

Appeals - JFK  
Mr. Allen McCreight, Chief  
FOIA/PA Branch  
FBI  
Washington, D.C. 20535

11/4/78

Dear Mr. McCreight,

Because your letter of 11/3 deals with a number of different subjects I address them separately, which may be easier for you, me and Mr. Shea.

My request for a photograph of Anatoli M. Golitsin was, as you repeat, for a published or non-secret photograph. If there is no photograph that is non-secret I recognize that a (b)(1) claim might be applicable. This is why I limited my request to what is not secret. However, you make the (b)(1) claim without stating that you do not have a non-secret picture. The clear inference is that you do have a non-secret picture and make a "national security" claim for what is within the public domain. This, of course, I do appeal. Correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that the KGB has pictures of its defector. If the KGB wants to knock him off it will not lack for pictures to provide to any of its "liquid affairs" or "wet" operatives. The prospects of a self-starter having any such interest is extremely remote. And he and other defectors do walk around with their bare faces hanging out. So while I began with the belief that there might be some conditions under which a (b)(1) claim might be applicable, you provide no reason for making the claim and do not even do what is obvious if you have no picture of him that is ~~not~~ within the public domain - accept the invitation I extended.

My interest really is in seeing a picture and I'll explain why.

Several years ago, when virtually nobody outside the agencies of which I had made information requests knew of my interest in Yuri Nosenko, I received a series of phone calls from a man with a heavy and I believed Russian accent. He called himself Mr. Martin. He had no knowledge of my work. He did not even know the titles of my book or anything about their content. His knowledge was limited to my interest in Nosenko and his clear purpose was to impress a point of view upon me. Mr. Martin could not hide his hatred and made no effort to. His hatred bordered on the irrational.

My requests were of the Archives, the FBI and the CIA.

There came a time when Mr. Martin proposed a person meeting. He said he lived in the Washington area and asked if we could set a time and place when I would be closer to him than I live. I picked a time I knew I had to be in Rockville, it was acceptable to him, and because I planned some shopping at Hechingers we met there. He also made purchases, of seeds for his garden. They were on sale. He gave me an idea of where he lived, as I recall in the Wheaton area, and of his gardening problems and limitations. We went to a nearby fast-food place for lunch and continued our discussion, largely his diatribe and the worst possible manner of trying to persuade anyone else.

While in all other ways he was pleasant and agreeable, except for not paying me for the copy of one of my books we used as a means of identification, as he promised, he ran off at the mouth considerably about other defectors. If I had the interest I would have learned more about them and spotted some. He even told me where one works and the capacity of that employment. If I'd had any interest in making an identification of him in his new identity, that also would have been easy. But I respected his wish and did not even try to look at his car and get its license number.

Since then, including in the Epstein book Legend, much more information about defectors, including Golitsyn, has become public knowledge. Golitsin, it is now known, has the hatred Mr. Martin manifested toward Nosenko. This made me wonder about Mr. Martin

and his atypical uncoolness, his not even bothering to have a pretext with me and his consuming hatred. I am not persuaded that a man who had no knowledge of me or my work or my Rosenko interest served any personal interest in his phone calls or seeking the later personal meeting.

Golitsin's employer is no longer a secret matter, if he has the same employer he had more than a decade ago.

Because I believe that Mr. Martin was serving an interest other than his own in attempting to influence me with regard to what Rosenko told the FBI - and I do believe the FBI's reports that I have - I want to see a photograph of Mr. Golitsin.

I do not hide from you my belief that if Mr. Golitsin was acting on behalf of a federal agency in trying to influence me that would be very wrong.

I did not believe that the FBI had sent him to influence me. But when you refuse to comply with a request for a non-secret photograph and make a "national security" claim for a request limited to the non-secret, I do wonder. My wonder includes whether the FBI has relevant knowledge and seeks to hide it in the interest of another agency.

Compliance with my request will in no way endanger the man. It will not - cannot - provide any lead to his new identity. My request is limited to what is well known to the KGB. Isn't the time ever going to come when the FBI and other agencies stop withholding from the American people what is so well known to the KGB? You even claim that in the interest of "national security" you have to withhold what you knew very well the KGB knows.

Crying wolf is no longer a mere habit. It is a fixation.

McCreight 11/3/78

Boyle and Martin motion pictures.

You state, and I therefore believe you were informed by others in the FBI, that Martin's film was "furnished" your New Orleans field office. This is at best ambiguous. No one without my detailed knowledge it would be misleading, leading to the belief that someone in the FBI has an interest in misleading.

Martin "furnished" his film to the Minneapolis field office. It sent the film to New Orleans.

At the time the President was killed Martin was back in college, in Minneapolis. He is my source.

You say that neither the New Orleans field office nor FBIHQ retained a copy. Will you please inform me about Minneapolis?

This is not prompted by curiosity. Martin told me that what was returned to him is not his original film. He had a simple and effective way of knowing this, an unusual procedure he following in filming.

I find it provocative, after all the trivia and nonsense I have read in FBI reports of what is described as an investigation of the assassination of a President, that this film was found by the FBI to "contain nothing of value to the investigation" when it shows a view of Oswald's face I have not seen in any other photograph and shows him being arrested along with those who caused the arrest, two of whom served the FBI. (Meaning at least two.) It also shows other people and the exact place of the arrest.

The Archives informed me long ago (this is another 1968 request I made of the FBI) that it has neither the film nor any reference to it nor any reference to this Martin in anything provided by the FBI. Before Martin gave his film to the FBI there was a Presidential Commission and, supposedly, it was in charge of the investigation and it was to determine what it found relevant and "of value."

From the records available in the Archives the FBI never informed the Commission that it also had the Doyle film, which was taken at the same time as the Martin film. Of course the FBI did not give the Doyle film to the Commission, either.

Yes, thank you, a black and white copy is quite satisfactory.

Powell reports and film.

You have yet to state that this former Army Intelligence man, who was inside the TSED for the entire period of the search and had a loaded camera, took only the single photograph outside the building mentioned in FBI reports with which I am familiar. If there are other photographs, I of course I would like prints of them. Even if he had no flash, a matter on which the FBI did not report.

Thank you for referring me to Sections 60 and 61 of 105-82555. As soon as I can I will read those sections. However, those Powell reports meaning those he filed, were made available to the FBI in Texas. You do not state that the FBI has no other records and I do want copies of Powell's reports, as I believe I requested. You refer me to the FBIHQ copies only. We both know that some records are not forwarded by the field offices. If any records are in Texas that are not in Sections 60 and 61 I would appreciate copies of them, as I requested in 1968.

McCreight 11/3/78

"...investigation of the communication allegedly written by Lee Harvey Oswald and destroyed by FBI Special Agent James P. Hosty..."

"Allegedly"? The one thing that is certain is that Oswald did write a letter.

All the available information is that he also wrote it to SA Hosty.

What is publicly know of Oswald-Hosty communications is limited to what was leaked to the Dallas Times-Herald after the retirement of former SAC Gordon Shanklin.

Ten years or ~~more~~<sup>so</sup> ago I heard of other Hosty-Oswald communications. I presume these also will be included.

The information came to me from a former SA.

McCreight # 11/3/78

CIA liaison

"Records ... from both FBI Headquarters and Dallas Field Office files."

Dallas was Office of Origins.

But other filed offices were involved.

The CIA was involved in this country and outside it.

All records do not go to the OO or FBIHQ.

A number of different kinds of CIA sources also were involved.

Inside and outside the U.S.

You refer (page 2, paragraph 3) to "the records" rather than "all the records."

I presume by "the records" you really meant "all the records."

Nosenko

I am happy to know that at last there is a review "to determine if current classification is warranted."

We are but a month away from the effective date of the new executive order. I ask that its less restrictive standards be employed.

Doing this now is one means of avoiding any possible need to do the same work over again. The request that it be done now is consistent with the provisions of the new executive order, which I have read.

May I also remind you that such was declassified for the House Select Committee on Assassinations and that it made much public, including a staff report on alleged contradictions in what Nosenko is stated to have said.

While I cannot tell you the total extent of the Warren Commission's internal memoranda on or about Nosenko I can tell you that much of what was once classified now is not classified. With regard to some of these records, some of what was originally withheld when there was partial release since has been released. An example is the names of those in the CIA who talked the Commission out of crediting what the FBI reported. (As I have told you I happen to believe what the FBI reported.)

The previously withheld pages of the Commission's 1/21/64 executive session transcript and the entire transcript of 6/23/64 were disclosed to me by the CIA the day a brief from the Government was due in the appeals court. This was only the middle of last month. Aside from disclosing that there never was any basis for any classification of them these transcripts disclose a CIA offer to have two of its KGB defectors review the non-classified information the Commission had pertaining to Oswald and ambivalence about having Nosenko do the same thing. Later Nosenko did do this and the staff memo on it is no longer classified. (The FBI has disclosed the Deriabin name in this regard and the HSCA disclosed that there then were only two KGB defectors working for the CIA.)

Sincerely,