#43 Lonnie Hudkins 2423 Mtg

The CIA was so uptight about the passing reference Rankin made to it its "record copy" was stamped "For FOIA Review on. [sic]May 1976." It would be "reviwwed" for "disclosure" beginning after thirteen years! Without any classification claimed or legitimately subject to claim!

Not only that, there is no information in the Rankin memo that came from the CIA so it had no basis at all for making any kind of claim to withhold it and the information in it!

That it did this does justify suspicion of the CIA.

This is because of a single sentence on page 3:

indent single space

Wade stated that he was also aware of an allegation that to the effect that Oswald was an informant for the CIA and carried Number 110669.

This numbering is consistent with CIA numbering. I have seen examples of it often on CIA records. It is used instead of names on those records.

Wade was correct in telling Warren and Rankin that the number attributed to the FBI was not as its informers are numbered for identification or as accounts are kept.

Hudkins told me that he had made the 172 and 179 number up to use on the phone in the belief that the FBI was taping his and other phones over this report. Hudkins also told me that not long after that was on this phone he was visited by the FBI.

Before theh Hudkinses and my wife and I became friends and in an effort to learn more about this I primed a reporter I knew to question Hudkins about the entire matter, including the fake numbers. In the course of this Hudkins claimed not to remember the correct entire number but he did give that reporter the first four of those six numbers correctly.

Of all the people of whom I know only my two friends, Hudkins and Henry Wade indicated any knowledge of that number.

When I asked Wade about it, my recollection after so many years is that he said he had no recollection of his source. When I asked Hudkins he just refused to answer. Given out ~~friendly~~ continuing friendly relationship I interpret this to mean that lonnie