

HAROLD WEISBERG

7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

9/9/94

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

Dear Ms. Oelsner,

I am neither surprised nor disappointed not to have heard from you in response to my August 27 letter after I got yours.

Of course I've still not heard from Posner. But I did see the Anchor reprint and did notice that he did take what I said about Failure Analysis in Case Open seriously enough to add a lengthy footnote that is typical of his distortions and other dishonesties.

I think you'll recall that I said of your prize package that what he wrote about me ranged from deliberate distortions to outright lies.

But what I'd forgotten is that years ago Random House published the ^{proof} ~~proof~~ of one of his nastier nastinesses where he said I'd been fired by the government as an alleged security risk.

In I think 1947 Random House published Bert Andrews' Washington Witchhunt. I am one of those of whom he wrote, following a series in the New York Herald Tribune.

So that you can get full enjoyment of this I enclose the proof that you did publish it. And if you'd like I can also send you the news account of the departure from the government ~~by~~ ^{of} the person responsible for that.

In some instances Andrews did not use names. So you can understand that I am one I enclose ~~a~~ letter to me after it was all over from your counsel. Two of whom I'd know when I got them to represent some of us. The one I did not know before then you will recognize as later a Supreme Court Justice. Arnold had been an appeals court judge and Porter a Federal Communications Commissioner. I've highlighted "vindication."

After all these years my recollection is indistinct, and I do not expect you to do any research on this because I think you'll be happy enough without that, but it is in my mind what connects Andrews with a Pulitzer.

I hope this can make you feel prouder and happier about your letter to me and about how responsible Random House is about what it published. At least once upon a time about what it did publish.

Sincerely,


Harold Weisberg

I have seen a copy of Posner's Anchor reprint and the note at its beginning. He is apparently impelled to lie as the presumed response to what he cannot make response to. He really has no need to establish himself as a world-class liar. He did that in the book you published. Nor does he have to continue to prove my point that he has trouble telling the truth by accident. In his note he said Case Open, to which neither he nor RH has been able to make any refutation, is my first to be published commercially. It is my fourth first published commercially and counting each edition as one, my 12th.

In connection with what I told you had been reported to me, that he was getting help from Harrison Livingstone - and I admit that taking Livingstone's word presents the same hazard as taking Posner's - I was surprised to get a letter from him in which he told me, "I'm glad ~~Random's lawyer~~ I helped Random's lawyers and they thanked me in writing."

Thus it would seem that it was not news to you, personally, despite your letter.

I'm told, not that he had any reason to delete it, that his reprint refers to the sales of my books as "dismal." One of those things he said I never had, commercial publication, was the 1966 Dell reprint of my first book. Its first of four printings was of 250,000 copies. If that is "dismal" how many did Random House publish of Posner's? Not even counting returns. Better than "dismal"? I understand not.

Dell then placed monthly ads of its best sellers. That was for six months its only advertised non-fiction best seller.

What to me is really dismal is commercializing intended dishonesty and then having it protected by those who have no more ~~regard~~ regard for truth or decency.

***** *Washington*

Witch *****

Hunt

BY BERT ANDREWS



Random House · New York

ARNOLD, FORTAS & PORTER

1200 EIGHTEENTH STREET, N. W.

WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

November 28, 1947


TELEPHONE
DISTRICT 3251


THURMAN ARNOLD
ABE FORTAS
PAUL A. PORTER
WALTON HAMILTON
MILTON V. FREEMAN
NORMAN DIAMOND
REED MILLER
L. A. NIKOLIC

Dear Mr. Weisberg:


We want you to know how deeply we appreciate your kind and generous gesture in sending us a gift and the warm sentiments which accompanied it. You know it was a pleasure to be of service to you and your own calmness and dignity under the most adverse circumstances were in no small measure responsible for your ultimate vindication.

Sincerely,


Thurman Arnold


Abe Fortas


Paul A. Porter


Milton V. Freeman

Mr. Harold Weisberg
2322 N. Nottingham
Arlington, Virginia

Matter Of Fact

Post
8/15/47

By Joseph And Stewart Alsop

The Case Of The Ten

THE SPOTLIGHT of attention may soon shift to one of the most complex and dangerous issues facing the American Government today—the issue of total security as against the civil rights of the individual. This will happen if, as now seems possible, a number of the 10 employes of the State Department, dismissed on grounds of “disloyalty” a few weeks ago, decide publicly to challenge the department on the issue.

These 10 people, none of them of top policy-making rank, and most of them well down the bureaucratic ladder, all received on the afternoon of June 26 the same mimeographed communication. They were curtly notified that, pursuant to the McCarran amendment to the State Department appropriation, which provided for the summary dismissal of any employes suspected of disloyalty, their services were terminated “with prejudice” as of that afternoon. Their names were not published. But a State Department press release announced their dismissals, and accused them of “indirect association with representatives of a foreign power.” In the public mind, they were identified, however anonymously, as something close to traitors.

Most of the 10 immediately inquired of their superiors as to the cause of their dismissal, asking for the evidence on which it was based. This was not forthcoming. It was at first made apparent that there could be no appeal from the decision. Since then, in response to pressure

Since these two individuals were not expected to return to work in the department under any circumstances, it is certainly possible that they were dismissed only to add to the department's box score.

No doubt it was assumed that the fact that no names were published would protect those dismissed. However, it has not worked out that way. In the first place, their fellow employes of course knew why they left the department so suddenly, and Washington is more addicted to gossip than Hog Corners. In the second place, employers have a habit of asking for references, and for reasons for leaving former employment. This fact has already stood between at least one of the 10 and a desirable position. Even those who have found new jobs live in constant fear of losing them if their employers discover why they left the State Department. A number of the 10 have been unable to find jobs, and are reported living on the charity of friends and sympathizers.

SOME OF THE ten purgees are doing what they can to get themselves reinstated, so that they may resign honorably. Failing that, there is at least a fair chance that one or two may decide to become the Dreyfuses in the case, and appeal directly to public opinion through the Civil Liberties Union. Such a public airing of the whole matter might indeed serve a useful purpose. For the issue involved is one of the gravest with which the American Government is faced.

Robinson Quits As State Dept. Controls Chief

By The United Press

Hamilton Robinson, storm center of criticism for his part in the State Department's loyalty program, has resigned as director of the department's Office of Controls, it was disclosed last night.

Robinson cleaned out his desk late yesterday as director of the office which frames regulations for security in Government departments and hears the appeals of persons who were dropped by the State Department as “poor security risks.”

State Department sources said Robinson's resignation, first submitted last November, was entirely voluntary. It was believed he would enter private law practice in Washington, where he now makes his home. He is a native New Yorker.

Sources close to Robinson said his resignation was prompted by the fact that his activities were under constant fire by congressional committees.

Set Up Wartime Rules

They said the fact that Pulitzer prizes had been awarded recently to two Washington reporters for their revelations of the activities of the Office of Controls was not a factor in Robinson's resignation.

These sources said the 39-year-old executive wanted to resume private law practice in the Capital

Dear Dr. Aguilar -

FR001 6/15/94
G-POSNER

My mother told me you were wonderful to her during her surgery earlier today (thanks) and it reminded me of how late I am in answering your May 2 letter. Sorry, but I've been traveling a lot on 2 magazine articles - not Kennedy related (and it should only get worse through the summer).

There must have been a misunderstanding about JAMA putting me in contact w/ Harris and Boswell. I actually talked to them months before the JAMA publication. I will not be releasing any notes on those conversations, or any other part of my research, until there is no litigation on the book. Currently, there are 2 lawsuits over an advertising campaign for the book. Let's see what happens when those suits are finished.

By the way, I did do all the interviews in my book. My wife, Trisha, often sat in on them, and she did one on her own of Harold Weisberg.

We are unlikely to ever agree on who killed JFK and why - but as long as we can debate the facts and ignore personal attacks, I'll be adding the discussion in the future - until then -