

Tom Hanks, Gary Goetzman, and Bugliosi's Bungle: A Comprehensive Review of *Reclaiming History*

Part V-2:

Bugliosi vs. Garrison and Stone, or, How to Investigate a New Orleans Conspiracy from Pasadena

James DiEugenio

V.6

As time has gone on, the Clinton–Jackson incident has gained both more credibility and more importance in studies of the Kennedy assassination. I refer, of course, to the famous sighting of Clay Shaw, David Ferrie, and Oswald in late summer of 1963 in two small towns in sparsely populated East Feliciana Parish, approximately 115 miles, or 90 minutes, north of New Orleans. As was the case with many JFK assassination occurrences, Jim Garrison was the first official to seriously investigate this intriguing affair. Since it shows Oswald in close proximity with two people he is not supposed to know—and who would blow his Marxist cover—the Warren Commission doesn't mention it. The FBI knew about it through witness Reeves Morgan (Davy, p. 103); and, as we shall see, the Bureau acted on it. (Bugliosi cannot admit this because, as we shall see in Part VI of this series, he is actually going to vouch for J. Edgar Hoover's investigation of JFK's murder.)

The clearest description of this fascinating incident was written by William Davy (pp. 101–117). I will briefly summarize the facts as he presents them. Oswald appeared first in the town of Jackson, which is about ten miles west of Clinton. He walked into the barber-shop of Edwin McGehee, and started talking to him about finding a job. McGehee thought the best place for him would be the local state hospital, which Oswald apparently did not know was a psychiatric hospital. He also referred him to two people who could help him: state representative Reeves Morgan, and local voter registrar Henry Palmer. Oswald visited the home of Morgan, who lived in Clinton, probably that evening. Oswald asked him about getting a job at the hospital as an electrician. Morgan said he could not put him ahead of his own constituents. But he advised him that it would help if he took the Civil Service exam or was registered to vote. Oswald was observed at the Morgan home by both Morgan's daughter Mary, who was inside the house, and his son Van, who was playing outside on the front lawn. Van recalled that the driver of the black Cadillac waiting for Oswald had a shock of white hair.

The next day, a voter registration drive was taking place in Clinton. Since this was 1963, it was an emotionally charged situation, as there were strong elements in the parish of the White Citizens Council, and, even worse, the Klan. But the voter registration group, the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), had set up a drive to register African-American voters. A black Cadillac drove into

the midst of this campaign. Although the majority of witnesses testified that there were three people in the car, a much smaller number said there were four. Since the black registrants were accustomed to the FBI monitoring their efforts, they paid special attention to the auto. Corrie Collins, the chapter leader, identified the three people as Clay Shaw, David Ferrie, and Lee Harvey Oswald. William Dunn, another CORE volunteer, corroborated Collins. Registrar Palmer walked outside his office and saw Oswald immediately, since he was the only white man in line. Several witnesses—including Charlotte Greenup, James Bell, Robert Thomas, Eddie Spears, and Gloria Wilson—vividly recalled the car. Henry Clark stated in an affidavit that he saw a well-dressed man in a suit outside the car, who was well over six feet tall, and resembled an actor (Garrison thought this to be Jeff Chandler). He also saw a man with unusual hair using a pay phone. He swore that the first was Shaw—who did resemble Chandler—and that the second was Ferrie.

With all the teeming interest about the car, Palmer asked local Sheriff John Manchester to approach the auto and try and get identification. Manchester did so. He approached the tall man in the suit, who said he was with the International Trade Mart in New Orleans. Manchester requested his driver's license, and asked him if he had anything to do with the voter drive. The man said no. Manchester asked for his name, and the man said it was Clay Shaw. Manchester looked at his license and the name matched. Manchester reported back to Palmer that the man was with the ITM. When Oswald was in line to register, Palmer asked him for an ID. Oswald gave him some separation papers from the Marines. When asked for local references, Oswald named two doctors: Pierson and Silva. When the HSCA subpoenaed the records of the hospital, incredibly, both names were on the list of doctors employed at the time. (How Oswald knew this is an interesting mystery, which has never been solved.) Palmer would also later identify the trio as Oswald, Shaw, and Ferrie.

Probably the next day, Oswald appeared at the hospital. The receptionist, Bobbie Dedon, directed him to the personnel office. He filled out an application for secretary Maxine Kemp, which another person, Aline Woodside, recalled seeing.

As noted above, Jim Garrison first investigated this incident in 1967. It was re-investigated by the HSCA, which—as we shall see—did not do as good a job as it should have done. There has been a documentary film made on the subject called *Rough Side of the Mountain*. Bill Davy, Peter Vea, and I have been to the scene twice to talk to the surviving witnesses. Joan Mellen did her own investigation for her book. And today, the ARRB has declassified and collected the surviving statements and records of witnesses from the two official investigations. (No surprise: it's not even mentioned in the *Warren Report*.) There was even a picture taken of the car parked in Clinton with the occupants inside (Mellen, pp. 223, 225). That is quite an impressive amount of material. Today, no objective observer can deny that the event occurred.

Bugliosi is not an objective observer; he is a Holy Warrior fighting the infidels besieging the Temple of the Warren Commission. So he spends twelve pages going after everyone—and I mean everyone—that was involved (End Notes, pp. 858–870). To read those twelve pages is to see a lawyer using every trick in

the book—and then some—to get rid of what attorneys call “bad facts”—that is, facts that hurt his case. And although Bugliosi wants to separate *Reclaiming History* from *Case Closed*, there are very few places in the book where he resembles Gerald Posner more than he does here.

For instance, he actually tries to use Marina Oswald as a witness against Oswald being on the scene (*ibid.*, p. 858), as follows. In one of his early statements, McGehee described a car, different than the Cadillac, in front of his shop. Based on this—if you can believe it—Bugliosi asked Marina if she had been in Clinton or Jackson; and then actually uses her denial as evidence against the event happening! First of all, McGehee's shop was located in Jackson, not Clinton. Secondly, this is the only time this other car is mentioned. Thirdly, McGehee testified that he never actually saw Oswald exit or enter the car that he drove up in. This other car had a bassinet in it. It was later determined that there was a laundromat next door, and that that was what this car was there for. Bugliosi has to know this if he read Davy's book, which he says he did—because it's all there, in black and white, on page 299. But, as I said, this is what lawyers do to obfuscate an issue.

Then follows a puzzling passage, which I really don't know how to take—except to speculate that he may be capitalizing on the simmering racial politics of the area for an argumentative point. For example, he uses a local right-wing lawyer, Richard Kilbourne, to cast doubt on the witnesses, and the fact that the event ever happened (*ibid.*, p. 859). But most informed commentators know that Banister had contacts with the white legal establishment in the area, and also the segregationist element there—who, of course, had no love for JFK; Bugliosi leaves this fact out (Mellen, pp. 225, 227, 229, 231). Bugliosi even quotes a letter from Garrison's office acknowledging the fact that the black witnesses are afraid to testify because of those elements, so they will have to win their trust. This is why some of the African-American witnesses were hesitant at first to identify any of the trio. Bugliosi then uses this against Garrison and those witnesses by casting aspersions on the phrase “win their trust” (Bugliosi, p. 859).

And now Bugliosi goes absolutely Posnerian. He says that Garrison used a faked composite photograph to “revive” the testimony of the Clinton witnesses (*ibid.*, pp. 859–860). We are now in Posnerland for sure, because this is what Posner did to try and discredit the famous CAP picnic photo of Oswald and Ferrie: he said this would be just like Garrison, since he had forged two photos previously. One problem: he had no evidence for this. Now, what is Bugliosi's evidence for this photo being forged? Does he present technical analysis? No. Does a credible witness back this story up? No. Does the author even show us the picture to point out faults and proof of forgery? No. Here is the sum total of his case: the proof it was fake was that Garrison didn't use it at Shaw's trial! As if there could be no other reason for Garrison not doing that.

Why Bugliosi was stooping to Posnerian depths puzzled me for a while—for a couple of hours, actually. Why did it puzzle me? Because I knew the story behind this picture years ago, and I have a hard time believing that Bugliosi does not, since his buddy Lambert wrote about the photo. After thinking this over, I believe I hit upon the reason why Bugliosi became Posner: because he wants to

discredit the fact that there actually *was such a photo taken at the time*, since that goes a long way in proving that the event happened—and lawyer Bugliosi does not want to admit that “bad fact”. So what does he do to negate that evidentiary impact? He first describes the photo wrongly, and then misrepresents the reason it was not used. He says that the photo depicted Shaw and Oswald in the front seat. But Garrison’s investigator—who actually had the photo—did not describe it that way; she described the picture as actually looking like *Ferrie* and Oswald were in front. I believe Bugliosi describes it wrongly because the clear majority of witnesses described Shaw in front. So Bugliosi switches Shaw with Ferrie so he can say that Garrison used the picture to “revive” their testimony—which he could not do with Ferrie in front.

What he doesn’t say is this: The car was parked for hours in Clinton, and Shaw got up and walked around for a while. Ferrie used a pay phone. And that’s when Ferrie probably slipped in front and when the picture was snapped. The actual reason the photo was not used at trial is because it was taken at a distance and at a bad angle; therefore, the identifications were not probative. Garrison tried to have the photo enlarged, but it lost too much resolution (Mellen, pp. 223, 225).

Bugliosi also says that Garrison removed two state investigators from the Clinton investigation: Anne Dischler and Francis Fruge (End Notes, p. 861). Wrong again: Garrison wanted to keep them both; the state police removed them from his staff, when *Life* magazine was pressuring Governor McKeithen to turn on Garrison (Mellen, p. 231). Bugliosi then uses Lambert’s long interview with Dischler to try to discredit both her and witness Corrie Collins. Dischler was later shocked at what Lambert did with her notebooks and their interview, and issued a statement saying that Lambert had twisted important facts in order to design her own scenario which was not the truth about what happened in Clinton (*ibid.*, p. 238). What was the Lambertian scenario? The idea was to get Oswald out of Clinton and to substitute a worker at the hospital named Winslow Foster for him. There is no support for this in the record.

Bugliosi also tries to say that if the event happened, then why didn’t the witnesses talk about it themselves, or report it, or offer it to the media? This proves that, in 21 years, Bugliosi never went to the scene, because the witnesses *did* talk to each other about what they saw. All he had to do was interview them—which he did not; or their kids—which he did not; because they told their children about it; and then their children talked to each other about it. I realized this the first time I visited Jackson. I tried to talk to McGehee, but he was too sick to come out of the house. His daughter was visiting him and she knew all the details of Oswald’s appearance at his barber-shop, and his traversing the area. We drove a few blocks around town—a few blocks is all there is—and stopped to get a bite to eat. Because I was there, she struck up a conversation with the son of another witness to the incident, who just happened to be there—and he knew all about it too. Almost everyone in both towns is aware of the so-called “Oswald visit”. But if you don’t go there, you can say otherwise.

As to his question about offering it to the media, well, I have a question in reply: What media? Jackson has about four thousand people in it; Clinton, about two

thousand. The entire area of Clinton is 2.8 square miles. At the time, the entire parish contained less than 20,000 people. That doesn't make for a real big media hub, Mr. Prosecutor; not a real big echo chamber—maybe a few hundred yards or so. And you won't make a lot of big advertising dollars with a population base like that either. Again, only someone who has never been there could write such stuff.

Bugliosi states that Reeves Morgan testified that he had alerted the FBI to Oswald's presence in Clinton after the assassination. He then writes that the FBI says that they have no record of this. Bugliosi finds this denial credible. It turns out that the FBI did get this call, and Elmer Litchfield of the Baton Rouge office later admitted this (Mellen, pp. 232-4). Further, Morgan's call very likely caused a visit by an FBI agent to the psychiatric hospital, for employee Merryl Hudson recalls that, a few days after the assassination, an FBI agent appeared and visited the personnel office there. The agent flashed a photo of Oswald, and said, "He is supposed to have turned in an application." (*ibid.*, p. 234). Again, if you never leave your home in Pasadena, how do you find out these things? It can only be done in a field investigation, where one link leads to another.

Finally, as he often does, Bugliosi asks for the reasoning behind it all: why would Oswald be trying to get a job in the area? I don't think that that was the point. Recall, Banister had some contacts in East Feliciana. I think Shaw and Ferrie sold Oswald on the idea of going up there as an extension of what he had just done with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. As Philip Melanson postulated in *Spy Saga*, the idea was to smear CORE with a communist; but, unknown to him, the real and underlying agenda was to get Oswald's application into the hospital—which, as revealed in his conversation with McGehee, Oswald did not know was a mental hospital. As Garrison came to believe, it would have been easy to then change the file over from an employee file to a patient file; and, come the assassination, this would cinch the image of Oswald as not just a Commie, but a demented Commie. However, two things altered the plan. First, it was unnecessary, because the media bought the Commie angle so readily, all by its lonesome. Second, Shaw and Ferrie did not expect the large turn-out for the CORE drive. It was so big that Oswald waited in line for hours. Consequently, too many people got too long a look at the pair of accessories.

To say, as Bugliosi does, that it did not happen, is simply not supportable today. There is the picture, as well as the application form that three—perhaps four—people saw. I say "perhaps four" because something Bugliosi does not mention is that, in addition to witnesses Dedon, Kemp, and Woodside, Bob Buras of the HSCA heard of another person who saw the application. His name was Dale Booty. But when Buras tracked him down, Booty wouldn't talk; he said, "I prefer not to get involved." (Davy, p. 111)—probably because the application ended up disappearing; and that was probably a result of Morgan's call.

But Booty's reluctance could also have been because of what happened to some other witnesses in the area. Joseph Cooper was a local policeman whom Garrison was going to call before the Grand Jury. Right before he was to be called, he was in a serious accident. While he was injured, the State Police tried to steal his files (Mellen, p. 224). As Jim Olivier discussed at a talk at JFK Lancer in

2003, Gloria Wilson was also a witness. She also identified Oswald. But she told her boyfriend that she had seen him there before. (If she did, it may have been through the operation of nearby Marydale farms, owned by Shaw's partner at the ITM, Lloyd Cobb: Davy, pp. 113-4.) Wilson died in 1964. It happened so fast, and she was so young—only 19—that friends thought she had been poisoned. When Garrison's investigators found out, they discovered that she had kept a diary at her place of work. The diary had been stolen (Mellen, p. 237). In July 1968, witness Andrew Dunn, while being held in a Clinton jail on charges of public intoxication, was found hanged (*ibid.*, p. 238).

Others, like lawyer Billy Kline, were intimidated by the aforementioned right-wing forces in town, like fellow attorney Richard Van Buskirk, who had been associated with Banister (*ibid.*, p. 225). There was also Gladys Palmer, potentially a very important witness, who was talked to by local right-wing heavies Jack Rogers and Ned Touchstone (*ibid.*, p. 227)—after which she forgot all about seeing Oswald. There were even others who, as late as the HSCA, were not located. In 1977, Robert Blakey received a lead from local investigator Ronald Johnston, who said he knew two witnesses who saw Shaw and Oswald together in the Clinton courthouse. The witnesses maintained that the pair then proceeded on to the hospital. Blakey didn't act on this for almost a year. The next HSCA call to Johnston was a brief contact report that said Johnston would get in touch with the witnesses. Looking through the files, Bill Davy never found any follow-up report on the matter (Davy, p. 110).

In summary, there were literally dozens of witnesses to the Clinton-Jackson incident. Bugliosi looks silly trying to deny it; and if the Warren Commission had investigated the episode properly in 1964, it had the potential to unlock the case—which is probably why they, and the FBI, did not investigate it at all. In fact, the opposite happened: the FBI likely confiscated Oswald's application, and then erased the record of Morgan's call—the same FBI that Bugliosi thinks did a satisfactory job investigating this case. Whew.

V.7

Because Bugliosi is intent on trashing Oliver Stone's film, *JFK*, he spends several pages in both the text and the End Notes discussing the Rose Cheramie episode. Stone depicts this in the opening credit sequence of his movie: one of the sequences that are inter-cut with the titles depicts the episode about Rose Cheramie being dumped out of a car. Later, after she is placed in a hospital due to drug withdrawal symptoms, she predicted that President Kennedy would be killed—before it happened.

Although Bugliosi's discussion of this is (thank God) not as long as his review of the Clinton-Jackson incident, it is just as pointless, tiresome, and aimless. It is almost as if, since Stone put it in his film, Bugliosi has to attack it; whether or not his critical points have any weight or value does not seem to matter.

Like the Clinton-Jackson incident, there has been much material made available on the Cheramie story since the creation of the ARRB. Most people know the

basic outlines of the story which Stone only briefly excerpted in his film. I will relate that story more fully here, using some declassified material. (Virtually everything that follows is taken from James DiEugenio and Lisa Pease, eds., *The Assassinations*, pp. 225–237.)

Cheremie was driving with two men on a drug run from Miami to Texas. In Houston, she was supposed to complete the drug deal, and also pick up her very young son. An argument ensued near Basile, Louisiana at a seedy lounge called the Silver Slipper. Her two companions were met by a third party, and she was thrown out of the bar. (Bugliosi actually makes a big deal as to when her companions discarded her—yet this point was not cleared up until the ARRB declassified files appeared.) While hitchhiking, she was hit by a car. The driver of the car delivered her to Moosa Memorial Hospital in Eunice, on 20 November 1963. The hospital administrator called State Trooper Francis Fruge to handle the case.

In the wee hours of 21 November, on the way to Jackson, Rose started to tell Fruge an utterly fascinating story. Apparently, because of her condition—she was in withdrawal and had been sedated—Fruge did not take it seriously. She told him that she was involved in a dope ring with the two other men. They were on their way to Dallas and then to Houston. Once in Houston they would go on to Galveston to get the incoming shipment of heroin. Cheremie would then transfer the dope to a man holding her child for her. The ultimate destination of the drugs was Mexico. But the really incredible part of her story was that the two men also talked about killing Kennedy.

Once at the Jackson hospital, Fruge left the woman. At the hospital, she told people who worked there—including nurses and interns—on the day of the assassination that it was going to happen. According to the doctor whose name Oswald used, Malcolm Pierson, one of the nurses who heard her was Charlie Wilbans (Mellen, p. 222). Dr. Wayne Owen, who was interning at Jackson at the time, confirmed that Cheremie had talked about the plot in advance. In fact, Owen also said that she had mentioned a man named Jack Rubenstein. No one knew who that was at the time. But later when they found out it was really Jack Ruby, they were stunned. They were told, though, that the FBI would investigate. When talking to Dr. Victor Weiss, allegedly after the assassination, Rose also talked about working as a drug courier for Jack Ruby. Weiss then went back and talked to some of the nurses, and they told him she had predicted the assassination on the day it occurred before it happened.

After the assassination, Fruge, now a Cheremie believer, went up to Jackson to visit with her again. He got more details about the dope ring. Apparently now in a more lucid state, she said the men actually seemed to be part of a conspiracy, rather than just cognizant of it. Fruge decided to check out the details of her smuggling story. Each and every aspect of it checked out.

On the way to Texas on 26 November, Rose read a newspaper story to the effect that the authorities could not establish a relationship between Ruby and Oswald. Rose giggled and said, “Them two queer sons-of-a-bitches. They’ve been shacking up for years.” She added that she knew this from her work with Ruby.

Fruge's superior called up Will Fritz of the Dallas Police, and told him about Rose and her story. Fritz said that he was not interested. At a JFK Lancer conference in 2003, broadcaster Jim Olivier said he later talked to Fruge. Fruge told him he also called the FBI in Lafayette; and they also said that they didn't want to interview Cheramie: as far as they were concerned, the case was closed. (Bugliosi makes no comment on the refusal of the police or the FBI to talk to a potentially important witness—he doesn't bat an eyelash.)

It stood that way until 1967. At that time, Jim Garrison discovered the Cheramie story (Garrison memorandum of 23 February 1967). He borrowed Fruge from the state police and asked him to find Rose. It turned out that she had died in 1965. Garrison told Fruge to go ahead and re-investigate her story. He did: he went to the Silver Slipper and talked to the manager Mac Manual—twice. The second time he brought back some photos for Manual to identify, in order to pick out the two men who were with Rose. Manual picked out pictures of Sergio Arcacha Smith and Emilio Santana. To say the least, that is quite interesting, because of their associations with people like David Ferrie, Guy Banister, Clay Shaw, Howard Hunt, and the CIA (op. cit., *The Assassinations*, pp. 230-7).

What Bugliosi tries to do with this story is almost as bad as what he does with Clinton-Jackson. Firstly, in a purely lawyerly tactic, he tries to go after the pronouns Rose allegedly used when she related her story. He says that the denotations differed by (1) her saying she was part of the conspiracy; (2) there being "word in the underworld" about it; and (3) the two men being involved, and not her (Bugliosi, pp. 1382-3). Now, firstly, the first time Rose told the story, she was going through intense withdrawal symptoms; so maybe she was not in any condition to parse her words accurately? Secondly, wouldn't "word in the underworld" include the dope ring she was involved in, which extended to the two men she was with? Thirdly, when she was out of withdrawal, she made it clear to Fruge that it was the two men who were involved in a plot. What possible role would Cheramie have had in it anyway? To me, these are just lawyerisms.

About her association with Ruby, Bugliosi quotes Walt Brown as saying that there is no paper documentation of her work for him (End Notes, p. 871). This is more silliness. Fruge wrote in his report that he had verified this fact; he did not say how, but Fruge was one of the best troopers in the state, according to the Department of Public Safety; and Brown made no attempt to find out how he did so, before casting aspersions on him. But let me ask a couple of questions about this. Firstly, everybody knows that Rose used several aliases. Did Brown check out every such alias? Does he even know each and every one? Secondly, Ruby ran a cheap strip club, with many transitory employees. What kind of records did he keep—especially before the age of computers? Thirdly, everyone has heard the story of how many of Ruby's things disappeared after the Dallas Police confiscated them. Now, since Fruge worked in the same area that Rose was involved in, he probably followed an interview trail from there to Texas—which is not very far—and that is likely how he confirmed the information. That is what field investigators do. What did Walt Brown do? Whatever he did, Bugliosi did even less, sitting in his chair in Pasadena: he just took Brown's word for it. Why? Because that is what he wanted to hear.

Bugliosi then tries to use derogatory information about Cheramie given to the HSCA by the FBI. The Bureau told Robert Blakey that the woman had “previously furnished the FBI false information” (End Notes, p. 873). The HSCA printed that denial—and Bugliosi robotically reprints it. This is the same Bureau that said that Reeves Morgan never called them (and the HSCA printed that one too). This is the same Bureau that did not want to hear from Cheramie in the first place, because the case was closed. So, obviously, if her information said that the FBI was wrong, and that it was a conspiracy, and that Oswald did not do it, does Bugliosi think that they would then vouch for her credibility? I don't think so. And the author does not note the disparity between her details checking out on this operation, and the FBI's blanket derogatory remarks.

Bugliosi then uses official FBI boilerplate denials to separate Arcacha Smith from Oswald, and also from the assassination—and he never even tells the reader about Santana at all (End Notes, p. 872)! As he usually does, the prosecutor leaves out some rather important—some would say compelling—details.

Smith was a close friend of David Ferrie, and a clear associate of Guy Banister. As I have noted, he was also a beneficiary of the Friends of Democratic Cuba, which moved from the Balter Building to Clay Shaw's ITM. Smith once had a meeting in Banister's office with Banister, Gordon Novel, and a man who strongly fits the description and profile of David Phillips. This was to arrange a broadcast telethon in New Orleans to raise funds for Smith's Howard Hunt-backed group, the CRC (*The Assassinations*, p. 231). When Smith's friend and colleague Carlos Quiroga took a polygraph for Garrison's office, there were three questions where the term “deceptive criteria” registered on the machine: (1) Did you know Oswald's Fair Play for Cuba Committee was a cover operation? (2) Prior to Kennedy's murder, did you see the weapons used in the assassination? And the capper in this regard: (3) According to your knowledge, did Oswald know Sergio Arcacha Smith? (*ibid.*, p. 235). So, according to Quiroga's test, Smith did know Oswald—and he knew him pretty well.

But it gets worse. When Richard Case Nagell was first interviewed by a representative of Garrison's office, he told him that he had infiltrated the Kennedy plot in the summer of 1963. And he had a tape recording “of four voices in conversation concerning the plot ...” (Garrison Memo of 18 April 1967). The memo states that Nagell said openly that one of them was “Arcacha”, and the other individual Nagell would only identify as “Q” (*ibid.*). The former has to be Smith, and the latter is probably Quiroga. If it was, then we know why he later flunked his polygraph.

In further opposition to the FBI denials about Smith and the assassination, Fruge once revealed to HSCA investigator Bob Buras a rather startling piece of information. During an interview, almost as a sidelight, Fruge off-handedly asked Buras if the Committee had found the diagrams of the sewer system in Dealey Plaza that were supposed to have been located in Sergio Arcacha Smith's apartment in Dallas. Now, if Quiroga thought he saw the weapons to be used in the assassination, if he knew Oswald was not really a communist, and if his friend Smith had a map of the sewer system in Dealey Plaza, then what is the

FBI information Bugliosi uses worth? This information raises Cheramie's story into real importance, and discredits the Bureau yet again.

Reclaiming History also tries to quell any mystery about Cheramie's death (Bugliosi, p. 1384). Garrison's investigators found that she had been killed in September 1965 after being hit by a car on a small highway between Tyler and Dayward, Texas, near Big Sandy. Garrison wanted to exhume the body, but the local authorities refused. The story goes that she died when her head was run over by a car driven by one Jerry Don Moore, who later took her to the hospital. The obvious question then would be: how did she get in the prone position, and how did Moore not swerve at the last minute to at least miss her skull? Researcher Bob Dorff got hold of what was left of the autopsy materials. (Gary Shaw found out that the actual report is missing.) He gave them to forensic pathologist Cyril Wecht, who reviewed them, and said that, from what he could see, the tires did not run over her skull, and he did not think the car killed her. Wecht thinks that she was struck on the head first, and then left on the highway (2003 Lancer Conference).

Perhaps no other single incident in the literature links all of the following: Oswald to Ruby, Ruby to the Cubans in New Orleans, and all of them to a former gun-running operation from Florida that now—with Operation Mongoose terminated—was turning into a drug-running operation in late 1963. And with her testimony, and Fruge's subsequent work, all these links were now connected in a plot to kill President Kennedy. It all exquisitely explains one of Ruby's most fascinating quotes, made after he killed Oswald: "They're going to find out about Cuba. They're going to find out about the guns. They're going to find out about New Orleans, find out about everything." (Armstrong, p. 193)

V.8

Although this has been a long and detailed discussion centering on evidence accrued by the Garrison investigation, the reader should note something: I have not mentioned the trial of Clay Shaw, or the testimony of Perry Russo, or Vernon Bundy, etc. I have deliberately left all that out. Why?

Because I want to show that, today, with the releases of the ARRB, Garrison's case is quite strong without any of what happened at the trial. Bill Davy and I have both studied the Garrison inquiry as long and as thoroughly as any other writers on the subject. In fact, as of late, he has studied it even more thoroughly than I, since he is preparing a revised and expanded version of his fine book. We both concluded that the Shaw trial was an anti-climax: Garrison's investigation had already been defeated at that time by a large, complex, and well-organized domestic intelligence campaign that was both covert and overt. And it was so arrogant and determined, that many times it did not deign to even disguise itself—in fact, I would go so far as to say that this all-out effort was one of the most significant operations aimed at a domestic target up to that time.

Now, before I briefly describe parts of this operation, let me do two things. Firstly, let me sketch what is wrong with Bugliosi's long treatment of Russo,

Bundy, and the Vietnam issue. About Russo, the author asks: well, why didn't Russo mention Shaw or Oswald in the press interviews he did early on? Maybe because he didn't know Shaw as Shaw, but Shaw as Bertrand. As for Oswald, the man he named was not actually him. In my review of *The Man Who Knew Too Much*, I discuss this issue at length: I have long suspected that this was not actually Oswald. Dick Russell has accumulated enough evidence to convince me that this was an Oswald look-alike (Russell, pp. 287, 367). Bugliosi also follows the Phelan/Lambert line on the whole controversy regarding when Russo named Bertrand and Leon Oswald to assistant D.A. Andrew Sciambra, and whether or not the hypnosis sessions were manipulated. In one of the new Garrison documents, it is revealed that, before Phelan visited Russo, he told the man who went to Baton Rouge with him that—shades of Walter Sheridan—he was going to destroy Garrison (*Probe*, Vol. 3, No. 6, p. 19). This is before Phelan even met Russo. In a recent interview I did with him, Matt Herron said that Russo told Phelan that he mentioned the meeting with Bertrand in Baton Rouge (personal communication with Matt Herron, 2009). So now you have Phelan, the guy who would later issue daily propaganda reports to the national press on the Shaw trial, disagreeing with the other three witnesses on when the meeting was first mentioned. (For Phelan's minority version, see Henry Hurt's *Reasonable Doubt*, p. 271. I should also add here that Herron told me that, by the time of the trial, Russo's testimony had severely weakened as to the conspiratorial aspect of the story. This reveals that the two-year ordeal he went through at the hands of people like Phelan, Sheridan, and Rick Townley got to him.) The real James Phelan is also revealed by his role in reversing the transcript order of Russo's two subsequent hypnosis sessions: he placed the second session first, and the first one second. Why did he do that? To make it look like Dr. Fatter implanted the details about both Bertrand and the meeting in Russo's mind. When you read them in the right order, it is clear that Russo describes Bertrand by himself, without help (see *Probe*, Vol. 6, No. 5, p. 26). Lambert tried to conceal the same trick, but she also used it (*ibid.*). It's these kinds of scams—and others not mentioned—that make it necessary for Bugliosi to deodorize Phelan for the reader.

Shifting to Bundy, Bugliosi interviewed John Volz, a Garrison Assistant D.A. Apparently he never asked Volz how he tested Bundy; but Volz told me how he did: Since he knew that Shaw would be approaching the place, he took Bundy to the vicinity of the courthouse steps. When Shaw appeared, Bundy jumped up and said that this was the guy he saw handing leaflets to Oswald. When Volz asked him how he knew that, Bundy said that he recognized the slight limp he had. Volz was still not convinced. He asked Bundy what color the leaflets were. To the lawyer's surprise, the witness did not say they were white, which would be the safe choice if you were bluffing; Bundy said they were yellow. Volz then checked, and Oswald did hand out a yellow leaflet that summer—which, by the way, you can still see in the Royal New Orleans Collection. Since Bugliosi never went to New Orleans, he didn't see it; I did (1994 author interview of Volz).

About Oliver Stone's treatment of Kennedy's intent to withdraw from Vietnam, much of Bugliosi's slant has been rendered obsolete with the release of the book *Virtual JFK: Vietnam if Kennedy Had Lived*. (And he ignores the work of previous writers like David Kaiser and Howard Jones, amongst others.) Like Michael

Beschloss, Bugliosi tries to soften LBJ's reversal of Kennedy's withdrawal policy, by portraying Johnson as something of a "reluctant warrior". With the declassification of the phone calls between LBJ and Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, this has been reduced to balderdash. (See my review of *Virtual JFK* in this journal.)

On the other hand, what does Bugliosi say about the Secret Team (i.e., the CIA and its allies), and their effort to undermine Garrison's original case? He describes it as such: the CIA only monitored Garrison's inquiry; and they only took action against the D.A. twice: once, the CIA local station asked Langley if they would deny that a prospective Garrison witness had actually worked for the Agency; and the other instance is when Langley gave permission to the local CIA station to "talk" to a Garrison witness (End Notes, p. 913).

This is what I mean about Bugliosi not being objective. Let us describe the uncensored version of this large covert operation—because, today, with the combination of what we already knew and the work of the ARRB, we can describe it in some detail.

The problem for the CIA was this: Garrison had uncovered so much evidence so quickly that, if left to his own devices, he would have convicted Shaw. In an ARRB-declassified document—which Bugliosi somehow missed—this is just what the CIA admitted in private. At a 20 September 1967 meeting of what was called the Garrison Group in what appeared to be James Angleton's office, this very point was discussed. The exact quote was: "Rocca felt that Garrison would indeed obtain a conviction of Shaw for conspiring to assassinate President Kennedy." Ray Rocca was Angleton's chief assistant. He was also an expert on the JFK case, since he worked with the Warren Commission and helped Ed Epstein with his book, *Inquest*. At this meeting it was also revealed that Shaw's lawyers wanted to deal directly with the Agency. There were two objectives discussed at this meeting: (1) what actions were available to the CIA; and (2) how the Director—who was Richard Helms—could be assured that the problem was "in focus" (meaning, of course, under control). The memo says that actions should be examined for what could be done before, during, and after the trial. Recall, this meeting is in the Fall of 1967. A later partial memo suggests that these actions were under ongoing review: "Recipients will receive updatings as the New Orleans cases develop. [Deleted] is requested to carry out tasks stipulated in paras. 5, 6 and 7. The New Orleans office of Domestic Contacts Service will be tasked by separate memorandum." (*The Assassinations*, p. 44) Victor Marchetti later wrote that, by early 1969, Helms began Director's meetings referring to the Shaw trial with, "Are we giving them all the help they need?" But Marchetti said that the specific actions were kept out of the minutes which he was taking. The discussion was "... but talk to me about it after the meeting" or "We'll pick this up later in my office" (Garrison, *op. cit.*, p. 234). Bugliosi does all he can to discount Marchetti, part of which he achieves by not referring to the above declassified CIA memos (End Notes, pp. 809–810).

He also does not discuss a 1981 interview by a Texas researcher of Garrison's, "investigator" Bill Boxley, who revealed that there was something called a "Garrison desk" at the CIA (*The Assassinations*, p. 45). Bugliosi scoffs at the idea

that there were plants sent into Garrison's office by the Agency (End Notes, p. 913). Question for the author: If you are correct about that, then how did Boxley know that there was something called a "Garrison desk" at the CIA? Maybe because he was delivering stuff there? It's a question that should not even have to be asked since, to any objective observer, it's a fait accompli that Boxley was a CIA plant. Garrison proves this in detail in his book (*op. cit.*, pp. 187-192). Once Garrison and Vince Salandria figured out that he was a spook, Garrison invited him down to his office. Boxley never showed. They then went to his apartment, which was empty except for one shirt in the closet. But something Garrison does not tell the reader is this: Later that night, after he split town, Boxley did call the office. Lou Ivon picked up the phone. Boxley told him, "Tell Big Jim we're coming after him with it all!" He then hung up. Question: Mr. Bugliosi, who do you think the former CIA agent was referring to when he said "we"? Him and his nephew? (1997 personal communication with Lou Ivon). Bugliosi likes to describe Garrison's mistakes; but what he leaves out is how the double agents in his office gulled him into making them—for example, Boxley egged him on in the Edgar Bradley imbroglio.

Gordon Novel is another example of this operation. Early on, Novel was introduced to Garrison by Willard Robertson, a wealthy car dealer who backed Garrison's inquiry at the time. Novel was an electronics wizard who had helped the Agency in preparations for the Bay of Pigs operation. He offered to work as a "security agent" for Garrison. What he actually did was wire Garrison's office for sound. He then made copies of these recordings for Walter Sheridan, who was one party that was paying him for his services. Novel made another copy, which he said he "turned over to a party, or parties unknown to me at this time" (*Probe*, Vol. 5, No. 5, p. 11). And if Bugliosi really believes that Novel did not know who the other party was, then he must also believe in Santa Claus. Now, we know through ARRB documents that Sheridan was in contact with the Agency while producing this program (DiEugenio and Pease, *op. cit.*, p. 39). In fact, he actually turned witnesses who had been interviewed by Garrison against him; for example, Al Beoubouef (*ibid.*). One indication of this is that the first time that Novel met Sheridan, it was at the invitation of Dean Andrews, in Andrews' office (*Probe*, Vol. 5, No. 5, p. 11). During his work with Sheridan, Novel was also sending telegrams and letters to Richard Helms (*Probe*, Vol. 4, No. 5, p. 27; I have actually seen one of the letters). So, clearly, Novel was working hand-in-glove with the CIA in the wiring of Garrison's office—yet Bugliosi writes that there is no credible evidence of such double agents (End Notes, p. 913)! Bugliosi has a rather big problem in maintaining this. Why? Because Novel admitted all these facts himself, in a deposition he gave in 1969 (*Probe*, Vol. 4, No. 5, pp. 26, 27; Vol. 5, No. 5, p. 11)! And the evidence indicates that, as early as February 1967, the FBI was also shadowing Garrison—because after Novel's first meeting with Robertson and the D.A., six FBI agents were waiting to question Novel afterwards at his house (*op. cit.*, Vol. 5, No. 5). Through Sheridan, Novel was so cognizant of the organized effort against Garrison that he knew when State Troopers were going to be assigned to the D.A.'s office before they themselves knew. How do we know this? Because Novel called them in advance and told them about it (State Police report of 1 April 1967).

Further, after Garrison found him out, Novel fled to Ohio. While there, he was in close contact with former CIA Director Allen Dulles, in his efforts to thwart extradition back to New Orleans (*Probe*, Vol. 4, No. 5, p. 26). While in Ohio, he was safe-housed by the Agency; but they apparently did not trust him, because a car was placed outside the place to monitor his movements (from a confidential source who knew the owner of the house).

Let's discuss another agent sent in by the CIA: the legendary Bernardo DeTorres. DeTorres had been with the CIA since the Bay of Pigs. He had been captured by Castro, and imprisoned until December 1962. At the time of Garrison's early inquiry, the Cuban was living in Miami. He somehow found out about Garrison's probe, even though it had not yet been exposed in the papers—even though Garrison had not yet centered on the CIA as his chief suspect. With Garrison, DeTorres posed as a private detective with a reference from Miami D.A. Richard Gerstein (Davy, p. 148). Since he was from Miami, Garrison gave him the assignment of tracking down David Ferrie's pal Eladio del Valle. Shortly after he was assigned, Del Valle's body was found in the vicinity of De Torres' apartment; he had been brutally murdered, gangland style (*ibid.*). (Let me add, here, that this happened the same day that Ferrie died. When Gordon Novel talked to the state troopers mentioned above about David Ferrie, he did not say that Ferrie died: he specifically said that he had been killed.) It was later discovered that Bernardo had been reporting on Garrison to the Miami CIA station (Davy, *op. cit.*). Why had Bernardo been so eager to penetrate Garrison's office? Because he had once said that he had photos taken in Dealey Plaza during the Kennedy assassination (*ibid.*).

In the face of all this, and much more, it is ridiculous for Bugliosi to write that there is no credible evidence that Garrison's office was riddled with double agents. It clearly was. And it clearly indicates that the CIA was very worried about his investigation. Which leads to the question: Why were they so worried, to the point of running a complex domestic intelligence operation against him? It's a question that Bugliosi author does not want to ask, let alone answer—hence he avoids all this documented evidence.

Let me briefly outline this Secret Team operation, as we know it today:

1. Penetration agents were sent into Garrison's office to record his conversations, steal his files, report back to the CIA desk, and to also report to Hugh Aynesworth, a cut-out to Shaws lawyers (*The Assassinations*, pp. 24–29).
2. Phony journalists like Phelan, Sheridan, and Aynesworth then arranged for propaganda pieces to be set up in publications like *Newsweek* and *The Saturday Evening Post*, and on NBC, in order to defame Garrison in the public mind, and therefore somehow justify the outrageous acts being perpetrated against him.
3. Witnesses were then harassed, intimidated, and bribed to turn on the D.A. In some cases they were most likely murdered; for example, Del Valle. I have previously mentioned Aynesworth bribing Manchester. A

man named Fred Leemans was threatened with bodily harm and an IRS investigation unless he appeared on the NBC special and denounced the D.A. (Joe Biles, *In History's Shadow*, p. 49). Cinching this point, the HSCA Deputy Counsel on the JFK case, Bob Tanenbaum, has said that he once saw CIA documents describing the monitoring and harassing of Garrison's witnesses (*Probe*, Vol. 3, No. 5).

4. Once witnesses and suspects were turned, they were then supplied—free of charge—with legal representation from a cleared panel of CIA attorneys (*The Assassinations*, pp. 34–35; Biles, p. 50).
5. Shaw's lawyers, who were in close cooperation with this effort, deliberately delayed going to trial, in order to give this operation enough time to cripple Garrison's case, to the point that he would be guaranteed to lose (*Destiny Betrayed*, pp. 181–3; *The Assassinations*, pp. 38–39). They finally stopped the delays when Garrison was sick with the Hong Kong flu and a serious back problem, knowing that he could not appear in court frequently. (Garrison admitted this in a letter to a supporter after the trial.)
6. As suggested in the memo, this operation continued up to and during the trial. James Angleton was doing name traces on prospective jurors (*The Assassinations*, p. 46). During the trial, a teletype machine was moved into the New Orleans CIA office, to keep Langley updated on testimony in real time (*ibid.*, p. 47). Covert operations were being run against trial witnesses. Bill Davy reports on a trespasser on the property of one of the Clinton witnesses at this time, dressed in a suit and carrying a briefcase, who was apprehended and taken to the police station. He asked to make one call: to the ITM (Davy, p. 114). Richard Case Nagell had a grenade thrown at him; after the event, he took its remnants to the D.A., and said it would not be a good idea for him to testify (Dick Russell, *The Man who Knew Too Much*, 2003 edition, p. 436). Clyde Johnson was beaten to a pulp, even though Garrison had moved him out of New Orleans (Davy, p. 310.). If you look at the photo of police witness A. Habighorst in *Destiny Betrayed* (p. 200), you will see that he is wearing sunglasses. That's because the day before he was due to testify, a man jumped out of a pickup truck and assaulted him. Garrison then put him on 24-hour armed guard until after his appearance (personal communication with his widow, 1993).

If you read the likes of Bugliosi, Posner, or Lambert, they either deny all this, don't mention it, or discount it to the point that it's meaningless. This is impossible to do today. It is a large part of the story of how the Shaw trial turned out as it did.

V.9

The reason for the denial is easy to figure out: because it strongly suggests that Garrison was onto something big. If not, why mount this incredible campaign

that risked exposing a domestic intelligence operation? So, to me, what were presented at the trial were merely the *remnants* of the case that Garrison could have presented. As I said earlier, historians—which, as we shall see in Part VI, Bugliosi is not—will never really know the details of the case that Garrison had, because of all the lost material. But it is possible today to understand why the CIA and its allies went after him tooth and nail: because Garrison was doing two things that had not been done yet. Firstly, he was taking the conspiracy out of the hands of the Warren Commission critics, and moving it to another plane: not concentrating on what did *not* happen, but rather what actually *did* happen. Secondly, he was filling in his assassination scenario with witnesses and evidence; it wasn't just postulation. Today, with the declassification process of the ARRB, we can fill it in even more. Let us do that in simple terms that most interested observers can follow and understand:

1. Oswald returns from Russia to the Dallas–Fort Worth area. Local CIA station chief J. Walton Moore asks George DeMohrenschildt to befriend him. The Baron and his wife begin to file derogatory reports on Oswald with military intelligence (Russell, p. 456). DeMohrenschildt introduces the Marxist Oswald to the conservative White Russian community. But, more importantly, he introduces the Oswalds to Ruth and Michael Paine.
2. The Oswalds move to New Orleans in April 1963. Oswald meets up with his old CAP leader David Ferrie. Ferrie introduces him to Guy Banister. David Phillips and James McCord are running an anti-FPCC campaign for the CIA; the FBI is running one also (John Newman, *Oswald and the CIA*, p. 243). Oswald gears up to be part of it, from Banister's office—but he stupidly puts Banister's office address on one of the pamphlets given him by Banister.
3. Since Oswald is not really a Marxist, but an agent provocateur, his FPCC activities end up discrediting that committee. First, Oswald is arrested after an altercation with another CIA operative, Carlos Bringuier of the DRE—which, according to Howard Hunt, is also under the wing of Phillips. And further, in a radio debate with Ed Butler and Bringuier, Oswald is also unmasked as a former defector to the Soviet Union. Because of his street theater antics, there are now photos—and even films; a court record; and a recorded debate about him.
4. This assignment complete, Oswald is next seen in the Clinton–Jackson area, about ninety minutes north of New Orleans. Told to continue his Marxist smear tactics against CORE, he is also advised by Ferrie and Clay Shaw to put in an application at the Jackson State hospital. This part of the plot goes awry, since no one anticipated the size of the voter registration drive.
5. After this, Ruth Paine comes down from visiting her CIA-employed sister outside of Langley, and picks up Marina. This will separate the Oswalds at the time of the assassination. Oswald then leaves New Orleans on a strange trip to Mexico City.

6. Oswald—or an imposter—visits both the Cuban and Soviet consulates in Mexico City. He makes an indelible impression by trying to get visas to both Russia and Cuba. But he is totally unprepared with his paperwork to do either. He creates an image of a dissatisfied, almost neurotic malcontent. But although the CIA says that this is Oswald, Anne Goodpasture deliberately sends a picture of a man—who is clearly not him—to CIA Headquarters. Furthermore, on at least one of the audiotapes recorded at the Cuban consulate, the FBI confirms that Oswald's voice is impersonated. Since this would expose the conspiracy, the tapes disappear. No photo of Oswald going into either consulate is ever produced. Finally, Oswald's files on this trip are segregated at CIA Headquarters so that only James Angleton has complete control over them.
7. Oswald returns to the Dallas-Fort Worth area. He rents a room away from his wife, who is now living with the Paines. Oswald starts looking for a job. A good offer comes in as a cargo handler at a local airport; but Ruth Paine does not tell him about this call (James Douglass, *JFK and the Unspeakable*, p. 172). Instead, through friends of hers, she helps him get a lower-paying position at the Texas School Book Depository.
8. On the day of the assassination, Oswald drives to work with Wesley Frazier. Oswald reportedly said that he carried a lunch bag to work that day. Frazier says it was a much longer bag. Yet, the man who first saw Oswald enter the Depository, Jack Dougherty, recalled Oswald with no such long bag (Warren Commission, Vol. 6, p. 377). No one else saw Oswald carrying it either (Sylvia Meagher, *Accessories After the Fact*, p. 58).
9. Kennedy is murdered at 12:30 p.m. Oswald is almost undoubtedly on the first floor at the time. Although Policeman Marion Baker later states that he confronted Oswald at the second floor soda machine, he wrote an affidavit on 22 November 1963 with no mention of Oswald: he said that he stopped a man in a brown jacket on the third or fourth floor. (I will discuss points (8) and (9), Frazier's dubious testimony about the bag, and Baker's first day report in Part VI, where I measure Bugliosi's glowing review of the performance of the Dallas Police.)
10. Thinking that there will be no more work that day, Oswald leaves the scene. He goes home, picks up his handgun, and walks to the Texas Theater. He sneaks in without paying. Someone sees him do this, and the police are called. Oswald is apprehended.
11. That afternoon, the back-story about Oswald in Russia and his FPCC campaign in New Orleans cascades through the media, and the portrait of a disaffected Marxist is painted in the public mind. That night, Jack Martin taunts Guy Banister about the things that happened in his office that summer with Oswald. Banister explodes and pistol-whips him (Davy, p. 1). That evening, at Bethesda, the military severely curtails the autopsy so that no one will ever know the true circumstances of how Kennedy was killed. The FBI also switches the bullet found at Parkland Hospital to fit the second rifle found at the TSBD, a Mannlicher-Carcano.

12. On 23 November, not realizing his small role in the plot, Shaw/Bertrand calls Dean Andrews to go to Dallas to defend Oswald. Also on that day, the CIA sends information to LBJ that Oswald was meeting in Mexico City with the head of KGB assassination plots in the Western Hemisphere. This information freezes any real investigation of Oswald, since it may lead to World War III. That night, Oswald tries to make a phone call to Raleigh, North Carolina to a man named John Hurt, a former military intelligence officer. The call is deliberately not put through by the Secret Service. The next day, Jack Ruby murders Oswald.
13. On 24 November David Ferrie begins to look for any connection between himself and Oswald: library cards or CAP pictures showing the two together. On this day, Johnson calls his first meeting on Vietnam. He makes it clear he is reversing Kennedy's policy; his aim is to win the war (John Newman, *JFK and Vietnam*, p. 442).
14. Frightened by Johnson's warning to Earl Warren about World War III, the Commission does not do any real investigation. Ruth and Michael Paine, along with an intimidated Marina Oswald, become the chief witnesses against Oswald. It is Ruth who eventually produces the Imperial Reflex camera allegedly used to take photos of the Walker house and the backyard photos of Oswald by Marina. This camera was not found by the Dallas Police in either of their two searches of the Paine residence; and none of the cameras they did find that day could have taken the photos. Furthermore, the Imperial is a camera that Marina did not know how to operate. Ruth and Michael also helped make Oswald's Minox spy camera disappear, by claiming that it was theirs. It was Ruth Paine who first found a book with a note by Oswald (without his fingerprints on it) describing what Marina should do if he gets in trouble with the law. Ruth surfaced this on 30 November, one day after the first report that Oswald may have been involved in the Walker shooting.

This plot outline is fairly demonstrable today, and it is not that difficult to comprehend—which is why Bugliosi does everything he can to obfuscate it. Jim Garrison was responsible for unearthing much of this evidence; and where he did not unearth it, he sure did point us in the right direction; for example, with Ruth Paine and George DeMohrenschildt. For that, he was, as Charles S. Pierce wrote, hunted by a pack of wolves. And then Harry Connick tried to destroy the evidence he left behind. But Garrison's contributions were so large that they can never be diminished; and the harder he tries to do so, the worse Bugliosi looks—until, by the end, he strongly resembles a guy he says he doesn't want to resemble: Gerald Posner.

And, in the final analysis, this chapter is worth about as much as *Case Closed*.