

- (1) Withholdable Presidential-protection matters: no changes since the assassination, except that the SS is now using a closed car.  
The confirmatory ltr which Rankin got Willens to prepare is R73-COR.4, supra.
- (2) Quite interesting account of meeting with CIA.  
Much about the details of asking questions of the Soviet Govt.  
CIA-FBI information exchange (thru WC) discussed.  
CIA will help prepare for Marina's testimony!  
Point (9) - CIA was allowed to show WC material to some outside consultants.
- (3) This is a routing slip. Rankin ~~xxxx~~ confirms to Willens that he had discussed the CIA problem with Warren; I guess this is followup to R73-I.M.2, which doesn't really indicate any x 'problem' with the CIA. Who knows?
- (4) I don't have the referenced Willens to Slawson 2/4; presumably ~~xxxx~~ still withheld; evidently it was questions to the CIA.  
This was withheld due to info. re ~~XXXXX~~ LHO contact with the Soviet Military Attache on 10/1/63. I don't recall knowing that this was the person he contacted until now.  
Significant memo.
- (5) Good memo on Mexico trip.  
First sections are not withholdable, but good summary of facts and problems re issuance of passport, etc.  
Pp. 8-10 relate to sensitive matters (visits to Embassy, &c). Good chronological summary.  
An important item to have in connection with the Mexico trip and related problems. Well footnoted.  
Pp. 13-16, recommended further investigation, is good stuff. Slawson is no dummy. I don't know offhand how much of this further investigation was done.
- (6) I x wasn't sent I.M.6; I'm guessing it is my #TC.67; I'm asking about this. Looks fairly routine; could it have been withheld because it ~~xxxxxx~~ refers to a request ~~xxxxxx~~ not including highly-classified info.? Cf. Dillon COR. items.
- (7) Helms notified the WC that a Possony article about LHO being a Soviet Agent was ~~xxx~~ going to be published in an Am.Sec.Council journal.  
I got this in 1970; didn't know it was supposed to be withheld. Would that have been because it revealed sources inside the ASC, or because this whole affair x seems to be out of the CIA's jurisdiction?  
The article was also mentioned (as forthcoming) in the CIA roundup of rumors, COR.31, p. 12 (#39).
- (8) Generally interesting 9-page memo on conference with the CIA, 3/12/64.  
P. 1 - the withheld CIA person's name is consistent with "Arthur Dooley" (with no comma after it) or with other names. Note that on p. 6 the last name of the same person is deleted; 6 letters; the 4th letter is consistent with the "l" of "Dooley" - it wasn't completely cut off. Careful, Marion!  
I can't venture a guess about the deleted 4 lines on page 1.  
The CIA was reviewing testimony - ~~xx~~ a reasonable idea, ~~xx~~ now that ~~xxxx~~ you think of it. Did the FBI do the same, and if not, why not? My impression is that the FBI wasn't interested in investigations except where specifically asked to check things out. I know they were asked to review some testimony - I remeber Lane's (in connection with the allegation that he had been accosted by the FBI).  
P. 3; re leak of State ~~xxx~~ telegram #234, Allen-Scott. Cf. CD 528, released 1970.  
P. 4 - interest in Hotel Comercio guests. JNS noted the coincidence of names between Silvano Martinez, 24H595, and a ~~Silvano~~ Silvano Martinez Romero, captured by ~~xxxxxx~~ Castro in 1965 and said to be CIA. (Ref.: my MS-5/70)  
P. 7 - here is WC opinion that some of LHO's ltrs may have been coached. Quotable.

P. 7: the referenced Ruby memo is in CE 2980. The reply, if ~~is~~ CD 1054 is all there was of it, indicates that the CIA didn't get into the problem of Ruby's Cuban trips, esp. their interpretation.

P. 7 (end) Liebeler (in 'Inquest') gave the impression that he was the main staffer working on the problem of the 'unidentified man' photo - but he wasn't even at this ~~xxx~~ meeting.

P. 8. The allegation that LHO was a CIA agent was apparently handled in as much a pro forma fashion as the claim that he was an FBI agent. An affidavit admitting that he was an agent might mean something; one making a denial means nothing. What sort of nonsense was that?

P. 8 - note that the ~~xxxx~~ staff was not satisfied with the Jan 31 memo - CD 347, still withheld.

What is the October 9 ~~xxxxxxxx~~ message referred to there, and the 10/10 message as distinct from that ~~xx~~ sent to other Federal ~~xx~~ agencies on 10/10? (See p. 9, top) Must have been internal CIA messages about this matter?

P. 9 - note declassification date of 7/11/73; that was after I had seen the 'recently released' stuff at the Archives. (6/29/73) In fact there is quite a bit here that I didn't see ~~xxxx~~ then.

(9) I got this routinely in 1970 (and a better copy, too). I don't know why it is classified as released in 1972-3.

(I should have a file on Stern's work re the CIA, as well as re the FBI.)

(10) Hubert ~~x~~ & Griffin on Ruby-Cuba links - good, quotable summary.

Like I.M.14 below, this is directed to the WC, not to Rankin.

Why was this withheld? Presumably because ~~x~~ of reference on p. 3 to SS undercover relationship with the DRE & the 30th of Nov. ~~xxxx~~ Movement.

There are CD's on this rumor/allegation, and at least one CE. (Lane cited it, I think.)

P. 5, 4 lines up, garbled? Looks like "Mr. Lankin Lanusa" on my copy.

P. 6, 3 lines up: odd: "info. reported by Mr. Rankin" that Ruby had gone to Cuba on a Czech passport. I haven't ~~xxxx~~ heard this one before.

P. 7 - interesting that H&Griffin would refer to the 'most promising links' between Ruby and the assassination. Makes them sound almost like real investigators! Quotable sentence.

Good on Oswald-Ruby link possibly through E. Roberts - B. Cheeks. They took this one seriously.

(11) Note typo in original ~~xxxx~~ title - the date of CD 631 (3/24/64) appears rather than 10/10/63, the date in the title of CD 631. Marion Johnson didn't repeat this error in his listing; i.e., he didn't transcribe Coleman's title.

An important memo to go with CD 631, LHO in Mexico.

The deletion could be of a Mexican source, as well ~~xx~~ as something like 'the CIA in Mexico.'

Note: apparently at this time Coleman didn't understand exactly where the photo came from and how it fit in. So why hadn't he jumped on the possibility (apparent from CD 631) that someone was impersonating Oswald? That is, could he have already been given an explanation by the CIA that explained the (alleged) mingling of ~~xxxxxx~~ sources in the first paragraph of the 10/10/63 telegram but did not explain the photo fully? Think this one over!

(12) Withholdable because of info on SS PRS criteria.

Last paragraph - Bouck still thought the FBI should have warned PRS ~~xxxx~~ about LHO. Did he say that in his testimony too?

This is Stern's 2nd interview with Bouck; I don't recall seeing any notes on his first.

## (13) Interview with Lawson.

Info. re choice of route & Trade Mart; re assassination itself; re questioning of LHO with ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Lawson present.

Note reference on p. 5 to 'Adams-Specter-Stern' office. I guess Stern took some of this space when Adams was no longer active; in any case Stern wasn't in the same office as Rankin or Willens.

Page 5, 4 lines up; 'incommunicado' intended, not ~~king~~ 'incognito.'

## (14) Shortened version of I.M.10, also to the Commission, not Rankin.

Rumor section is reduced to 1 paragraph.

IM.10 may not have been actually distributed to the WC - someone decided that a shortened version would be ~~XXXXXXXX~~ better?

I have asked for a ~~x~~ better copy; have not compared in detail to ~~XXXX~~ I.M.10 to see what was added or dropped.

(15) For more on the ~~Gutierrez~~ Gutierrez story, see CE 2121, pp. 126-143.

The car seems to tie in ~~XXXXXXXX~~ somehow with Duran. Offhand, I would think Gutierrez may have made up the story with that end in ~~XXXX~~ mind - it looks suspicious.

Gutierrez is not indexed in the WR or Vol. 15.

Presumably withheld because of info. in para. 3 (pp. 2-3) re CIA info. on LHO's visit to the Soviet and Cuban Embassies. The deleted material is probably interesting; I can't tell ~~XXXXXX~~ what it might be about. I guess we will have to wait. Important document re CIA/Mexico problems.

## (16) Slawson (or Coleman-Slawson?) summary of "D" (Alvarado) matter.

Note ref. to CD 442 as ~~xx~~ the "Ambassador Mann file." I got a routing slip in 1970 making an unclear reference to this, and calling it sensitive.

Keep in mind the possibility that Mann personally took a hand in this investigation. (Wasn't he ~~x~~ a close friend of LBJ's?) (I recall reading somewhere about some State Dept. ~~XXXXXXXX~~ person flying to or from Mexico carrying some ~~x~~ photos (unidentified man? Oswald).

## (17) I didn't know that the NSA checked out names as well as looking for coded material and the like.

I guess this was withheld because of the reference to the NSA having some info. on names which the CIA doesn't have.

Did they ever report anything to the ~~Gutierrez~~ Commission except for the few reports on cryptographic examinations which I have seen? Such as a big list of names which they ~~XXXX~~ checked out? Apparently not.

## (18) Slawson was trying to find out if the illegibility of the signatures on many documents from the USSR meant anything; the CIA said it seemed to have something to do with the pressures of a police state. No doubt. I guess that is what made this memo withholdable.

(19) Interesting that in 1964 the CIA could not permit publication of their 10/10 ~~x~~ telegram and now they can.

The paraphrase ~~xx~~ Slawson wrote down is nowhere near accurate - the whole matter of the ~~XXXX~~ unidentified man (at best, the mixing of two sources) is omitted. Slawson sure went easy on this! In fact, the final reference ~~xx~~ in the Coleman-Slawson appendix doesn't even have the date. (WR ~~xxx~~ 777, note 290) In CE 948 (18H188), however, the dates remained when the ~~x~~ telegram was removed from the ~~XXXX~~ State Dept. file.

(20) Seems odd that Ford's comments on the draft of Ch. 8 of the report were withholdable. I don't see anything sensitive in his comments. The Archives has been unable to find ~~XXXXXX~~ this draft for me; I am pursuing the matter. (I am interested in the section on Oswald and the FBI, of course.)

## (21) "N" is of course Nosenko.

I can't venture a guess as to what the deleted first section says about the following three quotations.

Compare "I" with WR 244-5; the implied reference to N. has been removed.

Compare Section II with WR 267; Furtseva's name and the suggestion that info. might have ~~been~~ come from Nosenko were cut out.

I can't readily find anything in the report corresponding to Section III, so I guess it was cut out completely.

So, my guess is that the deleted first part of this memo says "here are the sections of the draft report which deal with information from Nosenko; the CIA (or someone) thinks we should take it all out."

(22) Last-minute (9/23) work on footnotes by Weinreb.

Presumably withheld because of the CIA name: Mr. Wigren.

(23) Fairly routine memo about the 'sanitized' CIA memos used as CE's.

(24) Footnote first, get the CE later. This is "D" again; not very special.

Last sentence: Wesley J. must have been quite a joker, as WC staff went. Remember this is shortly after he had sought Rankin's help on the writeup of the Odio matter in the WR. (By the way, I have the galley proofs, indicating what was said about Odio before Liebler fixed it at the last minute.)

(25) More on putting together CE 3152, re "D".

As a former professional graduate student myself, I can guess how Pollak felt, doing this kind of work.

(26) I was not sent I.M.26; this is apparently it - I got it 3 years ago, routinely. I have asked for clarification. (Same problem as ~~with~~ with I.M.6)

Presumably withheld because the CIA had raised the question of publishing Odum Exh. 1. I did a memo on this long ago; apparently the photo was sent back to the CIA for retouching to black out the little bit of background that could be seen.

Various other points are interesting too.

(27) Marmor's summary of the CIA's ~~re~~ reports on press reaction to the WR.

The substance is of no interest to me.

I recall another case where an FBI report (I think on the leak investigation) was so long and/or unclear that someone did a summary of it.

(28) I have a similar memo by AG covering Sept. 28 thru Oct. 1 (#504.4).

Presumably ~~there~~ there is a first page (or pages) for this memo, or a separate memo telling what Goldberg did in the missing week or so.

Presumably ~~was~~ withheld because of CIA names (Mr. Skora & Mr. ~~Dooley~~ Dooley)

I have Goldberg's correspondence with Hoover about the New Leader article.

#### MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS:

(1A) Post-assassination report; garbled version of what happened.

Withheld because of derogatory reference to Pic?

(1B) The ONI copy of the CIA's 10/10/63 telegram. See notes on CD # 631.

(1C) Misc. handwritten notes; post-ass. Routine except for ref. to Winfield Scott. See notes above, COR.37.

(1D) Typical (?) post-ass. anti-Soviet allegation. Para. 5 has pre-ass. reference.

Bottom of p. 2 has a CIA name, Mrs. Roman (CIA/DDP/Liason).

(1E) Apparently, post-ass. summary of pre-ass. contents of ONI file. I haven't checked it for accuracy but it looks unsuspecting.

(1F) Post-ass. This is an Army document - where is the complete Army file? They sure knew a lot about the FPCC - and didn't think much of it.

Presumably info. on p. 3 was obtained post-ass. If not, there's a problem.

Was Stringfellow Asst. Chief of DPD Intelligence Section then? Why was he ~~giving~~ giving the Army this kind of (mis)information?

(2) 239-p. incoming mail log, Inventory Entry 3. Omitted except by request.

(3) Jackie's testimony; like M.R.2, released upon my FoI appeal. The changes other than the deletion are the most interesting; my notes therefore included. It may be that hers was the only witness (as opposed to deposition) testimony to be edited.

(4) Not ordered.

I didn't see this with the recently-released file (that ~~ix~~ is, it wasn't shown to me). I may have seen it ~~xxxxxxx~~ elsewhere, perhaps in the Liebeler office files. I recall something there that was just a lot of ~~xxxx~~ photos of bullets going through things, like blocks of gelatin.

~~Rxxx~~ Perhaps someone in Washington ~~ix~~ could take a look at this and see if any of it is worth getting. If necessary someone (not me) could order a few of the first pages.

This may have been released as a result of a specific request by one of us.

(5) This corresponds, although not very closely, to Section I of the Nosenko memo, I.M.21.

It just tells how and to what extent the WC relied on ~~ix~~ CIA sources, and how that problem is being handled in the report. Nothing special.

There are some handwritten marginal notes, not quite ~~ix~~ legible even in my copy.

This was probably written by Slawson (I'm ~~ix~~ just guessing.)

END OF NOTES

Paul L. Hoch  
December 3, 1973

The following lists may not be complete - I made them quickly:

Visit to Embassy in Mexico City; photo of unidentified man:

CD 631, CD 1216, COR.(17, 21, 28, 37, 52A, 53, 55, (58?) );  
I.M.(4, 5, 8, 11, 15, 19, 26), M.R.(1B, ~~ix~~ 1C).

"D": CD 1000, CD 1545, I.M.(16, 24, 25)

Nosenko: I.M.21, M.R.5, COR.26

Getting info. from Dillon & the Secret ~~ix~~ Service: COR.(10, 18, 20, 23, 39, 44, (56, 57?)), I.M.6