Dear Roger, 2/19/89

Today I made another search to see if I could find the Edwards memo Ix refer to in my appeal to the CIA of which I sent you an copy yesterday. I didn't.

But I saw this record, which I'd forgotten. I believe it is one I got from the CIA, perhaps as an attachement tox another record because it bears no nummer. They added their own xxix numbers other than correct file numbers for FOIA identification. These pages bear none. Probably duplicate copies I made when I got the records.

I find it interesting that this person waitedmore than half a year to ask Anderson about his column of March 7, 1967. That column appeared when Garrison was just getting his maximum attention, three weeks after the first story about him broke.

By October Garrison was saying quite a bit about the CIA and the talk shows were hot on the business. That may or may not have triggered this inquiry and visit.

Assuming what Anderson is quoted as saying is true, why should anyone in the CIA feed an account of their plots to assassinate Castro at just the time Garrison was starting? Can it be for any reason other than starting or fostering the kickback theory?

The second graf on page one refers to Ed Morgan. When Anderson, and I thought it was Drew Pearson, saw Warren Warren sent him to Rowley and Rowley to the FBI. In time the FBI Washington field office interviewed Morgan.

It is possible to believe that it was what he learned in 1966 that prompted Anderson to speak to a CIA contact when Garrison was steaming the media up.

This graf sort-of links the plot against Castro to the Kennedy assassination.

The two-line graf on page 2 may refer to Walter Sheridan, who then was working on an NBC anti-Garrison special. O'Hara is the name of a New Orleans judge (this says "O'Hare") Pershing Gervais was formerly Garrison's chief investigator and was quite a con man, and Stratton means nothing to me.

On page three the author gives "the White House's discouragement of CIA attempts to unseat Castro" as a ~~pro~~ anti-Castro motive for the assassination and "U.S. plots to assassinate Castro" as motive for pro-Castros.

While I question use of "admits" in the last sentence I find that this is included in this memo, when it does not relate to the conversation with Jack Anderson, a bit provocative. To whom was he sending this memo and for what purpose? Why this last page?

Harold

I had just gotten a CIA Sheffield Edwards memo to Bobby Kennedy on hearings of Bobby on the mafia plots

MEMORANDUM

Conversation with Jack Anderson on October 25, 1967

I went to see Jack Anderson to ask him about a report in his column of March 7, 1967, with respect to an alleged "CIA plan in 1963 to assassinate Cuba's Fidel Castro". He said that he had gotten the information directly from a contact in the CIA and, because of other circumstances, believed that his contact had okayed the release of the news with the Director of the CIA. He knew nothing of the details of the plot which he said had been "planned" but not "attempted".

Anderson said he had been approached in 1966 by a very prominent Washington attorney who, incidentally, was a former Chief Counsel of a Congressional Committee or Subcommittee. This unnamed lawyer had two clients who were in some way involved in the plan to assassinate Castro and/or Kennedy. For some reason which was not understood by Anderson, the lawyer said that the offense for which he was defending the clients would have the statute run at the end of 1967; hence his lawyer-client privilege would expire at that time; this is a total mystery. However, in any event, Anderson advised the lawyer to relate his story to Chief Justice Warren in order that Warren might be spared extreme embarrassment by having the story become public later. The lawyer went to Warren who decided that he had no interest in hearing the story; I am not sure if he physically talked with the lawyer-informant or not or just sent word that he was not interested. Anderson said that he was sure that the lawyer would not talk with me, however, I believe that Anderson

would keep his name to himself for his own journalistic reasons.

Anderson was in Garrison's office when a call came through from Vancouver, British Columbia, about a CIA agent who had defected and subsequently went to New Orleans at Garrison's request.

Anderson is very much impressed with Garrison but believes that he has bitten (1) more than necessary and (2) more than he can chew. However, he does believe that there is a very hard nub of truth to Garrison's contentions to some type of conspiracy involved in the assassination. Garrison opened all of his files to Anderson but the latter only had an hour or so in New Orleans to examine them. He was impressed by the fact that Garrison would open all of his files.

Anderson had not heard the story about Sheridan, Ohare, Stratton, Gervais, and Garrison and was quite interested.

Paraphrasing Garrison, Anderson said that he believed that Oswald was a disgruntled, mal-content who did go to Russia for the purposes stated in the Warren report. He said that he thought that the State Department permitted him to return to the United States because of his genuine re-defection. He was recruited in New Orleans by the anti-Castro people and volunteered to go to Cuba to try a assassination attempton Castro. However, he was blocked by bureaucratic red tape at the Soviet and Cuban Embassies in Mexico City. This attempt having abortted, he returned to the States where Ferrie recruited him as part of a complicated plot to assassinate Kennedy. End of Anderson's surmises about Garrison.

The one really difficult question in the theories of all of those who dispute the Warren Report's single-assassin theory, is whether "the assassins" were anti-Castro or pro-Castro. It has occurred to me that it is possible that there were elements of both factions involved. The anti-Castro's could have been motivated to assassinate the President because of (1) the way in which the Bay of Pigs was mishandled, and (2) the agreement not to invade Cuba, made at the time of the missile crisis and (3) the White House's discouragement of CIA attempts to unseat Castro. On the other hand, the pro-Castro could be equally motivated by (1) the attempted invasion of the Bay of Pigs; (2) the successful U.S. embargo of missiles to Cuba and (3) U.S. plots to assassinate Castro. As the Warren Commission admits, when Oswald printed up and handed out pro-Castro leaflets in New Orleans, he used as the address for his organization the exact address of the anti-Castro headquarters in New Orleans.

* * * * * * * *