

Letters to the editor
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

10/23/94

Book World's two lead reviews of October 23 illustrate how, when reviewers are underinformed and begin with prejudices despite seeming to be well credentialed, they are unfair to the books they review and mislead their readers about those books.

Neither Reviewer Richard Gid Powers nor author Mark Riebling has any knowledge of *and about J. Edgar Hoover* the official evidence in the JFK assassination to say what each did.

Powers: "...the FBI was ignoring even stronger indications that Oswald was a strange, dangerous character," which is entirely fictitious, and "the Bureau's failure to pay attention to the obvious was such a dereliction of duty that for months it reduced J. Edgar Hoover to a slathering, raving maniac out to wreak vengeance on every agent who worked on the case," which is also fiction.

There is absolutely nothing in Oswald's real life or in the official mythology about it that marked him as either "strange" or "dangerous."

Hoover was hysterical but not "a slathering, raving maniac", for a short period after the JFK assassination, not "for months"; there was no FBI "dereliction of duty" before the assassination; Hoover did not "wreak vengeance on every agent who worked on the case," hundreds of them, 17 only were disciplined and that unfairly; and what really bugged Hoover is that his and the FBI's reputations would suffer because they did not prevent the assassination, which was so sharply in contrast with the reputations he had built for himself and for the FBI throughout his long career of the most effective propaganda.

Riebling is also an ignoramus in saying, Powers's words, "that the Kennedy assassination could have been prevented if the CIA had only passed on to the FBI the news that" Oswald spoke to a "KGB agent attached to Soviet death squads" in the Mexico City consulate.

Except in the mythologies of both sides in the controversy, there is no relevance at all in that chance meeting and in fact the FBI, which had its legal attache staff in our embassy there, knew about this from the ^{CIA} ~~VIS~~ there almost as soon as it happened.

It was the FBI, in fact, that prevented the terrible consequences of the CIA's swallowing the obvious fabrication of a Dominican intelligence agent that he saw Oswald being^{MI} paid to do the dastardly deed in the Cuban consulate in Mexico City, the canard that if Ambassador^{Mann} had had his way when he latched onto what no intelligent child should have believed, Hoover in particular applied pressure to have Gilberto Alvarado Ugarte^U grilled vigorously. He then confessed to making it all up. He ~~did that carelessly~~^{alvarado Ugarte "lied"} and poorly because, without question, Oswald was in New Orleans when allegedly getting paid off in the Mexico city Cuban consulate.

Powers is also ignorant of the fact of his undescribed "well-known chestnut of Pearl Harbor conspiracy theory" in referring only to what Dushko^Kopov said, that he gave advance knowledge of it to the FBI. (I am not aware of any FBI denial of that.) There is no real question of Hoover's knowledge of Pearl Harbor in advance of the fact because the British told him after picking it up on their Enigma intercepts.

(Moreover, it was not all that hard to anticipate. I predicted it and much else the Japanese then did in an article published less than three months before it happened. Katherine C. (Casey) Blackburn, then ^{the Office of Government Reports} Number 2 in that agency, used my research ~~XXXXX~~ beginning the day after that attack in planting stories in the media. If I could ~~not~~ do that, why not the pros in government and the media?)

Warner's unfair criticism of David Corn includes Corn's writing that Ted Shackley "deserves no credit whatsoever for discovering the Soviet missiles in Cuba while he was in charge of Cuban operations." Corn is 100% correct. Contrary to the official mythology about when they were discovered, they were in fact discovered earlier by Defense Intelligence Agency Colonel John Ralph Wright^{Jr.}, and he was decorated for it after ~~a discrete~~^{the} passing of time, with a second oak leaf cluster for his Legion of Merit the next year, in June, 1963.

It is, I believe, tragic enough that our history is official^{ly} rewritten without the mythologies being added to and perpetuated by those who later write about them without really learning the actualities of what they write about.

Harold Casey

Apologies for my typing and writing. I'm 81, in impaired health and neither my typing nor writing can be any better.

I recognize this may be a bit long for you. If it interests you feel free to cut it as long as meaning is not changed.

I'm sending a copy to Ms King for her information.

What I say comes from what I learned in writing seven published books about the JFK assassination, none ever reviewed by the Post, and from the third of a million pages of once ~~withheld~~ official records I obtained by a dozen or so FOIA lawsuits. Some were also precedental and one led to the 1974 amending of the Act's investigatory files exemption. My Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report, was the first book on that subject. It was first published in August, 19~~68~~⁶⁵. My current book, badly butchered in being published, is Case Open. From neither Gerald Posner of the knowingly mistitled Case Closed, to whom I referred as a syhster, as a literary thgif and as a writer who has trouble telling the truth even by accident, nor from any of the innumerable others of whom I was critical in my earlier six books on the JFK assassination have I gotten any letter or phone call complaining of unfairness or inaccuracy. It may amuse you and Ms. King to know that all Posner could ^{in his anchor reprint} say in response to my severe criticism is to prove that even by accident he cannot be truthful. He says what he knows is not true, that I am of what he refers to as "the conspiracy press," and he follows this with saying that for Case Open I "found my first publisher." It is in fact my at least 12th commercial printing, counting reprints, and my fifth original commercial publication, two abroad.

Hu