

Dear Jim

Interrogatory Answers, CA 75-1448

6/15/76

I've gone through the Johnson list to the CIA on what to release and their markings to withhold.

This stuff is quite valuable as it relates to unjustified withholding and other dirty works, like kidding officials.

The later is Rhoads conference memo in which, a year after he had the autopsy pictures and X-rays, he did not tell DJ lawyer Reis!

There appears to be a clear pattern in Karamessines' marking of what to withhold--anything credible that could link CIA to LHO while having no objection to the meaningless: anything that would disclose anything about the fabricator Ugarte (Agent D) because the CIA wanted to make a deal of this and I have it in the Rocca memo to the Rockefeller Commission).

It appears to me that some of that marked for withholding had already been released in other form.

Everything on Nosenko is withheld. From this list it appears that the CIA got the Commission to omit him from the Report.

I think the Wozencraft letter is the same one we've had. A rereading tells me there is a case for legal obligations resting on Rhoads that he did not meet, that he had authority to disclose and suppressed.

I'm not going to write a memo on this. I'll mark up my copy for our discussion when we go into new interrogatories. This is be valuable for them and for informing the judge.

I am sure we can make a case for the CIA's deliberate violation of the Katz. 7/65 directive on disclose and the total lack of basis for the CIA's decision from what is available now and was ordered withheld by Helms then. I have some of these records and am certain there never was any basis for withholding under guidelines or EOs. I wonder if you can demand an explanation of each and every withholding to establish that the withholdings were improper and a basis for alleging those that remain are.

We can have real fun with the Soviet Brainwashing Techniques memo Helms ordered withheld. Any investigation of that would have led to their killing of their own man, Olson, with their own LSD. I have this. No basis for withholding. Same with one on kidnapping. I think we want to include a question of their help with the book KGB. It has the essence of the Nosenko story and was published prior to the more recent order to withhold the Nosenko stuff.

For my own understanding and thinking I'd like to know if we have the right in the new interrogatories to address the CIA's record on these withholdings as a basis for claiming they violate the official WH and DJ instructions and standards as thus persuading the judge that the continued withholding is for other than sanctioned reasons.

Not the "missing" on the highly-classified.

I think we'll want to go back to my initial request for these transcripts, all, and ask what was done to learn if they could comply prior to their rejection and the basis on which that rejection was made.

I do not think Robinson will be as patient as Green and that if we make out a good case before him we'll be in better shape and have a better chance of having a judge do something to these people who hide to prevent embarrassment only and are frivolous in their acts and decisions and misuse regulations, EOs and law and courts. Note that Johnson said we'd sue so the CIA knew it had to make a case. They have not provided us with a reasonable answer to what Johnson wrote. I have just received some of these records from the CIA, as I recall suggesting they were just made available to me.

Hastily,