

SL) Re CIA blind memo on photo of unidentified man in Mexico City originally called Oswald 12/14/8.

As soon as we finished speaking tonight I read this particular memo on the chance you'd phone back. I then went over the other ^{copies} I'm making a separate file of certain copies so that we may discuss them in the future because there are some strange and some provocative aspects of other records not related to this memo.

My first impression, and I still adhere to it, is that for some reason not indicated in these records someone in the CIA was interested in connecting Cuba with the JFK assassination in early 1977. From this I'm inclined to suspect that the identification of the man in the picture by the person consulted has a Cuban assignment/responsibility within CIA and from the rest of the content I believe that the suspected effort to connect Cuba with the assassination was not ^{INITIATED} by the part of the CIA in which this person worked.

This memo is not a normal intelligence analysis, from its content. It is remarkably uncritical, particularly of McDonald and his book, and it takes the accuracy of his writing for granted, also not normal. There is no single question relating to dependability or authenticity and I can't imagine any spook ~~not~~ wanting to lose his job doing that.

It keeps secrets from itself and obfuscates to the CIA and although it is disclosed elsewhere, this is so indirect that it does not even report that the version of the picture of this man published by the Commission was provided by the CIA.

It does not even refer to Herman Kimsey as having been fired by the CIA, which is publicly known. At the top of page 6 he is referred to as a "colleague of" McDonald which, at the time McDonald wrote the book he ~~wasn't~~ wasn't.

For some strange reason "Saul" is never referred to as an assassin. At the top of page 8 it says that he is referred to in the book as known by "highly specialized circles in Europe."

On 9 at 109 Kimsey is referred to as "alleged former Agency employee," with some interlining that may represent an earlier intent to omit.

On 11 at ~~178~~ 178 it is conjectured that Saul, still taken straight and uncritically, may be the "mystery man" who flew to Havana from Mexico City. No reason for conjecture is indicated and it is rather inflammatory.

On 12 at 185, and this is really incredible, the CIA person in the second column is represented as agreeing that Saul was telling the truth! Again, inflammatory and again, atypical for any intelligence agency without, at the least, some effort to accredit the book or establish a basis for believing it by some other means. And at 199 I'm interested in the recitations relating to the dead Kimsey.

Addee is first in the distribution list on Doc. 34. Know the name? Just about all others withheld.

Much else is strange about this memo. Especially because it is supposed to represent an effort to identify "Saul" and is supposedly inspired by the book. Why, for example, is there no indication that anyone spoke to Ben Davidov, who is identified in the book, by name, and was in the phone book, not that they didn't know him. Why no indication of any conversation with McDonald, or any recommendation that he be spoken to? Or no interest in seeing whether there were Kimsey files as, certainly, within the CIA there were, or at Davidov's office, etc.

I think it can be argued that the author of the memo was going out of his way to make a case he knew did not exist and was going out of his way to avoid what would establish it as a phony. Hence I think that Bud should ask for the records relating to the preparation of this memo. I've not tried to correlate the date with any event, but it coincides with Congressional interest. And some of the related records simply are not honest. Example, when the CIA sent the pix to Dallas by Rudd (name excised) it sent more than just these pix. (Book published in 1975)

It sent at least one tape, which was transcribed before or in Dallas.

Other of the records suggest that the CIA had the Soviet embassy so thoroughly bugged it included the security station. It gives the name of the security person with whom Oswald was in contact and it is so vaguely worded that it does not indicate whether this was in person or by tapped phone.

Unclear handwriting relating to Sylvia is interesting and provocative. You may recall I've always wondered whether or not she was CIA, as I'm inclined to believe she was. She was picked up by the Mexican police very rapidly, indicating that there was some means of knowing very rapidly once JFK was assassinated that she spoke to Oswald. Electronic surveillance may have been the reason, but there is no indication of this of which I know. But, if this is the explanation, then there ought be some exciting stuff kicking around, and fraught with hazard for the CIA because of the continued withholding through the HSCA investigation, and it was relevant in the Church/Schweiker inquiry. And, of course, to the Commission's and the Rockefeller Commission's.

Back to the USSR embassy, the delay in reporting Oswald's contact suggests to me that it had to await the transcribing of tapes of the ELSURs. As I recall, it is dated 10/9/63, almost a week after LHO left Mexico City.

The CIA Mexico still has the negatives, as of the date of a memo in the 1970s.

You asked why the CIA would disclose this memo now because it can be hurtful.

The letter to Bud says these records are part of another request and we do not know what it is or its purpose or who requested them. But disregarding this and what it may mean, an obvious possibility is to get them used.

With all that is missing, this might really mean misused - by having someone draw conclusions that may not be justified.

On the other hand, perhaps the CIA's estimate is that the other user will use them as CIA would like.

Another possibility is that there may be further disclosures along the same line.

I can't give you any answer that I'm confident is the answer but I do say that there is so much very wrong with this memo that I'd be careful. If it is used with great care it might be safe. But any loose language or hasty and ill-founded conclusions might make problems. I think the safest way would be in the form of questions. And without any mention of McDonald's book, even of him. He's bad medicine at any time.

Reminds me: recently someone was asking me how to get in touch with him. I now do not recall who, but this might bear on the other request. It was by phone.

I think the chances of accidental disclosure are much smaller with the CIA than with the FBI.

such

Nothing in these records explains why, if an identification could be attempted, it wasn't attempted this way in 1963 and 1964. And I'm sure the CIA has a "review" of the McDonald book and knows it is a fake.

HW