

Jeff Morley, Outlook
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

11/27/96

Dear Jeff,

Beginning with the 1973 energy crisis, I began using the clear sides of used paper. As long as I had any all my writing has been on second-hand paper. When I noticed this I thought you might have a little interest in it. It is something you should understand. I'll get to responding to your 11/22 and you'll be welcome to go over and copy any of my Bringuier/Pena records you may want.

It is unreal that you can say and believe that on "about 5 percent of the story we disagree." When you can say, without citing any authority for it, that the evidence of Oswald's lone guilt is "overwhelming" we disagree 100%. And that comes from your ignorance, not any blind refusal to reach a "consensus."

You can't say that ^{and} know the official evidence.

You can't say that and be familiar with ^{any} ~~the~~ thing I have written.

When I skimmed that awful stuff that ~~the~~ Outlook finally used when you sent it earlier I paid little attention to it. I found it incredible when I read it with care. Incredible that you could be that irresponsible, that ignorant of the subject matter and still pontificate about it.

When criticized you do not think at all and you do not reexamine, as you should even if you know what you talk about, as in that piece you did not.

When there is fact, and as I wrote Outlook, there is an abundance of real fact, the official fact that was ignored and misrepresented, there is no substitute for that fact. You would substitute an impossible "consensus." If you read any of my work you know that is impossible for me. As it would have been for ~~at~~ at least two members of the Commission. If you think the Specters are going to admit what they did you are flakey. So where will there be any "consensus?" And were there one, what could it mean? You ^{do} not get the great majority of the larger percentage of the people who do not agree with the official mythology to agree with it, which is what your "consensus" means.

There is ^{and} there can be nothing related to the assassination itself that involves Bringuier and/or Pena. I doubt there is really anything "significant" about Bringuier that you've heard. There was nothing but myth in what the La Fontaines wrote about him. He also is not really rational. He was known in the New Orleans anti-Castro community as ~~961?8888~~ "El Estupidos." That does not mean "Stupid." It means "the stupidity." Pena was sometimes/hard to understand and was perhaps not always truthful, although I never caught him in a lie. Then he got in real trouble and I've not heard from him since before then. He had enough not ^{money}

to get involved in that sex business over which there was a big bust.

If I did not tell you, and I do not remember, Bringuier is a liar when he says that Oswald was at his place for the first time August 5. That lie is to explain what he did. It was really much earlier.

He also was not a good person in many ways. What involves others I'd rather not talk about but it is pretty sordid.

Pena and his employes believed that was not Oswald who threw that spectacular drunk they say was a fake. Pena also claimed to have seen Oswald often with a Mexican reporter. Amanda Jarvis I'm sure said that and I think ^W but am less sure that ~~Haristo~~ Rodriguez also said that. ^{Andrew also} Anders said he was with a Mex.

My first time I saw Bringuier was memorable!

It was my first trip, when I'd testified to the grand jury and was about to return home. The detective who was to take me to the airport offered to drive me around a bit and show me places of interest. I liked that. When we got to the Havana, the detective parked his car partly on the sidewalk of the Customs building and I was about to take some pictures of the Havana when El Estupides came running in a crouch from his joint snapping away with a 35mm. Until he was about to jump me. The detective stopped that. El Estupides then, high-game hunter that he was, took those pictures to the NO FBI office. it did not want them but he insisted that they were very important so they accepted those he gave them.

He believed my interest was in him. I had no such interest.

According to Geraci and his mother ^{er}, it was in May when Oswald was at Bringuier's. There also was an earlier Geraci-Bringuier relationship of which the mother did not know. It may have been later, but if it was the mother did not know about it.

Oswald used Bringuier. Bringuier was so dumb it took ^{retroactively} Oswald a long time.

I have always wondered how Oswald knew the kind of dope Bringuier is, really who tipped him off. It is probable that Oswald is the one who reported the unlicensed Bringuier sale of 50% DRE bonds. Bringuier had Geraci doing that. Oswald was really baiting Bringuier.

But none of this has anything to do with the assassination.

At the time of the assassination there really was very little Cuban activity in the New Orleans area. There never was any pro-Castro activity and it appears that the withdrawal of the CIA's support for the CRC marked the end of what little anti-Castro activity there was. I think Arcacha Smith's abdication ^{ion} with the little money they had was part of that. He and Ronnie Caire started the Crusada. It cost Caire perhaps \$10,000, money in those days, and I'd not be surprised if Arcacha managed to latch onto some of that. There was reportedly a Logan Act

charge against him when he fled N.O.

Bringuier was the only DRE in the area. Pena had been active in the Frente but that was merged into the CRG and he was not active in that.

None of what Posner wrote about N.O. is dependable. His sources were it seems El Estupides and Hubie Badaux, to whom Hale Boggs was a Communist.

At this point in particular I think what you are up to is a total waste of time and can have no connection with the assassination itself.

Until you have the basic facts straight, and + do mean facts, it is not easy to perceive what is real and related and what is not or cannot be.

If you really care for your reputation you'd best back off a bit and try to think this whole thing through. Beginning with what you now cannot "just pass" on, what you've done for those genuine literary whores the La Fontaines. They are subjects a matter ignoramuses. They also have poor judgement to go with it. They actually, they say themselves, spent six months on that wickey white fabrication that disintegrates on initial examination to anyone with plain common sense. I do not remember a single meaningful, worthwhile thing in their book. They made up what they laid on what they picked up that others had made up, too. It is really all fiction and you have hung your reputation on it.

There is no "debate" about them, your word. They are frauds, period. Cheap sensation seekers. Whoever put you onto to them was also a subject-matter ignoramus possessed of the poorest judgement and little common sense on the subject.

Back to Bringuier, nobody would really have trusted him with any information of any consequence and that business the La Fontaines seek to make into something about the supposed coming Cuban invasion is nonsense as is just about all they say about N.O. and Camp Street.

You do not have either foot on the ground and you are entirely unwilling even to think about that. There is nothing about that La Fontaine fabrication that is at all real and until you come to understand that you'll be wasting much time and effort and damaging your reputation even more.

As in saying that in connection with the assassination there is "something significant" about Bringuier. I'll be glad to go over that with you if you'd like but I believe it is not possible.

It will also help you to learn that all the assassination nuttiness does not come from nuts. You'll probably not be willing to believe that but I do urge you to have it in mind and when you have any cause to wonder, wonder. But when you can be as persistent in crediting the La Fontaines I see little possibility of your being capable of that. You cannot question yourself about that when any

common-sense reading of their book alone suggests that. You cling to it despite all and all includes their silence when ^{you} I sent them what I wrote, their modification of their jail story when what they'd written was proven to be a physical impossibility and their indulgence of their dirtiness in ~~this~~ their book over that.

When you call next week do not make it Monday morning and if Wednesday not until late in the morning. Remember also that I retire about 4:30 now.

Try to pay attention to what I'm telling you. That is in your interest, not mine. I have no stake of any kind in it. and you ought not be running any risk of any of that kicking back on you at the Post.

Think!

Hardy

The Washington Post

1150 15TH STREET, N. W.

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20071-5530

(202) 334-6000

OUTLOOK
(202) 334-7573

22 Nov 1996

Dear Harold,

I have an idea: Let's be friends! I have another idea: why don't you help me? I have found out something significant about Carlos Bringuier. I am going to go interview him. Could you instruct me on the Bringuier and Orest Pena documents: I want to see them all and understand your interpretation of them. Can you help me?

As for the La Fontaines ad that whole debate, I think I'll just pass. We can spend our time more usefully than bickering about the 5 percent of the story we disagree. Let's work on agreeing more completely on the 95 percent.

I will call you next week. I hope you are feeling better.

Best,
