

BBC Panama 3/6/78  
Scheuinker

MAN:

relationship for someone who's assuming a false identity, I think in addition his role is such that by playing with both the Fair Play for Cuba committee on the one hand and then teaming up with Anti-~~EMMA~~ Castro Cubans on the other, he was playing out another intelligence role. Only an intelligence person who's tried to be an informer or a double agent would really like fit in that role, that Oswald fit. And of course to this day his mother swears in fact he was.

INT:

That he was what..?

~~INT~~ MAN:

That he was an agent of one of the agencies.

INT:

What do you believe? that Oswald was?

MAN:

I personally believe that he had a special relationship with one of the agencies, which one I'm not certain but all the fingerprints that I found during my 18 months on the Select committee off intelligence point to Oswald as being a product of an interacting with the intelligence community. Whether he acted as a double agent, or single agent or whether he double-crossed some people is the big question, and who would be embarrassed by that double-cross or that double agent that wasn't figured quite right, but er--but us.

INT:

But isn't there perhaps a simpler explanation just that he was a lone nutter acting by himself?

MAN:

Well if he was I can't believe that the Russians would have let an Ameri--a daughter or a niece of a Colonel in the Soviet Secret police go out of America with him, I can't believe they would have assigned that role to a person in that capacity. I don't believe if he was in that

A

SENATOR:

have a very thorough investigation but if you denied the most relevant, startling, exciting facts at the time er--the investigation means nothing.

INT:

If the theory which the Warren Commission supported of Oswald acting alone, a deranged person acting alone were true, shouldn't all the documents, all the documents relating to Oswald have been released by now?

SENATOR: =

I think there's absolutely no reason for not releasing these documents. I am one of the few people because of my committee assignment and security clearance is privileged to go in the archives and inspect them. And 98% of the material that I saw has absolutely no reason to be locked up and its a mystery to me why it hasn't been released sooner.

INT:

Well why is it say an Oswald CIA file only some like 60 out of a thousand documents have been released?

SENATOR:

I think they're obviously hiding some relationship with the Intelligence community, and its a little bit like the Jack Ruby case. J. Edgar Hoover denied that he was an informer for the F. Yet under the Freedom of Information Act release we found that he had 8 contacts with the FBI. Now that was as plain to say that a contact 8 times wasn't an informer, yet the pros in the game said if you talked to a person twice that's an informer, so we know that Hoover lied about Ruby being an informer for the FBI and I suspect exactly the same thing happened on Oswald.

INT:

From what you've seen from your privileged position, documents which have not been released, do you get a firmer impression both that there was a cover up

SENATOR: have a very thorough investigation but if you denied the most relevant, startling, exciting facts at the time er--the investigation means nothing.

INT: If the theory which the Warren Commission supported of Oswald acting alone, a deranged person acting alone were true, shouldn't all the documents, all the documents relating to Oswald have been released by now?

SENATOR:= I think there's absolutely no reason for not releasing these documents. I am one of the few people because of my committee assignment and security clearance is privileged to go in the archives and inspect them. And 98% of the material that I saw has absolutely no reason to be locked up and it's a mystery to me why it hasn't been released sooner.

INT: Well why is it say an Oswald CIA file only some like 60 out of a thousand documents have been released?

SENATOR: I think they're obviously hiding some relationship with the intelligence community, and it's a little bit like the Jack Ruby case. J. Edgar Hoover denied that he was an informer for the FBI. Yet under the Freedom of Information Act release we found that he had 8 contacts with the FBI. Now that was as plain to say that a contact 8 times wasn't an informer, yet the pros in the game said if you talked to a person twice that's an informer, so we know that Hoover lied about Ruby being an informer for the FBI and I suspect exactly the same thing happened on Oswald.

INT: From what you've seen from your privileged position, & documents that which have not been released, do you get a firmer impression both that there was a cover up



INT:

at the White House and even that there was a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy?

SENATOR:

Well I certainly get the very strong conviction that there was a cover up at the White House level, absolutely. The conspiracy park is harder to prove, because I think all the things that had anything to do with the possible conspiracy were never put in the files in the first place. I think they were given the self-destruct treatment and weren't investigated and that's why we didn't have the Cuban sections of the FBI and the CIA do the work.

INT:

But do you think that if all the documents that you've seen were made available, many more people would have more doubts about the conventional findings of the Warren commission?

SENATOR:

Absolutely, I also think we'd have many more ways to go in getting at the truth and it'd make it a lot easier to ascertain and I think that's exactly why the documents are--not been released over this time frame.

INT:

What's your view now of the truth?

SENATOR:

My view is er--basically there was a gigantic coverup out of the White House; my view is that there was in fact a relationship between the Cuban connection and the assassination and my view is that more than one person were involved.

INT:

Have you any idea of the identity or the affiliation of the more than one person?

SENATOR:

Yes I do but I have to say in all frankness that they are some of the best leads our sub-committee has are now before the House committee and I feel to protect



SENATOR:

the sanctity of their investigation and as well as my committee requirements, I honestly can't discuss them. EMK

INT:

But when the congressional committee, the House committee reports will we get clearer evidence do you think of different people other than Lee Harvey Oswald being involved in the assassination?

SENATOR:

I think you will get a different picture, how conclusive it will be will depend on their diligence and success with the leads that we've passed on to them, but we've passed on some very hot leads and that were timely and are still being pursued.

INT:

Can we learn anything from the titles of those documents that haven't been released, from the titles even we don't know what is in the documents, can we learn anything about the nature of those documents just from the titles?

SENATOR:

I think the--yes, you can, and think a lot of it relates to Lee Harvey Oswald's dealings with the Intelligence Community, I think that's basically what they're trying to protect.

INT:

Do you now believe that Lee Harvey Oswald was an Intelligence Agent?

SENATOR:

I believe he was working for somebody in the Intelligence Agency and either playing a single or double agent game, who, I don't know until we get all the documents out, and all the material declassified.

INT:

But Richard Hounds the deputy CIA Director swore on oath to the Warren Commission that there is no material in the CIA records that there was any contact had or even contemplated with Oswald.