

April 26, 1979

Dear Harold,

Thanks for sending me the material from the Newark file on Nelson Delgado. I've done a bit of checking, ~~xxx~~ and there does seem to be something peculiar ~~xxx~~ going on. My tentative conclusions:

- (1) The Newark office was certainly engaged in a strong (and, in my recollection, exceptional) effort to discredit Delgado's statements.
- (2) The December 16 report which you sent me was apparently not forwarded to the Warren Commission.
- (3) Parts of the 12/16 report were repeated in the 1/27 report; the most plausible ~~xxxx~~ explanation is that someone deliberately wanted to keep the unrepeated information from the Commission.
- (4) Nonetheless, Liebeler apparently did have the unrepeated ~~x~~ information from the 12/16 report in his possession when he deposed Delgado.

Here is a summary of the relevant documents:

Newark serial	Date	SA	Pp.	CD	Date of interview	FBIHQ serial
105-15291-						105-82555-
14	6 Dec	Murphy	2	123	(Subject=?)	802
29	12 Dec	(FD 302)	5	-	(Delgado)	745
30	13 Dec	?	8	-		745
32	16 Dec	(FD 302)	6	-	13 Dec	(no)
25	16 Dec	Marley	8	-	"	(no)
50	27 Jan	Marley	15	396	15 Jan	1523
56	11 Feb	Murphy	7	414	6 Feb	1873

I think it would be worth the effort for you to have all these documents pulled and assembled in a file. (Plus, any serials in the Newark file which you have copies of in the 105-82555 file, and which relate to Delgado. My guess is that you will find some very interesting communications with FBIHQ.)

Serials 32 and 25 (excepting the administrative page of 25) are what you sent me. I have serials 50 ~~xxx~~ and 56 on microfilm only.

So, for starters, we have two Newark reports - serials 30 and 25, of which at least the former relates to Delgado, which never got to the Warren Commission in that form.

The two items you sent me are, as far as I can tell, identical except for handwritten notations (and the extra page in serial 25). The first page in serial 32 bears the initials of SA Marley and ~~x~~ 'rcm,' ~~xxxx~~ presumably SA ~~x~~ Murphy. The fainter copy in serial 25 has some spelling corrections, other editorial changes, and "start" and "end," in what may ~~be~~ be "rcm"'s handwriting.

In fact, the section on pp. 3-4, set off and edited, does appear in CD 396 (serial 50), pages 9-10. (The corrections and changes were made, and the paragraphs were reordered.) Also, the indicated section at the top of p. 6 of serial 25 appears on p. 10 of CD 396. "Delgado started to teach Murry Spanish" has been changed to "Delgado claimed to have taught Murry Spanish."

Offhand, I cannot recall any other instance in which information of this kind in one report was repeated in a later one. I would want to check CD 396 again to be sure, but it looks like information Delgado provided on 12/23 is being represented as having been obtained on 1/15, which could hardly be acceptable FBI practice.

The last CD in this sequence, CD 414, is remarkable; it reports Delgado as disclaiming his own earlier observations as suppositions. It's quite clear that, as Sylvia commented in Accessories, and as Delgado claimed in his deposition, the FBI really was leaning on him to change his story.

I don't have any strong feelings as to why the ~~x~~ FBI didn't like Delgado's statement. It could be because he said Oswald was a poor marksman. It could be because of his generally sympathetic portrayal of Oswald. Maybe the FBI just took a strong disliking to the (allegedly) fat P.R. kid.

It could also be that something specific in Delgado's testimony hit a nerve. The only thing that springs to mind as a possibility is his description of Oswald's civilian visitor at the base in California. As I recall, it was the infamous Rocca

4/26/79

memo (CIA #451) which made a big fuss over the possibility that LHO's visitor was Cuban intelligence. The circumstances of the visit make that highly unlikely. I don't think Cuban intelligence would have come to Oswald late at night - when according to Delgado anyone could get on the base during the day. It seems more likely that Oswald's visitor was from U.S. intelligence.

The Newark CD's should be checked to see how this incident is treated. (In fact, they should be compared with the omitted parts of the 12/26 report.)

To repeat, I would not be surprised if the Newark-FBINQ communications (which can be located in the 106-82555 file from the Newark inventory worksheets) include some discussion of Delgado, and maybe even of what should be omitted from various reports. This seems like a worthwhile research project for your assistant, and I hope this memo can get her started. (She might also want to read Delgado's deposition. He strikes me as a very good witness.)

A secondary question came up as I was checking this out - did the WC in fact have the information in this interview? Although the 12/16 report was not a CD, it looks like Liebler was going through something very much like it when ~~xx~~ he was questioning Delgado. For example, he asked (8 H 259) about the "silent area," which is referred to on p. 4 of the report. Also, he asked about the FBI's (apparently incorrect) statement that Roussel was from New Orleans (rather than Baton Rouge) (8 H 264; cf. top of p. 4)

Liebeler apparently had or knew of 3 FBI interviews of Delgado (8H236), one as early as December 10 (8H237).

The easiest way to find ~~xxx~~ out what Liebler had would be to check ~~xxx~~ the Delgado name file at the Archives. Also, you could check the Dallas index. If the 12/16 report was sent to Dallas or New Orleans, it may have ~~xx~~ reached the Commission in one of the big CD's. (However, I found no references to Delgado in a hasty check of the indexes to the big CD's through CD 205.) Does the cover letter to serial 25 indicate distribution to Dallas?

In any event, wasn't serial 25 sent to FBINQ? It is possible that it really isn't in the 105-82555 file? (It could be that the reviewer of the Newark file just couldn't find it.)

Another possibility just came to mind - what if Delgado, the simple cook, was himself intelligence? That would explain the special handling in general, although not in specific detail.

As you can see, this topic has rather intrigued me. Let me know what you think, and if you find anything interesting in the ~~Bulky~~ Newark documents in the 105-82555 file. (The microfiche of ~~whitex~~ the big HQ files hasn't arrived out here yet; otherwise I would start checking this out myself.)

With best regards!

PLH

P.S.: From your letter, and from the absence of markings on the back, I gather that this copy of the Newark pages is for me to keep. Correct me if I'm wrong. (The copy of the Bulky file pages you sent will be returned.)

Also: I would like to share this with Peter Scott. OK?