

Dear Jim,

11/28/87

Last night I began to read the Carle affidavit. I got as far as the documents descriptions and wondered how much of this was in any sense necessary, how much hassle and how much ignorance. It is the usual boilerplate and I'd be surprised if most of what is withheld were not already disclosed.

Is this case before Flannery? I thought June Green.

With regard to the two pages of Item 71 it is not apparent worthy of comment that what was originally withheld was before then, long before then, very extensively in the public domain? Doesn't this indicate the nature of their claims to exemption? None of it is even identifiable as CIA information that the FBI used. I doubt that the withheld information in 95n is of any significance or worth any real effort to get. (Haven't I seen this thing the CIA calls an FBI brief?)

With Item 73 as with all this stuff I'd demand a competent attestation that the withheld name has not been disclosed officially. In this instance I'm certain, from context, that it was.

Item 100. It is likely that what is withheld has been disclosed officially. On page 2 it seems that some of what was withheld was the FBI's spying the exact description of which has been disclosed officially. Here it is The Worker. This is also true of FPCC. I'm not now sure but I think the janitor got stuff for them and/or an inside source. He says he addresses information withheld by CIA. Some of this was withheld by FBI and he makes no distinction. However, there is no reason to believe that any method used to get information about Oswald in Mexico has not been disclosed officially. With regard to the CIA, this includes electronic surveillance, taking pictures and a source inside the Cuban embassy. Remember the Phillips' deposition with the CIA present and agreeing to what he stated.

All of the information in the two pages of notes was disclosed before it was marked for withholding.

Item 101. Wonder if the withheld names could be Angleton and Nosenko? Other "intelligence sources" who could have been questioned about Oswald's activities in the USSR are disclosed, the several defectors and those who took photos and gave them to the CIA. No secrecy, no confidentiality, no special method, etc.

146. I'd be surprised if the withheld info was not, for the most part, public, including before HSCA. The Cubans all ran off at the mouth about such capers. I can't make what Hoover noted out.

238. This page is not identical with the copy I made when first released to Mark. I'd appreciate a complete copy of this as reprocessed. In context I suspect that the withheld information relates to the well and officially disclosed photo-taking. I'd also be surprised if the CIA's relationship with the obliterated group also had not been disclosed earlier and officially.

Please, do, send me a complete copy of this tickler.

Nowhere does Carle state that he made any effort to determine whether what he is withholding has not been disclosed. Even Dube used to say that he checked the copies of what had been disclosed. I do not believe there can be any proper CIA/Mexico withholding, based on what has been disclosed. I can't see how the CIA can assert a claim for the FBI's use of FBI material, which seems to be but may not be the case in the typed memo.

With regard to his declaration, on page 6, graf 8, line 8, he actually says that what he is withholding is "classifiable," not that he attests it is properly classified. The phone book and newspapers are "classifiable."

In general, you should undertake to make him attest of personal knowledge that

his catalogue of conjectured horrors is applicable to the information he withholds, not just that he is giving a generalized boilerplating of the general basis for claim to exemption.

With regard to his generalizations about protecting sources and methods, there are basic activities of all spookeries that can't be protected, they are that universal, so there should be a specific reason for withholding with regard to this information. Examples, the disclosed electronic and photographic surveillances and having a live source inside the embassy. Ads in newspaper classified ad sections, etc. Not needing any protection. Is he claiming that these are things not already disclosed by the CIA, examples above? Can he, after disclosure?

He withholds CIA names for all the world as though there has not been official disclosure of those involved in the WC connection, like Angleton, Karamessines, Rocca, Dolan and others. He talks about "revelation." How can there now be a "revelation" of what had long been disclosed?

I don't know if this is what you had in mind but if you want to discuss any of this further with me I'm filing it, and please remind me, in the office CIA file.

Best,  
Dunn