

II. Posner's Nitty-Gritty Grits ^{Posner}

Q The Kennedy assassination first part of Posner's book ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ ends on Page 342, ~~It~~
It is followed by his Jack Ruby story. But not until page 321, only ten pages before
his end, does Posner get into his nitty-gritty, that fabulous enhancement of the
Zapruder ^{film} ~~and the xxxxxxxx girl xxxxxxxx red skirt and xxxxxxxx white top xxx~~

(available to him alone and the basis of his vaunted "closing" of the "case" of "the
greatest murder mystery of our time," Random House's light-hearted description of ~~ix~~
what was known as "the crime of the Century," the crime that turned the ^{world} ~~world~~ around,
that most subversive of crimes that subverted our society and nullified our system of
government.

He gets into it saying, "Beginning at (Zapruder) frame 160, ⁴⁻⁶² ~~was~~ a young girl in
a red skirt and white ^{skirt} ~~top~~ ^{was} was running along (sic) the left side of the President's
car, down Elm Street, began turning to her right. But by frame 187, less than 1.5 seconds
later, the enhancement clearly shows that she has stopped, twisted completely away from
the motorcade, and was staring back at the School Book Depository. That girl was ten-
year-old Rosemary Willis."

This should be clearly understood Posner says ~~of~~ that all of this is

Posner
This wording reflects the Wall Street lawyer in *him as* Posner the writer: there is no

trick too petty or too dirty to pull on his reader to seem to make his point. The Willis girl, as he well knows, was not "running along ~~side~~ the left side of the President's car."

She ^{*not near it*} was running parallel with it. It was in the middle lane of the street that had three lanes painted onto it. She was ~~at~~ ^{*W*} to the President's car's left but she was not near ^{*neither close to it*} it

^{*W*} or in the street. She ^{*W*} was on the paved sidewalk on the south side of Elm Street. ~~That~~ That sidewalk ~~is separated from the street by~~ ends not far from Houston Street and all that side of Elm Street from there to the west is then grass until close to the coming together of three streets, from the south Commerce, Main and Elm, to funnel through the triple ~~as~~ underpass that carries a wide expanse of railway tracks over the merged streets.

Rosemary Williams was never "running alongside the President's car and Posner ^{*W*} knew ^{*W*} that very well. After all, did he have that fantastic "enhancement" right before him?

*P*osner's gross and prejudicial misrepresentation should not divert attention from the fact that

He also knows the Secret Service would not permit ~~that~~ anyone that close to the car.

from, and clearly and exclusively from those "new Zapruder enhancements" and that ^{only} "the enhancements clearly shows she has stopped...and was staring back at the "depository building." *without the enhancements, he says, this would not be known.*

This is what Posner says he "uncovers" in his book through ~~research~~ ^{and only through} the latest ~~scientific and computer enhancements of film...~~

(his as usual understated that Phil Willis' intelligence to which we should return)
After saying that "some" believe she stopped because her father called to her,

Posner says that was not the reason:

"However, when ^{Rosmary} ~~Rosmary~~ Willis was asked why she had stopped running with the President's car, she said, 'I stopped when I heard the shot'."

At this point Posner has a footnote numbered 18.

Continuing, nothing omitted in quotation, Posner gets to his keystone; what holds all of his solution to the crime up, ^{the enhancement and to} what is new thanks to him:

The Zapruder film is the visual confirmation that provides the timing. ^{This timing} is his timing, his proof that the first shot fired, ^{he says} he said it was the one that missed, was fired at about frame 160, not the frame 210 that despite Posner's denial of it is basic to the official "solution."

He then, ^{still} nothing omitted in quoting, has another quote:

"^{In} that first split second, I thought it was a firecracker. But within maybe one tenth of a second, I knew it was ~~positive~~ a gunshot...I think I probably turned to look toward the ~~up~~ noise, toward the Book Depository'."

Who Posner here quotes he does not say. ^{It} is not the Willis girl. Ten-year-olds are not likely to be able to understand ^{that} "one tenth of a second " is. Posner, ^{instead} of telling his read ^{who} he is quoting, has his footnote 19 here.

He resumes, still nothing omitted in quoting, "Just after Rosemary willis ~~slowed~~ and started turning toward the Depository, the enhanced film shows that ~~the~~ President Kennedy, who was waving as the car ~~turned~~ had turned the corner, suddenly stopped waving."

I skip further quotation of this because it means nothing at all, as anyone who has ever suffered the embarrassment of being the one honored in a motorcade, like for Miss New Jersey Blueberry or as I was, ¹⁹⁵⁹ as The National ^B "arbecue King, knows that

one has to wave all the time, except when, briefly, the arms are rested, and it does get to be a terrible bore. Moreover, Posner is careful not to identify what he refers to above keyed to the only timing device, that Zapruder film each individual picture of which was given the official number by then FBI Laboratory Agent ~~Mr~~ Lyndal L. Shaneyfelt.

Posner resumes saying, "In addition to the reactions of the Willis girl, the President, and Mrs. Kennedy, Governor (John B.) Connally's recollections and actions confirm a shot was fired before frame 166." (Page 1 322)

Whoa, Nellie! (which happens to be a phrase as well as Mrs. Connally's name.)
Didn't Danner say, "devoid of speculation?"

And isn't Posner's speculation about those "recollections and actions" what is his only "confirmation" of that early shot, other than that still unidentified enhancements of the Zapruder film. *in those "magical enhancements" in which a fortune was paid by his benefactor Posner did not identify?*

Anyone familiar with the Warren Commission testimony to which he makes only infrequent mention ~~and then gives~~ his own interpretations, ~~without~~ ^{to which} interpretations that naturally have the meaning he wants them to have ~~rather than~~ ^{he gives} what the witnesses are known to have meant. ^{he gives} ~~rather than~~ the witnesses did.
- It boils down to that ^{he gives} ten-year-old Willis girl and the meaning of her actions from that computer enhancement and from nothing else.

With it Posner says that from one of ^{this} Governor Connally's motions, "beginning at frame 162, when the Willis girl started turning around and the President stopped waving"

is when that first ~~shot~~ ^{shot} was fired (page 16 322)

13A *Mistaking on some and in a way the notes, return is what I skipped*
For what is not relevant in any way other than adding pointless notes to make the notes impressive when throughout the book so much that isn't at all so is not sourced at all, Posner, as I omitted in direct quotation above, says that "some" ^{some} believed the girl had stopped because her father called her. Posner's footnote is Number 17, On page 553, ^{in this} that reads, "17. Interview with Jim Moore, March 9, 1992."

Jim Moore's book, "Conspiracy of One: the Definitive Book on the Kennedy Assassination, Forth Worth, Texas, the Summit Groups, 1990, 1991" is in Posner's bibliography. (Page 582)

Doesn't sound much different than Case Closed, does it, *the definitive book?*

Posner sure can pick 'em! Real dependable people like all those big name plugs say.

21A

extra space

I return to what I ^{skipped} for continuity in what Posner says about the "enhancements and the Willis girl that he broke the continuity to say, ~~that~~ to his little distraction about one of his "somes." It turns out to be one, not ~~some~~ "some," when he ^{Posner} said that "some" believed the girl had stopped running because her father called her.

"Some" is evidence? Not the "theory" Posner supposedly never ^{resorts to?} Posner's ~~note~~ note for this is ~~Number 17,~~ on page 553. It reads, "17. Interview with Jim Moore, March 9, 1992." The average reader has no way of knowing whether Moore is an authentic expert or an assassination nut. ^{He is a nut but he} ~~who~~ happens to believe, as Posner does, that Oswald was the lone assassin. That is enough for Posner, who can find few kindred souls. So, he treats

It lacks the slight validity that can be given to a theory.

Moore not like the nut he is and pretends he is a dependable, quotable source.

Attributing special importance to the arranging of those boxes is typical of the genius of those who defend the official solution no matter what.

Nobody knows how those boxes were stacked, ^{at the time of the assassination, they} if indeed they were ^{not} stacked in any particular. ~~They~~ ^{WPM: --} They had been moved from the other side of the floor for the new flooring to be laid where they had been. And as Fosner knew, if not from his diligent research in the Warren Commission records, ³³ from page ~~one~~ of my Whitewash: the Report on the Warren Report. Citing the Commission's own evidence (21H643) and testimony ⁽⁻¹⁾ (7H140) I showed that those boxes had been moved by the police as soon as they reached that point in their search. I also published four of the Commission's photographs that also show what the ~~testimony~~ ^{proved.} testimony was (pages 204-5).

But nothing as insignificant as established fact deters those determine to prove that ~~the~~ Oswald was the lone assassin.

Like Fosner,

When Moore was a ~~g~~ high-school kid in Knoxville, Arkansas in 1975 ~~he stated writing~~ he called himself "The John F. Kennedy Assassination Research and Documentation Center." He sent me a copy of a story about him in the Arkansas Democrat for July 26 of that year. He was a ~~far-sighted youngster~~ ^{umble and modest fellow}. He once wrote me that he planned not to take his high school senior year so he could graduate college in an election year, when he could run for president of the United States;

Posner's theories ~~yes, dear famous names, he theorizes, and he theorizes in open~~ defiance of the existing, proven, official evidence, although ~~speculates~~ ^{theories} would probably be closer, there being ^{no} ~~no~~ basis in fact for his ^{or} ~~argument~~ ^{that} about Oswald's ^{was} ~~presence~~ on that sixth floor at the time of the assassination ^{or on his speculation about the time of Oswald's} and his alleged departure from it, ~~are~~ ^{are} much like those of Moore in Moore's "At the Depository - The Physical Evidence" chapter. In that chapter Moore, apparently seeking fame other than as President of the United States, recounts the evidence he and his friend and helper Rick "discovered" when they got permission to remove the plywood floor that ^{was} ~~as~~ being laid over the very, very old ^{hard and tough and} ~~sixth~~ sixth-floor of the ^{during the day of the assassination} ~~original ancient~~ building. They were looking for proof about how the cartons of school books has been stacked in that alleged sniper's nest. ^{14 ft here} And, like Posner, what Moore goes for, Moore finds. In his reconstruction prior to his lifting the new floor off, he says on pages 44 and 45, they found that the "marks on the old wooden floor," from the ^{alleged} ~~sniper's~~ nest (stacking of cartons, ^{they!} ~~wer~~ "were again visible when we removed the plywood to prepare " his "exhibit." They had to have been ^{made} ~~marked~~ made the day of the assassination "since there was no way for those marks to move during the twenty-five years ^{they} they were covered over, they serves as ^{extremely} ~~xtremely~~ accurate guides for the placement of the boxes" for his exhibit.

Now because that is what Moore wanted, those alleged marks could not possible have been made by ^{any} ~~any~~ other boxes during the decades of that building's life, ^{I have many years of many stacks of cartons there. Moore} Because he required for his fame and glory that cardboard boxes that one time only make "marks" on the tough, old, seasoned hard wooden floor, by golly, ^{more} ~~he~~ found those marks and those marks only.

Yup, Posner knows how to pick 'em, the most dependable of sources!

This ~~aburd~~ absurdity not only did not keep Posner away from ~~Moore~~ Moore not draw cutting remark from Posner, as did each and every author who did not agree with the Warren Report, Posner used ~~him~~ ^{him} as a source ~~in his~~ ^{in his} ~~note~~ ^{note} when there was no reason to use him as a source. Posner wrote (page 238), "Those who study the plaza (Dealey Plaza) are not surprised by ~~the~~ ^{its} usual echo ~~patterns~~ characteristics." Any one really familiar with the Warren Commission testimony could have found a source to cite in the official information. And almost anyone is more ~~far~~ ^{far} probative than Moore! But Posner's ^{in this} note (one Page 542) is, "Moore, ^{u p. 22"} Conspiracy of One, There ~~are~~ ^{is} less ridiculous books that Posner could have quoted. But it ~~seems~~ ^{seems} he wants to mention Moore. What did he cite Moore for? For Moore's use of Commission testimony, the very testimony Posner presents himself as expert on: "Counsel (Joe) Ball then asked (Lee) Bowers if he had familiarity with the sounds coming from " two locations in the area "Bowers replied that he "had noticed at the time the similarity of sounds occurring in either of these ^{two} locations. There is a similarity of sound because there is a reverberation which takes place at either location." (page 33)

Posner in his argument makes a big thing about ear witnesses. In addition to citing Commission testimony, ~~Moore~~ Moore also says on that page, "Again, the Plaza is a vast echo chamber."

From his own ^{Posner's} representations of his own most diligent scholarship in the Commission's published information Posner had no need for citing Moore. For example, in his fourth note in his Chapter ~~14~~ ¹⁴ Posner uses a very generally ^{used} and essentially meaningless note, meaningless if a reader wants to check that source for himself: "Author's review of witness statements published in the twenty six volumes of the Warren Commission and available at the National Archives."

In itself this is an unusual statement. Those twenty-six volumes were published. While they are rare they are still available second-hand, more rarely new, but they are ^{available} and they have been. Why this reference to the National Archives? Are they not also ~~and~~ available in numerous libraries, like Posner's own New York City libraries?

On July 12, 1992 I wrote Posner, needling him a bit, "Jim Moore wrote someone who gave

"
 me a copy: Vincent Bugliosi (Los Angeles prosecutor in the Charles Manson case and a strong, uninformed and vociferous supporter of the Warren Report) apparently agrees with me (that is, Moore), and a book by Gerald Posner (sic) will be published by Random House in 1993 asserting that my solution (sic and ugh!) is indeed the correct and valid reconstruction of the Crime. Thought you'd be interested." I did not dream for a minute that Posner would take Moore seriously. ^{Moore's} ~~His~~ overweening ego is apparent in his letter, those with bigger names agree with his "solution."

of June 12
 Posner replied under date of July 16, "Received your note and found it amusing. If I knew what I believe in this complex area, I certainly would not be working so hard as I am to make some headway through boxes of documents and piles of interviews." This was also to tell me that Posner had not ~~made up~~ yet decided what he believed about the case. The evidence is that he began with a preconception and published what he began believing. 16A

~~Posner then said,~~ "I met Mr. Moore when Trisha and I visited the Book Depository during our trip to Dallas a couple of months past. He seemed like a likeable fellow. ... I am not sure how I can agree with his 'solution'." The very word scares me as I am not sure there is a 'solution' to the case. Everybody sees what they want to see."

Posner is not an exception.

Posner's use of Moore as a source and that strange footnote so general in nature and telling uninformed readers that he ^{studied} ~~read~~ those twenty-six volumes is one of many suggestions that all Posner's work was not his own and that he in fact is not as familiar with the extensive available information as he ^{pretends} ~~pretends~~ to be in his book.

He had not much more than a year for doing all his travelling, interviewing, ^{and, as we shall soon see, much more} researching and reading. (It simply is not possible for any one person to have read all the sources he cites and, where he is critical, as he is of ^{almost} all other writers) than

Moore, and there are many writers! he had to read more than the passages he criticizes ^{without reading the entire book, how could he know of what he criticizes in them?} to be fair and not to err. ^{But is that a response to this or by any means a...}

Of course, ~~It~~ ^{It} is not impossible, that those he trusted gave him much of that, ^{them} ~~the criticism and why it is correct~~ the passages he quotes and how to criticize it. There

The notes on his interviews leave this without any question at all. So does his conduct and what he was and was not interested in when he was here in February, 1991. He did not ask me for evidence in support of Oswald as the lone assassin or for evidence against it.

Of Moore, Posner said,

If Moore Posner read Moore's book and then looked him up, that says all that need be said.

and read that nonsense about boxprints

From the many thousands of FBI pages I received in those FOIA lawsuits it became obvious that the FBI has just this kind of operation, and an extensive one, in the Division it called "Crime Records." Among the non-police, non~~investigative~~ roles those agents played was putting together entire books for writers the FBI knew would welcome ^{and write} what the FBI wanted published. The FBI had its favorite writers and publications, too, and it used them effectively to ~~manip~~ manipulate and control the news and what people could know and believe.

There is more, much more, that was ~~both~~ published in book form and available in libraries. *There also was* ~~and even~~ the sensational nationwide telecast of one of the most sensational Congressional hearings of all time. But as Posner knew, people forget. Is it not clear that the famous writers and the historian who plugged this book before publication both knew and forgot about that hearing in reading Posner's book?

Yet even after interviewing Nonseko, who was already on the public record saying the exact opposite, Posner

are agencies with such interests and facilities. From its own disclosed records the CIA was the ^{quickest} first to do that and to support the Warren Report, not a normal function of intelligence agencies. Its first target was Mark Lane when he travelled abroad.

The CIA did ^{Posner} ~~him~~ an enormous favor, ^{first} giving him something ^{first} almost ^{unique} and ^{was} entirely unique in promoting his book: it made its prize KGB defector, Yuri Nosenko available to him. ~~Of this Posner says in his acknowledgements (page 502) that only~~

Nosenko can be reached ^{d/} only through the CIA because the assume name under which he lives and where he lives are believed to be essential to keep him from being killed. Of this ^{trifly} rare favor done him by the CIA Posner says (page 502) "Only twice before had ^{Nosenko} he agreed to private interviews, and they had not been about Oswald. A journalist from one of the earlier meetings had later disclosed the ^{U.S.} state in which Nosenko ~~lived~~ was living, forcing him to move. Despite the risks in granting another interview,

he agreed with the argument of my first letter to him, emphasizing his duty to the historical record. The extended time he spent with me, combined with his recall for details, was more than I originally expected."

Hogwash!

Nosenko agreed to the interview because the CIA told him to grant it and the CIA would do that only if it was absolutely certain of Posner and of what his book would say.

Bearing on this is what Posner has in his book that he attributes to Nosenko. It is frills for the preconceived writing, no more. it is certainly less, than was if there is interest in the assassination and about the real Oswald and what the KGB thought of him, that was readily available, for example in my Post Mortem, that dates to 1975.

118 → ~~With the Nosenko interview Posner~~ ^{then} ~~seen~~ says that Oswald had a rifle in Russia and became proficient in its use. What Nosenko told the FBI is that with a shot gun Oswald as so poor a shot that when he went hunting his friends gave him game to take home because he never once hit an animal.

Moreover, as Posner should have known, private ownership of rifles ^{then} was prohibited in the USSR ^{then} and certainly the ^{officially} approved hunting club of which Oswald ~~was~~ was a ^{not} member would ^{will not} have permitted rifles if any had been available, as they

18

we return later to what Nosenko told the FBI that Posner had and did not use. His reasons for not using it are so highly suggestive they need no explanation from me.

There is a further strong suggestion that Posner's is a book unofficially officially supported. Nosenko's agreeing to be interviewed at length even after his life was considered endangered by the previous interviewer was truly exceptional. It was only the third interview Nosenko granted in his 30 years of secret living in the United States.

His public appearance for the very first time, ^{on 20/20 with Posner, even} albeit with his face hidden, is not less than remarkable ^{and unprecedented. Why this great favor to Posner, to him alone?}

Why in the world should Nosenko have travelled to the New York studio just to promote a book- with which he then disagreed so publicly in saying that Oswald was not ^{and could not have been} capable of being the assassin?

As, of course, he would have told Posner in the interview - if Posner had cared ^{or been honest enough} enough ~~enough~~ to ask. But that would have endangered his book with its ~~pre~~ preconception that had to be known to the CIA for it to arrange for the Nosenko interview.

There certainly is no question about it: Nobody about whom the CIA is not absolutely certain can even get a letter to Nosenko, leave alone interview him and then have him for the first time even to come out of his secret life to promote a book ^{on nation wide TV!}

There are ample indications that Posner paid it ^{the CIA} (back and forth) that it knew he would. ^{One} ~~if only~~ ^{example is Posner's} if only in his not using the readily available information from Nosenko that was already public. The quid pro quo is painfully obvious to all who are informed and not blind in the mind.

~~Posner also has an unusual acknowledgement ^{on} at the same page, to "Peter Earnest, chief of the CIA's Office of Public and Agency Information, who has always very generous in his assistance." (page 502)~~

~~What "assistance" other than handling the Nosenko deal?~~

~~There is no CIA record I recall from my reading of the book up to Posner's pretty little girl basis for his entire book. (His handling of it decided me to write this before reading the rest of the book.) What other "assistance" ^{did} ~~was~~ did the CIA give Posner? It certainly is not information of any consequence relating to Oswald because~~

14 ~~18~~

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

The same
(502)

One of Posner's acknowledgements, on ~~the~~ ⁽⁵⁰²⁾ page as his thanks to Nosenko but separated from it ^{and} in a sentence that has no apparent connection with it, is to the CIA:

"A special thanks to both Cynthia Wegmann, Esq. New Orleans, who allowed me to review her father's voluminous papers on the Garrison case, and to Peter Earnest, chief of the CIA Office of Public and Agency Information, who was ~~is~~ always generous in his assistance."

"Always?" In more than making Nosenko available? In connection with "the Garrison case?"

That "case," except to government agencies like the CIA and the FBI, was not "the Garrison case." It was the Clay Shaw case. Garrison had charged Shaw with conspiring to kill JFK. He had so little evidence that the jury, which believed there had been a conspiracy, found Shaw not guilty in less than an hour. There were unproven allegations published abroad that I reported in Max Oswald in New Orleans that Shaw was CIA. (page 248)

Why does Posner have these unusual formulations, unusual for a writer and unusual for a lawyer, ~~ref~~ referring to Edward Wegmann's records of his defense of Clay Shaw, chief of whose defense counsel he was, not as the Shaw case but as the Garrison case? And why does he bracket this with the CIA by thanking both in the same sentence.

Why, too, should Cynthia Wegmann have trusted Posner, been certain that he was writing a book in accord with her father's beliefs? What kind of assurances could he have given her and from whom that persuaded her to grant Posner that also unique favor?

and the "enhancement" basis for his book,

It was when I came to Posner's writing about the Willis girl that I decided to do this writing and began it. Among the reasons is that it is the entire basis for the book, that little girl and those "enhancements," and how Posner handled it. Up to that point, which is only a few pages from the end of the assassination first part of Posner's book, I recall no use of any record that ^{*is attributed to*} seems to be from the CIA and I am certain that in his notes Posner cites not a single thing he got from the CIA. Why then does he bracket his thanks to the ^{*daughter*} ~~daughter~~ of Clay Shaw's chief defense counsel with his thanks to the

and to whom he attributes not a single record;)
 CIA official with whom he dealt, and why that ~~man~~ "always generous in his assistance"
 as coming
 when there is not a single citation of any information from the CIA's public office and
 when his book reflects not a single record coming from that office of from that
 agency?

What dybbuk crept into Posner's mind and snuck into his computer when he wrote
 this?

Especially when there is no question about the fact that Posner could not
 possibly have done all the work he uses and cites in the time he had for this book.

For a single interview, if Earnest arranged that, "always generous in his
 assistance" is not an appropriate formulation.

Then there is something else that is strange. Posner knew I had done much work
 on Oswald and he should have known that I also had done much on Nosenko. I forecast
 more writing on both in what I ~~publish~~ published and he had. If he looked at the
 labels on the many of my file cabinets he spent ~~days~~ several days with he also knew,
 if he did not know earlier, as from any research at all he would have, that I filed
 two lawsuits to obtain the results of the FBI's ~~test~~ testing of JFK assassination evidence.
~~That~~ That he is a ~~lawyer~~ lawyer may not have led to his knowing that the first of
 those suit led to the amending of the Act's investigatory files exemption to open to
 FOIA access files of agencies of the CIA and the FBI. But it is well know and reported
 in the field and with minimal research, he should have known about it. He makes a big ~~thing~~
 thing later about some of that evidence. Yet when he was here he asked me nothing at all
 about it. He ~~did~~ saw and he had free access to sixty file cabinets of information yet he
~~did not~~ did not ask me for any Oswald, Nosenko or test-results information.

Posner

21 12
Posner has nothing but trivialities, nothing new of substance about him, and far less than was public about him that the CIA does not like, including a considerable amount that I had published and Posner had.

~~He~~ also had, as all writing in the field always have had, ^{free and} unsupervised access to the third of a million once-secret official pages I received after a dozen difficult costly and long-lasting ~~litigious~~ lawsuits under the Freedom of Information Act. Some of those suits lasted more than a decade. ^{case records fell} They involved more than two full file cabinets of records of these cases. The CIA refused to let me have, even in lawsuits, Oswald and other information that were to be given to the people under that law. But it gave Posner access to Nosenko. Posner and his wife Trisha spent three days here here copying whatever they wanted, and my Nosenko information is quite voluminous. ^{they did not ask for it.} Trisha's account is that they made 724 copies on our copier. Is it not more than obvious that with its consistent record of compelling those it knew did not agree with the official ~~solution~~ "solution" to the crime to sue for information that the CIA had to be certain in advance of what Posner's book would be and say?

The one other indication in the book that can possibly relate to the prized "assistance" Posner got from the CIA is a note on Page ^{Source} 511, ¹ ~~of his sources~~, "based on interview (sic) with confidential intelligence sources (sic)." Those are never possible without official approval, if not arranging.

It is clear that at the very least the CIA ⁴ knew from the beginning that Posner's book would be to its liking.

Disclosed CIA records also make it clear that the CIA's researches include precisely the kind of information ~~Posner~~ ^{especially on and about writers,} uses throughout his book. That is one possible explanation of how he could cite so great a volume of ^{work and} sources far beyond the capability of the fastest speed reader to locate and cite in the time he had before he started his writing. It was given to him.

~~We've been lectured that sweet little girl too long. Let us now return to her and to Posner's affair with her, the absolute basis of his "closing" the case." Later will be time enough to report what he had in hand and also free to be copied from my files~~

capability of the fastest ^{to} traveller and speed reader to travel to, locate, read ~~and~~ digest ^{read} and then cite in the time he had before he began writing this book.

The normal time spread between the handing in of the manuscript and the publication of a hardback book is six months. ^{Posner's} The book was on sale before the last ^{week} ~~month~~ of August, 1995. Posner told me he was just beginning his work in February, 1992. And what a truly great amount of work he ^{refers to,} ~~and~~ cites and claims to have done! ^{Yet} he had only about a year or a little more for everything, including the writing.

There is only one way of explaining this: much was given to him.

He did not have to do ^{all} that work.

The degree to which ~~this is~~ Posner's is a CIA book may be a question.

The fact that it is ^{without} ~~beyond~~ question.

At the very least, the CIA made Posner's book possible.