

check vs 85
inside on SBT
Oswald as agent?

Apparently there is nothing too cheap a shot for Posner to take at me and, as is his norm, it is actually incorrect.

At the opening of his chapter the title of which suits Posner himself admirably "What Happened to the Truth?" (obviously, I Posner happened to it) he says that "some buffs," of whom he mentioned Penn Jones and me, "published books but their ~~sales~~ had dismal sales."

My first book went through thirteen printings and of even small prints that is anything but "dismal sales." It was, when Dell reprinted it beginning to the end of 1966, Dell's only best-selling work of non-fiction for a half year. The first print was a quarter of a million, not by any means "dismal" for that era, and after I published Whitewash II.

Naturally, this writing being Posner's, he cites no source for his statement and he did not ask me anything about those sales.

Posner is cute on page 434 454 of the same chapter when he lays another foundation for he being what happened to truth.

There he says that I "had sued for the transcript of the January 27, 1964 ~~Warren Commission executive session~~ session of the Warren Commission, which discussed a newspaper article that asserted Oswald had been an FBI informer." His footnote says of this that the Commission members "discussed ways to approach J. Edgar Hoover about Oswald." His source citation, again Tricker Tricky Dickery, is to what he says on his page 348, that the report was ahead. There he still has no source. The reason is apparent elsewhere in Posner's book: he uses that transcript also for all the world as though it was just given out, including to him, and he never mentions that when he cites it he does not cite his source, my Whitewash IV in which I reproduce that transcript in facsimile.

Although there is nothing too contrived or too insignificant for Posner not to misuse, even invent, in his determined efforts to dem an all criticism of the official account of the assassination and its investigations, here is one of the places he could, if he was not ignorant and if he intended even to pretend honesty and impartiality

he could have reported more, much more, to be informative to his readers. Like the Commission classifying its dirty linen TOP SECRET when it had no authority to classify anything, the means by which that transcript had been withheld from me. Or he could have given a much more meaningful account of the book's contents, which means much more than the discussion of that press account indicates. I here quote only the back-cover summary of some of those contents. (This also means that Posner did not have to read the book, which he did or someone else did and gave him what he used from it, without crediting it as his source.) And what this brief summary indicates you will not find in Posner's definitive book:

• President Gerald Ford, the then-Commissioner: "First shock" he called this "dirty rumor" (p. 48). Ford took this TOP SECRET transcript--a federal crime--changed it to hide its meaning, then sold it (pp. 124-130)!

• CIA Chief Allen Dulles: CIA, FBI commit perjury when caught (pp. 62-6); hide (p. 61), lie about their agents (pp. 52-3, 62-6) who are "terribly bad characters" (p. 72).

• Commissioner McCloy: "very limited mentalities both in the CIA and the FBI" (p. 72).

• Chief Justice Warren: how LBJ conned him into doing what he knew he shouldn't.

• J. Edgar Hoover: the whole government feared him.

Here also for the first time is the secret relationship between Commissioner Russell and Weisberg, the story of the faking of a transcript to eliminate Russell's disagreement with the Warren Report and how Russell to his dying day encouraged Weisberg to disprove the Report.

None of this it worth mention to Posner? He didn't mention any of it, not that Dulles said that perjury is right and proper; and not that to become our appointed vice president, which shortly made him our first inelected President Gerald Ford denied that he stole this transcript and that he also sold it when asked at his confirmation hearing?

It can be understood that Posner would suppress the fact that Commissioner Senator Richard Russell had a secret relationship and that he "encouraged me" to his dying day

"Russell encouraged me to disprove the Report" he had been conned into

signing. That was because he believed the single-bullet theory the validation of which is the intent of Posner's book was impossible. As I reported, Russell told me that Kentucky Senator John Sherman Cooper agree with Russell^{him}, that the theory that is an indispensable basic in the Report was impossible. In 1991 my friend Gerard "Chip" Selby and his brother Rick, researching in the Russell li archive at the University of Georgia archive, at Athens, Georgia, not only located and copies Ruseel's records relating to me, to his high opinion of my first book and to the fact that it was in accord with his belief, they also located an O oral history by Senator Cooper confirming what Russell told me and adding detail to it. Cooper would not agree that the single-bullet theory was even possible.

This gets to the guts of Posner's dishonesty and his purpose in being so professional dishonest. He writes an entire book defending the single-bullet theory and not only suppressed what I had published and he had refuting that theory, he pretended that none of it existed, including that two members of the Commission considered it to be impossible.