

CHAPTER 19

The Shit Parade

This chapter title is not intended to offend or startle, nor is it intended to attract undue attention. It is a conscious descriptive that, when the subject matter is considered, it is in fact no unkindness at all. The subject matter, the assassination of a President and the exploitation and commercialization of it, is by any rational standard as serious a matter as is possible in a country like ours. The rest of this book addresses what does not have even the uses of fecal matter and in all ways is hurtful to our country and to what is so important in representative society, what the people can know and believe, will know and believe, if they take seriously what I believe I understate in referring to it as "shit."

When those books appeared almost nobody was in a position to evaluate them.

More, when it is being made up, there is no reason not to make it attractive.

And, of course, every reason to make it attractive while it was being made up.

People were excited by what they had no reason to believe was neither factual nor true. Those books sold well and the people were even more confused by them.

Those who trusted those authors and bought their books were paying to be misled and misinformed.

Without knowing it, without being able to learn what the truth and fact are.

What is not generally understood is that this is true of both extremes- the theorizers of a conspiracy and those who theorize there was no conspiracy to kill JFK.

Contrary to its monolithic acceptance by the major media when it was issued and ever since then the Warren Report is only a theory- and a theory that is disproven solidly by that Commission's

own evidence, published and not published. Save for the fact that needed no official confirmation, that the President was assassinated, there is no major fact in its account that can survive examination by the Commission's own evidence.

Of those most accepted by the major media in support of the Report, the most recent and most widely acclaimed, aired and republished is Gerald Posner. His book is the knowingly mistitled Case Closed (New York, Random House, 1993). It is by far the most conscientiously, determinedly dishonest of them all- a cunning formula for commercializing and exploiting the assassination. While I had, until reading it, planned to devote only a chapter or two to it, on reading it I decided that it was, particularly because of the most extensive sale of ancillary rights throughout the world and the enormous attention to it and to him by our major media, particularly TV, worth more attention. The record I made for history on it and on him is of more than 200,000 words, and at that it is not really exhaustive. There were parts of the book to which I paid no attention at all. Selections from it were published as Case Open (Richard Gallen/Carroll & Graf, New York, 1994).

Posner has trouble telling the truth, even by accident. Not only about the assassination, about himself, too. (Note: some editing of later pages may be needed.)

Of those who support the Report, David Belin, who had been of the Commission's counsel, is the next best-known and next most popular with the major media. Like Posner and all others on that extreme, Belin picks and chooses what he says is evidence, omitting or misrepresenting what is uncongenial with his one-sided case. When his books are boiled down what remains is that Belin, like the Commission is right because he says he is right, and nothing else matters.

Unlike the cold and calculating Posner, Belin is driven by a compulsion for self-justification. He is intensely emotionally involved where Posner is emotionless in his crafty, purposeful dishonesty.

Where Belin pretends to base his work on the Commission's own evidence, Posner pretends that he developed new evidence by close to 200 interviews. In fact, without exception, not one of those interviews brings anything both new and factual to light. He uses them as a mean trick to work his way around the official evidence, quoting from those interviews other than what those people testified to before the Commission. Posner makes his own "fact" up by means of these interviews that for all other purposes are entirely useless and valueless.

Because Belin's work is essentially rehash and because at my age and in the state of my health I am severely limited in what I am able to do, for the record I make and I leave for our history, with regard to Belin, I have to content myself with the copy of a speech I made when he and I spoke together at Vanderbilt University, I in Nashville, Tennessee in the late fall of 1975. In it I presented Belin's actual record on the Commission to him, to his face, and he was unable to refute any of it. That is what impelled him to announce as soon as he was back home, in Des Moines, that he would hold a press conference the next day. At that press conference he called for a new investigation. He then began publishing his pathetic books in which he seeks self-justification.

Then, instead of just part of a whitewash, of a covering up, he also was its mixmaster.

As presidents often do, when our only unelected President had a problem from serious complaints about CIA excesses he could do nothing about any other way, he appointed a presidential commission, as he had been made famous by Lyndon Johnson's appointing of the Warren Commission. When Gerald Ford established his Rockefeller Commission supposedly to investigate these CIA abuses and illegalities, he selected David Belin, known well to him from their joint covering up on the Warren Commission, to be its operating head. With his three-monkeys skills from that Commission, of seeing no evil, hearing none and speaking none, Belin covered it all with minor and since forgotten

criticisms that satisfied the major media and the politicians.

As it relates to the JFK assassination, some of what Belin's Rockefeller Commission had and did publish I obtained and published in the 1976 reprinting of my 1967 book, Photographic Whitewash (pp. 295ff). How the CIA got a copy of the Zapruder film did not come to light in Belin's three-monkey's sensation of an investigation of it. That its analysis of that film (pp. 298ff) disproved that of the Warren Commission did not come to light through Belin. He was mute when I published what remains of that CIA analysis that he had and did not publish and which his Rockefeller Commission suppressed.

There are many, many other CIA coverings up in the JFK assassination that Belin did not expose when that was his responsibility as working head of the Rockefeller Commission. But subsequent exposure of some of them did not serve to persuade him to shut his yap. Like its incredible torture and plotting of ways of killing the defected KGB minor executive, Yuri Nosenko, after Nosenko told the FBI that the KGB suspected Oswald was an American "agent in place" or sleeper agent and that he was so anti-Soviet he was anti-Soviet when he was in the USSR.

This was known to Belin. Post Mortem had not yet gone on sale but he had a copy in November, 1965, when we debated at Vanderbilt University, in Nashville, Tennessee. He had obtained it from a Member of Congress to whom I had given an advance copy. In it I published a summary of those FBI reports of its Nosenko interviews which his Warren Commission had- and suppressed (pages 627ff).

Publicly Belin called for the disclosure of all the CIA's assassination records. He said of them that he had seen them all as they relate to the JFK assassination and "there is nothing there."

He lied. He did not see them all and rather than holding "nothing" they include an astounding

number of thousands of pages about Oswald.

Aside from what I had published and the CIA information the FBI later disclosed to me and I believe to others in which Belin had had no interest at all when he as he claimed saw it all- and had the obligation to see it all- there is what the CIA disclosed in 1993 under the 1992 law requiring it that. Among other things reflected in them is the early CIA interest in Oswald after his so-called "defection" to the USSR, an interest manifested in those newly-disclosed records Belin had had nothing to do with when that was his Rockefeller Commission obligation. As Major John Newman of Army Intelligence discovered in them at least three parts of the CIA expressed written interest in Oswald even before the CIA established its personality profile 201 file on him.

No question about it, Belin was a real-life Perry Mason in his investigations of the JFK assassination, a Keystone Kop's Perry Mason. While throughout my earlier books I brought to light some of his derring-do in support of the official mythology as a Commission counsel, a case study of his deliberate covering up what was uncongenial to the official preconceived "solution" and could have destroyed it is in Whitewash II, pages 82ff.

Belin differs from the other former Warren Commission counsels in being of them all, of all those who were willing and conscious parts of that non-investigation pretended to have been a thorough investigation, in his compulsion to seek self-justification. In this he is the darling of the major media, particularly the op-ed darling. In actuality he is a contempt-worthy Judenrat.

The ghost he sees cannot and will not go away.

Belin and Posner, each in his own dishonest way, with our precious history and our national integrity involved, personifies Shakespeare's line, first let us kill all the lawyers.

While I would like to leave more of a record of the truth with regard to each of them, both being

strangers to the truth about the assassination and its investigation, that is now more than I can undertake. They do represent, in fact they symbolize their extreme of unquestioning support of the untenable official assassination mythology.

The other extreme, of those who pretend to have solved the crime by various conspiracy theories, produced books that also are untenable.

The major effect of the extreme that supports the official mythology was on the major media. In turn the major media popularized the Belins and Posners of literary whoredom to the average American. However, as numerous polls show, for all the great attention to the Belins and the Posners and their work, they did not really convert most people. After Posner's book theorizing that there had been no conspiracy had gotten great attention, a poll taken for CBS-TV News established that a greater number of Americans than ever before- nine out of ten- believed there had been a conspiracy.

What really influenced the beliefs of the average American is the attractive conspiracy theories presented as solutions. Not only did those books reach many people, their authors were welcome on a great number of talk shows. Between their books and their appearances these authors reached directly and confused many more people than the Posners and the Belins did.

Both extremes failed to meet the responsibilities of writers in a society like ours. With them both, the major media also failed in its responsibilities.

Their failures, I believe, endanger our society.

Infrequently I tell readers that my first book was the first book on the Warren Commission. That was not and is not to boast. It is to inform the reader, among many things, that I have labored and learned in this work for that long. That gives the reader one means of evaluating the opportunity I have

had to become informed for my writing.

It is also, as I've just recalled in writing this, a powerful indictment of our society, the society of all whose institutions, as I believe my writing has made clear. They failed us in the time of our national crisis when President Kennedy was killed and they have failed us ever since then.

In our society there is nothing more subversive than the assassination of a President. It nullifies our system of freedom through self-government. It gives us a president for whom we did not vote and who could not become president through being elected president. In practice, at least in modern practice, it gives us a president whose political beliefs are not those of the president for whom we voted. It gives us one whose beliefs are usually quite different from those of the one for whom we did vote. This is because the successful candidate selects to run with him one who can appeal to voters to whom he did not appeal. That is one of the reasons JFK picked LBJ to run with him.

So, when faced with this great subversion, what is the record of those whose responsibility it is to inform the people so that they may function in the democratic system as intended by those I believe are properly referred to as our "founding fathers," those I believe were the greatest political thinkers- and doers- of all time?

While Jefferson lived to change his mind he did say that the free press was most important to us.

With our growth the means of informing people expanded enormously.

In addition to a mammoth press, much of great wealth, new means of informing people developed and became powerful, first radio and then TV. We also developed large, some very large scholarly and research institutions employing those educationally and by experience well prepared for the most difficult and detailed studies and for reporting on them.

Reporters and their editors were much better educated than in my reporting days.

When the President was assassinated we had magazines of vast circulation that brought us both news and news with pictures. Besides the news magazines that survive with massive circulation, there then were the picture weekly magazines, LIFE and LOOK, with circulations of about seven million copies weekly. There was also the influential weekly magazine of varied interests, including serious articles, *The Saturday Evening Post*.

The news agencies grew and prospered and could cover anything. They had the means of assigning well-trained and -educated reporters to work long on major stories, as any political assassination certainly is. This was also true, in a sense even more true, of our major newspapers of ever-increasing wealth and influence.

Ownership of radio and TV stations were like licenses to print money and they, too, could afford major and in-depth studies of the great subversion of that most dramatic event.

Then, too, there were all those professional historians and political scientists and all those wealthy foundations which could support them in the study not one made.

Publishing books had become more remunerative. There were many book publishers who could have commissioned the books not one was independently commissioned.

There was the semi-official The Death of a President, William Manchester's phony Camelotization, published in 1967 by Harper & Row. Although Manchester had rare privileges, like a private office in the National Archives and access to what was secret from all others, he evolved his imperial version of the official version of the Warren Report. In the course of his work he learned and reported what disproved the official mythology but in reporting it failed to inform his readers of its meaning- if he realized those importances himself. Before his book was published he and it were involved in unseemly scandals that resulted in the Kennedy family disassociating itself from him and his

book.

The "specials" of the TV networks added the Sieg Heil! salute to their ass-kissing of the official travesty. The enormous funding they had and the large and competent staffs working on them could and should have evolved at the very least serious questions for the people to know about and consider.

Into almost every home they infiltrated what was more sinister than official propaganda because most people believed that they were independent and reached conclusions independent of the official ones. That they never intended to do and they never did.

In controlled societies the people knew what their controlled media told them was what officialdom wanted them to know.

Here, with no official control over the media, people assumed that what it told them was other than the official diktat.

It wasn't and it wasn't intended to be.

And it has not been in the 30 ensuing years.

The literary agent I had before the assassination, Toni Strasman, was wise and correct when in dropping me as her client she told me that "nobody" in New York, the heart, soul and vascular system of magazine and book publishing, would consider anything other than what Washington was saying.

After Toni dropped me as a client I was not able to replace her. All who declined, and there were six in a short period of time, declined to represent the subject. This is not my opinion- it is what all told me.

Several of the largest magazines and more than 100 publishers internationally proved her absolutely correct.

So, I indict, do not brag in writing that my first book on the Warren Commission and its Report

was the first book on them.

I refer readers to my emotional castigation of that situation in the epilogue of my second book, Whitewash II.

In all the many experiences of the 28 ensuing years, in all I've learned since then, I have no reason to moderate any of what then came to me one night shortly after retiring when, awakened by it, I sat and wrote and completed writing before the middle of the day that began for me so short a time after midnight when I was awakened by what then so troubled me.

No wealthy newspaper, news agency, radio or TV news organization, no magazine that could afford it and no book publisher commissioned any critical examination of what officials sponsored us about that "crime of the century" or about what, faced with it, officialdom did.

This is an indictment, a self-indictment more severe an indictment than any critic could make.

While it is infrequently true, as Andrew Johnson said, that one determined man can become a majority, how safe and secure are we if all others fail?

What does it say of us and our institutions when it was a man of no means and influence, whose writing of the past did not bring him fame or fortune; and who was an unknown, whose only resources were himself, his wife and a worn-out old upright typewriter; who wrote the first book critical of the official assassination theory presented as its solution and then, faced with more than 100 international publisher rejections of that first book on that "crime of the century," had to publish it himself if it were to be published at all; then did just that when he could not pay for the printing and was already in debt?

I do not boast- I indict. In a sense other than the radical Italian publisher Giangiacomo Feltrinelli asked me to indict in demanding in 1967 that I write a J'Acuse. He wanted me to charge the government with assassinating its President. I refused.

Feltrinelli believed that such a book would sell very well, would make me rich and famous.

It would have, as books theorizing conspiracies and "solutions" have others since then.

Governmental and institutional failures and abdications created the market, a market for these many fictions and frauds, hatreds of vacuums being what they are.

What is little recognized is that the official "solutions," also are no more than theories. That of the Warren Commission is well known while that of the FBI and the Secret Service remains virtually unknown although I reproduced the FBI's, with which the Secret Service agreed, in facsimile in my first book (page 195).

What is entirely unknown from what any of the major media reported to the people is that the FBI/Secret Service "solution" refutes that of the Warren Commission. Both are recorded in the Commission's records that have always been accessible in the National Archives. Once the Report was out the FBI always referred publicly only to the Commission's solution with which privately it disagreed. The FBI and Secret Service even exchanged sneering references to it. Both knew the so-called "single bullet theory" that is the basis of the Commission's solution was impossible. Each instead, and independently, pretended there had been no missed bullet at all even though each had irrefutable proof that a bullet did miss, resulting in the slight wounding of James Tague. His wounding was reported at the moment of the shooting by the police. Its broadcasts were recorded and the FBI transcribed those recordings for the Commission, which published the FBI transcripts in facsimile.

Neither agency troubled the people with its certain knowledge that the Commission's "solution" to the assassination was an absolute impossibility. And although this FBI and Secret Service disproof of the official mythology was always available to the major media, as was the FBI's in facsimile in the very first book on the subject, the major media, too, did not trouble the people with that disquieting news. It

preferred to extol the official mythology as the unquestionable truth, which is what it did.

Well-known reporters working for major newspapers and TV networks worked in those files at the Archives day after day beginning in the middle of 1966, after my first book was out. More than once I drove some of them to their offices when we left the Archives at days' working end. Those files have been worked in ever since, as those who have seen the TV spectacles should recall. This continuing work in those files is also reflected in what the major newspapers published.

But that these top national police agencies disproved the Commission's official mythology they did not report.

Many people believe these conspiracy-theory "solutions." Others rejected them, as they should. To those who know the established fact they lack any credibility at all.

It is not possible to read and understand the Warren Report and still believe it, not if it is read with care and with thought. My first book, based entirely on it and its self-described official documentation in that massive appendix of 26 volumes, disproved it point-by-point.

(And the New York *Times*, that newspaper of record, which then in its daily book section noted "books received," refused to mention it after getting and having asked for most of the 12 copies it got. To this paper of "record" a book not published by a commercial publisher did not exist. After that twelfth freebee I asked the *Times* to pay.)

With theories on both extremes, as I wrote in the *Washington Post* (op-ed December 19, 1991):

"What gets lost in all this controversy is that there is a middle ground. I confess loneliness in my occupancy of it. It is the ground that finds the Commission failed us and proves this with fact and official documentation. It also finds that the proliferating conspiracy theories mislead and confuse as much or more than the failed official conclusions."

There is my confession of a different nature I made above. We all erred. We all

failed."

It should be understood that whether or not there was a conspiracy to kill the President is not and cannot be established by theories. "Conspiracy theories" are not factual although those who spawn them pretend they are. Whether or not there was a conspiracy is and can only be a matter of fact, not of theory.

These proliferated pretended solutions that are theories, as of this writing soon to proliferate even more, publishers have learned that goosey as they are they are still golden eggs, so publishers eschew established fact- of which most authors are ignorant in any event. Their fantasies cannot survive the light of established fact.

Where the theories pretend to be based on fact, they are not. What oozes from the murk of their authors' minds is what they represent as fact and is no such thing, as with specifics we shall see with some.

The now available official records are of such great volume that the volume itself frustrates real study of them. This need be said in limited defense of those who invent these theories and misrepresent them as fact. Not infrequently those who produce this disinformation are rewarded by the considerable income from the ready market reached by the greedy publishers who publish nothing else and reflect no real interest other than the money they make from deceiving and misleading the people.

There now is a massive amount of official information available. The first official information available was in the Warren Report only. That was followed two months later with those 26 large volumes of appendix, 15 of testimony and 11 of exhibits. Then we had some access to what the Commission did not publish, at the Archives. The volume of the Kennedy assassination archive then was an estimated 200 cubic feet. Then by a series of FOIA lawsuits I obtained about a third of a

million pages. This since has been added to by others. Mark Allen and his lawyer Jim Lesar in particular have rescued much from official oblivion. Without what is now available from other sources and in other deposits, the volume of information is simply enormous. The enormity alone defies meaningful access to the information.

A reported million pages were made available beginning in August, 1993, in response to the 1992 law requiring the disclosure of all JFK assassination records, all that is not prohibited by some law or probative regulation.

Besides which, most of the so-called information is not relevant to the crime or its official investigations.

The FBI's answer to almost anything is statistics and the Commission exploited those misleading FBI statistics to give its Report credibility. Most of what the FBI gathered and reported on is just plain junk. Countless interviews with people who had no relevant knowledge at all, all dumped in great volume on the Commission and its staff already intimidated by the FBI's leaked and widely reported and credited "solution" that was, in its fabled founding directors own words to William Manchester, an instant vision he had the afternoon of the assassination, before the new President directed him to investigate and report on it.

Hoover's great wisdom and admission of his instant vision were recorded for him and the FBI's records by his omnipresent note-taker, then assistant director Cartha DeLoach, head of the Bureau's "Crime Records Division." He was also its leaker-in-chief, in addition to other functions having nothing to do with "crime records."

DeLoach prepared a memo on that interview on June 4, 1964. In form it was addressed to DeLoach's immediate superior, John P. Mohr. His title was "assistant to the director." The copy I have

is not the FBI's record copy. It is a duplicate or a "not recorded" copy from its main JFK assassination file, 62-109060.

The original, the "recorded" copy, is hidden in a special file the FBI steadfastly refused to search for me. Its classification number is 94. Its title is "Research Matters." The FBI steadfastly claimed that "research matters" are outside the records within FOIA. While that is not true, the FBI did get away with it. Duplicates I obtained from other files disclose that as "research matters" the FBI hid records of its leaking, of its propaganda, of its keeping track on the media and its "enemies" and even of its more polite blackmail. Some of its records relating to its relations with the Congress are also stashed away in that special vast 94 file of supposed "research matters" used so extensively for the DeLoach operations.

No internal FBI record ever addressed Hoover directly. All FBI records to headquarters are addressed to "the Director." Every paper intended for him went to him through channels, to the person next higher in authority than the author of the paper. He then directed it to the one next above him in rank. Thus DeLoach addressed his report on Hoover's Manchester interview to John P. Mohr, then Assistant to the Director. Of the six copies originally made, only two were for assistant directors. Two were to FBI propaganda functionaries and two went to secretaries.

While since 1964 the volume of the available official records has been great and increased yearly and although most of them are trash, they are not entirely inaccessible and are not all are of trash, but even if they were, those who assume the responsibility of writing about the subject have the responsibility of at least not ignoring them.

Without any exception, all these theoreticians are in various degrees ignorant of them and their content. Most know nothing about them at all. Not one has ever made an effort to make any real examination of them.

One effect is that they need suffer no discomfort from the knowledge they do not have, that the established assassination fact disproves their financially rewarding Keystone Koppery.

All of the quarter of a million pages of these JFK assassination records I have along with those on the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., the total is of about a third of a million pages, have always been freely available to all writing about our political assassinations.

In fact, because of my physical limitations and disabilities, this means they have unsupervised access to all those records and to what I have done with them and to the duplicate copies in a "subject" file. They have also had unsupervised access to our copier. What these supposed experts, and need they not be experts to write pretendedly nonfiction books, are too subject-matter ignorant to know is that there is also an index to most of the records created by the FBI in the most important period of its investigation.

(The volume of these official records requires that we keep them in our basement. My ability to use the stairs was limited when I began to receive these records as the result of all those lawsuits, so was my ability to stand still before any file cabinets. With the years I have become more and more limited in what I can and what I am medically permitted to do. However, each file drawer is labelled with its contents, by file and serial number, and each volume of records is within a clearly labelled file folder. My presence is not required to tell any user where any file is. They in fact are less accessible to others than they are to me.)

So, massive as is the volume that does to a degree frustrate access, there is meaningful access to all who write in the field and it is without charge and without supervision.

What this actually means is that those working in my records enjoy a degree of freedom not matched in the government agencies, either at the FBI or the CIA and their public reading rooms, or at

the National Archives. All agencies do supervise the use of their records and all require being told what records anyone wants to examine.

Some have used this freedom to steal only copies of my own work rather than make copies because when my only copies are stolen I lack that information and cannot use it or cite it. Of what without question was stolen, one theoretician in particular had a great interest in no copies existing, they embarrassed him that much. In the case of other thievery of again only copies, the obvious result was to prevent others writing on those aspects from competing with one of these successful exploiters of theories when he had an announced book on subject matter of these records.

But not a single one of these theoreticians who in fact are commercializers and exploiters has taken the time to make any meaningful search of any of this official information. And most assuredly, all of it is not junk. Witness my eight books on the JFK assassination and its investigations, the seventh about to be published as of this writing and the eighth to follow it.

For the use of others, who can in a sense, if a limited sense, be regarded as my competitors, I have from the first had a table and a typewriter in the basement for them to use and even supply our paper for them on it, along with other supplies, like pens and pencils, paperclips, tape, file folders and a typewriter.

None of this is boasting, either.

I try to live by my beliefs.

I believe that despite the considerable cost and effort of obtaining these records I have no personal ownership right in them. The property right I have in them comes from the use I make of them, not from possession of them.

I believe that those who obtain official information from the government under FOIA are

surrogates for the people of the country.

Although in practice it means that those who use my records are almost invariably those with whom I disagree they nonetheless have unlimited, unsupervised and unimpeded access, without any charge.

Mao may not have believed it when he said all the flowers should bloom but I practice it because that is my belief.

In this I do not distinguish between flowers and weeds no matter how noxious the weed.

None of us has any monopoly on being right or being wrong and those of us who write do not have right to impose our beliefs on others who write.

There are, of course, writers who cannot afford to come here and search for the information they seek. When it was possible I made copies for them and mailed the copies to them. When I had part-time help this was easier and these searches, copying and mailings were made.

There also were those who could easily afford it because they had the means or had advances against royalties for just such costs. But not one of them made a real search in person. For several I arranged for students at local Hood College to work for those authors, one in particular of whom there will be later mention, commercializer of an adopted and an invalid theory.

On one occasion such a student spent a considerable amount of time searching these records for the American lawyers of a foreign government. In this as in all other instances, I have not the slightest knowledge of what was copied for him and it. I know only what their interest was. That served their interest, not mine.

This situation has sometimes made me seem to be an oddball to others. Not infrequently that has been articulated, on occasion as defamation.

In a sense this is commentary on our times and on those people.

For no more than practicing what I believe, what I believe is traditional American belief- for only doing what I think is right and without commercial or personal reward or benefit- I appear to some to be odd.

We have developed into a society that is suspicious of anything not done for commercial reasons, a society in which what is regarded as beneficial is by many measured only in dollars.

That I enjoy a non-commercial benefit that means more to me than money appears not to be easily comprehended.

That, I fear, can come only from neglect of, if not abandonment of, the belief that we do what we think is right, what we think we should do, whether or not that can be measured in money. Is it not possible to believe that there are rewards more valuable than money?

Can others not see that for some of us there is more than adequate reward in doing what we think we should do, in doing what is right?

Have we departed so far from what we were taught in school and in such private groups as the Boy Scouts and girl counterparts?

Or has what is taught changed so much in the many decades since I was in school?

To this point, because I sit in judgement on others who I believe have exploited and commercialized the assassinations of the 1960s, before getting to that I have undertaken to let the reader know what I believe are my qualifications for that and for my own writing and investigating. I know of no academic training for such work, thus I have undertaken to make what were, for me, the learning experiences that, because there is no academic training for it, substitutes for it.

While to this part of this book that may appear to have the intent of being an autobiography, that was not my intent and what I have written omits much that came to mind as I looked back after all those years and all those and other experiences. It does not include some of what might have been more interesting, much that is anecdotal. Even in what I do go into, like all those FOIA lawsuits, I omitted much. My earlier reference in this chapter to "labor" reminded me of that so, to illustrate to the reader that there is much that I could have said and did not had my purpose been other than I represent, I refer here to the "labor" of all that FOIA litigation.

Some of the affidavits were of book length. I intended in them, if they accomplished nothing else in the litigation, to be a record for our history. They are in great detail and they are thoroughly documented, almost always with official documents. I did not have to do that. I did not have to burden my wife with that exhausting reading, correcting and then retyping of all those hundreds of pages in all those many dozens of lengthy and detailed affidavits, but that length is devoted to fact and making an official record of that fact was, I believe, important.

It was important too, because it was also a challenge to officialdom, a challenge that records the fact of our history and refuted the official corruption and misrepresentation of fact and was not itself refuted.

I sat, as for years has been medically required, with my legs elevated and the typewriter to my one side. That made my typing less accurate, requiring more time for correction. When in fact some of those affidavits were of book length, a not inconsiderable amount of labor with perfect typing, it was ever so much more work with all the errors to be caught and the many corrections made.

And, of course, a writer could have used the time preparing those affidavits required for writing books, especially with the great volume of documents to provide the content of that writing.

After my wife retyped and made copies of those affidavits I mailed them to my lawyer, Jim Lesar, after it became too dangerous for me to drive to Washington. It has not been safe for me to drive out of Frederick since 1977 and I have not.

After Jim read them he took them to the clerk of the federal court for filing. The clerk's office divides the filing among assistants who handle cases and who divide them up alphabetically. So, one morning bright and early when Jim appeared before the clerk who handled the Ws, he said, "I have an affidavit by Mr. Weisberg to file."

"Long and detailed," the clerk responded.

"Yes," Jim said.

"And thoroughly documented," the clerk laughed, Jim joining in the laughter.

It was that unusual a procedure.

My files on those lawsuits fill two file cabinets. They overflow into many cardboard boxes. Most of those records by far were not filed by the government. And of what we filed, most by far is these affidavits I intended also to serve our history.

In the court's files, those affidavits are available to all writing in the field, my supposed competitors. So also is all the documentation attached to them. Unless and until the courts and the government agencies purge these files they remain a permanent record. But they cannot purge my files, Lesar's and those of the others to whom I sent copies.

Further indicating the extent of this work in the form of affidavits, when most of them were filed the required paper was legal-size, or three inches longer than standard, letter-size paper.

That my purpose is not to write an autobiography is illustrated by the fact that when asked to do

that, with the cost of its publication guaranteed, I declined to do it.

After years in which we had had no contact I was again in touch with the two surviving dearest friends of my youth, Joe Labobsky, on learning how I had spent those years in which we had had no contact, asked me to write an autobiography. When I declined he said he would pay to have it published. I again declined, explaining that I do not have that kind of ego and that with what time remains for me I prefer to make other uses of it, especially making use of my knowledge of the field of our political assassinations, to try to perfect the record left for the future, for our history.

I meant and mean this also in the Santayana sense, that those who do not remember the past are doomed to relive it. That is something I do not wish for the country to which my parents fled, thus making me the first member of my family ever born into freedom.

Going back to Adam and Eve!

My dear friend Joe knows even better what it means to have this freedom. He was 12 years old when despite great obstacles his mother and her children were able to join their father and husband in freedom.

In a sense what is autobiographical in the beginning of this book serves history in recording something about me because I have done what I have done and however that may be evaluated in the future it is, as intended, a partial account of what prepared me for it.

Over the years, despite literary thievery, slander, libel and juvenile attempts at ridicule I have avoided public comment on those with whom I disagree to the degree that was possible, and almost always I did find it possible. Mostly that was because I did not want to spend time that way but it also was from my belief that even the most noxious weeds have the right to bloom. They may be beautiful flowers to others.

It is not any sudden revelation that the poseurs, the frauds, the self-seekers and the self-important, those who see themselves as possessed of wisdom, vision and insight not possessed by others, which they do believe themselves to be from their representations of themselves; the sick in mind and the arrant fools who have exploited and commercialized the great tragedies with varying degrees of public attention and financial success, are now also part of this history, an important part. I know of an excellent professional historian, my dear friend Dr. David Wrone, professor of history at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, who long has been preparing for his historian's overview of this strange collection of literary racketeers and their influence in misleading all, from ordinary people to the major media, in addition to many in legislatures. His will be the professional historian's assessment and it will be more inclusive and less personal. He is the coauthor of the only professional bibliography on the JFK assassination, Greenwood Press. He also is one of the small minority of college professors who responsibly teach any aspect of the assassination, his and way and that of two others being the politics of the assassination.

Some of the espousers of unproven theories have their PhDs and of them some do, in a manner of speaking, teach. One or two of them are among the nuttiest of those in the field.

Some weeks after it appeared, I was sent two pages from the "Book News" department of the weekly publishing house-organ Publishers Weekly, dated May 3, 1993.

That "Book News" was the coming publishers' blowout of the national mind as they in their own crass way "commemorated" the 30th assassination anniversary.

The first of the books on which it reported was an acute disappointment to be because Gerald Posner, its author, had represented to me that he would be assessing those of us generally lumped together, as we are not and should not be, as "critics" who commercialized and exploited the JFK

assassination. Not all did that. From Posner's publisher's description their book is not in any way a commercialization and an exploitation. What Random House's executive editor and vice president, Bob Loomis, really described is another work of sycophancy in support of the official mythology.

The new sycophancy that pretends it is scholarship holds that although the Commission was wrong in virtually all it did nonetheless blundered its way to what is correct.

Neither when Posner was here nor since then has he ever sought to learn whether his pretended affirmation of the official "solution" is correct, based on the official evidence, leave alone if that evidence permits what he presents as his triumph against all odds to be within reason.

But he is not alone. Not one of those authors has made any such effort, and if any publisher has had the normal peer review, it cannot have been by any who really do know what this previously-withheld evidence says and means.

But what more than any other one consideration decided me to address the JFK assassination industry is what Harrison Edward Livingstone told me in advance about his most outrageous, indecent, irrational and egocentric of them all. He kept his word. In it he claims that all with whom he disagrees or do not agree with him conspired to prevent his "breaking the case wide open" in October, 1992.

If it required being armed with a knowledge of the established official fact of the assassination he would not find it easy to break out of the mist in which he lives and works.

He could not "break the case open" with a nuclear bomb!

Publisher's Weekly's main headline on its report is "Assassination Anniversary Marked by 'Definitive' Works." The subhead is, "Several big books purport to answer the question, Who killed JFK? Unfortunately, their findings conflict."

These books are not "findings" because "findings" pertains to fact.

Robert Dahlin's two-paragraph lead concludes, after saying that "Such starkly conflicting views" as the books express "will collide in bookstores this fall... it is noteworthy that this season brings books from large houses that can afford lavish production and promotion, which has not been the case with most of the earlier books on the subject."

This is an important truth. Random House did "lavish... promotion on Posner's, the first book of which Dahlin writes, under the subhead, "The Lone Assassin." It is 'Case Closed: Lee Harvey Oswald and the Assassination of JFK by Gerald Posner (Oct., \$25, with 16 pages of black and white photos)."

Posner's title alone reflects his incredible arrogance, his sense of his own omniscience- that he is a consummate know-it-all- he and he alone has the JFK assassination Case Closed!

National hero, no less, this man who could do what no others did!

Not the Presidential Commission, with all its staff and resources. Not its national eminences who were its members.

Not the FBI. Or the CIA. Or the Secret Service.

All the great federal might and power could not do what Dick Daring, a.k.a. Gerald L. Posner did, alone and unassisted, save for his wife- and did in very little time, too! He says.

How little?

Well, it was in February, 1992 when he was here and told me he was just beginning. His book reflects that he had done little by then.

He had his work completed and his manuscript turned in only about a year later. It appeared in August, 1993, and the usual spread between submission and publication is six months.

And, according to his own publisher, most of the book is not even on the assassination.

As his publisher's vice president and executive editor Bob Loomis told Dahlin:

"At the heart of it is a biography of Lee Harvey Oswald that confronts all the conspiracy theories as it goes along. Posner takes up separate episodes as they occur in history- in Oswald's life, in [Jack] Ruby's life- making a chronological scenario in which we see how it all fits together."

All of that plus the personal investigation beyond all that federal power and all the many authors before him?

That he "confronted" all these theories- mastered and refuted them, too, in only a year, in itself is a super spectacular achievement!

What a man!

Perry Mason, Sherlock Holmes, Hercule Poirot and Inspector Morse, too- shame on you all!

Babies to Gerald L. Posner, whose apprenticeship for putting all others to shame was writing about Nazis, the subject of two of his prior books.

Tracing the histories of the notorious Doctor Joseph Mengele and his experiments on humans in the death camps and of the children of prominent Nazis taught Posner all he needed to know to investigate the assassination of a President- and close the case- in a mere year- much of which was spent in biographical interviewing.

Is there anyone more qualified to head the FBI or the CIA?

Posner's book is an ego trip by a self-important Johnny-Come-Lately who decided that the market was ready to make a book in support of the official mythology profitable and he devised as corrupt and dishonest a formula for that as anyone in the field ever conceived. It is shot through with stupid, ignorant factual errors of which only perhaps a few maybe from carelessness, like the names he gets wrong. It is also a work of remarkably brazen literary thievery some of which he attempts to hide

with tricky endnotes. Some he not only pretended was work done for him- he was even praised by many, including major media elements, for going to that cost and trouble. Even when caught at it, he refused to admit the truth. He is far and away the most unabashed and rewarded of the literary whores who sought fame and fortune from prostituting this great tragedy in our history.

When he and his wife Trisha spent three days with us in February, 1992, he seemed like an entirely different person than he portrays himself to be in his book. He also described an entirely different book. The kind of book he evolved is reflected as his actual original intent by what he dates within it, by whom he saw and interviewed before he visited us and had unsupervised access to all our files and to our copier.

For all they copied and for all he asked me about, he never once expressed any interest in whether in all those FOIA lawsuits I fought and won, in all the pages of once-withheld official information I obtained by those lawsuits, there is anything at all pertinent to his book's title in them. But then he did not tell me that title and what he did describe is not that book but one exposing the commercialization and exploitation- of which he turned out to be the pre-eminent practitioner. And the most successful.

So, he could not be truthful with me.

Like his book, Posner is a fraud. He says he is- and how Random House Hippodromes that- a "Wall Street lawyer." He spent about two years doing the most boring of drudge work, on discovery material in a major lawsuit, work also done by non-lawyers. Searches indicate that then and since then he never filed a single lawsuit, never took a single case to court! That makes him a real "Wall Street lawyer."

His book on that Nazi Atilla, Dr. Mengele, is an impressive work. But it turns out- and he

personally has given a number of contradictory accounts of it- that he began promising to take a case to court for a few survivors of the many thousands Mengele tortured and when he had collected enough for a book, decided to do the book rather than take their case to court. He has given different and contradictory versions of why he did not ever file that case. The one favored with the media after his mistitled Case Closed was out is that he could not sue a foreign government in United States courts. That is a lie. There was precedent, precedent his way, in favor of his supposed clients, including even a case in New York over which he told a law publication he would try to file the case in that district in the hope of being able to get the same judge. There was other precedent. There is no doubt that such a case could be carried forward successfully because several had been.

My book on him and his book was much longer than the publisher wanted. Case Open (Carroll & Graf/Richard Gallen, New York, 1994) is only about a fifth of what I researched and wrote. In what was not published there is considerable detail about the foregoing, as there also is about much else of what he published. It includes copies of the interviews he granted before and after his fraudulent book was out. Reading what Posner himself told the New York law publication makes it impossible not to wonder whether he took that supposed case against the German government in the hope that his clients would make his collection of what he used in his Mengele book possible. He traveled abroad and lived there extensively for that book, without apparent means for so young a man with so scanty a working history to have funded that from his record as a lawyer.

I think one also has to wonder whether Mengele's victims became Posner's victims.

Including whether they financed the case he supposedly was going to file for them and never did. Did they finance his book instead?

The Gerald Posner who emerges from his book, despite his careful and deceptive language, and

from his innumerable promotions for it, is a monster who is skilled in lying, overtly and covertly and at evading rather than responding, with his most practiced means of evading being personal attacks.

He is, as I said in my manuscript, using his own publisher's unabridged dictionary to define the words, both a shyster and a plagiarist. But that is not how he seemed when he was with us.

And, as is characteristic of most writing so-called assassination books, he is a cheap-shot artist.

But months before the assassination anniversary, Dahlen and Publishers Weekly had one thing right, in commercial terms Posner's was the book. Dahlen did not begin to report all of the outpouring of these "commemorations" of the money till. What seems to be the case is that the quest for money makes publishing anything at all on this subject legitimate. What was considered legitimate encompassed the palpably impossible, like quoting verbatim and at great length from- even what was in the mind of- the President's surviving brother what he never said to anyone, particularly not the author of those endless direct quotations from him. That was explained as probably what he had in mind!

Everybody became an expert on the assassination. The less he knew the more expert he was. Expertise was really imagination and the lack of inhibition.

This, at the time of that anniversary and at most other times presents a serious problem for the major media. It has the authors' and their publishers' representation of the authors' expertise and even honest efforts to determine the truth do not do that easily.

Very few in the major media are in a position to assess these claims and fewer have the interest or inclination.

The fact is that even those who have spent most of their adult lifetimes supposedly working the field remain theorizers of conspiracies. What they want to is for their theories to become real for their trusting readers when it isn't. With repetition the unreal tends to become acceptable to a reading public

most of whom have had access to nothing else, a reading public that yearns for answers and solutions when no solution is possible.

This is true of both sides. Despite the scholarly praises for Posner as being different, being factual and not engaging in theories, his is a book entirely of theory- and of lies. Deliberate lies. Intended lies. As was true of Belin's work on the Warren Commission, his writing, too, is, despite his contrary representations, of theory, not of fact save as he represents the theory of the Commission as fact and selectively cites its evidence. His and Posner's are non-conspiracy theories.

But gradually, over the years, more and more Americans came to realize that if any one of these books presenting conspiracy theories as fact was correct, all the others were wrong. From this more and more people came to realize that none of them told the truth, that they were all theories misrepresented to be factual.

Increasingly, thinking people came to recognize the realities. I believe this was reflected in poorer sales than were anticipated for the books that desecrated the 30th assassination anniversary. I know it is reflected in calls and letters to me.

Although no bookstore stocks my books and because special small orders are money losers many pretend my books are not available and it thus is difficult for most to learn that they exist or how to get them, I received more and more thanks for not engaging in theories of any kind and for not only being factual but in all instances providing the sources, almost without exception official sources.

Increasingly those who wrote and phoned identified themselves as not born at the time of the assassination or as those who were then very young. Surprisingly, many of those not born or too young to understand express love for JFK, and this despite the outpouring of revisionist books and wide attention to them.

There always was deep mistrust of government, from the time the Warren Report was issued. It gradually increased. When I was able to speak at colleges and universities, this not only crossed political lines- it often was more vigorous at the more conservative institutions. The issue of the assassination and of mistrust of government was never a liberal or a conservative issue from the time of the assassination on. Not among the people.

It was William Loeb, the very conservative publisher on the Manchester, New Hampshire *Union-Leader* who, after reading my first book, made the introduction that made it possible for me to get a printer when I was broke and in debt. Loeb was wonderful to me in every way. On his own initiative he even had two independent libel readings of that first book. If his secretary had not goofed as conservative a book publisher as the country had would have published it. He was one of the few I had not approached. He learned of Loeb's recommendation only after I had published that book myself.

This is how it should be, no matter how much the Posners and others who support the official mythology say to the contrary.

The assassination of any President affects all Americans. So does any deficiency in the official investigations of it. So, too, do any government failing and the failings of any of our basic institutions. And there is a gut understanding of this reflected to me from innumerable strangers. About 20,000 have written me over the years. I can't estimate how many have phoned me. But I have kept all those letters in the belief that ultimately they may be of scholarly interest, perhaps to sociologists.

What was surprising is the total absence, except from a few who know me, of any reflection of the influence of the more forceful criticisms of me in two of the more flagrant commercializations and exploitations of the 30th anniversary exploitations, Posner's and Harry Edward Livingstone's mistitled

but self-descriptive Killing the Truth: Deceit and Deception in the JFK Case (New York, Carroll & Graf, 1993). Of the many from whom I heard after those books appeared, not a single stranger asked me if there was any truth in what Posner or Livingstone wrote and said. And some of what they wrote and said was pretty nasty.

Only a few, fewer than a half-dozen, of those who had been in touch with me asked me for any comment on what they wrote and said, what in fact ranged from deliberate distortions to outright lies.

No publisher of any of the many books that commercialized and exploited the 30th assassination anniversary had any peer review. That did not concern publishers. The indications are that their sole concern, aside from potential profitability, was libel. If what was written was not within what was not under the broadened standards of the day libelous, there was no other worry. Not about truth or decency or any other such considerations. Not if it could be profitable. That was the sole standard.

The result, as became true after the first few books critical of the official mythology appeared, was a disgusting shit parade.

It is not possible to comment on all of them. There are too many.

There are a few minor exceptions. Of those referred to in Dahlin's story, Dutton's publication of my friend Dr. Cyril Wecht's Cause of Death: The Final Diagnosis, is not really an assassination book. The assassination is one of many subjects covered by that eminent forensic pathologist.

So, as in writing Case Open, where Posner is also a symbol, I go into only a few of those that had more impact from greater sales and extensive promotions, particularly on innumerable TV and radio talk shows. More people are reached by these promotions than from reading the books promoted.

I do not do this at the length and in the detail that is possible, there is that much wrong with

them.

This does not mean that others of this shit parade are any better. Some, like Mark Lane's Plausible Denial, the Thunder's Mouth Press' 1991 book reprinted to commercialize the 30th anniversary, are overt frauds. It is not alone in being fraudulent. Those other books did not have the impact of Posner's and Livingstone's. Some had only negligible distribution.

But what I say about those I use as symbols is a general truth in the field.

It is a field in which those of us who are generally and quite incorrectly lumped together as "critics," for all the world as though we are all in agreement when we are not, also failed the country while failing to meet the responsibilities of responsible writers.