

Briggs Vaughn index of 4/14/77

(amb later)

In each instance on the first few pages, he withholds all CIA stations and employees. It seems unlikely that none has ever been disclosed, as, for example, the Mexico and England stations have been, or involved employees, like Rocca, whose name has been withheld despite its official disclosures.

He also withholds the name of an FBI SA. In context it appears likely that this was the FBI's liaison agent, Sam Papich, also disclosed officially. Even his office address outside FBIHQ. *And, I think, is necessary.*

1257-1035 I think is the document referred to above. Perhaps also earlier.

1271-1029 Do we have any relations with the country in question? If Cuba there are no relations to be damaged and the only reason there are no relations is that the US doesn't want any. Liaison names also withheld. Some, like Prouty, are not secret and have been disclosed.

1277-1025 Assuming all representations are true, from the description it seems that the document could be disclosed with exempt information withheld. With regard to the content, what the CIA might regard as of no interest might be of considerable interest to subject scholars who can have knowledge the CIA contact did not have of this Warren Commission witness.

1282-1023 The claim is that the information is so unique that its disclosure would identify the Agency's source in Miami. I question whether Briggs could possibly have enough subject matter knowledge to represent this alleged uniqueness ~~as~~ *because of* for the multitudinous rumors in the Cuban community in Miami. It seems probable that the "foreign" intelligence source is actual an informer in Miami and on the Cuban community. If the subject is Cuba, there are no relations to be damaged.

1283-1022 Suggests that the CIA was operational in Dallas. Again, with stories about Marina the subject, there is little probability that there was any uniqueness that could identify the CIA's source. If the staff employee involved is J. Walton Moore, his CIA connection is overt and never secret. His component also is overt,

Domestic contact service (DCS).

1292-1010 is of 5/19/67 and is described as a plan for countering alleged Communist propaganda about the JFK assassination. This description is improbable if not impossible because as of that time there was no such Communist campaign. The date coincides with intense interest in the Garrison probe. There seems to be little likelihood that disclosure could identify any of the multitudinous anti-Castros who then had such plans. Moreover, I doubt if Briggs has any way of knowing whether or not all of this is officially disclosed, as it probably has been. It seems that the document could be disclosed with no prospect of any injury, with appropriate claims to exemption.

1311-1036-B, 7/21/66, relates to someone writing a book about the JFK assassination. As of that time I do not know of anyone writing such a book besides me. Sylvia ~~Magher's~~ was not published but it had been written. (She was at the UN then.) The "social contact" between this person and several individuals suspected of hostile intelligence service associations may have been one-time or more from the language Briggs uses, but the "social activities" of the suspects is in the plural. Lane's book was written but not yet published, and they could have suspected some of those who knew him, like Ralph Schoen ~~man~~ (?) and Bertrand Russell people. Unless those "social activities" were entirely secret there does not appear to be any probability that they could disclose what is described as "the intelligence source" or "methods," the former possibly merely someone who reported something and is not a regular "source" and the latter most likely no more of a method than reporting, which discloses nothing at all about a method. There is no ~~part~~ problem in excising the identification of the Agency employee to whom, apparently, the report was made or by whom it was repeated.

1313-1036-C, relates "to an individual named in an FBI report who claimed to have worked for the CIA," with a name similar to but not identical with that of a CIA employee. There must be hundreds if not thousands of persons of whom this is true and thus there is no likelihood of disclosing the name of an actual CIA employee. Moreover, there are many such claims that have been disclosed by the FBI, whose document this is. The document was not referred to the FBI. Disclosing any name not identical with that of a CIA employee would not identify any CIA employee. It is difficult to see how even a similar name could have this result. I therefore suggest that there is a different reason for withholding and not referring back to the FBI. The date is of the beginnings of Garrison's public activity when, for example, Gordon Novel claimed to have been a CIA employee. (He also disclosed the name of a real CIA employee, as I recall Weiss.) The description is void on the content of the record.

(In general these records are to have some relationship with the JFK assassination that often is not even indicated, yet that information might be disclosed without any harm, so I find its omission provocative.)

1323-1040, which has to do with someone meeting Bringuier in Dallas, may have been disclosed by the FBI in its reportings of Bringuier's meetings and appearances, as well as in records relating to Penabaz, *and others like them.*

1324-1041 is an illustration of the lack of explanation for withholding the information that relates to the assassination, with properly exempt information withheld.

1327-1042-A, unless this "private investigator" in his investigation had spoken only to the so-called "intelligence source" there is no probability of identifying that source from disclosure, and private investigators do not work that way. This also raises questions about the physical possibility - was that investigator alive or dead? If Bill Boxley (Wood), he is dead. And his prior CIA association is public.

1328-1042-B suggests there was a check of names related to the Garrison fiasco that appeared in a published story. It therefore appears likely that there could be disclosure, with appropriate claims to exemption. Certainly what appeared in the press is not exempt yet it is withheld. Here again what the CIA may regard as relevant is not a proper standard; what researchers regard as relevant is.

1331-1044 relates to an allegedly "unique" rumor about Clay Shaw, unique enough to identify the source. Few things are less likely than this, there were that many Shaw rumors and that many people aware of and retailing them.

1332-505/1045 contains no hint of the assassination information and no reason to believe that any such information was unique enough to disclose the source. The method, again, appears to be normal means of communication, not any "intelligence method."

1333-1046 withholds name of FBI SA who, if liaison, is disclosed.

1352-1060, sounds like several already disclosed stories, phonies

1355-1061 is a longer than average explanation which claims that "the substance" of what was reported to the CIA is already disclosed elsewhere. If that same information is reasonably segregable the CIA ought not be exercising the judgements of scholars who need not regard what the CIA describes as the only "substance" to include all that can be of interest to them. There are differences between the government and scholars on many matters, ranging from claimed solutions to the crime to what is relevant to private investigators. What may need protection can be protected, with disclosure of the content.

*and how
could
Briggs
know
this?*