

1525 Acton St.  
Berkeley, CA 94702  
(415) 525-1980  
May 1, 1978

Mr. Robert Genzman  
Select Committee on Assassinations  
3372 House Office Building, Annex 2  
House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Genzman,

Here is the material we discussed on the phone: my suggested questions for SA Warren DeBrueys, with my cover letter of December 14, 1975 to Sen. Schweiker's office, and the supporting documentation.

I understand that the Senate Committee did question DeBrueys, and that some of these questions were asked. Judging from the absence of any new information in the Schweiker-Hart Report in this area, I would assume that they didn't come up with much. In any case, I trust that you have had access to that testimony. (As far as I know, it hasn't been published.)

The FBI recently released some COINTELPRO documents relating to the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which might be quite relevant. I haven't seen these documents myself, but Mark Allen (who is now in New Orleans) has.

Also, I expect there is interesting material in the two large general FBI releases, which I have also not seen. There might be significant references to DeBrueys both in the immediate post-assassination period, and much later (when I and other researchers were submitting FOIA requests relating to DeBrueys).

Finally, the pre-assassination New Orleans field office files are relevant. I understand that they are now being processed for public release. The FBI has sent me a few pages from the pre-assassination Washington and New York files, with a covering memo indicating that processing of the Dallas and New Orleans files was initiated in October 1977, after I pressed the Bureau to respond to my FOIA request. I got the impression that, as of October 1977, these files had not even been brought to Washington for the use of any of the official investigations.

If you want to discuss any of this, please call again. You can always reach me after 7 or 7:15 in the morning (10 or 10:15 your time), until about 8:15. I usually get back home after lunch; at other times, you can try my home number (given above), or my office numbers (642-6681, 642-5743).

As I mentioned, I would be grateful if you could reimburse me for the Xeroxing and postage costs of the enclosed material. If this letter is not delivered by 5 p.m. on May 2, please just return the address label to me and I will get the refund from the Post Office.

Sincerely yours,

*Paul*

Paul L. Hoch

Expenses:

Xeroxing: 105 pp.,	\$ 3.53
Express mail:	\$ 8.65
Total	\$12.18

2599 Le Conte Ave.  
Berkeley, CA 94709  
(415) 845-4669  
December 14, 1975

Dave Marston  
c/o Sen. Richard Schweiker  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Dave,

Here is the material on DeBrueys which I promised you. As you can see, this project has gotten a bit out of hand. I hope that my organization of the large number of questions will allow you to make some use of all this material, including the attached documents. I have tried to put the most important questions in parts (A) through (D), but I think that many of the other questions are important too.

Part of the difficulty in preparing a short list of questions comes from the fact that I consider the FBI's handling of the Oswald case to be very important, as you know, and most of the peculiarities center on Oswald's activities in New Orleans. DeBrueys and Kaack, the two New Orleans agents who were apparently responsible for the Oswald case, did not testify before the Warren Commission at all. All we have to go on is a large number of tantalizing leads in the documents, and the testimony of SA Quigley, who interviewed Oswald after his arrest. I'm confident that DeBrueys and Kaack know some important things about Oswald, but I don't think I could predict what line of questioning would bring it out. At some point, they both should undergo questioning at least as extensive as what Hosty and Quigley got from the Commission. I doubt that you are in a position to get into that kind of detail now, of course.

Five different people, most of whom had only casual knowledge of the case, commented to me spontaneously that DeBrueys' remarks on the CBS program did not sound convincing. I can't confirm that impression myself, since I was concentrating on the substance of his remarks. But this does suggest that he should be questioned carefully.

In preparing these questions, I have assumed that DeBrueys will answer specific questions, but will not volunteer anything. I'm sure that he won't remember many of the issues involved. Where possible, relevant FBI documents should then be obtained and reviewed. Since DeBrueys is still with the FBI, he might be unwilling to offer opinions, but they would be valuable. (As I discussed in my manuscript, the Commission had a very difficult time getting FBI agents to discuss the opinions they must have held.)

As you can see, I have included a number of detailed questions designed to get DeBrueys to explain some relevant details before you tell him what you are getting at. Also, some of the questions in the last section are just hunches; perhaps you will be reluctant to get into a fishing expedition. However, that might prove extremely valuable.

Your office originally asked for 10 or 15 questions. Here is a summary of the questions I consider most important:

(5) Explain your statement to CBS that you did not have Oswald as the subject of an investigation, since he was the only member of the FPCC in New Orleans.

(13-14) Explain why Oswald's literature distribution of August 16, 1963 is discussed in your report with no source indicated.

(21) Why did you not submit an affidavit that Oswald was not your informant?



(26) Have you ever suspected that Oswald was an informant for any Federal, local, or private intelligence agency, including Guy Banister?

(33) Why does your report of 10/25/63 not mention Oswald's use of the address 544 Camp Street?

(35-6) Why does your post-assassination report (CD 75) not mention Oswald's use of that address, and why does it disguise the fact that Guy Banister's office was in that building?

(37) What ongoing relationship was there between Banister and the FBI?

(44) Please explain your apparent efforts to discredit Orest Pena in connection with his testimony before the Warren Commission.

(53) Why is Oswald's letter of June 10, 1963 to the Worker, which prompted the New Orleans FBI investigation of Oswald, not mentioned in your report?

(55) Do you know why Oswald allegedly asked to see an FBI agent after his arrest on August 9?

(68) Why is the disc recording of Oswald's radio appearance which was obtained the next day not mentioned in any pre-assassination report or in the early reports to the Warren Commission?

(75-80) Why is Oswald's intercepted letter to the FPCC not mentioned in any known pre-assassination report, and why was it apparently not followed up as a lead to an FPCC office in New Orleans?

(84) Why did the FBI give Carlos Quiroga the cold shoulder when he reported Oswald's activities?

(89) Why does the record suggest that Headquarters was not promptly informed of, or interested in, some of Oswald's FPCC activities?

(94) Why did you not participate in the questioning of Oswald after the assassination, since you were so familiar with his case?

(119) Do you have any reason to suspect that any of Oswald's political activities were related to COINTELPRO or were otherwise not the actions of an authentic leftist?

Sincerely,



Paul L. Hoch

P.S.: I am also enclosing a short unpublished piece on Oswald and the FBI written by a friend of mine. I would appreciate a card or phone call from you to let me know that this memo has reached you. Of course, I would be glad to try to clarify any of the questions which are unclear.

(A.) GENERAL QUESTIONS

(1) What was your position in the New Orleans FBI office from August 1, 1963 until the assassination?

(2) Please indicate the chain of command up to SAC Maylor, and explain your relationship to SA John Quigley and SA Milton Kaack.

(I expect that DeBrueys was rather highly placed on the Internal Security Squad. Quigley, the agent who was sent to interview Oswald on August 10, testified that he was assigned to general investigative work. (4H431) Both Kaack and DeBrueys wrote major reports on Oswald. I know very little about Kaack's general assignments. We should know if either was working for the other.)

(3) Describe the extent of your responsibility for coverage of left-wing and right-wing political activities in N.O. Did you specialize in Cuban matters?

(DeBrueys was mentioned by both Carlos Bringuier and Orest Pena in testimony to the Warren Commission; see section E infra. DeBrueys knows Spanish and may have been the FBI's Cuban expert in New Orleans.)

(4) Did you ever have Lee Harvey Oswald as a subject of your investigation?

(5) [If the answer to (4) is yes:] You said on CBS-TV that "Had he (Oswald) been an informant and had I had him as a subject of my investigation, it would have been logical that I would have been aware of that fact because of cross references in the file and for many other reasons..." (Tab B, p. 26) This is not clear; please explain.

(He probably meant that since he had him as a subject, he would have known if Oswald had been an informant.)

(6) Was the Fair Play for Cuba Committee (FPCC) in New Orleans the subject of an investigation by you in the fall of 1963?

(Yes - see next question.)

(7) Tab A is a report bearing your name, entitled "Fair Play for Cuba Committee - New Orleans Division," and dated October 25, 1963. Please explain the degree of your personal involvement in the preparation of that report.

(If DeBrueys only attached his name to it, many of the questions about details of the report (Section G infra) should be directed to the preparer also.)

(8) If you did not personally do the work involved in compiling this report, who did?

(9) Was any person other than Oswald involved in the FPCC in N.O. at that time?

(Not according to CE 833, #20 (17H799) and CD 1085a4 (see below). It was determined only after the assassination that A. J. Hidell was an alias for Oswald. Thus, the DeBrueys report is really a report on Oswald.)

(B.) POSSIBLE FBI CONTACT WITH OSWALD ON AUGUST 16, 1963

(10) Did you ever have any personal contact with Oswald?

(This was emphatically denied to CBS. See Tab B, p. 25.)

(11) Did you ever see Oswald?

(The denial to CBS may not have covered this possibility.)

(12) Specifically, did you see him on any occasion when he was handing out leaflets or demonstrating on the street?

(13) Please refer to page 3 of Tab A, which states that "On August 16, 1963, two persons, one of which is believed identical with Oswald, who identified themselves as being connected with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee (FPCC), distributed pamphlets in front of the International Trade Mart in New Orleans. They remained in that location for only a few moments and departed." Do you recall what the source of that information was?

(14) Can you explain why no source is indicated?

(This is important. It suggests to me that an FBI agent, quite possibly DeBrueys himself, was at the literature distribution.)

(15) What is standard procedure concerning references to sources in such a report?

(FBI policy seems to be to specify sources, by name or by informant number, for all information. Except for a reference on p. 11 to unspecified "confidential source(s)," this is the only statement in the report with no indicated source.)

(16) Would the files now show the source of that information?

(If it remains a possibility that an FBI agent witnessed this incident, a check should be made of the daily logs of the activities of DeBrueys and other candidate agents.)

(17) If this information had come from Jesse Core (who had an office in the Trade Mart), would the source have been indicated in the report?

(After the assassination, Core said that he had called the FBI on August 16, at the time of the incident. The DeBrueys report mentions only a contact 3 days later. See also section F below. Ref.: CD 75.692, Tab C.)

(C.) ALLEGATIONS THAT OSWALD WAS AN INFORMANT

(18) Was Lee Harvey Oswald your informant?

(DeBrueys denied this to CBS.)

(19) Does this mean that you not only did not have Oswald as an SI (Security Informant), but also that he was not a PSI (Potential Security Informant)?

(Hoover used this distinction as a basis for denying that Ruby was an informant.)

(20) To the best of your knowledge, was Oswald the informant of any other FBI agent, in N.O. or Dallas? Would you have known if he was?



(21) Can you explain why you did not prepare an affidavit for submission to the Warren Commission, stating that you did not use Oswald as an informant?

(See Tab D, pp. 3.25-6 of my manuscript. Hoover's language was that he had affidavits from "all agents, who had any contact with" Oswald. It would be characteristic of the Bureau to exclude DeBrueys and Kaack using the excuse that they had no personal contact with Oswald (although they had very significant contact with his case) if Hoover had something to hide.)

(If necessary, the FBI's instructions relating to the affidavits should be examined. Quigley and SAC Maynor were among the 5 agents whose affidavits were revised; the FBI told me that "minor technical wording problems" were involved. Nonetheless, I would like to see all the original affidavits. See p. 3.25 of Tab D.)

(22) Are you now satisfied that Oswald was never an FBI informant?

(Like a number of my questions, this calls for speculation, but might be worth asking anyhow.)

(23) Prior to the assassination, did you ever suspect that Oswald was acting as an agent or informant for anyone else - specifically, the CIA, the Office of Naval Intelligence, or any other federal agency?

(Such a belief might explain many of the peculiarities in the FBI's handling of the Oswald case.)

(24) Similarly, did you ever suspect that Oswald was working for the New Orleans or Dallas Police Departments?

(25) Did you ever consider the possibility that Oswald was working for Guy Banister?

(Banister was the former FBI agent who had an office at 544 Camp Street, the address which appeared on some of Oswald's FPCC literature. This is important; there is more in the next section.)

(26) Since the assassination, have you had any reason to believe that Oswald might have been an agent for any of these other agencies?

(I'm sure that someone in the FBI must have the same suspicions that I do - that someone else was running Oswald and that the extensive FBI file on him was being built up in the hope of being able to neutralize the FBI's investigation after the assassination.)

(D.) FPCC OPERATIONS IN NEW ORLEANS

(27) Please give your general understanding and opinion of the political position and activities of the FPCC in 1963, on the national level.

(It is important to recall that the FPCC was then considered a very extreme leftist group. Indications of Cuban government support were widely publicized; investigations were made by Sen. Thomas Dodd and others. The table of contents of a post-assassination report compiled by DeBrueys calls the FPCC a "basic revolutionary and/or front organization." That is really a quite strong evaluation, which is most unusual in a table of contents. If DeBrueys himself has very strong political views, they might be relevant. (Ref.: CD 75, p. 1b; see Tab E.)

(28) Do you recall any specific instructions to be on the alert for FPCC activities at that time?

(SA Hosty of Dallas testified that "the New York office had advised all offices of the FBI to be on the alert for the possible formation of chapters of this organization which was headquartered in New York," (4H445) and that he checked his sources. It might be helpful to get that NY notice.)

(29) Page 8 of your report (Tab A) indicates that Oswald gave SA Quigley an FPCC application form bearing the name "A. J. Hidell" and "P.O. Box 30016." Was this information followed up?

(These items were both checked out, as noted on p. 12 of Tab A.)

(30) What was the purpose of that followup?

(Presumably to find out who else was in the FPCC, and where the group was operating from.)

(31) Did you personally perform or supervise that followup?

(32) If you had located a P.O. Box, would you have attempted to get the associated name(s) and/or addresses from the Post Office?

(I expect he should and would have.)

(33) Tab F is the pamphlet by Corliss Lamont which SA Quigley obtained from Oswald and kept. Note that page 39 bears the rubber-stamped address "FPCC / 544 Camp St. / New Orleans, La." Can you explain why that address is not mentioned in your report?

(This is a very important question. The only excuse I can anticipate is that Oswald told Quigley that the FPCC had no New Orleans offices. (Tab A, p. 6, last paragraph) Of course, Quigley was told many other things which were not true. I suspect that the FBI had some reason for believing that 544 Camp St. was not an authentic lead.)

(34) Were you aware that Guy Banister had an office at 544 Camp Street?

(35) Tab G is pages 680-683 of CD 75, the first large post-assassination report which you compiled. These pages refer to the possibility that Oswald rented an office at 544 Camp Street. The interview of Banister on p. 683 gives his address as 531 Lafayette Street. Can you explain why it is not indicated that this corner building is also 544 Camp Street?

(36) Can you explain why this CD does not mention that Oswald distributed literature stamped with this address?

(What is concealed here and in the pre-assassination report, and remained unconfirmed until I got the pamphlet from the Justice Department (with great difficulty) is that the FBI knew about Oswald's use of this address before the assassination.)

(37) It has been reported that Banister's detective agency engaged in political intelligence work. What relationship, if any, was there between him and the FBI?

(Banister had been in the FBI, and one might expect that he and the Bureau continued to exchange information informally, as has been rumored.)



- (38) Was Banister a regular source of information for the FBI?
- (39) To the best of your knowledge, did Banister send people out to infiltrate left-wing groups in New Orleans?
- (40) Were you aware that the Cuban Revolutionary Council (CRC) used to operate out of 544 Camp Street?

(This probably stopped in 1962, but the record is not very clear.)

(E.) ALLEGATIONS MADE BY OREST PENA AND CARLOS BRINGUIER

- (41) Please repeat your denial that Pena saw you in his bar with Oswald.  
(See Tab B, and also question (10) above.)
- (42) To the best of your knowledge, when did Pena first make that accusation?  
(In evaluating Pena's credibility, it is important to note that he did not say this to the Warren Commission, or (apparently) during the Garrison affair, even though he did indicate in both instances that DeBrueys had harassed him.)
- (43) Pena indicated to the Warren Commission that he had a bit of a falling out with the FBI, and that you said you could get him in big trouble. He indicated that this disagreement had to do with whether he had in fact provided information about a certain unnamed individual; he said that he had and that you denied it. This apparently was before the assassination and unrelated to it. Can you shed any light on this?  
(See 11H361-2. Pena later told Harold Weisberg that DeBrueys had threatened to "get" or "bust his ass," which is similar to the language used in the CBS program, but there apparently was no indication that he had seen DeBrueys with Oswald. I am not inclined to believe Pena.)
- (44) CD 1203 (Tab H indicates that you tried unsuccessfully to get Pena to explain certain apparent conflicts in his report of seeing Oswald in his bar. Can you offer a conclusion as to Pena's behavior and motives?  
(I think this CD and CD 1349 (which is roughly identical to CD 1203b, and is also attached) represent a serious effort by DeBrueys to discredit Pena. CD 1349 reflects a superficially naive concern about whether Pena is pro-Castro or anti-Castro. It may be that DeBrueys had good reasons (not indicated in the reports) for believing that Pena was not telling the truth. In any case, I would like to know what was going on.)
- (45) Did your work include coverage of the CRC (Pena's group) and the DRE (Revolutionary Student Directorate, Bringuiers' group)?
- (46) Did you in fact attend meetings of anti-Castro groups in New Orleans, as alleged by Pena?
- (47) Did you happen to know David W. Ferrie in that connection?
- (48) Were you then aware of any connection between the CRC and the U.S. Government?

(It is now quite well established that the CRC was set up by the CIA.)



(49) Can you explain why CD 1349 indicates that the CRC "ceased to exist about 12/61"?

(See Tab H, synopsis. The CRC no doubt lost much of its value as a CIA front after the Bay of Pigs, but its government subsidy was apparently not removed until the spring of 1963. (New York Times, May 1, 1963, p. 11.) On August 22, 1963, Frank Bartes of the CRC in N.O. told the FBI that he did not know Oswald. (17H764))

(50) Do you recall telling Bringuier in August 1962 that you did not believe he was the only DRE member in New Orleans, and that the FBI could infiltrate the organization?

(Bringuier so testified: 10H34-5. That is a reasonable position for DeBrueys to have taken. Partly as a consequence of that warning, Bringuier was suspicious of Oswald when he first offered his services.)

(F.) DETAILED QUESTIONS CONCERNING COVERAGE OF THE OSWALD CASE

(51) Can you recall when Oswald first came to your attention?

(52) Tab I is the first page of a report on Oswald by SA Milton Kaack, dated October 31, 1963, which is 6 days after your FPCC report. Why were two reports prepared? Was the Kaack report derived from yours?

(The main difference is a formal one: the DeBrueys report is on the FPCC, and the Kaack report is on Oswald. The reports generally overlap, but there is some information in each which is not in the other.)

(53) Page 3 of the Kaack report (Tab I) indicates that the N.O. FBI interest in Oswald was prompted by his letter of June 10, 1963 to "The Worker," which included honorary FPCC membership cards and stated that he was forming an FPCC chapter in New Orleans. Why is that information, which relates directly to the FPCC, not included in the DeBrueys report?

(54) Can you find out if a copy of that letter is in the FPCC (97-74) file in New Orleans?

(My implication is that letters intercepted in the mail or obtained from informants were considered particularly sensitive. See the discussion in section G of another letter from Oswald which was apparently not acted upon. DeBrueys may have even had reason to question the authenticity of some of Oswald's letters.)

(55) Do you have any idea why Oswald asked to see an FBI agent after his arrest by the New Orleans Police on August 9?

(The usual FBI answer is that it was a self-serving interview, which explains nothing.)

(56) Can you give some idea of how often, in 1963, a left-wing political activist would ask to see the FBI?

(Quigley indicated that such a request was not unusual; Warren was skeptical. (4H435) I am too.)

(57) If Oswald had not asked for an interview, would the FBI have sought to interview him, either while he was under arrest or later?

(The FBI was told of the arrest by the N.O. Police on August 9; the request was allegedly made the next day. See Tab A, p. 2.)

(58) Are you confident that it was indeed Oswald who initiated this interview?

(Sylvia Meagher has suggested that maybe Oswald didn't really ask to see the FBI, but that the request was attributed to him by the FBI and the police to cover FBI intervention in a local case. That is, it may have been standard procedure for the FBI to try to interview someone arrested in such circumstances.)

(59) Do you know why the Times-Picayune article about Oswald is quoted in your report (Tab A, p. 11) but not in the Kaack report (CE 826)?

(60) Similarly, can you suggest why the August 16 literature distribution is discussed in your report, but not in the Kaack report?

(See questions (13)-(17), and cf. CE 826. I have a hunch that this difference between the two reports may be significant.)

(61) Your report indicates that Jesse Core was interviewed about the August 16 incident on August 19. (Tab A, p. 3.) Do you know why that is not in the Kaack report?

(62) Your report says that one of the people distributing pamphlets "is believed identical with Oswald," but the two descriptions provided by Jesse Core do not fit Oswald at all. Can you explain the conclusion that Oswald was involved?

(On p. 9 of Tab A, Oswald is described as age 23, slender, with light brown hair. One of the men described by Core was age 32 or 33 with black hair; the other was said to have black hair and a broad waist. There is, in fact, no doubt that Oswald really was there, but there may have been 2, not one, others.)

(63) Do you recall when you learned that Charles Steele was one of the people assisting Oswald in this literature distribution?

(Steele testified that he called the FBI on August 16, after hearing that his picture was on television; the FBI suggested that he call the TV station if he wanted to have them stop showing it. (10H66, 69) If he told the FBI that he was helping with the distribution (and not just that he was in the picture), it seems odd that the DeBrueys report does not mention this. Perhaps the FBI's file would have a record of Steele's call.)

(64) William Stuckey of WDSU testified that he interviewed Oswald on August 17, and that on August 20 he gave a tape to the FBI. He said that the FBI made a transcript and a copy of the tape, and gave him a copy of the transcript. Can you explain why none of this is in the DeBrueys and Kaack reports?

(The Kaack report does say that Stuckey talked with the FBI on August 30 concerning a later contact with Oswald. CD 897 contains the FBI transcript of the August 17 interview. There is something going on here, but I don't know what it is. Perhaps press sources were considered particularly sensitive and therefore sometimes omitted from reports.)

(65) Was is standard procedure for the FBI to get a tape and make a transcript of such an interview?



(66) Page 12 of your report indicates that on September 12, NO T-3 made available a transcript of the August 21 WDSU program on which Oswald appeared with Ed Butler and Carlos Bringuier. The Kaack report (Tab I, p. 11) says that Mrs. Jeanne Rodgers of WDSU provided the transcript on August 22. Mr. Hoover told the Warren Commission that NO T-3 was Mrs. Rodgers and that the date should have been given as August 22 in your report. Do you have any recollection of how this error occurred?

(I doubt that this was an innocent error; see next questions.)

(67) Was it unusual for the FBI to get a transcript of such a broadcast?

(68) Tab J is FBI Exhibit D-118, a photograph of a disc recording of this program which was apparently obtained by SA Kaack on August 22. Can you explain why the existence of this recording is not mentioned in either the DeBrueys report or the Kaack report?

(My implication is that the procedure was unorthodox enough to be discreetly unmentioned.)

(69) Is it unusual for the FBI to get a disc recording of a political broadcast?

(70) Can you explain why this recording was not mentioned to the Warren Commission until April 15, 1964 (the date of CD 897)?

(In fact, the text of CD 897 only mentions that Mrs. Rodgers provided a transcript on August 22, and sets forth the transcript; the recording itself is revealed only in the attached photograph. (CD 897, p. 528) CD 897 also says that Stuckey provided a transcript of his August 17 interview on August 29 (CD 897, p. 540); this disagrees with Stuckey's own testimony. (Cf. question 64. Stuckey's testimony is 11H165.)

(71) Who was in charge of the investigation described on pp. 11-13 of your report?

(Mrs. Garner indicated to the Secret Service that Kaack was the agent who talked with her. CD 325, p. 4; cf. Tab A, p. 11. I would like to know if DeBrueys was in charge of this investigation.)

(72) Can you explain why Frank Bartes, of the anti-Castro Cuban Revolutionary Council, was asked if he knew about Oswald?

(See p. 12 of the Kaack report, Tab I. Perhaps the FBI logically assumed that Bartes would know what the opposition was up to; perhaps they suspected that Oswald was a provocateur sent out by the anti-Castro Cubans. One Tulane student who was part of the small left-wing community in New Orleans has told me that at the time Oswald was suspected of being a police agent.)

(73) Why does your report include an appendix on the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee?

(See Tab A, p. 16-7. The only connection is that Oswald was handing out a pamphlet written by Corliss Lamont, a vice-chairman of the ECLC. I think it would be a mistake to assume that these appendices had no purpose; perhaps they served to make Oswald look like a serious subversive. Ironically, the Lamont pamphlet is the one with the unpursued 544 Camp St. lead, and Warren Commission Counsel Norman Redlich got in trouble with the right because of his connection with the ECLC!)

(74) To the best of your knowledge, did the FBI interview Ed Butler (who appeared on the WDSU program) about Oswald, either before or immediately after the assassination?

(It is inconceivable to me that the FBI would not have done so except for some significant reason - e.g., that Butler was someone else's informant or agent, and therefore off limits. I have been able to locate only a trivial followup interview; the FBI says that no earlier interview can be found. See Tab K, my correspondence with the Justice Department. Butler's testimony of November 24, 1963 to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is still unavailable; it should be examined. Although Butler's public comments about Oswald have been quite general, he may have given some significant facts to SISS.)

(G.) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE FPCC IN NEW ORLEANS

(75) Tab M is Exhibit 63 from CD 107 (the FBI Supplemental Report), described as a letter from Oswald furnished by the FPCC. Oswald stated that he had decided to take an office for the N.O. Chapter. Do you recall when you first saw this letter?

(The actual letter is V. T. Lee Exhibit 4.)

(76) Tab N is from CD 28, a New York report which indicates that this letter was made available to the FBI on October 27, 1963. Should that letter have been sent to New Orleans and brought to your attention, since it refers to the activities of the FPCC in New Orleans?

(77) Could you determine for us if and when the New Orleans office got a copy of that letter?

(This may be very important indeed. This letter is not listed in the Headquarters file on Oswald (CE 834), and is not mentioned in any available pre-assassination report. Most importantly, as far as I know the FBI did not react to this evidence of FPCC activity in New Orleans. (The letter was in fact written in June, but the FBI apparently did not know that.) This FBI behavior is consistent with knowledge that the letter was somehow not authentic. Given what we now know about COINTELPRO, and taking note of some oddities in Oswald's other correspondence, I would keep in mind that this letter may have even been written at the direction of the FBI. In any case, the FBI's handling of information received about Oswald has too many peculiarities to be ignored.)

(78) Tab O is pp. 672-3 from CD 75, which sets forth the text of this letter. This report, which you compiled (cf. Tab E), is datelined Dallas, but consists primarily of information from New Orleans. Can you explain why the source of this letter is given as "New York Confidential Informant T-1," rather than a Dallas or New Orleans informant?

(Although this usage is logical enough, it does not appear to conform to standard FBI practice. A number of other reports confirm that a Dallas report would ordinarily describe all informants as Dallas sources, regardless of where the actual original source was. I suspect that the use of New York here was intended to hide the fact that the letter had indeed been sent to field offices (Dallas and/or New Orleans) before the assassination. The FBI should certainly be asked about the dissemination of this letter.)



(79) From the available record, the FBI did not react to this evidence that Oswald did in fact have an office in New Orleans. Can you explain this?

(This would be provocative even if the address involved was not 544 Camp Street.)

(80) Can you explain why this letter is not mentioned in any pre-assassination FBI report on Oswald, and is not in the Headquarters Oswald file?

(I suspect that, at the very least, the FBI did not want to emphasize to the Warren Commission that they had access to Oswald's letters to the FPCC and other groups.)

(81) Are you familiar with CD 1085a4 (Tab P), a report of June 3, 1964 summarizing FPCC activities in New Orleans?

(I expect that DeBrueys may have written this report.)

(82) This report notes that the nonexistence of a N.O. FPCC chapter is confirmed by the FPCC's letter of May 28, 1963 to Oswald. Can you explain why the report does not mention Oswald's later letter indicating that he had taken an office, or his use of the address 544 Camp Street?

(I suspect that the FBI was being defensive about their failure to follow up the 544 Camp St. lead in the Lamont pamphlet.)

(83) Tab Q is a report on Carlos Quiroga's pre-assassination visit to Oswald's home, at which time he tried to find out about the FPCC. Quiroga is identified only as NO T-5, and according to the last page of this report (which you compiled), he had provided reliable information in the past. Do you know Quiroga, and do you know if in fact he had previously been an FBI informant?

(Both the FBI and Bringuier seemed strangely reluctant to give Quiroga's name to the Warren Commission. He was never called as a witness, despite his significant first-hand contact with Oswald.)

(84) Quiroga told the Secret Service that he had been willing to infiltrate the FPCC for the authorities, but that he "did not contact the FBI (with this offer) for the reason on a previous occasion he had notified their office that Oswald was handing out what he assumed to be pro-communist literature in front of the International Trade Mart, New Orleans, and the FBI had given him the cold shoulder." (26H771-2) Can you provide any explanation for this?

(The FBI told me they have no record of any such contact; see p. 2 of Mitchell's letter in Tab K. I can't guess why Quiroga might not be telling the truth. The FBI's reported reaction to him is suggestive, as are other FBI actions, of the hypothesis that they knew Oswald was not an authentic leftist.)

(H.) FBI COMMUNICATIONS WITH HEADQUARTERS ABOUT OSWALD

(85) Tab R is item 47 from the Headquarters Oswald file, which (according to CE 834) instructs the N.O. office to conduct additional investigation of Oswald as a result of the August 9 incident. Can you explain why special instructions were needed?

(The actual instructions appear to be in the deleted first paragraph, which should be examined. This item is among the 11 previously withheld pages which have recently been released as a result of my Freedom of Information Act request. Presumably HQ asked N.O. to prepare a letterhead memo on Oswald.)

(86) Tab S is an airtel from N.O. to HQ on Sept. 12, 1963. Evidently the deleted portion requests that the New York office furnish an appropriate characterization of Corliss Lamont, presumably for use in your reports. Can you explain why such a characterization was needed?

(This characterization is the peculiarly irrelevant Lamont appendix.)

(87) Tab T is the letterhead memo on Oswald prepared at the direction of Headquarters. Were you responsible for its preparation?

(The FBI recently released only the first page to me, despite the fact that the other pages were released in the CIA and ONI files some time ago.)

(88) Can you help us understand why this memo focuses on Oswald's arrest, and not his other FPCC activities? What is the purpose of such a memo? What is the function of the appendices?

(The appendices, not included in Tab T, are the same as in Tab A. It is my understanding that letterhead memos are for distribution to outside agencies; this one went to the CIA and ONI, at least. So far all I can conclude is that it is oddly incomplete, but I think it may be related to the other evidence that Oswald was not being treated like an authentic leftist. Hypothetically, what may have been happening is that HQ did not get the message from N.O. that Oswald was someone special. Naturally, I think the rest of the HQ files should be released.)

(89) The available parts of the HQ file entitled "Oswald" indicate that the New Orleans office did not send Washington information about Quigley's August 10 interview with Oswald, the August 16 literature distribution, and the August 21 radio appearance until the Kaack and DeBrueys reports of October 25 and 31. Is it possible that communications with this information would be at HQ only in the file entitled "FPCC"? Could you explain why this material might not have been sent to Washington promptly at all?

(This is a bit confusing, but perhaps important. Overall, there seems to have been little interest in Oswald as the subject of an intelligence investigation involving a rather significant radical group. The HQ effort seems to have concentrated on getting Oswald's arrest record disseminated to other agencies.)

(I.) DeBRUEYS' ACTIONS AFTER THE ASSASSINATION

(90) What was your reaction when you heard that Oswald had been arrested after the assassination?

(91) When did you go to Dallas to help with the investigation?

(92) Did you go to Dallas in connection with the Oswald case at any time before the assassination?

(This has been alleged by Garrison and others; I don't think there is any evidence for it. DeBrueys should be given the chance to set the record straight.)



(93) There is a Dallas Police report which lists you among "FBI and Secret Service Men at Interrogations of Oswald. Is that correct? If not, can you explain the error? (See 24H284)

(I am fairly sure this is a mistake. The index of this DPD report indicates that the list is of SS and FBI men assisting in the "investigation" of Oswald. (24H197))

(94) Why did you not participate in the interrogations of Oswald?

(DeBrueys was, after all, probably the agent most familiar with Oswald's background. If he did in fact know Oswald, that might explain his absence.)

(95) In general, what were your responsibilities immediately after the assassination?

(DeBrueys would have been in a good position to coordinate the FBI's study of Oswald's background in preparation for the anticipated trial.)

(96) After Oswald was shot, what were your responsibilities in connection with the investigation and the preparation of reports for the Warren Commission?

(He compiled CD 6 and CD 75, large early CD's dealing mainly with Oswald's background and New Orleans activities. He later returned to New Orleans.)

(97) Did you by any chance have anything to do with the preparation of the FBI Summary and Supplemental reports?

(These important documents, CD 1 and CD 107, were apparently prepared for public release; they are inadequate in many ways.)

(98) None of the early CD's from Dallas and New Orleans include a full listing of the field office files relating to Oswald. Can you explain this omission?

(The answer might be that Headquarters already had all relevant information, which probably wasn't true. Hoover certainly didn't want to simply give the Commission the files on Oswald, so he may have directed that such listings not be included in the field office reports. (I think it would have been natural to include such listings.) On the other hand, the field offices may have had reasons for withholding information from HQ, including clues to the nature of their relationship with Oswald. If Oswald had been an informant who had not been cleared with Washington, the field offices might not have admitted it.)

(99) Did you receive any commendation or reprimand from headquarters for your handling of the Oswald case?

(We now know that a number of agents were disciplined. It would be interesting if other N.O. agents were reprimanded, but not DeBrueys.)

(J.) MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

(100) Do you presently believe that Oswald was the lone assassin?

(101) What is your opinion of the possibility that he was under the influence of other people?

(102) When did you first hear about Oswald's note to SA Hosty?

(If <sup>DeBrveys</sup> Hosty knew of the note in 1963, he should have been interviewed recently by the FBI in connection with the Edwards Committee investigation. It may be relevant that he was nominally responsible for the peculiar summarizing of the Hosty investigation in CD 75, which may have been intended to hide any reference to the note to Hosty. See p. 7.14 of my manuscript.)

(103) Can you shed any light on the alleged Walters telex, warning of an assassination attempt against Kennedy?

(I don't believe Walters.)

(104) Are you familiar with the threat against Kennedy made in Miami in November 1963 by J. A. Milteer? (This was mentioned on the CBS program.) Do you recall learning of it before the assassination? Do you recall any communications relating to the Milteer threat which resembled the alleged Walters telex?

(I think that if Walters is not deliberately lying, the explanation might involve a similar warning in the Milteer case.)

(105) If President Kennedy had been scheduled to visit New Orleans in early November, and if you knew Oswald was in town, would you have notified the Secret Service?

(106) When did you learn of Oswald's trip to Mexico? What was your reaction at the time, and what is your present opinion of its significance?

(The CIA and FBI handling of the reports of Oswald's trip is quite peculiar, but that is another long story.)

(107) Tab U is the report of your interview of October 1, 1963 of Rudolph Ricardo Davis, reportedly associated with anti-Castro training camps near New Orleans. Can you shed any light on the reports that Oswald was associated with these anti-Castro Cubans?

(The camps, and Davis, figured prominently in the Garrison investigation. This interesting report is discussed in Weisberg's book, "Oswald in New Orleans.")

(108) Do you happen to know Sylvia Odio, Reynaldo Gonzalez, Antonio Veciana, Manuel Rodriguez Orcarberro, or Augustin Guitart?

(See my memo on the CIA for the relevance of the first 3 names to the possibility that an anti-Castro assassination plot had something to do with the Kennedy assassination. Rodriguez is the alleged Oswald lookalike discussed in that memo. Guitart, who lived in New Orleans, is Odio's uncle. Odio and Rodriguez are reportedly now in Puerto Rico.)

(109) Have you ever had reason to believe that someone was impersonating Oswald, either in the Soviet Union or later? Can you explain how that possibility came to be considered in the FBI?

(Refer to items 13 and 14 in the HQ file, CE 834. Item 13, which has now been released to me, suggests that the hypothesis that an impostor was using Oswald's birth certificate (which Hoover passed on to the State Department) originally came from the CIA in New York (where a letter to Oswald was apparently intercepted.))

(110) What became of the report from Oscar Deslatte that Oswald's name was used in connection with an attempt to buy trucks for an anti-Castro Cuban group while Oswald was in Russia?



(See CD 75, pp. 677-8 (Tab V). I am not aware of any followup.)

(111) After the assassination, were any constraints placed on your reporting of the case?

(I know Hoover was sensitive about what went to the Warren Commission. Walters has alleged that a message went out requiring agents to make sure that their reports contained no conflicts. Walters is not a credible source.)

(112) Are you aware of any films or photos of Oswald demonstrating in New Orleans, other than those taken by the press? Can you see if the FBI now has a copy of the film taken by Jim Doyle? (See CD 6, p. 443 (Tab W).)

(There have been a couple of reports of films which were given to the FBI and returned, allegedly in edited form. I don't know if anyone has ever seen Doyle's film. If any of these photos showed (e.g.) an FBI agent present, that would explain some peculiar handling of them. It may also be that the FBI or the police took some photos themselves.)

(113) On November 23, 1963, you and SA Clements interviewed Guy Bogard of Dallas, who claimed that Oswald test-drove a car at his lot. Can you recall why you did not bring Bogard in to view Oswald at a lineup?

(This point is raised by Sylvia Meagher on pp. 355-6 of her book.)

(114) The synopsis of CD 75 (Tab E) refers unequivocally to Oswald's contacts with David Ferrie, but the report itself is somewhat ambiguous as to whether these alleged contacts actually occurred. Do you know for a fact that Ferrie knew Oswald?

(DeBrueys may have known this from his own knowledge of the Banister operation, for example, and he may have let it slip out in the synopsis.)

(115) Tab X (CD 87, SS 517) indicates that the FBI turned off the Secret Service's investigation of Oswald's literature. Can you explain this?

(The reasons given were procedural, but I doubt that this was really the problem. Some of Oswald's literature, of course, had the sensitive 544 Camp St. address. CE 1414 indicates that SA Alker told the SS that the investigation of 544 Camp had been negative.)

(116) Can you explain what is meant by the statement that one reason for the FBI's interviews of Oswald after the assassination was "to obtain any information Oswald might furnish of a security nature"?

(See p. 3.22 of my manuscript, and CE 835. This is just odd.)

(117) Do you have any opinions on why the Dallas Police would want to emphasize the FBI's prior knowledge that Oswald was in Dallas?

(118) Did you participate in any COINTELPRO actions directed against the FPCC, the CP, or the SWP?

(119) Do you have any reason to suspect that any of Oswald's political activities were in fact COINTELPRO or COINTELPRO-type actions - i.e., not authentic?

(This is speculation on my part, but it was reported that Oswald had the famous picture of him holding his weapons and the Militant and the Worker taken so that he could send it to the Militant. Imagine how effectively the SWP would have been disrupted if the Militant had published this photo before the assassination!)

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS:

- A. DeBrueys report, 10/25/63 (From CD 1114-MI-29)
- B. CBS transcript, 11/26/75, pp. 23-26
- C. CD 75, pp. 690-2 (interview of Jesse Core)
- D. Hoch manuscript, pp. 3.25-6 (re affidavits from FBI agents)
- E. CD 75, pp. 1, 1a, and 1b (synopsis and table of contents, DeBrueys report of Dec. 2, 1963)
- F. Pp. 38-40 of Lamont pamphlet given to Quigley by Oswald
- G. CD 75, pp. 680-3 (interviews of Newman, Bartes, and Banister)
- H. CD 1203 (cover letter, synopsis, and pp. 21-23\*) and CD 1349 (pp. 1-2), re Pena
- I. Kaack report of 10/21/63, pp. 1-5 and 11-12 (CE 826)
- J. FBI Item D-118 (recording of 8/21/63 program), from CD 897
- K. Hoch letter of 6/5/71 and Mitchell reply of 10/20/71, re FOIA requests concerning Quiroga and Butler
- L. Leaflet obtained 8/20/63 from Jesse Core (Not discussed in questions)
- M. Oswald letter to V. T. Lee, CD 107, Exhibit 63
- N. Same letter, CD 28 (N.Y.), pp. 2-3
- O. Same letter, CD 75, pp. 672-3
- P. CD 1085a4, pp. 1-2 (FPCC in N.O.)
- Q. CD 75, pp. 705-6 and informants page (Quiroga)
- R. FBI HQ file, Item 47 (HQ to N.O., 8/21/63)
- S. FBI HQ file, Item 54 (N.O. to HQ, 9/12/63)
- T. FBI HQ file, Item 55 (N.O. to HQ, 9/24/63, and pp. 1-2 of the attached letterhead memo. The remaining pages are appendices.)
- U. CD 984b, pp. 24-27 (10/1/63 interview of R. R. Davis)
- V. CD 75, pp. 677-8 (interview of Oscar Deslatte)
- W. CD 6, p. 443 (re Doyle film of Oswald in N.O.)
- X. SS 517, p. 3 (from CD 87)

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS:

The attachments do not include a number of referenced documents which are in the 26 volumes.

Pages 46-47 and 49 of CD 106, which are still withheld, might relate to attempts to identify the people distributing literature with Oswald, and should be checked.

CD 1539 is a report by DeBrueys on Pena, classified Secret.

There are 6 items in the N.O. FPCC file (number 97-74) which relate to Oswald and which are allegedly summarized in the DeBrueys report, Tab A. By letter of 12/16/70, the Justice Department denied my request for this material.

My request under the FOIA for all FBI records on Oswald was denied in 1970-73; a renewed request under the revised FOIA is being processed very slowly. At least the New Orleans files are relevant to the questioning of DeBrueys. Rep. Dodd of the Edwards Committee has asked for the Headquarters Oswald file, which includes only a fraction of the relevant documents. At some point, all FBI records relating to Oswald should be compiled and released.

Paul L. Hoch  
2599 LeConte Ave.  
Berkeley, CA 94709  
(415) 845-4669  
December 14, 1975