

Chapter 14. The "Wet Job" on Hasty.

It took Lyndon Johnson's Ambassador Mann, one of the good ol' Texas boys, only overnight to get back into the swing. In Number 195, MEXI 7209, referring to 7203, in which Alvarado Ugarte confessed to fabricating the whole thing and claim he did because of the threat to "hang him by his balls."

space
in
mt

"Amb White sent cable to Mr. Alexis Johnson recounting contents of ref (or the confession of faking) and recommending that (redacted) and KUBARK consider sending experts (including LCFLUTTER operator) to (redacted) to interrogate ALVARADO."

In this Mann could have hoped only to find some way of explaining the confession away, of getting his effort to start that war against Castro back on track.

Headquarters got back on the Mann track in Number 210 the next day. Its DIR 86563 says that "Although we are confident that ALVARADO ~~IS A FABRICATOR~~ is a fabricator and that his ~~retraction~~ retraction of his confession is false, it has been decided that he should be LCFLUTTERED. ...Pls arrange to have ALVARADO ~~released to us for several more days.~~ released to us for several more days. ... We do want to blow him. ... We do realize that the Mexicans and Nics have some equities and plenty of rights in this case but we do not want to stop and discuss jurisdictional questions. ..."

space
about

The ~~at~~ Mexico City station set it up for the early morning of the 5th and will have a ~~turn~~ translator for the fluttrer named Davis who speaks no Spanish.

In Number 213, DIR 86621 of December 4, headquarters found this plan and progress most heartening. All parts approved..."

7 What seems to ~~contradict~~ ^{confirm - refute} the CIA's official statements that it had "routinely" erased all tapes after two weeks is its Number 218 of December 4, MEXI 7241. It reports "holding" it is ~~hold~~ ^{hold} all ~~tapes~~ reels from 22 Nov for both Cuban and Sov Embassies" but "Unless advised to contrary, Station will erase routing tapes Sovemb keeping normal two week lag."

Why the CIA wants to polygraph the confessed fabricator again is not stated but there is a possible suggestion that it is because he confessed to the Mexican police and they hope to rehabilitate his credibility because he claims he was abused by the police.

Alas, fortunately, for whatever the CIA at headquarters and in Mexico City had in

222
but fortunetely for all honest purposes, the polygraph reported in "umber 232 of December 6, MEXI 7289 shows "ALVARADO indictes he fabricated facts of his story," But the station till stains to find some basis for crediting him in saying he was "unsure of day of week" and suggests it could have been the 17th., when Oswald could not have been there. "Deception patterns were evidenced" when he was shown "photos of Oswald during testing." When he was confronted with this he tried to ^{le} explain it away by saying "he must have made honest mistake" in identifying Oswald.

That the CIA station is dying hard and still strains to have the phony believed is reflected by its note suggesting that polygraphing Latins is not dependable, "How good is FLUTTER on Latinos?" *Pocist?*

In its DIR 87666 of December 7, Number 234, headquarters said, "We satisfied ~~in~~ his whole story about seeing ~~anyone~~ anyone paid to ^{and} assassinate pres was a hoax." But they do not want him punished "to avoid all possible mishaps which might induce ALVARADO to resume his fabriacting on this case." But with his dishonesty established, why is that a probelm, why an excuse for his law violations in Mexico? Or can it be that they want the man to keep his mouth shut and ~~to~~ not tell the story about how he conned ~~the hell~~ ~~out of~~ those so anxious fools who are supposed to be the most professional of spooks?

By the time March rolled around, with the reports on the shadowing of Kostikov no longer mentioned when all have reported only his normal ^{activities}, the CIA gets around to the kind of propaganda about the assassination that it likes. The station reflects taking seriously the propaganda of the extreme right with its not to ~~check~~ "check" the March 16, ^{message 1/7} Number 307, which cites no messages either way in "Washington Report ~~BACKGROUND~~ BACKGROUND FOR ASSASSINATION, published by The American Security Council Editorial Staff. (good reading) Analysis on 'why and how' OSWALD's orders could have come from Moscow." "Anything, no matter how irrational or without basis, that gets them back into a Cold War "solution" is "good reading" ~~the chief excuse of Cold Warriors~~ for those lustiest of Cold Warriors for whom even the assassination of a President is a legitimate basis for hoking up an excuse for going to war.

What is there to "check" ~~and~~ against what that can be no more than the at be st

the opinion of a biased propoganda outfit^f of the right political extreme^c? Can it know the answer to "hy" Oe Oswald allegedly got those orders? Can it possibly know more about the "how" of spook communications that the spookiest of all spooks know? And how should this be the proper function of a CIA station when it has those lavish and so well staffed headquarters?

How could this opinion come from fact when those who formed the opinion knew nothing about the officially- established fact of the assassination^{and that} so long before even the Report was published?

In all of this there has yet to be the first word of what can be evaluated as fact. It's how could the crime be solved without a basis in fact? There is no way. But these people so anxious to get that third World War going demonstrate a willingness to stretch any excuse toward that end, not matter how flimsy or irrational that excuse may be.

These summaries reflect what was ^{already} known from the FBI's ~~and~~ disclosed record, that they are following up on all the nuttiness and all the innocent oddities in an effort to find what could be able to justify ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ going after Castro - which means to start a war. They reflect neither an interest in or any effort to learn what might relate to the assassination that might somehow be available in their territory. Only seeking a cause for blaming the Cubans, the Soviets or both.

Before the Cold War, analysis was the essence of intelligence, not the "dirty tricks" of the spooks. Simple analysis established that Castro did not want to eliminate ^{Rennedy} his only real protector against any invasion; that Khrushchev did not prefer the hawk Johnson to the ~~the~~ ^{the} Dove Kennedy with whom he was then in correspondence as they ~~were~~ groped toward peace; and that the Soviet Union, an economic basket case, needed peace urgently and for that reason alone, although there were others, could not have been responsible for killing the dove to get a hawk.

If this ever dawned on the CIA or on Mann there is no sign of it. All signs are to the opposite.

The intent not even to try to think this way, to have analyzed the assassination, even with the assumption that Oswald was the assassin, is further reflected in the March 31 Number 313. It is headed, THE NEWS- Hidden side of ^{OSWALD} ~~Oswald~~ case by Ralph de Toledano." It says that Toledano writes about "Theory ~~of Oswald~~ on assassination- History and background of time in Russia, facility in leaving Russia ~~with~~ w/a wife, etc. ... ^{The} mad political assassins issue flamboyant justification for their acts. The trained assassin clams up. This is what Oswald did, What OSWALD really was and who his principals were will remain in obscurity unless a new defector brings the story out with him."

Of all the articles and think-pieces ^{childish, fact-less Cold War & trashy assumption} this was worth the Mexico City CIA station's time, attention and recording?

It did not know that Oswald had not "clammed up" the ^{little} one time he had a chance to be heard? That at the momentary press conference the police had given him, their real reason to show they had not battered him, he had proclaimed his innocence? They did not know that in the hallway when being moved he told the press he was a "patsy"? And did they know, did they have any way of knowing, what he had told the police when questioned? These things the political stupidities of the ^{right} need not know. They have their beliefs and the beliefs of that ~~fring~~ is all the "evidence" and "fact" they need. As in the CIA's liking and that right-wing ideologue writing that Oswald was a "trained assassin." Do ^{little} they know anything at all about assassins, assassinations and "wet jobs" ~~to~~ not to know that no ~~dispute~~ ^{dispute} dispatched and "trained assassin" would have so undependable a rifle, one that required more time just to sight because it was not made for the telescopic sight on it, meaning that the eye would have to be removed from the sight each time the bolt was operated to ~~dis~~ eject the expended shell and put in a new in firing position? His imagined "principals" did not know that there are almost no rifles ~~more~~ not more dependable than that one, those that are made for telescopic sight and eject the used shell and put a new bullet in firing position automatically?

If the political idiots like de Toledano and the like-minded stupidities in the

CIA station did not know this little they knew nothing at all about shooting or about assassination ^{s/} and the problems they entail that are eliminated in advance, ^{these} of which that rifle is one. That no "wet job" principals would ~~never~~ have given their shooter. Besides which the evidence is that Oswald bought it himself. "Wet job" experts, those "principals" who are imagined to the delight of the CIA, could not afford more than a lousy \$20 for ^{the} ~~such a job?~~ ^{weapon for}

The conclusion of this what to the CIA station was "THE NEWS" is that Oswald and Trotsky's killer " had much in common psychologically." ^{at the} ~~Now that~~ That ^{time} deToladano had no way of knowing anything at all about Oswald "psychologically" is a reality that did ^{not} ~~not~~ trouble the Cold Warriors in the CIA station.

^Q Number 3164, ^W ~~xxxxxx~~ the next item of the next day, March 31, this document devotes more than half ^{a page} to an unnamed magazine's ^{to} ~~xxxxxx~~ comments on a book by the emigre United States reporter the station identifies as ^{a "Mugger"} ~~xxxxxx~~

With earlier mention of their coming, in Number 335 of April 14, reports that the Commission's Coleman, Willens and Slawson had arrived and were ushered into the ambassador's office for him to promise them full cooperation. There were several such meetings, with the time they took given as as much as three hours. These three "reviewed the take" of the phone tapings of the ~~and~~ Cuban and Soviet embassies, including of the heads of state and their ambassadors. They ^{the} "reviewed" the Duran "case," which is no case of any kind except against the CIA and the police. Then, "had me review case of Alvarado." Who "me" is is nowhere even suggested. "Me" evaluates the "cases" and says that the "outstanding ones" were of Alvarado Ugarte and Duran! "Outstanding" when they were and produced nothing at all? ^{the Commission's} ~~and~~ before going to Mexico ~~they~~ had conferred with the promoted Mann, then assistant secretary of state. "They said that Assistant Sec Mann still has 'the feeling in his guts' that Castro hired OSWALD to kill Kennedy; they said, however, that the Commission had not been able to get any proof of this."

"Me" has a ⁱⁿ comment in the margin, "And Mann was positive." ~~xxxxxx~~ This is to say that the nuts in the station were still hung up on the proven fabrication.

This item concludes by saying "these visitors were pleased with Station's work on OSWALD case." ^{of} "What there was for them to be pleased about is not apparent. "He" has this margin/comment, "What did they accomplish?" The reality is nothing at all. But I doubt that the Commission wasted all that time and money is not what "me" had in mind. It is more likely that the Commission was not impressed with what the station had to show for its "outstanding" cases ^{They} that were stupid in concept ^{may have failures that} and ~~proved~~ the stupidity of the station as well as its political ignorance. Aside from what is reflected above it had ~~had~~ no comment to make ^{it} ~~and~~ does not claim to have explained ^a to the Commission that it made no sense at all for Oswald to try to get to Russia by way of Cuba when in those days there ~~was~~ only one ~~one~~ plane a week, a Russian plane, and with little question it could not have space for an Oswald; that it made even less sense for him to try to get a Cuba visa without one from the USSR in hand, and he knew of personal knowledge the problems entailed in getting that. In short, what Oswald reportedly ^{of} went to ^{to} Mexico for makes no sense at all, and he should have known ^{that} ~~this~~ in advance.

In all the theorizing about the assassination in ~~and~~ all those books supposedly on it and of ~~the~~ all the discussions about Oswald in Mexico which has so titillated those who live for their theories, I recall none raising ^a these considerations. Or noting that there were regular flights ^{between Moscow and} ~~to and from~~ Canada ^{Canada} and that it was more lenient in granting passports ~~and visas~~ than most countries.

That such considerations are foreign to the assassination nuts is not nearly as unusual as that it is totally ~~is~~ foreign to the professionals in the CIA in their work supposedly on the assassination.

In its long comments in Number 352 of June 24 on what was taped from the phone bug inside the Soviet embassy, the CIA says they "Feel quite possible that OSWALD spoke with YATSKOV ~~basis~~ (sic) ^{Oswald} 1 Oct 63" rather than Kostikov. ^{disruptive of} He did speak to OBYEDKOV. Here the station notes the discrepancies between Kostikov and Yatskov, Oswald not having described ~~the~~ Kostikov. Then, "Also, given the apparent frankness ~~with~~ of Y's discussions with (redacted), particularly ~~with~~ his views ~~on~~ Stalin and Khrushchev, would appear

possible he told (redacted) truth re OSWALD, at minimum re meeting OSWALD."

Dear
Here that, Hotshot Hosty? Even the CIA in Mexico acknowledge the probability that Oswald did not meet with Kostikov. By this ^{time} the surveillances of Kostikov had yielded nothing at all even to suggest he was in any ^{"was not"} such role in Mexico. *# [if he had been, he would not have lingered there.]*

In 353 of the same day they record orders to check from DIR 30547 " to determine if ~~KATSKOV~~ was in Mexi City during period OSWALD there..." This seems never to have suggested itself to those experienced spooks, it being that obvious.

On June 16, in Number 458, DIR 12633, "H&S has reviewed advance copy book entitled "Inquest" ~~by~~ by Edward Jay Epstein EPSTEIN, subject being assassination. ...Since book now in print but not yet on sale, foregoing is advance notice to alert Station for whatever precautionary measures..." dots in original. This was over ^{Epstein's} the use of the CIA picture said to have been of Oswald but was not.

Epstein's book is not on the assassination. ^{It} is on the Warren Commission. Review copies were out and more than a week earlier copies were given away at the annual booksellers' convention in Washington. This seems to indicate that ^{a/} headquarters was alerting the station to possible questions rather than informing it ~~of~~ about the books and what they say. At least five books were by then available, including Whitewash, ^{four} and they have not ~~been~~ ^{ed.} mention. The CIA had Whitewash before then. I was given an amusing account of two spooks going to the Saville book store on the south side of P street in northwest Washington, west of Wisconsin Avenue, by clerks in that store. It took two ~~now~~ ^o obvious ~~or both~~ spooks to buy that book.

On August 8, in Number 463, with no source indicated, ^{they} this refers to The Second Oswald: The Case for a Conspiracy Theory - Inquest by Edward Jay Epstein and Whitewash by Harold Weisberg - by Richard ^Popkins." It does not say whether it refers to the New York Review of Books article or the Avon paperback by Popkin.

Then in Number 464, of August 8x 13, there is the report that Mark Lane's book is due. Quotations from it indicate they had the book.

will not have
On the 24th of January, 1967, in Number 503, BOOK DISPATCH 5847 (9 attachments h/w -
27 SECRET, 8 U_nclassified TO Certain Stations and Bases from Chief (redacted) Subject:

*Exposure
indicated*
 Countering Criticism of the Warren ~~Report~~ Report. PSYCH 1) Our Concern... increasing challenge ~~to~~
 to the Warren ~~Report~~ Commission's Report ... 2. Trend of opinion ~~is a~~ ^{is a} matter ~~is~~ to
 the U. S. including our organization... 3) Action. We do not recommend that discussion
 of the assassination question be initiated...^a However, they are ~~to~~ "To employ propa-
 ganda... 4) in private or public media discussion" for which it suggests useful argu-
 ments, "No significant new evidence," which is entirely irrelevant to criticisms
 of the ~~Report~~ Report, and "counter speculations by encouraging reference to the Commission's
~~Report~~ Report itself..." These elisions are in the original.

That CIA irrelevancy in an area in which the law prohibits its involvement, demanding
 "new evidence ^{of them}" was the most effective of all the criticism of the earlier books.

Why the CIA should get involved in this either abroad or at home is not apparent.
 That is not its role. That it got into the controversy is not inconsistent with its
 having a special reason for that interest and involvement.

It would have been much easier and safer for the CIA stations and bases to be told
 to say that comment on books is not within their assigned duties.

What seems to eliminate the canard not original with Hosty about Oswald and Kostikov
 is in Number 615 of June 12, It cites a "MEMO on Pavel Antonovich YATSKOV" prepared by
 (redacted)- YATSKOV has stated that he talked to Oswald OSWALD ~~at~~ when he was in Mexico
 (ca 28 ~~xxxxxSeptember~~ Sept 63) and that he believed OSWALD was too nervous a person
 to have been able to shoot Pres K (Source: (redacted))."

Number 677 of January 10, 1968, is captioned "RHW MVQA - GARRISON." It begin by ~~SE~~
 quoting the right-wing Paul Scott column without identifying the column. It second number-
 ed item is (2) a former ^{m/} congressional committee employee has given secret testimony be-
 fore the New Orleans grand jury." That was seven months earlier and it was no more secret
 than any other grand jury testimony. I was not admonished not to talk about it. However,
 I did not. But again, this ^{was} ~~is~~ a proper activity for the CIA, which by statute is precluded

from any domestic activity? Even more so is the politicizing of this with a biased ~~SE~~
 criticism of me that is deliberately contrived? I can't guess the source of this, which
 is not given, and much is plain untrue.

W. F. ...

The former congressional employee whose furnishing of information to GARRISON has interested congressional probers is Harold WEISBERG, author of books on the assassination, attacking the Warren Comm, the FBI and CIA; ... WEISBERG is the same man who testified in 1940 before a House committee that he bought forged documents in an attempt to link the Dies committee to the Silver Shirts. (At that time the Silver Shirts was a militant right-wing organization on the attorney general's subversive list. The documents were used in an abortive attempt by a Michigan congressman to smear the Dies committee, forerunner of the present House Committee on Un-American Activities.) Records of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee also show that WEISBERG was dropped from the staff of the late Senator LaFollette's Special Investigating Subcommittee for leaking subcommittee confidential information. / ... In WEISBERG's book on the assassination, he contends that OSWALD was framed by an impersonator. Congressional probers are now checking WEISBERG's long-time contacts in the CIA and State Dept, including several persons who transferred to those agencies from the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) after World War II.

I furnished no information to Garrison, but he did make use of my books. Whether or not I gave ~~him~~ him any information was not public. What business that could be of the unnamed "congressional probers" is not indicated and there could not be any, the First Amendment then being alive and well - and there being no committee looking into the assassination as of that time.

I did testify before the House Un-American committee but I did not testify that "I bought forged documents in an attempt to link the Dies committee to the Silver Shirts." ~~It was as described, but I wonder if the Attorney General's subversive organizations list had been established by then.~~

Congressman Frank Hook of Michigan did use them, over my objections, but not to "smear" the committee but in his effort to defeat the motion to extend its life for two more years. What he said about Dies ignoring native fascists was 100% true, until that forced him to subpoena William Dudley Pelley, the Silver ~~Shirts~~ Shirts' head. That ended that group of ^{native} Nazis.

What this does not say and was public is that those forgeries were executed by a man being paid by that committee, that he has attested to their genuineness before a notary, that when Dies forced a grand jury ^{effort} to indict me it refused ^{that grand jury; it did} to indict ^{Dies' agent} me for two felonies, ^{then} for which Dies copped a public plea for him, and that as to the best of my knowledge ~~is true~~, the Dies committee never dared publish my testimony,

That item about that Senate Internal Security Committee is news to me. It never spoke to me. I leaked ~~nothing~~ nothing, I had nothing to leak and neither the committee, to the best of my knowledge, ^{no I} had anything confidential, ~~or did I.~~ It was then the committee's editor and I had nothing but the public record, of public hearings to be printed.

The CIA says that in "my book on the assassination, " which there were then four published. ^{He} contends ^{that} OSWALD ^{WAS FRAUD BY AN} by an impersonator." I contended no such thing. I merely reported what the Commission's records report of what I referred to as "the False Oswald". And I did no more than report that, in my first book only.

I have no idea what is in mind, if ~~anything~~ ^{if} anything other than propaganda and defamation, in "Congressional probers are not checking WEISBERG's long-time contacts in the CIA and the State ~~Department~~ Dept., including several persons transferred to those agencies from the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) after World War II." I

I was one of those transferred but as of the time of this alleged item I had and for a long time had no contact with any of those with whom I had worked. I had no contacts of any kind in the CIA and never did, ^{Not} ever. ~~This~~ ^{the} all ^{above} had been true for about two decades, ^{and would have referred to no more than one or two persons.}

If in this item the CIA is reporting only what Paul Scott wrote, ~~he~~ also never, ever spoke to me.

But again, how can this be of proper interest to or a proper activity of the foreign intelligence agency for which all domestic activities ^{were} ~~are~~ prohibited by its charter? More so of its Mexico City station. And why was not a word of this disclosed to ^{persuant} me ^{under} my requests under the Freedom of Information Act ^{of more than two decades ago?}

This also involved ^{the} ~~an~~ illegal expenditure of tax moneys none of which were or could have been appropriated for any such uses. While compared with the fantastic wastes of tax money this is minuscule, ^{what it asks} as improper for the CIA it is not minuscule. ^{It} could not properly engage in this kind of defamation and propaganda and it could not properly spend a penny from taxes this way.

Except in principle this is minor compared with the reflection of the CIA's lack of professionalism, its ineptness, its stupidities and violations of law and what deserves emphasis, ^{its} using its influence on the Mexican police to get them to beat Silvia Duran up on ^{baseless} suspicion only, then to get a false confession for her, and to cost her ^{her} job.

This is not one of what Hosty referred to as his "bombshells," none of this is.

His supposed biggest bomb, that Kostikov was connected with Oswald's killing the President, is not even a squizzer. It has no powder and no fuze so it could not explode.

The CIA itself concluded that there was ^{for this,} no basis for what was at best only an unsupported suspicion to begin with. But the mileage the irresponsible right-wingers, Hosty in particular got out of this, ^{was} great. In it, Hosty pre^{ve}minently, lied to the people of the country and of the world.

So ^{also} did the CIA try and with leaks did do.

^{In} ~~In~~ providing a basis for evaluating Hosty's ^{words} ~~words~~ - about anything at all - but particularly about his non-existing Mexican "bombshells" with which he got such vast international attention, we also use the CIA's own records to tell another untold part of the endless mis^{de}feasances, malfeasances and nonfeasances of it along with the rest of the government when confronted with the assassination and ever since then.

These records and those disclosed two decades ago make a clear case that the CIA with and by misleading Ambassador Mann were engaged in what, if carried forward, could have led to World War III, by using the assassination as an excuse for building a non-existing and entirely false case of Cuban, Soviet or their joint arranging for the assassination.

~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ That ^{NT} this abysmally ignorant and really stupid career of wor-monger-
ing as our ambassador to Mexico need not have been the reason that ~~despite~~ it Johnson promoted him to be assistant secretary of State for the West Latin America. But it is quite obvious that it did not persuade Johnson not to promote him after after this manifestation of the poorest kind of judgement and the ~~greatest~~ greatest irresponsibility.

Had it not been for the attention he drew to the CIA's ~~propaganda~~ that on its face was false, none of this would have been available for Hosty's misuses of it. But that he did misuse it and how he misused it and lied about it and about his own record in Dallas on the assassination investigation destroys any ~~ever~~ credibility Hosty may have had with his allegations about anything at all, including his denial that Oswald had ~~any~~ had any kind of official connection, particularly not as his informer or source.