To the editor:

Having demonstrated from the beginning of the controversy he began with demonstrations of his ignorance, and his slurs substitued for fact and in making it clear that he fronted for Gerald Posner, Ralph Luker has now, with his stupid bragging about the Posner misunder of an FBI abbreviation as a fale identification, raised new questions, about himself, about why he started this controversy when he is so totally ignorant of the subject matter, and whether he was also serving the interests of the Virginia Foundation for the Humanities and Bubkic Policy whose name he signs with gis own.

I am certain that others will comment on his never once providing a correct GBI file identification or on Posner's failure to do that. Instead I raise the question that when Posner received the FBI records for which he fanks the FBI personnel, how in the world could they have provided those records in response to Posner's request when he did not know how to tell them what records he wanted? The obvious explanation is that he received what the FBI wanted him to have an use, not what he knew enough to ask for. Posner's book almost says this, the alternative being that Posner is of enormous dishonesty. Those records, of which Posner write hos book about a small sample of them, were made public by me in my FOIA lawsuit to overcome the FBI's refusal to maks them public, CA 75-1999, and I read and retained them.

Doing his own work, his own research, Posner says would have been "onerous". It whuld also have been honest and what is normal for real scholars and for those intendeding honesty rather than the propaganda Posner produced, ragist and ugly untruth proven to be untruth by official records that are publicly available and are not mentioned by Posner. Who knew about their existence from me and knew he could borrow a copy from me or make his own capies from my copy, as he had with hundreds of JFK assassination records. Posner knew that I had become Ray's investigator in an effort to try to make the system work, that I had conducted the investigation for the successful habeas corpus and that I had also conducted the investigations for the ensuing fourtte days of evidentiary hears, of which 'osner knew I had ha copy of the official transcripts of that fouteen days in federal district court in Memphis. The case is titled Ray v. Rose.And the fact it t at I developed and presented a factual case which did exculpate Ray and was entirely unrefuted. But the judge, who Wanted to survive in the Memphis of that day, held that guilt of

innocence were nat material in what was before him, part of which was had Ray had the effective assistance of counsel? What I developed and arranged for the lawyers to present was indeed material to whether Ray's could have given him effective counsel when that alwyer did not obtain what 1 had with relatively liffle effort.

No Matter how much from his ignorance and nastiness Luker thinks he refutes it whe cannot and it is the fact: Ray could not have been convicted at trial so, he had no trial.

This Luker campaign against the truth in the King assassination parallels one by Max Holland against the truth in the JFK assassination and Molland has been supported in his fictional and kudicrous endeavor with, among other things, a three-year Virginia Fellowship. The foundation says it is "affiliated" with the University "gut has its own separate board, budget and incorporation."

I think it is past time for the foundation to make it unequivocally clear whether Luker speaks for it in his campaign against the truth in the King assassination and whether it has other such affiliations producing other than factual, truthful accounts of these great tragediers as some of the its "projects" that "apply" to "the various perspectives of history" or "to the understanding of current policy debates," its words within quotation marks.

Ignorance and luntruth, which come from the Lukers and the Hollands do npt do either. Not honestly, anyway.

Harold Weisberg Frederick, Maryland Hackhuluny

12

2