

2599 LeConte Ave.  
Berkeley, CA 94709  
April 3, 1976

Dave Marston  
c/o Sen. Richard Schweiker  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Dave,

Enclosed are some of the CIA documents on the Kennedy assassination which have just been released, and my correspondence with the Agency. I alluded to this material when I talked with you on March 19. There are several points that might be of interest:

As originally released, CIA item 448 had the names of two Rockefeller Commission lawyers (David Belin and Robert Olsen) replaced by the phrase "agency official." I don't know anything about Olsen (other than that he was in law school with Belin), but I really don't think Belin is smart enough to be a CIA official. He has denied that he was working for the CIA. The CIA says that the use of "agency official" is a clerical error, which is certainly true in any case. Thus, although this is the most striking feature of the document, it is not the most important.

The odd thing about the CIA's explanation of the error (in the letter of March 31) is that Mr. Wilson seems to be saying that it was made in the sanitized version of this memo given to the Church Committee. You might want to check this. If true, it might be significant, since with the changes the memo doesn't make very much sense. It really didn't need to be sanitized at all.

What really interests me is that item 448 indicates that my memo was taken seriously, at least by Dr. Shannon. As I have mentioned, Olsen never contacted me, and the substance of my memo was ignored in the Rockefeller Report. There is only a passing reference to various people, presumably including me and George O'Toole, who submitted material which was just "a strained effort to draw inferences of conspiracy from facts which would not fairly support the inferences." (I think this is a fair description of the now-famous Rocca memo from the CIA, item 451, but I'm sure that reference was not intended.)

In this connection, it is noteworthy that CIA item 450 refers to previous comments on my memo. Since the CIA responded to my rather minor point about their analysis of the Zapruder film, it is safe to assume that they replied at some length to the rest of my memo. I have made a Freedom of Information Act request for the additional material.

I am quite curious to learn if the CIA did give their full response to the Church Committee. A failure to do so would, I think, be important. The CIA response should have included an analysis of the link between the Odio incident and the Veciana-Gonzalez plot to kill Castro, which George O'Toole and I wrote about in the Saturday Evening Post.

There are a number of other interesting things in the CIA documents, which I would of course be glad to discuss. It seems particularly significant that Rocca tried to revive the hypothesis that Castro was responsible. His memo to the Rockefeller Commission states that there is no evidence in CIA files that the Commission considered Castro's September 7, 1963 remarks; that may be, but the AP article is CE 1348; Wesley Liebeler at least wanted to refer to it in the Report. I find it bizarre that Rocca called Castro's remarks "an act of singular irresponsibility and under no circumstances excusable as retorsion (sic) for what the Cuban emigres were doing during the summer of 1963" (Item 451, p. 7), given what we now know about what the CIA was doing to kill Castro even on November 22, 1963!

Other CIA documents shed some light on the anti-Castro and anti-KGB theories which were apparently endorsed quite strongly by some highly placed people (and, in effect, specifically rejected by others in the government) shortly after the assassination.

I expect that it is too late for you to do anything new with any of this, but you may want to check that the CIA sent you everything they should have.

Sincerely,  
*Paul*  
Paul L. Hoch