

7th Cuban Exiles and "The Motive for Revenge"

Although there are many more candidates for assassin in the ^{irresponsible} assassination literature, Blakey is getting toward the end of his list in his Chapter 9. It is titled, "Cuban Exiles and the Motive of Revenge" (pages 157-178). ~~Before~~ ^{After} he gets to his favorite, ~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{one and only,} organized crime, he still has a long chapter on Jack Ruby, who did kill Lee Harvey Oswald, and his longest, on Oswald.

As we have seen, he has no case at all on any of his candidates who, to now, we have considered. His last chapter is titled as his book is titled and expecting anything new, anything ~~of~~ factual from that-from any of it is-is self deception.

Of what Blakey has made clear, and he has made clear much more than he intended, nothing is clearer than after his abundantly-funded investigation, with all the help and all the funding and all the authority he had, he is utterly lost. Not only is he entirely lost, without even a reasonable suspicion, he is as astoundingly ignorant as he was when he began, and he was really ignorant the , as he is as he nears his end.

It is ~~an~~ shocking that an experienced lawyer, with all the help Blakey had and all the resources at his command that in his book, judging from what we have seen, he is less informative about the assassination than the very first book on the subject, my 1965 Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report, still is. This is intended as the indictment of Blakey that is seems to be..

And that is an indictment, a real indictment.

That book also lacks the errors Blakey's genius included in his book of a decade and a half later.

This, of course, was forecast by his so-called investigation,

which was not that at all. As indicated earlier, he wasted much- if not most of his time- in a new whitewash in which he sought to put down ~~what~~ what others had written. That was not his job and it is, perhaps, his replacement of the job he had and did not begin to do.

But when he gets to motive, many more than the anti-Castro Cubans had ample motive. However, it requires more than ~~motive~~ ^{motive} even for consideration of those with motive as the assassins. But in his book to now and predicatably for the rest of his book, Blakey does not mention what more than motive, which many shared, is required. As a lawyer he knew that when lawyers do not have live witnesses, in their thinking, if not in all they do, they also have in mind means and opportunity.

Many people had the motive to kill, Kennedy but very few of the ^m had, in addition to ~~motive~~ ⁿ motive, the means and the opportunity,

Which, it should be understood, are not mentioned in the first half of this book and, predictably, will not be gone into in what remains of the book.

If Blakey could have, he would have in the numerous volumes of his supposed ² committee work that he published.

His hearing ⁵ and report ⁷ are barren on this in any real sense.

And, Congressional hearings and reports are to be factual, not idle conjectures. All that work, all those words, all those volumes and all that money spent, if people heeded ~~them~~ they were more confused than before Blakey got his big moment and wasted that and all that time, money and effort that he expended in his wasting of them.

It is a shame that an American President can be shot down on the sunlit streets of a major American city and the American

government, in all three of its major parts, is not capable of telling the sorrowing people the truth. Instead, as we have seen, as soon as the executive branch knew, from Ruby's killing of Oswald, that there would be no trial, it decided to pin the hat on a man who clearly had been framed and that hat of faked guilt is still there, on his head in his grave two years less than four decades later.

With all the branches of government determinedly trying to interfere with any effort to establish the truth, to prove the framed man innocent or to try to establish who did that dirty deed, the one that turned this country and much of the world around.

We'll now see if Blakey had a real word of fact, of truth, in his reporting of the "motive for revenge" of the Cuban exiles" and, if he does attribute real motive to them, if he goes a single step further, to show how they had both the means and the opportunity. He did not with any of his other suspects, and suspicion does not kill. Without which motive alone means not a thing.

The country was full of people who hated Kennedy, of people who had the motive. But motive alone is not fatal and an assassination is fatal. They did not all kill him.

Motive does ~~not~~ kill but Kennedy was killed.

And not by motive alone.

The first five pages are of generalities, on how Castro treated exiles, of the CIA station in Miami, on the Bay of Pigs fiasco and he even uses Andrew St. George, who he describes as a journalist, as a source rather than using his own supposed investigation.

Blakey gets down to his supposed evidence (on pages 162-3) when he writes ~~that~~ of Oswald that "the FBI did learn that on August 5 he approached Carlos Bringuier, a Cuban exile leader at a clothing

store. Bringuier managed the Casa Roca, and Oswald applied for membership in the Cuban ~~Student~~ ^{Student} Directorate" which had only one member in New Orleans, Bringuier. Who led himself and nobody else.

In fact Bringuier gave two different dates, August 2 and August 5, each after the event he used as an excuse for claiming he suspected Oswald. That excuse, with which Oswald had no connection, was an FBI raid on a so-called Cuban training camp on the other side of Lake Pontchartrain from New Orleans.

In his Warren Commission testimony Commission Counsel Wesley Liebeler led the schoolboy Philip Geraci ~~III~~ ^{III} to testify that he saw Oswald at Bringuier's store, ~~he~~ was half-owner, with his brother-in-law ~~and~~ They catered to sailors, did not sell only clothing, located as they were, on the waterfront, and I saw even sexy literature ^{in Spanish} in their window. Liebeler led Geraci, then in high school to testify that was the first time he was at Bringuier's store. What Liebeler, the Warren Commission, and Blakey and his committee all suppressed ^{is} ~~is~~ much about Bringuier and Geraci, ^{including} ~~including~~ that Bringuier had the boy selling Student Directorate "bonds" at fifty cents each. From Geraci I received a copy of one of the receipts Bringuier gave him for his selling twenty of these bonds. Geraci and his father both told me that was not the first time he was at Bringuier's store. Or, how could Blakey have conducted any kind of investigation without knowing these things and more, much more?

And the other ^{anti} ~~anti~~-Castros in New Orleans, rather than considering Bringuier a leader, as Blalock says, had a nickname for him, as two of them told me. He was known to them as "El Stupides." That means "the stupidity."

At the least this little bit tells us what kind of "investigation" Blakey conducted and drew upon. There is more about Bringuier which

says much about him as a witness, says much about his dependability, but for our immediate purposes this is enough.

He was loud, paranoid, a publicity seeker and nobody in the exile community took him seriously. ~~and~~ Witness, among many other facts, that he had not a single member besides himself in his organization ~~and~~ in New Orleans.

Blakey is so bankrupt of any real, any valid information, he ~~is~~ says of this nothingness by Oswald that it was an "unexplained overture" with "a sinister implication." (page 162).

What in the world could there have been that is "sinister" when there was nothing sinister that followed and not that even Blakey can imagine was planned.

But the use of such words as "sinister" in a book like this can suggest that there is something sinister where there is not, not at all.

Then Blakey has a very brief rehash of the Silvia Odio matter (pages 162-5) in which he adds nothing new and omits very much that is not new, was already on the record.

Next Blakey has the subhead "Oswald in New Orleans" in his chapter on Cuban exiles and their alleged motive for assassinating Kennedy (pages 165-7). Blakey drags in Guy Banister, a former FBI agent who had his office in the 544 Camp Street building, an address that Oswald stamped on some of his flyers, but the address of Banister's office was the side street, Lafayette, where it was 531. Oswald's most likely purpose was to direct pro-Castros to where they would not be welcome, the office of the Cuban Revolutionary Counsel, which was on the second floor of that 544 Camp

Street Building but so little attention was paid to Oswald's leafleting that not a single incident was even reported.

Besides which, as Blakey also does not report, the CRC was broke once the CIA withdrew its support, which was the end of April, 1963 so they had to give up that office space,

The New Orleans CRC was not then led by Sergio Arcacha Smith, as Blakey has it. Smith fled New Orleans ^{in 1962} when reportedly a Smith Act charge, having to do with a stolen automobile, ^{attributed to} was laid ~~in~~ ^{on} him.

Next Blakey goes into, or at least thinks he goes into Guy Banister, a former FBI agent who had a private detective agency in New Orleans and who politically was at the most extreme right. ^{Blakey} He wanted to connect Oswald with Banister and in his effort he uses two of the least dependable of sources where undependable sources were plentiful.

One is Jack Martin, who added the details Blakey wanted to a story he has been telling for years, including to me. The other was Delphine Roberts, Banister's former secretary and reported mistress, Jim Garrison told me that she refused to talk to him until she ^{after} got ~~lost~~ ^{involved} in a lawsuit with Banister's wife, both wanting ^{ed} his files. When Roberts did not prevail, she started talking, and when she did she was about as dependable as Martin. ~~Nobody would~~ No responsible writer would use either as a lone source.

When on the day of the assassination ^u Banister pistol-whipped Martin, ^{it was} not, according to Martin, the first time. In the story ^o Martin gave Blakey he asked Banister, "What are you going to do - kill me, like you did Kennedy?" This part of Martin's story, often as I saw him, was new to me.

Blakey stretches as much as he thinks he can but in the end he had nothing, as he admits he had nothing. One of his stretches is that he "connected" Oswald to anyone, particularly not to anti-Castros:

insistent
might
spec

It was difficult to evaluate the significance of this circumstantial evidence bearing on Oswald's summer in New Orleans, yet we recognized we were getting indications of an Oswald connection with anti-Castro activists, who had the motive and means to plot the assassination. Additionally, not all of the evidence was circumstantial. There was, for example, a news photo of Oswald, as he was passing out "Fair Play for Cuba" literature on August 16, 1963, in front of the International Trade Mart in New Orleans, assisted by a Latin-looking young man, quite likely a Cuban, who has never been identified. While we were no more successful than the Warren Commission in learning who the man was, we realized, in light of undeniable evidence of a second gunman in Dealey Plaza, that his association with Oswald in a political activity may well have had sinister significance. Was he pro-Castro or anti-Castro? Was he apparently one, but in fact the other? We knew that after Oswald's approach to Carlos Bringuier and the confrontation over "Fair Play for Cuba" leaflets, the Cuban Student Directorate had decided to infiltrate Oswald's FPCC organization. Was he an "infiltrator"? Referring to the Coleman-Stawson hypothesis again, we asked ourselves: Did the Trade Mart photograph represent valid evidence that in August 1963, in New Orleans, an Oswald association had been established that would lead ultimately to the events in November in Dallas?

In light of the photograph, we reviewed the other evidence. Martin's allegation that Oswald had visited Banister's office was hardly persuasive by itself, and it was not substantially bolstered by Delphine Roberts, who said she saw Oswald "on several occasions," since her demeanor as a witness did not lead us to place much credence in her testimony. ~~Ross Banister, an official of the Louisiana State Police, offered the explanation that Oswald had used the 544 Camp Street address to embarrass his brother, but that would not explain the reports that copies of the leaflet in question had been found in Banister's files after he died.~~ The reports were never substantiated. The blunt truth was that we had failed to document a Banister-Oswald connection, despite the evidence that it might have existed. But there was an established association between Banister and David Ferrie, and that was very interesting, because we were able to link Ferrie not only with Oswald, but with Carlos Marcello. (p 905 1-46-77 105-7)

The reason that Blakey can say "it is difficult to evaluate the significance of the circumstantial evidence on Oswald's summer in New Orleans ^{is} because, in connection with the Kennedy assassination, it has no ^{importance} significance, none ^{at all} at all.

While Blakey says those anti-Castro "had the motive and means to plot the assassination," this does not mean that they had the means for executing it as the evidence of the JFK assassination required. Not does what Blakey here conjectures ^{mean} is there ^{no} any reason to believe that any of them did carry it out.

When Blakey refers to that news photo of Oswald, as he was

In this book Blakey established that he is dumb, pretty
dumb. But he is not ^{as} ~~this~~ dumb as this is

passing out ~~Blakey is making up the only possible connection this~~ "Fair Play for Cuba" literature in front of the International Trade Mart in New Orleans, assisted by a Latin looking

~~man~~ young man, quite likely a Cuban, who had never been identified" ^{92A}

^{92A} ^{here} that Blakey is really confessing and ~~is~~ ^{is} too ignorant to ~~know~~ know that he is admitting it is ~~that~~ that he made no investigation of this at all, despite his large staff and largest ~~House~~ House appropriation never for a house investigation, ~~and is just making it up~~

That man supposedly handing out that "literature", which was no more than the single sheet he had had printed right there in New Orleans, was not handing out that literature at all. He had just been handed that single sheet a thousand copies of which cost Oswald only ten dollars. And ~~rather~~ ^{than} looking like a Latin, that man was a Japanese, as we saw before, named ^{Junichi} Ehara, who had been identified.

No anti-Castro connection here other than in Blakey's imagination.

With no limits on his ~~imagination~~ ^{imagination}, Blakey nominates the export-import businessman, Ehara, as the ~~so-called~~ alleged "second gunman."

And so far as the alleged inability of the Warren Commission to identify ^{his} ~~his~~ goes, it made no effort. Ehara's office was in that ITM building and all the other tenants knew him. Include the one with him on the way to lunch, John Alice ^{Alice}, as we also saw earlier.

So, of this man who had no connection with Oswald ~~at~~ all except for looking at that Oswald handbill, Blakey, sterling investigator that he was, says "that his association with Oswald in a political activity may well have had sinister significance." Good thing Ehara was not looking at a newspaper! When this single sheet meant what Blakey says ^A it mean, he could have made a war out of the many sheets of a newspaper!

Next demon investigator and sterling lawyer that Blakey is he

asks Was he pro-Castro or anti-Castro? Was he apparently one, but in fact the other?"

Not pro-Emperor nor anti-Emperor, if any such political ideas were in Ehara's businessman's mind as he actually mimicked Oswald? That great investigator, Blakey, looked at only a single print of the newspaper photo that the Commission published as an exhibit but the movie film shows more, and I have a copy of it.

Making even more of a fool of himself Blakey then says that "we knew that after Oswald's approach to Carlos Bringuier... the Cuban Student Directorate had decided to infiltrate Oswald's FPCC organization". Which did not exist. He had no such organization!

So, Blakey asks about the Japanese Ehara, "Was he an infiltrator?"

Now the actuality is that one of Bringuier's friends, ^{Carlos Quiroga} went to see Oswald but he did not even ask for a membership application!

Blakey concludes this paragraph asking, Did the Trade Mart photograph (of which that ^{one} other represents many hundreds on several movie films, two TV stations having covered it) represent valid evidence that in August 1963 an Oswald association had been established that would lead ultimately to the events in Dallas November in Dallas?"

What it does lead to, and all it leads to other than more like this, is that Blakey is a fool, and incompetent, an irresponsible and as an investigator, particularly for the House of Representative, a faker who makes things up out of nothing at all, a man who can be trusted with nothing, a man whose word is worse than useless.

Blakey is, however, honest in saying that "The blunt truth was that we failed to document (sic) a Banister-Oswald connection, despite the evidence (sic) that it might have existed, But there was an established ^{association} that they "were able to link Ferrie not only

with Oswald but with Carlos Marcello," local mafia don.

There was, as we have seen, from Blakey himself, no "evidence" of any connection between ~~Os~~ Oswald and Banister and "we," Blakey's committee "linking" Ferrie and Marcello," which Blakey gets to in what follows.

The reality of what Blakey calls a "link" is what he would not dare trying to get away with in court.

Next in the nonexistent case he is building, which is not at all new and which followed my bringing to light something that was being suppressed is under the subhead "David Ferrie: 1918-1967." (pages 187-79).

Ferrie, Blakey says, "dropped out" of a seminary "due to 'emotional ~~xxxxxxx~~ instability'." He was kicked out over his behavior. He was a homosexual. Skipping more ~~that~~ has no real ~~re~~ relevance Blakey says that Ferrie, "an excellent pilot", was also (emphasis added) "the commander of a Civil Air Patrol unit" Ferrie was not its only commander.

Blakey says that "By the early 1960s Ferrie's world began to shatter. His physical appearance, marred by the ~~loss of all his hair from a rare medical disease~~ ^{loss of all his} ~~odd loss of h~~ hair ~~from a rare medical disease~~ as the result of a rare ^R medical ~~xxxxxxx~~ disease, was made all the more bizarre by a homemade *mohair* hair wig and pasted on eyebrows. He was an aggressive homosexual with a penchant for teenagers...." True except understated.

I happen to know more about ~~this~~ because for a while Ferrie had a doctor who was my step-brother, I reported this in Oswald in New Orleans, in ~~1967~~ 1967.

When Ferrie was, as I recall, still an Eastern Airlines pilot he began to lose his hair rapidly. Several other pilots who were my step-brother's patients recommended him to Ferrie. Ferrie was responding well to Jack's treatment of Ferrie's alopecia. So

well, that he thought he should be his own doctor, with his own notions on how to treat the problem that usually is a consequence of a sexual disease. Under "doctor" Ferrie's treatment the allopaecia which was responding well to medical treatment turned into allopaecia totalis. That cost him every hair on his body.

This tells us a little about Ferrie.

Skipping more ~~of~~ that is well-known, some coming from Oswald in New Orleans, Blakey writes "In the proceedings in his suspension as an Eastern Airlines pilot, Ferrie got legal and investigative assistance from G. Wray Gill and W. Guy Banister. In return Ferrie assisted Gill in defending Carlos Marcello against ~~the~~ federal charges of ^Obstructing justice, a charge that was based on a fraudulent birth certificate ^held by Marcello, and illegal entry into the country. ..."

Blakey gives no sources and for much of this I have no basis for questioning. But some of it is other than was written me by ~~me~~ Marcello's chief lawyer in that immigration case, the late Jack Wasserman, of Washington, then one of the country's outstanding immigration lawyers. Wasserman told me that Ferrie had been working with Gill ~~and~~ that Gill had recommended Ferrie be hired to do some investigating. Wasserman then told Gill to hire Ferrie.

And, what ^{Wasserman} Blakey also omits is that ~~Marcello~~ ^{Wasserman} won that case for Marcello.

There was no ~~MFerrrie-Marcello~~ connection with this. The Ferrie connection was with Gill, whose office Ferrie also had ~~in~~ the use of.

In this part Blakey refers to several FBI reports without giving any citation for them In CA 78-0420 I was to have received

Ferrie

all FBI records and none of these were in what the FBI disclosed to me.

Blakey's Under ~~Blakey's~~ Ferrie heading he has a page that begins, "In early 1969 Clay L. Shaw, the only person charged in the belated Garrison investigation of the Kennedy assassination, was acquitted."

Others were charged and one of them is my source for an explanation of why Blakey made up that it was a belated charge. Based on Garrison's source it was not belated.

One of the others charge, but in that case but not as assassins, was the late Dean Andrews, a New Orleans lawyer who, in his general practise, defended homosexuals. Andrews was a Warren Commission ^{witness} and I used his testimony extensively in Whitewash (pages 24-5, 150-1). Andrews told me that in about November 1966 Garrison appeared in his office, threw a copy of Whitewash on his desk and told him he ought to read it. It was, I believe, a copy of the Dell reprint, which then had just come out, and that is what got Garrison started all over again. He had had Ferrie arrested immediately after the assassination and having no case, let him go.

Typical of so much of the writing of this hot-shot investigator/lawyer that ranges from false to dubious and is characterized by a lack of direct quotation or of any citation is:

~~a conspiracy, an intent to commit a crime, was absent.~~ We came to believe, however, that Garrison might have been on the right track, at least up until Ferrie's untimely death on February 22, 1967, for evidence of an association between Ferrie and Oswald, presented at the Shaw trial, was found by the Committee to be credible. Here we had an Oswald association as significant as the one indicated by the Trade Mart photograph — possibly more so, since the identity of the associate was known, and he, in turn, was associated with an organized-crime leader.

(page 170)

In this Blakey also puffs himself and his committee up in saying they found ^hat Blakey does not tell the reader to be credible. ~~So~~ did many before them, including me. But credible testimony does not have to be true. It means that those giving it are believed and appear to be believable. However, what Blakey is talking about ~~be~~ begins with the Warren Commission, in whose files I found FBI reports about those quite credible people from Jackson about ^{thirty} mile northeast of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, if I remember correctly, They all said, and they had different political views, that they saw Oswald in Clinton along with Ferrie and Shaw, at registration time. I spent a morning with them and they appeared to be as credible as any people I ~~had~~ ever spoken to.

But what they testified to was impossible. I am confident there was a case of mistaken identity. ^{of} (In his version Blakey leaves Shaw out but it is not likely that Shaw ~~was~~ would have ever had anything to do with Ferrie if he had a choice. Despite the fact that Shaw was sado-masochist, and I have the FBI reports on that, he was a man of culture ^{and} a successful playwright one of whose plays had been made into a movie.

Shaw's defense ~~argued~~ successfully that the man those five ~~persuasive~~ men swore they saw with Oswald was ^{not} Clay Shaw, it was really, in their version, Guy Banister.

The supposed explanation, which Blakey also omits, is that Shaw had taken Oswald to Jackson because he sought a job for Oswald at the large mental hospital there.

However, if Shaw had wanted to get Oswald a job, assuming he even knew Oswald, he'd not have taken a day off and driven that

sistance when, as director of the trade mart, he could have gotten the only kind of job Oswald could have held by phone. Oswald made out as well when he was on relief as when he was salaried. I do not recall his ever getting more than a dollar and a half an hour

What Blakey also manages to omit is that credible as those five men- and Blakey never even mentions that - appeared to be, the New Orleans jury acquitted Shaw, and that testimony alone, if believe, would have worked against acquittal in less than an hour, which is the record of that Shaw jury, all of whom, as ~~Blakey~~ Blakey also does not mention, believed there had been a ~~conspiracy~~ conspiracy.

The trial was of Shaw but Blakey never mentions that the alleged association was between Shaw and Ferrie and Oswald.

So, this alleged association, rejected by the jury, becomes to Blakey, for all the world as though ~~that~~ ^{association} it was his property.

"Here we had an Oswald as significant as the one indicated by the trade mart photograph - possibly more so, since the identity of the ~~associate~~ associate was known, and he, in turn, was associated with an organized-crime leader," *Blakey says page 170*.

All the way Blakey omits what brought this to public attention, that included in the allegation was Shaw, that the trial was of ~~Shaw~~ ^{Shaw}, yet Blakey writes of the allegedly singular "associate" of Oswald when in that testimony it was two, Shaw, ^{was played down} omitted, and Ferrie exaggerated. (Ferrie's "association" was with Marcello's lawyer, Gill.)

"We", that committee, had nothing because what those five men testified to was a case of mistaken identities.

"Allegations of a Mafia-Exile Plot," which follows, has

not a thing connecting it with the assassination or anything justifying a suspicion of any connections (pages 170-5). It is followed by "Other Allegations of Oswald-Cuban Exiles Ties" (pages 175-6) but ~~Blakey~~ Blakey was so little confidence in their relevance he gives that less than a ~~page~~ page of space. But at that Blakey wasted every word of that ^{space} ~~space~~. It is all trash, with no possible connection, if it had any meaning at all.

Next, "The Havana Investigation: Part Two" which also is given only a page (pages 176-7). Again, nothing at all about the assassination. No investigation, either.

Blakey ends this chapter with another page on "Oswald and New Orleans" (pages 177-80). As an illustration of how Blakey makes so much out of nothing at all we examine ^{what} ~~what~~ he says about Oswald and New Orleans about "Cuban Exiles and the Motive of Revenge":

Indent single space

New Orleans, the home of Lee Harvey Oswald from April to September 1963, is a southern seaport with a climate well suited to the Cuban taste. The size of its exile community in the early 1960s was second only to Miami's "Little Havana." In August 1960, just three months after the Democratic Revolutionary Front was founded in Miami, Sergio Arcacha Smith was sent by Antonio de Varona to form a New Orleans chapter of the FRD, which at the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion, in April 1961, became the Cuban Revolutionary Council. Arcacha remained the chief CRC delegate in New Orleans until January 1962, at which time he was fired for not being able to gain the confidence of the New Orleans Cuban community. There was a quick succession of CRC delegates after Arcacha: Luis Rabel held the job until October 1962, when business pressures forced him to step aside in favor of Frank Bartes, the former president of Consolidated Railroads of Cuba, who ran the chapter until the CRC was dissolved in 1964. We interviewed Arcacha, Rabel, and Bartes, and each denied having had any dealings with Oswald. They said that the CRC chapter had been primarily engaged in fund-raising, leading us to believe that the more combative activities were left to the student affiliate of the chapter, the New Orleans branch of the Cuban Student Directorate. Oswald's contact with the chief DRE delegate in New Orleans, Carlos Bringuier, had been well documented, and Bringuier maintained that what he told the FBI and the Warren Commission was the extent of it. We could not say, however, that the testimony of Arcacha, Rabel, Bartes, Bringuier, and others in New Orleans, in light of what we *had* learned about Oswald in the summer of 1963, left us with a feeling that we knew all there was to know.

100

What
might
have
been

As we wound up the New Orleans phase of the investigation, what we did know — what had survived the passage of time and had not been contaminated by the Garrison investigation — was that significant Oswald connections had been established: with anti-Castro activists and, at least through David Ferrie, with organized crime. Neither of these connections had been adequately taken into account by the FBI or the Warren Commission. We also knew that Oswald, as he was departing New Orleans in September, had probably gone with two of his Cuban associates to the home of Silvia Odio in Dallas. We were, candidly, at a loss to find a fully satisfactory explanation for the contradictions of Oswald's anti-Castro and pro-Castro activities (as he passed out

leaflets in front of the New Orleans Trade Mart, he was obviously acting in support of Castro, although we were unable to determine the loyalties of his unidentified Latin associate). The Coleman-Slawson deception hypothesis — anti-Castroites posing as Castro supporters for Oswald's benefit — was as logical as any we could reach. As for the organized-crime aspect of Oswald's associations in New Orleans, where it had been overlooked by the FBI and the Warren Commission, it had been studiously avoided by District Attorney Garrison, for reasons we believed had become apparent. If Ferrie was to have a place in history as Garrison predicted he would at the time of his death, it would be, in our judgment, because he was a connection between Oswald and the Marcello organization.

New Orleans did have a large Cuban refugee population and it cannot be imagined that the exile population of any United States city could have contributed less to exile activities, as we soon see. What Blakey refers to as the Democratic Revolutionary Front was the more conservative exile organizations, although Blakey does not mention the other. When Arcacha Smith headed the New Orleans office it had so little money it could not pay its rent. There were some contributions to it and some of those who did contribute told me later that they believed Arcacha Smith pocketed it. Blakey says that "At the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion, in April 1961 (it) became the Cuban Revolutionary Council." Not quite the way it was.

When the White House got both competing organizations to meet with its representatives, one of whom, Arthur Schlesinger wrote about it straightforwardly and in detail, I knocked heads together and forced both to combine in the Cuban Revolutionary Council

It may be that Arcacha Smith was "fired" for not being able to gain the confidence of the New Orleans Cuban community," although

I was told otherwise, then all his successors should have been fired for the same reason because the situation remained unchanged and none of his successors did any better. All those who followed ~~Mr~~ Archacha Smith told the house as ~~sassins~~ "that the ORC chapter was primarily engaged in fund raising," but they still did not raise enough to pay the niminal rent of their flea-bag office at 544 camp street.

Blakey says that this ~~pled~~ led his committee "to believe that the more ~~of~~ combatative activities were left to the ~~Cuban Student Director~~ ~~Directorate~~ ~~the~~ student affiliate of ~~the~~ chapter, the New Orleans branch of the Urban Student Directorate,"

There not only was no such affiliation, there was no such thing as the Cuban Student Directorate membership in New Orleans. That loud-mothed fool Bringuier, ~~was its only member in New Orleans,~~ ^{El Estupides,} as he testified! And of this Blakey then says what stretches words past their limit, Oswald's contact with the chief(sic) DRE delegate in New Orleans, Carlos Bringuier, has been well documented, and Bringuier maintained that what he told the FBI and the Warren Commission was the extent of it."

Or, there was nothing a sane and honest person could call a "contact" any more than a knock on the door by an unwanted salesman.

Aside from going to Bringuier's store and offering him the Marines pocket handbook it gives all Marines, there was nothing else that ~~even~~ Blakey could call a "contact" but there was more Blakey does not mention. And none of it can be called a friendly contact, albeit an indirect one. Of those reported in New Orleans and confirmed one reflects that what Blakey refers to as a "contact" and as an

"association" elsewhere was definititly anti-Castro. That one was Oswald telling the authorities that ~~Bringuier~~ was selling bonds without a license. That brough^t to an end his selling thos fifty-centers for the DRE.

Blakey concludes this section and this chapter with the opinion that is every bit as good as his many opinions he present^s as fact, and the lack of relationship between both parts of his expressed opinⁱon is his for he is quoted directly, that all Arcacha's successors at ~~CPC~~^R head in New Orleans denied any kind of contact or association with Oswald:

We could not say, however, that the testimony of Arcacha, ~~Rane~~ⁱⁿ Rabel, Bartes, Bringuier and others in New Orleans, ~~xxxxx~~ the light ~~of~~^{of} what ~~he~~^{we} had (sic) learned about Oswald in the Summer of 1963 left us with a feeling that we knew all the~~re~~ was to know.

Blakey's writing let^s it be known that he and his assassins committee "learned" nothing in New Orleans the summer of 1963 or about Oswald that summer which means a thing in connection with the assassination or that contradicts Bartes, Rabel and the other Arcacha successors.

~~It is an~~ This chapter is an unintended confession of bankruptcy by the bankrupt Blakey who failed to conduct anything that can be called an invewtigation when he was chartered, well financed and abundantly staffed to do what he failed even to try to do and at least in an effort to save his face ~~ma~~^{ke}s this kind of pathetic pretense to having done something worthwhile.

Which he not only did not do, but from his own account^{he} was clearly not able to do. Even to think about.

~~But~~ It is clear, not that Blakey makes it that clear, that, as could be expected, there were Cuban exiles and that some of them wanted revenge, especially those who had a good thing or a soft touch under the brutal and bloody dictator Castro and his handful of men ousted. But it is not at all clear that Blakey had any reason even to suspect ^h that they did the dirty deed in Dallas,

If anything. Blakey's failure to come up with anything at all that can be regarded as a factual reason to believe that those exiles were driven with ~~with~~ such a motive for revenge that they did kill Kennedy, especially after ^{Blakey's} his best-funded investigation in the House of Representatives' history ^l persuaded that they did not.

Which is also what the actual, official evidence also does show ~~ed~~ (6)