

Dear Jim,

8/2/83

It is probable that you sent me the earlier 0322/0420 transcripts. That they are not in my office does not mean I do not have them. I did not recall them and you made no reference to them in your recent mailings. Last year I started moving legal files to the basement, in the hope that I'd be able to open the French doors to the north this summer. I was never able to complete this because I had no help and cannot safely try to move the half-cabinets myself. If there is need for them I can go look for them and I'm confident they'll be the case file that was shifted when Rae was last here.

Re Harlan JUNE records: when Panic copied them they also used thin colored cardboard to separate and in the past, were I had identifications, I added them to the separate file folder into which I placed each cardboard-separated section. Yesterday I filed the JUNE + stuff with the covering letter you sent. It is not urgent for me to know what each means but it undoubtedly could be valuable to scholars in the future.

Not only does Arcacha figure in the filed offices suit but so also does the Sing decision you sent. It eliminates the FBI's pretended basis for most of its (7)(D) withholdings and confirms what I claimed in many appeals and probable in some affidavits. Conceivably it could give the FBI headaches in a 1996 remand where the same indefensible withholding was practised extensively over my stated objections and appeals. (However, henceforth you can expect at least the CIA to begin every report with the promise of confidentiality because its real reason is not confidentiality but covering its own ass and general obstruction.)

You ask if when I got the Criminal records they included the 9/18/67 routing slip and questions referred to in graf 1 of CIA PB2-0254/1. I do not recall but I can check, if you want, but unless it shows up the check cannot be definitive because those records are not arranged or disclosed chronologically. Is it important?

The CIA's responses are not at all definitive and appear to be evasive and incomplete. For example, the Shaw response is limited to Domestic Contact Service records. It does not state that any other component was checked and it does not state that there are no other relevant records.

Aside from introducing Cabell in 1961, the answer represents that the last contact with Shaw was in 1956. I find this difficult to believe, even in the limited DCS context because of the nature of his position and the nature of the information that continued to be available to him in that position. If I am correct, that he continued to be a worthwhile source to the CIA (whether or not anything else), then it is inevitable that the contact(s) with him were by other than DCS. Or he was replaced by someone else. I presume that with regard to Shaw and the answers to other questions Bud will ask for the information DCS was to have provided.

Under Arcacha the CIA claims that the answer to B, the its relationship with FRD, "This question has been answered above." But it isn't even addressed. All that the CIA states in a relates to Arcacha, and it says of him only that "there never was a direct (emphasis added) relationships between ARCACHA and CIA." There are two excisions, both alleged to prevent "disclosure" of intelligence methods. There is no likelihood of any "disclosure" of any secret method involved. Arcacha's use of a post office box at Coral Gables to report to FRD suggests that he reported and thus the CIA knew to the CIA operation there.

There is no response at all to "c. What was the Agency's interest in and support of the CRG?" The response is limited to reference to the formations of CRG and its leadership. I was not aware that the CRG was formed "in late 1960 and early 1961." In 1000 Days Schlesinger says it was formed at the Skylark Motel, Miami, about

3/17/61 or just before the Bay of Pigs. Its formation, by the CIA, is what led Hunt to retire from the project. The questions asks about the CIA's "interest in and support of" GRC. There is no mention of initer. An honest answer would have included that the CIA forced formation of GRC, over strongly-voiced internal objections, and that it financed it through 4/63.

These and other answers hinge on the word "associated." That Hovel, for example, was not "associated with" CIA does not mean that they had no relationship of any kind - and I cannot prove that they did. I merely point out that the CIA is equivocal throughout.

With regard to the lawyers, the denial is limited to direct payment by the CIA. While there may have been no connection (and Lotkin is only one of Hovel's lawyers) it is equivocal. The money could and if passed undoubtedly would have been other than directly from the CIA.

Reference to Double-Check (4 e) likewise is evasive and equivocal. It also is interesting that the answer to 4f makes no mention of the Hovest involvement in the Hovel polygraph by Furr.

With regard to Ricardo Davis (8) he is quite a liar but for whatever it is worth, he knew in advance of the raid, that he knew was confirmed to me by his then girl friend, when I found and interviewed her, and I can't think of a better explanation than he gave me: tip from a federal agency, not the FBI. Whether the CIA was connected with the so-called "training" at these camps is another question. Because they were intended to impress those from whom the Cubans hope to extract money and involved no real training, I believe the CIA's denial.

For the most part the other answers (and follow questions) likewise are not unevasive or unequivocal. The answer to 14 is not an answer, it is a conjecture, and the conjecture is based upon disclosure in the Mexico City picture of the Russian Embassy, which does not show in the picture as disclosed.

16 says that Oswald was at Atarqui for "marine training." That is news to me. I believe he worked as a radar operator there. This equivocal response is not asked for in the question so the CIA had some purpose in its misrepresentation.

The denial of "interest in or contact with" other lawyers (17) is as stated above and also is interesting because it makes no reference to other lawyers, like the workhorse of the Shaw defense, Sal Panzeca.

I do not suggest that this evasiveness and equivocation need have special significance, although the dishonesty and nonresponsiveness (as with GRC) does. It is so much a speak way of life it can be automatic and without special significance. So, the question of significance remains.

I assume and believe that the listed Shaw-DCS contacts are normal and proper because he did, certainly, come into possession of normal and worthwhile intelligence. But this is separate from any other kind of relationship, however, indirect.

Thanks and best,