

Mr. Paul Colford
New York Newsday
2 Park Ave.,
New York, NY 10016

7/20/94

Dear Mr. Colford,

My old friend Jerry Agel suggests I send you this copy of my Case Open with ~~either~~ a summary of its highlights. What was published is about 20-25% of what I wrote and I regret that at 81 and in impaired health I can no longer recall all that is not in it. (This also accounts for my typing, for which I apologize.)

Jerry is so old a friend he may have published the sprightly weekly BOOKS before you were into books. He ^{was} ~~as~~ enterprising, too. When my Whitewash, the first book on the Warren Commission, was entirely ignored, he introduced it the same time he did Ralph Wader's Unsafe at Any Speed. I don't have to tell you about Wader and Whitewash, despite more ^{than} 100 international rejections, without a single adverse editorial comment, remains the basic work on that Commission and its Report. It even became a best seller for a publisher who had rejected it three times. After I made a success of it. And in 29 years I've not had a letter or a call from anyone who claimed I treated him unfairly. Or had erred in any way.

In using Posner's own publisher's definitions I wrote of him, using the words, as a shyster, a plagiarist, and so determined a liar he had trouble telling the truth by accident, and as a fraud. ^{my} ~~the~~ book has been available for three months. I've not had a word from Posner or Random House or any lawyer. Posner knows ^{us} where I am. He spent three days, his limit, not mine, with unsupervised access to the ~~third~~ ^{third} of a million pages of once-withheld official records I got as the result of more than a dozen FOIA lawsuits. Some were precedential and one led to the amending of the investigatory files exemption in 1974. He, as do all others writing in the field, also had unsupervised access to our copier. And although it would have made no difference if he had told me the truth, he'd still have had that access, he ^{was} ~~as~~ shyster and liar enough to describe an entirely different project to me.

As you can see, he used tricky source-noting to pretend that what he literally cribbed from a bright 15-year-old boy (who was quite wrong) was the result of advanced computer technology not available to the Warren Commission and done for him. He pretended that a technical presentation prepared for the American Bar Association was done for him. (So successfully that the Phila. Inquirer praised him for it in an editorial!) He said that a shrink who examined Oswald when he was a boy and a truant decided that he was in effect an assassin ~~with waiting~~ ^{waiting} for his historic moment when that shrink testified to the exact opposite (Posner quoted both sides of that page of the testimony). That shrink, as Posner does not say, ^{was} ~~was~~ getting free sex from his woman patients until one sued and was awarded \$50,000.

what was eliminated was in effect the defense lawyer's brief in opposition to that of the prosecution, which is what most of Posner's book is. In this I disproved all of Posner's allegations about the assassination itself with the official evidence only.


A friend sent me the Jack Sirica story on Posner and his book when it first appeared. Sirica had no questions at all unless they were about how he could do more to puff that fake and his fraudulent book up. Even when Posner told him that he had had to index the Commission's 26 volumes, Sirica did not ask even to see it. It was not possible for Posner to index 10,000,000 words in 26 large volumes and still do anything else in the time he says on his entire project.

And what a mass of index cards he would have had!

In common with all others, reporters and reviewers, Sirica did no checking at all. Posner's book cannot survive even amateur checking.

Even the 200 interviews of which he boasts as I said without a peep from him served only one purpose, for bypassing and avoiding the official evidence that disproved what Posner had set out to say in the belief that the market was ripe for an Oliver Stone from the other side.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg

Two of his claimed interviewees claim they never spoke to him.

And one regarded the conservative Hale Boggs as a Communist and distributed literature saying so!

I hope you can give the rushed Case Open, with all its typos, a review. It has had no mention of which I am aware.