5/30/69

CD1114, File VI, pp.21-41, DeBrueys 10/25/63 report

Examination of this report at so late a date perhaps illuminates it more and discloses significant omissions that cannot be accidental, omissions that amount to deliberate falsification, and strange juggling within the FBI New Orleans office, at the very least. I think this are not inconsistent with LHO having been an informant for the FBI, of which I have no proof.

I note that while Knack conducted the earlier investigation (see my 5/27/69 on CD12:1-3), it is not cited and itself is dated later than this one by six days. That report, for example, shows FBI interviewing of Mrs. Garner August 5. The FBI had information on LHO, according to the Knack report, on June 26 and July 23, both omitted by deBrueys, who, naturally, omits the Knack report so conveniently not then drafted and, oddly, not in the same form so we have no way of knowing when Knack conducted what interviews.

Here I think it necessary to emphasize that deBrueys was not incompetent, is a lawyer, was a trusted specialist fluent in Spanish and handling Cuban affairs in N.O., and was highly enough regarded by J. Edgar Hoover to be entrusted with the compilation of the major reports after the assassination.

Perhaps the most remarkable omission is of Oswald's defection and what the FBI knew, his threat to give military secrets to the Russians. It is beyond conception that with an ongoing investigation, the N.O. files would not have disclosed it, particularly because this report disguises later knowledge of it.

The synopsis does not disclose earlier and continuing FBI interest in Oswald. It is probable that in New Orleans, at the very latest, this began at the time of the Wasp incident, June 16. There certainly was an investigation of him in New Orleans before his August 9 arrest, for the Knack report refers to twom interviews four days before that

What is also difficult to comprehend is how the later Knack report is classified by "character" merely as "INTERNAL SECURITY-CUBA" while the ostensibly earlier one by de Brueys is expanded to contain the additional "character" of "REGISTRATION ACT-CUBA", alongside which someone had put a mark parior to xeroxing.

The synposis is misleading in saying of the non-existent N.O. FPCC that "No activity of subject orgatization observed since 8/16/63", for non by the FPCC had even been observed, it being entirely non-existent, which, in the absences of any confirmation of its existence, should have been indicated in the report tiself.

While it is possible at the time of this report the FBI knew of only "another unknown white male" with LHO, they later reveal knowledge, based on no information not available at the time of the report, that there were two and that one was a Latin type, which they did know and left out (Jeese Core told deBrueys).

"Cuban sources at New Orleans have no pertinent information regarding anyone named Hidell and there is no record of any such name inthe New Orleans directory or from credit sources". It is not that Cuban sources had no "pertinent" information; they had none at all. And were they not asked about the FPCC in N.O. or Oswald? Of course they were and this inquiry disclosed no knowledge of either, which is why deBrueys omits it where it was essential, for it shows Oswald was pulling something.

However, the lack of knowledge of either FPCC or Oswald to these sources is in the body (page 11), where no meaning is given the intelligence.

Page 2: Celso Hernandez a 47-year-old "student". He is anything but the student type. It is doubtful if either he or Cruz were members of the DRE, Bringuier testified he was then thebonly "member" and, although it need not mean he was not in DRE, Cruz was Alpha 66. Apparently no one had any interest in the Cubans or their connections

"The records of the New Orleans Police Department under Arrest Number 112-723 were examined August 27, 1963." If this does not say they were not examined earlier, it certainly implies it, and it would seem that especially with the plice having notified the FBI the moment of the arrest (and on so minor a charge) and with a then-active investigation, these records would have been examined earlier. If there is any truth to the Quigley testimony, that Oswald had nothing to say when he requested an FBI interview (and after the beginning of the weekend, which, it can be imagined, Quigley just loved!), can it be believed that th FBI was totally indifferent to the N.O.P.D. files? But I again not the absence of reference to the ongoing investigation.

On this page also there is missing the return address on the Lamont pamphlet, "The Crime Against Cuba". Paul Hoch has established with correspondence with the Department of Justice that it bore the address 544 Camp St., which was well known to all the N.O. FBI agents, whether or not it was in headquarters. In fact, before this report was drafted by almost two months, the New Orleans FBI office conducted a raid on a Cuban munitions dump accross the lake. They certainly, in the course of their investigation, also learned what was no secret in N.O., that earlier similar munitions had been stored at that address. Besides, although suppressed from all official records, at least one New Orleans FBI agent, the author of the report, deBrueys, was a regular attendant at the Cuban meetings, some of which were at this address, which also was the local headquarters. The omission is not innocent, not accidental.

Note also lack of reference to the Wasp incient of 8/16/63, also certainly known to the FBI. Note particularly deBrueys omission of Oswald's request for an FBI interview when arrested and the fact of it, by Quigley. It also is not in the synopsis, where it certainly belonged, and it is a glaring omission, not in any way overcome by inclusion of Quigley's inadequate 8/15 report ostensibly of it.

Page 3: As above indicated, there is reason to believe the FBI knew of more than the one man helping Oswald. I know they knew that one man was described as a Latin type, for Jesse Core told me he told deBrueys this personally (they were friends). Oswald remained at the ITM for much more than the described "only a few moments", but the reason for this misrepresentation is not immediately apparent. Knowing Jesse Core and his desire to be complete and his deep sense of indignation that Oswald had done this, I am certain he described to deBrueys what he did to me (and was left out of all the pertinent FBI reports) that his secretary (note- she was Dolores Neeley and she was interviewed) phoned him where he was having lunch and he returned, etc. Core alone describes more than "only a few moments", as do other observers. More, whether or not deBrueys saw Core 8/19, Core told him 8/16, by phone. He also told him much more about the man with Oswald, for his detailed description to me more than five years later of such things as home-made shorts was accurate.

Page 4: Here again is indication of earlier FBI investigation of Oswald, again the same date, August 5, which is a remarkable coincidence, it being at a time Oswald was known to be active (and this was suppressed) and but four days prior to the Bringuier indident and the arrest. Whether or not Mrs.

Bertucci was the "Secretary" of the "Reilly" Coffee Co., she was the wrong person to ask about Oswald's employment. Here deBrueys is needless vague, if that is what he is, for he does not even indicate the end of Oswald's employment by Reily. It is not because he didn't know. While the reports do not indicate who conducted the inquiry, Kaack's report says that as of the same date, August 5 (where he describes her as "Personnel Secretary", the personnel manager "advised on October 1, 1963, that subject terminated his employment on July 19, 1963". This, I note, is not consistent with the later and official account, which still may be the true one. It might be interesting to know why the FBI asked the wrong person to begin with and why it didn't get word from the right one until so late a date-any why deBrueys omitted it. This also may raise the question, was Oswald really fired? The Kaack report quotes Personnel Manager Alvin Prechter as saying "that subject terminated his employment on July 19, 1963", not that Oswald was fired for laziness.

Page 5 is the first page of the 8/15/63 Quigley report. It is an unlikely account, beginning with the statement Oswald "was interviewed... at his request", with no indication of why or the unusualness or unusualness. It gives the termination date of Oswald's Reily employment as July 17, casting further doubt on the later official story. In the second paragraph it gives a fictitious account of Oswald's post-Marine career that the FBI knew to be false (and about which Quigley is without comment) and that Oswald had every reason to believe the FBI would know to be false. There is no reason to believe it is what Oswald said, as there is no proof it is not. However, it can be assumed Oswald did know his wife's maiden name, which this report does not reflect ("Prossa"). There is no suggestion Oswald had been a defector who also had threatened to give away real military secrets, none of his being asked about it. Now, if it can be argued that at the time he interviewed Oswald, ~~my~~ August 9, Quigley did not know about this, can it be believed that in the six subsequent days before he dictated his 8/15 report he did not learn? Can it be believed that by the time deBrueys got around to his report neither of them knew what was in their files about Oswald? It can not. The question that here becomes unavoidable is why did the New Orleans FBI leave it out of its reports to Washington, which also knew? And, conversely, if this was an oversight in New Orleans, can it be believed that when Washington learned of it it did not tell New Orleans right away? This also seems unlikely. The only conclusion, then, is of willful, deliberate suppression of the most material thing about Oswald, the subject of the pre-assassination investigation and reporting.

Page 6 has a deadpan presentation of what was attributed to Oswald, that he was a member of the N.O. FPCC, held meetings of it as his home, and didn't know the names of any of the members. Not even Quigley would have swallowed that. And in saying Oswald still had his national and local FPCC cards in jail, after his arrest, and other papers, Quigley casts doubt on Lt. Martello's story that he took the slip of paper he later gave both the Secret Service and the FBI from Oswald and just forgot to return it. Quigley pretends to accepts the existence of a N.O. chpater on Oswald's word and nothing else.

Page 7 is more of the same improbabilities

Page 8 refers to the Lamont pamphlet,"The Crime Against Cuba" with reference to the return address stamped on it carefully omitted. It also has the application for membership in the N.O. FPCC, which raises questions about why the Commission pretended it didn't have this, why Liebeler borrowed Bringuier's copy, when Bringuier was so peasi nately attached to it, unless Liebeler was consciously building Bringuier, which is not an impossibility and which he did in other ways. The copy in the record is not the FBI's but Bringuier's.

Page 9: Oswald says he was engaged in this picketing at the same

place, the 700 block of Canal St. (Canal and Berronne). Now I recall no mention if them in the Commission files, but a number of people were later to pick this exact spot but in a different way (Waterbury Drug Store) and to tell the Garrison office of Oswald there and making threats against JFK. Now, if this pre-assassination account is true, what of the post-assassination testimony that Bringuier and cohorts searched Canak Street beginning at Decatur and didn't see Oswald and that he was later spotted? Both cannot be true. Bringuier lied about other things. I'd be inclined not to believe his account of this. In part I may be motivated by the fact that I believe Oswald picked spots Bringuier would be likely to find him and react strongly. There is no evidence that in all of the large, sprwaling New Orleans area Oswald ever poiketed further fromBringuier than close walking distance and there is ample evidence that he did more picketing than officially accounted for.

This page also has a small item I seem to have missed earlier and now find quite fascinating. It has the Oswald who had to know that the FBI knew all about his past, when asked the date of his birth, "at time of arrest claimed from Cuba" set off in parens after the accurate New Orleans". IF Oswald did this, it is quite consistent with establishing a false identity, for a purpose. If he did not do it, one wonders why the FBI has it, or their source, since they were not present "at time of arrest". There is nothing of it in any of the other reports I recall or any of the testimony. In a report "charadterized" as "INTERNAL SECURITY - CUBA" Quigley has no interest in this, makes no other reference. And in his report, which has this and the additional "character"REGISTRATION ACT- CUBA", deBrueys is totally silent. Both are unnatural, deBrueys the more and inconceivably so.

Page 11 begins with a news story that is accurate but interests me because it is the only occasion on which his name might, by any stretched imagination, have been included in any inconsequential story where Bringuier's name is not mentioned. I have copies of the morgues of the papers and believe me, Bringuier was their pal. They went out of their way to puff him. And it is the kind of thing of which Bringuier would have been proud. I note only the extreme unusualness of avoiding mention of Bringuier's name when he was so well liked by the papers. Tbhe page is also the resumption of the deBrueys report, and he still makes no reference to the Oswald past. Deceptively, without reference to the interview before Oswald's arrest, he here says she was interviewed October 1, thebinference being for the first time. It is also interesting that the date of Oswald's departure is firmly fixed (later it was made the subject of questioning) and the purpose (also needlessly debated and since misused by the rightist fanatics) given: so his wife could have her baby where there was a woman who spoke Russian. I suggest these facts alone are sufficient for the Commission's ignoring the early, pre-assassination reports in its testimony and Report but I do not suggest it is justified or justifianle. I do not recall if Mrs. Garner was questhoned about this. Both Kaack and deBrueys have Mrs. Garner saying both Oswalds left the same time, 9/25, which is not the later official story. DeBrueys sees fit to omit some of what Mrs. Garner said that is in Kaack, such as that the same woman took Marina away as brought her, or even that Mrs. Garner observed Texas tags on the vehicle. Clearly, it was not deBrueys's purpose to be informative. Kaack's report says the woman spoke Russian and knew Marina well, and makes it specific that Marina was going to Texas to have the baby, citing Mrs. Charles F. Murret in almost exactly the same words deBrueys used. The differences are in the kinds of things that could be added, not removed, like, from deBrueys, the identification of Mrs. Murret as "LEE OSWALD's aunt" and "Mrs. OSWALD" for "the subject's wife". I believe deBrueys' report was later than Kaack's or Kaack quotes a still earlier one. There is ample reason to suspect the existence of earlier reports, for in these we have references to earlier investigations. I am not aware of them being in the form of reports, or at least I do not recall them now. In deBrueys Mrs. Garner was re-interviewed October 7 apparently for the

sole purpose of acking the most obvious questions required to have been asked in previous interviews, whether there had been, as Oswald claimed, meetings at his apartment. There were not. Yet at no point does the FBI reflect any suspicion about these fictions and the fictitious characterization of himself Oswald is said to have drawn. If Mr. Garner was asked anything else, it is not reflected. But what she is quoted as having said,"they didhave some friends, approximately three or four people, who used to visit them on occasion". The FBI, like the Commission, had no interest in identifying these Oswald friends. It simply is not believable, especially when deBrueys was writing both an "internal Security" and a "registration Act" report.

The recurrence of certain investigative date, like August 5, October 1, October 7, etc., may indicate that pe riodically, after their reports were studied in Washington, the FBI went out and did more investigating. It is, I think, not necessarily without significance that this was the unvarying fact, investigations that are quoted are on the same dates.

Still without arousing deBrueys' suspicions, his CP informants did not know of either the Oswalds or the FPCC in N.O. And not until 10/15?

Some of the above in Page 12, which also discloses NO T-1 says there is no assigned box 30016 but there is no disclosed inquiry into any box under Oswald's name, rather unusual, it would seem.

NO T-3 is said to have provided not the tape but a transcript of the Oswald WDSU broadcast. Why, then, did the Commission not use this FBI transcript? Now Arnesto Rodriguez, who has the local reputation of being an informant, is also said to have supplied a copy of the broadcast (he tried to tell me he translated it into Spanish, which is inconsistent with the Secret Service reports). Bill Stuckey also did, and if one were to desire to suspect him, he was also an expert on the Cuban paramilitary activities and wrote a series of informative stories on them that have disappeared from the papers' morgue. He also left N.O. In his brief discussion of the broadcast, its most salient aspect is outside de Brueys' notation: Oswald as a defecter. Now just how much investigating of "internal security" or "registration act" was he intent upon to filter the hottest part of the debate out? Can one believe he would ~~xxxx~~ deny knowledge of it to Washington? It is easier to conveive he knew they knew and did what he believed expected of him. Reference to "Ed Butler" is not to the way Butler is known except to his friends. He goes by his full name, Edward Scannell Butler. Another possible source could have been the station, but I do not believe they had any occasion to transcribe the "debate" If anyone not in an official capacity did, I'd nominate Butler and have no reason to believe it impossible for him to be ~~D~~ NO T-5. It thus would be interesting to make word-for-word comparison of the trm scripts and I think this particular copy shoud be requested of the DJ, if necessary under the Freedom of Information Act.

Page 13: deBrueys is so intent upon saying nothing that when he identifies and describes Bringuier, he makes no mention of his fracas with Oswald but does find it necessary to describe him "a cuban refugee connected with the Revolutionary Student Directorate" and "anti-Castro".

I find it impossible to believe deBrueys, experienced agent, Cuban specialist, fluent in Spanish, local youth and education, lawyer and trusted with the compilation of the more important post-assassination reports was regarded or could have been incompetent. Therefore, I believe his report is designed for the purpose of not disclosing information as the investigations were designed not to elicit it. I cannot assume this is without purpose. I therefore find fortification for my belief it is to hide the federal-Oswald association.