

Mr. Jeffrey A. Frank  
The Washington Post  
1150 15 St., NW  
Washington, DC 20071

2/17/94

Dear Mr. Frank,

One dishonest sentence in Gerald Posner's dishonest complaints about your review of his most intendly dishonest of all the commercializations and exploitat'ions of the JFK assassination typifies him and his dishonesty:

"In the book, the citations to FAA's work and Dr. Fizioli's testimony refer to the 1992 ABA mock trial, which is a matter of public record." (Book World 12/12/93)

His book makes not a single reference to the ABA<sup>on</sup> to its mock trial, and what is a matter of public record is that outside his book only. But he wrote the sentence to tell the knowing lie, that what is not in the book is "In the book."

Lardner is off writing his book but Anne Eisele, who spent some time here for him and for "incus on their assassination anniversary story can tell you what you may want to know about me. Including why my typing can't be any better.

When Posner's book appeared I decided to do as complete as possible for me of an analysis/commentary on it for the record for history. Some of that is to be published by Richard Gallen/ Carroll & Graf as Case Open in the near future. I think copies may be available in April. I have no knowledge of what copies the publishers will distribute but I write to ask if you would like one.

As part of my work on the assassination, which George will tell you has not in any sense been theorizing conspiracies, I've kept tab on most of the trash for the record for history. With all the simply awful stuff that has been published and including the more successful of it, by men who have serious emotional problems, none is even close to Posner in the thoroughness of the intended dishonesty and his dishonesties permeate more than those of any other. That formula, without any peer review, had more effort behind it than any assassination book I can remember.

Without the completeness I would have liked but with specifics <sup>and documentation,</sup> not generalizations, what I wrote comes to more than 200,000 words. It is that deliberately dishonest.

He did not crib from ~~the~~ Failure Analysis alone. He even cribbed from a boy then only 15, and ~~it~~ that is basic in his book. For a review you did not have the time to check his noting and his sources. I did.

As Posner and his publisher claimed, the most important part of his book is Oswald as a born-to-be assassin. This he attributed to that disreputable shrink, as you may recall, Renatus Hartogs. Not only did Hartogs say the exact opposite under oath only a page or two from where Posner quotes him, he also is one of those shrinks who used his shrinkery to get free sex. That court case got much attention. If when Posner was here for three days with unsupervised access to out files and copier he had looked in my Hartogs file, he'd have seen the clips. Sincerely, Harold Weisberg *Harold Weisberg*

volvement in the co-founding of the Dump Johnson movement, to name a couple of examples, were, if Chafe is to be believed, excuses to be around young men first and passionate commitments to important issues second. Regardless of whether or not my father ever had homosexual experiences in his life, this thesis is insidious, libelous, and absurd. *Never Stop Running* is, in order to support this stunningly shallow "insight," a 600-page ode to brackets and ellipses—every quote Chafe uses must be mangled, nipped, tucked, and coddled to fit his own voice—of which Joe McGinniss might be proud. The book is as replete with factual errors as it is with psycho-babble.

As far as Ehrenhalt's own opinions, perhaps he should go to Arlington Cemetery, where he will see on a large marble slab part of Robert Kennedy's "Ripple of Hope" speech, which my father helped write. Maybe he could visit the Congress or the Senate, where dozens of the young people my father helped inspire now work. He could talk to any of the hundreds of people across the country who worked with or debated against Al Lowenstein, all of whom would tell him that my father made a difference—in South Africa, in Namibia, in Mississippi, in the drive to end the war in Vietnam and the '68 campaign, and at the United Nations.

TOM LOWENSTEIN  
Evanston, Ill.

*Alan Ehrenhalt responds:*

Alard K. Lowenstein was a man of principle, compassion and genuine accomplishment. Nothing in William Chafe's book challenges that reality, and nothing in my review was intended to. I hope that, in time, the attention devoted to Al Lowenstein's

day of the assassination until the time of her death in 1966. However, regarding her story about the honking police car, journalist Hugh Aynesworth interviewed Roberts on the day of the assassination, and then three more times during the following few months. Roberts did not tell the story about the police car in the first two interviews with Aynesworth. According to Aynesworth, after Roberts finally told the story, it changed "dramatically" with each retelling. That is why I rejected it. My reason for that decision is explained in a footnote.

(3) Frank asserts that in my discussion of the young Oswald that I cited only Dr. Kenatus Hartog's testimony to the Warren Commission, "but not the psychiatrist's impressions from 1953." Again, this is wrong. I cited both Hartog's testimony to the Warren Commission and his conclusion from his 1953 "Youth House Psychiatrist's Report."

(4) Frank slights my research for the book. He summarizes my discussion about Oswald's use of "544 Camp St." on some of his pro-Castro leaflets by writing "that Oswald simply fancied that address as he strolled by it." Yet *Case Closed* details the anti-Castro connections to that address (the Cuban Revolutionary Council), and Oswald's desire to embarrass the anti-Castro activists by using their former address on his pro-Castro leaflets.

(5) When discussing an episode in Clinton, Louisiana, where six witnesses later claimed to have seen Oswald together with advertiser David Ferrie, Frank asserts that I did not dispute the witnesses' honesty, but only found contradictions in their affidavits, "a prosecutor's tactic." Frank does not even give me credit for having unearthed missing documents from New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison's late 1960s' probe into

Oswald mock trial, they only broke new ground with the technological work done for the prosecution. What is presented in *Case Closed* is a completely accurate view of FAA's technological breakthroughs.

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

Frank ends his discussion of the FAA work by saying that the result of the ABA mock trial was a hung jury. I am not sure what significance he implies by that, since the FAA work was only a part of the trial, and did not address the question of conspiracy. I am not surprised at the jury's indecision. According to FAA's Dr. Robert Pizali, all his work proves is that a single shooter had the necessary time to fire three shots from the rear, and that the so-called magic bullet was possible. Beyond that he could not venture a guess as to whether the shooter was Oswald, or if there was a conspiracy in the case.

GERALD POSNER  
New York

Jeffrey A. Frank writes that Posner brings nothing new to "one of the most mysterious episodes of Oswald's short life"—his visit to Mexico City—and dredges up the muddy theory that there was a second Oswald. Since when is novelty relevant to his tortography? Frank ignores the recollections of the two Australian tourists who saw Oswald on the bus to Mexico and who clearly remembered him at the time of the assassination; the Cuban Embassy staff who identified Oswald; the picture of Oswald on his

shots came from the Depository, and 29 percent believed they came from elsewhere. Such selectivity is typical of his methodology.

Similarly, Posner returns to his explanation of why Oswald may have used the "544 Camp Street" address on Fair Play for Cuba handouts, and his insistence that Oswald and David Ferrie (who worked for mob boss Carlos Marcello) did not know one another. Posner is so determined to keep Oswald and Ferrie apart that he accepts Ferrie's assertion that he never met Oswald in the New Orleans Civil Air Patrol, where they'd both served. Posner had evidently yet to see the photograph on PBS' recent "Frontline," showing Oswald and Ferrie together at a small air patrol function in 1955.

As for Failure Analysis Associates, Posner acknowledges that he wanted only the prosecutor's side of what was meant as a demonstration—utilized by prosecution and defense—of computer technology. The "insinuation" that there was a "fundamental misrepresentation" of FAA's work comes not from me, but from the chief executive officer of FAA. "It's just disappointing for a guy to go around representing this work as though it had been commissioned for him," Roger McCarthy told The Washington Post's George Lardner. "I would be embarrassed, but apparently not Mr. Posner."

ENDING

*Book World welcomes letters from its readers. Letters must be typed. They should be signed and include the writer's address and daytime telephone number. Because of space limitations, those selected for publication may be abridged. Address letters to The Editor, Book World, The Washington Post, Washington, D.C. 20071.*

