

Rt. 12, Frederock, Md. 21701  
3/17/77

Dear Rev. Creech,

Our routes have been renumbered. We have not moved but we are not on Rt. 12.

I appreciate your letter of the 15th. I'd like to give you a longer response but I cannot. In April 1975 I suffered a series of illnesses that have shortened my working day. This requires that I take less of it from what I regard as my primary obligation - the work.

The Keystone Kops of the House Gong Show have made many mistakes, none in my belief by accident. Their series of media events defames the Congress. They are pulling any stunt possible to prolong themselves, having reached conclusions (sense of déjà-vu?) without any investigation.

Almost two years ago Downing's people asked me for a position paper. I took the time for it and a trip to Washington to discuss it. They were here several times prior to my printing Post Mortem, the contents of which I offered them, as I did Schweiker after the book was at the printer's - I was en route to the hospital on crutches when it happened.

This past September two different people acting for him asked me to update this. I did, with what may seem to be but actually is not precise foresight. I predicted all the mistakes and what would happen unless the committee fixed on and adhered to the only possible course, establishing the corpus delicti and that with all possible speed. Sprague asked me to see him and I spent the morning of 10/22 with him. The afternoon was with some of the staff people who had been and others who had not been at the morning session. The research director, at both, knew my work from earlier work on another committee. He told me he was coming up the next week with his own xerox machine, taking a room at a local motel, and copying all. I have not heard from him since.

I did give them much through another staffer. They "lost" some of my originals and I had to complain to obtain any return.

I am certain Sprague asked to see me only so he could not be faulted for overlooking it. He not only did not keep his word, he saw to it that Downing's was not kept. My break with them was over arrogant disregard for legal rights and principles and their beginning preconceptions of guilt. There is no question about Sprague's responsibility in this. Or his knowingness. Alas.

What you have seen of Lane's work is nothing to what you will see, on King and from Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Due next month but lateness would not surprise me. I skimmed the Skeptic scrimshaw and missed Sprague's references to Lane.

Sprague not only does not mention my work, he has not obtained it in any form on JFK. Once they obtained it on King they started leaking it as their sensational new discoveries. They could have had all my files but they came for none. I think this provides you a motive evaluation. But I'd be interested in how Sprague answers you about me.

From the address you use I'm afraid we forgot to send you a notice of Post Mortem. I include it.

Despite all I do persist. I have three current cases in court. One is particularly productive.

I fear that if you place hope in this committee you will be disillusioned. After six months they have nothing, including the Trafficante sideshow that was designed to entice the Congress to continue them on the false assumption that this, too, is new.

Thanks and best wishes,



# The First Congregational Church

United Church of Christ

65 Church Street - Spencerport, New York 14559  
352-3448

15 March 1977

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
Route 8  
Frederick, Md. 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

As you know, I have read all of your books with great interest and am thoroughly convinced that you have made a strong factual case in every instance. Now, the current issue of Sceptic Magazine is carrying an interview with Mr. Richard Sprague and Mr. Belin regarding the reopening of the investigations into the murders of President Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr. I have written to Mr. Sprague in care of the magazine, hoping that they will forward my letter to him, asking whether or not he is going to talk to you, and if not, why not. He mentions Mark Lane, who, at least in my opinion, tried to make a fast buck out of throwing together a hasty book without sufficient research and documentation. But he does not mention you or your outstanding series of studies of both cases. I felt it was time somebody called this to his attention.

It has been some years since you and I exchanged letters. During that period I have always felt that you put your finger on the essential facts in both cases, and, further, that you proved your points carefully. Now that the Rockefeller Commission is defunct, and (if they speak the truth) this group intends to investigate without using the CIA and the FBI, something just might come of it. I know you were pessimistic in your last letter, and so was I, but I think there just might be a slight chance that something might come of this. I hope so, at any rate.

Meanwhile, let me thank you again for your labors---although I know, as your letter said, you would do it without this feeling--of appreciation. I only hope that those who are setting out to do something will continue--and especially that they will get in touch with you and your sources. I shall continue to hope so.

Most sincerely,

Donald G. Creech