

Epstein- "Legend"- "Oswald and the KGB in Dallas," second instalment, New York, 3/6/78

The actual title on p. 55 is "Oswald The Secret Agent."

This is more of Epstein's theorizing, in virtually no case with proof and in all cases where he suggests a meaning to something that something has at least another and opposite possible interpretation.

Because one he calls a top KGB man was in the "far east," that undescribed but very small and unpopulated part of the world, Epstein says of the presence of this man and of Oswald, "where he ^{was} quite probably recruited to defect to the Soviet Union." Well, this is not direct Epstein. It is the lead-in by Susana Duncan, whose has displayed knowledge not in Epstein's book and what one would not expect of the uninformed. Or, she is part of something and has been for a while.

Oswald's importance is repeated, "he had access to ~~knowledge~~ information about the altitude of the U-2..." (55) Not even good fiction.

First question, using the book as the source, says LHOlead "the life of Riley" in Minsk, "had a magnificent apartment...frequently dated beautiful women...was a celebrity, met top officials, had a living allowance from the ~~Soviet~~ Soviet security agency," all false, and "frequently went to the opera," true of most people in USSR ~~cities~~ cities."

After all of this fabrication, the question, "why would he give up all this spender to come back to the United States, where he faced prosecution and penury?"

"Answer. I ~~guess~~ have assumed Oswald was ordered to return, that having debriefed him about the U-2, the Soviets had no further use for him in Russia."

If Epstein were going to make up wild ones from that wild blue yonder, he should have used what was delivered from that wild blue, the late Francis Gary Powers, an authentic U-2 expert who talked and talked and talked and was almost in trouble for it. Oswald was ~~debriefed~~ "debriefed" of what Powers did not know? Because he was adjacent to a U-2 airport, a distinction shared with God knows how many hundreds of thousands of others people? (56)

FOIA When asked "Did you find any other(sic) evidence that Oswald was masking his activities in Russia" Epstein's answer is "Yes. Oswald had attached faked names to many of the numbers in his address book. Under the Freedom of Information Act, I was able to get a trace on the names and numbers. Many of the numbers led to Soviet ministry offices, not to the names" he'd jotted next to them."

FOIA If this is truthful it did not happen under FOIA. Or he put it wrong, meaning that he got the CIA's trace on the names.(56)

Epstein carries himself away with the character he makes Oswald into, advancing him from a radar operator to "had to do with aerial reconnaissance, that is, monitoring U-2 flights. It would seem too much of a coincidence that his job on returning to the United States involved the same kind of work." (56)

Apparently Epstein did not waste his time in New Orleans or his association with Tom Bethell. This is an improvement over Garrison's method on "investigation" and "logic." But a that Epstein did not squeeze all the juices out. Rather than one job to then Oswald had had an earlier one, in a welding shop. Welding is use in airplane manufacture so Oswald had two jobs "that would seem too much of a coincidence," Epstein also forgot Oswald's apprenticeship in the USSR, where the KGB fixed him up with a job in an electronics factory. U-2s also use communications and other electronics equipment. Ergo, Oswald is the greatest expert of them all. Now how explain the Reilly Coffee Company? Good for the nerves. (56)
(Actually, at Jagers Oswald was only an apprentice and was fired in short order. But it is true that Jagers did classified work.)

For the absence of a Mexico City picture of Oswald Epstein has an explanation he does not attribute to FOIA: "The only explanation the CIA offered was that Oswald must

have entered the Soviet Embassy through a back door." The CIA did not "offer" this "explanation" to the WC of to the press ingeneral. This means they spoke to him. (57)

FOIA "Q. The CIA did a number of 'name traces' for you. Which was the most productive?"

"A. Pavel Voloshin's name turned up both in Oswald's address book and on a letter [from Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow] found among Oswald's effects after his death." Voloshin was one of the "traces." Note that this is all that the CIA did the traces for him, not that they had been done earlier in the great Angletonian search for proof that LHO was KGB. Doing a trace is not providing an existing record, the limit of what can be asked under FOIA. (57)

FOIA "Q. Did Oswald make any other Soviet contacts? A Yes. The FBI intercepted a letter dated November 8, 1963..." Aside from a less than faithful Epsteinian rephrasing of the letter, intercept reminds me that this is included in my FBI FOIA requests, I'm pretty sure, and that I have an FOIA request for all CIA intercepts of any kind. (57)

EJE forgets himself on 58, re Re Mohrenschildt, "...when he was killed..." (58)

Beginning here EJE casts deM in a special intelligence role, also for the KGB, carried to EJE's wondering "whether he was part of Oswald's debriefing." How long the army of the KGB! How clever a "debriefing" technique, wait for months, until the one to be "debriefed" is out of control and half a world away. And depend on the passing of time to improve memory, as it always does.

Between them EJE and Duncan make much about the failure of the CIA to respond to 17 questions EJE asked it. He has four here (59) in a box.

The purpose of these questions? "In a final attempt to break open the Oswald case once and for all..."

The CIA's response: "We have reviewed your questions carefully and have determined that they do not constitute a request for reasonable described records, as prescribed in the Act. True, too."

However, some of the questions could have been rephrased to have them ask for existing records. That EJE did not do this makes me wonder if he knew so little about the Act or if he waited until he had gotten a; he could expect from the CIA and then wrote it self-serving questions he could use against it in the manner in which he has.

He is Lane-like in pretending that he obtained under CIA what he did not break loose, in citing Document 431-154 B (I don't recall if I have it" and the 11/25/63 staff memo reporting that its author had suggested that Oswald be interviewed on his return from the USSR. (59)

It is not odd that Epstein does not wonder aloud about why Oswald was not interviewed by the CIA then and that he does not report asking for copies of any interview reports to ascertain whether or not it happened and if so what LHO said.

To this point, both parts of the New York interview, there is only conjecture, no proof for any of the conjectures, little of no reason to support them and where it is alleged that there is factual support, the fact is not included. As with those "traces" done for him by the CIA, which would still depend on their word. Very thin stuff to be worth all that money. Entirely irresponsible.

I have a hunch that this project began when the subject was beginning to heat up again, about or a little after the middle of 1975, which makes its intent clearer, if my hunch is correct— to offset disclosures of fact inimical to the official mythology.