skeptic
THE FORUM FOR CONTEMPORARY HISTORY

February 18, 1977

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route 12, Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Because of your interest in the subject, I have marked for your attention a feature in the current issue of Skeptic Magazine.

If you would like to respond, we would be happy to consider your comments for publication in the forthcoming issue of Skeptic.

Yours very truly,

Nancy J. Brucker

Nancy J. Brucker
Associate Editor

NB/smm
Enc.

812 ANACAPA STREET · SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA · 93101 · (805)965-7021

Ms. Nancy J. Brucker, Associate Editor
Skeptic
812 Anamapa St.,
Santa Barbara, Ca. 93101

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
2/27/77

Dear Ms. Brucker,

In your letter of the 18th you say that because of my "interest in the subject" of the King assassination you "would be happy to consider" my "comments for publication in the forthcoming issue of Skeptic."

I do not want to be in any of your issues. I do make a personal record between us, no more. It will make a record for the future in my files.

This issue is consitent with your earlier assassinations exploitation in not justifying either your name of your self-description of "The [sic] Forum for Contemporary History."

Admittedly Sprague is a personality in the possible investigation. But how does any one of your contributors qualify as an authentic expert on the subject?

Huie personally corrupted all of the processes of organized society and refused to stand and be questioned in public in open court over this and he is impartial or even qualified? Yet you say he conducted an investigation of the King assassination. This is false. He conducted an incompetent investigation of Ray, which means he began with what he has made explicit under oath if in expected perpetual secrecy, that Ray was guilty.

Before you locked forms Sprague had publicly proven what he told you untrue. The most casual research in the Philadelphia papers alone would have told you what you owe your readers and whatever you may consider "history" to be. His report of the first of the year is explicit in his beginning with preconceptions of guily. This is "history" or "investigating?" You are a "forum" for disinformation.

Lane fits this perfectly. He is a walking and loud-talking encycopaedia of mis/information who has not conducted an investigation of the King assassination and isn't able to. Your selection of him when there is as of now only one book in opposition to the official account of the crime is at best dubious. You have the beginning of your comeupance in the Department of Justice's total rebuttal of the basis of his ripoff. But there will be more! You cannot have conducted any inquiry into credentials without knowing that he is expert in disinformation, self-promotion and self-enrichment only. "Forum for contemporary history?"

Belin is an experienced whitewasher. His record on the Rockefeller commission is blatant. On the Warren Commission it is wretched to anyone familiar with that record. Two days after I confronted him with it at Vanderbilt University last year he came out for a new "invesyigation." His part of the Warren Report suppresses what it had that is essential in determining whether or not Oswald was at the scene of both crimes. Witnesses who proved he was not were avoided. What his Rockefeller Report suppresses is to a small degree indicated in the new material added to the third of my Whitewash series in the recent reprint of it. This includes how Commissioner/Chief Spook Dulles guided the CIA so it could avoid being responsive to the Warren Commission's questions. You do pick 'em! Sanford's one skill was in manipulating the walnut shells for the yokels. And it is obvious he made no real effort to prepare himself.

Even your ambiguous title is deceptive and misrepresentative: "...will a new investigation establish the truth?" of the King assassination. What is totally missing in your issue has already established some truths, in particular a lengthy evidentiary hearing in federal district court in Memphis in October 1974. (Your demon investigator Lane was not interested enough to be there. Huie was afraid to be there and he was not.) Ray was a witness, subject to cross-examination. His defense demolished the allegations against him. So you ignore this and present Huie if overt and deliberate lies.

You cannot have written me because of my "interest in the subject" without knowing of my book or the fact that I was the Ray investigator in the habeas corpus petition that led to the hearing and for the hearing.

Your pretense is of authenticity and of scholarship - of being skeptics.

You do not present yourselves as entertainment.

So how do you manage to come up only with those who in one way or another have said that Ray was guilty and nobody who has made the case that he is not?

Lane is Ray's defender? If this is not all, how does he defend with (p.20) what it utterly and completely false about Ray and his guilty plea, "one suspects ~~that~~ the deal was that Ray agreed to tell nothing and implicate no one ... to avoid the death penalty..."

(In the rest Lane, as usual, can't even steal straight, even after his omnipresent unfactualness kicked back in Sprague's and the committee's face, as over the destruction of the red squad files.)

It is the literary scavengers, like you and those you present in the pretense of giving all sides and at least both sides, who are responsible for the continuing national anguish and the immunity enjoyed by those who with a bullet turn all of society aroun~~d~~.

Ypurs is literary and historical whoring - anything bu "the forum for contemporary history."

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

P.S. Where is the fine work of Newsday's Les Payne of more than a year ago - aside from in Lane's corruption of it after disguised theft of it?