

them, Stephen Ambrose, was silent when I wrote him. He has no defense of what he did. I asked that of him.

Posner is a man, as the full manuscript proves much more than this book does, who has trouble telling the truth even by accident.

This extends even to himself. He was not a Wall Street lawyer. His actual "Wall Street" experience was a short span of the most insignificant and most menial work, on "discovery" material for IBM in a major anti-trust case.

Without any of the media making any check at all, it, too, puffed him up as what he was and is not, a "Wall Street lawyer."

Of the innumerable instances of his subject-matter ignorance, I cite one.

I select this one because he had access to the fact in two ways. The first is that I published it in my 1965 book of which he has a copy and to which he refers in his book. His reading of that book was so close that he quoted four non-continuous words from a page of about 600 words. The other is that I have a file on it and he had unsupervised access to all my some 60 file cabinets of records and to our copier.

In support of his nonexisting case of a shot fired in the assassination earlier than the Commission said he refers to the late Nobel Laureate Luis Alvarez, as the inventor of the "jiggle" theory, that amateur photographer Abraham Zapruder's reaction to an earlier shot caused his camera to jiggle. I brought that to light in my 1965 *Whitewash*. Alvarez's students then asked him about this. He later wrote an article about it and had it published in *The Scientific American*—which Posner does not mention. My file, which is not included in the FOIA lawsuit to which I refer earlier in this book because I did not have to take that one to court, includes even Alvarez contemptuous disregard for his misuse of funds provided by the Energy Research and Development Administration for that work and publication.

But then Posner did not dare cite either my first use of that Zapruder testimony or the testimony itself because what Zapruder actually testified to is that a shot had come from behind him, from that Grassy Knoll so infamous to Posner, and that

he saw the President hit by the first shot fired, earlier than in the first of the official account! The shot that Posner said missed. (*Whitewash*, page 47)

There are few people bolder than Posner in his dishonesty, few who respond to criticism by making personal attacks on those who criticize him more than he does.

One of the many illustrations of this is when Dr. Cyril Wecht, to Posner's face on CNN, said that Posner had used Failure Analysis's work as his own. Posner launched a false and a personal, attack on Wecht instead of addressing the obvious truth Wecht spoke. That was, as Wecht soon proved, a false attack—another Posner lie. But in responding to Posner's false attack Wecht used up all the time. Posner got away with it and was even able to add to his lies that Wecht had "distorted" in telling the literal truth.

Posner got away with the same thing in a letter to the Washington *Post*'s weekly Book World section. In a perceptive review, reporter Jeffrey Frank had noted the same factual and truthful criticism that Posner used Failure Analysis' work as his or for him. Here is Posner's response, which is not only not a response but is a carefully-designed lie: the *Post* accommodated him by publishing it in its December 12, 1993 issue:

"The insinuation that I claimed that FAA's enhancements were commissioned for the book is false. In the book, the citations to FAA's work and Dr. Piziali's testimony refer to the 1992 ABA mock trial which is a matter of public record."

In this Posner intended to lie, having no real choice.

*There is no mention in his book of the American Bar Association or its mock trial or of "testimony" there by Piziali!*

If Posner had mentioned any of that he could not have gotten away with his studied pretense that all that work was for him. That the mock trial was a matter of public record is irrelevant. Posner's slyster-like reference to it here is to say that he told all of that in his book, which he did not.

Had he, he would have exposed himself and his book and he would have killed it in the writing.

He is clever at such deceptions and his practise of them never ends.