

XXXII CAESAR'S BEAT OF THE FORMULA

Case Closed became an international success with unprecedented or close to unprecedented attention. Gerald Posner became an international celebrity because of that book and, of course, because of what Random House and ~~an~~ <sup>the</sup> uncritical, unthinking, sensation-seeking major media did with him and with the book.

literally I was ~~to~~ about to type, "his book." But that is precisely the point; can it honestly be called "~~his~~" <sup>"his"</sup> book? What is there in it that is authentically his?

Is there a single new fact in it? Not one. For all that hoopla and all that fawning attention, of the little actual fact in the book almost all of it has been public knowledge for ~~to~~ about three-quarters of Posner's life. There is not a single fact in it that is not <sup>public for</sup> more than half his age.

Even if what he took from that ~~innocent~~ fifteen-year-old David Lui were factual, which it is not; and even if all that he took from Failure Analysis as his when it was ~~not~~ ~~were~~ factual, at it is not, what is there in ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> this book of such dedicated and determined dishonesty that is Posner's and his alone? What ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> his real claim to fame, <sup>and</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>What</sup> did he do to deserved the fortune <sup>(that goes with it, on and from this book)</sup> and what its success means for what he ~~writes~~ <sup>then</sup> writes next and after that?

443A → Not a blessed thing except ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> wildest exaggerations <sup>and</sup> interpretations and judgements that are not even reasonable when stacked next to the established fact.

Renatus Hartogs,  
He magnified the offhand opinion of <sup>that</sup> ~~that~~ shrink of such tarnished professional reputation, into the allegedly accurate <sup>forecast</sup> ~~forecast~~ that Lee Harvey Oswald <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ a natural-born assassin and he ~~at~~ <sup>laced</sup> the airways and battered the ears of interviewers with his opinion that <sup>it</sup> ~~it~~ is most important part of his book.

At least ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> is the one part he can claim <sup>as</sup> ~~as~~ his own, anyway.

And it is worse that worthless. ~~It~~ <sup>It</sup> is a monstrous disinformation.

Not a thing else in all those six hundred pages is his and his alone, <sup>and more of it</sup> ~~and~~ has any real/meaning at all.

He did conduct what he says were ~~two~~ <sup>two</sup> hundred interviews. Are they not new? ~~Did~~

Aside from the work of others that he presents as his own and the factual errors and the omissions that are his, he has not

in any constructive sense at all. They

They are not new, did not yield <sup>any</sup> (new) information about the assassination or about Oswald.

They did not, not a single time in all two hundred of them, <sup>as they are in his book</sup> As we have seen, the only real use he made of those interviews is to use them to hide the fact that he actually suppressed ~~that~~ that was public knowledge, ~~as~~ his way of not reporting what was relevant and what was public knowledge, by selecting what he <sup>w/</sup>anted of those interviews, not once using what had significance and was public knowledge and pretending that the scrimshaw he selected <sup>d</sup> was the guts of it. *It never was.*

<sup>^</sup> Yuri

~~See~~ Nosenko, for example, the defected KGB official who had all that knowledge about Oswald, the ~~Man~~ Nosenko to whom the CIA gave Posner access and the use of him, entirely unprecedented, to promote Posner and his book on international TV. With Nosenko as his unique and exclusive source of Oswald information, what did Posner really write about Oswald that has real importance that Nosenko said?

Not even what ~~the~~ Nosenko told the FBI and I got and published in 1975. That was when this self-styled ~~W~~ "Wall Street lawyer" whose fantastic career there was that of a clerk was still in college. He was then twenty-one years old, that is how long ago what he suppress from his book with the cloak of that sensation, his exclusive interview with Nosenko, was public knowledge.

And as part of his payback for the use of Nosenko he suppressed on behalf of the CIA what it itself had confessed publicly in official testimony before the Congress, telecast from ~~W~~ coast-to-coast and long forgotten, those gruesome, subhuman details about how it plotted terminating Nosenko, by drifting him crazy, or by flying him over the ocean and dropping him into it.

There is only one of my books he did not buy from me, Oswald in New Orleans. Clearly, it is the one he already had. It also is the one not in his bibliography. In that book he learned that Oswald had a TOP SECRET and a CRYPTO security clearance as a Marine and that this is not recorded in any official records the Commission had or the FBI disclosed. ~~and~~ This was not, to this new celebrity, this new new sensation as an author, of any interest or value in his version of Oswald's life, such being his version.

He was asked <sup>about</sup> this when he appeared at the San Francisco Green Apple book store

in his native San Francisco on September 29, <sup>1993,</sup> (with Channel 4 present and also interviewing him there. I have an account of it from my friend Hal Verb, who was present and, along with two other friends, questioned Posner during a question period. One, a doctor, Gary Aguilar, "faulted Posner for misusing Dr. Hartogs 'clinical' evaluation of Oswald when he was a truant and erring child," Hal's words. From Hal's letter Posner had little or nothing by way of real response to this and to other criticisms, like his asking Posner why he omitted this information about Oswald's high security clearance as a marina. Hal also asked him what in his bibliography Posner listed only five of my books, omitting Oswald in New Orleans, which held this and other information not congenial to the formula for Posner's book, fame and fortune. Posner's reply was that he put in his bibliography only those books that he ~~wrote~~ "actually referred to." Hal then called to Posner's attention what he did use that appears in that book only. In response, that ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> not response, Posner rambled in all other directions. Hal said "he never really answered."

This gets to a very real question; what kind of man, what kind of <sup>writer</sup> author is Posner, the man and the writer who is this publicly dishonest and is unabashed by it?

The fact is that of all Posner's snide cracks about me, none factual and some even irrational, the one that pretends to be based on fact is uniquely from Oswald in New Orleans and it is <sup>entirely</sup> ~~entirely~~ unsourced. He gives no source for what he says I wrote and he has no source for his false claim that it is not true, ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> ~~unfactual~~.

What is his record on this, on his compulsive need to put all others down as though, small man with the big ego that he is, that somehow elevates him?

At the same time assaulting those the CIA does not like, who have been critical of it or who in their work have done what it should have done and did not do.

His criticisms of me did not and do not trouble me. They are insignificant compared to those of the <sup>errant</sup> officialdom he serves with them. <sup>his criticisms</sup> When I was told about them I did not rush out and buy his book. He had told me he would send me one of the earliest copies and I was content to wait for it. (It never did come) When my History Professor friend Dave Wrone ~~read~~ started to read it he ~~had~~ <sup>had</sup> bought an extra copy for me and told me I should read it. I had ~~not~~ <sup>uncited</sup> written Posner asking him for his sources for the criticisms and com-

a picnic

It was not at our home. It was at our farm. It was ~~arranging~~ for Washington-area Jewish <sup>military</sup> service personnel and their families, with the children seeing eggs ~~hatch~~ hatch, playing with the just-hatched chicks, ducklings and goslings, <sup>(gathering just-laid)</sup> ~~gather~~ eggs from underneath the hens and playing with and riding on tame farm animals. The University of Maryland so liked what we were doing back in the 1950s, about the time Posner was born, it established its own ~~2~~ duplication of it as a "touching farm" for children in the Washington suburb of Wheaton. Old McWeisberg's Farm did not have a good <sup>ring</sup> sound. So they called it Old McDonald's farm. But it definitely was not McStalin's, as the FBI would have it.

There were other such made-up slanders

4067

Unlike Posner, as we next seen, I do not live a secret life. If he had wanted some professional slanders he would have found a <sup>large</sup> selection of them from the government records on me that are in that same subject file, under my name. That file also indicates ~~where~~ where the complete set of what was disclosed to me is filed. It is not all, <sup>false</sup> official nastiness, either. He might not have liked to learn from what the CIA disclosed that the records it inherited from a <sup>predecessor</sup> agency reflect that when I was an investigative reporter I gave President Franklin <sup>D</sup>elano Roosevelt what I had gotten from a then associate <sup>in Chile</sup> that he used in one of his famous "fireside" chats. It was documentation of a Nazi plot to take Chile over.

ment he made <sup>to</sup> never answered. As I learned later, he was not so busy he did not engage in communications with many others. But such criticisms themselves are merely minor nuisances. I was working on a different book and continued <sup>d/</sup> to work <sup>on</sup> it. Meanwhile, when I had the time, I was annotating ~~this one~~ for the historical record. I did that until it became apparent that the ~~corrupt~~ record <sup>for history</sup> he had fabricated had to be corrected for that historical record.

Posner's criticisms of me are like greasy kid stuff compared to what the FBI made up and distributed widely from the records I later got from the White House down. Thoroughly professional and widely experienced in character assassination it told LBJ that my wife and I ~~annually~~ "annually celebrated the Russian Revolution" with a party of thirty strangers at our home.

There was not a word of truth in it. What the FBI did was give that baseless interpretation it then passed off as fact to an annual religious gather well in advance of the date of that revolution, right after the Jewish high holy days.

~~There were others,~~ no less vicious, not less completely false, that also were distributed but not in that response to that White House request.

After living with years of such niceties <sup>as these and other official slanders</sup> what Posner said had no impact, except as a measure of him. It meant so little I did not bother to remind him that he had not answered ~~my~~ requests for his withheld sources for what he wrote about me.

But what soon emerged when I got to reading his book is that I was not the exception. ~~He~~ <sup>he</sup> did that with everyone <sup>any</sup> regarded as a kind of competitor, <sup>or</sup> whose writings contradicted his. Disproved <sup>his</sup> really. Even as we have seen, Edward J. Epstein, whose politics are close ~~to~~ those Posner discloses are his.

Then I remembered that this precisely what he had done in his Meneghel Mengele. (With John Ware; McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1986) He uses that book as a systematic assault on the reputation of that most eminent of Nazi-hunters, Simon Wiesenthal, a man so deservedly respected that a research institution in Los Angeles is named after him. Before Posner was born Wiesenthal was risking his life daily to expose and to bring to justice all these Nazis and their fellow murderers of <sup>those would</sup> ~~the~~ Wor War II at

unspeakable atrocities, <sup>those</sup> who differed from Mengele in degree ~~only~~. <sup>the</sup> In degree of their personal involvement in tortures ~~only~~. Some are responsible for many more deaths than Mengele was.

Checking Mengele it became apparent that Posner's assault upon him and his reputation was much more extensive than I had recalled.

He refers to Wiesenthal in it on twenty-eight of its three/hundred and twenty eight pages. This is on almost ten percent of the pages of the entire book. On all but three of those twenty-eight pages Posner insults, ~~demeans~~, ridicules or is ~~either~~ critical of him in other ways. One of those three exceptions is his reporting that a Nazi who had escaped to Brazil hoped to be able to torture Wiesenthal. On another page he makes his one acknowledgement that Wiesenthal was right about anything. And on the third he makes his sometime praise, as with me, saying that without Wiesenthal the post-war Nazi hunt might not have happened.

Again as with me, in not a single instance does any of Posner's criticisms seem to be necessary to his book. He uses what he writes as an excuse for assaulting the ~~premier~~ aged Nazi-hunter of (all of them).

This is not to say that ~~anyone~~ <sup>anyone</sup> is above criticism or that any of us do not make mistakes. I think, for example, that Wiesenthal was wrong to defend Kurt Waldheim from the proofs that he was involved in the Nazi horrors in Southeastern Europe, including in the slaughter of Greek, <sup>Jews,</sup> particularly those from Salonika, and in what then was Yugoslavia. In this Wiesenthal was also pardoning Waldheim for hiding his Nazi record when he was proposed to head the United Nations and keeping it <sup>so</sup> secret all the time he headed it. Obviously much of the world disagreed with Wiesenthal on this but only a Posner ~~so~~ would seek to defame him over it.

And in that seek to make himself look better by comparison, even more of a Nazi hunter.

A decent man does to Wiesenthal's reputation what Posner used his Mengele book as an excuse for doing?

And an honorable writer does anything like that?



No, of course not! Never!

Only a very small man with a very big and a very sick ego seeks to make more of himself by seeking to make less of others than they are.

With Posner's record in Case Closed as dishonest, as deliberately, ~~intentionally~~ intentionally dishonest as we have seen, his gall is as great as his uninhibited ego when he utters a word of any kind of criticism against anyone at all.

With what it is a kindness to refer to <sup>as</sup> Posner's mistakes, how can he possibly criticize anyone for what he believes are their mistakes?

The note in Posner's eye is no mere particle and it is permanent. He could not cast his note first if he wanted to, and that, as is obvious on reading his book, he never would want to do.

This is Posner's way and he indulges it broadly in the dirtiest and most unconscionable ways against those he regards as competitors or those he does not like when it serves no other ~~as~~ real purpose, in Case Closed.

Except, of course, to please those in the government and elsewhere who helped him, as part of his payback for their invaluable assistance in making his book what it became. That also is to their interest. Like telling the world that the CIA did nothing at all wrong, not really. Only that it was a mite too secretive for its own good. Ditto for the FBI and for all those living Warren Commission lawyers, too. He defends them all and he attacks those they do not like.

The FBI disliked Sylvia Meagher to the extent that it tried to get the United Nations to fire her. Not for any real reason at all. Just because of the FBI's belief of what her beliefs were. If Posner was not aware of it it is not because it is not set forth in the very file cabinet in which ~~it~~ <sup>he</sup> worked when he was here, clearly identified with her name on the file folder. But the United Nations would not do that, <sup>in fact or in law</sup> giving no basis, and more than merely pleased with her work.

About this and much <sup>more</sup> like it in those very files in which he spent three days, all the official reflection of all those wrongful and basically anti-American things it

did, Posner had not a word to say. That reflects his kind of Americanism, his attitude toward traditional- and Constitutional - American belief. But when he practises the identical McCarthyism with Meagher he can hardly criticize anyone else for doing what he does even when it ~~is~~ is so <sup>conspicuously</sup> anti-American in concept and in <sup>deed</sup> action.

He gets into the guts of his criticism of Meagher with this sentence, "Her book concentrated on any testimony or exhibits that raised doubts about the final report." Although he immediately refers to this as "leftist," what is wrong with writing a book that is critical of anything at all, particularly about the Warren Report?

How else does our society function, when it does, ~~is~~ except from the people having access to all sides of any controversy?

And how can anyone criticize this without himself not believing in this basic Americanism, this basic need of any diverse society, as our is and will be and should be for there to be a democratic system?

But where does Posner get off making any criticism like this of anyone?

What else does he do in his book except that he does it from the other ~~side~~ side?

And, unlike her, with the abuses we have seen.

What kind of concept does Posner have of American law if he does not realize that this is the way we seek to evolve justice, with two sides, not the authoritarian one side to which he is so obviously attached.

And this criticism of her, might you, from the very man who took only part of the work of Failure Analysis Associates as his own, limiting himself to the prosecution, pretending that there was no other side, no defense, and hiding also the fact that when this was judged in the American way, by a jury, <sup>He kept</sup> then keeping secret from his reader that the jury disagreed with what he said that prosecution case meant and would not convict <sup>as he</sup> pretended that all of the Failure Analysis work, meaning, of course, only the part he took, is beyond any question at all?

This man has the colossal colossal gall to criticize anyone else for "raising doubts about the final report," <sup>his</sup> words?

What an astounding denunciation of the most basic Americanism!

Even more so when it is remember<sup>ed</sup> that he does this with all who "raise doubts" about that Report!

Without spelling it out out loud, could he have stated more unequivocally that he does not hew to this most basic of American beliefs, *that we do question, de "raise doubts."*  
The next sentence reads, in full, "Meagher was a committed leftist, and her politics are clear throughout her book."

We'll come to what he says makes her "leftist" but first, did he mention a word about those extremist ~~of~~ the most extreme of the radical right he quoted for all the world as though there was no question about their belief and their credibility?

Light for example that Hubert Badaux who sent with his sick book that equates ~~x~~ says nudism is communism the incredible political propaganda we have seen, that the respect conservative Democrat Hale Boggs, later a Commission member, was a Communist?  
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ And this from the man who presented Martin Luther King, Jr. as a Communist!

How far is that from the racist right extreme? And he says ~~it~~ <sup>this</sup> while criticizing Meagher as a "leftist".

Assuming she said it, and his lack of an end note does not encourage belief that he represents it faithfully, he next says, nothing omitted in quoting to here, "She admitted ~~that~~ admitted that when JFK's death<sup>w</sup> as announced, and before Oswald was arrested, she derisively told her fellow workers, 'Don't worry . . . you'll see it was a Communist who did it'."

Which is precisely what did happen! *She was correct in what she said before it happened.*

Oswald, from the official records themselves an anti-Communist, was labelled ~~as~~ a Communist and that immediately.

*Is there something wrong with Meagher because she was correct? Only what she said does not like what she said, is not to Posner's liking, even though quite accurate, and misuses it to write against her?*

Still nothing omitted in quoting Posner, "When Oswald was taken into custody and she heard of his pro-Castro activities and his Russian wife, she knew he was 'framed'."

Except for the bitertending, careerist, upwardly mobile, formula-book writers like Posner there is no basis for believing that indeed Oswald was framed? *450 & next*

Can it possible be that Posner has done any of the work he claims to have done, boasts about, really, with all that jazz about having to reindex those twenty-six volumes holding so many FBI records in facsimile and he does not know that from the very first the FBI classified its JFK assassination records as "Internal Security- USSR- Cuba"?

For him nothing fails like correctness.

456 jobs

Unpleasant as it is, that is the fact in the official evidence itself <sup>that</sup> ~~only~~ the  
Posners of the literary world see no profit or future in faithfully <sup>ing</sup> report what the  
actual evidence is.

Of the many evidences of this that we have just seen, Oswald could not be and cannot  
be placed at the window from which in the official account he has to have fired those  
three shots, and the official evidence is that he could not have been there.

Can it possibly be that without his political blinders, those that keep him  
where the money and the greatest prospect of money is, Posner can't recognized that  
time and events have proven that "eagher was politically <sup>and correct</sup> sophisticated as he, hogtied  
by his political beliefs and his preconception, cannot be?

His last sentence, again nothing omitted from this page (419), is, "In Accessories,  
she charged that large numbers of the Dallas police were members of 'right-wing  
extremist organizations,' and ~~that~~ she spoke derivisely of the forces behind the  
assassination, including 'American Nazi thugs'."

And here he finally has a supposed source note.

If there was any one thing <sup>about</sup> ~~some of these~~ many of those Dallas police  
that was not secret, that was publicly and well known, it is that <sup>in my</sup> ~~these~~ they were member  
of such organizations.

It those day at least that was commonpalce, not at all limited to Dallas or that  
area. I then ~~lived~~ in the wealthiest and supposedly most liberal of the Washington  
suburbs and I knew members of that police force who were open members of the KuKluxKlan  
and of other extremist politically extreme-right groups.

For all of this and half as much before it Posner has this <sup>one</sup> source note before it ~~in~~  
by <sup>about</sup> half a much writing and this one after it: "40. Sylvia ~~Heaghar~~ <sup>Heaghar</sup>, Accessories  
After the Fact: The Warren Commission, the Authorities, and the Report (New York;  
Bobbs-Merrill, 1967)" Then, "41. Ibid, pp xxi, xxvi; Sparrow, After the Assassinations,  
p. 72)

The sentence preceding the paragraph from which I quote above is, "The second book  
that damaged the Commission was Sylvia ~~Heaghar~~ <sup>Heaghar</sup>'s Accessories After the "act,"

and it is at this point that he has his number 40 to refer to his <sup>notes</sup>. Those two pages in her Foreword are <sup>hardly</sup> ~~scarcely~~ the only place ~~is~~ in her book that she <sup>damages</sup> that Report. ~~And~~ and here was not <sup>the</sup> second, either. But there is nothing on either of those pages that says anything at all about <sup>"</sup>American <sup>"</sup>Nazi Thugs" being <sup>"</sup>behind the Assassination. (What that fierce part'san Sparrow said in his ~~Literary~~ London Times Literary Supplement <sup>article</sup> ~~article~~ that was later reprinted in the <sup>United</sup> States as a pamphlet pretended to be a book, but a pamphlet in all dimensions, including content, that Meagher says is not worth taking the time for. Posner says he read her book and a second-hand interpretation is not appropriate within quotation marks.

Or, once again, even Posner's notes cannot be trusted.

It is at this point that he also condemns her index in a lengthy footnote. ~~In fa~~  
In fairness to Posner and for evaluating his writing and his beliefs, this is it, ~~nothing~~ omitted:

---

\*Because it is the only index of its kind, Meagher's has been used extensively, even by the House Select Committee in its reinvestigation. However, the author, in reading the twenty-six volumes, made a new card index and compared it to Meagher's publication. Her subject index reflects her bias that Oswald was innocent. For instance, under her listing for Oswald's potential for violence, Meagher does not find a reference until Volume II, and lists a total of only twenty-three incidents in the volumes that relate to that subject. The author, however, discovered the first supporting reference was in the first volume, and there were more than fifty citations just in the fifteen volumes of testimony. There are quite a few other examples in which Meagher's index underplays evidence that incriminates Oswald but meticulously lists references that tend to exonerate him or raise doubts. That prejudice is critical since the index was marketed as a scholarly undertaking and is universally used by researchers. It means those who use the index are following each other in making the same mistakes and unwittingly ignoring evidence that buttresses the Commission's conclusions.

At this point in <sup>his</sup> the text Posner <sup>gives</sup> the number of words in <sup>these</sup> Commission volumes as "more than a million-plus words." Technically, ten millions is more than one million. But if Posner knew there were a ten million, from all the time he says he studied them and then indexed them, he would not have said "one."

Posner's claim that he indexed the entire <sup>↑</sup> twenty-six volumes, explicit here, is farcical from the ignorance of the content of those volumes ~~is~~ throughout his book, as we have seen. "Lagher's index, as printed, takes up one hundred and fifty pages. Each holds <sup>fifty</sup> seventy lines of type, with each line holding seventy units of type. the extent of the ~~index~~ indexing this accommodates is considerable. It represents an enormous labor in just acquiring the knowledge and then carding it. There is no probability at all that Posner did all else he claims to have done and made anything at all like a real index. He may have carded what he wanted to use but there is little likelihood that he did anything more.

The author of ~~the~~ this virulently anti-Oswald book ~~is~~ criticizes her for ~~being~~ having the "bias that Oswald as innocent." That is <sup>w</sup> wrong but his having "the bias that Oswald was <sup>/</sup>guilty is not wrong.

He uses his Hartogs's nonsense about Oswald and violence as a basis for criticising her in an admittedly incomplete index, the volume to be indexed making a full and complete index impossible. With all those fabled cards of his he gives not another illustration of how her "index unerplays evidence (that incriminates (which it ~~can~~ only tend to do) Oswald." *and a half*

Does this seem to fit her having some seventy citations to the "ballistics" evidence alone? That and other like it "tend to exonerate?" *On about an entire page on the ammunition? On more than three pages of it strong to the rifle?*

With this no more is needed to reflect what Posner is really up to here, still arguing his case and attacking all who do not agree with him.

What Posner really resent is that her index is not as blindly partisan from the ~~left~~ right as he would like it to be. he is also careful to give his biased description of her purpose in her index, the purpose it did and does serve, <sup>meanwhile</sup> ~~Posner~~ keeping his alleged alleged index <sup>secret</sup> as he does.

And where does he get off compl<sup>ain</sup>ing that hers is not a dependable index, his is and he has kept and continues to keep his ~~secret~~ secret. He does not dare <sup>to</sup> do otherwise because that, too, would ~~expose~~ expose him as additionally dishonest and an authentic fraud:

The objective of the index is to provide guidance to all information in the Hearings and Exhibits of direct or indirect importance, according to a rationalized system of classifications. It is hoped that this systematic, comprehensive key to all the source material on any specific subject will enable scholars to test the assertions and conclusions in the Warren Report against their independent judgment, on the basis of fidelity to the source data and impartiality of selection by the authors of the Report.

What Posner knows and does not say is that the official investigation itself was biased, beginning with the presumption of Ossald's lone guilt. The <sup>notes</sup> in the Report cite all that tends to support the official preconception as Posner does. Meagher's objective was to make what else there is in the official evidence accessible, ~~and~~ that she does and there is not a thing unscholarly about it. <sup>the</sup> ~~Her~~ authentic lack of scholarship, as by now is starkly clear, is Posner's.

His dishonesty pervades all he does. Here his victim is dead. Otherwise he would not have dared any such blind partisan from his opposite end of the political spectrum, this man who referred to Martin Luther King, Nobel Laureate, as a Communist!

In this and in many <sup>points</sup> places throughout his book he places himself in the right political extreme and his opinions, even if he believes them, can be evaluate by what he tries to hide and does now, where he comes from. politically as well as intellectually.

But again, to him ~~the~~ <sup>take the</sup> what is right and proper for an ~~America~~ American writer is to ~~take the~~ work of others and present it as his own, being careful to take only the prosecutorial part and then misrepresenting it as the complete thing while suppressing the part of it that proves him wrong in his own prosecutorial brief and then to condemn as partisan, as "leftist", those who write the other side.<sup>2</sup> Persuasively and honestly, so honestly Meagher in her very title accused the Commission of being "accessories after the fact" in the JFK assassination. And she did it in a book that has not been refuted. Not by him, certainly.



Why should I have? That book, the full title of which he omits to be able to hide the subject to contrive this phony criticism, is about the Warren Report. It is not about the Oswalds. It is titled, Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report.

Although Posner here skips about, I did not in that book and I continued to report about New York <sup>on the Commission,</sup> what was relevant in the book I wrote, not the book Posner wants it believed all should have written.

his book that he wa says in the only real biogr phy of Oswald.

Hung up on his ~~imagined~~ <sup>New York City</sup> contrived interpretation of the juvenile report on Oswald as an unruly boy when he and his mother lived in New York, Posner ~~as~~ criticizes me for saying <sup>enough about</sup> of their period in New York ~~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. The criticism of this tiniest would-be Caesar of them all is that I did ~~not~~ even inform the reader that "Marguerite and Lee lived with the Pics." (Page 11) 456A

Two pages later, when he is into his Hartogs fantasy, he criticizes me in another note, "Harold Weisberg talks of the tests but does not quote any of Hartogs' conclusions." Here he does not cite where I wrote that. He had ~~a~~ a good reason, as good a reason as he could possibly have. <sup>a cited what I wrote</sup> Had he he would have directed the reader to what in order to contrive his fictitious "solution," that Oswald was a boy/assassin, according to his interpretation of what Hartogs "concluded," he had to suppress <sup>conclusion about this in</sup> from the Commission's Report. It says that Posner is entirely wrong in his psychiatric concoctions. And what he here cites <sup>but I wrote,</sup> (is a continuation of what he criticized me for <sup>two pages earlier</sup> in the earlier note. Hartogs, the lone shrink in Posner's version, was not that at all, as what I here quote from what I actually wrote, which is not what Posner represents, <sup>makes clear:</sup> as the reader can see:

As he grew, Oswald was an inconsistent student. Sometimes he earned "A's", but more often, especially when older, poor marks. He had a lifelong problem with spelling. In August 1952, Oswald and his mother moved to New York City, where an older, married son by her first marriage also lived. Oswald became a persistent truant

and the object of study by social service agencies.

The Report does evaluate testimony from the trained people who examined Oswald because of his truancy. These included Dr. Renatus Hartogs, a psychiatrist (8H214ff.). Although not necessarily valid with respect to Oswald the man, two comments in the Report are worthy of consideration because of the lack of alternatives:

"It would be incorrect, however, to believe that those aspects of Lee's personality which were observed in New York could have led anyone to predict the outbursts of violence which finally occurred." (R382)

"Contrary to reports that appeared after the assassination, the psychiatric examination did not indicate that Lee Oswald was a potential assassin, potentially dangerous, that his 'outlook on life had strongly paranoid overtones', or that he should be institutionalized." (R379)

A more recent psychiatric examination of the adult Oswald is in the Commission's record but avoided in the Report. While in the Soviet Union, Oswald attempted suicide. He was hospitalized and at that time was subjected to three days of psychiatric observation. The psychiatrist's conclusion was that he was "not dangerous to others" (18H464).

(The Commission's panel of psychiatric experts evaluated its information, including all from Hartogs, for an entire day. The Commission had its court reporter there. The deliberations were taken down verbatim, the transcript as has long been available, and with the label "Commission transcripts" on that file drawer with but a single file cabinet between it and one of those in which Posner worked, it was available to him had he wanted it. But if he had heeded it, he would not have been able to<sup>w</sup>rite this book. So, he ignored it.)

The sentence following the one Posner quotes on his page 11 leads into what I in fact did report, <sup>truth fully</sup> only not as Posner would <sup>have</sup> liked me to report it. That sentence leads into what I quote from the Report, not from Hartogs alone, the <sup>not</sup> Report drawing on what he <sup>said</sup> alone of what the "social/service agencies" said about Oswald, the little boy.

Posner's problem is that the official conclusions are the ~~exact~~ opposite of his contrivance on which his entire hoked-up "solution" is based, that as of that boyhood time Oswald was clearly ~~indicated~~ as a coming assassin. The Report, which sought to prove that Oswald had a history of violence, not only could not do that, it ~~said~~ the exact opposite of what almost thirty years later Posner made up. The Commission did have a panel of psychiatric experts assess all the information, including what Hartogs reported. Its conclusions are the conclusions of those experts. The words of the Report could ~~not~~ be more ~~completel~~ completely the opposite of what Posner made up in saying of Hartogs in particular, as I wrote in Page 10 of Whitewash (he cited only page 9) "the psychiatric examination did not indicate that Lee Oswald was a potential assassin." Not even that he was "potentially dangerous." 457

The question here is not what meat this would-be literary Caesar eats but what he ~~bits~~ instead of meat. The meat is what I quoted fully and correctly, what is not meat at all but is the literary ~~equivalent~~ of LSD is Posner's fantasy that Hartogs forecast Oswald's alleged career as an alleged assassin.

What is no less a self-indictment in these <sup>Posner's</sup> contrived criticisms of my writing is that <sup>he</sup> Posner misrepresents what I was writing about. ~~He~~ ordains, this minuscule would-be literary Caesar, that all ~~see~~ see and write as he does. ~~He~~ says he writes about Oswald when in reality he writes about an Oswald he imagines and thus all writing is about Oswald. What he misrepresents is the <sup>what my book is about. It</sup> stage-setting of my book that is not on Oswald at all. It is on the Commission. The subtitle could not be more specific, "The Report on the Warren ~~Report~~." But even if this were not true, Posner still entirely misrepresents what I wrote. But if he had not, if he had cited what he pretends to refer to, he would have directed attention to what entirely ~~disproves~~ disproves the entire basis of his claim to fame and fortune.

Both the Commission and its panel of real not Posnerian psychiatric experts stated firmly, unequivocally, that Posner's book is based on a deliberate misrepresentation

490A

Here Posner hoists himself on his own petard. He cannot claim not to have knowledge of what he criticizes me for writing. So he knows that under vastly improved conditions, the very best, professional shooters of all could not duplicate the feats attributed to Oswald. If Posner had been honest and had reported either the official testimony and exhibits on this or had not misrepresented what I wrote about it in my first book, he would have had no book because <sup>on the proven impossibility, that</sup> he insists Oswald was the only shooter, that there was no conspiracy. Posner met that problem as he did all others, with overt dishonesty: he entirely suppressed the official account of the official tests, he omits my reporting of those results and he instead diverts by his false accusations against me.

In Whitewash

of the real Oswald as a boy, ~~and since after that.~~

He then criticises me in another note (page 29), writing, "Harold Weisberg states that Oswald's marksmanship... was poor..." Once again, ~~no~~ citation of where I said that. And once again Posner had the best of reasons. It is in the chapter "The Marksman" from the same, my first book, pages 24-30. It is here that I reported Dean Andrews' dissertation to the Commission on the requirements of good shooting ~~based~~ "on my five years as an ordnance man in the Navy." (pages 24-5) I follow this with ~~that~~ <sup>what</sup> Posner had to excise to serve his special ~~din~~informational purposes, The sentence he mutilated from page 25 reads, in full, ~~with what Posner censored out underscored,~~ reads, "Oswald's marksmanship in the Marine Corps, several years earlier, was poor, despite the efforts of the Report to establish otherwise." 458A

I then referred to and quoted the official Marine Corps evaluation of Oswald as a "rather poor shot" and I refer to the Commission's own interpretation of the tests done for it by the best rifleman in the country, provided by the National Rifle Association. I go into this in detail in NEVER AGAIN! but here I do show that they could not, in the official test that for all his reading and indexing Posner somehow managed not to report, duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald. (page 26)

The last thing in the world Posner wanted to direct readers to - or in the event that Random House had a peer review, as it did not, naturally - subject-matter experts to, is the official Marine Corp evaluation of Oswald as a "rather poor 'shot'." I printed that in facsimile in that chapter, the entire report "By direction of the Commandant of the Marine Corps." Oswald fired one point above the ~~very~~ minimum required of all in the services, scoring 191. Here is the official Marines evaluation over which Posner prefers the opinion of that good ol' boy Sergeant Zahm:

The Marine Corps considers that any reasonable application of the instructions given to Marines should permit them to become qualified at least as a marksman. To become qualified as a sharpshooter, the Marine Corps is of the opinion that most Marines with a reasonable amount of adaptability to weapons firing can become so qualified. Consequently, a low marksman qualification indicates a rather poor "shot" and a sharpshooter qualification indicates a fairly good "shot". I trust the foregoing will serve the purpose of your inquiry.

458B  
fals

Although we here focus on Posner's formula of attacking all others to make himself appear to more than he is by seeming to diminish them and to undermine their writing thereby, it should not be overlooked that in these <sup>o</sup>~~criticisms~~ baseless criticisms he make of my very first book he records the fact of his intended dishonesty with what is the very basis of his own book: Oswald <sup>1</sup> is the born assassin and Oswald, the <sup>y</sup>superior of <sup>Buffalo Bill -</sup> Wild Bill Hickock, Annie Oakley and all others as a rifleman when he was in fact so lousy a shot not to get kicked out of the Corp. his friends <sup>1</sup> scored him with hits when in fact he missed and thus phoned up a bare minimum ~~passing~~ passing score. Posner, if not from his own so often boasted of work, knew without question from my citations of the official evidence in the very passages he quote <sup>1</sup>selectively, omitting what exposes him as the fraud he is: Oswald was not the ~~pre~~ preordained assassin Posner says Hartogs concluded he was and Oswald was in fact a lousy shot <sup>man of his</sup> and ~~had~~ not been the shooting the Commission attributed to him is impossible for anyone.

The deliberateness of Posner's dishonesty could not have been better established by Posner himself.

*And without it he had no book!*  
459 fols

for 4/5/81

It is not from feeding on wholesome meat that poor puny Posner who would be the Caesar of assassination writers came up with these, his critical ~~and~~ references to me other than the one that follows:

In 1966, Harold Weisberg published *Whitewash*, the first in-depth attack on the Warren Report.<sup>25</sup> 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. Robert Blakey said his "rhetoric was so obscure, his arguments so dependent on accusation rather than logic, the effect of [his] work was to make complex issues confusing."<sup>26</sup> (Page 414)

Posner's source note in ~~it~~ to the Blakey book, <sup>only</sup> gives no source ~~at~~ for his calculated slur <sup>about me, his</sup> or ~~alc~~ calculated dishonesty, hardly what most writers include as credentials for the writing they cite. Beginning at the very beginning, Posner is in varying degrees inaccurate and deliberately prejudicial.

As the copyright page of *Whitewash* discloses, it was first published in 1965, <sup>9/</sup> ~~not~~ in 1966.

That I had been a reporter, an investigative reporter, an intelligence analyst as a World War II ~~soldier~~ soldier and as a civilian, a trouble-shooter in an agency of them, the OSS, is not to Posner qualification for the work I did in writing *Whitewash*.

<sup>Why</sup> What does Posner give no source for what <sup>seeking</sup> he seeks to portray me as undependable, as a "leaker" when he obviously has a source? His citation is not to that at all. <sup>with</sup> ~~He~~ <sup>his</sup> source,

but not for his distortion, may well have been me. I had nothing to leak and I leaked nothing. As for that Blakey quotation, Posner also knew, from me if not from his supposed research, that I was the credited source of <sup>and</sup> papers from coast to ~~coast~~ coast of criticisms <sup>and not doing</sup> of what Blakey was ~~doing~~ doing as the honcho of the House assassins, <sup>that</sup> ~~that~~ committee <sup>was when he</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> alive, while he ran it, and he never once had a <sup>y/</sup> response or contradicted a single thing I said. Blakey began each committee session with what he styled as a "narration" of what that hearing <sup>examined</sup> would ~~see~~ see at. In each and every case, so far from intending to conduct a real investigation was Blakey, he ticked off his selection of what critics wrote and then devoted that day's hearings to refuting it.



With ~~a single~~ <sup>one and only one</sup> exception: <sup>ed</sup> He never once mention my name or quoted any of my books for refutation.

When I was the source of public criticism of Blakey to which he could not r<sup>o</sup>/spond, what else would one expect him to say and how h<sup>o</sup>onest is citing him referring to me?

I once gave the St. Louis Post Dispatch official records that Blakey was supposedly investigating and suppressed. ~~The~~ paper got a series of four page-one articles from those records, sensational articles it also syndicated <sup>and</sup> were published widely. With this and with me cited by name as the source of criticism of him in the New York Times, the Washington Post and in other papers, and when Blakey could not fault a single thing I said, he was reduced to disapproval of my <sup>w</sup>riting and of the book that is today <sup>is still</sup> used as a college text.

Knowing this did not mean, of course, ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> Posner had to use it. There is no compulsion that writers tell the truth, a freedom he exercises extraordinarily often in his book.

Notice Posner's word, for "possibly" leaking. "Who ever heard of anyone being fired for what is "possible?" Knowing the truth he did not even say "allegedly." And knowing that I had then and for several years been that committee's editor, he says I was still <sup>an</sup> investigator. One can imagine that in his work an investigator can learn secrets to leak, ~~to~~ but not the editor of the public record. Who had no secrets to leaks as, ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup> committee itself had none.

I was not even ~~fired~~ <sup>fired</sup> "fired." I worked for the ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> Senate but I was not on the Senate payroll. I was certified by the clerk of the Senate to represent it in the Bloody Harlan trial <sup>of that era</sup> by the Department of Justice, <sup>it</sup> which borrowed me from the Senate to help it there. But even then I was not on the Senate's payroll, which was public. I was actually an executive agency employee and on that payroll. I was the ~~exec~~ <sup>exec</sup> administrative assistant to the Director of the Farm Security Administration. When I was relieved of my Senate duties I could have returned to that job. When I elected not to do that and instead to return to writing, the ~~Y~~ <sup>Y</sup>committee delayed my being returned to the FSA for several months in an effort to <sup>repay</sup> ~~pay~~ me for some of the inordinate ~~and~~ unpaid overtime I'd

been putting in <sup>several</sup> four years.

Although I continued to edit the Committee's hearings when I was in Kentucky on that "Bloody Harlan" case, I did get behind in the appearance of the books of hearings. Not far behind but they were delayed. Some of the newer ~~men~~ <sup>men</sup> members of the committee's staff, those who sought to use that on a curriculum vita to move upward with it, were anxious for the committee to cease to exist. It was not a standing committee and its life therefore had to be renewed by the ~~US~~ Senate with each new Congress, every two years. To this end they wanted me to rush the hearings, without correcting <sup>all</sup> inaccuracies. Because that "civil liberties" committee was doing historically important work - it even led to a radical change in corporate labor relations, one that contributed to an enormous expansion of the economy, I would not publish an inaccurate record. So, those careerists were anxious to oust me

At the same time the chairman believed, probably correctly, that the committee's continuation would interfere with his campaign contributions from wealthy corporations. He believed he had gotten all the political ~~benefit~~ benefit he could hope for and that if the committee continued with the work it was doing it would be hurtful to him politically.

Ending the committee meant cancellation of the planned investigation of the abuses of West corporate farms in California. The ~~workers~~ farm workers they abused <sup>so</sup> mercilessly were not ~~then~~ Chicanos or illegals from Mexico. They were the Oklahoma and Arkansas farmers and their families who had been wiped out by the dust storms of that ~~era~~ era. They were then referred to as "Okies" and "Arkies."

Believing that the planned investigation was important to the country, I openly lobbied for its continuation for those scheduled hearings. In that I was allied with one of the John Lewis- <sup>U</sup> ~~United~~ Mine Workers <sup>U</sup> ~~Union~~ "legislative representatives," the effective ~~lobbyist~~ lobbyist the late Gardner "Pat" Jackson. And, over even President <sup>F</sup> ~~Franklin~~ Delano Roosevelt's objections, we succeeded. The Senate did continue that committee's life for that investigation.

One of my official responsibilities as the committee's editor was to make the public record available to those who wanted access to it. In those days so long before xeroxing,

when after the committee's public hearings I had the stenographic transcript of each session set in type at the Government Printing Office, I had extra "galley proofs" made, called "pulled." Some of those ~~up~~ proofs I mailed regularly. One of the reporters to whom I was told to mail them was, not then having changed his name, Isidore <sup>F</sup>einstein, ~~at~~ <sup>at</sup> the New York Pbst. Izzy Stone, having changed his name later, became famous as I.F. Stone. He then became and he remained a friend. There were also college professors ~~was~~ to whom I was told to mail sets of proofs. I recall one was at Notre Dame. And then the "Washington reporters" came in to read them in my office. As did citizens with no need, with only the desire to study the hearings before the books of them appeared.

Doing this was part of my officially-assigned duties and I did it for three years. Sometimes one of my superiors would send a report <sup>or</sup> to me, or tell me to mail a set of galleys to those they told me to and, of course, I did that.

One day one of my superiors sent a reporter to my office so I could show him the galleys of a hearing already held but not yet printed in book form. It was on what then was known as the <sup>"Special Conference Committee"</sup> Industrial Conference Board. <sup>changed</sup> Its name has since been shortened. One of the ~~more~~ hairy exhibits in that hearing was a letter from a then General Motors vice president whose name, <sup>H</sup>arry Anderson, I still remember. In it he told his ~~board~~ associates from various of the ~~larger~~ larger corporations with labor troubles that they needed a "Black Legion." That was a Michigan band of <sup>auto-information financed</sup> terrorists who really terrorized, including by killing, those who led or supported efforts to unionize the auto plants.

That story was published by a labor news syndicate. It led to an ~~embarrassing~~ embarrassing uproar, as did much in the public record. It was a completely accurate story based on the public record only. What was officially the public record. It was not only my responsibility to give anyone access to it, in this instance I had been directed to do that.

It was over this that my detail from the FSA to that committee was ended. But even the <sup>11</sup> because all involved knew ~~in~~ what they were doing and ~~were~~ <sup>of it</sup> ashamed, ~~that having~~ because of the quality of the work I edited and published and because of the great amount of <sup>of overtime</sup> unpaid overtime I had put in to achieve that quality. That is why the end of my detail was delayed for months, months in which I could seek a writing connection.

461A folo

Feb 461

(That ~~reporting and~~ <sup>investigative reporting</sup> reporting was not without inter-  
est as credentials to one <sup>composing</sup> not <sup>comparing</sup> <sup>improvisations</sup> on a theme by Hartogs. The first  
of a series on <sup>exposed showing</sup> Nazi cartels <sup>and</sup> their interference with the <sup>us</sup> pre-Pearl Harbor war  
<sup>preparedness</sup> effort was praised in writing by the "White House," several cabinet members, including the  
then Secretary for War and even <sup>by</sup> Edgar Hoover himself. Some of the corporations I  
exposed were taken over after those stories appeared as alien property. Before I com-  
pleted that series I became an <sup>British</sup> ~~unregistered~~ <sup>agent</sup> in economic warfare at the  
suggestion of the Department of Justice. It therefore did not charge me with being an  
unregistered agent.)

*copy*  
If there be those who believe I did wrong to lobby for the committee's continuation, which the Senate did vote, so that it ~~could~~ could investigate those horrible conditions of those dispossessed farmers ~~from~~ mostly from Oklahoma and Arkansas, they can decide for themselves whether in fact I served the nation's interest in it by recalling either the book or the movie, "The Grapes of Wrath". They depict faithfully what the committee exposed.

As Posner knew. But as he did not say, preferring his sneaky dirtiness of that contrived slur.

The little man who gets smaller and smaller in my mind as I think of him has that enormous ego he cannot satisfy any way other than by seeking to diminish those whose work he cannot equal so that at least in his own eyes he appears to be larger than he is by any standard - other than <sup>his</sup> dishonesty.

What Case Closed has is ~~nothing~~ <sup>NOTHING</sup> ~~at all now~~ <sup>and factual.</sup> It has what is literary theft, and distortion, misrepresentation and conscious suppression of what is public as its basis.

To this, knowing full well that he is a fraud, Posner adds, as he did with that man of remarkable bravery and accomplishment, Simon Wiesenthal, deliberate defamation of those he regards as competitors and who in fact published work his cannot ~~survive~~ survive comparison with.

Aided and abetted as he was by Random House and the CIA and by the absence of any legitimate peer review, <sup>and</sup> the imposition on the ~~the~~ trust of famous writers also published by Random House, and by the massive advertising and public relations campaign and the widespread sale of ancillary rights throughout the ~~world~~ world, and by the unquestioning lusty support of the major media, and by so many other forces who saw <sup>benefit</sup> ~~benefit~~ to them or to their interests in this monumental <sup>my</sup> fraud that because <sup>me</sup> ~~because~~ such a success in deceiving and misleading more people than any other book supposedly on the JFK assassination ever did, Posner is an undeserved success.

All Posner's <sup>his</sup> contrived/demeaning and deprecation of those critics who had been critical of the CIA, as I had been, ~~and~~ obviously were part of his payback to it for all it ~~to~~ did to help him and his book.

~~And~~ what it did to help him and his book is without precedent in its entire history.

In violation of its charter's prohibition of any intrusion into domestic affairs by it, ~~it~~ it helped him immeasurably and he paid it back with his attacks on others not in its tent.

And so, for this and for other reasons, knowing full well what he was doing, Posner undertook his successful rewriting of our history in which, no netheless, the case is not closed.