

Dear Ms. Meyerowitz,

10/21/00

Because of your unfair space limitations I provide a bit more ~~for~~ your knowledge and for your files if you keep files.

As a young man I was a reporter, an investigative reporter, a Senate editor and investigator, and my pre-Pearl Harbor specialty was ~~the~~ Nazi cartels. ~~At~~ the suggestion of the Department of Justice, I became an unregistered British agent in economic warfare, giving all the information I developed to two of its agents in Washington. One of them introduced me to "The Man Called Intrepid," I think his name was Robertson, the chief British agent here, and he introduced me to some of the United States agents of those resisting the Nazis. It was from the ~~Polish~~ ^{Poles} ~~Polace~~ that I got some of the earliest indications of what became known as The Holocaust. It is monstrous for an ignorant and ill-intended ~~pig~~ ^{to be} like Luker ~~is~~ free to lie, libel and slander like you let him do to Wrono and to me. The ~~reverse~~ ^{of all he says being true} is not all that wrong, with him being in that ~~Pig~~ ^{is} Historian role.

The Commission Member who had a high opinion of my work exposing that Commission was the most conservative member, Senator Richard B. Russell. He regretted that his Senate obligations and terminal illness, ~~emph~~ ^{emph} ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~pre~~ ^{pre} ~~vented~~ ^{vented} his doing anything to help ~~me~~ ^{but} he did want me to keep him informed. Part of Inside the JFK Industry includes what I now remember to be about forty pages. (If you'd like to borrow and copy it, you are welcome.)

I don't know if you intend ^{painting} any other supposedly assassination works but may I suggest that you keep in mind what I know of no professional historian writing so the people can know and history record, ~~no~~ ^{historian of} ~~element~~ ^{re} of the mafia telling them, that the assassination of any President is a de facto coup d'etat.

Dialogue is great, and most of the people who have used my archive are ~~those~~ ^{now} those I ~~will~~ ^{will} disagree with but they have unsupervised, ~~un~~ ^{re} ~~stricted~~ ^{stricted} access anyway, and the archival deposit is for free access, but giving the pigs like ~~Luker~~ an open door for their defamation and outrageous lies can get you in court.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg

Please excuse this rambling ~~and~~ addition for your information and I hope understanding ~~of~~ what you have so childishly done in what from your own description is to invite irresponsibles, publicity seekers and ax-grinders to libel away in your pages and that under conditions that leave their victims unable to do a thing about it unless they can go to court. I am shocked at this procedure that, as you can see, was ~~unfair~~ ^{unfair} to both Wrono and me, ~~can see~~ because of your own space limitations, ~~much less than it in fact it.~~

Worse, ^d in a publication those studying and writing history use, should use and should be able to expect to use with dependence on its editorial judgements, ^{lex} ~~reflecting~~ truth from it at the least.

So, you defame the only one who wrote accurately about the King assassination, the one who forced the suppressed FBI records and other mischief out of secrecy and then, broke and in debt, he provided Ray with counsel that had no conflict of interest and much more. ^{I am} The one who tried to make the ^{system} ~~system~~ work.

Without any personal misuse of what ^{Ray} ~~he did~~ at all.

As Ray's ~~own~~ investigator I conducted the habeas corpus investigation that succeeded when his previous and right-wing counsel failed.

Then I conducted the investigation for the two weeks of evidentiary hearing in federal district court in Memphis, ^(Ray & Rose.) I located and prepared the witnesses we used and I got and we used the official evidence ~~Foreman~~ Percy Foreman, Ray's previous lawyer, could have used and didn't when he sold Ray out. All this and more, much more, Posner knew. He spent ^{hehe} ~~three~~ days working in those many file cabinets and I pointed out to him which were on the King case and which held the ~~re~~ stenographic transcripts ² of those ^w two weeks of hearings. All the testimony of both sides.

Posner knew all about this and had my ~~re~~ impressions when he asked for them.

The court, the government and the court reporter all had copies of those ^{my copies} transcripts. ^{two-drawer} They are in the ~~half-file~~ cabinet on which the copies Posner's wife used for three days in making for ~~him~~ all the copies he wanted.

But he wrote what is supposed to be a book on the ^K King assassination,

according

~~according~~ to Posner and his major publisher, the book of books, the book to end

all books on the subject, and he not only made no mention of those hearings,

he used none of the eight packed file cabinets of ^{official} information he knew + made

freely available to everyone. *As I did him with those JFK assassination records*

If history depends on Posner, not only will ^{all that} ~~visibly~~ ^{will} information not be mentioned in history, nor will that proceeding. *No those eight file cabinets of federal*

information

About which Luker knows so little he could not properly identify that

~~pro~~ proceeding, an oversight, if it was not ^{what} ignorance, a history magazine

should have asked him to correct.

What Posner suppressed ~~entirely~~ Luker knew not a thing ^{about} and said not a thing about for his reader. But he loved Posner and made that clear. To hell with fact,

readily ^Vavailable official fact. Not nearly as important as the political truth of that obviously and provedly ^{an} official frame-up.

Maybe what led the pbonny scholar, who is as ignorant ^{as} can be about the facts of the case, the established, unrefuted facts, to misrepresent and fail to properly identify that proceeding is that he knew the evidence in it exculpated Ray from any physical connection with the crime.

It proved he was framed.

This is glimpse for you, far from ~~all~~ that is publicly available to you, and yours is a magazine of history. ^{It} is withheld from your reader and by lying

about it. ^{The corrupt and greedy Posner is protected and those who established the truth are defamed.} ~~the truth are defamed at Case Open and so did Luker.~~

truth. ⁴ Posner knew about my Case Open and so did Luker but cheap and dishonest wisecranks is all Luker resorted to. In Case Open, only about 20 percent of ~~which~~ which the publisher printed, ⁴ doing the book on the cheap and having it sell out ^{fast}

without a reprint, I referred to Posner as a shyster and as a plagiarist. I have heard not a word of complaint from him ^{or} any lawyer representing him. But when

his Case Closed was reprinted, Posner eliminate the plagiarism from the TV

show prepared by the Failure Analysis associates ^{so they could familiarize lawyers}

with some of the gimcracks modern science makes available to them.

Posner stole that so effectively the Philadelphia Inquirer ran an editorial ^{thanking} and praising him for ^{allegedly} going to all that expense and trouble!

~~The~~ ^{the} only cost was that of the tape Posner ~~had~~ ^{took} and stole.

There is more, much more, on the shyster ~~was~~ ^{that} and the thief Posner that is in Case Open and if you or Luker did the minimum of checking you could not have missed that book.

And from it Luker would have known that another of Posner's plagiarism was from, of all things, a boy ^{then} ~~it~~ ten years old!

Bright for so young an age but not factually correct.

~~Luker says~~ ^{it does} ~~Whoring with history~~ ^{does} not only ~~does~~ ^{but} exist, ~~as~~ ^{he} with a phone call Luker would have known ~~that~~ ^{it does} it is based entirely on those 1974 evidentiary hearings - ^{two} weeks of them - that Posner ignored and Luker cheapens himself to ~~make~~ ^{out} does not even exist. Despite Wrono's page citations to ~~it~~.

Scholars and scholarship? This is, rather, The National Enquirer ^{run by Namok} ~~and ask~~.

~~But~~ ^I even it would not have goofed as Luker did. ^{National} And you, too.

I knew an ~~Inquirer~~ ^{remote} reporter who that sheet sent to Brazil to check on a report that blood was flowing from a ~~mountain~~.

Luker did not have to fly to Brazil. All ~~she~~ ^{he} had to do was use the phone but that exceeded his scholarship. ^{And precluded his lying deformations.}

~~To say nothing of his honesty.~~

These are the Pigs for whom you have built a false record of their ~~and~~ dishonesty and their corruption of this ~~great~~ ^{2/17} great tragedy in our history and whose corruption, personal and professional, you have hidden for them and from history.

As I read your letter you are aided in this by your unhidden preconception: You "warn" me that Luker will have a chance to respond. If editing ^{limits} ~~keeps him~~ ^{to} fact he can make no answer, not any denial or any refutation. I'm surprised that you

put it this way, "warn", rather than say, for example, he would be allowed to respond. This after I'd told you there is not a word of truth in what he wrote. You paid no attention to what I told you and treated all his lies and fabrications as without any question, ^{when} ~~as the fact that~~ not a single word of it is ^{is} true.

While I ^{am} ~~am~~ all for ^{real} dialogue and believe it is essential in our kind of society, an editor must be certain that where truth is known it is used, not the childish inventions Luker substitutes for truth and fact, which are and were then known and were publicly available. There is no way in which the intended harm from this kind of dishonest ^y can be undone. The editor and the magazine are, otherwise, part of the side of the "dialogue" which are the part that intends the harm that is done. Harm to the libelled person or persons and the awful harm to our precious history.

As I have told you, Luker is a subject-matter ignoramus who does not know the established and official fact ^a ~~so~~ I do not anticipate he will ^{exchange} ~~open~~ what he has as a professional reputation by as nasty, as dishonest and as ignorant, ~~and~~ as a baseless criticism ~~can be or another as sick as the one you published.~~

For their to be a meaningful or an other than hurtful dialogue there must be a primary consideration: truth. Falsehood ought to ruled out to begin with. Otherwise the person or persons whose hurt is intended are hurt and at least to a large degree, beyond repair. As is the ^a ~~trusting~~ readers.

History is, in particular, and no historical publication ought want or permit that.

Among the many hints from Posner that as an editor you should not have ignored [— is that he was not able to cite a single FBI record correctly when each has a unique identification. And on each it is conspicuous. You should have wondered why, especially scholar that he pretends to be, there is the question, did he know so little about the FBI ^{and its records} after two books on its work in the two political assassinations. Also possible, did he have the documents themselves or ^{did he substitute} some use of them by another or others.