ~~to hurt~~ King but the real disclosures had nothing to do with "King scholars," all of whom copped out when I approached them.

0/3/ The real disclosures were triggered by my FOIA lawsuit, CA 75-1996. It sought, specifically, those records It also yielded what none of those Luker styles as "King scholars," Has even asked to see, *S. L. I* the FBI field office ^{King} inventories alone, and not including the ever so much greater volume of FBI Headquarters records, ^{these} a total of four hundred and two pages of inventory alone!

→ And not one person close to King ^{or} of any kind of "King Scholar" has asked to see them or asked a single word about any of them.

If Luker had, he would have made this imperishable record of himself as a phony – as anything but a scholar.

"Bureaucratic ineptitude in the investigation" is another Luker invention. There never was an investigation of King's assassination. The investigation, such as it was, was to make it appear that Ray was the assassin when from the very first the evidence was that he was not and could not have been. What Wrone said on this comes from the FBI's own record I got from it while it kicked and screamed in court to try to prevent that.

If Luker's concept of scholarship had not been to make up what you want it to be and lie about the rest, as we have seen and could see in much greater detail, he would have known that the FBI was very embarrassed when this truth that it had not investigated the assassination, became apparent. Then the FBI

The publisher who did *Case Open* on the cheap, without even a single review copy being given to any publication for any review - he didn't even correct typographical errors -- may or may not have sent letters to him to me, but I did get about five hundred at home rather promptly -- did not place a single ad, and the book sold out in a few months just the same.

On his "King scholars" kick, where Luker wrote that someone in the government being hostile to King, he says, "there may have been degrees of conspiracy in his assassination," Luker cites no law or lawyers on this. Again it is because he cannot. In a murder, there is or there is not a conspiracy. If there is none proven there is none to be invented. There is or there is not. Except to the Lukers who give vent to their baseless beliefs and preconceptions when they are no more than that. To them and to their prejudices and as we see here, to their ignorance.

I have been asked by publishers to provide peer reviews, I accepted some and turned some down. I have been asked by other authors those I remember being college professors, to read their manuscripts for accuracy and an opinion on what they wrote.

I do not know what Luker means by "allies" but in all I have done I have been independent. How could this not be true of the author of the first book on the subject, especially when it was completed in mid-February 1965 when the Report was issued the end of the preceding September and the appended twenty-six volumes of its appendices, officially estimated at 10 million words, were disclosed the middle of the November after the Report was out?

I have fan mail from all continents, very few from some and rather more than would be expected from others. It takes different forms. Some are from writers seeking information. An Ohio high school class sent me the largest post card I'd ever seen. All the students signed it and they got their teacher and the school principle to sign it, too.

I could add more, but more is not needed. Other than to note that there is no way that Luker could have any source for this. Other than in his badly-overworked imagination which, as we have seen, cannot come up with a single fact as he vents his hate and as any careful editor should have seen.

As with all else, he cites no source and as with all else, there is none.

Next, another Luker fabrication and another redefining of words to suit his intent to corrupt. This charge: "It is worse than misleading to claim that James Earl Ray was exonerated in a 1974 trial. There were several court proceedings in Ray's case in 1974. There been a trial and had it exonerated Ray, as Wrone assures us, why did he remain in prison until his death?"

Aside from all that is ignorant and dishonest in this -- and Luker lies in what he says Wrone said -- any editor should have wondered why Luker doesn't identify those "federal court proceedings." All are titled and all are not trials. That one ^{is} as the evidentiary hearing to determine whether Ray would get the trial he never had. And, there is no question about it, that hearing ^{is} proved beyond question that Ray was not the assassin, could not have been, could not have been placed even in Memphis or at the scene of the assassination and it is sufficient not to add all that can be, that the crime as made up by the prosecution was a complete physical impossibility. 91

Taking his facility for making up whatever he wants to say into the meaning of words, Luker pretends that "exonerate" can be from a trial only. The small Oxford American Dictionary, published by the Oxford University Press, gives this as its definition: "to free from blame, to declare (a person) to be blameless." 11

And that is the entire definition. No need for me to wrestle with my unabridged.

I, not this ignoramus who wants to be regarded as the expert on the subject about which he knows nothing at all, know what was established in that "proceeding" in which there was examination and cross examination, the fact that is in the record. And here again when Luker gets a bit much carried away with himself he can't even lie straight.

And if he had wanted to know instead of being free to lie, which is what he did, he's have asked me to see the official transcript of those two weeks (which he did not know and did not say) of the testimony and its cross-examination.

Wrone did not in any way exaggerate what that hearing proved. He way have read my copy or made a copy for himself.

In this I have excoriated and ridiculed Luker for what he has so pathetically been, an unprofessional apologist for errant government. He is so unprofessional in that ~~his sole preparation~~, aside from his emotions, if not also his ambitions, ^{he flaunted his} was ignorance. His ignorance is so total it has him make a fool of himself as he fabricated his allegations ^{- his or those fed him -} and never once came within catching distance of a relevant fact.

It is conspicuous that he says nothing that is factually correct and nothing that can be exaggerated into some justification for the meanness, the stupidity, the dishonesty and, that word again, the total unprofessionality of his contemptible personal attacks on those about whom and whose work he knows nothing. He made no attempt to learn a single thing about them.

Nor did he about Posner or about Posner's writing.

In this I have also been critical of the *Journal*. Whether or not the *Journal* was professional in its publication of an obviously false attack on two men it also did not know and also made no effort to learn a thing about is something it should, by now, have considered. My belief is that in all elements it did not conform to either journalistic or historical standards in its publication of so viciously, so false, so personal and so rabid an attack, with venom and hate substituted for fact of which Luker has not a single one. That is, none that is a fact, none that is not made up out of nothing, none not driven by the hatred that, along with his ignorance, dominates Luker and provokes his venom that at the same time, invariably triggers more of his ignorance.

It is not all that easy for an experienced professional man to be as totally and as completely wrong in all his endless criticisms and it is not easy for such vicious and overtly wrong writing, particularly because its tone alone, not to give an honest, impartial editor serious trouble.

My experience with editing goes back to the time of the Great Depression when I edited my high school weekly. Of all that I learned in journalism class and all that I read what remains as the Number One consideration is accuracy. With that dominating all I did, the paper I edited won ~~from~~ the Columbia School of Journalism's All-American Honor rating.

5

Beginning in 1936 and extending through 1939, I was the editor of the most controversial committee of the Senate of that time, the Senate Civil Liberties Committee. Of all the many volumes I edited, not a single error was attributed to me. And that when the hours were unconscionable.

That began when I was twenty-three years old and it included a stint helping the Department of Justice in the most sensational case it had then. The title *Bloody Harlan* probably means little or nothing to most now but in that small county in southeastern Kentucky there were more murders each year to try to thwart unionism than there were in the entire state of New York. (My how I wish those elaborate credentials authorizing me to testify on behalf of the United States Senate had not disappeared during my service in the military after Pearl Harbor! They were quite impressive.) But still again, accuracy was the dominating factor, and there were no complaints about mine.

Accuracy is possible for boys, as it is for men, if they want it.

There is no accuracy in Luker's diatribe and how it is written, and what is not in it, it should have alerted editors to the fact that it is a journalistic and a professional atrocity, a disgrace for either a journalist or ^a of historian. to write for publication.

What is obvious begins with the fact that it is intended to defame, to do harm to people Luker does not know and that on a subject in which he is obviously quite ignorant. ^{and prejudiced.} What he submitted is entirely without support and yet is intended to be hurtful. That, too, should have at the least raised editorial questions. Because this is all obvious and should have been to the editors, that raises an entirely different set of questions and should have caused wonder, at least, whether it should be printed at all.

It is hurtful to more than Wrone and me. It is all lies about a significant event in our history. That it is without ^{any} ~~even~~ a made-up support or even a pretended support should have set the editorial flags to waving but clearly they did not.

All of this, and what concerns me most is magnified because the *Journal* is an old and a respected professional publication.

But not in this.

81

This, to get to my point, is more like *Pravda* or the *Voelkische Beobachter*. Before I return to this, please ask yourself how, other than in degree, what you have just done with Luker is any different than the sieg heil! history reported by those ^{and so many other} publication not so long in the past.

It and *Pravda* said what those governments wanted them to say and they did not say what their governments did not want them to say.

A perfect description of the propaganda Luker wrote and you, without the obvious checking that was necessary for both history and journalism, printed as though with a rubber stamp.

Going back to some of what I wrote above, ask yourself how normal, how American it was, for the first book about that most terrifying ^{most} and serious of crimes, the assassination of a President, not to be published, to be turned down, more than a hundred times, without a single adverse editorial comments.

The most serious of crimes, no edict not to touch it, and more than a hundred publishers would not touch it. Not even when it was the first, the only book on such a subject.

Even though their own people predicted that it would be a best-seller.

As, much less than it could have been, it later was a best-seller.

This is not what our Founding Fathers had in mind with their First Amendment. It is what they feared and wanted to avoid and in a sense it was worse. than they feared. They feared government compulsion and they protected against that. But this is more serious, much more subversive, It was voluntary suppression because all publishers assumed the government would not like it.

But is that the standard of what can be published so that representative society can work, with the people being informed and expressing their wishes after being informed?

Essentially there is no practical difference between Nazi and the Soviet domination of what their people could and could not know and the voluntary suppression of what they should know in this country because we were all raised with the belief it is entirely free. So, it is a natural assumption to be made here, that if there were anything for the people to know, their media would report it.

Ask yourself of your record on this and that of others such publications remembering the unique significance in our society of a Presidential assassination.

What did you print that you had any reason to believe the government wanted not to be printed?
What factual books did you report on if they were critical of the government or reported what you believed the government ^{did} ~~do~~ not approve?

However, the ten books I printed are still on sale, and I have had not a single serious error called to my attention. This after as much as thirty-five years. They stack. And were, in effect, suppressed.

I do not know what you think can be more important, particularly historically, than a Presidential assassination. But did you even mention the first, mine, or the most, mine, or the exceptional opinions, particularly official opinions, of them?

To those of the belief of our Founding Fathers on this, the record of all our media on this is the greatest of subversions, a danger to a genuinely free society.

As its voluntary censorship is.

I think you people should give serious thought to whether or not your record is one of suppression and compare that with the kind of slop from Luker you published. *I and then defended!*

Is this the way to record and report history, with made-up lies and personal defamations, and that with all the warnings that were obvious?

Is that how history is reported and recorded (other than in *Pravda* and the *Voelkische Beobachter*)?

If you tell yourself, and this would be a cop-out, that Luker is entitled to be heard, there is the fact that he is not entitled to cry fire in a crowded theater, or the right to be heard does have some necessary restrictions, and then how about me? Am I to be heard? Can I undo all the harm you have done me? And more important to me the harm to history, as recorded and to be understood?

You could not have phoned me?

You could not have asked Luker for documentary support of all that he made up, some being what he adopted from others who made it up?

The form of our government and how much of it is decided by the people have both changed, without any revolution. This has been possible because of the failures of the media and of so many other

institutions. Not only is this a great subversion, it is because the media and various institutions started it or made it possible.

I think you should examine yourself on this relatively simple matter and ask yourself whether you behaved in the traditional American way, the way that you were taught in school is the typically American way. *Or added your own suppressions and subversions to it*

If you have any questions, I will, to the degree now possible for me, answer them.

If you want copies of some of the records I referred to, copy away!

Some should shock you and some you might want, as might some of your associates, to have just to have.

Next, still unable to tell the truth, Luker refers to Wrono and I as "conspiracy theorists." If Luker read any one of my ten printed books he would know that there is no "theory" in any of them. I am close to unique in that but all those books come from the official evidence. Even *Frame-Up*, which is on the King case, came mostly from that evidence as given to the media.

After this canard - and after reading him this far I wonder is Luker knows any of the established fact -- that "conspiracy theorists," including Wrote and me, "have not yet offered "have yet to offer any (sic) evidence that government agencies conspired to assassinate King."

Why should we?

3
1
And where does this phony scholar, this fraud of a subject-matter ignoramus get off attributing to me ~~to me~~ what I never said or hinted at or believed? In the field in which I write that is a foul and a completely dishonest, a dirty and a nasty libel made up without an inkling of any kind of fact.

7
A despicable liar and libeler like this, and here we see that he has no factual basis for a word of his dirtiness that he makes it all up and is usually as close as possible to 100 percent wrong, and he is published in what presents itself as a scholarly journal of our precious history, without any checking of a single fact when as we have seen this literary arid history slime of Luker's

This is, for the master of deception, dishonesty, misrepresentation, and dishonesty even dirtier than his prior demonstrations of dirtiness. He assumes what he has no right to assume, just makes up. He then complains that we did not do it, pretending that we, as we did not, did it by "malicious innuendo." There is no innuendo in anything I said about Posner, as the few illustrations above leave without question. Nor is it mere "innuendo" when I refer to and document my saying that he is a plagiarist. Or a shyster. Not only was I explicit but in the face of it Posner was and has remained silent.

Not a word to say!

Where does Luker get off demanding that we lay "out a reasonable documented case for a conspiracy" in a book reporting the official fact of the case to show that there was no case against Ray and no official effort to solve the crime. Can Luker be so stupid that he does not know that, in doing this, I have made a solid case that the crime was a conspiracy.

In his Dogpatchian "scholarship," it is only pretendedly scholarly to demand that we lay "out a documented, reasonable case for such a conspiracy," one neither Wrono nor I alleged.

But where was the editor on this?

If it is "documented," that means it is real, and whether or not the phonies of assassination writing and opinion consider it "reasonable" it is real.

And who judges whether it is reasonable?

The Lukers who have all this to say without any knowledge at all of the books and what they report or the vast stacks of FBI records he has available and has not even looked at? Does not know how to cite them and makes up a meaningless citation?

Can't even cite the federal court "proceedings," his way of referring in the plural to a single one.

And announces in advance that omniscient as he is of all of which he has left his abysmal ignorance beyond question, he will again denounce and reject what he will call "malicious innuendo" no matter how thoroughly it is proven and that by the actual official evidence of which Luker could hardly be more steadfastly determined to be and to remain totally ignorant. He is demanding that we do what neither the Shelby County nor the State of Tennessee nor, most of all, the federal government, particularly its FBI, did not do when they all knew there had been one and they had ignored/avoided all the clues and leads they had.

He actually claims in order to report what we want to report on the crime. We had first to solve the it.

The unsolved crime.

His words mean and can mean nothing else.

And all else, to him and those who agree with him, will be no more than "malicious innuendo," despite the fact when confronted with only some of it, Posner, Wall Street lawyer boasts being, had not a sound, not a single word to say.

The title of my first King assassination book is *Frame-Up*, and unless it is believed that one man killed King and simultaneously did all that was done to frame him, that means there was a conspiracy and that alone is all that is needed to make a “reasonable case for conspiracy.”

I have read some awful, dishonest, outrageous, impossible and ignorant emotional outpourings but I can remember nothing that is as ignorant, as dishonest, as irrational, as unscholarly and as intendedly corrupting as this simply amazing self-exposure by the Luker who, pretending scholarship, is actually his own exposure of all these and many more disgraceful motives that are of magnified evil when by one who pretends scholarship and knowledge and is as totally ignorant of the available fact as the most intendedly ignorant man could be.

“Peddled,” indeed!

That is not what I did in a book based on the official evidence and it is not the way in which anyone not totally devoid of honesty of purpose or argument could rationally submit it to cross-examination, with the deck already stacked against him, as I did in those FOIA lawsuits.

(There were two King FOIA lawsuits. I won the first with a summary judgement and in winning the second, I got all those records referred to above.)

It certainly is not what I did in obtaining and presenting the evidence for that court proceeding this phony scholar can't even identify.

If I had, that evidence would have been destroyed on cross-examination, as none of it was.

And it certainly is not what I did in *Whoring With History*, the allegedly non-existent book based on the official stenographic transcripts of that proceeding. It had the name too complicated for the scholar, Luker pretends he is, “evidentiary hearing.”

Luker's ignorance, his bias, his dirtiness and his pretense of being Superman intellectually should have alerted the editor to what he was up to but again the editorial acceptance of this kind of evil should have caused an editorial demand for justification of all the harm set out to spread and did spread in the permanent record that the *Journal* let him make without any demand for any proof, any justification, even

any reason to believe what Luker literally cries out for checking – unless he wrote what the editors wanted to be believed, no mater how evil, how false, how hurtful it is. - m/

And he says of the authentic historian, Wrone, and of me, with this a peek at his own record, that peddle our “own distortions of reality.” This character does not know what the reality is in these cases. And if this is not dirty enough of him, he demands that we believe what we neither believe nor said not in anything of Wrone's that I saw did for it didn't:

Rather than laying out a reasonable case for a conspiracy, they peddle malicious innuendo about those who disagree with them, implying that Posner is motivated by 'purposes not historical, sinister 'private ends or CIA subsidies.”

This is never said but the CIA gave Posner major help on his mistitled *Case Closed*. It made available to Posner, the defected KGB official, Yuri Nosenko, and Posner not only interviewed Nosenko for his book. Nosenko appeared on a prime-time coast-to-coast TV show to plug sales. And on that show Nosenko laughed at the Posner line, saying it would have been impossible for Oswald, he was that lousy a shooter, that even with a shotgun in Russia Oswald never bagged any game, that his companions gave him game from what they got so he'd not go home empty-handed.

Of the little that remains and can be addressed in any degree to me I quote:

... If conspiracy advocates have evidence of that or of a conspiracy of government agencies in King's death, show us the evidence by publishing it.

As I write, the Justice Department has just issued a report recommending no further action on the King family's request for a renewed inquiry into the assassination. I have no "gratuitous, misconceived, and improper" advice for the family. It has received and acted on quite enough bad advice in the last twenty years.

By beginning that as a question he attributes to me and others, he gets away with his basic – and intendedly defamatory – lie. I do not and never have “theorized” any conspiracy.

However, as those few who are not subject-matter ignoramuses and have examined the official evidence, the supposed official evidence in both assassinations proves beyond any question that both were the end products of conspiracies. But the Lukers have no need for fact, for established and official evidence when they can make up anything they want and with this falsification of history, get it published, regardless of the hurt they intend and the libel they get away with, what should have been obvious to any editor intending honesty, fidelity to fact and ~~to~~ not to be propagandizing in support of errant government.

The last line quoted is true in a way that this apologist for the worst of endless government dishonesties does not ^{intend} end. Luker says that the King family had "received and acted on quite enough bad advice in the last twenty years."

The first advice – and the worst by far – was a bit more than twenty years ago and it was from the Department of Justice. It lied, and I use the word literally, to talk the King family into agreeing to a Ray guilty plea. That lie had two major parts. One was that Ray's guilt was beyond question and the second was that unless the guilty pleas was accepted Ray would be burned. All the Kings opposed the death sentence.

There is, in those many FBI files and reports I got in CA 75-1996, not a thing connecting Ray with the crime. That was made up by those who framed him and accepted by the Memphis police and was immediately adopted by the FBI and thus the Department of Justice.

There is no possibility that Ray could have been convicted in a public trial. It is ever so much more than Luker mocks Lesar for having said about the evidence that was exculpatory and virtually all of it was exculpatory.

There likewise, as I reported in *Frame-Up*, and again we face the question, did Luker read any of it at all or does he still again just make up what he wants to say and to have it believed no matter how untrue it is, would lay have been sentenced to death. *Frame-Up* has the statistics, but there had not been any death sentence carried out in the United States for many years.

That was bait for the Kings and their associates.

If the King family and associates had not believed, or made on they believed the deal that the Justice Department pressed on them there would have been no deal. There would have been a public trial and Ray would have been acquitted.

That is without any question at all.

What a fiasco that would have been for all the government, but most of all for the FBI whose Director hated King so intensely and condemned him so publicly.

I have and have studied what the FBI gave the Justice Department. It is no case against Ray at all! Much of what was not given to Justice was fantastically exculpatory. Much, too, is what Luker childishy ridicules Wrono for using – quite accurately – from the FBI's own records. It is no less than what was fully exculpatory, what the FBI could not avoid. Imagine what it would then have been with a competent staff of investigators conducting a Ray defense. Not just one aging and overloaded man with much to much to try to do.

But who nonetheless put in a solid, exculpatory case at the evidentiary hearing.

This atop the John Kennedy case would have been a disaster that is beyond belief. Then this would have forced the asking of the questions not asked in the JFK case. The questions that existed, were known, and again, were exculpatory. Then all that was suppressed, misrepresented and hidden so much of which was exculpatory of Oswald, would have been an unimaginable scandal because all of it that I have, and much of that is in these books I have written for history's record, is overwhelmingly exculpatory and although many years have passed, I recall not a thing that was really incriminating.

For example, in neither case was the death bullet connected with Oswald or Ray and in neither case was it possible for the rifle said to have been owned by the accused to have fired that bullet.

As indicated earlier, the shooting attributed to Ray, who then was not there, was a complete physical impossibility. So, as this is but a glimmer of what those who *Whore With History*, like the Posners and Lukers, have to overcome, which they cannot and did not do, before they can begin to argue - which is all they can do, the actual evidence making it impossible – that Ray was Kings killer. The killer who was not there to do the killing, which was not in any even by his rifle.

When this is the public record and it is in quite a few books that know-it-all Luker says do not exist, books he never asked to see based on the suppressed FBI records, it is the actual, official, fact forced into the public domain. With my successful litigation having forced those records into the agencies' public reading rooms where all, including Luker, can see them. These now public records include proof the government had learned on the King family and associates to coerce them into accepting the lied-about deal. Otherwise that by-passing of a trial would not have been possible. The sins that then would have been disclosed are of such magnitude the scandal would have been beyond imagining.

Here and abroad.

Nothing like this in our history comes to mind that alone would have made it a scandal of major importing.

In this case the official records, those still not kept secret in violation of the law, were fully available because, in federal court, I forced the FBI and the Justice Department, to disgorge them. All those not still kept secret, anyway

Even, incredible as it seemed and still seems, the FBI kept all secret from the prosecution until it complained to the Justice Department. (Yes, I have that record, too.) I have those many thousands of pages and they include some on what was done to fake the government's case

But there was no Freedom of Information Act in those days of my youth, the days of The Great Depression and yes, there were many suppressions in those days, too. Suppressions by the government, by the media and by what Luker typifies, by scholars, particularly historians. It was in seeking to overcome those forces and in trying to establish truth that I got what education is possible in preparing to bring to light what was kept hidden.

Sometimes that was done only by accident, without suppression being the intention but in my experience that still put men in jail and kept them there.

When there was writing to be published, there sometimes were batteries of lawyers convince it would not lead to a lawsuit. Nobody exposes such great powers as the du Ponts lightly and all publication lawyers are particularly cautious when that is done. As I did in a sensational series exposing Nazi cartels

and their repressive influence or preparing to defend oneself while exposing how our collaboration in those cartels deterred defense preparations and helped the Nazis in their preparations to defeat us.

During the war, I was in the OSS, forerunner of the CIA. General "Wild Bill" Donovan, himself a lawyer with a fine reputation, also took seriously the responsibility the command has to look out for the interests of those below the command. The assignment he had waiting for me when my background security check was cleared was the case of a brave squad of brave OSS soldiers who had volunteered for an almost certain ^{death} parachute drop in France, which the nazis then controlled. They had gotten into a fight with the Military Police and had been convicted, with their conviction upheld through all the channels of appeal. Six weeks after I got that case those men were free. (In the OSS record; which the CIA inherited, that is "the Paris case," called that because the ranking non-com was named Paris.)

Before the war, in addition to writing, I had been a Senate investigator and then the editor for the committee for which I worked. There also was no conjecture. It was all solid and documented or it did not exist.

Laws are not based on conjectures.

After the success of that first assignment I had in the OSS I was used as a troubleshooter, to try to succeed where others had failed. I remember one that was for the White House, with a 48-hour deadline I turned it in, completed after a single morning.

This is part of the background with which I have addressed the government's suppressions and dishonesties in those investigations and with which I have also addressed the work of those who sought fame and fortune by seeking to commercialize their defenses of errant government, the Posners and the Lukers.

I also learned, in that apprenticeship, that much of the failure ^{was} came from rushing too much, that the finest and most able did not succeed because of what they overlooked. In that first case, the "Paris" case, all I used was the existing file. No field investigation at all. The existing files acquitted.

And that is what I have done in my writing on the political assassinations. I have used the official records that had been suppressed then and were freely available to those who did wrong with our history,

the Posners and the Lukers. Ignorant as Luker is about everything relevant, his kind of writing needing and having no fact, he may not have known about all that was freely available, but there is no question about, it, Posner did, had it offered to him and he turned it down. All my King assassination records were in a different part of our cellar plus a file cabinet of them in my office. The part of my office is also where the transcripts and of two weeks of evidence that Memphis evidentiary hearing were and are and Posner knew about that, too. But did not want it. Had he not ignored it he could not have tried to commercialize the King assassination, because what I wrote about him and what he tried to do comes from and is based on those transcripts of that official hearing.

No less does Luker whore with our history when he knew about that book and tried to pretend that he actually says that (reprehensible) it does not exist. This is particularly true because of what Wrono wrote about it. But for Luker's kind of whoring with our history, which he did no less than Posner, when he is just making it up out of passion, vanity or some other nonprofessional motive, it is easier for a Luker to just continue making it up, and that is all he does in his diatribe against Wrono and me.

Luker, who does make it all up as he goes, has preserved a state of total and complete ignorance and this is but a single historically unprecedented series of acts on which, had he been an authentic scholar, had he given a damn about King other than to exploit him, he could have evolved – if he had the backbone to go head-to-head with the all-powerful FBI, ¹ some fact, some truth.

Or, he did not, he had no interest in studying the thousands of pages I made available to all. He is as totally ignorant of them as an infant would be.

The King cover-up was even more important to the FBI and all federal agencies than the JFK case was because, once the King frame ^{-up} and cover-up was broken, a major and a diligent look at the JFK case would have been impossible to avoid.

And that was the assassination of a President, an authentic coup d'etat.

There is no need to carry this further here, but it should be remembered that no real look at either case could avoid the framing much of which I have exposed in my earlier books.

And who did the framing could lead to who did the killing.