

a new chapter begins on 77. This part is "How the  
 little self themselves do Big  
 Posner's Fiasco with Garrison's Fiasco."

I do not take time to address Posner's writing about me from a sense of picque or resentment. There is no reason to expect any better once one realizes that he is whoring with our history and, like those who sell their bodies, for pay. Compared to him these are decent people and their sins against society <sup>are</sup> much less significant. By ~~the~~ <sup>to</sup> time the reader sees <sup>at</sup> that this book says on that matter, which will be less than is possible by far, there should be little doubt that it is a legitimate means of addressing Posner ~~and~~ as a person and as a writer and of addressing his thorough dishonesty that is without question knowing dishonesty. In this he is consistent at each meaningful point in his book.

579  
60

*[Handwritten signature]*

*[Handwritten mark]*

He is ~~conscientious~~ <sup>out</sup> in it throughout the his book.

Silly, too. And sometimes stupid, to say nothing of arrogant and less than rational in some of his criticisms. Some are quite dishonest, some reflect an abandonment of judgment to make a false argument. Those he makes of me reflect his inability and that of those who helped him to find a single, legitimate complaint or a single <sup>significant</sup> <sup>(in all my work)</sup> factual error. The first <sup>petulant</sup> <sup>in</sup> <sup>book</sup> on his book is <sup>petulant</sup>, too, because in 1965 I did not agree with his sense of value, for the book I then wrote <sup>with</sup> of his concept of importances in his 1993 book. That he ~~sees~~ <sup>believes that</sup> Oswald's record as a bad boy, and I do mean ~~literally~~ as a little boy, was important for my first book, which as not about Oswald but was about the <sup>W</sup> ~~War~~ Warren Report, explicitly stated in the title, Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Rept Report, led him

This also bears on another permeating Posner dishonesty we have already <sup>at</sup> addressed and which later will get more attention. Here he says that I published six books on the JFK assassination but ~~in~~ in his bibliography, on page 583, he lists only five. The one ~~he~~ he omits from his bibliography is one that was published commercially- as he knows. It also is one he uses in his book without refering to his source, and it is one to which he dares not refer the reader because it would prove, as <sup>we</sup> have seen, that he returned the CIA's favors to him by covering up ~~for~~ what the spookeries kept from all the disclosed official records, that as a Marine the man later the only official candidate for assassin was trusted with a rather high security clearance. An honest <sup>we</sup> riter, which Posner is not and ~~does~~ does not intend <sup>being</sup> to be, would at the <sup>best</sup> ~~best~~ have noted this important information suppressed from all official ~~so~~ records.

In chiding me for not reporting what was not relevant to my book, Posner's

61/11

to this stupid criticism in his footnote on page 11:

Harold Weisberg, in the first of his six self-published books attacking the Warren Commission, does not even inform the reader that Marguerite and Lee lived with the Pica. He covers the entire period by writing: "In August 1952, Oswald and his mother moved to New York City, where an older, married son by her first marriage also lived" (*Whitewash I*, p. 9).

6/11

~~His~~ fine-tooth comb yields only his own dandruff when he can lower himself to this kind of childish complaint. Why in the world was even the little I said necessary in a book that analyzes the work of the Commission? *He does not say.*

Can it be that after writing two books about German Nazis and having gotten the obvious major help he has in this one from the CIA *if not also other such agencies* he actually believes that he has the right and obligation to ordain what others should think and consider relevant in their writing *the right* and to criticize them if they do not?

He is ~~bankrupt~~ <sup>bankrupt</sup> in his criticisms of me, as will be obvious.

*- which was ...?*

Two pages later, still another criticism of my writing about the Commission, not about Oswald ~~he~~ he protests in his footnote on page 13, referring to ~~an~~ the opinion of Oswald still as a child by the psychiatrist Rhenatus Hartogs, "Weisberg tells of the test but does not quote any of Hartogs's conclusions." They are needed in a book about the Commission. Well, if that is his standard, ought he not be judged by it?

How can he justify not saying *the value of Hartogs' opinions and his* anything about Hartogs' own problems?

As a New York Times headline on its March 29, 1975 story reports of him, "Psychiatrist Guilty of Sex Inducement Must Pay \$350,000."

Hartogs' defense was that ~~due~~ <sup>due</sup> to a tumor he could not have sex. But as the Times reports, "Two other women, one an actress, the other a former schoolteacher, testified.... that they had had sexual relations with Dr. Hartogs on his advice."

The issue of TIME Magazine dated four days later gave Hartogs' <sup>practise</sup> practice of psychiatry the way Posner deems indispensable in a book about the Warren Commission almost a page, with ~~in~~ <sup>his</sup> picture and that of the woman who sued ~~as~~ <sup>him, Julie Ray</sup> her. His line with her was that ~~they~~ "they have sex to ~~erase~~ <sup>erase</sup> her guilt feelings over her guilt over an earlier sexual liaison with a woman." *The headline is "Love Thy Analyst."*

I have it in a file clearly marked, Re Hartogs, Renatus, unhidden.

You used Hartogs as a source, Gerald; I didn't. Does not a writer with integrity check to determine whether a potential source is dependable - or has any public record of any kind that can raise questions about him and his dependability, his character, any judgement on his opinions when it is his unilateral, <sup>opinion you cite</sup> not a judicial opinion, <sup>q2</sup> you cite, avoid the judicial one? *If why did you suppress the judicial opinion?*

Do you care so little for your own reputation or/so little for your readers' <sup>care</sup> that you use this to criticize me? For not including what was not relevant to my book. <sup>it in</sup> Well now, glass-house <sup>maven of</sup> <sup>residence</sup> <sup>else</sup> maven, how about what/you omitted about Hartogs, in that same TIME article on that "analytic guru" you find so dependable (you criticize not only me, but a dozen other authors for not writing <sup>what you say we should have written</sup> years ago what you attribute such importance to me now, you would have read as you would have seen in my Hartogs file in which you had no interest:

"In 1955, as a psychiatrist at Youth House, he diagnosed a disturbed 13-year old boy as dangerous 'potentially dangerous.' The boy was Lee Harvey Oswald, and Hartogs later parlayed the brief experience with into a quick book on Oswald and Jack Ruby (The Two Assassins, written with Freelancer Lucy Freeman)."

But if you had no interest in Hartogs' commercialization of the JFK assassination based on his "brief experience" with Oswald and none at all with Ruby, then you would not have been interested in or wanted to let your readers know that the literary agent on that deal was Maxwell Wilkinson, who was <sup>simultaneously</sup> also the agent of the CIA'S E. Howard Hunt. *he represented the Hartogs book you do not mention .. do.* Wilkinson told me this himself (and you certainly would not have been interested in the fact you could have learned from Who's Who, that Hunt used as his cover address in New York that of Littauer and Willington, 500 Fifth Avenue. (There is a Littauer foundation the ~~is~~ CIA used to hide <sup>it</sup> the CIA as the source of money it wanted handled in secret, but I have not checked that one out to see what Littaur was of that CIA foundation.)"

Your criticism of me is that in my book that was not on Oswald, remember, I did tell "Of the tests" but not any of Hartogs conclusions." Care to stack the legitimacy of your criticism against your own record in which you make Hartogs relevant? *and suppress all of this about him?*

~~Hartogs~~  
He enjoyed his practise so much he "waived his ~~total \$10 per session~~ fee, hired her as a ~~to~~ typist and paid her (my emphasis) \$3 a letter for typing "hundreds of letters." ~~He~~ <sup>He</sup> used her for <sup>4 1/2</sup> quite some time, according to the trial evidence.

The New York judicial system was not impressed by Hartogs' "opinion." Is there any reason to believe it was more trustworthy with a boy?

But here! here! Gerald Posner! Where do you get off criticizing others for the sources they use and me for what I do not say <sup>when</sup> ~~(not that it was~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~relevant in my writing)~~ because ~~it was on the Common, not on Oswald~~ when you write this book you knew would be heavily promoted, would reach many people, and you do not tell them what you could easily have learned about Hartogs? <sup>62A</sup>

In a footnote on page 16 Posner criticizes me when he talks about "Oswald's early fascination with Communism." He says, "Harold Weisberg writes that his attraction to Communism only makes sense when <sup>the</sup> possibility of Oswald's being somebody's agent is considered'." This, I believe, is a bit of Posner's Tricky D<sub>1</sub>ckery. He has me saying that of the youthful Oswald, when he was a <sup>boy</sup> ~~boy~~ in New Orleans. I am confident I did not say that of the boy. But then, did Posner find it useful for his book and his readers to tell them that Oswald's favorite book was Orwell's The Animal Farm?

<sup>miss</sup>  
Tsk, Tsk, Gerald Posner, how did you <sup>will</sup> that in your exhaustive study of the Warren Commission testimony, <sup>if you missed it there or in my Oswald in New Orleans</sup> That came out when one of those under-educated "arines so happy to help the government (and get a little attention from it) was trying to help Commission counsel <sup>W</sup> Wesley Liebeler make a case for Oswald as a red. It begins, if anyone wants to check, on page 254 of Volume VII. The witness is Nelson Delgado. He was trying, with some difficulty, <sup>to explain the message of The Animal Farm</sup> to explain the message of The Animal Farm. He did not ~~know~~ recall the title but from his belabored account of what Oswald explained to him ~~from~~ about his favorite book, Liebeler identified it for Delgado. ~~In the end, and this continued for about a printed page, Liebeler told Delgado, "It is actually supposed to be (sic) quite an anti-Communist classic." If by chance Posner missed this when he rwa read all t that tesimony he said he read and even indexed, he would have had trouble missing it in Oswald in New Orleans. (pages 97-8)~~

Well, given Posner's record, he could have "missed" it, too. After all, did he not miss in the book he persists as representing that I wrote about Oswald <sup>whn</sup> even its title says it is on the Commission, my quotation of Oswald's writings in which he referred to ~~the~~ Russian leaders as "fat, stinking politicians" and lambasted those in the United States for "betraying" themselves and the working class?

Orwell as a favorite books is a new kind of Communist. Posner's kind.

Before Posner exhausted, temporarily, that is, the supply of gnats at which he could strain on Page, 20 he into a little more substance. ~~he~~ <sup>he</sup> get into it in his own special way-crookedly. Referring to Oswald as reincarnated Buffalo Bill with a rifle he

63

begins making his case ~~in the footnote that~~ that Oswald's <sup>real</sup> mother <sup>must have been</sup> was Annie Oakley. His footnote begin," Harold Weisberg stated that 'Oswald's marksmanship ~~was~~... was poor" (Posner sure is cute in ~~omitting~~ <sup>omit</sup> citations. It makes it easier to ~~deceive~~ <sup>and it trips and wrecks research</sup> for it ~~astesz~~ <sup>astesz</sup> ~~time~~ <sup>wastes</sup>. He does not cite the page. or the book. That makes checking <sup>this</sup> him out impossible for <sup>most</sup> others.

But I ~~did~~ <sup>do</sup> remember writing about that in the book first published in 1965 so ~~I~~ knew where to look for it.

Posner prefers not <sup>that it give</sup> accepting the official Marine Corps evaluation of Oswald's marksmanship, <sup>it was Posner</sup> as did the Commission, because neither liked it. Well, maybe they are entitled to their own tastes. But forcing them on someone else is a different matter. So they <sup>Commission</sup> dug up a good 'ol' guy <sup>a non-commissioned officer</sup> of ~~an NCO~~ and a <sup>commissioned officer</sup> both of whom ~~are~~ were quite willing to say that the ~~assassinations~~ were not at all difficult and well <sup>a piece of cake.</sup> within Oswald's capabilities.

I wrote  
The full ~~line~~ <sup>proof</sup> that Posner <sup>prefers</sup> to condense is in the first of the Whitewash series, on page 25: "Oswald's marksmanship in the Marine Corps, several years earlier, was poor, despite the efforts of the Report to establish otherwise."

Firing a rifle is a mechanical skill. To preserve the skill - meaning with Oswald the one he never had - one has to practise regularly. There is no record of his ever having done that. The point <sup>I</sup> was making is that after several years his skills, if any, would be even less.

Five pages later ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> published that Marine Corp official evaluation and official opinion <sup>in facsimile</sup>. Does one suppose that Posner was so ~~blearily-eyed~~ <sup>blearily-eyed</sup> from his unending <sup>those twenty-six volumes</sup> studies of records that although his eye was sharp enough to spot four words from a longer entence in a page of several hundred words he could not see that Marines official report that takes up more than half a page?

Cplonel A.G. Folsom, Head, Records Branch, Personnel Department, by Direction of the Commandant of the Marines Corp (certainly not in the opinions class with a good ol' boy <sup>2</sup> ~~noncom~~, is ~~he~~), wrote the Commission: "The Marine Corp considers that any reasonable application of the instructions given to Marines should permit them to become qualified at least as a marksman.... Consequently, a low marksman qualification

~~charitable~~

A less ~~charitable~~ person might be unwilling to attribute this Posner omission to make the ~~frise~~ case that Oswald was old Buffalo Hill himself, to the presumed strain of his close and long<sup>71</sup> lasting study of all those Commission ten million<sup>published</sup> words. Such an uncharitable person could note that of the ~~seven~~<sup>six</sup> notes Posner has on this, Folsom's ~~testimony~~<sup>four</sup> is cited in five of this six, his the exhibit he gave the Commission is cited in the ~~sixth~~<sup>fifth, (Page 570)</sup>, ~~along with the citations~~<sup>and</sup> ~~Volume 1, Part 1, The First Two~~  
~~the citations on page 37, refers to the application of Oswald's~~  
~~Robert, in the school and the second page 36, has the entire page~~  
~~deleted to show that he is standing on a table and his skirt has gnat holes~~  
~~published off~~

~~This is an error in citation of his source~~

But he did not see my <sup>m/</sup> more than a half-page facsimile reproduction of this official Marine Corps evaluation of Oswald as a lousy shbt? When he read that chapter of my book with such care he could pick out just the four words of that short sentence he wanted to quote? Or my disappointment<sup>/</sup> in not reporting that Lee and ~~his~~ his mother lived with Robert Pic briefly in New York. And that I did not have <sup>his</sup> the high opinion of Hartogs ~~as he did~~ in what he used ~~that~~ in his book on Oswald that was not relevant in my book on the Commission.



(detail in my book)

(I go into this in considerable detail in NEVER AGAIN! that is <sup>4</sup>being prepared for publication as I <sup>v</sup>rite this.)

64

Oswald was so low it was only a single point above indicates a fairly poor 'shot'... <sup>The absolute minimum required by the military</sup>

Or, ~~perhaps~~, could this be the reason Posner did not <sup>include</sup> the book and page number? Well, if the Commandant of the whole, United States Marines Corp is not a good enough authority for the Posner who <sup>has</sup> have a preference for the Jim Moores and Carlos Albarriguers, well, maybe he is right to criticize me.

But he is criticizing me for being accurate and truthful <sup>and</sup> because I was faithful to the highest opinion that can come from the Marines. <sup>64 A</sup>

<sup>what to Posner is</sup> But with this an illustration of fair comment, Posner's <sup>his</sup> criticism of me for using what I regarded as <sup>the best</sup> high authority, what can be said about Posner himself if anyone had the chance? He spent all that time in these Commission volumes, where the report of firing tests he is less than <sup>referring to</sup> accurate <sup>and gives what he excludes from his book? That</sup> elsewhere in his books are published in the form of sworn testimony. <sup>And, as you know,</sup> the very best shots in the country failed to duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald and that under greatly improved conditions, <sup>when they tried for the Commission. 64 B here</sup>

Is it getting to the point where nothing Posner says can be taken to be all there is to say and that often his word cannot be taken at all?

I sure am sorry, though, that he has so low an opinion of the Commandant of the entire Marine Corp of the United States of America. Disappointed, Really.

Aside from what I <sup>in notes</sup> quoted earlier from Posner's <sup>in his text</sup> acknowledgement he has mentioned me five times before he refers to me on Page 414. There the kind of fine gentelman, the careful and honest writer, the appreciative guest that Posner is rises and is resplendent:

"In 1966, Harold Weisberg published Whitewash ( he omitted the identifying subtitle and there are for books to the Whitewash series, but then, as his own ~~first~~note reflects, that first bok was published in 1965), the first in depth attack on the Warren Report. (In fact it was the first book on it.) This sentence then follows, Weisberg, who later published another five books on the case, was a former Senate investigator who had been dismissed for possibly leaking information to the press." <sup>As is</sup> not at all uncommon for Posner

here again there is no source note. Certainly this is not something a responsible writer would say without some substantial reason for saying it, something other than *and that without any source at all!* hearsay. (Especially, because he also does not give the date, what he writes about <sup>was in</sup> ~~is~~ ~~in~~ 1913, long before he was born and could have had personal knowledge.

The one accurate, well, almost accurate statement is that I was "dismissed." I still was <sup>on</sup> and could have remained on the payroll. It was my decision not to.

At the time of the incident I was not a committee investigator and had not been for some time. I was its editor even for the four months I was <sup>from it</sup> borrowed by the Department of Justice to help it in a sensational prosecution of the era, ~~in~~ its 1938 prosecution of more than sixty defendants in a conspiracy case against coal operators and their deputized gun thugs in <sup>County, Kentucky.</sup> the "Bloody Harlan" case. Today few know how bloody the operator resistance to ~~the~~ union organization of those mines in deep southeastern Kentucky was. My work <sup>to Justice!</sup> there was this satisfactory, although I am not a lawyer I was recommended for employment by <sup>it</sup> the Department by the man in charge of its criminal division. I decided against it, preferring what I was then doing, preparing the record of one of the most significant Senate investigations of that era for publication and to <sup>make it as</sup> be an accurate <sup>a is was possible</sup> record of the history of the country it records.

That committee had no classified information of any kind. Not ever. If it had, however, I would not even have known about it. My job was to prepare the public record record for publication. This involved getting the stenographic record of the hearings and the attendant exhibits and the reports <sup>and then printed.</sup> set in type. First there were "galley" proofs, then page proofs so that corrections could be made.

Those hearings were public. Not one <sup>was</sup> in "executive session." To each the press and any person who wanted to be there <sup>was</sup> admitted. Nothing secret there, either. There were no xerox machines in those days and the cost of extra copies of the stenographic transcripts was prohibitive. So, for the press and for scholars and students, I always had extra copies of those proofs "pulled" by the printing office. For out-of-town reporters, of whom I remember Izzy Stone, later one of the most respected of reporters and commentators in the country, then at the New York Post. Others came to my office and examined them or,

when there were enough copies remaining and printing was close, reporters could borrow copies. Of the <sup>many</sup> citizens who came to my office to study the proofs instead of stenographic transcripts I remember <sup>several private and</sup> the sister-in-law of Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black..

These proofs, which were <sup>of</sup> the stenographic transcripts of the public hearings, did not and could not hold and secrets and every word <sup>was already</sup> had been in public. They were of already-held, public hearings. Not a word was unknown, publicly.

So there was nothing in them that could be "leaked" because there was not a word in them that was not already public.

When a reporter was speaking to one of my superiors on the committee staff and asked about a hearing, I was told to give him a set of proofs of that hearing, which I did.

Now it happened, as is not usual in the Congress, the chairman of that committee had decided that he had already reaped all the <sup>benefit</sup> political benefit possible for his next election campaign from those hearings. He feared if he continued it would cost him contributions ~~to his next campaign.~~

But the already-planned next set of hearings then would not have been held. The superior who sent that reporter to me so he could report that proceeding verbatim and I were among those wanting the committee to continue for those next already-planned hearings. Others on the staff agreed with the <sup>the</sup> chairman. They believed that they also had reaped all the benefit to their careers possible for them from those jobs, and they also wanted that committee to die so they could move upward. This was possible because of the prestige of having served on that committee. (It was then known as "the Senate Civil Liberties Committee"). In order to do that they had to control the staff, and one means of doing that was to assert power and intimidate those who wanted the committee continued. Of them I was the junior, the youngest and the most vulnerable. ~~And~~ And I was openly lobbying along with others in private life for the committee's continuation. So, on the trumped-up impossible charge, of "leaking" ~~the transcript of~~ the public record, I was fired. And I continued, rather than <sup>other</sup> seeking employment, to continue to help in that lobbying.

It was successful, the committee's life was continued with a new Senate <sup>and</sup> resolution, at those hearings, on the abuses of agricultural workers by corporate farms in California,

were held. These agricultural ~~was~~ workers were not illegal immigrants from "Mexico.

They had been farmers in Oklahoma <sup>and Arkansas</sup> and other states near ~~it~~ <sup>them</sup> whose farms were ruined by ~~the~~

<sup>severe</sup> dust storms of that era. When they ~~might~~ migrated to California seeking jobs so that in those Great G Depression days they, they wives and their children would not starve, they were known as "Okies" and "arkies."

That was long ago and most of those who may read ~~it~~ <sup>this</sup> have no way of knowing about the terrible conditions those hearings exposed so they could be corrected.

But there are some who may have read <sup>The Grapes of Wrath.</sup> John Steinback's book, Or seen the Henry Fonda movie on TV rerun. That will enable people to decide whether what I was part of, bringing those terrible conditions to light, was a worthwhile thing or not. It was for being part of what made that possible that I was fired.

And this is not at all what Posner intended <sup>to be taken from</sup> to be understood of his once again, ~~the~~ Tricky-Dicky Dickery writing in which he misleading slurs only.

At the time he wrote this and those other slurs intended to disparage me and my work, we were in a friendly relationship. He phoned me, we exchanged letters, he <sup>said</sup> referred by phone and in letters that he and his wife hoped to visit us again, and when his book was being published, in our last conversation, he said he <sup>thought</sup> ~~hoped~~ I would like what he said about me in his coming book. This is to say <sup>also</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>what</sup> as is obvious in any event, if he had intended other than he <sup>said</sup> ~~did~~ in this regularly repeated nasty comments about me he could have learned the truth from me. He <sup>knew</sup> I would be <sup>as</sup> he praised me for <sup>being</sup> open with him. He did write in his Acknowledgements (page 504) that <sup>of</sup> all the people with whom he had any contact in preparing his book I am the only one he singled out to say <sup>that</sup> ~~about~~ "His attitude toward sharing information is refreshing." <sup>It</sup> Yet he did not check this or anything else with me. What he wrote and published is therefore what he <sup>w</sup>anted to and it is designed to reflect on me, my character and my work. It has no other purpose. It was not in any sense necessary to what he was saying, that I had published five more books on the JFK assassination. <sup>It</sup> But suppose he had believed that <sup>was</sup> necessary and he wanted to be an honest writer and to tell his readers what there was about those who wrote books before he did. What else could he have said about me that could have told his readers about my earlier life;

68A

Or that, when General Donovan ~~was not~~ did not believe that justice had been done to a team of four OSS men who had volunteered for a very dangerous parachute drop behind Nazi lines in France, <sup>not involved in a fight with the military police and</sup> after their convictions were upheld and ~~they~~ were serving <sup>their</sup> sentences the job of investigating it was given to me. The Oss did not lack for fine lawyers. One later became a Supreme Court Justice, another, no relative the general but also named Dinovan, negotiated spy swaps with the USSR, got the U-2 pilot Gary Powers and the Bay of Pigs prisoners back. Six weeks after I was given that job, those men were ree free.

"In Posner's book all other than <sup>he</sup> ~~him~~ are "buffs." If he <sup>be</sup> could at all honest he would recognized that he fits his own term of depreciation better than <sup>many</sup> most others working in the field in <sup>relevant</sup> terms of prior professional experience, length of time working in the field and information developed, not a single fact of value being attributable to Posner, not even after that Nosenko interview. So, in his kinder references to me, I am a "buff" to Posner. There is, to this self-described "Wall Street lawyer," nothing professional about this partial account of a long life and the work I've done. As it relates to him, "mark" would be more appropriate, as we shall see more than we have already seen.

68 <sup>64</sup>

what he <sup>was</sup> supposedly addressing in his book, the qualifications of those who wrote  
the books on the subject <sup>long before he did?</sup>

Would it have ~~help~~ helped his readers and the historical record he was making if  
he had reported that in about 1932 or 1933 I had helped another reporter win that  
year's ~~Arizona~~ Pulitzer prize for local reporting?

Or that my writing was syndicated nationally before I was 20 years old?

Or that when I as an intelligence analyst in World War II General "Wild Bill"  
Donovan honored and decarated me for my work, which included trouble-shooting and  
delicate jobs for the White House? 64A

Or that, in the words of the late respected judge of the federal district ~~court~~,  
court, Gerhard Gessell, "as reported in The Washington Post of January 17, 1978,  
referring to the disclosure of some <sup>90,</sup> ninety-thousand pages of FBI assassination-  
related records then in process, <sup>say</sup> those "records would not now be coming to light  
were it not for earlier freedom of information <sup>litigation</sup> by Weisberg." This led to a congressional  
change in the law, opening the door to FBI investigatory records." ← 64B here

These things are all true, as are more, yet none was as ~~p~~ pertinent in what Posner  
thought he had to tell his readers <sup>to</sup> and record for out history as he deliberately ~~confr~~ived  
<sup>to defame.</sup> his character <sup>as</sup> he here reveals, <sup>it in his</sup> being what it is, his successful casting of doubt on  
my character for a nonexistent offense <sup>additional</sup> that raises questions about <sup>his lack of</sup> trustworthiness.

This <sup>one</sup> ~~is~~ of Posner's many indulgences of his nastiness streak enables readers to  
form their own evaluations of him as it does of me.

He does acknowledge that I published six books on the JFK assassination. He says  
<sup>he and his secret helpers for all their effort are able to, for all his dishonesty, able to make only</sup>  
not a word about their content, that is not contrived adverse criticism. That is, the  
<sup>the most virg-niform jibes. He says</sup>  
content ~~that~~ they have, what they did bring to light. Not a word about me being responsible  
for the amending of FOIA so that the secret and embarrassing records would be available  
to all, including the <sup>o</sup> Posners were were the beneficiaries ~~wiho~~ without having done a  
single <sup>o</sup> thing to earn that benefit to <sup>o</sup> them. <sup>delve</sup> Nothing about ~~oh~~ those many document I brought  
to light and published in facsimile so that peopoe could see them as they <sup>o</sup> actually existed  
who/they were held secret. But then if Posner had done that he could not have deceived



his readers and the record for history into believing that those he used without attributing them to my work ~~and in a way that led the readers to believe they were the result of his own work.~~ <sup>came from</sup> To carry this ~~int~~ intent forward he was careful in his Acknowledgements not to mention that he also obtained copies of those records when he and his wife had unlimited access to them and to our copier. Her accounting is that ~~they got~~ she made <sup>A</sup> seven hundred and twenty four copies for the book. In more than six hundred ~~of~~ pages Posner found neither <sup>of an honest man</sup> the interest in saying it nor the space for it. But he did find ~~some~~ space for his quoted ~~misrepresentations~~ <sup>misrepresentations</sup> and insults.

And thus, <sup>through out</sup> ~~through out~~ his book, my work ~~is~~ he represents as his work.

Not content with the contrivance addressed above, in his very next sentence Posner writes, <sup>R/</sup> "Robert Blakey said his (my) "rhetoric was so obscure, his arguments so dependent on accusations rather than logic, the effect of [his] work was to make complex issues confusing." Posner does not say why Blakey <sup>felt</sup> he had to criticize my work under conditions that precluded <sup>my</sup> responding. Relevant is what Posner says at the top of the same page:

In its own reexamination of the case in the late 1970s, the House Select Committee investigated the first generation of critics and found their work wanting in terms of fairness and accuracy. Robert Blakey, the Select Committee's chief counsel, said that many early critics "had special axes to grind. As a result of our investigation, the Committee found that 'criticism leveled at the Commission . . . [was] often biased, unfair and inaccurate . . . [and] . . . the prevailing opinion of the Commission's performance was undeserved.' "21

70<sup>00</sup>

As Posner also knows, I was the first of that <sup>V</sup>first generation of critics." And as he should know from his claimed, if not feigned, familiarity with that ~~committee's~~ committee's work Blakey began each hearing with what he styled as a "narration." He ~~repeatedly~~ <sup>at that day's hearing.</sup> cited the work of critics he intended to examine, meaning disprove, and that ~~was~~ <sup>This was his</sup> the unhidden ~~in his unhidden~~ <sup>in</sup> intent as he ran that committee.

But there was one exception: Blakey never once mentioned my name and never once <sup>cited</sup> cited a single word from any of my books that he could criticize or ~~refute~~ <sup>even pretend to refute</sup>.

<sup>too,</sup> This is typical of Posner, as by now should be more than apparent. He lumps <sup>those who do</sup> together ~~that do not belong~~ together and thus condemns all. <sup>as in</sup> Like his reference to the single assassination nut Jim Moore alone as "some."

Blakey had to have some explanation for never once addressing anything I said or <sup>wrote</sup> wrote so he made up what hundreds of letters <sup>and</sup> and phone calls from ~~school~~ school children say they could understand what Blakey <sup>says he</sup> could not ~~understand~~.

I am the one critic Blakey dared not say a word about in those hearings or reports or to my face or to in any way entice any response from me, as Posner should have known. Blakey had additional <sup>in</sup> reasons for wanting to say something bad about me because I was the credited source - I never sought anonymity - of many stories exposing <sup>the</sup> transgression of his committee during its life, prominently-played stories from ~~coast~~ coast to coast, Blakey was never able to make response, not to any one of them.

So, what is Posner really up to in this part of his book, other than running all others down, mixing legitimate critics in with the illegitimate to give the illegitimate credibility. This was easy with a Mark Lane to tar all others with, what Posner does <sup>next</sup> ~~next~~

(page 415) It is hardly possible not to find more than justified criticism of Lane, but that relates to Lane and to him alone, not to all others, the sense in which Posner writes his criticism. In a footnote on page 415, for once ~~unretated,~~ <sup>understated, Posner</sup> ~~who~~ understates, ~~ent~~ with

~~Posner is more often to be found when he cannot avoid not making unfavorable criticism,~~ <sup>of what</sup> ~~he says~~ <sup>only</sup> I said, "Harold Weisberg believes Lane is interested in self-promotion and money, and says that Lane <sup>is not from what we've alone</sup> largely <sup>V</sup> cribbed from his book Whitewash."

<sup>This</sup> criticism of Lane as a literary ~~thief~~ <sup>thief</sup> coming from Posner, an expert

is like Dr Kettle describing The frying pan as "black"  
practitioner of that craft, as we have seen and as well we shall see again,

Posner did, remember, "crib" the basis of his book from that fifteen-year-old Lul  
boy and palm it off as his <sup>own</sup> "enhancement" work. That is not all by any means but it  
should serve to remind the reader that the ~~un~~disclosed case ~~has~~ been made, <sup>against Posner has already</sup>

As he continues his determined effort to put me and my work down, giving not  
once in his six hundred pages found time to give even the remotest hint of what that  
work is or <sup>of what they</sup> those books say, he reflects either his ignorance, which he does display  
more often than I will take time for, <sup>and</sup> his dishonesty, ~~and both of which help him create a false record~~  
in his determined effort to pretend that nobody else did any real work in the field,  
~~latter~~ ~~and~~ ~~both~~ ~~of~~ ~~which~~ ~~help~~ ~~him~~ ~~create~~ ~~a~~ ~~false~~ ~~record~~  
~~and~~ ~~both~~ ~~of~~ ~~which~~ ~~help~~ ~~him~~ ~~create~~ ~~a~~ ~~false~~ ~~record~~  
~~and~~ ~~both~~ ~~of~~ ~~which~~ ~~help~~ ~~him~~ ~~create~~ ~~a~~ ~~false~~ ~~record~~  
he has this footnote on Page 420:

"Researchers did not discover the existence of the card index until ~~Watsberg~~ sued  
for the Dallas field office files in 1978, and the index was disclosed in 1980."

This refers to a secret index that is part of the FBI's standard operating pro-  
cedures in what ~~it~~ to it are politically-sensitive cases, "Researchers," as Posner well  
knew, did not just "discover" it. I "discovered", if that is how Wall Street lawyers  
refer to years of hard work, although its existence was carefully hidden in all the dis-  
closed JFK assassination records, in a different case entirely and in records produced  
in that King assassination case by the Chicago FBI office, it was not merely "dis-  
closed," as Posner puts it voluntarily by the FBI, it was litigated because, as he avoids  
telling his readers, avoiding getting the FBI to dislike him in every possible way, the  
FBI had lied about its existence.

He knew the truth because ~~my~~ I showed him those two full file cabinets plus two  
full drawers, ten liner <sup>ce</sup> liner feet of Xeroxes of what was originally forty-two feet of  
three by five ~~card~~ index cards, as I do with all others who come to use those records.  
It is the only index to those records available.

So, first Posner pretends that it was not the most difficult kind of litigating that  
resulted in the disclosure of all the quarter of a million pages of JFK assassination  
record to which he had access here, and then, such being his genuine interest in the  
book upon which he was engaged, an entirely different book than he described to me, he,

72A

not separate line

↑

(See Post Mortem, pp. 403, ~~437~~ 437-40, 445-7, 451, 470-1, 606-7, 624-5.)

personally, made no use of it at all.

This makes obvious that when he was here he did not give a damn about all the FBI's information pertinent to the shooting and to the witnesses and the Zapruder film.

Relevant to the evidence relating to the shooting, I filed two FOIA lawsuits, the first leading to the amending of the Act to open FBI and similar files to FOIA access. In his definitive book he finds none of this worth reporting and when he had access to all the results of all the scientific testing, including what he comes close to ignoring entirely in his book, the results of the neutron activation testing of the ballistics and ballistics-related <sup>evidence</sup> testing, he did not even peek at those results.

Had he, he might, and I say "might" because his morals, ethics, professional and personal dishonesty, cannot be entirely ignored, have found it difficult to report those phony conclusions of his.

He knew the results from Post Mortem and even after that he asked me not a single question, nor did he ask for copies to be sent him. 72A Here

- - The neutron- activation testing of the paraffin casts made of Oswald's cheek the day of the assassination prove that Oswald did not fire a rifle. <sup>That day,</sup> Posner's handling of ~~his reference to that index and what it leads to, as reported above, are more of his so unintended self-discription.~~ <sup>once again</sup> ~~ended~~

He continue this, not intending it at all, on the next page where once again he goes out of his way to give little or no value to this litigation or the information it yielded. He refers to one small part of that lawsuit, for the results of all the scientific testing, what relates to the spectrographical testing of a Dealey Plaza curbstone. He has to misrepresent that elsewhere in the book and, as usual, he is up to that dishonest. We address the <sup>same later</sup> ~~subject elsewhere.~~ Here he says, "although the Warren Commission discussed and relied on the results of the Bureau's spectrographic test in its final report, the FBI steadfastly refused to give Weisberg the underlying data. To many, that obstinacy added to the growing public perception that the government had something to hide in the Kennedy case. But to Lesar it does not ~~necessarily~~ necessarily indicate cover-up as much as the bureaucratic mind-set of the agencies." <sup>Posner</sup> He attributes

cover the - FBI's -ass lie to Jim Lesar by adding a direct quotation from him that was not in reference to this particular matter at all but was a general statement of our <sup>the</sup> experience when ~~he~~ ~~represent~~ Lesar represented me in all those lawsuit.

Whether from his subject-matter ignorance, obvious to ~~wo~~ one with real subject-matter knowledge in reading his book, ~~or~~ from his <sup>e</sup> determined effort to protect <sup>c</sup> the official assassination mythology all he can, or from what <sup>one</sup> ~~can~~ not ignore in this small-minded man who has such an exalted opinion of himself, his mendacity, what I quote directly has errors in it.

One is that the FBI never formulated the results of its supposed curbstone testing. Another is that not having them they could not have given them to the Commission! *We return to this later, in detail.*

If as he never intended being, Posner was an honest man writing an honest book, he could not have made any such reference to the FBI's and the Commission's actual records, <sup>because did</sup> the FBI <sup>e</sup> not making any formal <sup>2</sup> report on ~~any~~ of its JFK assassination Laboratory testing and the Commission <sup>because</sup> ~~or~~ <sup>ad</sup> accepting that and pretending ~~to~~ the opposite, that the FBI <sup>had</sup> done what it did not do.

As the records in this lawsuit, C.A.75-0226, are specific in <sup>revealing</sup> ~~revealing~~ when the FBI was compelled by the court to deliver the filmed spectrographic <sup>film</sup> ~~test~~ of the that curbstone <sup>test</sup>, it pretended it could not be found. It alone ~~of~~ <sup>made</sup> of all those <sup>many</sup> ~~films~~ in spectrographic testing, the means by which the test is <sup>a</sup> made. When <sup>n</sup> called upon to explain this in court, where not <sup>my</sup> ~~ally~~ hearsay is not acceptable, <sup>on</sup> ~~unsworn~~ <sup>d/</sup> ~~retired~~ FBI agent <sup>is</sup> alleged to have said that he is not certain but he thinks that little piece of film was "destroyed to save space." A single piece of film saved <sup>any</sup> space at all in these ~~FBI~~ FBI files so massive they cannot be imagined? And then there is the fact that this <sup>alleged</sup> ~~destruction~~ was strictly prohibited by law and by regulations.

But as the court <sup>y</sup> ~~accepted~~ what is not acceptable to American courts, so also did this man who boasts he was a "Wall Street lawyer".

Those "many" to whom Posner <sup>beginning</sup> refers in ~~beginning~~ this convoluted dishonesty, who <sup>were wrong in taking</sup> ~~he~~ says ~~took~~ what the FBI did in that lawsuit as evidence of deliberate withhold, <sup>ing</sup> do not exist. Few knew about it and none discussd it with me. ~~It~~ is another on Posner's straw

There is little as palpably, ~~completely~~<sup>completely</sup> and intendedly false as Posner's contrived justification of the FBI's complete misrepresentation of this testing and then denying it to me and to the people through me. ~~assassination~~ He ~~attributes~~<sup>it</sup> to no more than the FBI's "bureaucratic mind-set in litigation. "Cover-up" or suppression? ~~Errors!~~<sup>Errors!</sup> Perish the thought, Posner says. (Page 421)

But if the FBI had not suppressed the ~~truth~~<sup>truth</sup> about its alleged testing of that curbstone, as without question Posner had to know when he contrived this excuse for it, ~~the entire official mythology would have been impossible.~~<sup>JFK assassination</sup> That also means there would have been ~~no~~<sup>no</sup> possibility of the exploiters and commercializers of the Posner ~~stench~~<sup>stench</sup> ~~enriching~~ themselves from their sycophancy.

74 20

a new chapter begins with, new copy preceding red dash mark below

men he invents to cover his per<sup>e</sup>minating dishonesty throughout the entire book. ← HA

But is it not worth noting that when he spent three days here, interviewed me and ~~was~~ was in touch with me thereafter by phone and by letter, he continues to have and my work he never once goes into? only second-hand references to me? This is true throughout his book.

Throu<sup>o</sup>ghout this chapter as well as most other parts of the book Posner clearly depends on work other than his own that he pretends is his <sup>often</sup> own work, he cannot cite correctly and more often he twists and dist<sup>o</sup>orts. Thus on page # 433 his footnote quoting Mark Lane reads, "Clo<sup>o</sup>ser to the <sup>trial of Clay Shaw</sup> trial, Lane predicted, 'When ~~the~~ it is presented in <sup>court</sup> court it (Garrison's evidence alleged evidence against Shaw) ~~it~~ will shake ~~the~~ this country ~~in its history~~ as it has never been shaken before' (UPI)."

If Posner had that newspaper story <sup>and the name of the paper</sup> he would have had the date ~~and~~ would not have been wrong <sup>about</sup> in when it appeared. The trial ~~is~~ was two years later and that was one of Lane's first publis statements when he <sup>first</sup> got to New Orleans early in 1967.

This is far from the only persuasive reason to believe that particularly when <sup>Posner</sup> he goes after that largest of available ~~targets~~ targets, Jim Garrison, and along with him all who hold ~~believe~~ what to Posner is not the only acceptable belief about the assassination and its investigations, Posner's information comes uncritically from others of so biased a source that he gets it all twisted. He also indu<sup>o</sup>lges in his trickery with footnotes, as on Page 448. There his statement relating to me is a lie: "After he (Garrison) spoke to Weisberg, he put <sup>a</sup> ~~an~~ shooter in the Dal-Tex building and cleared Oswald of firing any shots." On Page 575 his end note reads, "Epstein, Counterplot, p.78."

Whether or not that is what Epstein wrote, it is a lie. It also is true that Epstein never once spoke to me, ever. Nor did ~~Posner~~ Posner do what is normal in responsible non-fiction writing, ask me about it. Why do that when the truth he knew was available to him was so <sup>in</sup> convenient for his dishonest purposes? Here they are to link me with conspiracy theories not one of which I have ever ~~is~~ espoused and all of which when possible I debunked?

Garrison never spoke to me about what Posner avoids indetifying, <sup>N</sup> ~~official photo~~ photographic evidence in the official records I printed in my second book for entirely different purposes. All those phot<sup>o</sup>graphs <sup>w</sup> were used to raise substantial questions about



the gross negligence in and dishonesty of the official ~~investigations~~ investigators for not really investigating the leads in those photographs.

Neither the FBI nor the Commission ever tried to get the ~~original~~ <sup>original</sup> and an important photograph taken by Ike Altgens, Associated Press Dallas photographer. It took me a year of effort with the AP. I then took it to a photo lab operated by a retired FBI photographic expert for him to ~~enlarge~~ <sup>enlarge</sup> enlarge part of that picture that had been cropped from the version in the Commission's evidence, which was provided to it by the FBI. The unexplored leads relating to the Dal-Tex building ~~are~~ <sup>include</sup> a man above the crowd on the fire escape, never called as a witness, even though he seems to have been falling half-way through the assassination, and something projecting from an open window on the second floor, near that fire escape.

How ~~ever~~ <sup>ever</sup> Garrison may have interpreted or misinterpreted those photographs, and I repeat, neither he nor Epstein nor Posner ~~ve~~ <sup>that</sup> ever discussed ~~them~~ with me, that had nothing at all to do with ~~Garrison~~ what Posner also sneaks into this sentence, Garrison only then "cleared Oswald ~~w~~ of firing any shots." ~~which~~ <sup>That</sup> Garrison had said earlier in any event. ~~7~~

Posner cites nothing in my books to ~~just~~ <sup>I did not write that</sup> justify what I did not ~~say~~ write, thus he cannot cite it, ~~that~~ there was a shooter in that building.

Still again, dirty, dishonest, prejudicial writing that has no basis in fact and cannot be supported by whatever the end note cites.

Again typically, Posner has no citation for his footnote on this page. ~~It~~ <sup>is</sup> is intendedly dishonest in several ways. One is to demean all who criticized the official ~~mythology~~ <sup>his own best</sup> as amateurs and unserious, and ~~his~~ <sup>intent</sup> point here is to include all, me in particular as still another of those he refers to/as "buffs" and as of the same mind. He knows both not to be true. Moreover, when it comes to professional qualifications in this work he has none other than whatever he may have learned as he practiced his boasted-off "Wall Street" law. His record in this book, ~~however~~ of permeating dishonesty, whether natural

for him or acquired on Wall Street, ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> not normal ~~prod~~ <sup>is</sup> professional qualification ~~s~~ for his book writing <sup>on this subject or for</sup> or the work that led to it. He entered the field ignorant, which is preferable to how he ~~as~~ <sup>is</sup> as when he wrote his book, his ignorance deceiving and misleading ~~is~~

That was better and less dishonest than he was when he wrote the book in not much more than a year from when he started. But by the time he wrote the book he was largely still ignorant of the basic and established official fact of the assassination. His quest was ~~never~~ never for fact of the assassination. He sought only what he could use of misuse to denigrate all others, ~~and~~ that he could distort into seeming to support the official story or that he could pretend <sup>did</sup> when it did no such thing.

nobody other than himself, and for his investigating and writing he had little more than a year. To make a serious claim that in so short a period of time, with so much to ~~absorb~~ absorb and master, that ~~within that time~~ he could become <sup>of</sup> professional and authentically expert ~~and~~ and have the knowledge required for any honest version of what he set out to do is ludicrous. Posner is not even a "buff" in this. <sup>He</sup> is more <sup>like</sup> the solemn buffoon. *To anyone who does know what he avoided learning.*

Page 448 -

Getting back to that footnote, which he begins with the inevitable lying when he <sup>representing that</sup> ~~percees~~ persists in all those who did not agree with the official solution ~~as~~ believing, saying and doing the same thing about everything, <sup>Posner</sup> he says, "the buffs usually encouraged Garrison's proclivity to widen his conspiracy charges." When I was present this as <sup>more than I can recall.</sup> true of almost none of them. If after all his alleged work Posner believed Garrison had to be encouraged, he really never got to understand that strange man. And I never did that or anything like it, although throughout he has included me in those "buffs."

He then gets into what he knew correctly but either did not like the truth or was just sloppy and careless with it. He begins with a "they," plural, referring to "buffs" when he is talking of me alone. ~~The~~ The rest of that footnote is: "At one ~~xxxx~~ point in the investigation he had a warrant drafted for the <sup>arrest</sup> ~~arrest~~ of Robert Perrin, who supposedly could testify about ~~the~~ Ruby's gunsmuggling activities to (sic) Cuba. The night before he made ~~is~~ the arrest notice public, Weisberg proved to him that Perrin had died in 1962."

In this Posner's like the ~~cha~~ character in the old TV show, "Will the Real (person) Sit and Up?" Even for the Posner self-reflected and self-described in this book, that is the apotheosis of worse than ~~inacc~~ inaccuracy - and it is ~~less~~ inaccurate on each and every point. <sup>lute</sup> Absolute perfection in inaccuracy is not an easy accomplishment, but in this Posner displays real professional ~~cred~~ credentials.

Even more of a self-indictment is it that the truthful account was an ever so much better Garrison story than the <sup>Posner gives as usual, with no source.</sup> ~~one~~ he made up. ~~Unless he thought that the truth was more favorable to me than he wanted to admit.~~

It was not "at one point in the investigation," it <sup>was to</sup> ~~as~~ have been Garrison's

75 <sup>to</sup>  
commemoration of the fifth assassination anniversary. ~~Even~~ that Posner learned from me, its only source save one—Oliver Stone, and Posner did not interview Stone! Why when he <sup>Posner</sup> went after Stone, too, ~~he~~ muffed this one I <sup>can't</sup> ~~can't~~ imagine ~~it~~ unless it is the normal murk of his mind when truth raises its head in <sup>his</sup> ~~Posner's~~ face.

We were talking about Stone and his movie JFK. I told Posner that although I believed that he like all others have ~~a~~ right to write whatever they please, <sup>now</sup> ~~one~~ of us has the right to present fiction as nonfiction. <sup>(What it is more clear is what Posner himself did)</sup> That was the only consideration that led to <sup>me</sup> ~~my~~ first writing <sup>to</sup> Stone and then starting <sup>to</sup> the exposure of his movie. Stone did say he would record their history for the people and tell them who killed their President, why and how. These are his exact words and while from time to time after his exposure he modified them, he never did, as some of those associated with him believe, ever abandon them.

After I read Stone's statements <sup>wrote him at some length, about four thousand words,</sup> on this I <sup>at</sup> ~~rote~~ <sup>some</sup> length because he also said he was going to do that based on Garrison's book, On the Trail of the Assassins. I told Stone that I was there, that the trails of the assassins is the one trail Garrison never took, and I gave him some illustrations. I also attached some documentary proof and offered more if he <sup>w</sup>anted it and to answer all questions he might ask. When Stone did not <sup>re</sup>spond - and that was several months before he started shooting - and I was given a ~~one~~ script that Stone himself had given <sup>way</sup>, I gave the script and my files on what Posner makes virtually unrecognizable in his completely ~~in~~ <sup>more</sup> inaccurate version in that footnote.

What had actually happened is that just as I was about to leave New Orleans ~~about~~ in early November, 1968, I learned of Garrison's coming "commemoration" of that fifth anniversary. I spoke to Andrew Sciambra, known as "Moo," the junior staff lawyer but the one who spent most time with Garrison, not without cost to his personal life, and to Louis Ivon. <sup>to</sup> ~~of~~ Ivon Posner has but a single reference in this shabby piece of work so extolled by those personages of big names whose trust was ~~is~~ imposed upon. On Page 434 Posner says, "Louis Ivon [another Garrison staff investigator]..." (The rest of this sentence lacks any credibility at all, no doubt the reason Posner liked it is <sup>is</sup> much but it libels Ivon and does not relate to that footnote.)

How <sup>must</sup> her is this (pre-eminent of subject mavens, Posner, and he is that ignorant

79<sup>14</sup>

of Garrison, his "probe" that Posner has set out to describe to his trusting readers, his staff and what they all did.

Although Posner has at least two others as Garrison's "chief investigator" on his JFK assassination fiasco, in fact there was only one, ~~XXX~~ Save for ~~two~~ ~~three~~ three that Garrison hired and paid from ~~public funds~~ private funds, ~~two~~ on Mark Lane's encouragement, one by Garrison over vigorous staff objections, his entire official investigator staff was composed entirely of New Orleans Police Department detectives detailed to the District Attorney's office by the City of New Orleans to be his investigators. Of them, Ivon, then a sergeant, was the chief investigator.

Still again, the most thoroughgoing ignorance of fact is Posner's only real qualification for this writing. He neither knew nor wanted to know the truth and he thus could not write it.

From Ivon and Sciambra I learned that Garrison had had an even more grandiose ~~and~~ commemoration in mind, but his staff, mostly Jim Alcock, who was a judge the last time I saw him and is now in private practise outside of New Orleans, talked him out of all but two of the "Grassy Knoll" assassins he was going to charge as assassins. I saw immediately how I could handle the other one, and with ease I did, but from what I knew about Perrin, that would be a tough one to handle in a way that was not impossible for Garrison to live with.

When Ivon and Sciambra asked me to return and see if I could prevent the utter inanity on which Garrison was engaged I agree to and did.

Robert Lee Perrin had taken arsenic in New Orleans ~~in~~ in 1962, about fifteen months before the assassination. Garrison as going to charge him as an actual assassin. I knew what Garrison had and as working on from records Ivon got for me and he said he would have his police investigators do what investigation I required. He did, they got the documentary proof of what I wanted and after two weeks I wrote a long memo on it.

Garrison had made up the story that those long-planning assassins of that vast conspiracy had, with not inconsiderable foresight, arranged a cover for Perrin by

replacing Perrin's body with that of an unknown <sup>Venezuelan</sup> seaman who was <sup>allegedly</sup> buried in Perrin's place. ~~After~~ In Garrison's rather imaginative script Perrin <sup>feigned</sup> suicide ~~he~~ continued to live and thrive as a pulp writer under the name of "Starr." By the time I put it all together in that report (a copy of which I offered Posner, along with the documents, and he declined) I gave ~~it~~ it to Sciambra on a Saturday night. He suggested that <sup>we</sup> meet ~~early~~ the ~~next~~ Sunday morning at the <sup>DA's</sup> ~~SA's~~ office, where he could find me rapidly and where I could work while he and another did the bearding, and I did that. Three or four hours later Sciambra phoned me to tell me it was done and to ask ~~me~~ me to his ~~dinner~~ home for what he did not exaggerate in telling me would be the finest Italian meal I'd ever had.

There is much more but it is ~~not~~ necessary here.

That sick invention had nothing to do with Ruby or any of his alleged "gun smuggling" into Cuba, Posner's own ~~fiction~~ fiction, "no arrants had been drafted", It was not at night and quite obviously no "arrest" of Perrin was possible without digging him out of his grave.

*to whom Posner attributes all but the original sin*

<sup>Do</sup> And, obviously, "the buffs" had nothing at all to do with anything. *he here still again is neither fact nor truth full about.*

This is not only the real Garrison—it is the real Posner.

Posner  
 This ~~Posner~~ ~~writing~~ rewriting of Garrison's and Stone's history and what both knew they were doing in Stone's ~~new~~ movie, when both knew it was not the truth Stone had pledged to the many people who trusted him lacks fidelity not because I did not tell ~~him~~ <sup>Posner</sup> the whole story <sup>to</sup> that to me remains embarrassing because it reminds me of my own bad judgement in believing Garrison when he explained his excesses in those many public statements to me as his "fighting fire with fire." He claimed it was to counteract federal intervention most of which he attributed to the CIA and the FBI, *stick here*

I also told Posner that ~~before~~ <sup>only</sup> then I had decided that it was necessary for the trial to proceed, that there should be a determination of fact in court.

He knew, too, the time of this incredible insanity I prevented, that it was in early November, 1968.

Yet having nothing concrete or factual he could use to defame me, as though that somehow elevated him, he lies about me in the previously quoted footnote on Page 433. There he says that ~~it was~~ it was not until "when Garrison's investigation ended ignominiously several years later" that "some" of ~~his~~ Garrison's "supporters" <sup>+++</sup> "backed away from him. Some, like Harold Weisberg and Edward Epstein even condemned him."

With me Posner knew that was not "several years later" at all.

Epstein was never a Garrison "supporter" as Posner had to know if he personally read Epstein's Counterplot, which Posner cites in his notes and lists in his bibliography. His gross error with Epstein is one of the ~~an~~ innumerable indications that Posner drew upon sources he keeps secret, sources that had as little concern for truth, accuracy or fairness as Posner himself.

Epstein was always and publicly opposed to Garrison. Counterplot, the book, was a <sup>an earlier</sup> later enlargement of a very long New Yorker article <sup>it</sup> that was published the early summer of 1968, hardly as Posner lies about with me, "several years later," the lie he addresses to Epstein also. *published before the trial,*

What is really incomprehensible, especially in this Garrison chapter, "Black is White, and White is Black," (pages 423-52) is that an experienced writer, self-styled investigator and ~~always~~ lawyer, albeit a "Wall Street lawyer," could make as many

C1A

that seemed credible because these agencies had intruded in to my life and that of others.



mistakes about what was so well and so publicly known. Garrison, as too many of us, me included, ~~recognized~~ recognized only too late, was a nonstop liar, like Posner himself. In even the most minor details ~~of~~ Posner's account of how news of Garrison's probe broke, he has <sup>small</sup> little errors. Posner, also knowing the truth, does not tell the truth about what got Garrison started on his "probe" that became public Friday, February 17, 1967. Excerpts from ~~his~~ <sup>two newspaper</sup> newspaper account are published on the back cover of my Photographic Whitewash, which Posner has. The Washington Post story reproduced in facsimile there begins:

The scenario guiding New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison in his investigation of President Kennedy's assassination can be glimpsed in any bookstore. The investigation is Garrison's, but the script apparently started with Harold Weisberg, former Senate investigator and author of "Whitewash," a paperback attack on the Warren report.

Under the headline, "Mystery of Kennedy Inquiry Cleared Up" The Times of London ~~London~~ report, also in facsimile at the same place, begins:

One mystery of the rather mystifying investigation of the Kennedy assassination now being conducted by Mr. Jim Garrison, the Attorney General of New Orleans, has been cleared up. The source of much of his information is Mr. Harold Weisberg, the author of "Whitewash Report on the Warren Commission."

This is not a matter of claiming credit. ~~and~~ Claiming credit for Garrison is like claiming credit for inventing AIDS. Nobody can really claim credit for what strange things that strange man said and did. It is a matter of Posner's <sup>the man and of</sup> his writing, of whether he can be believed about anything he says. There is much more on this one point but it is not necessary after this reflection of <sup>Posner</sup> the man and of his book.

What also is incomprehensible is that when the truth makes an even <sup>stranger</sup> strange case against Garrison and his lack of concern for anything at all, including retribution, Posner shuns truth. Even when he knows the truth because he is a lawyer.

Because he is a lawyer Posner knows also that he lied in saying of Garrison's innumerable <sup>will</sup> ~~will~~ public statements and accusations, that "a courtroom protected him from libel for anything he said." <sup>(Page 432)</sup> There is protection only for what transpires in the courtroom. (Page 432)

Whether from <sup>care</sup> ignorance, <sup>carelessness</sup> carelessness or <sup>vanality</sup> vanality, Posner persists <sup>even</sup> in minor errors throughout his attack on Garrison and those he could attack by attacking Garrison. It is ~~neither~~ <sup>neither</sup> possible nor necessary to address ~~all~~ <sup>some</sup> of them. But I do note that when Posner gets to telling his readers how news of the Garrison "probe" broke he has no source and ~~has~~ <sup>has</sup> that twisted. This also indicates that he did not do his own research and did depend on those not interested in truth and who had their own <sup>agendas</sup> ~~own~~ to ~~grand~~. For them as for Posner the grim New Orleans truth is not enough.

When as he is this chapter alone, the Garrison chapter where he had the richest material

<sup>Posner</sup>  
~~When he is~~ <sup>by</sup> this grossly ignorant, this professional dirty in his writing, this  
unconcerned about all those things necessary to and typical of good and honest non-  
fiction writing, does he not himself make it plain that nothing he says can be taken on  
his word ~~alone~~ and that it <sup>seemingly</sup> confirmed, cannot ~~safely~~ ~~n-see-see~~ be accepted with normal  
standards of confirmation, <sup>reading his source notes,</sup>

And, save that he is a viper, how petty it all is, all his exaggerations, con-  
trivances and inventions, <sup>and all those plain lies.</sup>

If Posner had not begun with his obviously corrupt and dishonest purpose and if  
he had done all of his own work <sup>he might</sup> ~~Posner would~~ not have been as careless, as inaccurate  
and as overt in his demonstration of his ignorance of the basic, established fact as  
he reflects in this chapter as well as throughout his entire book.

Why did so experienced a writer who is also a ~~lawyer~~ lawyer do what Posner did?

The most obvious explanation is that he ~~go~~ began with objectives <sup>that include</sup> ~~a~~  
<sup>making</sup> himself out to be what he is not and was not when he completed his travesty  
of a book, a real, authentic expert on the ~~John~~ JFK assassination and its investigations.  
Knowing this ~~not~~ to be ~~truth~~ true, he then undertook to diminish all others he regarded as  
his competitors, however he did it and whatever his dishonest means.

In this, of course, he was also paying the CIA back for those great and unpre-  
cedented favors <sup>they</sup> ~~he~~ did <sup>him</sup> them, great and unprecedented even if there were, as there is  
reason to believe, <sup>other</sup> ~~they~~ were greater favors ~~than~~ <sup>also met</sup> than Posner reports.

#