7/8/94

Dear Richard,

As the hasty note I added to the proofs that you ~~should~~ have received or be receiving no more than an hour and a half from now, here is the brief Conclusion for Case Open.

I believe that a conclusion is an urgent need and that the content of this can help the book material~~ly~~, as the absence of any will hurt it seriously.

There is in this what can cause a sensation if there is any promotion of it, that Oswald security clearance not yet reported publicly anywhere.

I've written in a plug for John Newman's book.

Using it now will not hurt his book~~-~~it will help it, create an advance interest in it. And hurt its competitor, Lifton's.

In the interest of brevity, when I ~~set~~ wrote this I left that out. But in thinking about it I realized that it is important in and to the book and can be, with help should be, a significant boost for the book.

And if it is not there it cannot be used that way.

Please believe me and listen to me: Consluions are absolutely essential, as I've already indicated. I do not want to have my reputation suffer for the lack of them and you and C & G should feel that way about yourselves.

There are many things I can do to help the book when it is out. When you have it, please let me know so I can prepare for it.

Meanwhile, I have a few things in mind that cannot conflict with anything you and/or C & G will do, when I can I'll try and I'll keep you informed, with copies.

If a competitive situation is created, this book is loaded with dynamite!

Best,

Harold

Conclusion

This book is, as intended, an exposure and an indictment of Gerald Posner and his mistitled book, Case Closed, the most dishonest of all the many books on the assassination of President Kennedy and its investigations. It also exposed and indicts those who connived with Posner to make his most dishonest of books the most successful of the sycophantic works and of those that commercialize and exploit that great national tragedy. It indicts and exposes the media, too.

How dishonest are Posner and his book? Strong as is the case in this book, it is much less than the case I put together and that was much less than was possible. By the time my manuscript exceeded more than 200,000 words I did no more. This books shortens that lengthy indictment to make it more accessible to more people. However, copies of that lengthier indictment will be deposited with professional historicans and their institutions for the historical record for the future. Those historians provided the professional peer review that Posner and Random House avoided. They avoided this tradition on non-fiction publication for a very simple reason: with a competent peer review they would have had no such successful exploitation and commercializtion of this great tragedy in our history. There is no competent peer review of this most thoroughly and intendedly dishonest of books that would not have condemned it for this reason and for others.

These other reasons include gross ignorance of the subject matter, despite the prepublication raves by men of eminence not one of whom was in a position to offer the opinions used to sell this rewriting of our history. ~~for profit.~~ The professional historian among them, Stephen Ambrose, was silent when I wrote him. He has no defense of what he did. I asked that of him.

Posner is a man, as the full manuscript proves much more than this book does, who has trouble telling the truth even by accident.

This extends even to himself. He lies about himself in referring to himself as, and as Random House Hippodromed on the book and in all those many effective promo-

~~tion~~

tions as a "Wall Street lawyer." His actual "Wall Street" experience was a short span of the most insignificant and most menial work, on "discovery" material in a major anti-trust case. That is work for which other major corporations have found those fresh from college and without law degrees perfectly satisfactory. I have a friend whose first job after she got her undergraduate degree was doing precisely that work for another major corportation. ~~If it was not then as large as IBM, Posner's firm's client, it was close to it.~~ His name does not appear in that lawsuit. But for that matter, it also does not appear in searches of the indices, like Lexis. While those indices do not include all litigation, they are a fair reflection of importance.

I have a New York lawyer friend who told me his check, too, shows that Posner never filed a single lawsuit.

Ten years or less of the most menial ~~of lawyer tasks~~ makes him a "Wall Street lawyer."

Without any of the media making any check at all, it, too, puffed him up as what he was and is not, a "Wall Street lawyer."

Of the innumerable instances of his subject-matter ignorance, I cite one. Some, however, could be reflctions of the permeating dishonesty of his book.

I select this one because he had access to the fact in two ways. The first is that I published it in my 1965 book of which he has a copy and to which he refers in his book. His reading of that book was so close that he quoted four non-continuous words from a page of about 600 words. The other is that I have a file on it and he had unsupervised access to all my some 60 file cabinets of records and to our copier.

In support of his nonesting case of a shot fired in the assassination earlier than the Commission said he refers to the late Nobel Laureate Luis Alvarez as the inventor of the "jiggle" theory, that his reaction to an earlier shot caused ~~Abraham Zaprduer's~~ camera to jiggle. I brought that to light in my 1965 Whitewash. Alvarez's students then asked him about it. He later wrote an article about it and had it published in The Scientific American - which Posner does not mention. My file, which is not included

earlier in this book

in the FOIA lawsuit to which I refer because I did not have to take that one to coirt, includes even Alvarez contemptuous disregard for his misuse of funds provided by the Energy Research and Development Administration for that work and publication.

But then Posner did not dare cite either my first use of that Zaprduer testimony of the testimony itself because what Zapruder actually testified to is that ~~he though~~ a shot had come from behind him, from that Grassy Knoll so infamous to Posner, and that he saw the President hit by the first shot fired earlier than in ~~before~~ the first of the official account! The shot that Posner said missed. (Whitewash, page 47)

There are few poeple bolder than Posner in his dishonesty, few who respond ~~whose response~~ to criticism is by making ~~to make~~ personal attacks on those who criticize him more than he does.

One of the many illustrations of this is when Dr. Cyril Wecht, to Posner's face on CNN, said that Posner had used Failure Analysis's work as his own. Posner launched a false and a personal, attack on Wecht instead of addressing ~~was~~ the obvious truth Wecht spoke. ~~It was~~ That - another Posner lie was, as Wecht soon proved, a false attack. But in responding to Posner's false attack Wecht used up all the time, Posner got away with it and was even able to add to his lies that Wecht had "distorted," in telling the literal truth.

Posner got away with the same thing in a letter to the Washington Post's weekly Book World section. In a perceptive review, reporter Jeffrey Frank had noted the same factual and truthful criticism that Posner used Failure Analysis' work as his or for him. Here is Posner's response, which is not only not a response but is a carefully-designed lie! the Post accomodated him by publishing it in its ~~issue~~ December 12, 1993 issue:

"The insinuation that I claimed that FAA's enhancements were commissioned ~~by~~ for the book is false. In the book, the citations to FAA's work and Dr. Piziali's testimony refer to the 1992 ABA mock trialm which is a matter of public record."

In this Posner intended to lie, having no real choice.

There is no mention in his book of the American Bar Association or its mock trial or of testimony there by Piziali! If Posner had mentioned any of that he could not have gotten away with his studied pretense that all that work was for him. That the mock trial was a matter of public record is irrelevant. Posner's shyster-like reference to it here is to say that he ~~said~~ told all of that in his book, which he did not.

Had he, he would have exposed himself and his book and he would have killed it in the writing.

He is clever at such decpetions and his practise of them never ends.

His and his publisher's claim is that the most important part of his book is his biography of Oswald, It is contrived to make it appear that there is a factual basis for Posner's saying he was considering him a born assassin. Posner says this based on ~~He cites~~ what he says is the professional opinion of the New York City psychiatrist, Dr. Renatus Hortogs. Hartogs exmined Oswald when he was an unhappy little boy who behaved badly. But in fact, when a witness before the Warren Commission and at precisely the very point in his testimony Posner cites repeatedly, Hartogs swore to the exact opposite!

Posner has to be checked out. I did. The media didn't. Had it, it could not have ~~misled~~ misused him and his book to cover the media ass for its failures and abdications at the time of the assassination and ever since then.

Posner begins his book with his fabrication that Oswald was that born assassin. At the very outset, in carrying this fiction forward, he says that Oswald was so pleased with himself after assassinating the President that he "smirked" repeatedly. Posner repeatedly, He says that us using that work twice, on page 4 alone, for example.

I checked all Posner's sources out. Like Renatus, Posner cites their Warren Commission testimony. Not one of his claimed sources used that word or even suggested it!

Posner lied and the media went for it even unquestioningly. And has yet to expose him. Which would mean, of course, expose itself. Not very likely.

So, there is no doubt about it, Posner is a shyster, in the meaning given the word by his own publisher's unabridged dictionary, and he is a nonstop liar, in and out of his book.

When this is so very blatant on the most cursory check, what does this say about the media which did no checking at all and made him a world-famous man as soon as his fraud of a book was out? What does it tell us of the degree to which we can depend on our media, the means by which we are informed so that we can meet our responsibilities in a representative soriety? It tell us that the media more that retails lies, it glorifies liars. How, then, can the electroate be truthfully informed? How can our

system work?

Confronted with a palpable lie - and in this Newsday's Jack Sirica is the rule to which there was no single exception- he glorified Posner and his book. He even sought out the book's blurber, Historian Stephen Ambrose, to enlarge upon his rhapsodies, saying of Posner's fraud, plagiarism and overt lies, ""It is just a model of historical scholarship." proving thereby that as war is too important to trust to the general, so is our history too precious to entrust to the professional historians.

This influential Long Island newspaper with a New York City edition devoted four pages of its September 16, 1993 issue to extoling Posner and his book. More than half of the first page of its Section 2 is devoted to a staged photo of him, brows wrinkled in a shirt-sleeved pretense of deep thought. (His sleeves are not rolled up.)

Carried away in his own ecstacy Sirica reported that [redacted] "posner also employed computer technology" that included "computer modeling and animation." His source: Posner. Who lied in denying he had said anything at all like that, ever, notably on coast-to-coast TV and to the Washington Post, as cited above.

This is journalism, puffing up handouts, sking no questions, swallowing the fish along with the hook, line and sinker?

system work?

Comfronted with a palpeble lie, an impossibility - and in this Newsday's Jaxk Sirica is the rule to which there was no single exception - g he glorified Posner and his book and even sought out greater praises. Like the bookss blurber, the professiona historian Steven Ambrose. In that influential Long Island Ba based paper, with a New York City edition, for all the world as though Random House was paying him for his promotional efforts , he quotes Ambrose as saying,

Sirica is one of the many who were suckered by Posner's obviously impossible claim to have been forced to index the Commission's 26 volumes. If the absolute impossibility of indexing 10,000,000 words in the about a year Posner took for all of his work, for those 200 interviews and all that travel and then the writing did not suggest itself to Sirica or his editors, what kind of repprter is he?

Did it now once occur to him to say "show me" and demand to see that index?

Any perceptive reading of the book discloses that Posner is ignorant of the content of these 26 volumes, cites it from secondary sources and, as understatedly indicated above, actually misrepresents and lies about it.

Is it possible that of all the thousands and thousands of reporters in the country, particularly in Washington, not one remembered that sensational and dramatic CIA confession of sins against Nosenko and checked on that, or did not remember a word written about him and checked that? When any checking at all would have disclosed that for all his interview with Nosenko, a real rarity, Posner published much less than was already in the public domain.

At least one of those many reporters should have remembered that Nosenko said that

AP

The Associated Press, which provides most of our papers with their national news, actually gave the country- in fact the world - as its main story when the "eport was released its first chapter, its "Summary and Conclusions," word-for-word, verbatim.

1

~~g~~ the ~~KB~~ KGB suspected ~~that~~ Oswald might be an American agent. At least some should have known that the first Commission crisis was when it could no longer avoid such a report. It is, among other public sources, in Gerald Ford's book, ~~and~~ he had been ~~was then~~ a Commission Member and the House Republican leader. A telephone call to any of the many critics familiar with it or to me would have disclosed that I had published the fact that Oswald had a Top Secret and a Crypto clearance when he was a Marine. That kind of high security clearance for a man later accused of assassinating the President and that Commission did not report it and Posner's book, for all its emphasis on its account of Oswald and his career makes no mention of it? 7A & 7A1 here

Nobody in all the media could do the most minimal checking of such a sensational, ~~so often~~ exhaustively and extensible promoted a book and on this subject?

With this just a tiny peek at the actual record of all the media, is it not the most persuasive and convincing reflection of the totality with which it abandons its most basic responsibilities in a society like ours?

When it makes a palpable fraud, a persisting and ~~persuasive~~ diligent liar, into an international celebrity and persuades much of the world that a ccass commercialization and explotation of the assassination of a ~~pre~~ President that his deliberately dishonest account is the unquestionable truth?

The media itself changed with its universal acceptance of the official assassination mythology. Instead of giving that Report the critical analysis we expect of it, the media rivaled in glorifying it when in fact the Report alone cannot survive critical examination and when compared with its supposed evidentiary base in those 26 volumes it is clearly a work not of inquiry but of politically sought "truth" that is not ~~at all~~ true. insert A P

Our society can work as intended by our Founding Fathers, those who to me were the greatest political thinkers in history, only when the people are informed truthfully and accurately. That can happen only when the media tells them the truth, reports fact not falsehood as it did with Posner and his mistitled book.

As this ~~f~~ fraction of what I was able to write in a mere two months reflects, neither Posner nor his book can survive the critical examination we should ~~expect~~ of

Suppresded it, really.

He knew about it because he had and read my Oswald in New Orleans, which reported it in 1967. That was the only one of my books he had when he bought the others from me. It is also the book based on a minor fact in it he attributed his only factual error to me. ~~In fact~~ He did not know what he was talking about because what he criticized is correct and his criticism was so obviously wrong he could have learned that from the phone book. it is an address.)

When he appeared while promoting his book soon after it was out at the Green Apples ~~a~~ book store in his home town of San ~~in~~ Francisco, my friend Hal Verb asked him why that book is not in his bibliography. Posner's response is that his bibliography lists only the books he used!

~~Hal~~ Hal knew that was a lie, as did other ~~a~~ of my friends who were there.

But with Posner's mother also there, none wanted to embarrass him by proving him a liar, ~~in public and~~ to his mother's face. and that in public.

There is no question about it, Posner knew that Oswald did have that exceptionally high security clearance and that it was expunged from his Marines record. We even discussed it when he was here.

If he had had the interviest I would have given him the official proof that Oswald did have that high clearance. I got it after I published Oswald in New Orleans.

We none of us own our country's history. I certainly make no such claim. Posner in fact, reported that I make all the information I have available to all who write in the field. As he wrote of me, "He allowed me full run of his basement, filled with file cabinets. ... His attitude toward the ~~sh~~ sharing of information is refreshing..." (page 504)

Posner knew that ~~Os~~ Oswald had ~~this~~ that exceptional security clearance. But he could not have reported that in his book that makes Oswald the lone assassin. That is the same reason it is expunged from Oswald's Marines records.

(I have since made those records available to John Newman who is writing a book based on the Oswald records ~~d suppr~~ suppressed until their disclosre was compelled by law in 1993.)

Posner was safe behind his mother's skirt at that book-store appearance.

That was one of the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ places he admitted that contrary to the title of his book, the case is not closed.

One of the ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ three accounts of what he said that I have from those who were there ~~xx~~ says he began his answer to that question ~~when asked~~, "Of course the case is not closed."

Yet known ~~his~~ INT his book has a lie for its title, he used that lie because it is the lie that made him an int rnational figure and made his book.

The media did not pick it up and report it.

be able to suspect of our media and until recently at least most Americans believed they got from it. Many still believe that. Tragcially, we cannot, and that is a great danger to all of us and to our system of society.

That in time of great crisis and with this assassination, ever since then, all of our institutions failed and continue to fail us and themzelves is the thrust of my work. This book is the eighth of my published books in which this failure is brought to light, with a ninth to be published later this year. That and all those FOIA lawsuits and their ~~yield~~ yield, in court precedents and in that third of a million pages of now available and previously-witheld official records is not an inconsiderable work.

Yet not a single reporter writing about Posner and his book, not a single news magazine that promoted it, not a single TV show or ostensible news account asked me a single question about that book for all the work I have done and ~~is~~ known to have done in the field.

In the enti e country, with this the subject and with Posner's version of that great ttagedy, not one reporter who wrote any story at all about it asked a single question !

This describes our media today better and more definitively than any critic of it can.

Book publishing is, of course, an important ~~part of~~ element of our ~~the~~ media. While a book do not reach the audoence of the print press or the electronic media, it is the one means by which important national issues can be addressed at length and with real definitiveness.

But not a single major publisher has brought ought a single truthful, responsible book that is ~~fieri~~ critical of the government's record when the President was killed, when as is inevitable, we had an ~~Amiric~~ Amerifom Ameriform coup de etat.

If ~~there~~ any believe that was not the effect of this assassination, they need only compare our country and life in it then with what we have today. ~~It~~ After Viet Nam, after the Watergate, after the Iran/Contra disgrace, after a ~~Pred~~ President was forced to resign not to be impeached, after he picked his successor ~~when~~ who then immediately pardonned him.

Crime is a major national issue. Compare crime now ~~and~~ with then, with 30 years ago.

Look at the streets overflowing with the homeless, many of whom had decent jobs and could not afford a place to live despite being emol employed. Was this true then?

The national debt is another major issue. Compare it now with what it was then.

Compare what we now have to import that we used to export, daily increasing the national debt thereby, with that national debt alone denying the country its ~~most~~ urgent needs.

Compare our infant mortality then and now and with that all the other major health ~~issues~~ problems. For a developed country we now have one the of the highest infant mortality rates.

There is no real question, the assassination of a President in our country inevitably had the greatest consequences. It also nullifies out entire system of government. It is the greatest subversion.

Yet the ~~mah~~ major media failed to meet its responsibilities then and ever since then and as this book shows, persists in refusing to meet its responsibilities after ~~oe~~ 30 years.

No major book publisher has ever published this kind of criticism - and it is constructive criticism in a society like ours - and when such a book can be published, it is by small publishrs. They have the courage, The ~~Rand~~ Random Houses pimp for the literary whores who sell themselves for fame and money, in prostituting our history.

We are in bad shape when this can happen in out country.

And it has happened!

When the Posners can get the Random Houses to publish such malevolent, such dangerous trash as his mistitled Ca se Opened, the title he knew and admitted is untrue, when the major media can fall all over itself in telling the people that such a crude lie is the truth, when this is what happens when our government ~~if~~ fails- and it did happen - then we are all in danger with our system in such great trouble.

As the philosopher Santayana observed so succintly and truthfully, those who do not remember the past are doomed to relive it.

We are reliving it. We'd better ~~re~~ remember!