

Ms. Joanne Meyerowitz, editor
The Journal of American History
1215 East Atwater Ave.,
Bloomington, Indiana 47401-5603

10/7/00

Dear Ms. Meyerowitz,

The commentary I told you I'd be writing is being retyped. When I get it back I'll send it to you. But in rereading it a little more carefully to address it I got the definite impression that Luker was being used by someone else and another and less certain impression of who that someone else is.

If this is true then the JAH is more damaged in this than I'd thought.

It encourages me to again urge that you press Luker for the sources not mentioned in what he wrote for there can be no authentic sources for that indecency.

When you learn that you will be in a position to better understand what I am calling to your attention.

And what you have permitted the JAH to have been misused for.

That you have libelled Wrong and me is, for us and for history, a serious matter but what you have done to history and in pseudo-scholarly support or defense of a de facto coup d'etat is a more serious matter to me.

As, I would have hoped, it would be to the JAH and those on it.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg
Harold Weisberg

How could Luker, obviously a subject-matter ignoramus, write with such certainty about what he knows so little about? By being fed by someone he trusted? Posner is someone with an obvious interest in defaming Wrono, particularly in doing that in the JOAH, but he made no effort to refute what I ~~wrote~~ ^{devoted a book to saying} about him ~~in a book that was getting extra attention.~~

Louisiana professor Michael Kurtz also had an interest in defaming Wrono because he won an argument with Wrono when Kurtz insisted on Mark Lane alone addressing a historian's convention in Louisiana but without any senior critic being included. ^{as a compromise} A student, Howard Roffman, was invited to share the time with ^{and who would} Lane and when Lane heard of a college student being there, not ~~to~~ speak on conspiracy theories, Lane chickened out. He just did not show up. That did embarrass Kurtz who, despite his denials of it, is an underinformed conspiracy theorist. Roffman's Presumed Guilty has no theories in it. Kurtz's book is loaded with them, many impossible and some really foolish. Kurtz has also undertaken to deny Wrono publication with criticism ^{involved} in a peer review that consists almost entirely of ^{ridiculous} conspiracy theorizing ~~that is invalid.~~

~~When~~ CBS-TV took a poll after Posner's appearance on it with his Case Closed getting all the attention he and it got. That poll reflected that nine out of 10 Americans did not believe the Warren Report-which Posner endorsed. ^{of much} The official evidence which by then had been published was not used in any known ~~official publication~~ professional publication if it did not seem to support the conclusions of the Report or if it did prove there had been a frame-up, as much does and by then had been published but without ^{major media} much attention. But not even after this proof was published, the JOAH did the ~~same~~ meet its obligation to report on it to historians and others. Nor did it tell its readers that we had had a de facto coup d'etat and a cover up. Instead, by its silence, it protected both the coup and the cover-up, the framing of one of the most significant events on our history.

Can you honestly say that the JOAH or any other history publication ^{at the time of these assassinations} then or since, then met its professional responsibilities to the people, to history or to itself?

In your uncritical publication of Luker's diatribe, do you not continue the policy of defending the official fabrications relating to our political assassinations of the 1960s?

Did you ask yourselves if Luker made any factual response to ~~Wtone's~~ ~~Wtone's~~ Wtone's criticisms? In fact Luker did not. Did you then note that Luker did not and instead libeled Wtone - and me, when Wtone made no mention of me, ~~by substituting~~ substituting lies and libels for commentary on or refutation of Wtone's factual criticisms all of which are factual and true.

When Wtone cited a specific page in Whoring with History and Luker ~~qu~~ quoted that, why did you then published all of Luker's lies and defamations, especially his obvious lie that Whoring does not exist.

Do you believe that you have the obligation to publish ~~ob~~ obvious and defamatory lies? Especially when in all that is defamatory and is intended to be defamatory there is not a word that even tries to refute what Wtone wrote?

Before publishing these obviously unfactual and obviously defamatory lies about Wtone and me, why did you not ^{check} phone either of us? We are both in the phone books. What if anything did you know of Luker that led you not to check ^u what he wrote, what you published, that libels us both and lies about our precious history to all the historians, ~~including teachers~~?

Did you consider what the cost of defending a libel suit would be or if one was filed, what it would do to the JOAH's reputation *and bank account?*

Do you really believe that you ~~can~~ eliminate the harm done by a libel by giving its victim 500 words to make full response, full refutation, when with all ^{Luker's} ~~the~~ venom that has no relationship and is no refutation of a single word Wtone wrote. That short space is barely enough for no more than a denial, and that alone cannot undo the harm you did us and history. However, you did not even make such an offer to me and I ^{first} learned about Luker, of whom I had no knowledge, and ~~if~~ his libels only when I was sent a copy ~~by a subscriber~~.

I think you owe me and I ask for a published apology and an admission that Luker's allegations are not true. I think you owe me, yourselves and your readers a real effort to learn whether Luker was misusing you in the interest of or at the instigation of another - which I think is the fact.

What does this reflect of the JOAH's knowledge of our history