

Chapter 11
I, Gerald Posner's Road to glory
~~Spooking the Spook~~
"CASE CLOSED"

All hail Gerald Posner!

He has done the impossible - what had not been done in thirty years!

He solved the JFK assassination case, what the Warren Commission, the FBI, the CIA and all those other government agencies, and all the others who have written on the subject (which for almost all means more or less on the subject), those Posner critics and condemners throughout, were not able to do.

Thus, with his characteristic modesty, his title, Case Closed.

All the major media seems to agree. There is virtual combat to get him on the tube.

Even the CIA pitched in by arranging for its prize ^{secreted} and hidden KGB defector, Yuri Nosenko, appeared with Posner on the August 27, 1992, 20/20. Brokaw had him on NBC. Even Marina Oswald, who for ~~20~~ years has disagreed strongly with Posner's "Case Closed"

solution, that alone and unassisted, her late husband ^{band} did it all, helped him. *The Oswald daughter, June, was on TV with him right away.*
Media notables were so excited in advance of publication that they jewelled the dust jacket with virtually unprecedented praises.

David Wise ~~heralded~~ heralded it as the long-overdue "voice of sanity," as "brilliantly researched, ~~and~~ utterly convincing and compelling."

Frederick Dannen (author of Hit Men) proclaimed "This book really does close the case." Displaying his detailed and intimate knowledge of the writing in the field, Dannen is ecstatic because Posner, "for the first time ever, presents an account of the Kennedy assassination devoid of speculation." (Did he read the book?)

Apparently William Styron did not read Dannen's hosannah because he ^{says} Posner's analysis, "a brilliant and meticulous analysis," and one man's analysis is another man's "speculation."

^{fictionian} Stephen Ambrose is a bit cagey, although he does conclude that "This case has ^{indeed} been closed by Mr. Posner's work." (^{Saying} That it is his work is worth remembering.)

^b Ambrose must have read one of Posner's earlier books, like perhaps his Mengele.
Of what he says of that infamous Nazi doctor who experimented on human beings already.

1. Afols

Ambrose must have had one of Posner's earlier books in mind in speaking of Case Closed as the work of "a single researcher, working alone." Posner himself, in the half of his dedication, ^{that is} to his wife Trisha, says she is his ~~the~~ "partner", and two are not "a single researcher." In describing the book as "a model of historical research" Ambrose was apparently so overwhelmed by Posner's representation of what he had done and read in about a year that he did not even ask himself if that is possible for "a single researcher!"- all those interviews, all that travel, ^{of so many books, with} all that reading, ~~of~~ ^{10,000} ten million words in the Warren Commission twenty-six volumes of appendix alone besides its nine-hundred page re Report, and indexing that massive appendix too. ^{Referring to} Describing all of this and the time of the writing as a mere "model" ^{of the work done in a single year by a single m.} falls far short of an adequate description of the impossible.

Tom Wicker begins his encomium referring to all the literature on the subject, as does Posner, ~~as~~ of "one Kennedy assassination conspiracy after another," which both know not to be true, refers to them all as ~~#~~dishonest," a word that will come back to haunt, and concludes, "the case of JFK is indeed closed."

Impressive as is this indictment of all those who failed or erred, hundreds of ~~books~~ books and their authors, it was inadequate from for Random House.

2 folo

Feb 14

under Hitler's ~~death-camp/c~~ death-camp tortures, Posner said not quite "case closed" but it means the same thing. He is a ^{closer} case-closer and he admits it himself. But in this book, which Amrose missed if he ^{had} read it, Posner says his wife Trisha is his "partner." The two of them are not exactly "a single researcher, working alone."

Tom Wicker concluded his encomium that begins, as Posner's book would lead one to believe, that all the assassination literature is of theorized conspiracies, by saying that thanks to Posner, "the case of JFK is indeed closed."

That this lacks ~~editing~~ editing, as the book lacks peer review acknowledgements, nobody at Random House picked up. But then they were not the picker-uppers; Posner was.

The publisher broadened it a bit, adding "the Warren Commission (to whose who) erred." Perhaps not without reason ^{Random House} the publisher does not include the FBI and the CIA. But he ^{it} does begin his pitch with ^{it} ~~no~~ ^{out} false modesty and unequivocally by saying that "After thirty years, Case Closed finally succeeds where hundreds of other books (considerable fewer than Posner's ^{total}) and investigations have failed - it resolves the greatest murder mystery of our time, the assassination of JFK."

Of all ^{that} Random House said made ^{Posner's achievement} this possible, and with one ^{exception, "secret files,"} ~~particular~~ instance it is true of none of what Posner writes, "secret files," all but one of what Posner says comes from "the latest scientific and computer enhancements of film and evidence." ^{Posner} based his book upon is not new. What he did not take and present as his own - ^{in fact comes from something else, something not} and I know because some of it is my work - that has to do with that "case closed," alleged ^{at all new} fact of the assassination, is limited to "scientific computer enhancement of film and evidence."

Here Random House ^{also} quotes Stephen Amrose ^{as} saying what is ^{dust-in jacket,} saved from his/back-cover blurb, "Mr. Posner's chapter on the single bullet is a tour de force, absolutely brilliant, absolutely convincing." ^{We'll see. 2A folo}

~~Random House singles out "startling details from his (Oswald's), classified KGB file" as particularly significant, forgetting that ABC-TV News ^{earlier} had access to it for several ^c several weeks.~~

Posner's use of them is not quite in accord with all these ecstasies of wonderment.

Random House singles out as new "startling details from his (Oswald's) classified KGB file" as it does in referring to some of the book's Oswald content as "told for the first time by the KGB agent who handled his case." ABC-TV News had access to that ~~same~~ same supposedly "classified KGB file" and broadcast^a it months before the book appeared and that former KGB agent, former by almost three decades, did not "handle" Oswald's case. His importance is that he knew about it and for a short ^e period of time after the assassination had and read the "case" file when it was retrieved from Minsk ¹ for that agent, Yuri Nosenko, who was based in Moscow.

There is no "revelation" in the book that Posner got from Nosenko, who was a gift to him from the ~~VIA~~ CIA, as he does not tell his readers and for which he paid with his integrity.

What Posner used from the KGB is not quite in accord with all those ecstasies of wonderment resplendent in the blurbing.

3/16

6/24
2/24

His "brilliantly researched" book, David Wise's words, "meticulous," William S. tyron's, "model of historical research," Stephen Ambrose's, and "deliberate, detailed, thoroughly documented," Tom Eicker's, does not include what ^{"168" information} published from them in 1975. And Posner has that book.

Returning to those "secret files" in Random House's claim, and to what Posner learned, ~~from them~~ thanks to the CIA from "the KGB agent who handled his case," perhaps no more than the usual ^{falsity and} publisher's excess in referring to Nosenko, Posner's book says that Oswald and Oswald alone ~~was~~ ^{he} was the assassin. Nosenko disputed this, telling the ^{he shared with Posner} 20/20 audience that Oswald could not hit the side of a barn door with a shotgun, leave alone a rifle, ^{and could not have been the assassin.}

However, what Random House refers to as "the latest scientific and computer enhancements" ^{are} the key, in Posner's own words (pages 321-2), to ^{new} his "solution" to "the greatest murder mystery of all time, ^{how he and he alone "closed" the case.}

This ^{also} gets to Ambrose's "tour de force", Posner's proof of the single-bullet theory that is quintessential to the official "solution" to the crime, ^{and to Posner's}

And to a ~~sweet~~ ^{then} sweet little ten-year old girl ~~then~~, now married and a school teacher.

Posner ^{3/11/76} ~~Attributing~~ his new evidence that "closes" the case to "New Zapruder enhancements" ^{4 jobs ← 10/75}

~~He does not say whom made them or for what purpose, leaving it to be wondered if they were not made for him and maybe just maybe had been made for some official agency.~~

Posner gets right down to ^{his analysis,} ~~it~~, if that can be said of what he first mentioned half-

way through the book, including appendices, notes, acknowledgements, bibliography and ^{it is actually not until almost the end of the assassination part of his text:} index.

"Beginning at ^{of} frame 160 (of that fabled Zapruder film), a young girl in a red skirt ~~and~~ ^{top} and white to who was running along the left side of the President's car, down Elm Street, ~~Posner apparently forgot the car had~~ began turning to her right. By frame 187, less than 1.5 seconds later, the enhancement clearly shows ~~her~~ that she has stopped, ~~she~~ twisted completely ~~around~~ away from the motorcade, and was starting ^{back} back at the School Book Depository. That girl was ten-year-old Rosemary Williams.

Let us pause here to be certain it is clearly understood that ^{Posner says that} all of this ~~is~~ ^{from}

4
Abraham Zapruder was a Dallas manufacturer of women's clothes. His place of business was ^{on the third floor of} in the Dal-Tex Building. It is ~~across~~ across Houston Street at Elm, on the northeast corner of what is called Dealey Plaza. ~~On~~ On the other side of Houston Street also at Elm is the Texas School Book Depository Building in which Oswald worked and from which Posner says Oswald fired the three shots of the assassination, as ~~does~~ the official accounts of the crime. ^{(That} ~~These~~ of the FBI and the Secret Service are not identical with that of the Presidential Commission appointed by President Lyndon Johnson to investi-

gate and report on the crime. ^{known after its chairman as the Warren Commission.} ^{The fact that there are mutually contradictory affidavits Posner does not trouble his readers with.)} Zapruder, ^{safely} standing atop a concrete structure to the west of the TSD building, used a Bell & Howell eight millimeter motion picture camera in photographing what became the most important single piece of photographic evidence of the crime and the official time-clock clock of it. Motion pictures are really a series of individual pictures called "frames." That film of that era was only about five ^{six} sixteenth of an inch wide.

Zapruder ^{ced} assigned his rights to his film to the TIME ^{LIFE} publishing giant. It ^{proved} provided thirty-five millimeter color slides ^(of some of the film's original) to the Commission. Enlargements of some of those ^{frames} ^{were} made for the Commission by the FBI laboratory. They became Commission Exhibit (CE) 885, published in the Commission's Volume XVIII of those twenty-six volumes of appendix, on pages one to eighty-five, inclusive. (18H1-85). They are published two to a page. As I brought to light in the second of my six published books on the JFK assassination, Whitewash II: The FBI-Secret Service Coverup (1966) for an unexplained reason the Commission, ^{of this exhibit.} failed to publish the last nine of those frames. As the result of my exposing this, those ^{slides} ~~frames~~ were added to the trays of them in the National Archives in Washington, where they can be projected, reviewed and studied as in 1966 and ^{early} 1967 I did. ^{The Archives is the repository for all disclosed official records.}

^{bootleg copies of Zapruder's film,} Before long ~~bootleg copies~~ most of poor quality, appeared and were themselves duplicated. Posner does not ~~say~~ ^{but not necessarily} tell his readers any of this, perhaps ^(indicating) rush in the ^{wr}iting and editing of his book for appearance before it was scheduled to appear. He also does not say what copy of the film he had enhanced, whether it was the original that after scandals about the film and ^{the} extraordinarily high charged made for its use,

5
in
was deposited ~~at~~ the Archives. Because Zapruder's heir/retain the copyright ~~and assess~~
large charges ~~for use of the film~~, Posner and Random House required ^{then} permission to use
any version of that film. The more remote from the original the copy of the film used
~~is~~ the greater the loss in clarity.

A When motion picture film is projected for ~~view~~ viewing, those individual ~~fram~~ frames
are moved ^{by} with a sprocket whose teeth ~~engage~~ rectangular holes ~~razzazzzz~~ cut into
the film when it is manufactured.

What Posner also keeps secret in his "deliberate, detailed, thoroughly ~~is~~
documented" and "conclusive" book that ~~is~~ such "a model of historical research" is
that a little more than twenty percent of the image captured on the film is not seen
when the film is projected or when it is duplicated in automatic copying machines.
Keeping the this secret is an absolute essential to Posner's interpretation of what
he says is the "enhancement" of the film that is the basis for his "closing" of the "case."
In any honest examination of the film, ~~and~~ its meaning and the timing of the shooting,
this ~~image~~ twenty percent of the image that is lost when the film is projected is also
an absolute essential ~~in the timing~~ ^{quintessential} because it holds evidence not ~~seen~~ on projection.

This relates to thirty ~~five~~ ^{taken} millimeter pictures ~~taken~~ by a bystander, Phil Willis.
When he had ~~taken~~ ^{took} the fifth of the series of ~~these~~ ^{his} pictures ~~he took~~ is established
beyond question in the ~~images~~ ^{that exists} only in that part of the film not seen on projection. I
brought this to light in my second book, in 1966, ~~it~~ has not been contradicted and
Posner has that book. He raised no questions about it with me. I obtained about a quarter
of a million pages of once-withheld official records, mostly those of the FBI, by a dozen
lawsuits against the government under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) ^{in them}. There is
no contradiction of what I published in ~~that~~ chapter, "Willis in His Own Name," on pages
195-206.

This timing ^{unquestionably} is a vital element in any version of the "single-bullet theory." It
is as ~~absolutely~~ vital to Posner's book and "solution" as it was to the Commission's.

Both ignore it. Neither makes any mention at all of it. This, too, is what Am-
brose refers to as "a tour de force, absolutely brilliant, absolutely convincing."

analysis

Most of this "enhancement" Posner attributes to Failure/Associates in a note beginning on page 317 and extending onto page 318. He ~~also~~ describes ^{what it did!} its work as "an extensive undertaking involving 3-D ~~models~~ scale generations of Dealey Plaza, physical mockups of the presidential car, and stand-in models for the President and Governor, all to determine ~~the~~ trajectory angles and the feasibility of one bullet causing both sets of (nonfatal) wounds (to both victims). Failure Analysis also recreated experiments with the 6.8mm ammunition, using more updated information than was available to the Warren Commission, to further test the 'single-bullet theory' and the condition of the missile."

One thing only is clear about Failure Analysis: Posner does not say this elaborate and costly work was done for him. He also does not say in his book ^(that he says) ostensibly to set "close" the "case" of the Kennedy assassination, who invested such an extraordinary amount of money in an effort to prove that the single-bullet theory was valid and then gave it all to him, without any charge. *Who had both these interests?*

Is it right for Posner to keep the identity of ~~the~~ Failure Analysis' client secret? ⁴ Or the reason for this very big undertaking? Why does he keep it secret? He ⁴ does not even give an address for Failure Analysis, or say how it is staffed. ⁴ Can there be any client for this massive ~~and~~ and costly work other than the federal government? ⁴ Could it have been by the CIA? Do many agencies have its sources of ~~unaccounted~~ ⁴ funds the expenditure of which it does not have to account for?

Just the cost of preparing for the work Posner ⁴ describes has to be beyond all individuals ~~an~~ who have such interests. No ⁴ corporations are known to have those interests. This ⁴ seems to limit Failure Analysis' client to the government and within the government there cannot be many agencies whose appropriations of federal money need not be specified in appropriations and whose expenditure of them is a permanent secret. ⁴ Whether or not so, ⁴ it seems that the most likely client with these funds at hand ⁴ was the CIA.

⁴ If so, why in the world would it spend all that taxpayers' money and give it all to Posner? Why him or all people? By what right was it given to anyone when the money came from the taxes people pay?

8

*for his readers
created and then been silent about.*

This is a mystery Posner should not have kept secret.

How many reasons can there be for his keeping it secret?

Is the man not capable of public tanks for such a costly gift the results of which could not otherwise have been available to him ^{when this gift} and that is the very basis of his book, the wealth from it, ^{the extraordinary} and the fame and fortune, public attention that represents a license to print money for an author in ^a that book and in any that follow it?

~~Is it that his not identifying his benefactor is a condition of his getting all that work?~~

~~Can it be that he ^{dared} not disclose who his unprecedented benefactor is?~~

~~Because it was the CIA?~~

~~If it was the CIA, why did it select Posner of all writers to have the ^{exclusive} use of ~~what it paid for with public funds, in itself a dubious if not illegal thing?~~~~

~~Does it know Posner from previous relationships?~~

~~Does it impart that trust in him, ^{is} that confident that he will use what it paid for the way it wanted it used and in no other way?~~

Looking back over eighty years, over varied experiences that include those of a reporter, an investigative reporter, a United States Senate investigator and editor, as an analyst and trouble-shooter in the forerunner of the CIA, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) and on all I learned of in and as a result of those occupations and on all the reading of a long lifetime, I cannot recall anything at all like this truly extraordinary and unprecedented gift of all that expensive work the purpose of which is also ^{is kept} a secret from Posner's readers.

Or was it a gift?

~~As writers should think, did he sell his soul for it?~~

~~Or did he get it because there was no doubt at all about what he would do with it?~~

~~What was wanted to be done with it by the CIA, or by any other such benefactor.~~

~~Whatever ^{indeed intolerably} the improperly secret answers may be, it is without any question at all that if Posner ever considered saying other than his benefactor wanted to be said, and I know of no reason even to suspect that he did, once he took all of this free he was ^{is} bound to use it as his benefactor wanted.~~

Extra space
is

There ~~are~~, as we shall see, and extraordinary number of questions about this book. Perceiving most of these questions requires detailed knowledge of the fact of the assassination of President Kennedy and its official investigations and of the literature. There also are many obvious questions, obvious to the kind of critical reading those asked to endorse a book might be expected to give it before vesting their reputations in it or risk having their reputations misused to endorse a bad book, one that deceives ~~or~~ or misleads the people, one that, as Posner undertakes to do, has as a purpose writing ^{his version} some of our history, one that, as Posner does not hide, has as a purpose defaming others.

All ~~these~~ and other questions should have been raised in the minds of reviewers, ~~and~~ ^p reporters and commentators called upon to review or report on the book and the public attention to it, particularly on all those major TV ~~and~~ shows. And should not those who arrange for and produce those TV shows also have ^{had} questions? Should they take what may not be true to the people ~~as~~ as the truth about so important a matter in our history without making an effort to check its truthfulness?

Ought reporters, reviewers and all those involved in all those TV shows ~~then~~ regards themselves as nothing but promoters of what seems attractive and exciting and urge snake oil ~~on~~ on those who trust them?

Did any one of these many who ^wound up encouraging people to buy the book without any independent basis for knowing it is not a fraud even think of phoning some of those it is obvious Posner has some reason for demeaning and criticizing to ask any questions at all? I received no such call and I know of no reason to believe that anyone did.

All these many people of ~~the~~ influence abdicated their responsibilities to the public, ^{to themselves} and to the country. They recast themselves as mere propagandists. Posner himself discloses that he, personally, made no such effort, as decency, honesty and responsible writing required of him.

These are but some of the many questions that are obvious in any critical reading of a thoroughly bad book, a professionally and designedly dishonest book. But of all the

many questions and mysteries, none cried out as loudly for attention as ^{Posner's} ~~the~~ almost amateurish obscuring of where he got what without it he would have no book at all, this Failure Analysis Associates quite costly work.

Should not any mature mind has wondered why he makes a mystery of this?

Should not the obviousness with which he makes a mystery of it not have raised additional questions, the most basic questions when without it he has nothing but a diatribe that in itself should have raised questions?

There is also the mystery that is in itself commentary on what has happened to our major media, to those who let the people know what is happening in their lives and to their country, why not one of these men of outstanding reputation did not ask a single question about the work done by Failure Analysis or its purpose - even whether Posner's is an honest representation of it.

All those reviewers, reporters and many TV and radio people also should have been other than propagandists and should have asked this same and very obvious questions, *as well as other obvious questions.*

Nothing more was required than a phone call to Failure Analysis, ^{or} ~~to~~ Posner or his publisher, *Random House.*

Yet there is no indication that any one of these professional ^communicators did that simple thing.

Well, there is no mystery about it, other than why all these these many communicators failed to meet their personal and professional responsibilities.

SA, in due time, we shall see.

In seeing this we shall also see that among the many communicators, ~~if~~ some of whom are paid more than highly-paid corporate executives, there was not one with the perceptiveness of the little boy in the fable who told the emperor ^{garments of} his/fabulous ~~rich~~ beauty did not exist and that he was naked.

This raises still another question, what does all this say of the ^{state of} "fourth estate," of the nation and of its future?

#

Because of Posner's failure to identify Failure Associates' client, deliberate on his part, not an oversight, as his own words leave without any question at all, one is left to wonder who could possibly have wanted such a job and was able and willing to pay for it. The most obvious possibilities are the CIA and the American Bar Association.

Lee-this precedes handling of CIA as the client. Below follows the lit part

If it were not the CIA, perhaps it was the American Bar Association for its 1992 supposed legal study for its session on "The Trial of Lee Harvey Oswald."

If so, this makes the association parti pris in the controversy because it would have sought and obtained a detailed scientific mumbo-jumbo of a nature that ~~prohibited~~ ^{precluded} what the bar more than all others should have insisted upon, what the authority Wigmore ~~described~~ described as the greatest engine for establish truth, cross-examination. (This, of course, is also true of Posner's use of it.) There is no possibility at all that the lawyers representing the defense could have known what was required to cross-examine those who prepared that misrepresentation by computer of the known actualities.

This means that at each and every point the bar association was not a neutral like a judge but was a partisan. This also means that it was all over again in permitting its use in so partisan a book.

= That puts the bar association in line with that of the doctors through ^{their} ~~its~~ Journal of the American Medical Association as partisan in the fierce controversy each ~~mag~~ should have sought to explore and have explored with the most scrupulous impartiality.

~~If~~ If anyone at the bar associatoon cared about what it was doing and the use that would be made of it, or if anyone now does, a careful factual cross-examination of this ^{computer-based} monstrous corruption of reality by one of those permitted to do such things in litigation could do much to limit the possible uses of such supposedly scientific contraptions to defeat the purpose of our judicial system, to see to it that justice is done.

S

With the sole claim to fame of his book hanging, as will be seen, precariously, in Failures Analysis, this is all Posner says about that firm.

His Appendix B (unnumbered page 473-unnumbered page 482), a graphic representation of the cockamamie theory presented as a reconstruction and ~~an~~ scientific analysis by means of advanced computer technology is grotesque and smacks o smacks of Rube Goldberh without the chutes, chains and animals, as we shall also see. ~~This appendix~~ is not credited to any source. It appears to be Failure Analysis job, but by not providing any source, his frequent practise throughout the book, Posner claims it as his own. There is not a single source note for th ese pages of obviously different y typography. There is not even a heading for it in those notes. (pages 576-7), another false Posner representation that it his work or work done for him. As we shall see in detail, this graphical mishmash melds ignorance, error, conjecture and gross and deliberate omissions to reach ~~the~~ preconceived conclusions. That intent is not even disguised.

As Failure Associates Failure Analysis Associates appears in this book perhaps "Associates" is not inappropriate in the firm name. That name, from this book, should Failed "Analysis" Associates.

