

III. The "Enhancement" of Posner's Book.

While there was a good reason for it, we have neglected that pretty little girl too long. Let us now return to her and to Posner's affair with her, his absolute basis for his ~~closed~~ "closing the case," as he put it. Later will be time enough to report what he had in hand and what was free to him that he could have copied and used from my files, ^{information} that he knew about and did not want that came from and was about ^{Rev. C. Powell,} Nosenko ~~and~~ what he had said and what he knew.

Wilt ~~is~~ Phil Willis's daughter

Wall Street Lawyer at That.

Posner is a lawyer, ^{m/} He should have told his readers most of who lack knowledge of the law and do not know what testimony really is what it is and what makes it a superior and more trustworthy source of information. Testimony ^{under oath} is what is sworn to and therefore is subject to prosecution if it is perjurious. It is in a proceeding often presided over by a judge. Testimony is also subject to confrontation and to refutation. ~~XXXXX~~

Quoting what someone wrote about what someone else allegedly said is not nearly as probative. The person quoted may or may not have said what is quoted. ^{or man a may not have know the truth} Either one could have made a mistake or had a motive not to be truthful. And there are no penalties

entailed for false representation. In addition, what Posner said earlier in his ~~book~~ ^{book} that testimony ^{of} ~~and that it is~~ ^{applies here, if} it was "closer to the event" ^(it) ~~#####~~ must be given

greater ⁸ ~~wight~~ ¹." While as most lawyers do when they are adversaries, Posner says what it suits his purpose to say ^{it} one place and pays no attention at all to his ~~very~~ own words in a different place when that suits his purposes, *what he here is quoted as saying is a basic truth*

~~That is what he did in what we address here.~~

Compare what he said with what he did in what we here address.

24 #5

that he knew about and did not want from Nosenko, and about Nosenko.

With her Posner was either ignorant of ^{the} published Warren Commission testimony he boasted about have studied so diligently or worse, he did not dare use it.

He would also have discovered, as after more than 25 years I had forgotten, the Commission did not even ^{keep the Willis' two daughters} get her name straight. They actually have ^{and} her testimony published ^{the other one, Linda Kay instead of Rosemary.} under ~~the~~ a name not her's. For a man ^{as Posner is} sadistic with words, ~~that would not have responded~~ ^{with} ~~about~~ ~~miss~~ ~~ix~~ ~~having~~ ~~anything~~ ~~to~~ ~~do~~ with the others writing in the field and the Commission, it is not easy to believe that he would miss ^{this} that opportunity to make himself look so much more important and so well informed. ^{with another of his usually politically phrased nasty comment.}

Only four pages after he gets into his key to his "closing" the case with the Willis girl he said, not for the first or the last time, ^{is a lawyer's principle but} what is quite true and what he did not practise with her and with ^{he would} quite a few others when not abiding by his own and oft-stated principle ^{did not fit with} ~~fit~~ his need:

"Testimony closer to the event must be given ^{it} greater weight than changes or additions made years later, when the witness's own memory is often muddled by television programs, films, books, and discussions with others." (Page 235)

24A

→ Writing about those "New Zapruder enhancements" for which he needed a timing ~~key~~ key, and ~~was~~ writing without any source cited, making it a clear statement that he is writing about his own investigative derring-do, he wrote, as we have seen, that "Beginning at frame 160, a young girl in a red skirt and white top who was running along the left side of the President's car, down Elm Street, began turning to her right. ^{frame} ~~frame~~ 187, less than 1.5 seconds later, the enhancement clearly shows she had stopped, twisted completely away from the motorcade, and was staring back at the School Book Depository. That little girl was ten-year-old Rosemary Willis." ^{INJECTED} It is here that he ~~has~~ his diversion for which he used Moore, that his unnamed "Some believe the ~~girl's~~ girl's reaction was because her father, Phil Willis, standing only 10 feet away, told her to stop and come back to him toward him." At this point is his footnote 17, the one ^{in which Posner} ~~that~~ attributes that nonsense to "Interview with Jim Moore, March 9, 1992."

~~What then follows this diversion and what also is the end of Posner's attribution~~

What follows Posner's Moore diversion cannot be attributed to Moore as its source because it ~~is~~ ^{following} in text after his citation of Moore as his source in his Footnote 17.

~~If~~ If he sources what is next quoted, and nothing has been omitted in direct quotation ~~of~~ ^{here notes} of what Posner ~~says~~ ^{4/} it must be attributed to another source. What he says next is:

on which his book is based.

This claim goes back to ⁴⁴ that Bob Loomis, Random House's executive editor and vice-president told Publishers Weekly's ^{R/} Robert Dahlin no later than April, 1993, before the book's publication, ^{12/} at least four months before it. ~~In~~ the ~~was~~ issue dated May 3 dahlin quotes Loomis as saying that Posner depended upon "computer and laser enhancements of the eyewitness Zapruder film."

Following what is ^{from Posner} quoted directly above, again nothing omitted in quotation, ^{he} Posner again ^{and inserts} distracts with what is basically unnecessary in the book. But is absolutely essential to what our Supersherlock is up to, using ^{source} footnotes to pretend he is citing all the sources he uses so that he can claim the work of another as his own personal discovery ^{what is} ~~is~~ the very basis of this book. ^{And he crafted it from a kid!}

⁴ ~~And~~ ~~He~~ ~~used~~ ~~tricky~~ ~~writing~~ ~~and~~ ~~tricky~~ ~~footnotes~~ ~~to~~ ~~hide~~ ~~it!~~
We have seen what information is attributed to his Footnote 18. This is what he has directly following ^{source} Footnote 18: ^{source} ^{stat}

^{include} "The Zapruder film is the visual confirmation ~~at~~ that provides the timing."

~~He has no footnote here. He then says, nothing omitted, "In that split second, I thought it was a firecracker. But within maybe a ~~that~~ tenth of a second, I knew it was ~~gunfire~~ a gunshot . . . I think I probably turned to look toward the noise, toward the Book 'depository'." And then his Footnote 19.~~

~~The can be interpreted ^{his} as meaning that this footnote applies to all quoted since ^{Foot note 19 cites his only source for what} follows what he ~~sourced~~ ^{in Footnote 18}. This means that what is not in his Footnote ~~18~~ ¹⁹ source he represents himself as the source of.~~

~~His footnote 19 is the only citing of his source for what he says after Footnote 18. This includes that "The Zapruder film is the visual confirmation that provides the timing," that very basis of Posner's book.~~

~~his source to ~~what~~ what he here writes to what ~~precedes~~ precedes Footnote 17, is:~~

"However, when Rosemary Willis was asked why she had stopped running with the President's car, she said, 'I stopped when I heard the shot*'. ^{Here} then he has Footnote 18. By this he attributes the ~~girl's~~ ^{and only not to the source cited in Footnote 18.} saying that the shot made her stop, ~~and nothing~~. His sole use of his Footnote 18 source is to the Willis girl's reason for stopping.

Then, referring to her stopping, he follows, nothing omitted in quotation, "The Zapruder film is the visual confirmation that provides the timing. ^{Posner} ~~He~~ has no indicated source for this. ^{Then} This is his own personal and remarkable Perry Masony, what he alleges ^{he discovered in} the enhancement- ⁱⁿ and only the enhancement ^{on which his book is based} ~~was referred to exclusively throughout all of this and much elsewhere means and proves.~~ ~~27/10~~

~~He then has what is basically irrelevant and gives him the excuse for another footnote that indicates he is careful to credit all others with their own work but what also can have been used to support what he says about when that first shot was fired, and for this his source is indicated in Footnote 19 at the end of the quotation:~~

~~"In that first split second, I thought it was a forecracker. But within maybe one tenth of a second, I knew it was gunfire. . . . (his elision) I think I probably turned to look toward the noise, toward the Book Depository."~~

~~He then indicates no source other than his "enhanced film" for the next ^{Posner} ~~page~~ half page ^{at} he devotes ^{what he says in} to saying that the first shot ^{This is now he turned} he ~~misses~~ at Zapruder ^{He says it} Frame 162 ~~missed.~~~~

~~He goes through motions by the President and his wife he says means that and, falsely and without citation of the page and volume, says that besides the girl and the first family, "Governor Connally's recollection and actions confirm a shot was fired before frame 166." I know that in testimony he does not cite and the one citation of Connally's testimony relating to frames he cannot use is when ~~the~~ Connally himself was shot.~~

~~Posner cannot cite that because Connally was firm in his testimony and in his belief (v Commission Volume VII, page 139, for example.) that he was shot later than Posner bases his book upon, ~~Connally's recollection from his examination of those frames before the Commission is that he was hit at approximately Frame 236-246~~~~

Posner then quotes Connally on looking over his right shoulder when he heard what

~~There is no such confirmation in that testimony, for that reason he does not~~
~~it and this page on which it appears~~

He then refers to motions by the President and his wife to which he attributes his own interpretation and meaning to make them mean what they do not mean, that they are reacting to that missed ^{early} shot at frame 162. He then says that besides the girl and the first family, "Governor Connally's recollections and actions confirm a shot was fired ~~at~~ before frame 160. ^{For} ~~So~~ this he cites no ~~text~~ page numbers ^{for that} in the testimony.

There is no such "confirmation." There is no such testimony, Posner makes it up. When Connally testified in ^{14/} relationship to ~~page~~ frame numbers he ~~said~~ ^{he was firm in saying that} that he was shot later than Posner says he was, as in Volume IV, at page 139.

Remember, Connally was alive for long after Posner was down in Texas working on his book. Posner boasts of more than 200 interviews. ^He did not interview Connally. ^Hinstead he invents what he wants to have believed and he attributes that to the since-died Connally.

After this tricky deal Posner quotes Connally as saying he was looking over his right shoulder when he heard what

Posner indicates no source other than what ^{alone} he saw in that "enhanced film" for ^{the} ~~his~~ next half-page ^{at} he devotes to saying that this is ^{how} he timed the first shot at Zapruder Frame 162. (He says it missed.)

he immediately identified as a rifle shot. Posner's citation of that testimony is to Pages 123-3, earlier in the Connally testimony *in the Commission's Volume 10* supposed

It is important to remember that in Posner's establishing of the time of what he claims was the first shot, the shot he says missed, all he has attributed to anyone else is when the Willis girl stopped running.

Now for the truth.

Footnote 18 reads, David Lui, 'The Little Girl Must Have Heard,' The Dallas Times Herald, June 3, 1979, H-3."

Long before Posner started *exploiting the JFK assassination in* this book that paper went out of business. *It's the* remote possibility anyone wanted to check *Posner on that* a story on a little girl hearing something ~~when all involved in assassination research knew that many people other than this little girl heard shots,~~ there is no newspaper library to consult. And how many people outside of Dallas have any reason to clip Dallas papers? *Other than* Those down there Posner portrays as less than dependable sources.

And who ever heard of David Lui? He is not mentioned in any of the assassination book ~~so~~ which I know.

But it happens I do remember David ~~Lui~~ Lui. Friends from New York City to California sent me copies of ~~stories~~ *that story* stories from three other *News* papers. It is not a Dallas Times-Herald story. It was syndicated by the Los Angeles Times. The New Yorker who sent me the story as it appeared in the Boston Globe wrote on the back, *for laughs*. I also have copies as it appeared in the Washington Star and the San Francisco Chronicle. They were not all used the same ~~to~~ day. Some were shortened.

When ~~he~~ *Lui* wrote his story in 1979 ~~he~~ *he* was at Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island. When he was 15 years old and a student in Beverly Hills High School, ~~near~~ he undertook an extra-credit project on the JFK assassination. He had a boogleg copy of the Zapruder film. ~~They were~~ None of them were very clear. He *also was* later ~~as~~ able to buy a set of the Commission's twenty-six volumes. Here is how ~~his~~ *what* he began his story:

"I sat watching the silent Zapruder film for ~~about~~ *what* must have been the 50th time that night. Suddenly, this time I saw something that startled me: a young girl running

If this is not scandalous enough, there is more, more that makes "scandalous" into a praise. *Not bad!*

Throughout Posner brags up his diligent and ^{personal} inclusive scholarship. He is king of the heap and he knows it all. From his endless self-praises of his ^{all-} inclusive scholarship it is obvious that he had to know about what he suppressed from his book and from his readers. *There is no reason not to limit this-suppressions by omissions* of what he had to know.

He actually ~~claims~~ ^{claims} to have read all of the Commission's twenty-six volumes but in fact he had so little knowledge of them he cites ^{of them} them as used by others and he ~~even~~ said other things that are not true. This, of course, raises questions all over again of where he got what he could not possibly have done for himself, how he could have read what exceeds the capability of the speediest of speed readers if ~~they~~ he did nothing else in the time he had for his book, like travelling and conducting all those ^{two hundred or two hundred!} proudly listed interviews.

In fact, he understated the number of words in those ^{Commission} volumes by ten times. Yet at the same point he claims he read them.

Withal condemning those with whom he disagrees. He uses his assault on Sylvia Meagher, (an assault that would have been hazardous were she still alive to repond, articulate, and passionate woman that she was) to boast about himself and the magnitude of the work he professes to have done alone and unassisted.

In the course of his attempted literary assassination of her (on Page 419) he is critical of her index, the only one available. ~~In~~ this he actually said that "the (Commission) volumes originally had only a name index...."

~~False~~, glaringly false!

Only the testimony has an index, and it is a name index. But the even greater volume of pages in the appendix do not have ^{even} the "name" index this most pre-eminent of subject scholars ^{says} ~~said~~ they have, ^{and} it is with them, ~~that~~ and them alone, in his words, that the lack of any index-other than Meagher's of course -makes "it almost impossible to work (in) effectively."

30A

(What he deems it not necessary to quote ^{is} what Meagher said ^{in her index's} her explanatory note,
 her purpose, that she "hoped" her index "will enable scholars to test the assertions
 and conclusions in the Warren Report against their independent judgement...." The
 massive Warren Report ^{is} exhaustively noted to its claimed sources and it is written to
 convince Oswald. That, in Posner's concept of true scholarship, is fine. That it was care-
 ful not to cite and thus not to direct attention to what contradicted its conclusions
 or its interpretations of evidence, that also he regards as fine. But for someone to
^{access to other than what the Report says,} provide a counterpart, that it simply terrible! What makes Meagher "a committed leftist"
 is being accurate ^{in saying} in advance exactly what would be said of Oswald when he was
 arrested and when it was learned that he had a Russian wife. He makes it plain that any
 complaint about the politics of the writer being reflected in the book depends on the
 writer's politics. If it is ~~leaved~~-loaded on the conservative side, with that view, as
 his book is, that is the way it should be. But if it is whatever he may mean by "her
 politics are clear throughout the book," her politics not being his politics, that is
 very, very wrong. What are his political complaints against Meagher and her writing?
 Such things as, his words, "she charged that large numbers of the Dallas police force were
 members of ^{of} right-wing extremist organizations'..." (Page 419) Is Posner on this plan ~~net~~
 or did he just get carried away with himself ^{and this} only true belief? It is beyond question
 that in ^{what} ~~this~~ Meagher ^{said about some of the Dallas police,} neither exaggerated nor erred and it has for all these these many ^{of}
 years been anything but secret. And when it comes to Posner's complaint (all on the same
 page, 419) ^{that} her index reflects her bias that Oswald was innocent," how is that any more
 biased than Posner's ^{the} beginning with ^{of his guilt} that assumption (and in his book systematically pretend-
 that what tended to ^{does not exist?} exculpate Oswald that Meagher did index? Enough illustrations - ^{fr} from
 all, he provides that many - of his biases against Oswald and for the government and its
 official mythology will follow. There is, however, this difference: Posner's ^{personal and professional} honesty and
 integrity will be ^{in question in his complaint against Meagher} addressed. But he makes it clear, anything and everything is right for
^{m/} ~~hi,~~ the gander, but nothing ^{the gander} he dislikes is good for the goose.)

30B

moreover

But where does he get off complaining about the alleged bias of anyone else in an index when he uses his ^{own} index not only to reflect his ~~political~~ ^{political} biases but even to argue!

With his claim that his book holds new biographical information about Oswald, ^{does} ~~does~~ he index Oswald's politics, as important as they are? No. Does he have anywhere in his index what Oswald said about the USSR or about the American Communist Party? *No.*

But he does have a listing under Oswald for U.S., denounced ^{by} ~~by~~. He also in his index suggests what Oswald was not with his listing ^{of Oswald's} "anarchist behavior."

He did not have to do any research to ~~learn~~ ^{a little about Oswald's politics} because I published that in Whitewash, my first book, where I do have a "politics" listing under Oswald, with many pages given. For example, on page 122, "Oswald's hatred of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union exude from 150 consecutive pages of his notes....in Exhibit 97 (of Volume 16, pages 283-34) he rages, 'The Communist Party of the United States ^{Oswald} has betrayed itself.'" He also wrote that ^{the U.S. Communist Party} it had betrayed the working class and of the Soviet leaders, he ~~was~~ castigated them ^{as} "fat, stinking politicians." These kind of views expressed so extensively in such voluminous writings for a man so lacking in formal education are not worthy of indexing?

It is fact, less than honest to refuse to index them? *o*

It is also less than honest to criticize anyone else for indexing with this ~~personal record~~. If Posner had ^{ing} and interest at all in a scholarly study of Oswald's writings for ^{an independent} personal record, his supposed definitive biography and had mentioned it to me I would have directed him to a file drawer of copies of his writings of which years ago I ~~have~~ made duplicate copies and filed them all ~~at~~ in one place for just such a scholarly interest, someone ^{who might want to make a} ~~who might want to make a~~ study of what Oswald wrote, not what hacks and hired pens ^{said} would say of what he wrote.

In Posner's claim to have read and indexed those massive twenty-six volumes of those ten million words

That a ~~Will~~ Willis girl testified, and with all he said about the superiority of testimony closer to the time of the event, Posner makes no mention of this official testimony before the Warren Commission. This is how his book can be as "definitive" as boasted: it finds the hearsay of a decade and a half later to be so much superior to first-person, contemporaneous eye-witness testimony ^{he} it makes no mention at all of what ^{she} Posner says is superior, testimony closer to the event. Linda Kay, the fifteen-year-old ^(7E498-9) Willis girl/eye-witness who did testify/is a non-person in Posner's definitive book so highly praised because "it answers all questions."

Where did that "originally" come for, pre^{eminent} scholar? They still have not been indexed by the government. *It has made no index available.*

~~After some consideration of the various methods of indexing the Commission's volumes~~

The balance of his line partly quoted above on the difficulty of working in the Commission's volumes gives their word count as "more than 1 million words." And here he has a note on the at the bottom of the page.

The official estimate of the number of words in those volumes is not one million- it ~~is~~ ten million. *30A here*

Posner's
His footnote containing Meagher all over again, true gentleman that he is, say he read all ten million words, and he in addition indexed them because he found hers ~~partisan~~ *biased!* From the man who write this book that is an appropriate criticism? His is the most biased, openly biased, of all books, biased in favor of the official "solution." So, "unable" to use hers, he "made a new card index." In addition to all ~~he~~ *could he possibly have* he claims to have done that he could not possible have done he also indexed the millions words? *too?*

~~Apparently, his child hood index~~ Her bias, ^{index} he pontificates, R"reflects her bias that Oswald was innocent." ~~Asd Aside from his unhidden bias that Oswald was guilty, who needed more than the Commission's own citations, by volume and page number, in the back of its report to find the allegedly incriminating evidence?~~

Or did he not read that report, either, but obtain what he uses from it from another source? *30A*

Posner's
It is apparent in this one of his many claims, to have encompassed ~~as th~~ all there is to encompass and to have ~~brought~~ *brought* much new information to light leave it without ~~question~~ *question* that his claim is to complete knowledge of the Commission's volumes, ~~from reading them and from indexing them.~~

How, then can this devote of original sources explain his using and using as his own work, no less -Young ^{story?} ~~Lui's work~~ *Lui's article* his own? How could he quote that 1979 ~~publica-~~ *note* tion or that utterly meaningless reference to the interview of ~~XXX~~ Rosemary Willis by *Narcia* ~~Narcia~~ Smith-Durk, without reference to where it is or can be seen? *And why did he cite nothing else?*

Posner does

~~This man who did~~ prate, ~~as~~ quoted above (from page 235) that "testimony closer to the event must be given greater weight" because with the passing of years recollections are influenced and change. (~~And his~~ ~~testimony~~ neither Lui's article or Smith-Durk's interview is "testimony.")

Phil and Marilyn Willis had two daughters. Both were at the scene of the ~~crime~~ with both parents and both saw the impact of bullets, as did their mother. As Phil, with whom I had a friendly relationship and exchanged phone calls and letters told ^{me} ~~me~~, Liebel called "the wrong one." Wesley Liebeler, the Commission's counsel who deposed Linda Kay Willis, "got the wrong girl." ~~It is made confusing but their testimony, the only testimony that Posener ignored, is Linda Kay's. It is brief, as Liebel told her when he swore that older girl than 15, to tell the truth. (Volume VII, pages 498-9)~~

3A

If simply is not possible that this man who read and indexed ^{those volumes} every word ~~he~~ did not know of Linda Kay's sworn testimony, ^{His suppression of it - of its existence - magnifies the magnitude of his own dishonesties and underscores his intent to be forgiven greater right.} the kind that he ~~he~~ himself said "must be given greater right." ^{and try to corrupt our already officially corrupted history even more.} The only alternative is that he lied through to "close" that case.

In response to Liebeler's asking ^{she} ~~he~~ is, she heard what she took to be shots she testified - under oath - "Yes; I heard one. Then there was a ^{little} bit of time, and then there were two real fast bullets together. When the first one hit, well, the President turned from waving to the people, and he grabbed his throat, and he kind of slumped forward, and then"-and this requires close attention, "I couldn't tell where the second shot went."

Q of Posner did not suppress this he had no look at all! ^{and} She said it was the second shot that missed and she was looking at listening! ^{Linda Kay} ~~Where was she looking directly at the President? It was a right track~~ Where was she? ^{when she saw the impacts on the President?}

"I was right in line with the sign (that said Stemmons Freeway) and the car and I wasn't very far away, but I couldn't tell where the shot came from."

Like Rosemary, she also "followed along the street with the car."

Sure you didn't see Linda Kay "enhanced," ^{so} Gerald Posner?

She testified that she "saw the President get hit in the head," too. "Actually?" Liebeler asked and she again said, "Yes." He estimate her distance from the President Liebeler translated into about twenty-feet. ^{That was close.}

Liebeler kept Linda Kay's testimony brief. He could have asked her more questions about the shooting and how she saw the victims react, for example. But neither he nor Posner wanted that.

Like Liebeler, Posner could have spoken to Mrs. Marilyn Willis. She was right there, near her girls, also looking at the President when the shots hit him. Would not one ordinarily believe that an older and more experienced person would be a better witness than a child (unless, of course, the child is "enhanceable")?

From what Phil Willis told me and I have in a memo, ~~omit~~ the testimony on the shooting that his wife and older daughter would have given was that the President's fatal wound was from the front.

The testimony of either would have presented an impossible situation to the Commission as it would have to Posner, for the same reason to both. It would, if not ignored, have made impossible the ~~lone~~ ^{lone}-assassin preconception of the Warren Commission and of Posner's preconceived ~~smah~~ ^s book that so "definitively" and all those other many encomiums says there was only the one assassin, Oswald.

~~Oswald~~ ^{Oswald} could not simultaneously have shot from both sides.

(For those who doubt there was this official preconception of a lone assassin, proof of it is throughout my published book. I cite in particular the Introduction to Post Mortem, "Conclusions First." Being prepared for publication as I write this is unquestionable official documentation of it in NEVER AGAIN! That book begins with this official documentation from the highest of places in the government.)

32-20

When Liebler repeated the ~~same~~ ^{same} questions she gave the same responses, repeating that it was the second shot she heard ^d that she did not see impact ^{hit} ~~the one Posner says missed.~~
~~Posner, who read and indexed every word, he says writes,~~ ^{these volumes} obviously ~~they~~ had to know of Linda Kay's testimony and in knowing about it, he also knew that it refutes his ~~the~~ concoction of a new semi-official mythology and he ~~therefor~~ ^{that explains why he} makes no mention of her sworn testimony. 5213

Need anything more be said of Posner and his book than he says for himself in the foregoing?

Need anything more be said about the published ^{not-fiction} not having the traditional/peer review? There could not have been an authentic one without my knowledge.

Did Posner and his publisher impose upon the trust of all: of those who wrote ~~the~~ ^{dust-jacket} those glowing/endorsements? Those who plugged the book with major TV attention, major reviews, glowing news stories?

Is there anyone whose trust was not imposed upon?

- "Computer enhancements," huh?

Isn't that how Steven Spielberg brought dinosaurs back?

~~extra space~~
Because the little understood thrust of my writing is that in that time of greatest crisis and ever since then all the institutions of our society failed and have continued to fail since then, in my book NEVER AGAIN! being prepared for publication as I write this I reprint information I brought to light in earlier books because that information ~~was~~ was from my publication readily available to one of our basic institutions, the media. I do that once again now because Posner also had that information. I know because he got it from me personally.

Posner makes a big deal of his interview of Nosenko. He does not tell the reader that the CIA delivered Nosenko to him, naturally. But he pretends that in his interview he did learn from Nosenko what was not already public knowledge. That is not true, there is nothing of any importance he reports getting from Nosenko, if he got anything at all,