

HAROLD WEISBERG

7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

Mr. James C. Turner, staff director
Legislation and National Security Subcommittee
Committee on Operations
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

4/20/94

Dear Mr. Turner,

Please excuse my typing. It cannot be any better.

I appreciate the copy of the November 17, 1993 hearings Jonathan Meyers asked that I present. I had two reasons for writing it, aside from reading it. One is general, as part of the rather ~~large~~ large archive I leave that will be at local Hood College. The other is because two who were present told me that Posner interrupted Dr. Robertson with a statement I have every reason to believe is untrue. I wanted that for the rather large file I have for our history on Posner, who has a very clear record of having difficulty telling the truth ~~one~~ even by accident. I find that is not in the transcript. I would very much appreciate the stenographic transcript of that section for the historical record. My own writing about Posner and book with between 75 and 80 percent eliminated as unnecessary has been published. If you or any Member would like a copy I'll be glad to send them.

The Congress is unfortunately situated on such subjects as the political assassination because it is without means of evaluating those who ask to be heard. Posner was not only grossly untruthful to you, he was using you to promote himself and his book. I illustrate from pages 26-7.

Few have resorted to "baseless speculation" more than Posner himself. I read and annotated his book with care and I know the subject-matter so well the FBI itself told a federal court in one of my dozen FOIA lawsuit that I know ^{more} about it than anyone working for the FBI.

Posner is an attorney by virtue of having passed the bar exam. His slight work for the Ravath firm was by his own statement limited to discovery work in an IBM case. Friends who have checked did not find any record of his filing any lawsuit or taking a case to court. Lewis makes no mention of him in connection with the IBM case.

He has not "looked at the available record ... of the Warren Commission" or "the tens of thousands of documents that have been released by freedom of information requests ~~and~~ lawsuits..." He spent three days here. Of the FOIA records alone I have about a quarter of a million pages of them. He never asked me how to locate a single page in the large collection and he did ^{not} ask me where he could even find the Warren Commission records I have. He seems to have restricted himself to a biased selection of official records of Warren Commission critics, including me, of which I have a file of duplicates. His reflection of them is less than honest and he asked me ^{not} anything about them,

A grosser and more deliberate misrepresentation than his boasting of "going beyond ~~what~~ ^{what} was on the available record" is difficult to conceive with what he used ^{these} "nearly 200 interviews" for: circumventing the official confidence when it disputed his ~~pre~~reception. His is a formula book. He believed the time had come when that kind of support for what I regard as the official mythology could succeed.

He actually used less of those KGB files than was published and he misused them selectively. For all his interview with ~~Posner~~ ^{Nosenko}, and he lied in saying he had "the first-ever one," he suppressed what I published from Nosenko in 1975 for the simple reason that if he did not he destroyed his own fiction he was palming off in his exploitation of that great tragedy.

There were no "lost files" of Jim Garrison to be found and he very obviously did not find them, there being not a thing in his book cited to them or that can be cited to them. He had access to a large repository of them at Jim ~~Lesar~~ ^{Lesar}'s organization and among his other possible sources is the daughter of one of Clay Shaw's counsel in that Garrison case.

His reference to that phony "new analysis of the Zapruder film" he in this different way ^{still} suggests that it was done for him in saying ^{it} is the result of that work... published by Random House in November of this year, Case Closed: Lee Harvey Oswald and the Assassination of JFK."

That "result" was in fact "published" by the American Bar Association, which is not even mentioned in ~~his~~ ^{his} book, and when he saw it on the Court channel ^{11/1/92} by his own account he changed the kind of book he would write.

There can hardly be anyone with less "enthusiasm" for new records to become available because those of any significance will redound against him, his book and his deliberate dishonesty, including to your committee.

He knew I'd sue the FBI for the results of its scientific testing, even that the Congress had amending the investigatory files exemption over the first such suit in 1974. He did not ask where he could find the records in that (or any other) litigation and aside from the numerous records I obtained by it we deposed four FBI Lab SAs.

I regret very much that the Congress cannot always perceive those who are literary whores, plagiarists, which Posner is, or just plain shysters.

Recently I mailed Congressman Conyers a letter from the FBI I should have sent you, along with my response. It actually told me that it is releasing nothing new, only what it had already disclosed. From the news accounts citing those records, that is true.

Sincerely

Harold Weisberg
Harold Weisberg