RANDOM HOUSE, INC.
201 EAST 50TH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10022
TELEPHONE 212 572-4923
TELEFAX 212 572-6000

LESLEY OELSNER
ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL

August 24, 1994

BY FEDERAL EXPRESS

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD 21702

Re: CASE CLOSED, by Gerald Posner

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I am writing with regard to your letter of August 11, 1994 to the President of Doubleday concerning the Anchor reprint edition of Gerald Posner's book Case Closed.

Your allegations about Mr. Posner and Random House are utterly without basis in fact or law. Whatever your motives, you have far exceeded the bounds of appropriate or accurate comment. It is clear that no purpose would be served in listing the many errors in your letter, and we decline to do so. Nor does your vituperative personal attack on Mr. Posner warrant response. (You are, of course, totally wrong in thinking that Mr. Posner had added a "lengthy personal attack" on you for the Anchor edition. Mr. Posner has neither desire nor need to engage in such attacks.)

Sincerely,

Lesley Oelsner

LO:ts

Ms. Lesley Oelsner, associate general counsel 8/27/94
Random House
201 E 50 St.,
New York, NY 10022

Dear Ms. Oelsner,

Please excuse my typing. I'm 81 and medical and physical problems keep it from being any better.

When Mr. Trager at Doubleday informed me that my letter to it had been referred to Random House I had expected another of his indignant and sometimes colorful tirades from your Bob Loomis and I had rather looked forward to how with his involvement in Gerald Posner's plagiarisms, among the other responsibilities of editing, he would reply. So, I accept your total nonresponse as the best Random House can come up with in response to what it has long known about and has been unable to respond to, my detailed exposé of Posner's and Random House's work of the most deliberate dishonesties, and that about what I regard as the most subversive crime possible in our country, the assassination of a President. Not much less of a subversion, I believe, is the gross and obvious dishonesty of the government in its determined refusal to investigate that crime.

In your first sentence of the scanty body of your letter you say my "allegations about Mr. Posner and Random House are utterly without basis in fact of law." Aside from that law business, and I made no threats, reflected no intention of suing, if you do not know better than the rest of it, you have no business responding to me. Because I believe that you do know better I have no relucatance in telling you that you know what you say is not true.

Skipping your next sentence, which imputes some unspecified motive to me, you say "It is clear that no purpose would be served in listing the many errors in" my "letter." This is a lawyer's confession of complete inability to refute a single thing I said about Random House and its author. You had an opportinity to do that in the lawsuit to which I referred in the letter to which you make no response at all and you were not able to do that. And as you should well know, you did not, not being able to.

One of the reasons I'd looked forward to how Mr. Loomis would respond is because I got word from inside Random House that he was prowling about clutching a copy of my Case Open in his fist and muttering, "Gotta figure out a way to sue this bastard."

To make the record clear on this, and if you do not repsond, that will in itself make the record clear, I challennge you (plural) to show me a single factual error in anything at all in either my letter or my book.

Skipping nothing, your next sentence is, "Nor does your vituperative personal attack on Mr. Posner warrant response."

In this you may be referring to my letter, to my book or both. And I think we should include my affidavit you ducked in court, which is based entirely on the book.

Using Random House's own definitions of the words, I referred to him as a shyster,

a plagiarist, a liar who cannot tell the truth even by accident and among other things all of which are not necessary for my present purposes, to make a response to your letter than is not tainted by a single truthful statement, as a literary whore.

This, you tell me, does not "warrant response" and you expect that to be believed, by me or by anyone else?

That Rudenrat has been silent. I do not mean to suggest that he is not man enough to stand on his own feet, which I happen to believe. I mean that he could not make any response, so he did not.

The sentence I skipping about is, "Whatever your motives, you have far exceeded the bounds of appropriate or accurate comment."

Aside from the fact that inside the judicial system and outside you and he have not been able to cite a single "inaccurate comment" I made, and I think that referring to what I said as mere "comment" is a considerable understatement, have you read what that pig of yours wrote about me, without a single citation? You perhaps do not know that before I saw your Orwellian reweiting of our history, that of one of our greatest national tragedies - I was delayed in reading it because I believed Posner when he said he'd send me a copy, which he did not do after taking three days of my time and having entirely unsupervised access to all my hundreds of thousands of pages of records and my copier - I wrote and asked him for those sources. He did not trash trith and reality as you do. He merely did not respond.

So first I tell you that after what he said about me - and you do not respond to my saying of that that it ranges from deliberate distortaion to outright lies - it is not possible for any response to be one that "exceeded the bounds of appropriate or accurate comment."

~~And then~~ I return to your dirty lawyer's trick of having a letter on file that you can flash to indicate you made a response when you did not. "Whatever your motives," is how you begin ~~the~~ that sentence.

Anyone reading the letter you do not and cannot respond to will understand that I wrote it to inform Doubleday. I had the additional and unhidden and entirely proper motive of making a record for history. I do not have your access to the media and to the stable of scholarly literary whores who will say anything to get their names in print or to cozy up to one who does or can publish their books. So, four our history, whether or not it will even be seen, I made a record. And I do thank you for your remarkably satisfying addition to it, the addition of a large and wealthy and powerful corporation which for all its resourcdes is entirely unable to say a word in ~~rfut~~ refutation of the entirely accurate expose of your and Posner's disgradeful commercialization and exploitation of that great tragedy, with a few side defamations of those whose published work proved him to be the literary whore he was in his book, from concept (about which I have much

in his own words) through execution. On the latter, Mr. Loomis made his own noteworthy contrivutions. Between his and Posners, among other things they make it clear that he was aware of the fact that Posner was rewising the book to base it on plagiarisms. And he is your vice president, executive editor and Posner's editor who shares the books dedication.

You conclude with two sentences in parenthesis. The first is one in which you take liberties with what I wrote in my letter. It refers to the first sentence in my letter tp Doubleday as my "thinking." My first words are, "It is reported...." That does not in any way indicate what I "think" and it was in fact "repoerted" then and after I wrote Doubleday. Your next sentence is, and it makes no difference to me whether you spoke to him about it and reflect what he told you because he and truth are in any event total strangers, "Mf. Posner has neither the desire not the need to engage in such attack," meaning on me.

You do not say that He planned no such thing and that either he decided against it or Doubleday did not like it. I neither know nor care. I point out that you are up to a shady lawyer's trick in this. He could well have prepared for what was reported from the other side, the side to which he allegedly turned for help, having read that awful stuff in that sick man's book, and then have decided that it was too risky. Which it certainly would have been. And the last thing he'd do is brag about it, or even admit it.

You say of Posner's personal attacks on me that he "had neither the desire" to do that or any "need" to.

Did you read his book, counsellor? That speaks for him in his words, disgraceful and dishonest words, not in your baseless lawyer's words that are either based entirely on complete innonence or are in themselves dishonest and false.

With regard to the "need" to repond to me that you say he does not have, without geting to the attachments you have from Doubleday to my letter to it and quoting them verbatim, which you do not need and I do not take the added time for, they include the ireffutable proof of Posner's deliberate dishonesty in what he and Mr. Loomis both said is what is new and most important in his book, that the disreputable shrink Hartogs said that Oswald was an assassin awaiting his moment in history. I attached the page of Hartogs' Warren Commission testimony in which, when asked the very questions Posner says he responded to the way Posner wrote about it, he swore in several ways to the exact opposite. My book and my letter and I believe my affidavot point out that in this Posner quoted pages both aide of that page and omitted that page.

That leaves no "need" to respond, counsellir?

I attached what was feely available to Posner in his entirely unsupervised access to all my records, to news accounts of Hartogs being sued suucessully for getting free sex fro his woman patients, who in fact paid him to get his sex without paying them for it

it. There is no "need" to respond to that when he suppressed it from his and your book?

For which I note there is no possibility that Random House had any legitimate peer review.

I said that Posner lied in saying that he did not use my Oswald in New Orleans and proved himself to be a liar with one of his criticisms of me. I also noted what was in that book that made his book impossible, in terms of legitimacy and honesty. He criticized what is in that book alone. Not just alone in my book. In ~~may~~ any book. He could not have gotten it anywhere else. And he not only lied to contrive a false and baseless criticism of me and of my accuracy about an address he made important, I attached the appropriate page of the phone book.

That leaves no "need" to respond, counsellor?

I referred to Oswald's clear record of being anti-Communist and of being against the USSR even in the USSR, with those FBI records freely available to Posner in the very file cabinet in which he spent most of his time here. I referred to what is both in that very file and in my Post Mortem, which Posner said he did use, not only what I say above about his politics but that the KGB suspected that he was an American agent and that in the USSR he could not hit any game even with a shotgun while Posner presents him as a marksman superior to the best in this country who engaged in tests for the government and could not duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald. I also attached from a book he says he did use my first, in facsimile, the official Marines evaluation of Oswald as a "rather poor 'shot.'"

None of this leaves any need" to respond, counsellor?

Or that another of his prime interview sources- two of who I noted had already stated he did not interview them - actually referred to the respected, conservative Louisiana Democratic Congressman and Warren Commission as a ~~Soviet~~ Communist - this also "needs" no comment?

I need no more, do I?

For what Posner and Random House did there is nothing that can be said of it that can be too "vituperative," your word, and I welcome your disagreement. Which I do not expect.

You have, I believe, in your completely evasive, nonresponse and entirely untrue letter, made your own record and that of your literary whore, Gerald Posner in his intendedly dishonest work that Random House had to know was dishonest before it published it.

To put this another way, I do thank you for your affirmation of the complete accuracy of my Case Open.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg

There is anothner of the many matters of which I do not herein remind you that, while not nearly as dramatic on paper as thievery, of which there is more than I make reference to above, before my publisher experiences in the JFK assassination I believed that any publisher not part of the literary whoredom would want to know. That is that Posners use of those so often boasted-of 200 interviews were to enable him to write untruthfully about the assassination by avpiding the proof of his dishonesty in the official evidence itself. He used those interviews to lie about the facts that had been officially established but that also destroy his book.

The thievery I refer to in the preceding paragraph is from an article written by a mere boy, and inaccurate article Posner used and attributed it to modern computer technology not available to the Warren Commission.!!!!

I have not yet seen Posner's paperback but I've been told about what he added. Typical of Posner and his prostitution of all accepted standards of scholarship if not, perhaps inconsistent with his boasted-of career as a "Wall Street lawyer" is what he knows is a lie, that Case Open is my first book published commercially. He knew this was a lie in writing it because he has at least two of my books that were published commercially. He bought one of them from me.

Five of my books have been published commercially, the first with an initial 250,000 copies 1966 first printing and it was reprinted three times. It was for six months Dell's only best-selling work of non-fiction.

He has dedicated himself to proving what needed no proof, that he has trouble telling the truth even by accident. Real trouble, too, because it comes from Gerald Posner. And that is something no Gerald Posner appears to be capable of coping with.

While as you can see I found your letter somewhat inspirational, I do regret that even with a little inspiration my typing cannot be any better.

Those two, and I do not refer to them as men, hide behind your skirts. Skimpy as they may be, they are small enough to be hidden. Or to think they are.