

Dear Paul (Jim and Mark),

9/17/84

Your note to me of the 7th and your 9/8 to Jim, cc Mark and me, both are very good and very helpful. I'd forgotten several of the things you mentioned and found good use for them.

With regard to your caution re IG report, it was published by Anderson prior to use by HSCS, but the use by HSCA is much more significant because it was disclosed with the CIA's assent and thus none of that information can be withheld properly, whatever its form.

And with regard to ambiguity in the CIA's 5/2/77 to you, that is their problem and if they elect to be ambiguous they have to live with my interpretation of their ambiguity. My position is that unless they say "some" they mean all, and let them deny it. How can they possibly find any explanation for not acting on requests a decade old?

On your memo, I suppose that by now we are all fuzzy about the plots against Castro, but I have an adequate recollection of them. They actually began before the Bay of Pigs, as I know from a man who was (I think only later) CIA and who was present. Vastro wasn't killed then because of what can be regarded as paranoia or caution. After a rest stop of a procession in the countryside, instead of returning to the jeep he'd been in, he switched to another. The jeep he was in got a direct hit from a bazooka.

I disagree strongly with your second graf and your fear of the substance and withheld information in the document. I've filled in the gaps, added what was omitted, and what is of greatest legal significance, the factor that interested you, it was all public domain before the 7/22/82 Dubeous affidavit. (I had to ~~resist~~ resist the pun in the affidavit.) The most effective legal thing is to show that they knowingly and deliberately withheld what was officially in the public domain and then lied about it. Their dishonesties in their 9/10 submissions magnify this! How I'd love to depose those bastards! Moreover, if you stick to the simplistic, releaseable in 1976 but not in 1984, you are hung on their oh-so-sorry, simple, honest error line.

Was it inter or intra, Dube one, index another. Knoche says neither. the significant thing is that it was not predecisional, wither intra or inter, and I've addressed that, using it also to include the kind of known and disclosed info that was omitted, which makes an additional case for intended to underinform or misinform. After much thought I came to believe that it is Rocca's memo to the CIA people who ought to know of exactly what he did and did not tell Belin. Ha was a natural to con Belin, having done it earlier.

You say you see no purpose in dissembling. Perhaps re inter or intra, but you ought recognize the significance of any dissembling. They lie in order to invoke b5

so don't divert yourself by wondering whether it was inter or intra. The thing is that it was not and could not have been predecisional.

However, I'm reasonably sure they would not let such a self-indictment get out of their own hands voluntarily, it is that inadequate a job.

I think you are pretty sharp in connecting it with the RC but believing it was not sent to it, which is what Knoche actually testifies it was. And, give the Belin-Olson makeup, might have been after Rocca spoke to Belin. It was not, clearly, intended as the initial response to RC, which they went out of their way to make verbal. However, when they found that acceptable, they could hardly decline a copy later.

Re Regan on RC: my recollection is that he did as little as he could get away with and he has a record of doing very little when he could get away with little.

Reagan's attitude toward Castro: Knowing today's Reagan and his published thoughts tells you all you need to know. He'd believe anything anti.

Hoover testified to the WC that the JFK case will never be closed and they do continue to add records to the initial files.

I'll have trouble retrieving copies of CIA 1646-452 A (RC 5 in your file) and related records, like 16440451. I'd appreciate copies and anything else like them and I think Jim should have them on hand. Also, do you recall how we learned that Rocca was the author of that nasty diatribe, which I recall but can't remember where one of the girls who helped me file it? It will be particularly valuable for JL to be able to show that while the long and nasty memo includes Castro at the Brazilian embassy, the 13-pp one withheld from you doesn't, when it surely should have. Also an records of internal discussion at the CIA. Useful on deposition and in court

The FBI told LBJ about the CIA's anti-Castro plots, and that is an attachment to the first affidavit I sent Jim. There should never have been any question within the CIA because long before the RC LBJ went public, Murder, Inc. in the Carib. And to Cronkite, on CBS, edited out as his request, leaked to Bud, Published in WxPost.

What you "toss out" at the bottom of p. 1 is, I think, in the right area. (part of a CIA response, you say.) But I think ex poste facto. Like Rocca saying this is what I said, and didn't say. But I think it is not a good guess to guess that it was by someone who did not know. Rather do I believe that it was by someone who did know and thus knew what not to say.

Jim and I also should have copies of your #60m Rocca's memo on his conversation with Belin. The sentence you quote is an excellent example of lying while not technically lying by insertion of the irrelevant, Castro's possession of "documentation" of proof. Documentation is entirely irrelevant. And the CIA would not know if he did in any event. And wasn't it enough that he captured assassins who confessed, of whom Subela is not

the only one?

16444-451 may also be useful, now and in the future if as I see possible, someone can be interested in a wase study of how the CIA disinform. What makes you think that this⁹otoc, was by Rocca?

Next you say you think you learned somewhere that Roccas was ignorant of plots against Castro. While DP may have kept them secret insofar as its own discussion of them went, it appears to me to be impossible that as Angleton's honcho Roccas would not have been familiar with what Castro said about them, which would have given him that much and kind of knowledge. So it is inevitable that he had some knowledge, if not from the "elmsmen."

You underestimate CIA gall is you think the feigned indignation and outrage over what Castro is reported to have said could not have been said by anyone who was aware of what we were up to. This is, rather, typical of their postures and posturing, their self-portrayal, their intent to deceive and mislead. What follows is in keeping, the denial limited to "plans underway or known to us in CI staff." That SOB knew very well that DP would not inform any other component, would seek to preserve deniability, and that CI would be kept in a position to deny even if it had all the informal knowledge in the world. And above all they would not have anything along that line on paper in CI, "As far as our materials show."

I think a simpler explanation of the Knoche disclaimer is Cover the CIA's Asss Then Cover My Own Ass. "None of those characters was ignorant or innocent."

Next, your impression of unsophisticated is not apt, although mediocrity is, but I think you lack context. Those CIA cats knew all they had to know about Belin, even without any personality profile. And the (lack of) intent by RC. So rather than being unsophisticated, this reflects their scheme for getting away with what they got away with, absence in the RW report. Why was there no reference to Harker's story in this? Belin's sick self-concept and perpetual self-defense compulsion: the WC published the Harker story, so why bare Belin's ass, knowing he didn't want that done? And indebt him thereby.

Rocca also had to cover his own ass, so reconsider your last sentence, penult graf on 2, that the CUA didn't want to screw things up by letting Castro find out about the CIA's role in the plots. He didn't have to have proof and he did not and could not avoid the suspicion, which is all he needed. This is at the end of 452-C and is obvious.

Last graf, not window-dressing because of what was public before then but an account, I believe, of the little Rocca told Belin that satisfied Belin, in Rocca's mind. And while the memo does speculate that the participants would not talk, in fact

they did, as the IG's report reflects, Giancana quite early to a or the Chicago papers, before this date through Morgan, to Bearson, then the FBI, and how could they expect the Vegas fiasco to remain entirely silent? Once the mafia types decided to talk through Morgan, there was no longer speculation about CIA involvement.

The AMLASH portions are self-serving, semantical and nexcessary because, as the memo does not state, Castro had Cubela, tired, confessed and booby-hatched. The only reason FitzGerald was there was to consummate earlier conniving, not to initiate it.

You say (on 3) that the Schweiker report concedes that the CIA made the mafia plots unattributable. Perhaps this is a fair parapbraise, but much of it was immature and nutty anyway. I suggest the correct formulation is that the CIA designed this plot to be unattributable, but it was not and could not have been unattributable per se and as it turned out.

Penult graf, p. 3: If the first copy you got lacks any clasification stamp, that is very important so please send copies to JL and me. It is not at all likely that and it is against regulations for "the basence of visible classifications marking" to be "an artifact of the copying process." They are all over the newer Dube copies, albeit indistinct, and classification reugations required this and cancellation of them after declassification and disclosure. If JL can produce a copy in court without and classification markings/declassifications he has a sensation.

Page 10, line 1, nothing at all that can even be guess is visible in the copy attached to the 9/10 Dube declaration but on the copy Einstein sent JL the tops of the last two letters appears, not enough for indetification, but the denult could be taken for an "1" and the last for an a,o,e,p, etc. This page has Secret/Sensitive at the bottom, about 1/2" high and thick letters.

I don't think that any of the post 11/22 Cubela stuff is new.

Subordinate of the Syndicate contact: not Rosselli. This "contact" was Maheu, so it is his subordinate

I also am hurrying, so please excuse the typos I'M sure you've had enough experience with to make out. I think that aside from this litigation this is an important area historically and in the litigation I think it is of exceptional importance if JL makes the effective use he is now in a position to make. In court and out, particularly if the Senate does not agree to all the House changes in the pending bill.

Please try to thinl along the lines above and please also send both JL and me any other records you can see as in any way relevant. With and kind of luck and effective usage, they can get really clobbered and it can be helpful all around.

Best,

Harold