

Documents attached to Briggs' Vaughn index

1240-1005, of 7/65, which is when Lane had suspended his activity and I was taking WW around to publishers - and I thus know of no other reason for any interest in the DeMohrenschildts, is a gross reference, without citation of the record itself, which ought be disclosable. I find it of interest and call your attention to the fact that it seems to say that a CIA component has a "permanent" collection of material on "Ruby/Oswald." This can refer to each separately or to an alleged relationship. But this seems to identify a component with permanent copies that can be provided.

* 1249-1010 is a 1961 indices search requests covering Lee and Marina saying "see B," but no B is attached. The first name is not that of Oswald, but ?H.Oswald is added, with a 7/8/55 date, under "RESULTS REVIEW." Under this is "attached," but nothing is attached. There also seems to be a '64 date on a '61 search clip. Bearing the same Doc. Number is an "abstract slip," the first of the CIA's that I recall. Thus there seems to have been CIA abstracts like those of the FBI, which someone might want to request. If provided, they could identify the missing records. As they would if they'd been searched. Too illegible to be deciphered with any certainty, but two clear numbers are written on, 1048, 1049. Could these be the numbers of disclosed records?

1257-1035 suggests that the CIA tapes at least some incoming phone calls.

1258-1034 seems to indicate existence of a CIA "crank file."

1260-1033 is of interest because supposedly the names of all who worked with Oswald in the Marines have been disclosed and thus not properly withheld. Nor is his offer to help when those who were interviewed were disclosed publicly. What can be of considerable interest to scholars is this information, which appears to date to Oswald before and after transfer to Santa Ana. Among those I can recall this could fit Thornay, except that he claimed not to have spoken to other agencies, and he never worked for the FBI. This person seems to have been in a Marines reserve unit two of whose members were Agency employees and had tipped the CIA off about the coming call. The information provided is not attached, is not immune, and can be significant. This is hardly an intelligence source and no intelligence method is involved. At the least the privacy claim to withhold the name can't be asserted because of prior official disclosure and it alone can be important. Ask for the withheld information he provided, all of which was supposedly disclosed to and by the Commission.

1273-1027 reports a "Human Events" article stating that Oswald was seen several times by a CIA rep in the Moscow Embassy. What is interesting is that Richard E. Snyder is identified and there is no denial that he was still CIA or had been. But 609-786, same as 1274-1026, does.

1313-1036-D and 1326-1042 relate to Clay Shae, Arcacha Smith

The first refers to communications from Domestic Contact Service, N.O., refers to its undisclosed communications regarding Shaw's relationship, I presume, if not other things also. That was 4/11/67. The second is dated 9/28/ and still does not contain complete info on Shaw, which appears to be unusual. It also is limited to DCS.

With regard to Arcacha, the CIA denies that he was the registered representative of Frente Revolucionario Democrática (FRD) but avoids reporting that his associate, Ronnie Caire, was so registered. If the CIA reported any relationship with FRD it is excised, but I believe that relationship is public, officially, whether or not by CIA. The apparent claim to withhold is "methods," not appropriate if disclosed. The answer to the question of the CIA's relationship and support of Cuban Revolutionary Council also is withheld, apparently the same claim, but it was officially disclosed when the CIA announced its termination as of the end of April 1963, (CIA denies any relationship with the Crusade to Free Cuba but there is an excision. Caire was Arcacha's associate ~~with~~ with regard to Alvin Beaubouef, interesting that his 5/9/67 trip to Washington

"was supplied by a CIA contact." He should be identifiable and of some interest?

There is #11, which ask about any relations between Guy Banister and Hugh Ward with the CIA. The answer is excised. Unless they were employees, the claim is "intelligence methods" which is improbable. They do not claim confidential sources.

17 asks about lawyers involved and named and the CIA's denial is of payment or assistance, in general. Other relationships are possible, as, for example, if Dean Andrews' niece worked for the CIA. (She did work for an intelligence agency. I saw her the Saturday before she went to that work and shortly afterward when she was present at a conference of gifted students I addressed. She was present with a man she identified as a psychologist, with my last name. He ~~first~~ name is Pat Young.)

1331-502/1045, p. 3, at 8, states that CI made a detailed study of the Harrison investigation. It should be requested. I have no reason to doubt the rest of the information in this document.

1336-1049, when Guy Banister is mentioned,, follows his name with "#428810," which seems to indicate a CIA file or relationship, some identification of him with its given number.

1338-1052 begins with citation of a newspaper story about Banister. All the rest is excised. Unless he was an employee the exemption claimed is "relating to the nature of Agency intelligence methods."

1347-1059 quotes a Hoke May article reporting that Novel had addressed a letter to a Mr. Wifess, presumably connected with the CIA. All following is withheld. the claim is in connection with the CIA only, as a source or activity requiring continued protection. (I think Wifess was DHS, but maybe not)