

These notes cover the 59 new documents in the batch labeled "B" by the CIA, which was released in September 1976 (along with some re-reviewed documents, and some renumbered ones (Batch C)), and the 255 items released in January 1977. Refer to the separate listings for a one-line description of each new document. Key documents are indicated on those lists by "\*". There are notes here on all 2-\*\* and 3-\*\*\* documents, and on some of the one-\* ones.

I have not yet had a chance to correlate the new documents with each other and with the old ones; these notes are mainly based on a review of the documents in sequence. In the future, I may try to put together a more coherent analysis of some of the key items.

The most interesting material here touches on 3 questions:

- (1) The degree of completeness of the CIA review, and the nature of some of the withheld material;
- (2) CIA concern with countering criticism of the Warren Report, and the Agency's relationships with various critics, Congressional investigators, and the press.
- (3) The photos of the Mexico mystery man ("MMM"). These new documents provide some additional information on the question of what was going on before the assassination, and the CIA's failure to level with the Warren Commission; they also reflect a remarkable amount of concern about the publication of this photo by the Commission and comments made about it since.

First, some comments on the few 3-star items:

\*\*\* Unnumbered item, "Document Disposition Index" (271 pages.) (DDI)

This document is in fact a legal document in Fensterwald's FOIA suit.

The DDI evidently covers the Oswald 201 file. The cover letter asserts that this file "may be viewed as containing most, if not all, of the substantive information collected by the Agency in regard to the assassination," but that a review of "additional related documents" is continuing. In fact, some of the most interesting material is not included.

The DDI covers documents with a first identifying number ranging from 1 to 1194, and a second identifying number ranging from 1 to 436A and from 522 [Item 18] to 1003. [That is, items # 1-1B through 1192-436A and 18-522 through 1191-1003, basically.] The list of released documents provided by the CIA in March 1976 has (in addition to items 1-436 in the 201 file) items 437-498 inclusive. These latter documents are identified as coming from files entitled Marina Oswald and Jack Ruby, DDO, OGC, SIG, OS, Station, DDI, and Nosenko. This non-201 material included quite a few of the most interesting documents in the original release - e.g., #448, 450, 451, 481, 485, and 497, covering the CIA's submissions to the Rockefeller Commission, etc.

The CIA has also released #499 through 521, relating mainly to the Garrison investigation, and containing some very interesting material.

Also, the CIA has sent Fensterwald a list of denied documents numbered 522 through 1129. Part of this list (#1004 through 1129) presumably describes the withheld part of the CIA file, which is presumably now being reviewed. I am confident there is important "substantive information" there. I have had a formal FOIA request pending since March 17, 1976 for all CIA material submitted to the Rockefeller Commission in response to my memo on the CIA and the WC - specifically, CIA item 1088 and various other items from 1083 through 1092. No additional material has been released in response to that request. There really is some good stuff in my memo, if I do say so myself; my interest in the CIA's response is heightened by the apparent continuing Senate Committee interest in Veciana ("Mr. X" to Jack Anderson). I trust that Fensterwald will be able to maintain pressure on the CIA, through his suit, to complete their review of the assassination files.

I also question the completeness of the CIA file being reviewed on a couple of specific grounds. The CIA has released some of their correspondence with critics making FOIA requests, including correspondence with me up to January 1972 (#1049-947J). A small amount of material responsive to Congressional requests, dated as late as 24 Nov 75 (#1159-432J) is included in Batch D. Internal CIA memos resulting from inquiries by me and by Fensterwald have been released. I am particularly interested in seeing if the CIA will list or release two additional items relating to me (which, understandably, would probably not have been in the 201 file): The



first is my letter of July 10, 1975, which argued in favor of my request for the release of CD 347, the CIA's memo of 31 Jan 64 about Oswald in Mexico. According to the Document Disposition Index, this item (#509-803) must be withheld in full. My letter referred to material from this CD which has been cited in other, available, documents. The Index admits that most of the substantive information is now available, but asserts (as the CIA said in a letter of 9 Jul 75 to me) that the available information is "inextricably mixed with operational details which, if exposed, would compromise" sources and methods. In fact, one of the reasons I wanted to see CD 347 is because I am quite confident that it would confirm that the CIA was much less than candid with the Warren Commission on the issue of the mystery man. As documented in my 1975 chronology, the CIA did not even tell the Commission during the March 12, 1964 meeting that the "Ruby" photo was associated with the Mexico trip, although both matters came up and the Commission had asked for an explanation. CD 347 evidently indicates that an erroneous description was in the 10 Oct 63 message, but does not mention the photograph. [More on the MMM later.]

Secondly, I would like to see the CIA's memo on my visit of July 2, 1973, when I took them up on their peculiar invitation in their letter of 15 Nov 71 (#1045-947F). I'm not sure they should be releasing this kind of correspondence, and I don't intend to show them my memo on my visit, but I am certainly curious.

The Document Disposition Index includes quite a bit of useful information about the withheld items. In many cases the descriptions in the list of denied documents provided to Fensterwald in March allow us to make some sense of the reasons for the denial. When I get a chance, I plan to make a systematic study of items which appear to be improperly withheld.

It is clear that some of the denials are less to hide information than to avoid setting a bad precedent. For example, "City" is routinely withheld from references to the "Mexico City station." The tendency to withhold information that has been made public elsewhere seems largely to have been overcome. (In the original release last March, Helms' name and signature was frequently withheld from his letters to the Warren Commission which had been published in the 26 volumes.)

One other specific withholding is worth mentioning here. Items 1189-1001 through 1191-1003, dated September 22-23, 1975, are described in the Index as a discussion of the compromise of some classified intelligence information. "The release of this document would provide public confirmation of the validity of the information leaked." The list of denied documents confirms that these items relate to the New York Times article of 21 Sep 75, by Nicholas Horrock, alleging that Oswald's calls to the Embassies in Mexico were taped. So, I guess we can consider the story confirmed? (There is, of course, a lot more to be said about this story - it includes a CIA statement which fails to mention the MMM photo or description; I knew about the taping since 1970, thanks to an FBI release; this story substantially conflicts with the Kessler story which caused the House Select Committee to focus on the Mexico trip; etc.)

In summary, the Document Disposition Index (and any additions to it in the future) deserves careful scrutiny, especially where additional information can be obtained from the list of denied documents.

\*\*\* Item 948-927T, 7 pp., 12 May 67 - The facts on the MMM photo.

This is just one of many documents on the MMM; I'll use it as the starting point for some general comments on what I picked up from my initial reading of this file.

Specifically, there is one hypothesis which I would suggest should be checked against the full record: that even within the CIA there were two rather different explanations of the MMM problem floating around (from right after the assassination, until now). Actually, there seem to have been two rather distinct levels at which the problem was understood: some people more or less denied there was a problem, and other people (or other documents, or whatever) recognized the problem - that is, were well aware that one existed. This is obviously a very vague idea in my mind right now, but worth further thought.

One explanation can be aptly described as "evasive." This appears in the 1975 Horrock piece, in a number of letters to critics, etc. Roughly speaking, it focuses



on the fact that the specific photo shown to Marguerite Oswald was taken on October 4 and associated with the case on November 22, and steers away from the erroneous description in the October 10 telegram (and the now-known October 1 photos of the same man). One of the interesting things about the evasive explanation is that it appears as early as November 24, 1963 (Item 149; see my earlier notes on the March "key items.")

The second explanation can be labeled the "plausible" explanation. What I have in mind is that it comports with the available documentary evidence; I suspect that some variant of it was good enough to satisfy Slawson and the others on the Warren Commission staff. The key facts, in this version, are: someone just made a mistake in matching the unidentified man and Oswald; and, although there are no photos of Oswald at the Embassy, we know (from the tapes and other evidence) that the real Oswald did make those visits.

I wouldn't want to imply that the "plausible" explanation explains all the facts. Certainly the lack of candor to the Warren Commission can't be explained away. The existence of two levels of understanding within the CIA suggests that getting to the bottom of this story could be extremely complicated, since there may have been an in-house coverup - perhaps the CIA's own internal investigation was stymied. In this case, if there is any real fire behind all this smoke - e.g., something on the level of the Kessler allegations, that Oswald tried to make a deal with the Russians and that his offer caused a stir in the Mexico station before the assassination - it may be nearly impossible to find out what it was.

By the way, although I intend to review the new MMM material, I am very reluctant to undertake a study at the same level of detail as my 1975 chronology (which I think would be necessary) without having all the documents. It's an interesting challenge to try this kind of analysis on an incomplete set of sanitized documents, but it's also a real waste of energy to do this when presumably the House and Senate Committees have access to all the documents, witnesses, and other evidence.

Until now, the most detailed version of the "plausible" explanation was (I think) the Slawson-Mosk article (reprinted in "The Assassinations" p. 271). The central question is how the description of the MMM got attached to Oswald. Slawson confirms my immediate interpretation of the 10/10 telegram, that two different sources were involved. He wrote that "the central headquarters" had trouble putting the two bits of information together," and that "someone in the CIA ... guessed" that the two men were the same. The newly released items also uses the word "guessed." "In its report to CIA Headquarters on 9 October [about the "Oswald" visit], the CIA station included descriptive details based on the photograph which ~~they~~ it [sic] guessed might be Oswald because of the coincidence in time between the photograph and the report of Oswald's contact..."

The most detailed explanation of the actual events which I have seen still boils down to the word "guessed." In a quite detailed letter to O'Toole on 29 July 1975, Belin provided an expanded explanation which started to slip back into evasiveness: "... a Mexico City representative of the CIA coupled data received that Lee Harvey Oswald had been in Mexico City with the fact that there had been a photograph .... On the chance that there could be an association [between the two bits of data], the two items were reported as separate facts in a cable to headquarters." (My emphasis. That is not really a fair summary of the evidence; of course two facts had to be reported separately. Belin is implying that Headquarters made the guess; but the current CIA position is that the Mexico Station did.) In any case, the bottom line of what we now have is that someone "guessed." Needless to say, I don't think that is an adequate explanation by itself, even though it might be correct.

The handwritten change in this new document ["they" to "it"] reminds me that there must have been some individual who made the incorrect guess, or whatever. Presumably there was a detailed in-house CIA investigation. Where are the records? How often was this kind of guess made? How often was it wrong? This is the kind of question that the "plausible" explanation fails to answer. If there really was something funny going on - e.g., an impostor on any occasion - that is the kind of questioning that would be necessary to find out about it.



This document, by the way, is a draft memo, apparently prepared in the General Counsel's office for submission to the Attorney General. (The author is not named.) This presumably had something to do with the Garrison investigation; however, I don't recall seeing any final version of this memo. The letter that eventually went out to Judge Bagert in response to a Garrison subpoena related to the MMM had only the bare minimum of facts.

Despite the author's claim that this memo "states all the facts" and "will hold up under closest possible scrutiny," there are some signs of deliberate ambiguity in language. On page 2, it is stated that "CIA did not have a known photograph of Oswald in its files before the assassination of President Kennedy either in Washington or abroad." (My emphasis.) This is supposed to explain the request to the Navy for a photo. In fact, the pre-assassination file (CD 692) does include a newspaper photo of Oswald (which was naturally more recent than the Navy's photo). One still has to consider the possibility that the request to the Navy reflected concern about an impostor - perhaps, concern that the Oswald who defected was not the one who had been in the Marines.

By the way, this memo claims that Oswald's visit to the Cuban consulate was "revealed" after the assassination. I think the CIA's position on this has been consistent, and in contradiction to Kessler's sources. (Mark Allen has been working on a memo on the problem on non-reporting of the Cuban contacts; see also my memo in response to the Select Committee report.)

The summary description of the photos given to the FBI (p. 3-4) raises still another problem. This memo reports 3 on 1 October, 5 on 4 October, and 2 on 15 October. (According to paragraph d on page 2, which may have slipped past the sanitizers, the first two sets were at the Soviet Embassy and the last at the Cuban Embassy.) Although it is not mentioned here, the CIA told the Warren Commission that the MMM visited the Embassies "during October and November" (CD 674, p. 1) In any case, this memo lists 10 photos. However, eleven have been released by the CIA (#929-939) and a twelfth is withheld (#940). I guess it is possible that more turned up after the submission to the FBI; in fact, I think I recall seeing some items in these new batches suggesting that some photos had just been found. I am confused about the crucial October 1 photos (the day of Oswald's visit): this memo describes three, but there are four which do not fit the descriptions for October 4 or 15 (i.e., #934-937). To make things worse, the man in these photos is wearing what the CIA describes (in connection with the October 4 photos) as a light "pull-over shirt," whereas the memo says "white pullover, open shirt." Although other details of the description certainly do match these four photos, the most prominent feature - that the man is apparently putting a wallet-type object into a large pouch - is not mentioned in the description. I don't have the slightest idea what all this means, but it's the sort of thing that prevents me from writing off this whole question!

\*\*\* Item 954-927Z, 1 p., 4 Dec 67 - memo proposing release of the original Helms affidavit on the MMM photo.

Naturally, this is of particular interest to me since it deals with my original FOIA request for MMM material.

This memo has the handwritten notation "ok from DCI 12/5/67," so it looks like it got personal attention from Helms as well as Houston (the author) and Karamessines.

Paragraph 2 says that I have "some connection with Ramparts." Not true at that time, although in the summer of 1966 I had done some work for Ramparts and had ordered documents from the Archives in their name, etc. The CIA probably made that connection earlier in 1967, when they were worried about the release of the CD list by the Archives. (See #1094-413 and 1107-720.) The Archives told the CIA who had gotten the list, naming Weisberg, Penn Jones, me, NBC, and USN&WR; I was said to have been associated with Ramparts. In fact, I do remember getting the CD list on film for Ramparts, probably at their expense. The significance of all this, if any, is that in 1967 Ramparts was very high on the CIA's shit list.

This memo says that I "have learned" that there was an earlier version of the affidavit, which was not published. Sure enough - from a handwritten notation on the copy of the CD list which the Archives sent me.



Houston, Karamessines, and the CI staff agreed that "there is no basis for withholding this affidavit from the public domain." Interesting, given all the stuff that was withheld for many years, and, in some cases, is still withheld. Compare, for example, the CIA's position (in #1107-420) that the Archives should send out the sanitized CD list unless pressed for the original one.

This memo correctly points out that "The main difference [from the later Helms affidavit] is that this document [the earlier one] specified that the picture was taken on 4 October 1963, which was one day after Oswald left Mexico City." Release of this affidavit served to make more tenuous the chain between the man in the photo and the erroneous description in the 10 Oct 63 telegram. I don't think it was known until Belin revealed it in 1975 that there were any photos of the mystery man taken on 10/1.

In this context, the most interesting part of this memo is the assertion that "in fact the date noted above would probably be helpful in laying to rest this problem." The formulation in the previous item (#953-927Y) is a little more direct: "Although I [author not named] do not feel that Mr. Helm's [sic] affidavit (attached) poses any special security risk, I believe it should be kept under wraps until we find it expedient to release it, or circumstances force our hand." (My emphasis.)

I would appreciate a second opinion on whether I was used in a subtle little information-manipulation operation. I hesitate to call it disinformation, since the information released was (presumably) correct, and it didn't purport to be complete.

\*\*\* Item 994-937, 2 pp., 1 March 65; critique of Ford's book.

On or around February 11, 1965, the CIA got "a [deletion] copy" of the Ford-Stiles opus from a deleted source. That's interesting in itself - did Ford submit a copy to the CIA, or did they manage to get one?

In paragraph 4, the author notes some distaste for a "truncated" quotation of Dulles in Chapter 1. Does this mean that the CIA reviewer compared the text with the executive session transcript? (If so, he chose not to mention that the transcript was classified.) In any case, the author "took no action on this" (what could he have done), because of his feeling that in general "the less we touch in this manuscript the better." (Who was asking the CIA to touch it at all? What right did they have to do so?)

I don't know exactly when Ford's book was generally available - e.g., to reviewers. In a letter of January 30, 1965, he responded to a query of mine by noting that the expected publication date was May 1965, and that the title was "The Portrait of an Assassin." (My emphasis, of course.)

It is amusing that what shocked the reviewer about Chapter 1 is that Ford and Stiles "really don't nail down the charge [that Oswald was an FBI agent] as an absolute and utter canard. I felt, therefore, that the chapter, as written, could be used by the Lefties (Mark Lane et al) to continue the campaign of which you [Helms] are already aware."

\*\*\* Item 1127-987, 19 July 68, re Epstein's article on Garrison.

This document consists of a one-page cover memo, Epstein's article from the New Yorker of 13 July 68, and one page listing the "Field Distribution" (all of which is deleted).

The covering memo speaks for itself. The article was to be used to brief interested contacts and assets. It is specified that "personal attacks upon Garrison ... must be strictly avoided."

There are a number of other documents throughout this file dealing with CIA attention to the writings of the critics; see, for example, #1035-960, which was the subject of an AP story by Dave Martin on 2/4/77.

In fairness to Epstein, it should be noted that his (first) book is panned in the CIA reviews. (See items 1021 through 1027 et passim.)

I suppose that this kind of propaganda operation, while in questionable taste, was perfectly legal - otherwise they wouldn't be releasing the documents now. It does make you wonder what they did that they haven't told us about.



\*\*\* Item 1188-1000, Part 1: 4 pp., 18 Sep 75, absence of CIA-LHO contact.

The two parts of this CIA item are of interest for somewhat different reasons, so they are listed separately. This memo, whose author and recipient are not known, supplements two points mentioned in the second part of this item.

On the first point, the author summarizes his own check of agency files, ordered on 11/27/63, to see if Oswald had been connected with the CIA "in any conceivable way." The author lists a number of CIA components and indexes which he checked, with negative results. The checks were finished on December 4.

What particularly interests me, of course, is the document which turned up in the August release, indicating that (contrary to Helms' testimony) someone in the CIA did contemplate getting information from Oswald, and that this interest went at least as far as a discussion of "the laying on of interview(s)." According to an AP story by Dave Martin, the Schweiker Committee did try to check this out (although it is not mentioned in their report) but got essentially nowhere.

Of particular relevance here is that the actual memo about this contemplated contact is dated 25 November 1963, but the covering memo (sender and recipient deleted) is dated December 12. Thus, it may be that this information somehow escaped the thorough check which the author of this memo completed on December 4. (He may have come across this information, but it apparently is not mentioned in this memo - although with all the deletions it is hard to be sure.)

In paragraph 4, the author notes that CBS News has raised the question of whether Oswald had been routinely debriefed. (This is an obvious question, but CBS might have picked it up from my memo on the CIA and the Warren Commission, which they had - see pp. 466-7 of "The Assassinations.") The memo notes that "we were extremely concerned" that such a routine debriefing might have occurred. This is new, and amusing - remember that Nosenko reported essentially the same concern by the KGB! The memo's judgment that Oswald probably wouldn't have had the kind of information the CIA wanted to put effort into getting is really less plausible than the statements in Item 435-173A - for example, that "we were particularly interested in the [info] Oswald might provide on the Minsk factory in which he had been employed, on certain sections of the city itself, and of course we sought the usual [biographic information] that might help develop [foreign] personality dossiers." As I noted in my CIA memo, Oswald's manuscript was full of just the kind of detail the CIA likes, and the agency's routine coverage of visitors to the USSR was extensive enough to pick up a tourist's photo of Oswald in Minsk. The release of a large number of CIA documents with traces on Russian names confirms that they squirrel away an amazing amount of detail.

Paragraph 5 is interesting - the author's original records search found no indication that Oswald was working for another U.S. intelligence agency. I raised that point in my memo, so CBS might have raised it with the CIA; it is particularly striking in contrast to the FBI's apparent reference to indefinite indications that Oswald had at some time had an intelligence assignment. (SR 54)

The memo's second major point has to do with what was in the CIA's file on Oswald before the assassination. Actually, I don't see any discussion of this in "the referent memorandum" (next item), but I read it quickly and may have missed something. One of the points in my CIA memo was that the CIA had told the FBI on 11/22/63 that they had no CIA-originated documents on Oswald. Here is the first answer to that allegation - the stuff from Mexico City was being held at the Mexico branch and "had not as yet been included in the 201 file." For six weeks? Is this really plausible? (Maybe the Lee Henry/Harvey problem confused a clerk at this point?)

\*\*\* Item 1188-1000, Part 2: 2 pp., 6 Sep 75, Colby-CBS conversation.

This is a memo of a conversation between DCI Colby and Dan Rather and Les Midgley of CBS, in connection with CBS's forthcoming series on the assassinations.

Rather claimed to have found it incredible that the CIA had not contacted Oswald. That's more or less what he asked Colby on the air. (Part 2 (11/26/75), p. 10)

The two most interesting things used by CBS from the Colby interview are not even mentioned in this memo. One is that the CIA intercepted Oswald's mail, going both ways (Page 8). The other is that Colby "thought" there were voice recordings of Oswald from the Embassy contacts. (P. 13; cf. my comments on p. 2 above on the



withheld items on Horrock's 1975 story, #1189 through 1191.)

There is one apparent reference to Item 435-173A, which is discussed at length in connection with the previous memo in this item. On page 2, Colby speculates "with respect to Oswald's one appearance in our records" that "the CIA might well have shied off from any interview with him if there was an indication of prior FBI interest." Not very plausible, really, especially if you interpret this to mean the FBI's obvious interest in seeing that Oswald was not working for the Russians, rather than a possible interest in recruiting him. (The author of the previous memo specified that he found no indication of the latter situation.)

I am a bit surprised that a reference to the "Interagency Source Register" and the "DCS Joint Debriefing Program with the military" has not been deleted.

Colby ends with an optimistic comment that "there is a chance that the program will indicate that there is no CIA connection with Oswald beyond that noted above. This could make a contribution to knocking down the paranoid belief to the contrary." What I find surprising is Colby's apparent eagerness to make sure that Dan Rather is properly informed: "We parted with my assurance that anything else that arose which would cast doubt on my statements would be brought to Mr. Rather's attention.... We must ... insure that Mr. Rather does learn anything which would cause the slightest doubt on the above account before he produces the programs in November." (The last sentence has been underlined.) Frankly, I wonder if this language might have been understood to signify just the contrary - that if anything comes up, Rather should not find out about it. I really doubt that if the CIA were to come up with information about an Oswald contact they would choose to release it through Dan Rather. It would be interesting to know what Rather thinks of all this.

Specifically, what about the release of #435-173A, revealing the contemplated interviews with Oswald? I find it hard to believe that CBS had it in September or November 1975 and chose not to use it, although the language of Colby's memo ("with reference to Oswald's one appearance in our records, I explained...") suggests that this item specifically was discussed. The memo is stamped "for FOIA review on May 1976," and was released shortly thereafter. I can believe that the Schweiker Committee had it and didn't mention it (as Dave Martin of the AP has reported), but CBS is something else. So, when did it turn up within the CIA, why didn't it turn up earlier, and why didn't Colby give it to Rather (or did he)?

Now for some brief notes on all the 2-star items and some of the 1-star ones. Please refer to the one-line descriptions for date, number of pages, etc. My rating system was somewhat arbitrary and hastily applied, so don't hold me responsible if I have not taken note of a few good items.

\*\* Covering letter to Bud. As noted on p. 1, the scope of this review is not clear. Bud's suit may have covered only the Oswald 201 file, but there is certainly important additional stuff; this letter makes specific reference only to some "additional names" which are of interest to Bud.

\*\*\* Document Disposition Index - see notes on pp. 1-2 supra.

\* #538-801A. The WC staff (Slawson?) evidently had a number of questions about the sensitive material in CD 347; the questions are withheld. As with the CD itself (see p. 1-2), I suspect that the questions would show that the CIA was holding back. This would be a good item to request re-review of.

Offhand, I don't know what the "allegation of some significance which emanated from the White House" but is not in CD 347 might be. ("D" is in CD 347.)

\* #871-388A. These "Propaganda notes" instruct that "covert assets" should be used to "explain the tragedy" and "counter all efforts to misconstrue it intentionally." It looks like the commercial editions of the WR are being recommended, if it turns out there are no "drawbacks" in the introductions. (Cf. #1152-432C)

\*\* #881-901. This and other documents describe how the CIA insisted that the WC blank out the small amount of background visible in Odum DE 1. I figured out in 1969 that something like this had happened, and wrote to the Archives (June 16)



more or less suggesting that it was naughty for the Warren Commission to retouch a print that had been entered into evidence. Naturally they just referred me to the CIA. I'm still not sure I understand why the CIA was so sensitive about the whole MMM problem. (Slawson declined to answer my questions about this.)

\* #888-906 and 890-433, Joesten. The question is - if this is the kind of effort the CIA put into digging up dirt on Joesten, how much did the FBI do against the domestic critics? I wouldn't mind seeing some of the memos Hoover sent to LBJ. (Church Committee Report, Hearings, Vol. 6, pp. 181, 511, 762.)

\* #894-911. This memo notes that the MMM photo will be properly blacked out in the WR and that all the hearings will be published in November, which is a change in schedule; it adds cryptically "[in] view [of] above you may wish modify timing and planning." Who? What planning?

\* #898-392. They're trying to tell us that they wouldn't have been interested in information from Oswald? When they come up with some bits of info about the Radio Moscow people from a source in late 1964, the FBI gets a 4-page memo under the Oswald caption.

\* #903-393A. Everything but the title and date has been deleted, but for what it's worth here's the cover page of the infamous CD 347.

\* #385-736. This background information on John Carlos Wilson-Hudson, who claimed that "Santos" was visited in jail in Cuba by Ruby, makes him seem a much more interesting person than the "psychopath" description released earlier. (See documents # 59, 83, and 94 in the original CIA release.) Part of his story is given some credence by Crile's account of the suspiciously favorable treatment given to Santos Trafficante in Castro's jail.

\* #449-183A. This may be a useful reference document on Cuban press reaction to the assassination. The Document Disposition Index confirms that something has been deleted but that 53 pages make up the entire document, so it is not clear whether page 2 has been withheld (which would be odd) or if it is missing from this copy in the CIA's files.

\* #795-871A. Slawson had a rather subtle understanding of the sort of thing that could affect a witness' testimony. Quite a contrast to Belin.

\*\* #916-921 (and other documents from 915 to 930, and 932). An Allen-Scott source evidently got hold of a quite secret CIA study of Soviet use of assassination and alleged that it had been withheld from the Warren Commission. The CIA reaction to this leak was quite extensive, and their analysis interesting. (I do wonder about various other Allen-Scott columns about the Warren Commission, which are not mentioned here.) Although it is evidently not in the Oswald 201 file, the CIA reaction to the Pearson columns in 1967 (and 1971, and 1976, and 1977) must have been substantial - I would sure like to see that!

The author of #916 notes that "investigators," according to Allen & Scott, are trying to find out why CIA reported Oswald's visit to the Russian but not the Cuban Embassy. This memo states that the Cuban contact "was developed after the assassination; there was no hard [my emphasis] information that linked Oswald by name [my emphasis] with the Cubans before 22 November." This is of course relevant to the Kessler-Phillips story.

\*\* #924-924. Early in November, at Goldberg's request, the CIA went to look over some FBI reports which were going to be published as CE's. Goldberg pointed out that "some of the remarks made about the Cubans reflected disloyalty on their part toward the Castro regime and probably would hurt them when the evidence became public." The CIA concurred. (This memo leaves the impression that it was all Goldberg's idea in the first place, which may well have been the case.)

What particularly interests me about this is that it presumably explains the deletion in CE 3147: "One of the persons hidden in their [the Odios'] Havana home was Manolo Rey, now a prominent underground leader and the head of ... 'JURE'." (CE 1546, p. 203; cf. 26H836). It may have been just a lucky accident that the



CIA did not delete from Manolo Rey's statement to the FBI the fact that "at the time of their [the senior Odios'] arrest, MRP leader Reynold Gonzalez was caught by the Castro agents on the Odio farm near Havana." (26H839) Gonzalez was the associate, in a plot to kill Castro, of the now-well-known Antonio ("Mr. X") Veciana.

\* #941-927M. This is the CIA's version of their contact with Liebeler with regard to the MMM photo; compare the Liebeler-Epstein account. Although the latter may be exaggerated, I doubt that the contact was as smooth as this memo suggests. The last paragraph accurately points out that there are questions about who this man is and how he got involved (that is, there would be if he is mentioned without adequate explanation), but the memo doesn't indicate who raised these questions. I suspect that Liebeler did, and that he didn't know the answers.

\* #944-927P. Same as #881-901 (see comments above), with somewhat different deletions. For example, "Mexican station" here was replaced by "[field rep.]" in #881, and "Examination with a magnifying glass or by a knowledgeable person would indicate" is deleted here but not in #881.

\* #945-927Q. A parenthetical remark, relevant to arguments about the size of the WC's staff relative to that of the House Committee. The previous item mentioned that Rankin was delivering the WR to LBJ on Thursday 22 September 1964, and then would be in New York until Monday. This memo simply says that Rankin will not be back until Wednesday the 30th. Fair enough - he is certainly entitled to three days off after finishing up. The catch is that for the two-week periods ending September 26 and October 10 Rankin claimed to have worked 112 hours - that is, the equivalent of 7 8-hour days each week. In fact, Rankin was paid at the rate of 8 hours per day, 7 days per week for every two-week period from January 19 through November 21, 1964. There is some question in my mind if he really worked that much - evidently the maximum allowable amount per week, and more than any other staff member.

\*\* 947-927S. Various interesting points: The CIA wanted to make sure the MMM photos in the WC's files were fixed so that there was no recognizable background. The CIA asked if many WC people had access to it; Goldberg said that a few people, including Redlich, did: "The name of Redlich was mentioned at this meeting only because he was a controversial member of the Commission." (Who mentioned him, then?) The CIA again "expressed regrets ... over the publicizing of this photograph which could involve an innocent person." (Didn't the CIA even want to find out who he was?) Goldberg said, in essence, that's the way it goes, and mentioned the Ziegers in Russia: "Dr. Goldberg indicated that some of the references to the Ziegers' [sic] by Lee Oswald have been toned down somewhat to protect them." (Does that mean the translations of some Russian material were deliberately inaccurate, or what?)

\*\*\* #948-927T. See notes on p. 2 supra.

\*\* #953-927Y. Various interesting points in this response to my request for the MMM affidavit. The CIA deleted, for security reasons, the statement in Liebeler's draft affidavit that the CIA took the photo. This seems to confirm that it was not, as we had speculated, a Mexican operation which just fed information to the CIA. (This makes the question of why there was no photo of Oswald from his several visits one which can properly be directed to the CIA.) This memo specifies that the "Mexican operation is a continuing one," which is no longer news. Oddly, the memo comments that "Both the Soviets and Cubans have had more than three years to identify the individual..." - what about the CIA? (See the comments on the next item also.)

\*\*\* #954-927Z. See notes on p. 4 supra.

\* #960-927AF. I would guess that Bud's claim to know the identity of the MMM has something to do with the McDonald-"Saul" story. The CIA was clearly giving him the "evasive" explanation. Those who think Bud is a CIA agent should be interested in these documents - it is hard to believe he has that elaborate a cover, isn't it.



\* #971-927AQ. Someone, presumably the FBI, turned down Bud's request for some MMM photos and was then "shocked" at seeing one of them in the WR Hearings.

\* #974-927AT. Garrison's handling of things I happen to know something about convinces me that his investigation was a crock. I don't know of any reason to question the conclusion that he didn't know what he was talking about (on the MMM) and was more or less shooting off his mouth in this article.

\* #979-927AX. A now-deceased source reports a Mexican plane landing at Havana on 11/22, carrying 2 Cuban gangsters. Might this story have been intended to pair up with one of the stories of mysterious travelers to Cuba from Mexico?

\* #985-927BB. In addition to Trevor-Roper looking silly against Anthony Lewis, we have Lewis saying things like "your suggestion that it [the WC] was not sufficiently independent and too closely tied and committed to an FBI view seems to me to display an appalling ignorance of the American system and the FBI and its relationship with this Commission. One thing, you said the FBI had already established its case when the Commission was founded. [Lewis denies this.]" Oh well, I wouldn't want to have to defend everything I said in January 1965 either.

\* #991-398. Refers to a letter to LBJ from "some small-town mayor" protesting long-term withholding of WC files. The CIA ought to watch its language.

\*\*\* #994-937. See notes on p. 5 supra.

\* #1004-400. The other Marine who had been in Minsk has a six-letter name (not Webster). The memo just notes coincidences in the two backgrounds for the FBI. It is not clear how the second Marine came to be the subject of FBI and CIA files.

\* #1007-951. Apparently the CIA gave the Russian-language Oswald material to someone familiar with the USSR - perhaps a former resident or defector.

\* #1013-406. Someone in the CIA wanted to study Oswald's handwriting to see if "personality restructuring had been attempted on Oswald in the USSR." Evidently others, including the author of this memo, thought that was pretty silly. They must have some weird things going over at the CIA.

\* #1025-954B. The FBI reported that Epstein had gone to the USSR in 1958, and in 1959 complained to the FBI "that his rights were being violated because other students were bugging or taping statements he was making in the course of a student election at Cornell." (No action was taken.) The FBI also reported that Knebel told Dulles (who told Papich) that he had collaborated with Epstein (which Knebel's critical review (see #1027-954D) convinced the CIA was not correct). The CIA thought Knebel's participation would explain the book's "readability."

\*\* #1026-954C. This analysis of Epstein's book focuses on the MMM photo, and contains the "evasive" explanation. Paragraph 8 says that "Actually the [short illegible handwritten insertion] information [that Oswald had visited the Cuban Embassy] was in the files of our Mexico station, but was not disseminated until after the assassination when it came to light during an intensive file review." Some material in this memo is withheld, including part of paragraph 13, perhaps giving opinion or background on Liebeler.

\* #1031-405. This 1960 Oswald material from a "soft" file (?), with a 1966 covering memo, is in itself familiar; the covering memo might have interesting information about CIA filing procedures, but naturally much has been deleted.

\*\* #1035-960. This generally interesting memo on "Countering Criticism of the Warren Report" was the subject of an AP story on 4 February 1977. It is not clear if "The Theories of Mr. Epstein," by "Spectator," was supposed to be planted for publication; I didn't know the CIA admitted to writing anonymous articles like this. [The attachments are: "Legal Ignorance and False Logic," by A. L. Goodhart, Q.C., 15 Dec 66 (3 pp.); "JFK in Dallas," by Arnold L. Fein, Saturday Review, 22 Oct 66, 7 pp.; "Autopsy Surgeon Says Photos Support Warren Report on Wound in Neck," Peter Khiss, NYT, approximately 25 Nov 1966 (1 p.); "Dallas 'Exposes' Deflated,"



by Merriman Smith, Washington Post, 20 Nov 66 (3 pp.); "No Conspiracy, But - Two Assassins, Perhaps?" by Henry Farlie, NYT Magazine (1966?); "A New Wave of Doubt," by Fletcher Knebel, Look, July 12, 1966, (10 pp.); interview with Specter, U.S. News & World Report, October 10, 1966 (11 pages). The last two pages are a "Field Distribution" list with everything deleted.]

\* #1044-947E. This memo notes that Garrison's book, called a "phantasmagoria," repeats "his phony charges against CIA and his oft-repeated innuendoes" about certain withheld CD's, including numbers 674, 931, 1054, which are now being released. The release "should help to dispell their illusions and to ease the minds of legitimate researchers who may have doubts about the Commission's findings." Nice of them to allow us to have doubts and still be legitimate.

\* #1045-947F. Although claiming to have no more information about the MMM's identity, the CIA wrote me saying "If you have further questions about this picture, we would be glad to discuss them with you if you come to Washington." I took them up on that offer on my next visit to Washington, in 1973; as noted above, they haven't released any memo on that meeting. I never did find out why they made this rather peculiar offer. (Anyone who would look on this as evidence that I am a CIA agent probably is already convinced I am one, so I won't worry about that possible effect of the release of the correspondence.)

\*\* #1048-947I. At the time, I thought it very odd that the CIA would send me a copy of Belin's article from the NYT; I still think it is odd. It certainly couldn't have been intended to make Belin look better to me! This copy of the letter includes a handwritten note, " - suggested this also since it is a good article." Maybe they really believe that!?

\* #1050-947K. The CD's released at the request of Rep. Richard Ichord, Chairman of the House Internal Security Committee, were CD 1545 and CD 1000, both relating to "D"; the CIA noted that related CD's had been released by the Justice Department. Ichord wanted CD 347, but it was still withheld.

\*\* #1057-947R. Rep. Ichord came to visit on May 8, 1972, and was apparently easily persuaded that all is for the best. "It was quickly apparent that he knew very little about the Oswald case, and that he had been misled by Bernard Fensterwald, Jr. regarding the extent of CIA's coverage of Oswald" in Mexico. Ichord said that he has learned of Bud's "dubious credentials as an expert on the assassination and of his association with Jim Garrison [sic] and others of questionable repute." (I wonder who the others are - me, for example?) The CIA told Ichord that the WC staff "consisted largely of attorneys of varied political and ethnical [sic] backgrounds from widely separated [sic] parts of the country." Maybe he meant "ethical"?

\* #1058-947S. This summary on the Oswald case was prepared "3 March 72 for possible use of the Director;" the context is not obvious. The reference to "an unknown man photographed in front of the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City" caught my eye; it is my impression that even now many references (but not all?) to where the photos were taken have been deleted.

\* #1063-964B. In June 1971, some CIA person prepared brief notes on where the WR refers to Oswald's Embassy contacts in Mexico. His source - 5 annotated pages of which are attached to the memo - was Sylvia Meagher's published index!

\* #1066-964E. The lists of withheld documents have been reviewed "from the standpoint of protection of sources and methods, and also of impact they would have on the Agency should Mr. Bernard Fensterwald, Jr. and his associates on the [CTIA] attempt to exploit them." Bob Smith's requests are referred to here also.

\* #1071-964J. Since Bob Smith referred to a phone call from Mr. Dooley of the CIA in his letter, the CIA couldn't very well delete Dooley's name here - although they seem to have deleted it elsewhere. (Dooley was one of the people who met with me in 1973.) Judging from the handwritten notes on this item, Dooley made the notation on #1048-947I supra.)



\* #1073-964L. This is "22. The Assassination of President Kennedy." A handwritten note (Dooley's writing?) says "Insert for [deletion] history - based on [deletion] memo 30 January 1973." I have been interested for some time in what the CIA's internal investigations and secret histories might have to say. If this is typical, such sources are just as bad as the explanations the CIA has been handing out to the public over the years.

\* #1081-963. More "propaganda notes," cf. #871-388A. This is from the authors of #1035-960 also. The author is quite enthusiastic about Newsweek's expose of Garrison, the Goodhart article, and the Charles Roberts book. The author offers to provide copies of these items.

\* #1085-418. Nothing particularly interesting about the specific allegation in this memo, except that the CIA says that they have no record of Manuel Garcia Gonzalez except an FBI report quoting Dean Andrews as saying that he invented the name. What caught my eye is the references to several 1967 FBI memos on the Garrison matter. I would certainly like to see the FBI's file on Garrison.

\* #1088-969. Slightly puzzling MMM stuff - it is not clear who knew about or had the October 15 photos before this June 1967 memo.

\* #1094-414. Good stuff; I think I commented on it last year. (It is quite familiar to me, anyhow.)

\*\* #1107-420. (This was released earlier, with significantly more deleted.) General Counsel Houston is dealing with the problem of giving out copies of the CD list. The Archives told the CIA that 12 copies of the unexpurgated list have gone out, to such people as Weisberg, "one of the most violent critics of the [WCR]," "Mr. Paul Hoch, who has been associated with Ramparts," NBC, etc. The Archives had recently gotten a request from the National Enquirer and found it difficult to deny. Houston said there was no legal basis for continuing to withhold the full list. The final position, agreed to with the DCI, was "give the new expurgated list to routine inquiries but release the original full list if pressed." That's not a very nice position, really.

\* #1113-422. The CIA didn't want to release Goldberg's memo of 30 Sep 64, which says that the CIA has raised the question of publishing the MMM photo, but the Archives insisted on it, and the CIA then agreed.

\*\* #1114-422A. All that has been released on this Allen-Scott column appears to be the column itself, with a transmittal slip. The story itself seems to be badly screwed up, since the rather obvious explanation of how Oswald might have known that Azcue would be recalled from Mexico is in the Warren Report. (In fact, it is in the CIA document which the column quotes in part.) (My letter of 12 Dec 67 to Tom Bethell discusses this and earlier Allen-Scott articles.) Bethell thought they had done "surprisingly thorough research!" (I have a longer version of the column.)

\* #1115-422B. Affidavits saying just the same thing as the McCone affidavit (that LHO was not a CIA agent) were prepared in 1964 for Marshall S. Carter, Ray S. Cline, Robert L. Bannerman, and Helms (respectively DDCI, Deputy Director for Intelligence, Director of Security, and DDP.) There is no indication that the failure to complete these affidavits had any substantive cause, but that's in interesting idea. Perhaps these people could be asked if they knew about the contemplated contact with Oswald.

\*\*\* 1127-987. See notes on p. 5 supra.

\*\* 1129-425. Researcher Emory Brown wrote the CIA, asking for access to classified documents under the provisions given in the Federal Register for the Defense Department. The CIA correctly pointed out that they do not have provisions for making classified documents available [officially] to qualified researchers. Fair enough - however, there was a background check made on Brown, consisting mainly of a check of RID and OS indices, and an inquiry at the Archives, where Marion Johnson said that Brown had seemed to be interested in Oswald's diary from a cryptographic standpoint. Is the CIA supposed to be doing that kind of background check?



\* 1142-434. The problem was that the FBI didn't want the CIA showing actual FBI reports to defector sources; this was worked out.

\* #1152-432C. Naturally, the unnamed author liked the introductory material in the Bantam edition of the WR.

\* #1155-432F. This memo, relating to the 1975 release, gives identifying data for some (and maybe all) of the CIA-related internal WC documents which are still withheld: Slawson memo of 22 April 64; Rankin letter of 2/7/64 to Helms; a memo (from the CIA?) dated 17 Dec 63; "Revised Draft" by Slawson, 27 Mar 64; Coleman-Slawson progress report of 15 April 64 to Rankin.

\*\* #1176-432Z. McCone says he is supplementing, not dissenting from, a report to the President on implementing the WR recommendations re Presidential protection. (Do we already know about that report?) First, McCone suggests that the Presidential bodyguard should be chosen by, or at least with the concurrence of, the Secretary of the Treasury or the head of the Secret Service, rather than by the President himself. Secondly, McCone thinks the SS should be "directed by a man of demonstrated ability greater than that possessed by those presently in charge." He says, in essence, that the present head (Rowley still??) is a nice guy and good at Presidential Protection but not necessarily at management. This is a memo that some people might be able to make something of. Refer, for background, to Peter Scott's essay, "Assassinations and Domestic Surveillance," p. 443 of our anthology.

\* #1177-994. (Re Ichord's interest.) This is in fact another copy of part of #1057-947R, with fewer deletions in the distribution list this time.

\* #1183-435. An unnamed, recently retired, female CIA employee who was "assigned to the Mexican station during the Oswald investigation" was asked, with negative results, about the 20 photos given to the FBI which Bud was after. It is mentioned in passing that "[deletion, possibly Scott, the station chief] is now dead, as is [deletion] the FBI legal attache who headed the FBI investigation in Mexico."

\* #1184-435A. Robert Fitzpatrick, in 1973 a Baltimore City Councilman, reminisces about meeting Lee and Marina in July 1963 at Spring Hill College in Mobile; Fitzpatrick was a friend of Murret.

\* #1185-999. The unnamed author (Rocca? Angleton?) is telling the Acting DDO that "somewhere along the line HERSH has alleged that there were contacts during the Warren Commission period between me and Mr. David BELIN." He denies it. The memo also transmits 3 attachments - 2 from the press - whose relevance is completely unclear. This caught my eye because I was under the impression that Sy Hersh was quite disinterested in the Warren Commission.

\* #1187-436. This fairly routine summary of the Oswald file at the time of the assassination may be evasive. Item #1188-1000 "explains" that the Mexico stuff had not reached the 201 file as of 11/22. (See p. 6 supra.) This memo just says that "there is also" the 16 Oct 63 memo to Mann, and "subsequently there were several Mexico [City] cables...." Looks evasive about where they were on 11/22.

\*\*\* #1188-1000. See notes on pp. 6-7 supra.

The remaining notes cover the new documents in Batch B. (By the way, I can already see that my zero-through-three-star rating system is not very consistent.)

\* #608-256C. This is mostly internal WC material and the INS file, so I have not looked at it very carefully, but it is certainly worth one star at least.

\* #695-302A. It would be worth correlating this brief with the actual testimony given to the Warren Commission. It was recommended that the DCI "not respond on the record" to queries about Oswald in Mexico and his possible relationship to the Cuban DGI. The author went on about the Soviet-sponsored misinformation campaign which he wanted the DCI to link to the charges that Oswald was CIA; I think this was not played up in the actual testimony.



\* #728-846. This is a fairly routine crank-type allegation. The name of the subject (Mrs. Sherwood) is deleted here, except once on page 2. That doesn't make any difference, however, since the FBI report on this story (CD 1288) has been available at least since 1969, when I got it with no deletions from the GAI-1-CIA file.

\*\* #741-319B. This is a letter from INCA (signed by Ochsner) pushing the record, "Oswald: Self-Portrait in Red." The mailing specifies that Boggs and Ed Butler, as well as Ochsner, make comments on the recording. Of special interest is a handwritten note, "The Commission already has this." Of course, Butler is conspicuously absent from the Warren Report, despite the fact that Boggs was on the Commission; Butler's testimony of 11/24/63 to SISS is apparently still withheld, despite Sen. Dodd's announcement in 1967 that he hoped to release it soon. There's something going on here, but I don't know what it is.

(The last page of this item is a Washington Star clipping, 6/8/64, "Ruby denies connection with Oswald," which seems to be completely unrelated to the previous 4 pages.)

\* #751-322A. I have not yet read this, but on glancing through it I was stuck by how pervasively cold-war-like it was, and how relatively unsophisticated it appears. (Maybe that is in part because it is 20 years old, of course.) People who assume that at least the intelligence part of the CIA is intelligent may be making a mistake.

\* #774-866. Mr. "Kohlman" of the WC staff wanted to publish the 10/10/63 teletype message; the CIA disapproved. On July 21, Coleman asked for a quick decision "since 'the printers are breathing down my neck'." Sure!

\* #777-336A. Goldberg was interested in the allegation in Washington Report that Furtseva had helped Oswald. As I recall, Peter Scott was interested in some other part of that issue of Washington Report, which is attached to this item.

\* #803-350A. This item includes copies of various State Department items of particular sensitivity, mostly relating to the MMM problem. There may be something new here - e.g., relating to the distribution of the 10/10/63 message - but in any case it is nice to have all this in one place. By the way, here the bracketed words are not deleted from "a reliable [and sensitive] source in Mexico" in the 10/10/63 message. Consistency is the virtue of small minds.

\*\* #807-878. This covers CIA reaction to various points in the Mexico part of the WR. Slawson worked with them to protect sources and methods, etc.

\* #841-866. Slawson asked about Duran's morale and current attitude. It was thought by CIA that the WC was considering "confronting" Duran with Oswald's visa application as provided by the Cubans. This language is corrected by hand in this copy of the message to something milder - seeking to have Duran certify that she compiled the visa application.

\* #842-887. For whatever reason, someone took note of a statement by the DeMohrenschildts that they were going to N.Y. to appear on a TV program about Oswald. This was passed on to the WC orally.

\* #929-927A through 939-927K. Eleven photos of the mystery man. See the comments on page 4 about #948-927T, which describes 10 photos; it is not yet certain that we have all. (The CIA claims one is withheld because the background overlaps the figure "to such an extent that the background cannot be removed without obliterating the figure." What does that mean??) By the way, it is not all that obvious to me that items 938 and 939 really show the same man as the others. For example, compare #931 and #939. Individual features seem to match, but he looks quite different in the two shots - vaguely younger and smoother in the latter photo. I suspect this just proves how much difference lighting conditions can make. Also, the neck area in #939 looks odd, presumably because of the way the background was removed.

[END]