

Mr. David Marwell AR&B
600 E Street NW 2d floor
Washington, DC 20530

8/5/95

Dear Mr. Marwell,

Although some time ago I concluded that writing you is a waste of time your recent accomplishments make me believe I owe you acknowledgement of your success and of the reflection in it of your determination to see to it that all records relating of the assassination of President Kennedy and its investigations are made available to the people.

Making it possible for the people to know that the CIA had numbers beginning with the letter "P" is, as you see it, related to a "core issue." So much the "core" that it is not necessary to indicate what the number or the letter mean. Perhaps "pouch?"

The very first of this series of Mexico City CIA station records already disclosed with a few redactions reflects the CIA's respect for the board. It is stamped as disclosed under its "historical review program" rather than under the Act that created your board.

The next in that series discloses more CIA numbering, on those records, that it also happens ^{were} ~~was~~ disclosed earlier in other disclosed CIA records. Box 57 identifies all of them as it summarizes them all.

Also "core" is the next record from which the well-known and widely disclosed and publicized name of the then CIA station chief, Winston Scott, is now "disclosed." Along with the handwritten notation, "Can we now send in a report to HQS ^m ~~dismissing~~ our cable?" a seeming reference to their crediting the woman who was a liar, a ^{psych} ~~psy~~-path of both, Elena Garra de Paz.

The next of these "core" records adds to what was disclosed, some of these numbers again with what had been been redacted showing that the earlier withholding of those same numbers to have been unjustified, perhaps diminishing that earlier "core" accomplishment a wee bit. The Letter "S" and the name "Scott" also are restored in this version but relative ^{are} ~~to~~ that ^{by} the notations "What an imagination she has !?" and "should we send to HQS?" had not earlier been redacted.

Disclosed on the next of these "core" accomplishments is the name Ann ^Furgerter that had not been secret.

Also "core" and of great significance in the JFK assassination and its investigations is the restorations of numbers already disclosed to CIA Document 1017-949 along with the identification of the Mexico City station and several code names the meanings of which are not disclosed, "LIONION," "LICHANT ^F ONE" and "RYBAT GPFLOOR."

In this "core" in the next document the names C. Bustos ^Furgerter, Roll and Gallery are restored. Ditto for the next record, where restored are "Redwood,"

"LCIMPROVE", "limited" (relating to "coverage,"), "LICALLA," and "LILYRIC."

Restored to 116-50 are the names and code names "RYDAT," "KNIGHT," ^{and} "ODENVY," the latter, in context, seeming to mean FBI. These are also restored on 119-51. These are also restored on the next record, identified as "DUB of 230-650," along with "MANA" and "ERTHYROID." From the context of records disclosed perhaps two decades ago by the CIA "ERTHYROID" seems to refer to polygrapher.

The names Scott and Shaw are next restored.

The code name "LITEMPOS" is restored along with two other restored in earlier records on 197-629. What did happen pursuant to this cable is that the CIA station did turn that amateur faker over to the Mexican police. It seems to ^{be} LITEMPOS.

On the undated record with the number ~~4~~ 000151 stamped on it and ~~DO~~ DO1075 written on it the name Win Scott and the fact of telephone coverage of the USSR embassy had been withheld although disclosed more than 30 years ago but the fuller explanations of the delays with the intercept transcripts and photographs are helpful to the CIA.

One name is referred to the next record.

On the next there are more code names restored, "KURILOT," "AQUATIC," "L-22" and "LIERODE", the latter referring to the consulate being covered photographically. On its second page is also "PARMUTH.2"

All of this- and I add nothing else - you say is of "significant historical interest" that in context must mean relating to the JFK assassination and its investigations. This "significant historical interest" that I do not see at all must have been very significant to you for it to be the first matter you announced you would get tough about.

On the face, and this can, of course, not be correct, in this you seem to have gone to ^{the} ~~the~~ interest of John Newman and his seriously flawed book with the unjustified ^{title} ~~title~~, "Oswald and the CIA." I saw no connection of Oswald with the CIA in it. He also reportedly is working on another book. There are a few ^{other} ~~other~~ people who have great interest in the CIA's Mexico records as parts of theories they hold dear.

In this, of course, the board makes clear still again that it is determined not to do a thing about getting real assassination records disclosed and is building more of its phony case of having heard ~~all who~~ wanted to be heard and done what it could about what they asked. Yet at the same time you and the board refuse to do a thing about compelling the disclosure of the notes of the autopsy. If there is anything at all more "core" in an assassination I have not been able to think of it. And you were well and in detail informed about this along with being given the proof that it was the subject of repeated official perjury.

And that, clearly, is not "core" to you or to the board.

Consistent with your gift of listening to all, regardless of how little they know or how much they imagine, is some of what happened at your New Orleans hearing of June 28. The board expressed interest in much of that meaninglessness. But not in the autopsy notes, among other real items of real evidence in the actual assassination.

Chairman Tunheim uttered fine words as that hearing began. Like, "...it is our responsibility to find the records and we have sufficient powers to be able to do that, as given to us by the Congress." He then referred to your task, saying "This is an issue of trust for the American people, an issue of trust in their government, and we hope that through our work we can restore some of the trust that perhaps has been lost over the past 30 years with the veil of secrecy that has shrouded some of the records of this tragic event."

That can be done by listening to all the nuts to whom you gave attention while refusing to do a single thing to bring to light actual evidence of the assassination and actual records of the character of its investigation? Like, again, those autopsy notes among much else?

When Professor Michael Kurtz finished his testimony chairman Tunheim said this about his book, that it "is particularly good at putting together a lot of the different theories that are out there. I found that very useful..."

Mr. Tunheim might have found useful the review of an expert ~~no~~ stranger to you of Kurtz's book, Jim Lesar. I enclose a xerox of that review from the Journal of American History. Kurtz is so dependable an expert he has his own theory, that the shooting was from the TSBD's second floor and he has that lower than the limousine. Which is to say it was underground when the shot was fired from it!

Along with some of what has been obvious for years to some of which Kurtz adds an anti-Kennedy family twist in addition to what is justified, there is an example of how "useful" a source Kurtz is and of how much blind faith can be put in academic credentials in what he urged the board to learn about former Secret Service agent James Fox. Asking why Fox ^{made} ~~made~~ personal copies of some of the autopsy pictures will not be easy for the board, Fox has been ^{dead} ~~ea~~ that long. Nor did Fox have "legal possession" of them. Or "the legal authority" to "sell these so-called couched set of photographs to David Lifton in 1983 and authorize Lifton to reproduce them."

It is my information that Fox sold Lifton nothing.

R That "scouched ~~asset~~" seems to refer to Mark Crouch, who told me that Fox had given those pictures to him and that he had given a set to Lifton.

All of this and more for which I do not take time, including at that hearing, reminds me of what I've been told by several sources, that members of your board, scholars that they are, have said that they find ignorance about the assassination an asset rather than a liability.

How the board can see to it that withheld records of the assassination, even within its restrictive description to exclude the most valuable information that can exist, there being no smoking gun in any of them, can be located by them from the depths of their ignorance is not readily apparent. And if they cannot identify withheld and relevant records how can they meet the responsibilities they assumed?

The real question, and the record supports this belief, is did they really ever intend to bring to light legitimate "assassination records" of any ~~kind~~ kind?

Chairman Tunheim found Kurtz on theories informative. How he did not say. Nor is that apparent.

Unless, of course, the board, too, intends to debunk those theories and pretend that meets its mandate.

Records do not exist because the nuts you listened to have theories that they do. Like that one who in Boston urged the board to get the real limousine windshield because it had been replaced by a phony one. Not can there be any records located on the basis of Kurtz's theory that the shot that hit the President came from below the surface of the earth, through all that concrete, too.

Those were fine words Chairman Tunheim uttered at the beginning of that New Orleans hearing.

But the board's record will not be in those words unless it undertakes to give them the meaning its own record reflects it has neither the interest nor the intention of doing.

Witness, I emphasize, what it went to bat with the CIA to get disclosed.

While rejecting the real, of which those autopsy notes are typical.

Sincerely,



P.S. Too bad none of you thought to ask Kurtz ^{is} when he was at Tulane ⁱⁿ 1963 he saw Oswald with Guy ^Dainster, if he told the FBI. Whose records reflect that he did not. ^{Or} to tell your scholar that the Kennedy Senator about whom he testified was from NY, not Mass.

In writing you in the haste reflected by the postscript I added on the page before this there is much I missed, much I could add and would have added if my purpose were to prepare a full briefing. It is not. However, one glaring incongruity does come to mind that for your information and as a record I do refer to.

All of Jim Garrison's irrationalities and worse ~~are~~ you have held in your New Orleans hearing, fair game and within your legislated responsibilities as you define them but what the executive agencies did to and about him is not? And as you have already held, what they did to and about critics and their law violations to interfere with our Constitutional rights with respect to the assassination is not?

What the CIA did to interfere with my ability to be published is not in your concept and definition an "assassination record" but what Garrison said and did is? Yet when both the FBI and the CIA set up special files on him, and I have copies of the records of each from them, and that is not an "assassination record" to you ^{but} all the junk he had is?

Official lawlessness with regard to the assassination is not to you an "assassination record" but all the silly mouthings about it other than official are?

Are you going to ask the French government for all the records of its spookery then known as "SDECE" when it created and published the ^{assassination} fake book the English version of which was titled Farewell America and on the filmed documentary on it - timed to have influence on what Garrison was up to? Will you ask the CIA for all its records on that? Or the current Russian government for all the KGB and other Oswald records that the CIA successfully saw to it our government would not ask for at the time of the assassination? Or for its records the existence of which the FBI and CIA were told about by Yuri Nosenko, as their disclosed records reveal? Or for the records of other USSR agencies that did interview Oswald? *Including the MKD?*

This reflects earning the "public trust" of which you/ chairman spoke in New Orleans of your determination to use the powers you have to meet your obligations?

Is not referring to this as an incongruity an understatement?

KW

Crime of the Century: The Kennedy Assassination from a Historian's Perspective. By Michael L. Kurtz. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1982. xi + 291 pp. Maps, illustrations, notes, bibliography, and index. \$17.50.)

In *Crime of the Century* Michael L. Kurtz laments that "professional scholars" have neglected the assassination of President John F. Kennedy; he also disparages the works of Warren Commission critics for their "obvious bias" and lack of "the careful analysis of objective evidence that characterizes the scholar." Having set the stage for his own entry, Kurtz announces "an original interpretation based on carefully calculated scrutiny of the most reliable and convincing sources" and promises "much new evidence." He vows to avoid speculation because it "is not within the realm of the historian."

Kurtz concludes from his examination of the evidence that there clearly was a conspiracy to kill Kennedy and that the probes of the Warren Commission and the House Select Committee on Assassinations were seriously flawed. Although these conclusions cannot be faulted, there is virtually nothing of any consequence in this book that is new. With minor exceptions, its valid points derive from the very critics Kurtz deprecates. For example, Kurtz relies heavily on the work of Harold Weisberg and offers little information that Weisberg has not previously revealed.

This book lacks scholarship. The author makes blatant factual mistakes and important errors of omission: Mark Lane's *Rush to Judgment* (1966) is not the first book on the subject; the wounding of James Tague is totally ignored. There are falsehoods: the Warren Commission was not "[u]naware of the FBI's real attitude toward it"; to the contrary, its members stated in their secret sessions that the FBI "would like to have us fold up and quit," and they also asserted that the FBI had concluded that Oswald was the lone assassin without having "run out all kinds of leads." Kurtz relies on commission testimony by an FBI agent contradicted by FBI records and on the results of tests performed for the House committee on evidentiary items inexplicably different in size, shape, and weight from the original FBI specimens without evincing any awareness of the discrepancies. The book's footnotes retard rather than advance scholarship: they generally do not support the assertions made in the text, nor do they identify with requisite specificity the materials cited.

In his last chapter Kurtz forgoes his vow against speculation—already broken—and reconstructs the assassination. He hypothesizes that a shot that hit Kennedy in the back—he asserts at an *upward* angle—was fired from the second floor of the Texas School Book Depository Building. Here he whooshes across the line separating speculation from fantasy. His assertion that "the first two floors of the Depository were lower than the limousine at the time of the shots" requires a feat of levitation that is neither recorded on any film of the assassination nor testified to by any eyewitness.

Kurtz rightly calls attention to the need for professional historians to appraise the assassination of President Kennedy and the official investigations into the crime. Unfortunately, this book does not measure up to the demands of that gargantuan task.