

From admissions in 1997

Is the component name obliterated from the King records (from their source) included in the names of components in the Tip O'Neill letter lists? If so why hide it except to hide information on King and uses may rather than to protect anything.

The records given reflect no real use. Why collect domestic intelligence and make no use of it.

One of these records has King a Chicom and getting money that way. No use or significant distribution is reflected. Is this the purpose of either foreign or domestic intelligence?

There is no evaluation provided. This stuff certainly has to have been evaluated.

There is neither beginning nor end of the records provided. There has to have been something earlier and later.. This did not spring full-grown from Hoover's rib.

But with the CIA having such interests and with their coincidence with the now well-known interest of the FBI, there is no indication of any real cooperations, no related referrals either way (none from FBI, which represents I have all). Can it be that the CIA had information of Chicom influence on King, tried without success to shift its source to the FBI and yet did not give any such info to the AG of the USA or his ISD?

If it did not make this kind of use, what other use could serve any legit purpose?

It had one source and no other one? Not even incidental to other projects?

Why did it do this in the first place and why did it continue with the obviously domestic intelligence against a great man? What business was it of the CIA's? Does it just collect dossiers on Americans and then pretend it has no retrieval system?

When they were caught in domestic intelligence with police depts, as you should recall, they claimed they rendered this service only because they had the best filing system and the best retrieval. Superior to the FBI's because the FBI has that responsibility with local police and does train local police. If they had such exquisite filing and retrieval systems how could they find nothing except in the offices of their cops? Do their cops do their literary work? And having done it, do nothing with it?

My recollection is that nobody described the search. Savage did not say he did it. Not did he say he was qualified to. I'd explore the entire search machinery in this case.

Because it is official in a different category and has been so found by the AG did they do their usual search? Is this why they kept finding things after the search was over? Because it is historical, what efforts to did they make to learn which components did have records? Did they send a memo around? Ask for it. If they did not, in a historical case, why not? If they have to get down on hands and knees and paw through all their records in a historical case, how do they function in time of crisis?

Did they do a computer printout? All systems? Hard files and soft? (Speak to Mark Lynch about getting Snapp and others to give affs on "soft" files. Marchetti, the Angola man, etc.) Stockwell in particular has been all over TV talking about soft files.

As I remember it the stuff about me and Frame-Up is not in any affidavit. It is Beasleyed by JoAnn. I therefore am more convinced that it is false. She says that they turned nothing upon books because I am the subject. False. The title of that report is Book by Harold Weisberg. The book is the subject. But if I was the subject and this in an item of the request, how come they gave no records on me? I'd attach the Bud and me copy of the CIA one and ask the obvious questions, including on the claim to exemption for me and not to Bud. not just withholding all of it from me and not him.

Compare this business on buying books with their extensive records on the authors of JFK books. They sent information memos around, etc. Why did they have any interest in Frame-Up? How could they justify spending public money on buying it, reviewing it and doing any memos on it?

If they felt that they did not have enough information on the book them, did they ask for more? Have they asked me for more info in the past? Or said they did not have enough before they were in court? After they were in court, did they seek more info? Did they ask their own library? Did they consult or ask their library to consult standard indices? The CIA is quite familiar with publishing, having operated in the field.

(I find myself wondering if they are afraid of what will out if they open any file

because of what might come out about me- them and me, that is.

My books are critical of the CIA. One has the CIA in the subtitle. How come they found nothing? Does not the item cover it? My recollection is affirmative, it does.

They have reports that King is Umicom and nothing in his books?

Why does the Office of Security do their book work anyway?

Get them to admit that every component obliterated on the records provided is a publicly known component/included in the letters to O'Neill.

As they read the KGB's information and that of other intelligence agencies, have they, aside from the name of the King informant, withheld from me what they have reason to believe foreign intelligence agencies know? Do they believe that the obliterated components are unknown to the KGB? I't get to the reality: they withhold from the American people and the Congress what in the intelligence business is its public domain- they all know what the CIA hides from the American people.

What JoAnn attributed to me gives you a tee from which to use a hard driver on the recent exposures of CIA dishonesties. Church com. Schwieker, etc. Get them to admit they lie, with not only the Dulles boast of it, that I'd use.

It is impossible to believe they did so little after the assassination. Impossible.

Compare what they have given me with what they have given the Church and House committees. They cannot have come up with so little, but both searches have to have been completed prior to this one.

They hide the location of stations. On King/Ray this has to include Mexico. Ask if this is not known and if in fact they did not make the disclosure re JFK records. They and FBI's Legats ~~at~~ together yet no reflection of this in what was given to me. Nix on Ray there. They did work in Mexico is one admission. They gave me his another. Etc. Other countries?

I think you can have some Admissions fun on all the official characterizations of the CIA as liars, JoAnn having made an alleged opinion of mine on this an issue. Ask them, including staff counsel of the WC, the Congress, both Houses, courts, officials.

There is no reference to CI and the ~~W~~Angletonians in the records I received. Whicoms and no CI routings? No reports or analyses from CI in response? No CI records at all when they have these reports about King's red not only Whicom entanglements.

They would appear not to have received anything of this sort from the FBI, either.

Angleton et al/ were the domestic assassination specialists over JFK, WC. Nothing from them to anyone else, not even DCI, when King was killed? Inhouse experts not consulted?

Whicom entanglement and no Asia desk involved in a single records I received.

(Obviously everyone knows they have such components so there is and can be no question of "disclosure.")

This is historical case. Did FOIA people make any phone calls within CIA to ask if various components had any relevant records?