

TWO Lib. and Posner's, Not Pardonable

XIII

Before leaving Posner's <sup>special</sup> version of events and persons in New Orleans, in recalling my experiences with them of two and a half decades ago I remembered my silence about what others may criticize me for saying nothing about until now.

Starkly put, Clay Shaw did commit perjury.

I hasten to add so would just about everyone else. I would have, faced with the vindictive, hateful and probably ~~very~~ frustrated ~~indeed~~ indecency represented by Garrison's charging him with perjury after the jury acquitted <sup>him</sup> Shaw in less than an hour.

Garrison based his perjury charge on those credible Clinton, Louisiana witnesses Posner deprecates. They all testified to ~~top~~ having seen Shaw and ~~Oswald~~ there Oswald there Oswald there together when supposedly Oswald was there looking for a job. <sup>W.C. A.H. & O.B. here</sup> At his trial Shaw testified he was never away from New Orleans because he had the full responsibility for renting the space in the new ITM building then nearing completion. I believed as soon as I heard of that testimony that it was false. I also knew how to determine whether or not it was false. The ~~clues~~ clues were ~~in~~ in of those TV pictures of Oswald picketing the old ITM building the importance of which as news if not as evidence should have been obvious to Garrison and all of his staff and to the journalists of minimal competence. <sup>Lately of course, to Posner, too.</sup>

Johann Rush, another Posner favorite because they hold similar political views and because, based on them rather than any real investigative work Rush also believes that Oswald was a lone assassin. Rush was there taking the pictures but he ignored the leads in what he was looking at.

The FBI, however, had not ignored those leads. Only it did nothing about them. I have the FBI reports in which it identified ~~se-a~~ some of those in some of the pictures.

Their identifications of two men in <sup>one</sup> ~~are~~ of those pictures that all the supposed ~~investigators~~ <sup>investigators</sup> ignored. <sup>then and later, was my clue</sup> The pictures indicated what I believe <sup>of</sup> about them and what they were doing at that old ITM byu building.

I had other reasons to believe that Shaw lied at his trial in his alibi testimony.

So did Garrison and most of the reporters.

Saying they were credible does not mean I believed what they said ~~and then~~ when I talked to them and then that they testified ~~to~~.

~~They~~ were credible.

But that Shaw would have had to take Oswald up to Clinton to get him a job, ~~or~~ if that was Shaw's intent, is not credible.

It also is not credible that if for some reason Shaw wanted Oswald to work at the hospital he would have had to drive him here.

He was a well-connected man who knew people all over and like most men in his position, he could and did do much business by phone.

Shaw ran the Trade Mart. If he had no job opening he could have made a job for Oswald and it would not have been as menial as working inside a mental hospital at least one of its buildings ~~is~~ kept locked. *all the time, I was there.*

I do not know what the truth is and I never tried to find out.

For me it was enough that no matter how credible those Clinton witnesses appeared to be ~~the~~ story did not make <sup>s</sup>ense *for Shaw.*

That once again someone <sup>or</sup> was counteffeiting Oswald or at ~~the~~ least <sup>o</sup>pretending to was a possibility but by then my work had passed that kind of study, as my books reflect, and I could devote no more time to anything like that.

(An aside: ~~For~~ years I've been telling young <sup>or</sup> people interested in the subject, particularly those who fancy theorized "solutions" to the assassination, that in keeping with the wisdom of the medieval British ~~the~~ philosopher, William of Occam, ~~that~~ we seek the simplest solutions <sup>o</sup> they should ask themselves two questions. First, is what they are considering reasonable. If they are satisfied it is, then they should ask if it is possible.

(~~I~~ considered that the identification of Oswald and Shaw by those Clinton witnesses failed both tests.)

(Similarly, those reading books like Posner's, which give the impression he ~~seeks~~ to give, that in effect he discovered sex and invented the wheel, in addition to asking the above questions there should be sensitivity to the end-noting. How complete is it? How much that should be ~~sourced~~ <sup>sourced</sup> isn't sourced at all? How much is sourced to what readers

cannot understand, cannot get, sourced in ways that defy checking? And for those who know something about the subject matter, what is omitted and why it is omitted; what is represented incompletely or unfairly and again why.)

That still from those movies was not required to believe that Shaw had sworn falsely ~~because~~ because of this other reason to believe that he had.

The plain and simple truth is that if Shaw had not lied, innocent ~~as~~ <sup>as</sup> he so clearly was of Garrison's charges, he could have been convicted. Conviction was not merely a matter of going to jail. It ~~was the st~~ meant he would bear forever the stigma of having conspired to th kill the President *then and forever in history.*

I avoid giving their names because if I do and if they are still alive these two <sup>9</sup> When on other work I was near them I interviewed them. It was not in New Orleans. innocent men ~~wh~~ would be plagued by demands for interviews. ~~But~~ I have my interviews <sup>5</sup> *interviewed them separately.* on tape. (I did not seek to interview them until the charge of perjury against Shaw had run its course in the courts. He died exonerated, an innocent man, as he was.

The Trade Mart had contracted the renting of the space in its new building to professionals in that ~~field~~ <sup>branch</sup> of real estate. The two men in those pictures ~~nevertheless~~ of Oswald picketing the old ITM building were, they told <sup>there</sup> me, <sup>the</sup> (under that contract that Garrison ignored although it was public knowledge, <sup>they did</sup> had done the actual space-renting ~~who had that responsibility he testified he had.~~ work. It was not Shaw/and they said he had nothing to do with that space rental.

- This incident indicates how guilt can be ~~created~~ <sup>created</sup> despite innocence. If Garrison had not been so totally immersed in the fictions of his own ~~fab~~ <sup>fab</sup>rication, if he had been thinking <sup>as</sup> of the experienced prosecutor he was, he would have thought of ~~these mistakes~~ <sup>picture</sup> that space-renting contract and those two men in that ignored still from those movies, he would have subpoenaed them, and their truthful testimony would have been made even more persuasive by the <sup>signed</sup> contracts they, not Shaw, negotiated.

~~had~~ <sup>what</sup> makes it even more incongruous but is also typical of Garrison, that strange man, is that for an entirely different purpose he often, loudly and sometimes at great length declared that the name of the company hired ~~for~~ to do that spece renting was a CIA name!

And he still missed it.

This is not intended as criticism of Posner. For his book he had no need to know more about Garrison's persecution of Shaw than that it failed, that Shaw was found ~~as~~ by the jury <sup>to</sup> be nit guilty.

This is not to say, however, that if he had intended the full and complete investigation he and Randon House tout, he should not have looked into it.

extra space

There is so much more that can be said about Oswald in New Orleans that Posner did not say about it in what he modestly proclaimed to all cameras and open mikes is the first and the only definitive biography of the man, the first that understands him, Hartogs-style; and there is so much more than can be said about Posner's version of Oswald in New Orleans.

By this time, however, more is not needed for adequate exposure of this ~~part~~ <sup>or</sup> ~~age~~ of Posner's CIA-assisted commercialization and exploitation of the assassination so carefully timed to further exploit the thirtieth anniversary.

But before following Posner's tracing of Oswald to Mexico City there is a credit due him.

In Jim Garrison's On the Trails of the Assassins, (Sheridan Square Press, New York, 19 ), and I know of personal knowledge that is the one trail Garrison never took, he explains away his failure to quote from any of his own files of his own "probe" as that fiasco was referred to in New Orleans, by claiming they were stolen. From one of the members of his former staff I have learned that Garrison blamed one of those who have been most unquestioningly loyal and devoted to him. Garrison's claim was that this man sold them to the CIA. That is even less <sup>credible</sup> than most of the ~~many~~ things Garrison said.

Posner, however, claimed he "discovered" them. He uses that strange was of ~~it~~ putting it. Posner does not say where he "discovered" them. <sup>or how</sup> He does not say what he found in them. He does not, in fact, have a single end note referring to them.

Why, then, does he boast of having "discovered" what he makes not single reference to?

Posner, demon investigator he presents himself as being, "discovered" the files of the man who ~~just~~ made international headlines for several years and does not in his book claim to be so definitive. <sup>include</sup> not include a single word from <sup>those</sup> that Garrison files? ~~At yet~~ Not only did not a single interviewer or a single reporter wonder ~~why~~ why, after allegedly "discovering" Garrison's files <sup>Posner did</sup> not attribute ~~as~~ as little as one word in his book <sup>Garrison</sup> of more than six hundred pages to those files.

Not surprisingly, Random House makes the same boast. In its fall, 1992 1993 issue of its house organ, At Random, it devotes the first two articles to Posner and his book.

164-2

The first, ~~is by~~ The Man Who Killed Kennedy, is by Carsten Fries, Random House's production manager and <sup>a</sup> ~~managing~~ editor ~~of~~ of this house organ, The second is a ten-page treatment of Posner's great exclusive from the CIA, his interview of ~~Nosy~~ <sup>Wojtyla</sup> ~~ko~~. In Fries' account, in writing his book, Posner "originally set out to ~~re~~ ~~examine~~ ~~all~~ the evidence." In so short a period of time ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> yet, for "all ~~the~~ evidence." Fries repeats Posner's proud boasts saying of it that Posner "created his own index" to the Warren ~~material~~ <sup>material</sup>. Naturally, Fries also finds it necessary to include Posner's ugly ~~slurring~~ <sup>slurring</sup> of Sylvia Meagher, being every bit as decent a man as Posner. And then Fries repeats <sup>another</sup> Posner's boast, ~~saying~~ <sup>saying</sup> "he made ~~discoveries~~ <sup>discoveries</sup>, such as the undisclosed files of...Jom <sup>H</sup> Garrison." Needing to know nothing and knowing nothing save that the sole purpose of this ~~puffery~~ <sup>puffery</sup> was to sell more books, Fries adds of this tremendous Posner accomplishment for which he found not a scintilla of use at all, those ~~disc~~ <sup>disc</sup> Posner-discovered files "will resolve many controversies." <sup>Not in his book,</sup>

<sup>Of</sup> ~~The~~ unquestioning multitude that fell all over itself <sup>themselves</sup> in praising this crude and obvious fraud of a book, not one wrote or spoke a word about what is in those files that would "resolve many contriversies." <sup>Not one asked why not a word of them is in the book, attributed to this remarkable discovery, possible after all these years only to Random House's supersleauth.</sup>

The reason is obvious and my learning about what Posner can have been magnifying into this added one of his ~~spure~~ <sup>spure</sup> ~~claims~~ <sup>claims</sup> may have significance in explaining what his real motive was in doing this hippodromed fakery of a book.

When I was in New Orleans I spent all the time I could in trying to learn more about Oswald. I did not copy Garrison's files, as many, including the later Bernard Fensterwald did. I had no interest in Shaw or in that strange collection of characters in Garrison's ~~imagined~~ <sup>the by then dead</sup> conspiracies, save for David Ferrie. That was not alone because I ~~am~~ <sup>am</sup> the one who brought Ferrie to light. Fensterwald established the Assassination Archive and <sup>R</sup> ~~Research~~ <sup>Research</sup> Center. All his personal files are there.

As was Posner, <sup>he was there</sup> When ~~can~~ <sup>can</sup> pinpoint the beginning of Posner's book and its purposes.

Geroge Lardner, Washington Post Pulitzer-prize winning reporter and assassination expert, was at the AARC checking ~~out~~ <sup>out</sup> its files after Oliver Stone's movie JFK was out

105

The controversy over Stone's fictional account of the assassination he had boasted was non-fiction Lardner and I started. I gave Lardner what I told Stone two months before he started filming <sup>to</sup> proved that Garrison's book was fiction and dishonestly ~~so~~ <sup>and what had given Stone</sup> so. Then I was give a copy of the script. I gave Lardner both <sup>and</sup> he wrote and the Post published an expose of Stone's <sup>use</sup> (use of the assassination to say what he wanted to say anyway.

Posner's presence at AARc at that time strongly suggests that his <sup>concept</sup> ~~concept~~ of his book so consistent with his political beliefs is that it would be ~~the~~ what Stone's movie was from the opposite side. He would do for the other view, that Oswald was the lone <sup>u/</sup> assassin, what Stone did for the view that there was a conspiracy.

Obviously, Posner did not find, what people would usually say, or even "discover" Garrison's files. ~~What~~ <sup>What</sup> "ensterwald" <sup>l</sup> copied of them needed no discovery and, in fact, could not be "discovered." How can one "discover", which means to be the first to find something, what had been publicly available for more than twenty-five years and is listed in <sup>its</sup> ~~the~~ available records at AARC?

<sup>The only</sup> ~~The~~ <sup>only</sup> real discovery Posner seems to have made is how he could exploit and commercialize the assassination with what would have major ~~media~~ <sup>media</sup> appeal, a switch on the official mythology with the false <sup>re</sup> ~~pretense~~ <sup>pretense</sup> of supporting that mythology by "new evidence."

As we have seen and as we shall see again, Posner has not produced the tiniest sliver of new evidence. As it relates to the crime and its investigations, not a single word is new. And of what he claims as his own work, we have seen and we will see again, that is the work of others he presents <sup>A</sup> as his own work. <sup>IN</sup> less polite language as laymen ~~rather~~ rather than lawyers understand the word, what is "new" in Posner's fraud of a book is what he stole. <sup>u</sup> ~~Not~~ that he ~~did~~ did not also steal what was not new, what was published, and present that as his own. We have seen this and we shall continue to see it as we continue to expose Posner's commercialization of the new assassination sycophancy, even the formula <sup>fr</sup> for which is not his, with increasingly less need to expose all of it, exposure to this point being that definitive and devastating <sup>money-bags fraud</sup> of the man and his ~~fraud~~.