



Sorry.

I have lettered the paragraphs in Walter B's reply.
As to 1.

(a) In the second and third lines, ^{the words} "in his attempt to correct a grave mistake" do not reflect the facts. It can be said that the Embassy ~~person~~ was lenient in the sense that its action had the effect of keeping Oswald from making a serious mistake but that is as far as the record goes. Therefore I have difficulty with the statement that the Department applied extreme leniency in facilitating the return of Oswald to the U. S.

(b) I cannot make sense out of this paragraph

(c) It may be that the law should be changed but I must say that Walter fails to convince me that the State Dept's action "forfeits or violates".

As to (2) This is too technical for me

As to (3) Both paragraphs in this section relate to Oswald's trip to Mexico City in late September and early October, 1963. I am inclined to support Walter's points

As to Marina and the child; if I have given the correct answer, under (a), in respect of Oswald, I would let the "tail go with the hide" and admit the wife and child.
JHR.

CONFIDENTIAL MEMO

Determined to be Administrative Marking

Date 4/2/78 By IC

To: Mr. Ford
From: W. M. Besterman

The answers of the Department of State to questions propounded by the Commission leave the analyst with three inescapable impressions:

1. ^(a) Possibly motivated by humanitarian considerations and the desire to assist a United States citizen in his attempt to correct a grave mistake, the Department of State has applied extreme leniency in facilitating the return to the United States of Lee Harvey Oswald and the entry of his wife and child.

^(b) Leniency was exercised in one instance (the formal finding that Oswald did not expatriate himself) through a series of administrative operations not violative of the spirit or the letter of the law (see Department's answer to question 11).

^(c) However, in two other instances (issuance of an immigrant visa to Mrs. Oswald, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 243(g) and 212(a)(28) of the Immigration and Nationality Act) the application of the law is characterized by interpretation so extreme that it borders on violation (see the Department's answer to questions 7 and 8).

2. ^(a) File management and administrative procedures of the Passport Office, as reflected in the Department's answers to

questions 12, 13, and 14, reveal a deplorable picture of inefficiency most detrimental to national security.

(b)
Basic reforms of regulations and practices, along with extensive re-evaluation of suitability of responsible personnel of the Office seem to be imperative.

(c)
3. The Department's answer to question 16 in conjunction with the answer to question 5 (see attached secret message from the CIA) requires separate investigation and the questioning of Messrs. Richie and Seeley.

(d)
Any intelligent person, even if completely deprived of sensitivity in security area must have been able to detect the importance of the information submitted by CIA informants in Mexico. In describing their action, terms like "neglect" or "incompetence" seem to imply understatement. The flat dismissal of the CIA report by the officers named, without even attempting to correlate the report to information regarding Oswald's previous attempt at defection, borders closely on criminal neglect of duties.