

JL- Epstein taped for KSAN 4/5/78 w. P.D.Scott

HW 6/4/78

As I told you when you phoned about another matter I was pleasantly tired and a little euphoric about how much hard work I was able to do this afternoon after completing the affidavit. So I may not have been as sensitive to some matters as I might have been.

I agree with Paul Hoch - there is no proof Epstein got anything under FOIA. He said less about this that he has in the past and a bit more about other sources than in the past. However, there is a point at which he may have said something. Assuming he can be believed.

Excuse the typos and the haste. I got up at 4 to be sure to complete the affidavit in time for Lil to get it retyped and assembled. I should be in bed, where she is. But I may forget if I let this go until the morning, which will be broken up by a 6:30 and an 8:00 trip into town.

More and more I found myself wondering what Scott was doing. Sorry Paul was not there instead. Scott was his skill.

Epstein seemed to say that the FBI had an espionage case against Oswald. And that it destroyed files. Perhaps a reference to the note to Hosty. Epstein's (and Scott's) interpretation of that story is blind acceptance of one of the contradictory FBI versions. I do not accept any of the versions.

E. does not dispute he had \$500,000, which pretty much means it is true. Otherwise he'd have demurred.

Readers Digest has nothing to do with the book. Its editors located the "arinos, witnesses from the photo-engraving plant, etc.

Says no one can figure out LEO's route to Finland - not what book says.

Speaking of "recruiter" he says "through Freedom of Information - I brought it to his attention."

After the beginning of talk about Angleton, "By the time I wrote my book, in '76..." He hesitated a bit here. But he did say he had the book written in 1976, which I regard as important because I believe the thing was made over, accounting for the delay in appearance. I'm more convinced of my analysis now.

"There is an organizational need not to like Angleton, throughout the CIA," because Angleton was critical of or censored the intelligence summaries. This is part of what runs through it all, justification of Angleton. Regards the CIA as wrecked w/o him and his departed staff. (Lost the organizational memory with these departures.)

Angleton suspected Colby of being ~~the~~ KGB mole, "at one time confronted him."

"...I became more interested in the shenanigans" of the spooks than in Oswald.

Side 2 begins with silly stuff about LEO being worked into position where he'd have access to classified info. Sense deMohrenschildt worked him for CIA.

On the Hosty note, suggests another intelligence agency wrote the note, the "most important piece of evidence" in the JFK case.

Says CIA covered up in JFK case because it regarded "mole" case as more important.

"I was put in touch with a psychiatrist by the CIA," story from book, re Webster.

on deMohrenschildt, "the type of things I was discussing with him (was) his connections with intelligence agencies." his after suggesting deM was "handler." I think enough to flip the sick George over and out.

Digest "didn't know what ~~was~~ the book was about until they received it." ?? On its KGB, "was heavily spoon fed to them by Nosenko."

Most of the book comes from individuals he names, as in book. But here he says most

and not in any sense in any LHO connection.

"I spent six months going around with the counterintelligence staff."

"Under Freedom of Information I only got some of the information" on Voloshin.

Angleton sees Senate Intelligence Committee as chance to flush mole out.

This last is almost verbatim. It is less that Hoch said he said as I recall it.

My belief is that Angleton knows better than Epstein says. I therefore believe that Angleton, crazy as he may be, has other purposes. Like vengeance.

Epstein says the CIA is wrecked and Angleton apparently believes it. Angleton is of the dedicated wrong. I think he can believe that by getting some kind of vengeance he can be doing a public service.

I can believe that Epstein with or without inspiration may have used the claim to have received so much under FOIA as a cover for how much he was fed by individuals.