

Even a Kidnapping!

XI

When Philip was in Viet Nam in the infantry and I was in New Orleans, I ~~phoned~~ ^{phoned} the Geracis. They ^{y/} agree to see me at their comfortable road ^{corner home} in a pleasant section of Metairie, at 2201 Green Acres Road. We sat at their dining-room table. As we finished discussing various topics ^{to} be be certain of accuracy and that they had said what they wanted to say I placed the ~~tape~~ ^{tape} back. They heard it and they were satisfied. I ^w showed them a furious FBI reports ^{and} they ~~read~~ ^{read} them, and Mrs. Geraci believed there had been an earlier FBI interview. The ~~first~~ ^{first} by date in the Archives was dated on the day the FBI was there, November 29 quoted above, Page 217 of D CD 75. Mrs. Geraci recalled an earlier FBI interview because she recalled the friends she had asked to be present because her husband had used Monday, November 25th, a day off, to go hunting. He confirmed he spent the day that way. I supposedly have all the FBI's relevant New Orleans records and no such report is included in them.

Both Geracis impressed me as concerned parents and as truthful and almost always forthright. I think they were about ^{their son's} his emotional problems, if not in all details ^{what} ~~to~~ the sensationalizing Posners would be ^{some details were} "arty-gs-like". They told me about having him hospitalized at "Andeville, the hospital for such patients across Lake Pontchartrain. They told me he had run away from home. Even about homosexual advances made ^{to him}. They did not know that I knew about ^{them} these matters ~~and~~ they were volunteering ^{that} this information. They even used the name of a prominent man connected closely to Clay Shaw, then charged but ^{They used his full name. I do not. Some} but not yet tried. ^{near their school} adult New Orleans homosexuals kept watch on a frozen eustard stand ^{just here} (the boys patronized). ^{both} One whose name ~~the~~ parents and two of Philip's friends also gave me is "Mario." When I mentioned this ^{homosexual advances toward Philip,} without any name to "Dayan" she asked me immediately if it was "Mario." She did that also when I told her about interviewing another boy of that group. "The first thing she asked me, ^{my notes say,} is "Did he mention "Mario?"

Both parents, my note also says, were "specific in saying that the 'children' had told them this was "Mario". ^{The parents write his full name} ~~and that they had written his name~~ of a slip of paper they still had. All the children ~~described~~ ^{described} "Mario's" car the same and correctly. He had taken Philip for a ride in it.

They used rides in their fancy cars as bait. The boys loved riding in those cars.

Mrs. Geraci was quite clear in her ability to date her son's first visit to Bringuiet, ^(The first) at least of which she knew. His school year at East Jefferson High School had just ended, he needed some Civil Air Patrol (~~was~~ CAP) uniform, she had a dental appointment in downtown New Orleans so she drove Philip and Vance Blac Blalock into New Orleans and home again. (Philip later told me he needed an appropriate shirt.) That, Mrs. Geraci told me, was toward the end of May. *Philip later confirmed it was just after school was out.*

When the boys let Bringuiet know that they were interested in helping the anti-Castro movement, (as what good ol' March "aurader would not be) ^{of the Cuban Student Directorate} he gave them bonds ~~the Miami~~ outfit with which Bringuiet was connected, to sell. *How did the Geraci's were both telling me this story,*

^{he} The father left and returned with a shoe box in which he kept various papers relating to his son. One is such a bond, with a face value of fifty cents. Of the Directorio ~~Revolucionario~~ ^{to name in Spanish} Revolucionario Estudiantil, of the DRE, ^{there} this is Bond Number 113778.

Along with a copy of this ^I got a copy of Bringuiet's handwritten receipt to Philip for Ten dollars and fifty cents for those DRE binds he had sold. In his own handwriting Bringuiet dated it, "July 5th, 1963."

There soon came a time when Philip was told by a man on the street that he could not sell bonds without a license. While if there is proof of it I do not remember it, ^{but I do} do remember that there were quite a few people in New Orleans, including reporters, who believed that it was Oswald who made the complaint that ended the sale of those bonds that would never draw interest or bought back.

That Philip had been at Bringuiet's before the Warren Commission record said he had been, and earlier than this receipt/reflects, interested me greatly because that November 29, 1963 FBI report on its interview with him states what Philip later told me: "...at the time he met Oswald as the CSD (Cuban Student ^{Directorate} Directorate, or DRE Anglicized. with "revolutionary" omitted), he Geraci, was visiting ^{that} it place for the first time, for the purpose of obtaining information regarding the CSD, which he had heard was an anti-Castro organization."

So, the date that ^Bringuiet gave repeatedly and under oath as August 5 was before July 5 by ^{at least} (however long it took Philip to sell those ^{twenty-one} eleven fifty-cent bonds at the least.

Philip
 From his mother's recollection it was toward the end of May. *Philip said about the same thing in deposing it after the end of the school year.*

According to that same FBI report, when Philip was there for the first time and was talking to Bringuer (whose name the FBI misspelled), "an individual whose photograph GERACI advised was identical to LEE HARVEY OSWALD came into the store" and asked ~~Bring~~ Bringuer about "anti-Castro literature."

~~and~~ that is not what Bringuer swore to.

On his part, according to the FBI's report of its November 25, 1963 interview of Bringuer, the previously-quoted ^{CD} DD 75, part 2, page 686 in the Commission files, was less the friend to ~~the~~ Geraci boy than the boy was to him. As FBI Special Agents Regis L. Kennedy and Claude L. Schlager wrote, "BRINGUIER advised that ~~he~~ knew of no associates of OSWALD with the possible exception of PHILIP GERACI." His reason, again consistent with that being on the boy's first visit, was "because they were ^{of} both in the store at the same time."

So, with ^{my then} a clear recollection of the transcript of Geraci's deposition when questioned by that same Wesley J. Liebeler as it was printed by the Commission (10H72ff) not reflecting this at all, I got the stenographic ^{typewritten} transcript. The stenotypist was Mrs. Helen L. De Dietrich, of the firm of Dietrich and Witt, Inc. It is ~~is~~ somehow dated two days, "April 7-8, 1964," when the boy was deposed only a single day. That was in Room 415-B, Old Civil Courts Building, Royal and Conti Streets. It is initialed on the cover, "OK to Print - WJL." But it was not "OK to Print" until Liebeler made a few changes.

~~Now~~ I've had considerable experience preparing transcripts for publication when it was not a court transcript. It is permissible to make slight changes that do not effect the meaning of what was testified to, like correcting grammar and spelling. But changing the meaning is not acceptable. I was on my honor not to do that and once I was cross-examined rather ^{stiffly} when I was about twenty-five years old. When it was over, the then United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, ^{about it} David Pine, later a federal district court judge, nicknamed me "affidavit-face." The cross-examining ^{lawyer} ~~lay~~ had the typescript and the printed ~~we~~ ^{my} version and could compare the two. He could not find a legitimate complaint much as he tried because all I had done was correct grammar and

13 | ~~eliminate~~ a few "uh's"

substantial
eliminate a few "uh's" ^{with space} by the Senators, not the witness.

The hearings we were then holding was on the incredible brutality and murders by the coal operators and their association in what they was known as "Bloody Harlan" ~~so~~ county, ¹⁹²⁸ Kentucky. The next year the Department of Justice borrowed me for its failed prosecution of some sixty-five operators and deputized gun-thug defendants. I ~~then~~ ^{there} learned what probably ^a explained the unexpected conclusion of the ~~case~~ in Washington in which I was Pine's witness.

One of those coal operators, Ted Creed Creech, son of the owner of the Creech Coal Company, had threatened a witness who had not yet testified. It just happened that, the ~~morning~~ ^{morning} session of that hearing having ~~just~~ just ended, that I was in the men's room and saw and heard it.

Open and shut case?

The jury acquitted.

After I'd been living and working with the Department of Justice prosecution down in Kentucky the next summer and made local friends the ^w lawyers and FBI agents did not make, I learned how that sequestered jury had been fixed. And when the assistant attorney general in charge of the criminal division, a man who liked me and my work ^{en}ough to recommend me for employment by the department I did not want, would not believe what I told him, I returned to my Senate ~~auto~~ duties.

The fixing was simple and effective.

The coal operators bought up the mortgages of all the jurors who owned their own homes. They then saw to it ~~that~~ ^{that} the wives knew. When the wives visited their husbands they told their husbands. The husbands told the only people they could see, the United States marshals who guarded them around the clock. The marshals, of the same ^department of Justice as the FBI, did not trust the FBI. So they instead told the clerk of the court, my good friend Mike Pennington. (Whenever Mike was in Washington on department business, he came to ^{see} me at my Senate office as long as I was there.) Mike trusted neither the lawyers nor the FBI so he found me ~~talk~~ ^{talk}ing a wjak before retiring about

two one morning and he told me.

So, I ~~learn~~ learned when rather young that what ^{is} wrong ^{to do} and cannot be done often can be ^{done}. Witness, for example this Posner book and the overt and covert help he had on it.

And I knew that there ^{is} a limit to the changes that could properly be made in the verbatim transcript before the Commission.

It did not take long. Liebler knew the truth and by accident he let it slip out in questioning Philip.

His first question on page eight of the ~~transcript~~ ^{typescript} as he asked it was, "Now, is it correct that on the day or one of the days that you came into Casa Roca to give this ~~the~~ money to Carlos, was that the time you met Lee Oswald?"

What Liebler himself eliminated before publication is the two references to Philip having been there more than the one time Oswald as was!

The one, ^{that} as we have seen, had its date changed from the actual earlier date to Bringuer's ~~spalibi~~ date of August ~~the~~ fifth!

— "One of the days" ~~is~~ is Liebler's first excision; "was that the time" is ~~his~~ his second excision!

Bringuer's story is that Oswald offered to ^{teach} the Cubans what he claimed to have learned in the ~~Marines~~ about guerrilla warfare ^{about} which he had learned ~~but~~ a blessed thing in either his training or experience as a radar operator, his official duty. According to Philip, that was Oswald's offer to him, not to Bringuer but to him [Ⓞ]. ^{A Oswald} He is supposed to have said he would ~~give~~ give Bringuer his manual.

But as Philip testified, and this is on page 13 of the typescript of his testimony,

"Oh, there was one important thing" after Oswald had filled the boys, not Bringuer, with his malarky ^{about} of all he had learned about guerrilla warfare, "Oswald said something like that he had a military manual from when he was in the ^Marines, and he said he would give it to me, ~~A~~ and I said, 'That's all right. You don't have to. You can give it to Carlos.' He said, Well, O.K., he will give it to Carlos next time he comes'."

This is not at all the version Bringuer testified to ^{when} and, like Posner did, ^{me} was ^{by the Commission} accepted as one capable of speaking only the complete and the literal truth.

So, we have learned a little about what the Commission did not go into and what it changed its official printed record to hide. But we have no reason for these untoward and wrongful developments.

We also have learned what could have led the official 1963-4 investigation in Clay Shaw's direction, whether or not that had any connection with what Garrison later alleged. ~~Some~~ Some of those hawks ^{were} ~~are~~ fond of chicken. It may have been no more than that. But without question, "Mario" ^{was} ~~was~~ close to Shaw. And he ~~was~~ enjoyed a ~~similar~~ public reputation similar to Shaw's, including being respected. He also was a successful business man.

Bringuer soon ^{got again} proved himself something less than Philip's most dependable friend, although the boy, who did not get along well with his father, regarded Bringuer as a trustworthy adult. ^{male.} That Jeff Parish juvenile ^{file} report states that the boy did run away, to Mississippi. He kept himself there for a while and during that time was in touch with "Dayan". When he decided to return she met him at the Greyhound station. He wanted to consult with Bringuer. They went to his Casa Roca from the bus station. Bringuer did not tell the boy to phone his parent, who, obviously, had to be worried. He did not phone the Geraci himself. Instead he sent the boy to the nearby flophouse, The Silver Dollar. Its clientele were the drags, the lost souls, ^{secret} who could flop there in a dormitory-like arrangement of bunks, for a dollar ^a night.

~~XX~~

"Dayan", knowing that I wanted to talk to Philip, told me when the father by accident killed himself. She also told me when, because of that, the Army returned ^{Philip} him home. ^{from Viet Nam. Then} They from the New Orleans papers I learned that ^{Philip} ~~she~~ he had ignored three Garrison grand jury subpoenas. Ignoring them is an automatic offense. So, I arranged to return to New Orleans.

Almost immediately and entirely by accident I saw Judge Louis Trent whose lawyer wife was the Geraci family lawyer. Because this was at the entrance to the District Attorney's office, it was an auspicious accident ^{right then} because Trent was in a position to confirm

what I told him I had done in ^{Philip's} Geraci's interest ^{that} and would prevent Garrison's filing any charges if ~~the deal~~ ^{Philip} he agreed to the deal I'd made with Garrison. That was, simply, that I would interview him and tell Garrison what I learned that ^{I believed would be} ~~was~~ of interest to ^{him.} Garrison. ~~And~~ In fact after that interview I told Scimabro. And that ended Philip's trouble with Garrison.

~~THE~~ Mrs. Trent, who practised law in her maiden name, ^{as} Mrs. Lillian Cohen, in partnership with Dorothy Cowen, arranged for the meeting to be in her home at 2127 Jefferson Avenue. Because she and the judge were going boating that weekend she arranged for us to start ^{so that} and when we ended at four in the afternoon she had time to arrange It was on Saturday, December 14, 1968. for their going to their boat. I was surprised that Mrs. Geraci was there ^{and} because I feared that she might ~~cow~~ or intimidate Philip, ^{but} I was ~~so~~ soon glad she was there because ~~she~~ she could confirm one of the very strangest ^{if not the strangest} of all the unusual twists and turns in ^{that} the nightmare of Garrison's.

^{Judge Trent} Her husband seemed to take me at my word for he left without confirming it. He told me to phone her, I did, she seemed pleased and said she would set the meeting up.

The way I arranged the tape recorded ^{pleased} Lillian Cohen. It was where she could reach it to turn it off. I also told Philip and his mother if ~~there~~ there was anything they did not ^{want} recorded to tell me and I'd turn the machine off. ^{But} It was turned off only when I turned or changed tapes. I am not digging them out because my notes are adequate for present purposes.

Philip ~~confirmed~~ ^{that} his mother on his first visit to Bringuier being right after school was out. He also handed me that July 5 ~~receipt~~ receipt his father had promised to ~~send~~ send me and hadn't. That was as best he could recall his third receipt for bonds he sold for Bringuier. ^{w/} He showed me a receipt ^d dated June 21, 1963. For the rest, until he stunned his lawyer and me, he ^{said} ~~to~~ pretty much what I'd know ^{n/} and what the FBI and Secret Service ^r reports state. Before ^g getting into that, he did confirm what ^{is} ^{subsection} ^{which is what Bringuier said,} contrary to this particular ^{mythology} of the assassination ^{mythology, but is what} Bringuier the unimpeachable in Posner's accounting, that so dependable source he gave him special thanks ^{for} explanations and guidance.

My notes on what Philip said about what Oswald ~~as~~ said and did at Bringuier's read, referring to Philip:

"He was unequivocal in repeating his testimony that while he was present, there was no offer by LHO to train guerrillas - ~~not~~ nor anything even remotely suggesting it. This is also what (Vance) Blalock told the government. He says he was in the store when LHO arrived and was still ~~there~~ in it when Oswald left."

What Philip denied is the story Bringuier gave and Liebeler and the Commission preferred and used and Posner prefers, too. It is more anti-Oswald and gives him a seeming purpose he did not have. But they also liked for him to have that purpose he did not have. Posner, of course, too.

The next paragraph of my notes is the stunner. Lillian Cohen was perhaps more shocked than I because in the false representation that those who in effect kidnapped Philip saying it was for Garrison, actually removed Philip from Garrison's jurisdiction instead.

When Philip graduated from high school ^{in Metairie} he got himself a job in New Orleans and lived there. While the border between Orleans and Jefferson Parishes is invisible, Metairie appeared appearing to be part of New Orleans, Garrison's jurisdiction ended at that invisible line. The most obvious thing of all is that they were not doing anything for

Garrison:

He told of a strange incident his mother confirmed, that at 2 a.m. the night David Ferrie died, meaning the early morning after it, he was awakened by Sgt. Borne of Jefferson Parish Sheriff's office, who had worked on his juvenile case, taken from Orleans into Jefferson Parish to the home of an uncle, and severely interrogated about Ferrie (he had been in Civil Air Patrol also but in 1962-3, and was looking for a proper shirt the first time he went to Bringuier's). He was told this questioning was for both parishes, specifically that it was for Garrison and would keep Garrison from troubling Philip. He was reminded that "20 people" had met mysterious deaths - frightened - and kept in Jefferson Parish a week. He was reinterviewed on tape and told a copy would be given to Garrison's office. Neither Sciambra nor Ivon know anything of this. Why anyone would question Philip about Ferrie is not clear. I suggest the possibility something else was sought.

I think I misspelled the name and that it is Bourne but I'm not certain now. The other man, I was told, was Frederick S. O'sullivan, of the New Orleans Police Department vice squad. This is not confirmed, Ivon opposed my questioning him and I therefore made no effort to.

When O'Sullivan testified before the Warren Commission, as I ~~missed in Whitewash~~ reported, and I brought both Ferrie and O'Sullivan to public attention, two paragraphs of O'Sullivan's testimony were withheld by the Commission. (8H27 ff) Although when he testified O'Sullivan identified himself as a member of the police vice squad, the Commission description of him in its list of witnesses is, "Acquaintance of Oswald at Beauregard Junior High School, New Orleans." (Report, page 494)

What the Commission withheld did not protect Ferrie's privacy. It was O'Sullivan's testifying to his having been charged with offenses against boys. *Those charges were public.*

There can be no question about ~~the~~ ^{De Ferris} identification of Bourne or Borne. They both knew him because he ~~had~~ handled Philip's juvenile case.

If ^{his} mother had not confirmed Philip's story, interrupted him to tell ^{some} of it herself, it would have been impossible to believe ~~it~~. It also was risky for the officers involved - and both Geracis did know Bourne - because for each it ^was wrong. What Philip and his mother could remember of the thrust of the questioning may make some sense as it related ^{to Ferrie} but only if there was some reason to have an interest in him after he was

dead. That would make sense only if he actually had been what Garrison charged and that ^{But if it was official, why in the world would both parishes do it in so many a way, parti-}
^{I did not believe, either by when they would have had no need to question Philip in}
^{secret?} ^{being questioned about.}

What else Philip remembered, again confirmed by his mother, who was there for part of the interrogations, related to "Dayan" as part of a girl sex ring. My notes on this use the wrong word and misspelled it. She was quite feminine but was not of the physique one would be include ^{med} to expect in such a role. She was the skinniest ^N young woman I remember, she dressed only for comfort and at fifteen she might well have been even skinnier.

Because they had earlier identified that "second officer" as O'Sullivan and because O'Sullivan had been in the CAP with Ferrie - FBI records I got from John Mitchell when he was Attorney General and my FOIA request for what the Archives withheld was routed to him - indicate that it was O'Sullivan who recruited Oswald into the CAP. If he was that second officer, the mystery is even deeper:

As there is no apparent reason for questioning Philip about Ferrie, there is even less for any mention of 'DAYAN'. The least likely thing is that this very uneffeminate young woman is part of a sex ring. It may be that this was given as a reason so the officers' interest in her was disguised. Mrs. Geraci confirmed this, as she did all of Philip's story on that questioning. Part of it came from her. There would seem to be no reason for Mrs. Geraci (or Philip either) to involve 'DAYAN' for an apparent reason, for there is no involvement of any kind of a sex ring of young girls in the story of the assassination. However, it does seem clear that Philip was questioned about "DAYAN". I think when I return I should pursue this further with the Geracis, to see if it is possible to pinpoint the real reason for terrifying and questioning Philip at all and about "Dayan". One possible explanation for questioning Philip is "Mario". "Dayan" also knew all about this. When she learned I had questioned Raul, one of the first things she asked me is, "Did he mention Mario?" And why did the Jefferson Parish authorities pretend to be working for the Orleans Parish District Attorney? Who was really with Borne? Could it have been someone not with that Parish, perhaps a federal officer?

They told Philip Geraci and/or his mother ^{or} that they didn't believe him, that he was gay, that he had to be because of CAP/Ferrie (his leader was a woman, a major) and the second officer said he knew because he had been in the CAP with Ferrie.

That doesn't indicate that O'Sullivan was the second officer.

With Philip's CAP leader a woman, ^{then} he had no formal connection with Ferrie in the CAP.

"Deyan"

From Philip's account the girl was not sexually active. He said, quoting my notes, "he had tried to 'make' her and hadn't been able to. Earlier Philip had volunteered that ~~he is not~~ "he is not gay," my notes say.

Aside from the very strange business of the ^{Philip's} virtual kidnapping with the family's assent so soon after Ferrie was known to be dead and the riskiness of this impropriety if discovered officially or reported and the seeming purposeless ~~of~~ of it from what Philip and his mother knew I also wonder, in retrospect, why Philip was so insistent upon ^{denying} saying that what Bringuier ~~of~~ said Oswald ~~of~~ said and did when he was at the Casa Roca and his ^{Philip's} emphasis on saying he was there when Oswald got there and remained there after Oswald left. On this Philip had the confirmation noted. Why, then, did Bringuier give the account he did give and did not change in any of the records I have seen?

Why, too, did Ivon want me not to talk to O'Sullivan? I regarded Ivon ^{as} a good professional policeman, a solid detective and I respected him.

I never had a chance to carry any of these mysteries to any conclusion, if one were possible, because the Shaw trial began a month later, with the empanelling of the jury, the holidays intervened, and if I was in New Orleans after the holidays and before the trial began, it could have been for a brief visit only.

After ^GGarrison had withdrawn from his lawsuit to obtain the autopsy film, the ~~rifle~~ rifle and other evidence to present to the jury during the Shaw trial I had phoned and notified his office, I believe it was Sciambra, that I would not be there, not be the "Dealey Plaza" expert I had agreed to be a year or so earlier. I was lied to and told that it was not Garrison who had issued that statement so I did go there again. After spending the Sunday before the trial's opening on Monday with the lawyers who would do the in-court work I again said I would not be part of it, that they would lose and that they deserved to lose. I returned home without ~~of~~ ever laying eyes on Shaw, without going into the courtroom at all, even though the New York ^{sitting} Times listed me ~~as~~ at the prosecution table in that courtroom.

This is not the kind of ~~a~~ simple mistake one ~~can~~^{can} explain away by realizing that we can all make mistakes. It reflects a person's ^{al} ignorance of important aspects of that Garrison ~~tragedy and farce.~~^{tragedy and farce.} It could not ~~be~~ Posner could not and would not have made such a mistake if he had sought and obtained any real knowledge of that Garrison mess. Yet he writes about it as though he is the only one who has any ^{real know} knowledge of what really happened there. ~~It~~

But even if Posner had ^{been} the world's most eminent and understanding authority he pretends to be and Random ^{House} made such an ~~effort~~ effort to have him recognized as, does this not again reflect the importance of peer review with non-fiction and again raise questions about why, with the fortune Random House spent on this book, it did not protect ^{with a} itself by ~~the~~ normal peer review?

Or is this a self-answering question?

Another of the innumerable instances of this is the direct contradiction of all that Bringuier said that Oswald said and did at the Casa Roca by Geraci and the other boy, Vance ~~Biao~~ Blalock, and by the FBI's reports on it. If Posner-minded and Posner-politicised Bringuier said it, that was absolute and unquestionable truth to Posner, no matter how wrong it was.

In this he was like the Garrison he ~~condemns~~ condemns, making it up to suit himself, regardless of truth and of fact.

Posner is so ignorant of the actualities, ^{This} which means he did not even check the newspaper and did have a source he does not credit for his ignorance ~~of~~ about Garrison's effort ^{and by film and} to get that evidence into the trial record and before the jury ^{so} that instead of reporting the truth that is so devastating to Garrison, that he abandoned his ^{own} successful effort at the moment of his success, ^{describing} attributing the case he filed as a CIA effort to ruin him, Posner says he lost that case! 139A here

^{serious work} This is a fair reflection of Posner's "research" and "investigation" and of him as a writer. He ^{he} certainly did not get anything that wrong from the Wegmann file. Shaw's ^w lawyer certainly ^{had} that that ~~was~~ straight, certainly filed ^{the} those newspaper stories about what is probably the most irrational thing Garrison did. It represents Posner's carelessness with what he says to stir people as long as it is not libel. It is one of the many indications that he didn't really care about New Orleans other than to use to it belittle those he disagreed with. ^{and to promote himself.}

Posner was ^{ent} continued to crib the undependable Marrs whose writing, if Posner knew anything at all about the subject matter he had to know was undependable, for his account of the wrong ^Geraci sudd suffer suffering an "unnatural" death in his previously ~~at~~ quoted ~~exp~~ "explanatuon" in which the only thing he had correct is the spelling of "Philip" and of "Geraci." ^{he presents himself, with Random House's assistance, and} But this supersleuth, as he is hailed by those extolling his book, ~~he~~ had no interest in the mysteries around the correct Philip Geraci, the thjrd, even whose existence ~~Posner~~ Posner was ignorant of when that strange kidnapping was clearly connected with the JMW assassination, Garrison's so-called "probe" of it or both, ^{and he} as so far removed from reality or any interest in ^{reality} it that he not only ~~depe~~ depended on that man of the mists in his mind. Bruiguiet and credited him for being so dependable in his book, He had no interest at all in anything real in New Orleans. 139B

If ^{posner} had some any of the work he ^{doing} boasts about in those twenty-six volumes he claims to have studied so ~~thausovely~~ and even to have indexed, he would have found, ~~demon~~ investigator that he says he is, the same lead I found that disputed Bringuiet's ~~deep~~ account of when Oswald was ^a ^{up to} at his place of business. What I followed ^{up on what} the what the Secret Service said about when ^{of} Philip gave Bringuiet that bond money he collected. 139C

...
A secret Service report in those twenty-six volumes reports Geraci's trip to give
Bringuer ^{what} ~~what~~ he had collected by ^{then} ~~June~~ when Geraci took that money to him. ^{June} ^

^{are questions about}
 Then, too, there ~~is~~ the kind of person Bringuier really is. Aside from ~~all~~ that he believes is true and isn't true and all the things that he imagines ~~and~~ ^{are} not real. Posner makes no reference to ~~the~~ ^{his} radical religious right, ^{connection with} Hargis et al, ^{they took} taking Bringuier over and onto a speaking tour while ignoring the fact that in his store window Bringuier displayed ^{Spanish} pornographic books to attract the Spanish-speak^{ing} seamen who might ~~see it~~. Perhaps their similar political views blinded Posner to the reality of Bringuier. ^{He is the} ~~the kind of~~ nut who rushed from his store in a crouch to take pictures of me while I was looking elsewhere, at Pena's bar ^{He is} ~~and being~~ so out of touch with reality that he ^{then} rushed to the FBI with those pictures for all the world as though they had any significance at all when they did not in any sense, ^{not} even in the nuttiness of ~~the~~ ^{of} Bringuier. The reality of Bringuier, from that Jeff Parish juvenile report, is that when the boy Philip returned from Mississippi and he went ~~from~~ from the bus station to Bringuier, Bringuier did not tell him to phone his worried parents or do that ~~is~~ ^{rise} himself. Instead he sent him to a disreputable flopho-flopho-flophouse where he was abused but ~~is~~ denizens the character of whom was so well and so publicly known.

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Posner's judgement if not again his intentions is also reflected in that ^{other} New Orleans source ^{wisdom, knowledge} of such eminence and dependability, Badeaux. The man who passed on to a fine woman who trusted him the utterly ~~is~~ insane allegation that the conservative Democrat ^{is} Congressman Hale Boggs was a Communist.

But then is this so unusual for the real Posner and the reality of his book when in his own personal shrinkery it is that woman-abusing Hartogs who is the sole basis for Posner's ^{of} statement that Oswald was an assassin-in-the-making from his boyhood!

I saw Posner's first ~~fact~~ facial expression, his face ^a being a ~~virta~~ Virtual mask until then, when Chris Gordon asked him what he could twist into ~~the~~ his Hartogs line of utter nonsense. *Then Posner beamed and unboxed his shrinkery.*

These three, the woman-abusing Hartogs, the Badeaux who regarded everyone touched by the rising sun as "red," and the Bringuier who was not truthful to the Warren Commission and ^{who} ~~the~~ had the relationship with the ^{him} ~~eraci~~ boy recounted above, are a fair representation of the kind of sources upon whom ^{Posner} Posner depends for his rewriting of

our history for his own thirty pieces thirty pieces.

But when there were legitimate leads to be followed in New Orleans, some of which are indicated above, Super sleuth Posner was lost in his sewer of slurs, indifferent to the reality, the reality ^{to which} that he would have found leads to in those records he says he ^{stuck} exhausted ^{with} and which he convinced many reviewers and reporters he did exhaust, the records that say clearly and redundantly that the lone-nut of the Posner ~~revision~~ ^{revision of} mythology ~~revising~~ the official mythology, that lone Oswald Posner reports in his book and on his appearances, was anything but a loner in New Orleans.

I note still again, that ~~is~~ if he had been an honest man when he was here, if he had not lied to me about the book he was writing, if he had said - but that would have been a lie, too - that he had a genuine interest in following up on known facts relating to either Oswald or the assassination, he would have gotten it. If he had searched the files ^{Cabinet} he did search with any such interest, he would not have missed it. What follows was all there.

- ~~Not that~~ some of what was in them was ~~not~~ missing the first time I checked them after he left, for this writing. Much was and later I discovered that even more is missing. And all that is ~~is~~ ~~I know~~ missing from the limited searching I am able to do one way or another refutes Posner's book, with the single exception of a file he might have believed others were interested in, others in official positions.

This does not constitute proof that Posner stole what is missing. ^y But I have no reason to believe that any of it had been ~~also~~ missing and I know of nobody other than Posner who had any interest in what is missing. And nobody had used those files after Posner and before I did again. ^T That was a slow period here, none of those writing books ostensibly on the assassination ^a and for its thirtieth anniversary ~~to~~ tarnishing their preconceptions with established fact.

etc space

127A

I want also to make it clear that I know of no reason even to suspect that there was any homosexual-ring involvement of any kind in the assassination. Garrison did have this ~~is~~ irrational belief. He imagined such a ring of ~~be~~ the wealthiest and most influential men as secret ~~said~~ ^{sado-masochist} sadist homosexuals. I personally ^{ended} (that incredible ^{in Los Angeles} irrationality when a man working for Garrison through ^{the} former FBI agent ^{and a} professional thief for it, William Turner invented "evidence" in support of Garrison's night-marish belief, and I caught him at it. The prominence of those Garrison had in his ~~a~~ non-existing ^{S/M} ring is absolutely astounding and it extended in to the JFK White House!

"Crazy" is hardly ^o the word for it!

When he made it up he was a good novelist. Hearing him talk about it was like hearing a reading of a novel. All the imaginary details were there, too. And none of his clique ever asked him how he acquired such knowledge. The part I remember, along with some of the names, had these national leaders, men of wealth, influence and distinction from both parties, arranging fancy parties for their wives and themselves and then slipping off en banc to their ~~S/M~~ S/M binge.

Of course this left all those ^{best-family, upper-class} women by themselves together. If Garrison worked his way around that little problem, I never heard it or do not remember it, as I think I would have. I think he had not gotten to the point where he had ^{all} them (either secret lesbians or all poets who welcomed a post-midnight seance).

No, there is no reason even to suspect that from a middle-teens girls' or a wealthy aduly-gays there was any kind of assassination-connected sex ring.