

Ms. Diane Camper
Newsweek
1750 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20006

12/20/78

Dear Ms. Camper,

Thanks for the copy of the Lane piece. The Chicago Tribune is among the other publications with similar interest. Its piece is due this week.

I have also been sent a copy of Newsweek's "Was Ra Out for Money?" article to which you contributed. It prompts a caution, with the committee's report due.

Under Blakey the committee has not been adept at media manipulation but it has been successful. As a result it has created a media state of mind, one that makes the unreal real and what on analysis is meaningless an acceptable theory to the press. The Ray/money piece reflects this.

However one may theorize - and I do not but am aware of I think all the so-called theories - this one of the committee's many is not reasonable. I say this not from theorizing but from my knowledge of the corpus delicti, the actual evidence that has to be abandoned entirely for such conjecturing.

The committee has set up straw men it will bat down. Its criticism of the FBI will be unfair and in one of the areas (at least) where it is not justified. The area of Rays and bank robberies is such an area. I have just completed a new analysis of the committee's own evidence on this. If you give it a critical examination I am sure you will find it entirely meaningless save for having been credited by an official body and the subsequent (uncritical) reporting.

In all of this the legitimate criticism will be unmade and the good that can come from honest criticism will remain unaccomplished.

The committee did not include all the so-called evidence of its 12/1 narration in its press kit. It did not provide us with all it used and has not provided all it misled us at the hearing. However, based on the pages I have there is no doubt at all in my mind that the only reason for executive sessions was to cover the committee. Not to protect other reputations. What we forced it to produce on 12/1 proves that the substitutes it included in the narration are later contrivances to circumvent the information it did not want known in the executive sessions. There can be no innocence in the exhibits as the Eberhardt interview report you have. Eberhardt conducted the executive session questioning of the same witness, who testified other than the committee wanted, have believed. So he substituted his own creation of an interview report. (I believe used the refusal to call James Ray back as an excuse to cover himself, his job all to end in any event. A nice cover for getting out, seemingly on principle.)

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg