

*Intended for Bradley but not read Long story on Lane/Fauntroy  
killed second Sunday straight after it was to be in - and with most of those*

*issue was a set of series of magazines in which there were type*

When Mark Lane threatened you with a spurious libel suit last year you wrote me that you threw up your hands. As I recall my response it was that you were yellow and were abdicating your responsibilities as an editor.

In the past four months you have made me Merlin, the man who remembers the future. The Post's record is of abdication and cowardice.

Tinged with tolerance of McCarthyism from the pseudo-left.

For the Post more than the Times the House assassins spectacle is a story, ~~more~~ especially because Lane's other McCarthy, Charlie, is the District's delegate. Your guy, it seems.

Once there was a factual criticism of these latter-day Martin Dieses they were faithful to that tradition. Lane began it with a WDC broadcast in January: all those who criticized the committee were working for the CIA and the FBI.

Then the Fauntroy who is both McCarthys, Joe and Charlie, picked it up. When he was forced to retreat this was not news to the Post, so he is at it again, in last night's Harambee. You had to know this two days ago, when I heard it on a radio newscast.

And so today, Jason Hobards, you are silent.

No news stories, no editorial articles, no letters-to-the-editor.

You just quit, forgetting that he who is silent in the face of evil becomes part of that evil.

Before you people tucked tail you did have several accurate if enormously understated stories. There has been no denial of the accuracy of any one and in fact there cannot be. A not unusual editorial response would be to examine the fact in the context of the McCarthyism, to ask why there had been this McCarthyism and why there has been no claim to factual inaccuracy - how does truthful reporting make a reporter a spook.

Phonet Fauntroy gave you an invitation on this broadcast. He says he welcomes what he called "hard reporting." Well, he said much else, pretending it was fact. And he is, in addition to your guy and your delegate a subcommittee chairman. A little "hard reporting" would be illuminating. Especially on the originality of his work and his cited sources. He is a walking encyclopaedia of misinformation and disinformation.

He is, in fact, what I called Lane, a literary thief. Like Lane he is an incompetent one, unless you measure competence by headlines.

If he were Martin Dies would you have forgotten that when he first was about to expire he had a sensation about a witness with a story about a James Earl Ray meeting with a coconspirator in Portugal?

If he were Joe McCarthy and playing that number's game would you have been silent this past week when after his next exploit in propaganda blew up in his face he disclosed pursuing it still? These charlatans have spent tax money interviewing 21 Louisville police about a total irrelevancy converted into a gross defamation. These Baird fabrications are safe because the FBI and I are those defamed.

This is the fairy-tale about the FBI having agents floating around with loose half-millions of dollars to get King killed. Two and a half years before it happened and other than where it happened. The Post has the letter Clifton Baird then wrote. It does not say the FBI offered him anything to kill King. It says other than this. It does say there were dynamitings, that he ~~was associated with~~ had associated with all the apprehended dynamiters and was himself a suspect. So you were silent when the wires carried the story about the interview of these 21 people and were silent again after Fauntroy again endorsed this garbage ~~last night~~ on Harambee.

If your intelligence does not revolt at this and so much more all 100% like it you are yellow. A quitter not an editor.

If this gong show is going to investigate every threat against King - and the Baird story is not even that - will there ever be an end?

Cannot anyone in the press ask what any of this has to do with what did happen?

Is it foreign to normal journalistic concepts to ask the FBI for an estimate of the number of threats against King in its files, (which can't be all of them) ~~and~~ I know of hundreds. There must have been thousands. Could all of these combined in the assassination?

These exploiters of great tragedies and those national trauma that have subverted society may in some individual instances have something else in mind but they are actually practising the Dies-McCarthy method. One is to pretend that all is secret, all their own investigatory derring-do and thus they cannot even let the Congress know.

They can <sup>hint</sup> ~~hint~~ and with these hints they can excite. <sup>It</sup> becomes blackmail. What elected official dares risk being accused of opposing an investigation of either assassination?

Yet in eight months not a single new fact has emerged from these charlatans, not a single one of ~~its~~ their self-serving allegations has been authenticated.

They cannot be and they will not be. Even the plagiarism is out of context. Except where the allegations are fiction they are plagiarized. <sup>Including</sup> ~~particularly~~ by Fauntroy on Hirambee. What he attributed to "CD1052," which included none of it, you will find in your own files and library, in a story ~~David~~ Donald Baker wrote toward the end of 1974 and what Claiborne sent you from a New York Press conference I <sup>+</sup> held the end of April 1975. I gave it to you and other papers more than six years before <sup>+</sup> published it. When I did there was an AP story you may have.

My point is not personalization. Do we need the most ~~exp~~ costly Congressional investigation in history for incompetent plagiarism? With so swollen a staff it is limited to usually dishonest rehashes of the ~~public domain~~ published <sup>and</sup> fantasizing about the irrelevant?

With this you can be silent and meet your responsibilities?

This really is only openers.

You'd not be able to get ~~in~~ Fauntroy and any other members and any of their staff up to all of it, with Lane to boot, in the same room with me to discuss each and every one of their allegations in their reports or in their leaks.

Obviously I am not seeking your favor. Equally obviously there is no possibility of personal gain for me in taking this time.

When I am the first to have called for a Congressional investigation of the JFK assassination it is not easy for me to condemn this one. <sup>the</sup> ~~This~~ need <sup>is</sup> ~~is~~ the conclusion of my first book, which dates to February 1965. This ~~one~~ <sup>committee</sup> leaves me no choice. What would corrupt it I could see two years ago, as perhaps what Claiborne then filed from New York may tell you. My one clear recollection of that press conference is his chiding me for understating. I was pretty sick then but despite the pneumonia and pleurisy felt I had to go through with the press conference and giving people like you what all of you then

suppressed. I was not able to read and cut and edit my prepared speech, which I believe I have given the Post and on which, despite these problems, I am prepared to stand. I was indeed Berlin remembering the future.

I say this not to boast. Rather is it that I am steeped in this ~~xx~~ subject as nobody else is. As a first-generation American I see in it what most others do not.

My work does not have me chasing whodunits. It addresses the functioning and non-functioning of ~~the~~ our basic institutions in time of great crisis.

I regard the press, in the traditional concept, as one of our basic institutions.

It has failed the nation in this continuing crisis.

Today's Post tells me again that it also has.

This is not a self-serving letter. I will make no use of it.