

Dear Kari P.,

2/4/87

You need make no apologies for your English. I did not notice any errors except for a simple transposition in spelling a single word. And having read your letter, I'll respond to your questions in the order of their appearance.

A rather large percentage of the many people who have written me were about your agent when JFK was killed and all remember clearly where they were when they heard that bad news.

By the way, surface mail cannot be insured. And you can do the calculations when you get the packages, of which this is the first.

The man who claimed to be the dead Oswald's lawyer and who actually represented Mrs. Oswald senior is Mark Lane. He is an exceptionally able man who is also exceptionally amoral. He is a plagiarist and is dishonest in many other ways. I owe you candor.

While on the subject of critics, I can't speak to highly of Meagher's and Roffman's books. All the others are flawed in various ways. Kurtz is a strange one - he puts down all those from whom he steals and there is nothing original in his book other than his errors. Summers twists things to reach a preconceived conclusion that is based on nothing and has no basis in real fact. Or reason or logic. I've not read his book on Marilyn Monroe and will not because I know his method and because I'm not interested in being titillated. This and the element of scandal involving a celebrity, I believe, account for the interest in that book in Sweden and elsewhere. The Weberman book also is fiction. I believe I addressed the Vecianna business when we spoke. Nothing to it. Thompson's book is a ^{con}jecture based almost entirely on the work of others, some credited and some cribbed. He had a different conspiracy solution in an article in the old Saturday Evening Post. Wecht has not written any books. His testimony before the House committee was quite eloquent and solid. If Kurtz says that my work is conjectural you'll be able to see for yourself that it is the opposite. ...People like Kurtz, Lifton and Thompson have a problem by the time they write all they have to say has been published, so they evolve means of getting around that, at least to their own satisfaction and often to that of the usually uninformed critics....I see Kurtz said "speculation." You'll see for yourself.

Kurtz may have had his own reasons for the formulation you quote but he cannot honestly say that the "evidence" shows that Oswald had no intelligence connection first because the Commission never sought any such evidence and second because Kurtz also didn't and is ignorant. The crime was never investigated, nor was the possibility that Oswald had an intelligence connection. I believe he did, on the basis of my own analysis to begin with and later on the basis of records the Commission avoided that I did get and for now am not using publicly. I have given permission to another.

On publishers not answering mail: if they have nothing to seal they are ill-mannered enough not to invest the cost of responding when the books are out of print. Just yesterday my wife wrote to one of the larger chains of bookstores asking them as she has many times to pay for the books they bought for eleven of their branches and never paid for. I was sorely disappointed to learn how extensive dishonesty is in the book business....I see you refer to Scott. He is quite bright, imaginative, and he confabulates, as I learned when I asked him to confirm something he had written. I have not read what you refer to. He was one of three who compiled an anthology that also is not worth getting because it is not faithful to the writing of those it uses. ...My apologies for my typing. I must sit with my legs elevated and type sideways.... I'm not surprised that Woodward hasn't answered you from what you say. He is embarrassed and probably is busy and considers himself rather important now. At the same time, please remember that he may get too much mail to be able to answer all of it.

I fear that what you say of German intelligence is typical of all of them. Our CIA, for example, did not learn from the many crimes of its anti-Castro Cubans and

has been and is making the same tragic error with the fascistic Somoza Nicaraguans. Where will they go and what will they do when Honduras, as ultimately it must, tries to kick them out? And if it fails, what will they do in and to Honduras?

I don't know the original of the description "black bag" jobs but I believe it was the FBI here and many years ago. Those burglaries were more often not in embassies and they got that name because they used black bags to carry what they stole.

What your intelligence people did other agencies, including our own, also did to elected officials and their families. They all suffer the same paranoia...It would not be easy for most people to believe what the FBI's own records disclose it did to me, for example, and I am far from unique in this regard.

I've read of Peter Wright's problems with Maggie Thatcher and the opposition to her in Australia. He can solve that problem easily by publication in the U.S. if he does not prevail in Australia. I'd like to read his book.

I agree with you that in a genuine democracy nobody is exempt from the law but here those who are responsible for enforcing the law, like the Department of Justice and its FBI, are wholesale violators of the law, from my personal experience in my Freedom of Information Act litigation. And the courts, almost without exception, seem to fear them. In any event, they have to now been immune. I have them charged with perjury and fraud in one case and they've not even denied it. They feel they do not have to and thus far they have been correct in this. The judges all know what they have done by way of character assassination. Court records are immune from suit and my case is irrefutably documented but no paper gives a damn and I've sent copies to quite a few. So the official criminals have this added immunity. Often I wonder if democracy can survive this.

We spoke of Penn Jones and I've never read Nash's gush of goo about him. Won't.

Seth Kantor's work is dubious in that he exaggerates the meaning of the incidents on which he builds his case. Ruby was never more than a punk and nobody would ever have trusted him in any kind of conscious conspiracy. I do believe, however, that Kantor did see Ruby at the hospital. He knew Ruby well.

What you quote of Scheim's book is one of the reasons I've never read it. Bud Fensterwald was born rich, is bright, conjectures conspiracies with which I do not agree, I've never joined any of his organizations, but what Scheim says is garbage. I know Bud very well. He merely follows the lawyer's obligation to represent those who need a lawyer.

We discussed Garrison and Ronzi. The House committee followed my last book and they avoided it and me. Lane did not defend Ray, he ruined him, and it was before the House of Representatives, this committee. Lane will do anything for attention and that mess got it for him, coast to coast.

Thank you for your personal comments about me. When you've read my work you will see that I've actually made a study of how our institutions work or fail to work, and I do not speculate about the crime. I regard it as no more than a writer's obligation in a democratic society and as a personal obligation, more so because I am the first member of my family going back to the pre-Christian era who was born to freedom. My people fled to pogroms in Russia.

I will not always be able to answer long letters because if I follow my doctors' orders just taking care of myself requires more than five hours a day. I'm not supposed to sit still for more than about 20 minutes at a time, so long phone conversations also are not good for me. But I appreciate the genuineness of your interest and I think that I've answered all your questions. I'll follow your desires on mailings.

Best wishes, Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg

Stockholm 24.1 1987

Dear Mr Weisberg

I got your letter with the prices on your books yesterday 23 of Jan. I of course want to buy them all. According to the paper the price altogether will be 72,75 dollars (with insurance on Whitewash series included). The postage costs to Sweden will no doubt be higher so I will send you a check of 75 dollars when I get my pay on the 28:th of Jan. When you receive the check you could start sending me the books. I suggest you not to send all the books at once in one package, because over here you have to pay customs and sales tax on packages worth more than 14 dollars. So the best thing to do is to send the books separately or at most two books in each package. I'll of course pay if this means higher postage costs for you.

The syntax in this letter might not always be perfect, sometimes my sentence-building will be heavily influenced by the Swedish language and there might even be a few misspellings. Hope you will excuse me for this.

As I mentioned on the phone I was a boy of twelve when President Kennedy was murdered. Like so many others I already back in the sixties doubted the official version of the murder. I can still recall an interview on Swedish television (in 1968 I think) with a lawyer who~~s~~ was advertised as Oswald's lawyer

and friend (I don't recall his name). When the reporter asked him if Oswald had committed the murder, his answer was: "Of course he did." The whole thing seemed suspicious to me. It looked as if the lawyer was on a worldwide (he had visited several countries before Sweden) campaign assuring everybody of Oswald's guilt.

But at the time I was completely unaware of all the critical books that had been written. And I remained unaware until April last year. That month there was an article in one of the biggest newspapers in Sweden entitled "The Kennedy and Palme murders two unsolved cases." In the article the reporter shortly described the contents of a book he had just read by the historian Michael Kurtz. I was flabbergasted: where there really seemingly serious people like historians writing critical books about the President Kennedy assassination? This must be a unique book, I thought. I simply had to get it. I got it in June and had to pay almost 50(!) dollars for it. Later I found out that the bookseller had overpriced the book with at least 15 dollars and I decided to never again buy a book through that dishonest seller.

At first sight professor Kurtz' book looked very solid and serious. On the back flap you can read: "Thoroughly documented and based on the most exhaustive research carried out to date on John Kennedy's murder..." Today I know that this statement is nothing but a

flagrant lie, very much thanks to you, Sir. But last summer it seemed plausible, especially because the whole book is written in an atmosphere of "believe me this is the only serious book on the JFK assassination". For instance on page 215 Mr Kirtz passes judgement on his fellow critics: "The second category includes critics like Mark Lane, Harold Weisberg, and Sylvia Meagher, who uncovered many of the Warren Commission's gross errors but who also proved incapable of distinguishing reliable evidence from speculation. The third category includes such critics as Joriah Thompson, Cyril Wecht, and Howard Roffman, who relied almost exclusively on scientific evidence to offer convincing critiques...."

On the phone I forgot to ask about your opinion on Joriah Thompson and Cyril Wecht. The latter seems to me very reliable thus far. But he hasn't written any books as far as I know. I wonder what Kirtz means when he says you speculate. I suspect it has something to do with what he writes on page 205: "Did Oswald work for an intelligence agency of the United States government?" No. The evidence clearly shows that Oswald had no direct relationship with United States intelligence. "Do you share this point of view? Or is it that you don't share this view that makes Kirtz call you a speculator?"

Perhaps the best part in Kirtz' book is the bibliography, because it made me realize that in fact

a plethora of books on the JFK murder had been published in the United States. I was surprised because I had never before heard of any of these books. And I think myself better informed than most Swedes. For instance not a single one of all these books has been translated to Swedish. Not a single book! Isn't it strange? Especially as there is considerable public interest in the assassination here (as in most European countries). With proper marketing such a book could easily become a bestseller.

To illustrate this strange state of affairs let me take an example. In 1980 Anthony Summers wrote the (for us both well-known) book *Conspiracy*. It wasn't translated to Swedish nor have I ever seen the English version on sale in any bookshop over here. Now the same man (Anthony Summers) has written a book about Marilyn Monroe. This book has been translated to Swedish and during last autumn there was a big promotion campaign for the book in almost every Swedish bookshop. Why didn't *Conspiracy* get the same treatment? I am sure it would have sold at least as well.

Yet another surprise was in store for me. When I tried to order more books on the assassination and related topics I was informed almost all of them were out of print or that the publisher had no rights of sale in England. (I order most of my books through ~~Haffers~~ Haffers booksellers in Cambridge, England.) The few books which officially were still in print seemed

to be as hard and painful to extract from the U.S. as pulling out a tooth. For instance I ordered Canfield and Weberman's : Coup d'Etat in America and Peter Dale Scott's : Crime and Cover-up last summer (in July) and haven't so far got them despite several urgent reminders from Heffers booksellers to the publishers. The publishers haven't even bothered to answer the letters from Heffers. Strange behaviour.

We are supposed to have a free flow of information in the West. I have lately come to realize more clearly than ever before that this is just an illusion. Information that is uncomfortable for the authorities is suppressed without hesitation. You Sir, are a living example of this suppression, being forced to self-publish your books. Another perhaps unexpected example is big Washington reporter Bob Woodward. Simon and Schuster had intended to publish a book about CIA written by him. The book should have been released in August last year but was stopped by CIA-director William Casey. I wrote to Woodward in November inquiring about the book. He hasn't answered me. Star reporters obviously don't care to answer ordinary people's letters.

But much more sinister than suppressing information are the criminal activities of the intelligence communities. One example : Back in 1967 there was an anarchist left-wing group in West-Berlin called "Volkkommun 1".

Andreas Baader, who a few years later became a notorious terrorist, was a member. Also a member was a man by the name Peter Urbach, Urbach urged the other members to start committing acts of violence. If anyone wanted guns or explosives he could provide them, he told the others.

Later it was revealed that Urbach was not a genuine member of Volkskommun 1. He was in fact an infiltrator from Verfassungsschutz - the West-German counter-intelligence. This of course explains his easy access to weapons and explosives.

In 1967 Andreas Baader was not yet a terrorist. An interesting question is to what extent agent provocateurs like Peter Urbach have contributed to German leftist terrorism.

Another example of criminal activity intelligence engages in is the breaking in into foreign embassies and stealing the code books. This seems to be so common that it has got it's own name: black bag jobs.

A somewhat more bizarre activity was revealed by the Norwegian ex-intelligence officer Christian Christiansen in his memoirs. During the fifties the Norwegian security services were spying on prime minister Gerhardsen's wife! Her phone was tapped and she was shadowed. For some incomprehensible reason she was thought to have left-wing contacts that were a threat to national security.

At about the same time Swedish intelligence secretly had the Swedish Social-democratic youth league under surveillance, although the Social-democratic Party had been governing Sweden for thirty years. Again for some incomprehensible reason Social-democratic youngsters were thought to be a hazard to national security.

But perhaps the biggest scandal to come into daylight so far ~~are~~ the recent revelations of former MI5 officer Peter Wright (presently living in Australia) that the Labour prime minister Harold Wilson was under surveillance by MI5 both times he was PM in 1968 and 1974. A democratically elected PM a threat to national security! This shows clearly that the intelligence community doesn't have much respect for democracy and that it truly is an "Invisible Government" as David Wise has pointed out in his well-known book.

Peter Wright has made his revelations in a book called "Spycatcher". The book hasn't been published yet, because Mrs Thatcher has made vigorous efforts to stop it. The case was in Australian court last year and there's going to be a court ruling in the matter in mid-February this year. (As I guess you know.)

I hope the book will be released. If it is I am certainly going to buy me a copy. The publisher is Heinemann.

I am a passionate believer in democracy. And a cornerstone of every truly democratic society is that

there is a law from which no-one is exempt. No organization, no authority can be allowed to stand above the law. Therefore there can be no excuse for the above mentioned and other criminal activities by intelligence. In fact these activities are undermining democracy. And it is our democratic duty as citizens to expose them. In a democratic society there can be no cover-up of crime in the name of national "security".

This is why I am interested in the Kennedy assassination, because as you and others have pointed out there seems to be a truly big cover-up surrounding the murder. It is our duty (if we believe in democracy) to try to untangle this web of conspiracy.

Now I have to try to start ending this letter. Otherwise I might never be able to stop. There are so many questions I would like to ask, so many points I would like to discuss. But lack of time prevents me ~~to~~ ^{from putting} it all down in one letter.

I'll end with a few questions about other authors. What is your opinion about Penn Jones? He has written four self-published books on the Kennedy murder. And there is also a book written about him: H.C. Nash Citizens Awrest: The Dissent of Penn Jones in the Assassination of JFK.

What about Seth Kantor the expert on Jack Ruby?

Joachim Joerten? Author of books like "The Case Against Lyndon Johnson."

What about Bernard Fensterwald? David Scheim calls him a mob lawyer in his book "Contract on America".

What about the Garrison investigation? Was it just a hoax to divert peoples attention from the real issues as David Scheim claims?

Do you know anything about Mark Lane's book Code Name Zorro? I remember Lane defended James Earl Ray in the Senate hearings 1977.

I saw that your last book was published in 1976, before The House Select Committee on Assassinations had made their investigation. What is your opinion of the House investigation? Have you included it's findings in your books after publication? Or didn't they find anything of interest? I found the acoustic evidence that proved it was a conspiracy highly interesting. And the research done by Gaeton Fonzi about the Anthony Veciana - "Maurice Bishop" connection. Do you have any comment on this?

Last but not least I must express my great admiration for men like you, Sir. In my eyes you are an American Hero (not Oliver North). How many men have the strenght and perseverance to go on for decades working for their ideals under obstruction from the government like you, Sir?

Not many, I am sure this world would be a much better place to live in if there were more men of your breed.

Yours faithfully

Kari Postiainen

P.S. I enclose the check in this letter.