Dear Jim, 2/26/89

You really have Carle! I've made copies of some of the attachments to his Vaughn and arranged them in what I believe is chronological order and I'm on only the first when it is apparent that he has to be withholding what was officially released long ago. I'll be detailing this after I resume, after an interruption, but I begin with a suggestion, that you go back, as I have not yet done, over an earlier memo I gave you over an affidavit he filed in an earlier case, 81-1206. And bear in mind what I'm sure Dube attested to for the CIA, that in processing under FOIA they learn what has been released. (He may have restricted this to the CIA but nobody discloses CIA records without CIA approval, witness his giving authority only recently for the DJ to disclose its copy of the 5/7/62 memo referred to in these records. This from he did it for them

Dube before him and others before Dube regularly withheld for the CIA what has been disclosed officially. Now it is Carle and now you can really clobber him, with some ridicule and humor. Was he trying to hide the sound effects of bugging Dan Martin's bed? This is the stuff he withholds in the record with an unclear September date, 17, (13) and the number 15 written on it. (I've not read all his gobbledegook after starting it.) Clearly he is withholding what is embarrasing to the CIA although already public.

In this first record, which responds to what Bush asked in annotating the Anderson column, all but the first two grafs is redacted. What is disclosed addresses only one of these two questions. The second paragrpah Bush marked up relates to Morgan and Bush asked, "Who is he?" (The first reports McCone at Bobbys and asks, "Is this true?" The response to this, at least the first paragraph of it, is not redacted. There may be more in what follows.) It is clear from context that the CIA and Carle are withholding what relates to their combination with the mafia to off Castro, and the Morgan/Rosselli part.

This Anderson column is unfair to CIA. The ambassador was not CIA so his records it was the obligation of State, not the CIA, to convey to the Commission. And in saying that "within hours" of the assassination the CIA had information indicating Castro involvement, it was not hours but days and before there was a Commission it was established that the information was fabricated. In any event, that info was not withheld from the Commission, from whose records I got copies. (There was immediate conjecture about Castro doing it.)

The last line on Document 17 amounts to a CIA 1976 statement that there was a conspiracy to kill JFK because it says that it was "tightly compartmented." Not with a lone assassin. (Does "compartmented" suggest it was a state job, too?)

Page 2 refers to the IG's report. That is not the original source and it is an interpretation of original sources. The CIA has original information. I've misl-id the internal memo of the conference with Bobby. It may be true that the CIA's interpretation of what he said was not to do any business with organized crime without consulting him but that certainly includes using the mafia to kill Castro.

That Bobby gave info to Hoover on this scheme does not mean that Hoover and the FBI did not have that info sooner. I don't recall when the arrest was made in Vegas.

On page 4, g, can it be that there was Mexico City info not disclosed?

Document 18 quotes Bush as confirming that some of these CIA plots were public yet in processing this Carle did not check to see whether what he was withholding was one such?

Document 14, however, may indicate that Document 15 does not include the information on Morgan. However, neither, as disclosed, indicates to the Director, no less, what was involved in that caper and certainly the Director should know. Unless, of course, this is what Carle withholds in Document 15 and elsewhere, and as I've sent you by mail in what he withheld from me recently, exactly that.

The other Carle documents of which I've made copies relate to the CIA's disclosure used in an AP story that is attached as it appeared in the Star. Two versions of this are

disclosed, each a copy of the same clipping Bush annotated with a question. In Document 11 it is largely illegible but it is clear in Document 12 as Document 11 attachment to it. This is important because here you really have Carle, who processed and disclosed both and withheld from one what he did not withhold from the other. Bush also wrote a question to "Seymour" (Bolten) on a routing slip, asking, "will this cause problems for Helms. Is "*" part true?" Some notations appear on this and are redacted that do not appear on the copy attached to Bolten's response, Document 12. At least two are at the bottom of the Document 11 copy. However, on the copy attached to Bolten's memo what Carle disclosed in the Document 11 copy he withholds here, and I can't think of any exemption that can apply. It is Bush's question, "Is "*" part true." The "*" part refers to both Helms' false Commission testimony and what the disclosed record states about thinking to use Oswald to get USSR information from him. Bush marked those two paragraphs with an asterisk.

The two different xeroxes of the same Star story with the same memo to Bush written on it discloses, in Carle's processing of Document 11, what is withheld in his copy attached to Document 12. What I quote here is withheld entirely on the Document 12 attachment and I quote it from the Document 11 attachment:" (Redacted) has advised his editors (redacted) <u>not</u> to run the AP story."

If the rest qualifies for withholding, as I am not convinced it does, what I've quoted does not, yet while disclosing it Carle also withholds it and swears to the court that the witholding is necessary.

(I suspect that the first part of this redaction includes the name of the reporter to whom the CIA spoke and that of his paper and that after "editors" it is likely something also not properly withheld, like "in N.Y.C." ~~is what he redacted~~.

This note also indicates that the CIA protested the perfectly clear and accurate Martin story as "sloppy" to the AP and had it changed. I think this is important for people, especially scholars, to know, that the CIA can protest what it admits is entirely accurate and get the media to make changes. (I've not compared the two versions to see what AP ~~deleted.)~~ changed.)

I've not gotten or been given copies of these Oswald records that ~~were then~~ CIA disclosed to AP. If the archive has them and you can provide copies I'd appreciate it very much. Thanks.

Document 9, from which Carle withheld its date, I prsume as top national security, is the IG's memo to DCI on this story. The first redaction on page 2, which can be taken to refer to the case officer's assignment at the time of the assassination and in space could say "in Cuba," does not, and I think it states his assignment at CIA HQ, like CIEU, if that is the way the Eastern European section of Counterintelligence would be cited. He has to have been in a component where "laying on" an Oswald interview would have been ptoper. It is, I think, interesting that he dates this thought and his discussion of it as "sometime in the summer of 1960," when Oswald was in the USSR. How did he know that Oswald would ever return? To be questioned? (The story says he was coming home then.)

Here it seems that in his third redaction in the text, saying with whom he discussed that notion, he withholds what was disclosed, unless what is redacted is names only. He discussed this with his subordinates.

That there is no record reflecting any CIA interest in or connection with Oswald toward the end of 1976 does not mean that there had been no such record earlier.

By coincidence, the CIA employee's interest was in what Oswald could say about the Minsk electronic plant in which Oswald worked. The coincidence is that in my first book, in 1965, I noted that what Oswald wrote about that plant is the kind of information that would interest intelligence agencies.

I think that you would be well adviced to move that Carle's declaration be expunged

and that the CIA be required to substitute one who has knowledge of what was disclosed to make the attestation. When we spoke about this earlier I said that Carle had to be incompetent or mendacious because he swears to the need to withhold what had been disclosed officially, and I was thinking of what the FBI disclosed about that stupid mafia caper, which is what Carle withheld in the record I just got. However, when in a single fell swoop he swears to the need to withhold precisely what he himself is disclosing simultaneously, it is apparent that whichever fits him, incompetent or mendacious, he ought not be entrusted by the CIA or the courts with such a function when he imposes upon the trust of the courts and swears he has to withhold what he simultaneously discloses. And, of course, when he swears to the need to withhold what much earlier had been disclosed officially.

Temporarily I am keeping these dupes I may do with what I got from the BJ as a referral to the CIA. I hope you remember to have a search made to see if the archive has the record mislaid here, the in-house version of that briefing of Bobby, CIA's.