

	#	Pp.	Date	Description
*	1237-499A	3	28 Aug 64	Comments on Joesten's book and background
	1238-499B	4	1967 (?)	Joesten's mailer for "The Kennedy Murder Fraud"
	1239-499	6	15 Nov 68	Joesten's "Truth Letter": sample copy with cover letter
*	1240-1005	1	20 Jul 65	Cross-reference sheet on DeMohrenschildts (odd deletion?)
*	1242-488	1	-	Computer entry (?) for DeM's - ref. in Ramparts article (6/67)
*	1248-1009	1	(Probably 24 Nov 63)	Initial info on Ruby from FBI (=#507)
**	1249-1010	2	Oct 61	Indices search request, Oswalds (Peculiar??)
*	1250-1010A	1	28 Sep 61	Info on Marina in response to request re Oswald (?)
	1251-1011	1	26 Nov 63	No station traces Dandol Dianzi
	1257-1035	7	24 Nov 63	Crank (?) call from Valdo Regas; transcript to FBI & SS
	1258-1034	1	25 Nov 63	"Incident Report" on crank call from Texas
	1259-460	3	1 Dec 63	Apparent crank letter from "G-48," who knows LBJ, he says
**	1260-1033	1	1 Dec 63	Call to CIA from ex-FBI fellow Marine who worked with LHO
	1262-461	3	3 Dec 63	Crank (?) telegram from Texas re influence on LHO
*	1263-461A	3	4 Dec 63	(Illegible) Ashbrook comments in Cong. Rec. re "Coverup ..?"
	1264-462	2	7 Dec 63	Crank call from man in Pan American Building
	1265-463	1	10 Dec 63	Telegram in #1262 being sent to FBI
	1266-464	2	-	Pre-ass'n info in Office of Security (OS) files on LHO
*	1267-1031	1	18 Dec 63	Priscilla Johnson contact with LHO (with deletion)
	1268-464A	5	19 Dec 63	Info from Valdo Ragas (Cf. #1257)
	1269-464B	7	24 Jan 64	Review of INS file on Marina (Memo of 3 and 17 Dec, & notes)
**	1272-1028	2	20 Feb 64	Concern about Mexico info having gone to Secret Service
**	1273-1027	2	10 Mar 64	Allen-Scott column re State #234; Priscilla J.'s employment
*	1275-465	1	4 May 64	Source may get info from Lt. Zaryk, who may have known LHO
	1276-466	3	11 May 64	Same subject as #1275 - LHO in Minsk, etc.
	1279-466A	2	1 Jun 64	Sherwood story (it's a CD): "CIA courier" with foreknowledge
	1280-466B	2	18 May 64	Same subject as #1279
***	1281-1024	1	4 Jun 64	Blind memo for FBI on Davison being in notebook & "Inv. Govt."
	1284-466C	1	4 Jun 64	Warren Comm. press release - no final conclusions reached yet
	1285-467	2	16 Jul 64	Andrew Zaryk (Same subject as #1275-6)
*	1286-1018	1	29 Jul 64	Letter to Newsweek re LHO - gov't contacts (known to writer)
	1287-1017	2	30 Oct 64	Reasonable-sounding crank (?) who gave LHO ride in 1960
**	1289-1019	2	10 Jun 65	Much-sanitized review of Ford's book (for DCI)
*	1290-1020	1	12 Jul 65	Ref. to Dulles in printed version of Lane's lecture
*	1291-1021	7	22 Sep 65	1 p. memo + 6 p. catalog list of LHO items at auction
*	1293-468	4	2 Oct 68	Background on LHO, and summary of (Nosenko's (?)) info
*	1294-481	7	19 Jun 64	Entries on LHO address book (deletions re Davison, &c)
	1295-482	2	8 Apr 64	OS memo; deleted comments on 3 Russian notebook entries
*	1296-469	10	31 Mar 64	Notebook entry for Sharapov; most info deleted
*	1297-480	2	3 Feb 64	Notebook entry for G. & A. Taylor (and more?) (Deletions)
*	1298-477	2	3 Feb 64	Notebook entry re ACLU, Maasdam (Deletions)
	1299-470	1	31 Jan 64	Possible traces on "Kozlova" entry in notebook
*	1300-479	4	3 Feb 64	"Mr. Bargas" notebook entry; odd attachments deleted
*	1301-476	1	30 Jan 64	Stuckey entry in notebook; info deleted
	1302-478	1	30 Jan 64	Shirokova entries in notebook; info deleted
*	1303-474	5	29 Jan 64	"Mrs. Max Clark" notebook entry; attachments all deleted
*	1304-473	3	28 Jan 64	Kuznetsova entry in notebook (from FBI report); deletions
*	1305-472	3	23 Jan 64	Jaggars-Chiles-Stovall notebook entry; info deleted
	1306-471	1	17 Jan 64	Kuznetsova entry in notebook and on Martello slip
*	1307-475	1	31 Jan 64	Wm. B. Reily & Co. notebook entry; info deleted
**	1308-475A	1	10 Jan 64	Request for partial traces on notebook for FBI
	1314-1036D	1	11 Apr 67	Correspondence from N.O. office re Garrison inv'n of Shaw
	1316-475D	3	18 Apr 67	[and 28 Mar] Garrison probe; Novel's lie detector test
*	1317-475E	2	4 May 67	Clips from "Councilor" [20 Apr] forwarded (Right-wing stuff)
*	1319-487	2	14 Aug 70	Correction of spelling in LHO notebook entry (Alizberg)
	1320-484	1	8 May 67	Pakistani press coverage of Garrison charges

	#	Pp.	Date	Description
	1322-484A	1	31 May 67	Public library record checks on Lincoln Lawrence & J. Amory
*	1325-484B	1	22 Sep 67	Garrison story clip from p. 7 of N.O. paper
**	1326-1042	8	28 Sep 67	Queries from JD re Garrison probe; CIA denials, mostly
***	1329-484C	1	3 Mar 67	Jack Anderson broadcast (3/2/67) re RFK, Castro plots, etc.
**	1330-485	1	9 Dec 66	CIA "guidance" to Finney (NYT) re MMM photo
**	1332-502	7	1 May 67	[=#502] Novel's claim of CIA affiliation; Bast, Turner, &c.
*	1333-1046	1	6 Apr 67	Clay Shaw; his DCS contacts; liaison with FBI [See #1358]
	1334-1047	1	6 Apr 67	[Deleted's] request for info on Shaw's DCS contacts
*	1337-1051	2	16 Mar 67	Sullivan, J. Monroe (Shaw's S.F. alibi witness for 11/22)
*	1338-1052	1	8 Mar 67	Garrison probe of LHO case; Guy Banister (info deleted)
*	1339-1053	1	3 Mar 67	Call from [deleted], 3/2, re Shaw; contents of Shaw file
	1341-1043	1	15 Jan 68	Kerry Thornley (Garrison comments and WR references)
	1342-485A	3	29 Nov 67	(2+1 pp.) Allen-Scott column re Azque removal (FBI, LHO)
*	1345-1057	7	7 Sep 67	Memo #6, Garrison & the ass'n (Much deleted) [=1230-515]
*	1347-1059	1	5 Jul 67	Hoke Smith May (as recipient of Novel-Weiss letter)
*	1348-1059A	4	9 Oct 67	Subject (in Chicago) unclear; much deleted
*	1349-483	2	18 Apr 74	Office of Security did not investigate JFK ass'n (?)
	1350-1038	1	(1967?)	Denial (routine?) of foreign press report that LHO was CIA
**	1351-1059B	5	10 Jun 75	Hunt; Sturgis not CIA (Also: Lanz, Stuckey, Hemming, Hall)
**	(same item)	3	(Jul 62?)	[w/att. ?] Stuckey article on Hemming et al., & cover memo
	1353-496	3	29 Oct 75	Info from Nosenko in 1967-8 (with attachment, next item:)
	1354-495	10	5 Jan 68	Nosenko's comments on Oswald
	1357-506	3	5 Apr 67	The LHO case; Jack S. Martin (SRS memo)
	1358-505	1	6 Apr 67	[Identical to #1333-1046; this copy is clearer]
*	1359-503	2	7 Feb 68	OS index check on Ferrie; undeleted info is from public stuff
*	1360-504	1	13 Sep 68	L.A. Free Press article on Broshears; Project Resistance (?)
	1361-500	2	16 Oct 68	OS memo on Broshears, based on LA Free Press
*	1362-1061A	2	20 Dec 73	Ferrie; Layton Martens; Martens' homicide arrest; deletions
*	1363-501	2	26 Oct 67	Sergio Arcacha Smith (OS memo)

Total: 84 items, 220 pages. [103 pages are from new items, per CIA letter to me.]

NOTES: [Three-star items first. As usual, the rating system is subjective.]

\*\*\* 1281-1024. This blind memo contains only the Davison entry from Oswald's address book, and a sentence mentioning the Soviet claim that Penkovsky would call Davison (from "The Invisible Government," by Wise & Ross; the source is given as "Page 250 [deletion].") Item 1294-481 states (on page 4) that "Davison was apparently never used clandestinely by the Agency" (in the Penkovsky spy case). (Some additional information is withheld; I'm skeptical, of course, and would like to see it.)

What is most interesting about this memo is the handwritten notation, "Orig. handed to FBI 6/4/64 [deletion]." Was this a lead for the FBI, or a warning that they steer clear of a CIA matter? Why a blind memo? Why was the background info on Davison apparently never brought to the attention of the Warren Commission by the CIA? Why, in fact, make a fuss about the reference in this book, when the Soviet charges against Davison had been reported in the N.Y. Times in May 1963?

The FBI investigation of the Davison notebook entry, which was completed by March 1964 and as far as I know not reopened, was extremely inadequate. Only the Secret Service even made reference to the fact that Davison was an alleged spy. (Anyone who is at all interested in Davison is welcome to my rather detailed notes on the CD's and other public sources.)

Incidentally, since the CIA was interested in buying up Random House's entire printing of the Wise & Ross book, I would be curious to know if the quoted sentence actually appears on page 250 of the published edition, or if that cite might have come from the galleys or some early draft the CIA had access to. Can someone check?)

Of course, the deleted material in these memos should be examined, and the FBI should be asked about their (non)-reaction to this "lead" from the CIA.

\*\*\* 1329-484C. This memo reveals that Jack Anderson talked about the Castro-retaliation story on television the evening before the famous March 3, 1967 column was published. Someone in the CIA wrote a memo for the record the next day summarizing what Anderson had said.

As reported by the CIA, what Anderson said was pretty much what was in the column. This memo is very short; I don't know if Anderson actually said more on the air. Two points not mentioned in the CIA memo may indicate a certain discretion (or may just not have been on the air): Anderson's column refers to "one version" which claims that "underworld figures actually were recruited to carry out the plot"; there is nothing like this in the CIA memo. Secondly, the column says the CIA hatched the plot, and that insiders say it must have reached Robert Kennedy, with "one source" insisting that RFK "played a key role in the planning." The CIA memo says that "the Attorney General ... planned, through CIA, the assassination of Castro or encouraged it."

I don't suppose the TV station, or a local buff, would have a tape of the Anderson broadcast? I'm curious about whether Drew Pearson usually did that broadcast himself; the column was published with attribution to Anderson, as was commonly the case.

Several people have suggested that I am overly suspicious of the failure of the Washington Post to print this column at all (except in a much abbreviated form on March 7). I still think that should be pursued, on the chance that there was some sort of intervention to prevent publication. Was there an early edition of the Post on the streets on the evening of March 2? Which Pearson column did it have? Presumably the column went out by mail to Pearson's subscribers a few days before March 3; did the government learn its contents through a subscriber? Who got this little memo, and what did the recipients do about it? Isn't it almost certain that there was a "damage assessment" done in response to this report? Has anyone talked to Anderson about this? Are there any relevant documents in the CIA file on him which he got from the Agency some time ago?

[Notes on all two-star and some one-star items:]

(Before I forget - I would have to give two stars to Earl Warren's chapter on the JFK investigation in his memoirs, which have just been published. He says he saw the autopsy photos himself and takes credit for keeping them from the public.)

\* 1237-499A. This and various other one-star items are well worth reading, but I'm not including notes on them since the topic and key points of interest can be inferred from the one-line description in the listing.

\*\* 1249-1010. This looks quite interesting, but unfortunately much information is deleted and much of the rest is illegible. The first page is an "Indices Search Request" form, reflecting the results of a request from [deletion]. The "name of subject" appears to be blank (rather than deleted, but I can't be sure); the next section suggests that the search was done under "Oswald, Marina Nicholaevna; Oswald, Lee; and Prusakova, Marina." The search was apparently done on 12 and/or 14 Oct 1961, and seems to have uncovered three references.

The first apparent reference is most peculiar. As far as I can tell, "No. = 2" means that it is a reference to the second of the names listed, Lee Oswald. "Index = C" might mean covert indexes, which are distinguished from the overt ones at the top of the form. "File = L. Oswald [deletion]" might be interesting, but I can't figure out what it means. "Reference = Wright, Raymond" leaves me completely puzzled. (My reading is uncertain, and there may be parentheses around this name, which rings no bells for me. (This does not seem to be Rep. Jim Wright, who may have made inquiries on Mrs. Oswald's behalf when Lee went to Russia.) If this were a CIA name, I would have expected it to be deleted. Under "Location of file" there appears a short deletion, followed by "Apt" or "Hpt" or something like that. Finally, under "results review" appears "7/8/55 p.2." (The "55" is quite clear.) In 1955, Oswald was 16 and had not yet even joined the Marines. It's a bizarre idea, but it might be relevant that in 1955 Oswald apparently was in the Civil Air Patrol.

(See, for example, the FBI interviews of Anthony Atzenhoffer (CD 405, p. 17) and John Ciravolo (CD 464, p. 13).) If I were in a position to do so, I would certainly try to find out exactly what every notation on this form means. Maybe the House Committee will do this.

The second reference located appears to be "FNU card Mrs"; that is, an "Abstract File Slip" which is attached. It is almost totally illegible. I think it would be worthwhile for someone in Washington to check with the CIA about seeing the actual document involved, or getting a better copy.

The third reference appears to be from the overt indices, with a file number which is not deleted but illegible (possibly "YS- 4"), with a reference to "Lee Harvey" Oswald.

Three additional lines in this part of the form have been deleted.

This item might be related to #1250-1010A, a memo of 28 Sep 61 providing info on Marina in response to someone's request for info on Oswald.

I would certainly like to know what relationship, if any, this item (with its reference to Lee Harvey Oswald) bears to (a) the long-suppressed discussion, apparently in the summer of 1960, of the "laying on of interview(s)" (#435-173A), and (b) the opening of a 201 file for Lee Henry Oswald long before this index check, on 9 Dec 60. This might turn out to be a three-star item after all.

\*\* 1260-1033. On December 1, the CIA got a phone call from a man who said he knew and worked with Oswald for nine months in the Marines in 1959. What is noteworthy is that he had not yet discussed his knowledge of Oswald with the FBI or the Secret Service - although he worked for the FBI from June 1953 to 1956! Also, the CIA got advance knowledge of this call from two Agency employees who are members of the same U.S. Marine Corps Reserve unit as the source. The source's name has seven letters - which is consistent with Donovan (but I don't think Donovan told the Warren Commission he had been an FBI employee!) This memo indicates that the CIA took steps to pass this lead over to the FBI "through official channels." It may all be quite trivial, but it strikes me as odd.

\* 1263-461A. These negative copies of pp. 22215-6 from the Congression Record are quite illegible, but it appears that Ashbrook introduced a resolution for an investigation, which he felt should center on the State Department's role in bringing Oswald back from Russia; someone has underlined Ashbrook's question about why Oswald was in Minsk, etc.

\*\* 1272-1028. On 19 Feb 64, someone complained to the author of this memo, who was evidently in the Office of Security, about the furnishing of DD/P material to the Secret Service on 11/23. The documents in question relate to the Mexico photo and other Mexico matters. (See CD 674, and the entries in my old Mexico chronology under November 23, February 12 (when the Commission requested this material) and March 24 (when the CIA provided it).) The complainant, who advised of the Commission's request, has a 6-letter last name, consistent with Dooley. He said "that the [12 letters], [10 letters] has the job of determining which pieces of information should be made available to the Commission." Perhaps the information in the Schweiker Report about the peculiar choice of CIA liaison would enable us to fill in these deletions. The complaint may have been on purely procedural grounds, or maybe the Mexico stuff was considered particularly sensitive. I'm pretty sure that before the CIA sent over this SS material (after an unnecessary 6-weeks delay) the Warren Commission had no idea that the CIA had thought that another man was Oswald. I would like to see this memo without deletions.

\*\* 1273-1027. This memo, to DDS from "Deputy Chief, [Deletion]," deals with an Allen-Scott report alleging that State Dept. Dispatch 234 (11/2/59) reports that Oswald was interviewed by the CIA in Moscow. The dispatch indicates only that Snyder interviewed Oswald.

For no apparent reason, the memo then notes that two separate press reports, on 1 Dec and 20 Feb, had mentioned interviews of Oswald in Moscow by Priscilla Johnson. I've never really appreciated the interest in who she was officially working for, since her close cooperation with Embassy people is clearly set forth

in the testimony. Nonetheless, for what it's worth: the first 4 lines of the next paragraph of the memo are deleted. Then: "Johnson's biographic data reflects that from December 1955 to April 1956 she worked in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow as an employee of the Joint Press Reading Service [whatever that is - PLH] (although other sources show employment variously as 'free lance'; translator, U.S. Embassy; North American Newspaper Alliance; New York Times) and during 1958-60 she was employed in the USSR by the North American Newspaper Alliance." (Item 1267-1031, which is about Priscilla Johnson, has a paragraph deleted.)

\*\*\* 1281-1024. See notes on p. 2 supra.

\* 1286-1018. This slightly peculiar item appears to be a letter to the editor of Newsweek, made available to the CIA; the writer is reluctant to believe the alleged non-surveillance of Oswald, saying "Yet, we ourselves have a list of names and dates pertaining to contacts between U.S. agencies and Lee Oswald over the past five years." If the writer is a buff who put together this information after the assassination, it's nothing special, but when I first read this letter I thought it might have come from some semi-private intelligence group which knew about Oswald before the assassination. All information about the writer has been deleted.

\*\* 1289-1019. This version of the CIA's review of Ford's book went to the DCI. It is pretty mild, and interesting mainly by comparison to Item 994-937, dated over two months earlier, which was directed to Helms. The earlier memo referred to "the campaign of which you [Helms] are already aware" by "the Lefties (Mark Lane et al)." This memo more discreetly refers to the possibility of "quotation out of context [by] those who seek to damage the image of the FBI." This memo notes that "In February, when CIA saw the galley proofs of this book, this information was called to the attention of the FBI on a confidential basis. However, no action was probably taken by them, because there appears to be no change in the published version from the text of the galley proofs."

\* 1291-1021. Charles Hamilton, the N.Y. autograph dealer, was selling a number of Oswald items apparently obtained from his mother, including (#147) two unopened letters from her to him in Moscow. The author of this memo to the DDCI noted that Mrs. Oswald must be strapped for cash, and specified that this memo was "for information only."

\* 1294-481 through 1307-475. This series of memos is the result of index checks on the entries in Oswald's notebook. The main point of interest is the deletions. All were released earlier with, typically, only a little more deleted. Several references to "OS files" have been allowed to remain; apparently these are all OS memos. In some cases, pages which have now been made available with all the information deleted do make me wonder how come OS had so much information about (e.g.) Max Clark. (It may be that the OS files reflect information from other agencies, perhaps even from the FBI reports given to the Warren Commission which have now been made public; perhaps the CIA feels constrained not to release the kind of stuff that the FBI was releasing at the Archives before the Privacy Act took effect.) Also, it is of some interest to me that the OS analysis seems to be based on the FBI's memo on the address book (which is not very accurate), not on a photographic copy of the book itself.

\* 1308-475A. This memo explains the previous series. The FBI sent over the notebook and other information from Oswald's papers, and asked the CIA to look for any connections with Soviet intelligence. While [deletion] will be responsible for replying to this request, the memo says, "this office would appreciate being furnished any information contained in your files on any of the names, addresses, etc., whether in the U.S. or abroad, which would have significance to the Bureau's or this Agency's interest in trying to put together relevant pieces in this case." This memo indicates the kind of semi-independent study of the assassination as a whole which I wondered about in my 1975 memo to the Rockefeller Commission.

\* 1317-475E. The author, presumably a N.O. CIA man, notes without quotation marks, but evidently with ironic intent, that the forthcoming Assassination Report (from the White Citizens Council) "will provide much information about the Agency and a copy of it will be forwarded to Headquarters."

\* 1319-487. A rather routine-looking memo (except, maybe, for the deleted parts) about an entry in Oswald's notebook which might be "Eliasberg." The question is, why is the CIA worrying about this in August 1970? (I guess it could be because they had just gotten new information from a Russian source.)

\* 1325-484B. Forwarding a clipping from the N.O. Times-Picayune of 22 Sep 67, the author notes "The fact that the article appears on page seven of a New Orleans newspaper is believed to have significance in view of previous treatment of news on this topic." This doesn't have to mean that the CIA is taking credit for the "improved" balance in the coverage of Garrison, but I'm sure some people will take it that way.

\*\* 1326-1042. For Garrison buffs, this is probably a three-star memo. In September 1967, the CIA got a rather long list of questions relating to the Garrison probe from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division. The questions dealt with the CIA's alleged links with Shaw, Arcacha Smith, Novel, Ruby, Oswald, Ferrie, Davis and the training camp, Beaubouef, Banister, Ward, the White Russians, DeMohrenschildt, Underhill, Atsugi, and various lawyers involved in the Garrison case. First, it is interesting that someone in the Justice Department was asking these questions. Also, the CIA answers, which are generally denials, are noteworthy. The CIA does discuss the information provided by Shaw to the DCS (in more detail here than elsewhere, I think). The CIA seems to admit a relationship to the CRC and the DRF, although the admission seems to be deleted. On the Mexico photo, the CIA specifies that the man "was thought to be possibly Oswald when the photo was turned over to the FBI after the assassination," which is correct but quite incomplete and misleading; the Agency specifies that they did not photograph Oswald at any time.

On the other hand, the CIA denied a lot, and some of the denials are not plausible. There was never a "direct relationship" between Arcacha and the CIA; Novel and his lawyer Plotkin were never associated with the CIA; there was no relationship with, and no file on, Ferrie before the assassination; the CIA had nothing to do with the Lacombe training camp, or with Davis, or with Guy Banister; there were no CIA employees or operatives among the Dallas White Russians. Also, there "is" no CIA association with George DeMohrenschildt - I guess his contacts with Moore don't count!

\*\*\* 1389-484C. See notes on p. 3 supra.

\*\* 1330-485. Please refer to my notes of 5/5/76 on the "key items" in the original CIA release. The name of the CIA man who told John Finney of the NY Times that the MMM photo "has nothing to do with the case" is now revealed - it is Joseph C. Goodwin, Assistant to the Director.

\*\* 1332-502. The first 3 pages are a memo from Osborn (Director of Security) to the Deputy Director of Support, entitled "Claimed Agency affiliation by conspiracy case figures." It recounts Novel's claims, as reported by the FBI and the press, especially about the Schlumberger arms bunker burglary. The CIA basically denies it all, saying (among other things) that munitions were not handled like that. There has been "no documented Agency utilization" of Novel, Ferrie, or Arcacha Smith. (If you can't believe that Ferrie flew for the CIA, what can you believe?!)

However: the last paragraph notes that during the CIA's inquiries into Novel's charges, "one tenuous link was developed which conceivably could be exploited and distorted in attempts to link this Agency with Novel and others. An interlinking with a personality [sic; I think that means 'person'] reportedly from Ramparts Magazine might also indicate a connection between Novel's charges and the concerted efforts of some to smear the Agency." Only the first half or so of the attached memo, which explains this, is not withheld. It links Novel to polygrapher Lloyd

Furr, and Furr to Richard L. Bast and their firm Redex. Bast's background and various enterprises are described; the author evidently considers him "unscrupulous and untrustworthy." The memo then reports that when Bill Turner was checking out the Asia Foundation in January 1967, he left a calling card, which he said was an old one, for "Redex-Pacific." The rest of the memo is withheld.

\* 1333-1046. Whether or not Garrison made a big point of Shaw's CIA links at the time - and my recollection is quite strong that he did not - it is clear that the CIA was concerned about this problem.

\* 1338-1052. The undeleted section of this memo does not contain the claim that Banister had nothing to do with the CIA, so I wonder what the deleted section does say. (However, cf. #1326 - there the CIA does say they had nothing to do with Banister.)

\* 1347-1059. The interesting paragraphs, if any, are deleted. It is not clear why Hoke May's involvement (as the alleged recipient of Novel's letter) would warrant a memo.

\* 1348-1059A. Almost all of this memo is withheld. The subject had apparently been the source of information about the FPCC and CPUSA in Chicago. There is one provocative reference, quoting someone in CIA as saying "It appears DCS is cleaning out their files re Lee Harvey Oswald et al." I assume that is quite innocent.

\* 1349-483. Someone had made a verbal request for a check of whether the Office of Security had ever investigated the JFK assassination or the killing of Oswald. (The answer was, essentially, no.) What strikes me as odd is that such a request was made in April 1974. (I did ask essentially this question of the Rockefeller Commission, but that was a full year later.)

\*\* 1351-1059B. This memo was presumably done for the Rockefeller Commission. The author of the memo "found no information in the material reviewed which would contradict the Agency's public statement [that Sturgis was never connected with the CIA]; however, it is apparent that an unknown group has backed some of Sturgis' activities." The writer will not go further, he says, "without approval from higher authority."

The memo, most of which is not withheld, deals with Hunt's book's comments on Diaz Lanz; the Sturgis-Lanz link; Sturgis' Anti-Communist Brigade; Hemming's Interpen, and Loran Hall, "the individual in Interpen of most interest to Garrison."

The memo also mentions an article by Stuckey, which is attached, with what appears to be a contemporary (1962) cover memo. Unfortunately, both the article and the cover memo are almost illegible.

This may well be a three-star memo; I'm not familiar enough with all these people to analyze it properly. It is worth having a copy, if you are at all interested in this area.

\* 1360-504. This memo mentions in passing that an earlier issue of the L.A. Free Press was sent to Headquarters "in connection with Project Resistance." I suppose that project is public knowledge, or the CIA would have deleted this, but I don't know offhand what it was.

\* 1362-1061A. It is not clear what prompted this interest in Ferrie and Martens in 1970. The file on John Edward Whalen (?) has some additional information not in the OS files for Ferrie and Martens, pertaining to Martens' 1968 arrest by the N.O. Police on a homicide charge. [I don't know what this is all about!]

\* 1363-501. Although Arcacha's CIA connection is summarized as "none," some subsequent information - presumably explaining the relationship between his group and the CIA - is deleted.

In general, batch F is a pretty good one, and I expect batch G to be even better!