

Dear Jim,

12/31/73

After writing you the second of the letters I mailed this a.m., the one dealing with the CIA documents, I got to thinking and, while Lil was making breakfast, I skimmed the remaining documents in this new stuff to see if they may relate. I think, without having had time to go through all, that some do. Perhaps not closely, but they are not out of the park. I am aware that I see things my way and others may see them in other ways. I am also aware that what seems like domestic work can be alleged to be part of international work and I'm not arguing. I do believe that a sufficient accumulation can break that down and will. Meaning that I do think it is possible to obtain enough.

My earlier acquisitions are filed with what ~~is~~ if it were a system would not take WG and related interests into consideration. In time I'll go over what I have carded and check each of the many WC subjects files in which I have each filed. This may be a very large time-taker. So, it occurred to me that there may be ways in which some or all this time can be saved and documents other than those I have turned up. One would be if Bob has the CIA's files by agency, like CIA. If that is the case, then the cost of copying these would be less than the cost of retrieving mine and might still produce what I do not have. Especially for the period when I was so troubled about adding to my indebtedness and got only those pages for which I saw immediate use.

Unless this is an exceptionally extensive file, if there is no objection, that is what I'd like to do if it can be done and if I know the approximate cost in advance. I think we will have multiple uses for what is useful and I also think that an occasional sentence in a paper on other subjects may be an interest or use.

There are recurring references indicating domestic operations having to do with writing and writers and showing pre-publication knowledge of contents and doctrine.

Don't drop everything and ask Bob what he has and how he has it, but when it is convenient please do, with no more description of interest than necessary. I don't want any Corrigan research or appearances. The interest is in publishing of any nature and domestic work of any character, but while there could be separate files of this kind they need not include all because of these asides and added comments I have spotted.

Prouty might be helpful here, but again I'd not disclose reasons because those he seems to protect were in similar misdeeds. If he has any knowledge that might be the way to approach it and see if he has or discloses.

I have McCord's letter to Mae and it is limited to Realist, which can't begin to return his costs in suing. HW

11
CIA
Oswald post-Prison?
Zorn
S.A. Stern/aw/3-27-64

cc: Mr. Rankin
Mr. Stern
Files ✓

March 27, 1964

C

MEMORANDUM

TO : Mr. Rankin
FROM : S. A. Stern
SUBJECT: CIA File on Oswald

Today, Friday, March 27, 1964, I met at CIA headquarters with Mr. Rocca to review the CIA file on Lee Harvey Oswald. The file contains those materials furnished to us previously by CIA. In addition, it contains the following materials:

a. Cable reports from the CIA station in Mexico of November 22 and 23, 1963 relating to photographs of a person who had visited the Cuban and Soviet Embassies in Mexico City during October and November 1963; and reports on these cables furnished on November 23 by CIA to the Secret Service. These messages are accurately paraphrased in the attachments to the CIA memorandum of March 24, 1964 (Commission Document #674).

b. Cable of October 10 from CIA Mexico City station to CIA headquarters reporting on Oswald contact at Soviet Embassy, and October 10, 1963 message from CIA headquarters to Mexico City station of background information on Oswald. These messages are accurately reported in the CIA memorandum of January 31, 1964.

I did not review any materials later than November 23, 1963.

Mr. Rocca also showed me the "printout" of the references to Oswald documents in the CIA electronic data storage system. There was no item listed which we have not been given either in full text or paraphrased.

When I evidenced an interest in the CIA electronic data processing system, Mr. Rocca said that he would arrange a detailed explanation at a future visit.

Jan. 18, 1974

Dear Harold:

Please refer to your note of 1/2 on the recently released item R73-COR.48. This is the CIA cover letter and list of enclosures on brainwashing. The Archives ~~x~~ sent me enclosure 2, and noted on the list that ~~ix~~ items ~~xxx~~ 2-24 are available.

This is to expand on my note that the CIA had gotten and given the WC original carbons of papers ostensibly prepared for ~~ix~~ scholarly journals.

On checking my taped notes, I do not find confirmation of the fact that these papers were for journals. That may still be correct, however; you should check the Archives files.

These ~~ix~~ papers are in the last 2 of 3 folders in the "GAI-1-CIA" section of Entry 11. (They were originally in the 'brainwashing' folder of Liebler's office files in Entry 44, in the 4th box of his files; according to a charge-out card there, they ~~xxx~~ were moved to the GA-1-CIA file by ~~ix~~ Marion M Johnson on 8/7/72.)

I specifically noted that there was an original carbon of item #15, a paper by Lawrence E. Hinkle, Jr., M.D., New York Hospital - Cornell Medical Center. This paper is a physiological statement of what happens to the brain when a man is interrogated. (I think the ~~ix~~ little typed summaries on the papers ~~xxx~~ were done by the CIA; that's just a guess.)

"Preparation of this paper was supported by a grant from the Bureau of Social Science Research." I wonder if that's a CIA front?

I ~~xxxxxxxx~~ commented on this one paper only as an example; the others might be equally interesting for these reasons. My recollection (vague) is that more than one was an apparent original; I could be wrong.

In your letter of 1/13, with comments on R73-COR.34, ~~xxx~~ you asked for 2 copies of Stern's 3/27/64 memo to Rankin re his visit to the CIA. Enclosed. *Paul*

PLH

Jim City directory—the other name is Public Affairs Staff. I have the names of individuals with it. I am surprised that Praeger would be so openly connected, same office. Latin American Reports as of active days, Bay Figs, etc., coincides in several cities including Washington at earlier address with Free Cuba Committee in its addresses and Mullen represented Free Cuba, I think through Radio Free Cuba. (Among early clips I can't find.) I have much of this in COUP. The hunch was a very good one but the carelessness is unexpected. I'd be on the alert for VN stuff, too. Just possible for the right years. I think the thing to do when you can is go back to the beginning of that building or conversely, to check as far back as necessary on Praeger, whose connection is old. I went to Praeger very early 1965, so there was no ignorance about my existence, work or doctrine. I think old biographies of Frederick P. are now in order...The whole thing fits very nicely and where there may be no certainty of relevance there is no proof there is no relevance. There is nothing I've seen that is inconsistent for needs in litigation and everything I've seen is justification for depositions —and among many! Office-mates swearing no connection could have point if one assumes perjury would be eschewed. Suppose they'd not swear no connection? For my records until I get xeroxes: IAR, Praeger and another you do not recall all

I have overexposed the poor copies attached to make them easier to read. If you want to keep, please just give me identifications for CIA-suit file for which I made them. JL and I will discuss this tomorrow. It would appear that the CIA was a little less paranoid about leaving a (classified) record that the liberal Stern or the Commission, but it seems pretty obvious that this is still another CIA domestic operation, "A National Name Index Network." It also seems to parallel what McCord's reserve outfit was doing, compiling names for Der Tag.

According to Szulc, during the first of the two months, September, Hunt was Acting Station Chief in Mexico City, so he would have at least know about this, whether or not he had anything to do with the giving of the wrong picture called that of Oswald. Obviously, it could not have been LHO who visited embassies 11/63. Note no ref to content "background" info on LHO in 10/10 cable to Mex. Cy station.(b)

Aside from his personal assignments, suggest this national name index could have been one of the things Hunt had in mind in his Ervin testimony, part that was entirely unreported by media despite its being telecast. HW 1/28/74