

# computers and automation

*The magazine of the design, applications, and implications of information processing systems.*

815 WASHINGTON STREET  
NEWTONVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS 02160  
617-332-5453

August 25, 1970

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
Rt. 8  
Frederick, Md. 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I have your letter of August 22, and I am sorry to dismay you.

Your second sentence has the framework:

If you have to be told why .... is terrible, irresponsible,  
and damaging, you lack the knowledge required for any  
responsible publishing in this field.

This framework of sentence applies to the following for example:

If you have to be told why the Bible is the true revelation of  
God, you lack the knowledge required for any responsible  
publishing in this field.

The last persons who used this kind of argument to me were some of my older  
relatives, who used this argument thirty years ago:

If you have to be told why ....., then it proves that ....

Such argument is totally inadmissible in scientific, logical, and mathematical  
circles, which deal with evidence and not assertions.

I shall be glad to receive from you specifics, and I hope I can publish them.  
For example, what is the story about Milteer? Did he actually have anything  
to do with Kennedy's assassination? Or, if there are errors in anything we  
have published, please tell us, give us the necessary evidence, and we will  
publish the corrections.

Yours sincerely,

*Edmund C. Berkeley*

Edmund C. Berkeley  
Editor

ECB:hb

8/28/70

Dear Mr. Berkeley,

When I first wrote you I intended not insult but what is now apparent is a futility, to warn you that, regardless of your intentions, you are doing great harm to that which, I am sure, you do not intend to hurt any more than Dick does. I regret that you elect to be non-responsive in your letter of the 25th and to portray yourself as what I cannot believe you are, stupid and arrogant.

A smattering of knowledge is, in itself, a dangerous thing. You have no more, nor has Dick, and you both have confabulated beyond any prospect of getting you to see - or be willing to try and see.

Your reference to the Bible is shamefully childish and bears no conceivable relationship to what I said. No matter how painful it may be to you, it is obvious to anyone with any knowledge of the established fact that, if you do have to be told what is wrong with what you've published, you should be locking the flaps of your face, as should Dick, whose influence in New Orleans bears a large share of ~~the~~ the responsibility for the things that went wrong there.

I repeat, when you saw "about six confessions", you saw everything an editor need see. I could add indefinitely, like with Hicks, but it would be redundant and you refuse to face reality.

Because you are possessed by a demon of solving the assassination when you are not in a position to, you are willing to do anything. Your ignorance of the work that is going on in the field keeps you from knowing when you jeopardize it, but should it not be obvious that when you have only second-hand stuff, someone else is doing some work, and using a small part prematurely can endanger further work? You have done this, and I cannot assume responsibility for your ignorance. Because I feel you cannot be trusted, I will not jeopardize this work by telling you about it. But, as an editor, you know it is wrong to use the work of others without their permission, and this, too, you did. In one case Bud assures me that he gave neither you nor Dick permission to take it.

Because I am one of those doing the work that is perasited, I cannot take the time for pointless correspondence with a closed mind. If I do, you and others who fail to do significant original work will have less to light. Now it happens you have used material from two books I have not yet been able to get printed. One is copyrighted. I am not threatening you. I am repeating an apparent futility, trying to explain to you.

I also presume maturity on your part and ask you to consider whether any real good is done by tid-bitting, particularly when you know the material is not original. Can you really do anything but indulge your ego this way? Can you not realize that such as it has destroyed everyone's credibility? How much more of a burden must you impose? Instead of all this retailing, why not spend the time in original work and run the risk of bringing something substantial to light? I want you to publish nothing from me. My purpose was not to make further public controversy, too much having already been made necessary by dishonesty and irresponsibility, on which you hold no monopoly. There is much on Miltarr you do not know. I have copyrighted it and have no intention of submitting it to the kind of treatment you are, demonstrably, capable of. Your ignorance of the fact, even the published fact, is amply reflected in your question. And for God's sake, the last thing you should consider is printing all the errors you have already made. You have already done enough damage.

Sorrowfully,  
Harold Weisberg