

6/24/95

The Board's 6/ 21 press release tells us that it voted unanimously to compel the CIA to disclose names redacted from Mexico City records relating to the Oswald trip there in ^{September and} October 1963. This seems to be rather clearly a John Newman interest he processed upon the board. From the board's release two exemptions were claimed to withhold what ^{usually} it wants disclosed, protection of sources and methods. The first relates to persons who can be hurt and who may have worked for the CIA, formally or otherwise, the second relates to what has always been used to extreme, the protection of "methods."

While maximum possible disclosure is what all want and the board is to seek to assure, the value or importance of this kind of information in the CIA's Mexico City records cannot begin to compare with information about the assassination itself. And there is no indication of which I know of the board making any effort to get released records that have to do with the crime itself and of which it knows, like the notes of the autopsy.

The ARRB's previous boastful announcement was its, from its own words, great success in persuading the FBI to disclose what conspiracy theories have regarded as of ^{the} great value it does not have, CD 1359. As disclosed it is a major incitation against Cuba by those with an animus and with a record of giving the FBI bad information consistent with their political desires, the Child brothers, renegade reds. The board went farther: it praised the FBI for disclosing what is utterly without value in the assassination records and cannot be compared with what remains withheld. With the FBI and this Mexico City interest, for example, the tape of at least one intercepted Oswald call and the transcripts of it that records I got in FOIA litigation prove it had the night of the assassination, before the next day broke.

I've read Newman's book with care. It tells us nothing about Oswald and the CIA. It tells us what was known without the book, others having learned it and the CIA having disclosed it voluntarily to frustrate the disclosure requirements of the 1992 Act. It tells us that the CIA had an extraordinary number of Oswald records and interests. But not a word about Oswald and the CIA. Newman's great ^{to me} disappointment is a bad book, an ignorant book, a lying book, an inflammatory book, inflammatory in the way the military was inflammatory about Cuba from the Eisenhower administration on, and by the time Newman had completed it he was still a subject-matter ignoramus. He does not know enough about the assassination itself or the existing records relating to the assassination to be able to tell the ARRB what assassination records remain withheld. He has pursued in this his personal interests reflected by his book's title, interests he followed without any work to give him a basis for it, that is, searches in the disclosed records to extract their real and significant meanings.

So for what the board itself boasts about as accomplishments, as a reflection

of its intent to fulfill the obligations it undertook, there is nothing that gets even close to the significant records known to be withheld.

As I have indicated to the board itself, its public record is of establishing a basis for a later false claim that it met its obligation, withⁱⁿ the fact that it heard all those wanting to be heard. *Mostly nuts.*

In this current release it refers to itself on the same page as a "federal agency" and as "five private citizens playing a key role in determining" what will be disclosed.

Its previous release, dated June 16, announces New Orleans hearings on the 28th.

First on the list of those to be heard is "ember Hale Boggs' widow and successor in the House, Lindy. Perhaps she does know from him of some relevant records that are withheld. OR she may testify that much of what is said about him is not so. She is not likely to testify to what his files held because her son Tom, a Washington lawyer, had them.

Then there is the New Orleans City Library official who oversees its records and it is testify to Garrison records. That should be worthwhile for Nuttiness. Besides which, for whatever Garrison's records may be worth, they are not on deposit in that library system. There is the mythology about Oswald's use of a ferris library card for which he had no need, having his own.

Next will be Michael Kurtz. If he has any knowledge of withheld records that is not reflected in his crappy book.

Stephen Tyler produced a TV show on Garrison. No knowledge of existing federal records in that for him to tell the board about.

And then there is the lawyer daughter of one of Clay Shaw's lawyers, Cynthia Wegmann. She can be expected to dump on Garrison, perhaps praise her late father, but there is no reason to believe that he or she can lead to withheld assassination records that are within the 1992 Act.

What else? Steve Tilley, of the archives, is flying from Washington, where he and the board are based, to New Orleans to give the board, the release says, "an update on the Collection." That he could not do in DC? Or is that intended to get the board a New Orleans press that is favorable?

I see nothing possible in this hearing that a) required a hearing or b) can lead to the disclosure of any significant assassination records.

I see in this only the board making a false record of trying to do its job while diligently avoiding doing its job, so that it can later boast, it listened to all who wanted to be heard. Almost none of whom have any real knowledge of existing and withheld records.

KW