

Dear Jim,

2/15/90

As I think you will perceive in my enclosed letter to Shaheen, this is not a good day for me but I'm not rewriting it, in part to be able to mail it when we soon go out for supper and in part to be able to write you about the Nosenko records that came today.

While a couple of these pages do have the Oswald number, they are mostly if not entirely not from the Oswald file but from the Nosenko espionage file, ~~660x~~ 65-68530.

In more recent years I've been keeping a card file of disclosed FBI numbers. This Nosenko number is not there. It is, of course, possible that I forgot to make a card. You may remember that I did get some that were, I'm sure, released under the request of Mike Mooney. You'll remember my telling the FBI not to dare call me a moonie.

First Moschella's letter to you of 2/5/90. You can have some real fun and perhaps it can help you in Mark's case. And first of all, why were these and the other records he refers to not disclosed to me? My second (Moonie) request was 1978 and I wrote often and at length and filed ignored appeals. Some of this at the very least was not provided. And what he said is outside the scope of your request, because it was not provided to HSCA, certainly is not outside my two requests if it relates to Nosenko. So, you can get it. I may write him about it. Now go over the paragraph that begins at the bottom of his second page. He says that they may not disclose records relating to living people under 6 and 7c and can't even confirm the existence of records. Yet I sent you his form saying that I am the subject of a request and that I am not the subject of a Gregory case request in which I was not the subject of investigative interest. He also says that this would be a violation of the Privacy act.

Yet when I wrote him about this he refused to respond and said, in general, which he may have intended to refer to other parts of what I wrote, that they would make what I wrote a matter of record.

OIP also refused to do ~~anything~~ anything. You have their letter to me.

Some of this might make a good Vaughn but I'm not sure. Some of what you have stapled together also is incomplete, with pages not logically following each other.

65-68530-41, 3/4/64 has the WFO file number withheld while the FBIHQ number isn't. The claim is b1. That a copy was sent to NY, also ~~of~~ others, may reflect referral for questioning Fedora. The WFO number is also withheld from other records.

Serial 50? (partly obliterated) 2/27/64 has the airtel withheld, the identification of it. Can they properly? ("referenced airtel")

Serial 27 is of the day before. 23 records in a single day? Referenced airtel not withheld here. I presume page 2 is of the same record. ALL of the first page is withheld under claim to 7c. Every word? *The serial numbers reflect with me activity & many records*

Serial 9 is dated 3/4/64. It withholds the identification of the Not Recorded copy. Under b1. On 2, what is marked unclassified is withheld as outside scope. Not outside mine.

3/5/64, Branigan to Sullivan is Not Recorded in the Nosenko file but the record copy in the Oswald file has the number partially eliminated in xeroxing.

Serial 39, to CIA with copies of reports on what Nosenko told FBI may and I believe does mark the beginning of the radically altered CIA treatment of Nosenko, from princely to incredibly abusive.

It appears from the last three pages, which bear no identification, that the FBI cast a critical eye on CIA interrogations and collateral investigations, not provided. On the second of these pages, a table of contents, I take it to the CIA memo, has all of the Summary and Conclusions withheld, every word, under b1, as secret. Has this not been disclosed, if subject to withholding, by the CIA in Hart's HSCA testimony? (page 1) The next page is 5, most withheld under b1...I've only skimmed for content and will do that on a better day, when my mind is clearer. Best,

*Harold*