

32²⁰

Posner suppresses what the CIA disclosed - WHY?

When Liebeler repeated the ~~same~~ ^{same} questions she gave the same responses, repeating that it was the second shot she heard that she did not see impact. ^{hit} ~~the one Posner says missed.~~
~~of~~ ^{as he said,} ~~if~~ ^{these volumes} Posner, who read and indexed every word, he ~~says~~ ^{writes}, obviously they had to know of Linda Kay's testimony and in knowing about it, he also knew that it refutes his ~~own~~ ^{that explains why he} concoction of a new semi-official mythology and he ~~therefore~~ makes no mention of her sworn testimony. 3213

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~~ ^{dist- 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~~ ^{assumption} 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 ^{my} 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~~ ^{does} not tell the reader that the CIA delivered Nosenko to him, naturally. But he pretends that in his interview he ~~did~~ ^{did} learn from Nosenko what was not already public knowledge. ^{From what is in Posner's book, he learned nothing.} ~~That is not true,~~ ^{all} there is nothing of any importance he reports getting from Nosenko, ^{Posner} if he got anything at all,

he used ^{to} if that interview was ^{to} anything more than sucker-bait promotional material for his book.

Those not familiar with the available fact, particularly ~~not~~ overly-busy people like those

big-name types who provided pre-publication promotional statements, have no way of knowing these things. ^{Posner and Random House suckered them in particular with the pretense that Posner got what is new and important from Nosenko, and is important}

What Posner does not report ~~and~~ he did not have to get from Nosenko because I published it in 1975, ~~is that he did not get the FBI and the CIA that the KGB~~ ^{which Posner has} in Post Mortem a book Posner has and supposedly read.

What I say there is considerably abbreviated but I also stated that in addition ^{from previously secret government records} to what I was then publishing, "I have obtained hundreds of relevant pages, seek more and will be writing about this separately." (Page 627) ^{if Posner never asked me for any of that inform. or for copies of any documents,}

With all those once-withheld records, some classified Top Secret, I should explain why I then devoted so little space to Nosenko and the information he had and gave the FBI. (pages 627-~~628~~-9.)

After my first book was rejected by more than 100 publishers internationally I decided to publish it myself. I became and remain, I suppose, the country's smallest publisher. My wife and I did all the work other than the actual printing. She substituted for the printing typesetter and I, having been taught by my friend the late Sammie (right) Abbott how to do it, did the makeup. Sammie did ~~do~~ the covers.

Books are printed in what are termed "signatures," often of 32 pages or of sixteen ^{depending on the printing press used} pages. ^{(were four pages that) (So, I used them on Nosenko. in formation)} When I made Post Mortem up for printing there would have been ~~four~~ blank pages.

Although the Nosenko content has no relationship to the rest of the book, wanting that ^{and knowledge of its availability} information to be available, even for the kissers of official ass like Posner as well as

for those with a genuine interest in trying to establish what truth could be established, ^{it was considerably condensed but it did identify the documents I used, held the essence and} I filled even available line in those four pages with information. ^{was a record for the future.}

If Posner had not been playing Dr. Faustus to the CIA as Mephistopheles, he would have paid close attention to how I began that much-condensed writing:

Coming exposes will prove the CIA withheld vast amounts of relevant data from the Commission and that the Commission knew it, knew the CIA would and did lie, and allowed the CIA to suppress those records which would embarrass it. (Instead of investigating the crime, the CIA investigated critics of the covering up. I have copies of some of its espionage on me.)

careless about his country and its future and

If Posner ^were what he is not, a traditional American writer, holding to traditional American beliefs, learning -if he did not already know it - that the CIA, for which it is prohibited by law - "instead of investigating the crime... investigated critics of the ~~war~~ covering up. I have copies of ~~it~~ some of its espionage on me - ~~we~~ would at the least have been offended. Anyone should be outraged by such anti-American, authoritarian ^{agencies. They were} behavior by the intelligence ~~agent~~ ⁺ restricted by law to foreign operations, with domestic-operations specifically preclude by law. *They were not to spy on or intrude into the lives of americans.*

Posner and his wife Trisha were here. Trisha's receipt for the number of pages of my records she copied ^{Says they got 724 copies} tallies ~~724~~ on February 13, 14 ^{Gerald} and 15, 1992. (They also borrowed and returned some photographs.) As ~~he~~ ^{Gerald} noted in his acknowledgements I "allowed him full run of " my "basement, filled with file cabinets..."(Page 504) He also noted that I grant access to those hundreds of thousands of previously-withheld official records to all writing in the field. He did not report that in fact I do not and cannot supervise those uses of my records and I also ~~can~~ allow all to use our copier.

~~He~~ ^{free access to} also makes no reference to his getting copies of these records I got only after years of the most difficult and costly lawsuits under the Freedom of Information Act. This omission is ~~not~~ ^{in them} explained by a careful reading of his notes. He pretends ~~these~~ he got those records by his own work. As a result, for all his self-described Herculean effort and all the knowledge he wants the reader to believe he has, he cannot even ~~exp~~ explain and he ~~does~~ ^{or to learn more,} not explain the meanings of the file numbers or why on some there is no file identification. In at least one instance that I notice without looking for them he is so ignorant of the FBI's main assassination file number at its Dallas office he misread the poor copy I got from the FBI and gave his readers an impossible number for those desiring to check him out. ~~Is there any other legitimate reason for such notes?~~

At the time of that writing I did have "hundreds of relevant pages" and ^{it is true} that "Coming exposes will prove the CIA withheld vast amounts of relevant data..."

I was then not able to do that further writing or to ~~expose~~ ^{expose} that "the CIA withheld vast amounts more" because as soon as I had the book in the hands of the printer I was virtually immobilized and then hospitalized for acute thrombophlebitis, a circulatory disorder that can cause excruciating pain.

The thrombophlebitis with which I began a decade and a half of the most intensive litigation in a dozen of those suits that filled my basement with filing cabinets was followed by a number of surgeries. Post-surgical complications when I was already a septegenarian imposed serious limitations on what I am able to do. The use of the basement stairs is difficult, excessively tiring and not without potential hazard for me. So, I led Posner and his wife to the basement, ^{and} showed ^{them} ~~him~~ how the files are arranged *and identified* and where each kind is located, especially those in which he had explained his exclusive interest. If he had been truthful in describing his book, he would have been able to read and copy hundreds of pages that would have made this book impossible for an honest writer. This is true of all parts of his book other than its ~~the~~ section on Jack Ruby, the man who killed Oswald. It is particularly true of what Posner says about Nosenko and the CIA and about what he says about the shooting. I filed two of ~~these~~ that dozen FOIA lawsuits against the FBI for the results of its scientific testing, including of all the evidence relating to the shooting. It was over the first of those two cases that the Congress amended the investigatory files exemption of the Act in 1974 to make FBI, CIA and similar files accessible under the provision of FOIA. ^{If Posner} ~~He~~ had been truthful I would have given him pictures that prove some of what he would be writing, ^{the writing about which he deceived me,} of which I did not know is impossible. But, obviously, Posner did not want that. If he had been interested in the ^{secret} second of those two lawsuits for the results of scientific testing he would have found the ~~scientific~~ suppressed scientific proof that Oswald did not fire a rifle that terrible day. But, again, Posner did not want that. Dr. Faustus wanted to have and to enjoy his Mephistopheles time.

Knowing I had all those ~~records~~ records and made them available without any supervision at all Posner did not ask me a single question about them. Not even how to find them more rapidly than an uninformed search could take.

They do hold what exposes one of his many ugly little services to the CIA ~~in~~ in his book.

I was not in a position to volunteer when ^{he} he would find ^{these and related} records of interest to him, ^{I did not know the kind of books he was writing} because I had assumed he was an honest writer writing an honest book because he deceived me about the book he was writing. He told me he was writing a book limited to exposing commercialization and exploitation of the assassination by some of that motley crew generally known as "left critics" and ^{on all deception of the people about that tragedy} I am all for setting that records straight.

35A The only information ~~within~~ I told him about because my impediments and medical problems make my use of the stairs difficult and potentially dangerous was information within his own description of the book he was then, as he told me, just beginning.

^{in Post Mortem} In what I quote above from the beginning of those rushed and bobtailed Nosenko pages I refer to ~~the~~ the "vast amounts of relevant data withheld" by the CIA. Is it not at this point, worth considering whether there is or can be any connection between Random House's ^{the rushing} of Posner's book into sales and promotions ahead of the announced schedule, even at the risk of losing some reviews thereby, to coincide with the actual flooding of ~~these~~ that ocean of records into public availability? The book did reap a rich harvest of free and major publicity from the washoff of the great attention to the making of those records available, ^{if "available" is the reality}

(parenthetically, I note what escaped all media comment at that time, that the mere volume of those records defied access. There were 800,000 pages in most accounts, ^{and 1,000,000} 900,000 in some, and that is a volume no individual and no even major media component can begin to cope with. The minimum cost of copies and cabinets to hold them would be a quarter of a million dollars or more. It would also require about one hundred and fifty file cabinets. Who has this kind of money to invest in those papers and who has the ^{would rent or construct the space} space for storing them and for getting access to them? As with all earlier disclosures of JFK assassination records, the government made a media event of it. The media were

not for it the first day and by the third day it as was no longer interested.)

With all this ^{I had} Nosenko information, free for his taking Posner had no interest at all. Again, if he were an honest American ~~writer~~ writer who belived in the fine tradition of American writers going back to Zenger, who established basic ~~or~~ rights for those who followed him ~~or~~ who believed in the responsibilites imposed upon us by our founding fathers, he should have been interested in a sentence on the next page of Post Mortem:

"Nosenko told the CIA ~~not~~ (not one report from which ^{can} be found in the Commission's files) and the FBI that the Russians actually believed Oswald was a ^{is} "sleeper" or ^{is} "dormant" American agent. ^{That} This was the reason for the KGB's keeping Oswald under the surveillance Posner does ^{not} report. (Such agents are also called "agent in place," as for future use)

Posner also had no interest in that. Not while he was here, not after he left, not in our phone conversations or letters - absolutely no interest. Period!

Two paragraphs later I wrote ~~that~~ "The CIA could not deny the FBI access to Nosenko (referring to when he first defected). FBI agents known to have interviewed him are Maurice A. Taylor, Donald R. ^{Walter} ~~Barter~~ and Alekso Popanovich, beginning 2/26 (1964). This is a date that would have ^{glorified} an honest, impartial writer seeking truth to take to the people or a nation that, if its ^{democratic} system it to ^{truth and} function requires knowledge. We return ^{this} to it.

~~And then~~ ^{have} Although Posner should ~~have~~ known it, I quoted from one of the Commission's executive sessions that dealt ^{of Oswald as an agent.} with the subject specifically and in general. Those sessions were so secret, classified "Top Secret", the Commission's staff was barred from them:

"The CIA knew, Dulles told the Commission, the FBI had no agents in Russia."
^{Annnday 27, 1964}

My citation is to the stenographic transcript of the session ^{that} after ^I obtained it in ^{in Whitewash II, along with other relevant documents} FOIA litigation, I published in facsimile. Posner got it from me. He had it. ^{He} knew.

So, Posner did not care about the Russian belief that Oswald could be an American agent, ~~or~~ that I had all those records he could have, or that if he had been an American agent, Oswald could not have been from the FBI. What, then, did Posner really care about? ^{Does he reflect ask my Nosenko about? Did Posner} What did he ~~write~~ write if he did not go into the possibility that Oswald might have been an American agent with Nosenko ^{What, then} in their interview? And then what ^{writes} did Posner write.

37

Not a ~~defined~~ ^{does he reflect getting} new thing that meant anything ~~did he get~~ from the Nosenko the CIA

made available to him, and ~~extra~~ extreme rarely, as Posner is not reluctant to boast ^{u about, I note telling the reader if the CIA imposed and ground rules and if so, what} about. ^{they were}

Pretending the honesty he lacks, pretending the impartiality that is foreign to him, pretending not to be snuggled in the CIA's bed (and if he had not been he would have had no book at all other than ^{by} dull and worthless rehash) he misleads the reader into believing that he tells the whole story of how the CIA abused Nosenko and why.

It should by now be no surprise that he does no such thing!

And never intended to!

^{Posner} What ^{about} he does report of this he presents as the result of his own work. That is false. Worse, he hides the secret from his readers and from those who in the future may have an interest ^{this sordid incident} (in our history and make the ^{who} mistake of ⁱⁿ trusting ^{Posner} him and his book.

With the extraordinary attention ^Random House, aided by the CIA, got for Posner's book, many traces searchers of the future will find that lead to it will be impossible to miss. ^{They} will thus be guided to a work of the most thoroughgoing, intended, ^{professional,} ~~ref-sigma,~~ dishonesty-and that in a field that suffers no lack of them.

I do not use these words lightly. Before I stopped annotating Posner's book to do this writing I found such a number of the most ^{deliberate} dishonesties I fear no challenge from him. Were they to do ~~that~~, there ~~w~~ then would be a ~~record~~ public record of what without that will exist only in private, for scholars of the future. I cannot use all of them in this book.

It should be no surprise that ^{ob.} all I can remember ^{with out searching my files-} and they are on paper ^{and} that I have no need to search ^{for them-} ~~new~~ -that all have the same intent: coering up for the official miscreants, for the CIA and for the official mythology misrepresented officialy as a "solution." ^{to that most terrible of crimes,}

[In his latter role ^{apologist's} ~~he~~ ^{Posner} adopts the new math of the ⁱⁿ official apologists that traces ^{back} to the misbegotten miseriable mess made by the House Select ^Uommittee on Assassination, the strange but major-media-accepted notion that the Commission could have been ^wrong in just about everything it did and by some ^ymystery or magic been right in its con-

(readers should remember Posner's criticism of Sylvia Meagher for her alleged political beliefs allegedly appearing ⁱⁿ ~~in~~ her book and ~~in~~ her index when we get to this, as we shall shortly.)

clusions nonetheless. The apologists always have some such convenient self-deception they, thanks to the ~~same~~ major media, always got away with. Such as when it was proven that the world's best shots could not duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald they said that Oswald just got lucky that one time. This is an area of one of Posner's most blatant dishonesties, where he quotes the official ^MMarines record as indicating Oswald was a superb marksman when the Marines officialy evaluated him as a "rather poor shot." No wonder! On his last ^Vtesting Oswald scored one point over the minimum score required of all in the military, and he was then aided in passing only by his fellow "arines who scored ~~his~~ misses at as hits.)

An uninformed person reading Posner on the impediments to Nosenko's defection and on his subsequent long-lasting, incredible, subhuman mistreatment by the CIA for close to three years would get the impression that Posner really exposed that fully. He alone, as usual, too. As usual, he again misrepresent. Cleverly, lawyerlike.

In fact, he covered that up, too! And worst of all, going back to that KGB suspicion that Oswald could have been an American agent, he not only suppressed this he fails ^{to} report its significance in what happened to Nosenko after that, such really terrible abuse he is lucky to have survived it literally ^{or} emotionally.

^{his third,} Posner's Nosenko chapter is titled "The War of the Defectors." It has ninety-nine numbered notes. Of those more than half are ^{to} Nosenko interview. It has one citation to the House Select Committee on Assassinations hearing, which is not to the CIA's formal testimony relating to Nosenko, and one to that committee's report. The reader is thus given to believe that all the information in the chapter is new and that Posner personally developed it when he interviewed Nosenko. This is also how Posner makes his contribution to the historical record appear to be. This is false. The Posner version is ever so much kinder to the CIA than the CIA's own official admission of the beyond-belief evils it inflicted on the man. Posner also ^{names} give an entirely different person in the Department of Justice ^{as responsible there} ~~for its responsibility~~ that the CIA did ^{officially} ~~officially~~. ^{38A here}

After a fancy beginning to this chapter in which he palms off the CIA's nonsensical reason for not trusting Nosenko, Posner starts to tell his version on page 36. Posner there says that when Nosenko ~~appeared at the~~ "contacted an American diplomat in 1962 (it was in Geneva, and I think that "diplomat" was a CIA person with official cover) the

38 29

CIA was immediately notified." *This meant CIA head quarters in Washington.*

What ^{Posner} he does not say here is that a year earlier Nosenko had done the same thing at the same place. That gave the CIA more time than it needed to check on Nosenko, *as it then should have - and probably did.* degree possible.

^{Posner} He says that the CIA "dispatched thirty-seven year old Tennent 'Pete' Bagley and an agent ~~officially named~~ fluent in Russian, George Kisevalter, to meet Nosenko four times in a safe house near Geneva's center." Those meetings, Posner, says were taped and the tapes were transcribed. Posner admits that the information Nosenko provided was good information. Instead of citing the CIA's ^{public} evaluation Posner, still pretending that there was no such thing, cites another book, one by Tom Mangold, ^{an} British reporter and another Faust whose book was largely provided by the CIA in return for which he protected the CIA as an institution and blamed all its excesses on ~~Mangold's~~ ^{an} Cold Warrior, his book on the then dead and buried James Jesus Angleton, who had headed CIA Counterintelligence.

Posner then says that while ~~Gale~~ ^{over what Nosenko disclosed,} Bagley was "ecstatic" / his state of ecstasy when he returned to Washington ended / when Angleton, ~~the~~ ^{the} dead ~~men~~ when Posner wrote his book, remember, "was convinced no matter what that Nosenko said, he was a KGB plant." Angleton turned Bagley around, and thus it is that ^{in Posner's opinion} in Posner's ~~opinion~~ that once again the CIA as an institution ^{is} was exculpated as were ^{others} those involved who outlived the well-known super-paranoid Angleton, ^{by Posner.}

A rather thick file of CIA records I did not get from the CIA, ~~contemporaneous~~ ^{contemporaneous} records, ^{as} give an entirely different ^{account} view of what really happened in Geneva, not after Bagley and Kisevalter returned to Washington. Those records, which it now is obvious Posner would have shunned like cholera, make it without question that ^{beginning} almost the ~~the~~ moment Nosenko turned up someone in the Geneva station started trying to persuade headquarters that Nosenko was a "plant" and should not be allowed ^{to} to defect. The reasons ^{given} were so childish in their transparent falseness that they had to be replaced with ^{new reasons no less senseless} when they collapsed on superficial examination. This was the immediate CIA Geneva behavior and it ^{was} ~~was~~ not ^{until} after the team returned to Washington, ^{then} Nosenko had to lie to force ^{he lied} the issue and he was allowed to defect.

Not by accident Posner says (page 39) that on arrival ^{in Washington} Nosenko "was placed in a nice comfortable safe house."

on the same page Posner

~~He~~ (then skips from February to June 24, when Richard Helms, soon to be the CIA's director and then deputy head of its dirtywork ^{department} with the euphemistic title of "plans", told Warren Commission chairman Earl Warren, that the CIA "doubted Nosenko's credibility." In fact, ^{and others from the CIA} Helms threatened the Commission so it would not interview Nosenko. ^{Posner} ~~He~~ ^{then writes - still on that one page, as much did Posner condense it - that} Helms did not tell the Chief Justice that since early April, with the backing of attorney general Robert Kennedy, Nosenko had been under hostile interrogation."

To refer to that as ^{merely} "hostile" is to praise it. Those with good memories that can carry them back to September 15, 1978 and were looking at TV or listening to the radio broadcasts of the CIA's official testimony ^{in the House of Representatives} on that barbarity may recall the truth. ^{unprecedented}

The truth and the fact that Posner here pretends did not exist. To puff himself and his case "closing" up he make not a single mention of the fact that most of the information he attributes to his private, secret interview of Nosenko ^(and even so much more in significance) was broadcast coast-to-coast when the CIA gave its testimony to that ^{House} committee.

^{the CIA} called a former office ^{its presents}, not a spook, back from retirement to make a close and independent study of all the records and then to testify to their content, for the CIA, as its official witness and confessor.

That CIA witness was John Hart. He testified that September day, ^{the fifteenth,} his testimony is published in the Committee's second volume of JFK assassination hearings beginning on page 487. Posner makes not a single reference to this or even to Hart's name, as his index (Page 593) reflects. ^{His reader do not learn from him. That it existed and his failure to do so, the apotheosis of blatant dishonesty led the uninformed to believe it did not exist.}

In Hart's official testimony - remember Posner's cracks about Sylvia Meagher for her supposed political bias? - identifies the Department of Justice official with whom from the first and throughout ^{the CIA conferred} as Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach.

Not as Robert Kennedy, as Posner says ^{time on one page 79}

So much for Posner's political ^{neutrality} and his criticism of others for the beliefs he attributes to them.

If this is not enough to "open the case" on Posner, more follows.

If that is not enough, let us go to why Posner ~~recounted~~ recounted the early stages of Nosenko's defection other than as the CIA's own records record it, with CIA opposition to his defection ^{partially} almost immediate in Geneva. ^{by}

Those who believe that what the CIA says can always be depended upon should read that lengthy transcript beginning on page 48. By the time they reach page 62 they may be prepared for former CIA Director Allen Dulles, when he and the other Commissioners expected perpetual ~~secretcy~~, ^{to} tell them that swearing ~~falsely~~ under oath, the felony of perjury, is right ~~and~~ proper and is sometimes required. He also said that he might not ~~have~~ tell the Secretary of Defense the truth ~~if he were still hearing the CIA.~~

①

A

If believe this needs emphasis so I repeat it.

In Posner's account, nothing happened between the time Nosenko was nested in that nice and comfortable house (it was in one of the better sections of Northwest Washington, the "Embassy Row" area) and the date he ^{here} does not give for ^{when in} "early April" when that "hostile interrogation ~~was~~ began.

But something did happen. Posner's omission of it ^{seems} to be deliberate. He got the information from me in February, 1992, when he and his wife visited us. It is in Post Mortem, ^{on} the pages quoted above. If for any reason Posner preferred not to cite my book, it even gives the numbers of the Commission's records I used in what I ^{wrote}, CDs (for Commission Documents) 434 and 451. Those are the FBI reports on its interviews with Nosenko. Nosenko, telling the FBI that Oswald had an openly anti-USSR record within the USSR also told them, as I reported ^{where} and cited above, that the KGB suspected that "Oswald was a 'sleeper' or 'dormant' American agent'." (They are also referred to as "agents in place.")

It was on February 4, 1964 that Nosenko defected and it was on February 26 that the FBI interviewed him and he told it of the KGB's suspicion that Oswald was an American agent. (Post Mortem, page 627)

The CIA did not have to be told, as its former director, Allen Dulles, told his fellow Warren Commissioners, that the FBI had no agents in Russia. (Post Mortem, page 628) But if for some reason not apparent Posner had to be told, he had in it Post Mortem and he had in in the facsimile reproduction of that ^{January 27, 1964} Top Secret Commission executive session ^{transcript} in Whitewash IV. ^{40 + here}

So, in the unclosed case against Posner, he suppressed ^{these significant} the facts and misrepresented them even to indulge his own politics. ^{side from protecting the CIA in it all,} he omitted what my files to which he had access also show, that the FBI ^{hand-delivered to the CIA} immediately sent its reports on its interview with Nosenko. That informed the CIA that Nosenko said that the KGB suspected Oswald was an American agent. That could not have meant for the FBI because it had no agents there.

And it was ^{as soon as} after the CIA learned ^{from the FBI could have} that Nosenko pointed a finger at it that his

treatment by the CIA changed abruptly from princely to subhuman barbarism ^{it was that for about} and that for three years! Inconceivable torture all that time, all that time in isolation for the arcane tortures the CIA D dreamup up for him and to which Hart testified. In~~is~~ isolation without so much as a window, plus those terrible acts by the CIA. Not by Angleton, as Posner would place the blame. It was the CIA ^{as} an institution.

^{Posner} The case is not yet closed. Far from it.

Beyond belief as it is that any American writer could bring himself to write such a knowingly false, distorted and dishonest account of one of the most ^{to any human beings} awful things any part of our government has ever done; ^{to put out the CIA; or} would rewire our history; could bring himself to do such totally anti-American things for the book the CIA gave him with ^{or} without other rewards, ^{Posner} he did more.

On page 39 he gets around to dating this change in Nosenko's treatment by the CIA. It was on April 4. He begins his account by saying that "Nosenko's ordeal had started on April ~~4~~ 4, 1964 when he was driven to a three-storey safe house in a Washington suburb. Later he ^{mentions} ~~gets around to saying~~ that in that nice ^{and isolated in} place Nosenko was confined to its ~~attic~~ attic.

It took the CIA fourteen months to build the brick tank in which ^{Nosenko} he then was confined without widows or anything else, even something to read, and with inadequate ^{asked from the lack of both privacy and care.} food from which he then suffered. While Posner makes it clear that Nosenko was treated ^{portrays it as far less abusive than what we know officially to be} badly, his account ~~is far less~~ than that testified to by the CIA official witness, John

Hart. As Posner eases his way to the end he admits that it was not easy for Nosenko to ¹⁰ "keep his a sanity ¹⁰ and he continues to limit the blame for it all to "Angleton and Bagley."

(Page 41) The worst that Posner attributes to ^{these} the incredible official abuses by the CIA he attributes to that pair alone, saying they ¹¹ debated drugging him to hasten his breakdown. ...an assortment of drugs were ~~used~~ considered, including a so-called truth serum, an amphetamine and even LSD." (Pages 41-2) That was far ^{very far} from all, as ~~the~~ Hart di

did testify. He testified to a deliberate attempt to drive Nosenko crazy so he could be confined and stifled in an institution, to various torturing ^{in and many ways} ~~was~~ of killing him, even ^{one was} to ~~fling~~ ^{fly out} him over the ocean and ^{then} dropping him into it.

Some analysts!

Can anyone without their doctor of philosophy degrees believe for a minute that the USSR or its KGB ~~pre~~ preferred the hawk Johnson to the dove Kennedy?

The assassination made that authentic.

CIA

Then there was that juvenile/cold-war concoction that Nosneko was "dispatched" to "disinform" about the JFK assassination. This was ~~exciting~~ exciting because it meant that the USSR had done the job and had to deceived the ~~world~~ world about ~~it~~ it to avoid retaliation. This silliness was reported widely in the papers and I do not know of a single one that raised a single question about it.

Neither of these fairy tales was ~~worth~~ worthy of Posner's Olympian notice. Nor did either prompt him to any thinking of his own about them.

Inherent in the absurdity of the USSR having to disinform, to lead the ~~assassi-~~ ^{investigation} nation away from it, ~~if there~~ that there was the possibility of the investigation going in that direction. There never was any such possibility and the USSR knew it, as well as did all others with any political ~~wisdom~~ wisdom at all.

This is because there never was any question about what the official conclusion ~~would~~ would be. The FBI leaked it, knowing, as did all political analysts of all the world's major-power intelligence agencies, that no person and no body in government would dare dispute it and bring ~~its~~ ^{down} its enormous power and fearsome retaliations ~~down upon them~~ ^{It had a well known and feared} with ~~its well-known~~ ^{that} disposition do to ~~do so~~.

The plain and simple truth is that only the FBI could have leaked it because only the FBI had copies of the report it leaked. That was the report President Johnson ordered it to make the night of the assassination.

The FBI did not distribute any copies until December 7, 1963. It then distributed very few copies including those it gave the Commission and the Department.

Aside from I learned about this leaking, and what I learned includes the name of assistant FBI director who was one of the leakers, ~~from~~ ⁱⁿ the FBI's own records I found its file copies of ~~how~~ ^{how} what it leaked was reported and handled. The first of those was dated December 2. The major leaks ~~are~~ were on December 5. That day Deputy Attorney General Nicholas

Katzenbach appeared before an executive session of the Warren Commission. He told it that while the FBI claimed it was ~~pleas-~~ "leaving no stone unturned" to learn who did the leaking, he knew that only the FBI could have done it. *if the Commission did not know earlier it knew then.* ~~It was not later than that that~~ the Commission knew. There is little doubt that it knew from the first that only the FBI could leak what only the FBI had.

The Commission itself recognized and articulated the fact that it did not dare oppose the FBI. In its executive session of January 21, 1964, which after obtaining it in under FOIA I published in Post Mortem in facsimile (pages 475-87), it could not have been more ~~sped~~ specific - or more terrified.

Naturally, the CIA also knew. As, in silence, did all the major media.

All the world's spookeries and foreign offices knew with as much certainty as if ~~J. Edgar~~ J. Edgar Hoover himself had phoned each and told them official ^{ly} what the conclusions of the Warren Commission would be.

The USSR knew with even more certainty from the questions it was not asked by the United States government.

So, as the CIA knew very well when it made that absurdity up as a justification for questioning Nosenko's "bona fides", it was an obvious fraud.

The USSR had nothing about which to disinform and on this simple basis it had no need to disinform ^{Nosenko} or to plant, to protect its disinforming.

All of the above also Posner, answering all questions as he has from the puffs of those dust-jacket celebrities and his publisher's ^{own} ~~own~~ as he does in his book, ^{putting-up} ~~in his handling of the Nosenko story~~ he makes no mention of it. In this, too, he pays the CIA back by again not embarrassing it all over again after the passing of so many years.

~~So, as the CIA knew and as Bagley rhapsodized,~~

There were other reasons, like the fact that Kennedy was negotiating with Castro formally and informally and with Khrushchev, with whom there was an exchange of some 40 letters, seeking a detente. Neither wanted to change that by offing JFK.

Writers can, do and should have ~~and~~ different opinions about what is valuable and what is important but that Posner, Wall Street lawyer, Mengele-case closer (if that is what he did) and an experienced investigator could omit such fantastic intelligence disclosures as Nonseko made it simple cannot be believed that ~~his~~ ~~suppressions~~ in favor of the CIA and of sparing ^{it} embarrassment all over again after so many years was not a payback for making his book and his fame from it possible.

Posner even suppresses what was probably the most public, the most sensational, the most stunning and politically significant disclosure of any KGB spying ^{ever} when ~~he rose~~ ^{(Ambassador} Adlai Stevenson rose and addressed ^{He was} ~~in~~ the Security Council of the United Nations ~~and~~ with eloquence and passion/seen and heard throughout the world and reported by the press of the world. He held in his hand and displayed prominently

Endless, endless ~~and~~ ^{awful, subhuman} torture for all that time and then American government officers plotted murder!

This was the CIA! Posner knew it. And he ~~did not~~ not only does not say it, he softens that (unprecedented, official ~~UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT~~ CIA abuse of a human being based only on fantasies imagined by the sick of mind in high position in the CIA and tolerated ^{justified by me} _{in silence} by all there who knew of it.

The pretended justifications of this were themselves insane. How anyone in the CIA, which is supposedly composed of intelligent, well-educated, sophisticated, politically informed ~~analysts on whom the safety of the country depends -~~ and mature people could have believed any of it is incomprehensible. 42A, 42A1 here

The information Nosenko provided ^{immediately and} voluntarily ^{and he was} was not in any sense what the spooks refer to as "throw-away information." It was (the richest intelligence haul of all.

To a degree Posner admits this, as usual for him a limited degree. (Page 36) ^{understatedly} ~~He does not offer his own opinion,~~ ^{the obvious, often as he expresses opinions, that it would have been} that it was utterly insane for the KGB to hurt itself in so unprecedented a way by having Nosenko give the CIA all that ^{was} so hurtful to it information ^{by him to plant / with / (Page 36)} solely for a cover for himself. Here, for most of a short paragraph

graph of his bobt ailed account of what Nosenko did give the CIA that has Bagley so ^{was} "ecstatic" to begin with, (in Switzerland) all the time the CIA Switzerland (doing its best to prevent) Nosenko's treasure-trove the most valuable intelligence information, to ^{was} "om Mangold" Mangold and his CIA book and to Posner (his own Nosenko interview. He does not even suggest that infinitely more was testified to by Hart and he makes no mention at all of the most dramatic exposure of intelligence operations I can recall. It came from Nosenko.

Our ambassador to the United Nations, then Adlai Stevenson, arose there with a beautifully sculptured large seal of the United States, a gift to our Moscow embassy by ^{the} the USSR. Without mentioning ^{of} Nosenko's name Stevenson then shocked the Security Council, ^{if not much of the world's} and by international TV the entire world by declaring that a microphone had been hidden in that "gift" and that it transmitted every word spoken in the ~~the~~ ambassador's ^{private office.} ^{Hart testified that this information and the discovery of many other bugs in that} ^{private office.} is only part of what came from Nosenko.

With a minor attribution to Mangold, Posner again pretends that all that is known he got from Nosenko even when he was reporting ^{over so} (much less than the CIA learned from Nosenko. ^{admitted publicly it had him}

Even that is not all. ~~THIS~~ Self-promoting Posner knows of two earlier ~~in interviews~~ interviews Nosenko, -meaning the CIA, gave during the chilliest ~~part~~ time of the cold war. ^{The first} ~~It~~ was to the politically-acceptable Washington editor of the politically-acceptable Readers Digest, _____ Barron. In his much earlier book KGB Barron disclose some of the valuable intelligence Nosenko gave the CIA. His book ()

even identified spies Nosenko exposed by name.

No, Barron is not in Posner's bibliography. (Page 579)

Is ~~this~~ case now closed? No, it is not

It cannot be because Posner has not yet ^{fully} earned his reward.

extra space