

What never ceases to amaze about the major media is its capacity for not asking the questions we all expect them to ask and then not infrequently let the people know they do ask as it fell all over itself in praising Posner and extolling his book. The New York Times did this repeatedly, without any indication of making even the most perfunctory and ~~meaningful~~ superficial effort at any checking at all. Without any exception all those heaped that major paper's accolades on Posner and on his book blindly, unthinkingly accepted his word as the given word, one not to be doubted at all.

Thus in the New York ~~R~~ Times Sunday book review section, along with a glowing endorsement of the book by Geoffrey Ward, there is a box by Kathy Rose. She could not have read and understood his book without knowing that what she wrote is refuted by the book itself.

She quotes him as saying "The biggest story would have been to come up with incontrovertible evidence of a conspiracy." But the book itself does not even address the evidence that leaves it without question that there was a conspiracy, the evidence of which Posner knew and he ignores. The book is an undisguised attempt to make the case that there was no conspiracy. It is an obvious prosecution-type case and a remarkably dishonest one at that.

No competent examination of the book and its cited source can avoid the obvious, that Posner set out to commercialize and exploit the market by from the first deciding that he would write a book that regardless of the evidence would say there had not been any conspiracy.

Nor did she or any other writer, anywhere or at any time, making an effort to know whether Posner's so-called evidence is evidence, is true or fair, or proven wrong by any available evidence.

She next says, quoting him, again unquestioningly, that he "applied the same standards of evidence to both sides."

He never did that and he obviously in any critical reading of the book, the kind of reading reviewers are supposed to make of what is said to be nonfiction, did not even make a pretense of evaluating the existing proofs, not mere evidence of, a conspiracy,

While a reviewer may not be expected to be subject-matter experts, when they write as Rose (and Ward?) did about him and about the book in order for them and for the Times not to vas vast themselves in the invidious role of porpagandists they did have the responsibility of honest riters to make an effort to do at least the minimal checking with those they knew hold different views.

She then writes, "It was only after Mr. Posner, who was once a Wall Street lawyer, spent close to 16 months combing the written record and then conducted some 200 interviews that he was conb v convinced he "c 'could reach a conclusion' - that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone."

Once again she and the Times tell their readers what is not true and the most ~~mere~~ superficial checking would have told them that. But, like Posner, the Times also holds a view ~~that~~ and that view is the one he expresses. So, in prising his book, the Times was ~~defending~~ its uncritical editoial pose of 30 years.

An informed, fcritical reading eliminates the need for any checking. It is obvious from the book and its sources and his own dating of them that he began with the commerciallt promising preconception apparent in the book.

It apparently struck nobody as at all unusual that a man of his age, with the dates he published the books lised in this one, could claim to be or would claim to be not merely a lawyer but a "Wall Street lawyer."

If they had checked only the standard directory of lawyers, "Hartindale-Gubbell, this would have been an obviouslt exaggerated claim if not an overtly fraudulent one. And that, of course, would have indicated that other questions need be asked.

not
But boe a sangle person anywhere in any of the media did that simple thing, try to learn if in fact during the only two years his own accounting of his own career was in any capacity at all on Wall Streetthat could honestlt be described as practising law in that brief time he claims he spent there.

And if any had questioned the standard computer sources they would have learned that this practise fau fraud, this shyster to this day has never filed any case in court.

That, indeed, makes him a "Wall Street lawyer"!

Still not able to muster a single question, Rose writes "And he was surprised that much of the discussion of the book has centered on his account of what happened in Dealey Plaza, not his detailed profile of Oswald."

Is there any rational reason to believe that people are more interested in any account of Oswald's life than they are in the fact about the assassination of their President? Is there any reason for this not occurring to Rose, is she cared about anything other than writing what she believed the Times would like and print?

(And, as we have seen, his account of the crime itself is not his, much as he pretends it is, and his version of Oswald's life is phony and dishonest.)

Continuing the quotation, nothing here omitted, "And he was surprised at ~~the~~ how little reaction greeted his interview -the first ever -with Yuri Nosenko, ~~the~~ a KGB agent...."

Did Rose read and understand what Posner used from that Nosenko interview - with which was not at all "the first ever"? There is nothing of any real interest and nothing new in it at all. It was a shell for the suckers like the Roses, There is much more publicly available from Nosenko as we have also seen, that Posner used the interview to be able to avoid.

Any why should there have been any interest in anything Posner attributed to Nosenko when on ABC-TV, where he appeared to promote Posner and his book, he insisted that Posner did not know what he was talking about because Oswald was so poor a shot he could not hit a barn with a shotgun!

The mighty, the omniscient, the paper-of-record The New York Times typifies the major media not only in its unquestioning acceptance of every word, no matter how false or dishonest uttered by Posner.

Posner's book says what the Times has been telling its readers for 30 years, without ever making any effort to learn if there is anything else to tell its readers. So, with that book tending to cover its deficiencies, its abdication of the traditional responsibilities of the press particularly in major events and crimes, there is no attention to this fad of a book, this gross commercialization and exploitation of the "crime of the

century" that was too much for the uncritical, unquestioning, unthinking - and uncaring - "paper of record" that boasts it prints "all the news fit to print."

What this book says about Posner and his book was readily available to the Times.

If it had wanted to be other than a propagandist it would have learned at least some of that this book says about Posner and his book.

It did not have to search for what reached it unsought. Like the fact that Posner stole and presented as his own work that Of Failure Analysis - and did that with the additional dishonesty of pretending that it was unquestioned when there was the other side also presented in that mock trial for the ABA - and that Posner's version did not satisfy the jury!

In the normal course of events, this did reach the Times.

That it that was not news "fit to print."

But what this unofficial propaganda in support of the official mythology was fit for the Times' one propaganda with the same intent of 30 years standing.

The Times was not alone in this. What it did and did not do symbolizes what with only a couple of exceptions all the major media did.

Those exceptions did, however, also inform the rest of the major media/.

Which ignored it.

With only this couple of exceptions all the major media extolled Posner and his book and in that, as did the Times, covered itself for its own 30 years of abdication of all journalistic responsibility/.

While it wonders why the people have lost their trust in it!

Still an Unthinkable Thought

When Gerald Posner decided to write a book about the assassination of John F. Kennedy, he wanted to identify the issues that were still outstanding almost 30 years later.

"The biggest story here would have been to come up with incontrovertible evidence of a conspiracy," he said. "I applied the same standards of evidence to both sides." It was only after Mr. Posner, who once was a Wall Street lawyer, spent close to 16 months combing the written record and then conducted some 200 interviews that he was convinced he "could reach a conclusion" — that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone.

That is why Mr. Posner was so surprised at the reaction to "Case Closed." In the two months since it was published, he has had letters accusing him of being a C.I.A. agent or of being on the Federal payroll. Someone has taken the trouble to find out his interview schedule and to fax belittling letters to radio stations. A computer network has asked members to try to discredit the book. In Boston, a group of demonstrators gathered in front of his hotel with signs saying "Case Still Open — Posner's a Dupe."

He also has been surprised by the telephone calls in the middle of the night. Some have



BOHUSLAV RAPOSH/RANDOM HOUSE

Gerald Posner.

been accusatory, some taunting, some obscene. And he was surprised that much of the discussion of the book has centered on his account of what happened in Dealey Plaza, not his detailed profile of Oswald. And he was surprised at how little reaction greeted his interview — the first ever — with Yuri Nosenko, a K.G.B. agent who was kept by

American authorities in solitary confinement for two and a half years after he defected. But most unsettling have been the efforts to discredit him. "Perhaps my title is fighting words," he said. "It tells people who spent 20 or 30 years on the case that they wasted their lives."

Mr. Posner pondered the national obsession with the assassination. "This is viewed as the great unsolved murder mystery of the generation," he said. "It is hard for many to swallow the notion that a misguided loser with a \$12 rifle could end Camelot."

KATHY ROSE