

x

Mystery camp. My M

"New York, New York - It's a wonderful town" are the words of a of a popular ^B road-way song of years ago, if I remember them correctly. The same can be said of the New Orleans of my experiences there. It can be a wonderful town. I concentrated on work too much to appreciate it as much as I could have. Traditional jazz was and is ~~my~~ one of my favorites in popular music, not unusual ⁴ for my generation, but I did not once stop ² work to take in those wonderful marching bands at their funerals, digges ⁱⁿ going to the cemetery, happy music on leaving it. I got to Preservation Hall only ^c once, and I was working then. I had no advance on a book, no contract for one, no regular income, and I did have debts. But perhaps because of my financial situation I met more of the ^very good and very considerate people there.

Like all other places, it also had its ^share of the wild ones, particularly politically wild. Rabid fits some. It is no exaggeration to regard a few ^as crazy.

Posner's ¹
His ~~reads~~ readers will not get the feel of the real city or most of its people. ¹
Nor can they of the ¹ people of whom he writes. ¹
from Posner. He ¹ sets out to do a dishonest job dishonestly and he did precisely that.

With an ineffible ¹ instinct for it, too.

He had his own political views to slip between the readers' ribs, like a shiv.

He found the least trustworthy to be trustworthy, as long as they said what ^{he} wanted to say and particularly when he and they were alike in their political views. ¹
He also did not ¹ restrain his instinctive untruthfulness. The man is smooth in it, too. ¹
Only the ¹ ^{most} informed will ¹ catch it.

He regards himself as a shrink and he practises his shrinkery.

He regards himself and a mind-reader and does he ever do that!

Whatever at any point in his writing serves his intentions at that point becomes instant fact even though on the same thing, with some pages intervening, he says the exact opposite. Where he wants to argue that Oswald was inflamed by the report of a speech made by Castro, in order to have some basis at all for this he writes, "Oswald,

an avid newspaper reader, almost certainly saw the article" reporting it in the New Orleans papers. Because the story says what Posner wants the reader to believe he has no questions about its accuracy. It also conforms to his own political beliefs and prejudices and that makes it even more acceptable. (Page 168) Yet ~~xxx~~ when it served Posner's propagandist's purposes he says that Oswald "was a notorious ^{7 P}peny-incher" (Page 209) and in between he actually says, indispensable for his argument as the contrary is, that Oswald "was too miserly to buy a daily paper." (Page 202)

And all of this is about Oswald when he was in New Orleans, ^{before the assassin in action.} that relatively short span of time.

The newspaper story Posner uses to ~~cast~~ ^{appeared} Oswald in the assassin role just before he left New Orleans for Mexico, the end of September, 1963, ⁷⁷ has Castro making threats to kill Kennedy. Such a story did appear. Virtually the same thing ^{was} ~~was~~ said at the same time, as I report in Oswald in New Orleans, by an anti-Castro former Batista-dictatorship diplomat ^{Herminio Portek} named Poretl-Villa, also attributed to the same source, a speech ^{of Castro} Castro allegedly made at the Brazilian embassy in Havana. ^(Page 144) ^{Miami} The FBI's investigation of the report to it proved it wasn't accurate and the FBI did not credit it. The political ^{of} ~~relativity~~ of the time makes it highly unlikely that Castro would have said anything at all like that story reported.

Like the Warren Report, which Posner set out to validate with the new line of its ~~ap~~ ^{apologists}, that although the Report was factually incorrect in almost all it said, it managed to blunder its way to the correct solution, he ignores, really suppresses, because it as well known, the fact that as of that very time Castro and Kennedy were seeking to work their way to some sort of modus vivendi. In addition, with the ^{of} ~~splution~~ ^{of} to the October, 1962 Cuba Missile Crisis that Kennedy would protect Cuba, ^{↓ (1st. list)} from any invasion, a guarantee even Khrushchev could not ~~be~~ make, there is little likelihood to kill or have killed that Castro wanted/the one person in the entire world who gave him security.

Through our Ambassador Attwood (correct) at the UN Kennedy was at that very moment negotiating with Castro through his ambassador. ^{There} On the informal level, Kennedy used any emissary he could. One ^{was} ~~as~~ Jean Daniel, the well-respected French correspondent of that era. ^{JEK} He spoke to Daniel ^{before} Daniel left to see Castro and asked him to

return and report to him after he ^{spoke to} interviewed Castro. It happens that Daniel was with Castro when Castro learned that JFK had been assassinated. His account in the New Republic ^{magazine} for which he wrote a series of articles (I have in my files) leaves it without question that Castro was shocked, extremely distraught, and ~~grieved~~ ^{troubled} by the adverse effect on the world of that assassination. ^{Daniel quotes him as saying the assassination was very bad for the whole world.}

All of this it is to say that truth is not a consideration when Posner has an argument he wants to make and have believed. He says whatever he wants to have believed, regardless of the readily-available fact and even with contempt for the known realities.

For the same dishonest purposes Posner pretends that Oswald was the official representative of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee in New Orleans ^{Orleans} and that all Oswald did there was on its behalf ^{and to its knowledge and interest.} In fact Oswald had no more connection with the FPCC than did anyone else who mailed it the membership fee of five dollars.

Nonetheless the first words in his chapter 8 are "Oswald's initial efforts on behalf of ~~the~~ Fair Play for Cuba. ..." (~~page~~ page 149) ~~On the next page~~ Posner begins the next page with some of his mind-reading with what neither Cuba nor anyone with any political sophistication would agree with, more propaganda, with these words, "Convinced ~~of~~ his work for Cuba was getting attention of national leftists..." There is nothing that Oswald ever did that was "for Cuba," officially or unofficially, and there was no reason at all to believe that Oswald's insignificant leafleting in New Orleans ^{meaningful} got any attention anywhere. If Posner had made any investigation at all in New Orleans, he would have known that it took quite some ^{time} before even the anti-Castros paid any attention to what he was doing.

Bringuer, as undependable a source as can be imagined save for those who care enough about the accuracy and dependability of what they write, is quoted by Posner to tell a lie that is consistent with the propagandist's thrust of his book: "Bringuer... had no idea that Fair Play was active in New Orleans..." (page 153) The reason Bringuer ~~had~~ "had no idea" if it is because it did not exist. Not in any form.

(In a note on the same page Posner refers to Oswald's "legitimate pro Communist Credentials." That is something Oswald never had. He as, as only those wanting to

perpetuate propaganda for their ^{own} political purposes do not say, virulently anti-Communist, as quoted above from the ~~Republic~~^W Warren Commission's ^{own} records.

Bringuier is not the ^{only} zany from the idiocy fringe of the extreme political right in New Orleans who is ~~virtually~~ virtually an oracle for Posner. Another is a man whose name Posner never even gets correct. He refers to Hubert J. Badaeux as "Hable Badaeu" on six different pages, 139, 149, 424, 328, 461 and 464. Yet with all this attention to and dependence upon Badaeu, Posner manages not to indicate the sheer idiocy of what that man wrote, said and believed.

Quite the opposite of Posner's pretense, that it is only ~~the~~ those he refers to as otherwise undescribed "leftists" were alone in the early refusal to accept the official mythology, as I indicated earlier. My source on Badaeux was one of New Orleans's wealthiest and ^{most} staunchly anti-Communist women. She ~~is~~ was from a wealthy family prominent in industry. She gave me her copy of Badaeux's book he inscribed to her March 27, 1962. It is titled The Underworld of Sex. The one ^{of} recent thing about that book is that Badaeux and/or his printer gave it a plain paper dust-jacket. Nothing at all is printed on it.

The inside cover page has Badaeux's subtitle, "A Documented Account of Organized Sexual Degeneracy." By this he refers to nudism, which he represses as the "red" effort to undermine our society. This volume, and there is no reason to believe there ever was any other, is at the same point described as the "Advanced (sic) Edition." It is for "Restricted Circulation Only.", to be distributed through "The ^{of}Harald Express, Inc. New Orleans, La."

In the ugliness of mind reflected in the book, Badaeux has all the genitalia of the pictures facing the camera. What he ^a masks is the eyes of those photographed.

If there are those who may regard my ^{contrary} description of the politics of those Posner uses as the most credible of possible sources, virtually the pillars of New Orleans society, I cite merely one of the enclosures with this lunatic book, the "(ELECTION SPECIAL)" of The Federationist, which carries on its front-page masthead for that April 22, 1936 issue "(Truth Hurts None, But The Offender)" (sic).

The lead story, by "Wm. L. DONNELLS" is headed, "Can Boggs Be Trusted?"

he,
or had, as responsible ⁴ ~~writers~~ writers do, made even the most perfunctory check on the
reliability of his source,

Without any further identification of Boggs, ^{at this point} in its lead this story begins, "Can Boggs be trusted?" After a ~~sentenced~~ sentence ~~in which~~ saying that neither Donnels nor the paper believe he can be, the story ~~continues~~ lead continues, "Is Boggs a Communist today? Was Boggs a Communist in the past?"

"Boggs" is finally identified by a picture. It is Hale Boggs, ^{respected} the/conservative Democratic Congressman who was later a member of the Warren Commission.

Whether or not Posner was aware of this political idiocy, and he would have been if he had asked me about it, ^{122A here} the obvious fact is that he made no effort to learn whether Badaux ^{is} was a dependable source or, what is no less a ~~condemnation~~ ^{condemnation} of himself for his dishonesty, Posner knew the truth and suppressed it from ^{m/} his readers ^{time he uses} to be able to use a source with no ~~credibility~~ ^{credibility} as a credible one. There is the side issue of the similarity of their political views that, for Posner, ^{here and throughout his books, make the un-} and in this book, ~~makes the undependable quite~~ ^{acceptable quite} acceptable.

The same is true of Bringuiet. Bringuiet is his unquestioned and unquestionable source on thirteen pages. (page ~~50~~ 587) Posner also uses his index for political purpose. ~~Remember~~ Remember his condemnation of Sylvia Meagher and her index because Posner regarded it as "leftist?" Here he has separate listings for the Bringuiet-Oswald so-called debate in a radio appearance, amply reported by the Commission, which also published the transcript of it, and ^(sic) "trial of Oswald and," another separate index entry.

On that "debate," Posner either keeps secrets from his reader or is ignorant, either ^{is} ~~are~~ likely from his record in this book. He does not tell his reader that the first ~~tape~~ ^{tape} of it to reach official hands was ~~given~~ delivered by a man Posner refers to in a different and dubious context as "a former CIA contract agent." (Page 184) Posner gives no source for saying that ^{"Ernesto"} Rodriguez had work for the CIA. ^{had} In the sentence in which ^{Posner} he says this, what is in that sentence attributed to Rodriguez ~~is~~ ^{actually}, nothing to do with Rodriguez but is attributed ^{to} to Lieutenant Francis Martello, the New Orleans police official who interviewed Oswald after his arrest with Bringuiet in a fracas Bringuiet actually began, which is other than Posner says in his quoting of this best of sources, El Estupides ^{himself}.

The Secret Service gives the name as "Arnesto." I have forgotten the name as it appeared on his language school on St. Charles Avenue when I interviewed him there.

I do recall, whoever, that he^{was} quite forthright about what I did not see in any official record and with the distorted attention Posner gives to that 544 Camp Street address should have interested him, for ~~for~~ a while Rodriguez held ~~at~~ ^{night} some classes ~~there~~ ^{there} in which he taught Cubans how to speak English ~~at~~ ⁱⁿ that ~~very~~ ^{very} building.

At one point Oswald did go to see ~~Rodrig~~ Rodriguez, which Posner also does not report. ~~Yet~~ for all the attention Posner gives to that address and ~~to~~ Oswald's having stamped it on some of the literature he handed out, he does not see that maybe, just maybe, there might have been a little interest in what anyone without Posner's personal political views or his preconception so clear in his book, might ask if there should not have been an investigation by the FBI and/or the Commission of the fact that when Oswald picked his fight with Bringuier and got that radio attention in the New Orleans area from it, the man who ~~fixix~~ lost no time in getting a tape of that radio confrontation into official hands was ~~the~~ one Posner says was a CIA contract agent, ~~to~~ whom Oswald had gone with the subterfuge of ^{wanting} to take Spanish classes. ~~Rodriguez~~; ^{CIA's} the Rodriguez ~~who had~~ rented space in the 544 Camp Street building, to use at night; and ~~that~~ Oswald ~~did~~ use ^{d/} that address on his literature. ^{Of no interest to Posner.}

The real world is full of coincidences, and the ~~po~~ probability here is that the foregoing is only ~~that~~, but with Oswald the only official ^{as well as Posner's} candidate for assassin, and with the government ^{claiming to} as well as Posner ^{says he was} conducting a full and diligent investigation of Oswald and his entire life, at the very least for Posner ~~and those he~~ supports ^{and demands} ^{indicates that he had no} not to have looked into this at all ~~does not reflect any~~ interest in any part of Oswald's life other than what he gives his own ^{twist} to.

Posner ~~is~~ is high on his political bedfellow Bringuier and Bringuier involves ^{the youngest} Oswald and Philip Geraci ~~who~~, as we have seen ^{Jim Marrs Marrs'} in Posner's ridiculing of those with whom he does not agree he was so ignorant he just cribbed ~~the~~ ^{and uses it as his own} nutty and incorrect stuff he ridicules. Posner, like Marrs, knew nothing about it. They did not know that there

weret were three Philip Geracis then in that area and the one ^{of} whom they were ignorant and so totally ignorant, is the third of them, the youngest, ^{he was} only 15 at the misrepresented time he saw Oswald at ^Bringuier's place of business, the ~~Sec~~ Casa Roca store in the 100 block of Decatur Street, just inside the French Quarter and close to the river and the tough area of docks and warehouses.

Besides being ^{simpatico} with him. Posner had the need to build Bringuier up as a dependable source, which he is not at all. So, ^{Posner} he refers to him (on Page ¹⁸⁰ 90), as what he most ~~of~~ assuredly was not "the New Orleans anti-Castro leader." Naturally, Posner cites no source on this as, obviously, he could not because it is just plain false.

^{is a fake} Posner's ^{is a fake} account of the incident Bringuier ^{Posner} himself ^{admits} says he caused deliberately ^{by} insulting Oswald publicly. ~~and~~ "Bringuier tried to incite ^{the} ~~the~~ crowd against Oswald," in Posner's version, for which he cites Bringuier himself as his source (page 530). Yet in the very same paragraph ^{Posner} without any question at all quotes Bringuier as not being the aggressor. ~~If he had hit Oswald, which Bringuier admits Oswald invited him to do, and neither Posner nor he had any questions about that.~~ He quotes Bringuier as telling him that he did not hit Oswald because "That would have made me the aggressor."

Inciting the crowd against Oswald and calling him a Communist, one of the more ~~and~~ effective means of inciting crowd violence, that was not being the aggressor?

In a careless moment when Posner allowed himself to slip closer to ^{some} relevance ^{he indulged} in all of this ^{political} but with his customary ^{exaggerations}, in the course of smearing a new Orleans college professors as ^Wleftist," typically, no source given, along with some other also utterly ~~irrev~~ irrelevant such information ~~for which, probably indirectly~~ because he gives no source, is all from the political garbage the FBI fed the Commission. Posner does say of what he ^{there was} now calls a "fight," ^{finally} ^{of it he says} that, knowing all there is to know and thus needing no authority, it "was not staged, it was certainly prompted by Oswald ^{and} it was intended to ~~en~~ enhance ^{of} his legitimate pro-Communist credentials." (page 153)

Now if there is one thing that Oswald never had it is any kind of any "legitimate" credentials of any kind. ~~He~~ had nothing ^{imitation} other than the meaningless self-created and self-serving greasy kid stuff of an intelligence action ^{childish} and that business would have

125

with the Wilson and the DeLoach

impressed nobody at all and, as Posner knows, when Oswald tried to use it as "credentials" in Mexico City it got him ^h down to the door.

~~But~~ Despite the amateurishness of those little stunts Oswald pulled in New Orleans, they should have been officially investigated and it is only ^{because} that Posner whored with Oswald's history as he did with the history of the assassination and its investigation that ^{he did not do} ~~kept him from doing~~ that. Well, ^{for maybe} all the guff he was just handed may have told him there was no need to investigate. But given Posner's line in all of this, the more probable explanation is that for what he was engaged ⁱⁿ up he was better off as ignorant as he remains after writing his book.

Oswald's career in New Orleans, as I observed in my first book, completed in mid-February, 1965, when Posner as still a pre-puberty boy, was "consistent with what in intelligence is called 'establishing a cover'." As we have seen, this is what Posner distorted and misrepresented, giving no source, ^{his} in one of ~~that~~ snide and incorrect and ~~or~~ uninformed cracks he made about me, discussed above.

That is a purpose of this petty little interlude with Bringuier that, if Posner had done any work at all, he would ~~not~~ have known ~~that~~ it took Oswald many days to pull of. El Estupides ^{was} ~~being~~ just that and not being able to find Oswald who spent several weeks in his picketing just where ~~a~~ ~~was~~ Bringuier's business was.

^{Like} ~~The~~ government before him. Posner does not ~~scare~~ ^{fear} about, if he even knew it, that ~~two~~ ^{the} people both took movies of part of that fracas. The FBI was indifferent to it, publicly at least, until I forced its interest. We'll ~~not~~ come to that.

But ~~why~~ ^{why}, with all the reasons for really investigating Oswald's activities when he was in New Orleans the FBI steadfastly refused to do that, and why the Commission did not even ask the FBI, politely, to do that is a mystery. A mystery made more provocative because as soon as the New Orleans FBI ~~learned~~ ^{was getting at the truth from the Jones Printing Company,} that the Secret Service, which does and then did have the responsibility of protecting the president, ~~it~~ alerted Headquarters and Headquarters immediately ^{learned} ~~learned~~ on Secret Service headquarters to get ~~the~~ its New Orleans agents to drop that investigation. They did, forever.

Another of these mysteries created and then abandoned is the Philip Geraci story.

note with the same fiction, "The addresses were part of Oswald's effort to discover the headquarters of the ~~the~~ Cuban ^{by} exiles."

On the next page Posner's ~~remarks about~~ mention of Geraci ^{is} are limited to this sentence: "Bringuier walked away from the counter, leaving Geraci and Blalock talking to Oswald." He then says, "When they told Oswald they were interested in guerrilla warfare, he regaled them with stories on how to derail ~~a~~ a ~~train~~ train, blow up a bridge, and make a homemade pistol and gunpowder."

Despite his interview with ~~Pos~~ Bringuier, this is all Posner has on Geraci and the quote above is taken from his Commission testimony.

That is testimony a n honest writer and a diligent investigator would have checked a little.

As I did.

on
 How Posner writes about Geraci and his failure to identify him properly any of
 the ~~pres~~ three pages ~~on~~ which he refers to him is ^{still another} indication that Posner did not
 do his own work on this and that in fact he did not know that there were three Philip
~~Gea~~ ^{Geacis} and that this one is Philip III. As we saw earlier, ^{Henry} what ~~was~~ had written
 incorrectly ^{as Posner's own work} ~~that~~ appears (on page ~~496~~ ⁴⁹⁶ in one of Posner's appendix of what he captions
 "The Unnatural Deaths." There, referring to the ^{boy's} "unnatural death" as by "accidental
 electrocution", Posner says he "was the fifteen-year old youngster who spoke to Oswald
 at Carlos Bringuier's store in New Orleans when Oswald tried to infiltrate the anti-
 Castro movement." There is no source and it is not true, as we shall see. But what
 Posner has yet to ^{some of} acknowledge in all his effort to ^{of Bringuier} make something he was not ^{is} out of
 Bringuier, in New Orleans the entire Cuban Student Directorate consisted of one man
 only, Bringuier. How in the world, as the experienced Posner should have wondered, does
 one "infiltrate" a one-man outfit?

Posner never once gives the boy's correct ^{identification} ~~identification~~. Yet there is not a single
 mention of him in the Commission's record that is other than as Philip Geraci III. This
 alone ~~causes~~ ^{causes} wonder about whether Posner did his own work on Geraci in those
^{that he studied so carefully and even in detail} twenty-six volumes. In Volume 10, where Geraci's ~~testimony~~ ^{own} testimony appears, he ~~is~~
 appears as Philip Geraci III in the ⁹ preface ⁽¹⁰⁾, in the table of contents (vii), in the
 caption above the stenographic transcript and in the introduction to his testimony
 (both ^{on} Page ~~74~~ ⁷⁴). If Posner had looked at the Commission's unpublished records ~~for~~
 over which he is so emphatic in ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~Archives~~ ^{Archives} personnel, he would have found that
 even in the FBI's interview of Bringuier on November 25, ~~2~~ ² 1963, it also refers to
 Philip Geraci III. (This appears in the second of the volumes of FBI records identified
 by the Commission as CD-175, where it is page 696.)

What Posner says at the first of his two textual mentions of Geraci ^(on Page 150) can come from
 ignorance, can be written as it is for a purpose and it not in any event accurate. ^(C)

Bringuier's store, Posner says, "served as the Student ~~Directorate's~~ ^{Directorate's} unofficial
~~headquarters~~ ^{headquarters}, as well as a general clearing house for Cuban activities in
 New Orleans...."

Posner has the name of the organization wrong. (His indexer fixed that up for him on Page 590) ^{if it} The one-man outfit needed no "headquarters," official or unofficial, and it had none. ^Q And Bringuier was not trusted by most of the anti-Castros in New Orleans. None that I met were as flakey as he and they regarded him that way. As of the time of the assassination there was no real anti-Castro (to Posner "Cuban activities") in New Orleans. There were ^{many} anti-Castro cubans there but no real activities of any kind. ^{They} That really ended when the CIA withdrew its support of ^{its own creature,} the Cuban Revolutionary Council, ^{the CRCA} ~~its~~ office had ^{that} ~~which~~ it happens, coincides in time with Oswald's return to New Orleans, ~~its~~ office had been in that 544 Camp Street building about which Posner knows so little ^{and says so much.}

The rest of this quotation from Posner, nothing omitted, is, "Bringuier was explaining the Cuban fight against Castro to two fifteen-year-old Americans, Philip Geraci and Vance Blalock, when Oswald walked up to them. Geraci recalled that Oswald asked, ~~to the~~ 'Is this the Cuban exiles' headquarters'?"

It is at this point that Posner has his incorrect nonsense of an attempted criticism of me about that non-existing Canal Street address that was an empty lot when I photographed it in early 1967. As I noted earlier, Posner ^{is} careful to give no source for his wrongheaded criticism of me over those addresses. Thus he could believe that for ~~four~~ all practical purposes his lies would not be questioned. But on my only mention of these addresses in anything I published, in Oswald in New Orleans, on pages 79-80, ~~what I~~ actually wrote regarding the number ~~102~~ 1032 in Oswald's notebook is that ~~the~~ "The numbers go from 1030 to 1034. In the on that side of 1030 is a small fruit stand. It ^{is} ~~is~~ number ^{covered-over passageway} 1030 1/2." Typically through ^{out} the book Posner has no sources for his nonsense like this as well as for more serious mistakes that typify his writing. I was there, I did take pictures. So, still again, is this Posner's own work or did he have a source feeding him ^{my} ~~this~~ ^{infantile} ~~javeling~~ rubbish?

As in his text at this point, naturally no source given ^N and perhaps attributable to his mind-reading that here would perhaps be better ^e described as extra-sensory perception in his communications with the long dead, he says that at Bringuier's, Oswald was looking for "the Cuban Exiles' headquarters." ~~and~~ on the bottom of the page he ends his phony

It has two parts, before the assassination and after it, during the Garrison fiasco. *We return to this later*

Definitive as Posner claims his Oswald biography is and hailed as answering all questions by ^{him} Posner and by those people of prominence who proved ^{id} the dust-jacket puffery, ~~there is no~~ *Posner has not a word about either part.* there is not a word about either from Posner. Posner ~~is~~ the omniscient who criticized me for not paying as much attention as he thought I should have to his expert, Dr. Renatus ^Hartogs, the guy who used his woman patients for free sex.

By that standard, save for his total ignorance, Posner could as ^{reliably} ^{have} predicted *when a boy of the Three Philip* that the youngest Geraci ^{was} also going to be the presidential assassin he wasn't because he ^{also} had a froubled boyhood, complete with the kind of anger Oswald displayed and with a period of institutionalize because of it. *That Oswald did not need or have.*

It should be clear and it is a fact that neither the boy nor his caring parents ~~did~~ did anything at all wrong, ^{except} ~~that perhaps the mother was a mite too caring and protective.~~ Philip was at all times honest, including when I interviewed him in 1968. ^{Wesley Liebeler's} My initial interest in him was prompted by ~~the kind of~~ ^{Wesley Liebeler's} questioning of the boy ^{by Wesley Liebeler} in which I got the distinct impression that Liebeler was skirting something he did not want in the record and that the mother was going along with it when the boy did not.

If ~~Perry Holmes~~ ^{only} ~~of perhaps he is Sherlock Masen,~~ as Posner presents himself, had even taken ^{Commissioner's} ^{its} (the slight amount of time required to check the list of witnesses in the Warren Report ^{Pages} 483-500) he would have known that the boy was Philip Geraci III. ^{because that is how his testimony is listed (at 10H75 ff.)} If ^{he} had not been intent on deceiving me so he could later misuses that and if ^{Posner} had looked at my volumes of those hearings ^{he} would have seen that I had some of Wesley Liebeler's leading question, questions with answer built in, marked for attention. *126 H-C/H/11*

It happens that the young woman who was a ~~narcotic~~ narcotics informer and became one for me knew ^Philip. They were the same age, lived in the same general area of Metairie, and although the enlightened people of that ^{area} then believed that boys and girls should not be educated together, so they did not go to ^{the} same high school, they knew each other and in fact were ~~friends~~ ^{friends}. friends. As I knew from the Jeff ^Parish's juvenile

report on Philip, he trusted "Dayan" when he trusted nobody else.

That juvenile report also ~~spin~~ goes into some of Philip's boyhood interests. In one he had his own youthful pretend-guerrillas. He called them ~~I think~~ the ^{marsh} "Mauraders."
 I am certain he used the word "maud" "mauraders." They practised what they imagined guerrilla warfare was in ^m empty lots near where they lived. Philip then got what he later told me about, such literature in that field as was published by Robert K. Brown, of ^{Panthy he said?} Palladin Press, Boulder Colorado. As of my 1968 interview with him and his mother he said the Jeff Parish officials sheriff's office had not yet returned ^{that literature} to him.

As he told the FBI when ^{it} interviewed ^{him} on November 29, 1964, this conversation with Oswald had a slightly different cause than Posner prefers:

"GERACI recalls mentioning to OSWALD ^h that he, GERACI, had done a little reading ~~reg~~ regarding Guerrilla warfare after which (emphasis added) OSWALD informed him that he was familiar with various types of guerrilla tactics" (CD 75, Part 2, page 217)

Posner never does ^{allegedly} make clear what purpose Oswald could have had in seeking the location of those nonexisting New Orleans ant-Castro "headquarters" ^{Posner gives no} or even for any reason to believe anything like ^{not there!} them existed. If Posner needs it he just makes it up. That is how best-sellers and ^{by} reputations are made.

But in using Geraci as his vehicle, Posner has brought up questions and mysteries and even a possible connect to Clay Shaw. In ~~the~~ ^{course} course of it he also brings up an existing question, was Bringuier untruthful in swearing to the Warren Commission that ~~it was because this incident with Oswald~~ ^{of Oswald} he was so suspicious ^{July 29} (because of that raid on ~~what~~ ^a he exaggerated into ~~that~~ nonexisting "paramilitary base" that was raided, which had just happened, ~~he was also suspicious of Oswald~~ ^{one} He ~~p~~ ^D dated that Oswald ^{one} visit at August 5, 1963. There is reason to believe that it was earlier and ~~that~~ therefore Bringuier's alibi for going after Oswald is not explained by ^{it} that. If so, why did Bringuier not tell the truth and what is the truth?

Part of that truth I got from geraci's parents, before ^{his} the father was killed ~~ed~~ in that ~~incident~~.