

Dear Gunnar,

11/27/94

I'm sorry to say I did not remember sending you Case Open or why. I'm sure I did not expect payment. So thanks. I'm sorry also that I did not keep a record of those who wanted Oswald in New Orleans because I then could have let them know when it was possible for me, with my limitations, to have a durable xerox with an excellent ~~links~~ and durable binding made. I've packaged one for you. It is \$25 plus whatever the postage will be. My wife would know but she's asleep.

If I did not tell you, Case Open was butchered. It is about 20-25% of what I wrote and not only was it not edited, the typos I picked up were not corrected. And more that is too visible that I could do nothing about. Like two different subtitles, no table of contents or index. Posner has not had a word to say about it and in the reprint proves how right I was in saying he can't tell the truth even by accident. He said it was my first commercial printing. It was my fifth original commercial printing and counting reprints my 13th. And that is all he could say. *Or did they,*

It was not anti-semitism to refer to him as a Judenrat. I am a Jew. He is half one, his father only. His mother is Catholic. He is in the same role in this book as was a Judenrat under Hitler. It is an intended insult but not anti-Semitism, I think.

All the indications are that NEVER AGAIN is being suppressed by the publisher. I had it finished before the end of 1992. It could easily have appeared by the middle of 1993. When I finally learned their plans for it I was told it would be on sale by September 1993. When that did not happen I was told ^{coming} March of this year. It was in book store computers for ~~September~~ ^{September 19 94} publication. Then I was told that it would now be this coming ¹ March. It was removed from the computer listings for September and without March replacing it. I've written without response. I go into Katzenbach at its beginning, say there was a de facto government conspiracy as soon as Oswald was dead not to investigate the crime. I had a Katzenbach memo that means that and nothing else, an FBI memo saying that he phoned Hoover the afternoon of 11/24/63 with his notion and Hoover agreed, and documents indicating the LBJ knew and approved. So whether or not he was friendly with the CIA is not relevant in the assassination situation and investigation.

Marchetti is of the right political extreme. His work with Marks is dependable but I do not believe that is true of his work since then. He is associated with the prime Holocaust denier in this country, a native Nazi who years ago published what was expected to be the ^{my} American Hein Kampf, Willis Garto. But I do not recall how ~~Pierre~~ ^{have} Poinsner, as I think of him, treated that.

In trying to show a non-existing error in my writing, without saying what he was citing he quoted from Oswald in New Orleans, to say I had a bad address. He was wrong. He there talks about a building in the next block of Canal Street. But he also omits

that book from his bibliography. When you read it you'll see why. Among other things Oswald had an exceptionally high security clearance and did very secret work in the "Marines." Which the official records do not show. I now have proof, official proof, that he had such clearances.

He stole little from me, by not saying that documents he got here he got from me. He gives the impression they are from his work. But he did steal from that boy and from Failure Analysis. He had a lengthy footnote in the reprint giving grudging, unclear and half-assed credit to FaAA.

In what you quote from Case Open, that was clearer in what I wrote. I said I did nothing with what he wrote about "uby because I had enough without it and my objective was to make a record relating to the assassination and its investigations.

He asked me for nothing by way of documents when he was here. He spent three days going over my files, selecting what he wanted copied and his wife made the copies while he searched. I have no idea what he copied and I accepted their count on the number of copies they made. In any event, I've not read what he wrote about "uby.

If you will have your publisher send me the permission he wants under Swedish law I'll be glad to sign and return it. My intent is to make you free to use whatever you may want to use, so have no uneasiness about that.

Do I take it correctly from the silence that there is no forthcoming Palme assassination book?

Our best wishes for a fine holiday season and the best of possible coming years for all of us,

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg

Uppsala, November 18, 1994

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick
Maryland
217 01 USA

Dear Harold,

thank you so much for your letter and for "Case Open".

You did not specify what you want me to pay for the book. I enclose \$ 14, I hope it covers the price and freight costs.

I am sorry I have not written earlier. One reason was that I wanted to read at least parts of both "Case Open" and the Posner book first.

That is what I have done. My first reaction when glancing through Posner was to think about something you wrote in one of your letters to me, that the reader is the prisoner of the author. And Posner, as the lawyer he is, sure knows how to present his case - at least to the non-expert.

What immediately sounded suspicious even to me with my limited knowledge of the subject, is the way Posner tried to present himself as the cool, balanced researcher in a world of nuts and extremists. I asked myself: if the Warren Commission's case was so strong, and its critics so dishonest and incompetent, why didn't anybody succeed in closing the case long ago?

Now, with your book at hand, I am no longer a complete prisoner. While I have not yet had time to read all of it - my main occupation is editing my own book - I already have found a number of facts about Posner's working methods and omissions which clearly show the political character of his work as pro-establishment, pro-CIA and so on.

Since I wish to use the Katzenbach memo in my book I looked Katzenbach up in Posner's index and found the reference to p 404-05 (British Warner Books edition). In those pages Posner - in between his teeth - almost has to admit that dominant forces in Washington from the start were very keen on denying the possibility of conspiracy. Still he avoids saying this loud and clear. The reason is obvious: this would be adverse to his description of the US authorities as essentially truth-searching, honest, concerned and so on. How easily he accepts their own version of themselves as gospel shows for example his completely unproven assertion that Hoover "was convinced within days of the assassination that Oswald alone had killed Kennedy" (p 407). How could Posner know what Hoover - of all liars - really thought about the murder?

I have also noted with interest what you mention in "Case Open" (p 50) about Katzenbach's ties to the CIA. This is in accordance with what Marchetti/Marks write in "The CIA And the Cult of Intelligence" that the CIA in the 60s considered Katzenbach as a "friend". Do you have any comments about

Posner's treatment of this subject? Do you regard the Marchetti book as a reliable source?

* * *

You write that "Never Again" will carry the Katzenbach memo forward quite a bit. Since the book is not yet published I do not want to ask you to tell me more about it, but I would like you to send me a copy and a bill as soon as it is out.

* * *

I also note that in the beginning of "Case Open" there is a list of your published works which gives the impression that "Oswald in New Orleans" could be ordered from you. When I bought your other books you told me it was not available. If there is a reprint of it now, please send me a copy and a bill.

* * *

I note that Posner feels forced to briefly admit that he is strongly indebted to you because you gave him access to your archives and helped him in every reasonable way (p 504).

In "Case Open" you, too, refer to his visit at your place and his studies of your archives. You clearly point out that he did not ask for documents concerning certain subjects which were to become important parts of his book - and you drew the convincing conclusion that he had built his own case on dubious material and was avoiding all kinds of evidence which threatened to show that he was wrong.

Posner tries to give the impression that all writers who believe that the murder in Dallas was the result of a conspiracy form some kind of semi-secret society, collaborating to throw dirt on the good old US authorities. I for sure know that he is dead wrong at least when it comes to you: you are ready to help any researcher regardless of his/her opinions and at the same time you do not hide your strong objections concerning the quality and moral integrity of work made by others who believe there was a conspiracy (Lifton, Garrison, Marrs and so on).

Posner is building much of his case on the alleged or real errors made by assassination researchers who have been promoting conspiracy scenarios - in fact he seems to try the old trick: if I show that others are wrong, then the reader might uncritically assume that I am right.

Undoubtedly Posner has had access to a lot of knowledge about factual and logical weaknesses in the assassination literature - more than he could have digested all by himself. Is it correct that he - obviously familiar with your attitude of helping everybody and your unwillingness to cover for others just because they believe there was a conspiracy - came to you mainly to exploit your expert capacity concerning the grave errors made by best-selling assassination writers?

Has Posner in fact built part of his reputation from stealing your research, in the same way that he stole from the FaAA?

* * *

Concerning the above-mentioned subject: how should I understand what you write in "Case Open" (p 44): "This is true of all parts of his book other than its section on Jack Ruby..."? Did he ask for material about Ruby? Did he happen to

use it in a serious manner? Is his chapter on Ruby qualitatively different from the rest of his book?

* * *

Last: a thing which has puzzled me. In your 10/4/94 letter to me you write relating to Posner: "Cheap, unscrupulous bastard! Judenrat!"

I am fairly familiar with your basic opinions both from your books and our correspondence and I have always been completely convinced that you are a stubborn democrat in the deepest sense of the word - including that you are strongly opposed to any kind of racist ideas.

I have of course not changed this opinion because of a surprising passage in a letter. But if some unknown person had used the above-quoted polemical expression I would have drawn the conclusion that he had some kind of anti-semitic prejudices.

You suggest that I show your letter to my publisher to prove that you agree that I use your material. I appreciate this very much but I am afraid that regardless of your real intent most Swedish publishers would react strongly - and without the beneficial influence from knowing you and your books.

I would very much like your comment on this matter which has made me feel uneasy and in fact delayed my writing to you.

With best regards

Gunnar Wall

Gunnar Wall
Dirigentvägen 145
S-756 54 Uppsala
SWEDEN