

Orig + doc under Pouch

11/8/69

Dear Paul,

The first two pages of 3D1349 are rather interesting. They make me wonder about the identification of NO T-1, whether it is a single person. It also makes me wonder whether it is a rational person. It certainly sounds like a Bringuier-type Cuban. "c one who knows Crest would dream any of these things are true. He had neither interest in nor plan to go to Moscow. But suddenly there is this gangup of adverse and false data, just at the time it was necessary to undermine any official confidence in him. Of the Habana-incident witnesses, the only one who could communicate with the Commission is Crest. The others speak no English at all. The most obvious reason is a very obvious one: the real Oswald did not throw that drunk there. He was out that late only once, the night he was in jail. Here a lie by Marina would have helped the Commission no end, for her testimony is the evidence he was not out. There are no indications he was ever a night-owl. When he returned the night of 11/21 at 9, he slept through the alarm 10 hours later. This person was also seen in that area much too early in the morning for it to have been Oswald. Pena is opened around the clock. The barmaid coming on at 7 a.m. saw this bird at the corner when she stopped to get Evvie his coffee. Two witnesses confirm this. There never was any pro-Castro activity in N.O. There are a few people, of whom Pena is one, who realize that some of what Castro has been doing is popular and has improved the lot of the poorest. If NO T-1 is a Cuban, he is an irrational one or an irresponsible one, for he should have known this drivel could not apply to Crest. De Brueys did also. He knew Crest well and it is not in this or any other report. Pena was also a mark. Arcache, among others, took him. He collected funds for the front, had collection boxes in his places, put up as much as \$200 at a time for their essential costs, like rent and utilities, and finally, realizing the money he put up had been pocketed, went to Miami about it. This also made him a few enemies. He is a mercurial guy, was a good friend to me until Mark, Boxley, Hall and God knows who else tried to cut me out, when he blew. He is not stingy, but doesn't waste money. He can be generous, works hard, likes women indiscriminately, but he cannot be either pro-Castro or pro-Communist, as deBrueys had to know, and ~~xx~~ deBrueys should have had the deepest suspicion of anyone who fed him this nonsense. Which makes me wonder if he made it up for just such purpose as this achieved (if you remember Liebler's questioning of Pena). But when this had all been exhausted much earlier, when the data allegedly originated 4/30, what is the point in a deB rehash 7/17 (which just happens to coincide with Liebler's second investigative trip)? deB is careful to include the truth, but the germ is here. He also knew F had not a single business but four of them. The very last sentence of this summary should have been the first and casts the deepest doubt on the dependability of NO T-1. It also confirms that deB knew the alleged source NO T-1 wanted.

I don't suppose it is worth it, but now I'm curious about the rest of this swill. I'd like to try and dope out who was up to this, for the purpose too neatly coincides with official desires and needs. Also, it is possible to deduce from this that the code designations are not inflexible, perhaps are designated anew for each report. Just conjecture. But these are not consistent with other representations of these confidential informants.