

along with the FBI,

Because both the CIA and the Archives had in the past developed an adversarial relationship in which noncompliance was its objective rather than meeting their obligations under the law - I had sued ^{of} them both under FOIA and had obtained what was withheld improperly - I asked others to seek copies of the CIA director's memos on his meetings with JFK.

The CIA replied to my friend, Dr. Gerald McAnight, head of the Hood College history department, with its usual no-speak ^{excuses.} untruths. The ~~the~~ archives provided my ^{friend,} ~~retired~~ University of Wisconsin history professor with a hundred and five pages. The selections from this that ~~were~~ ^{Dr. Dan Wrona} sent me are of early 1960s only.

To discourage McAnight from further effort, Lee S. Strickland, the CIA's Information and Privacy Coordinator, wrote him on September 8, 1999 that "our workload is some 5,000 FOIA and Privacy act requests, and it is our policy to handle each on a first-in, first-out basis which is equitable to all requesters." Or, it will take forever for you to get anything at all if you try again.

And on that first-in, first out jazz, I have FOIA ^{of the CIA that are} requests, now thirty years old that the CIA had ~~has~~ never complied with - ^{has ignored completely.}

Not only that, it invented excuses for ignoring requests after that. It sent me what - had not asked for ^{in full} month after telling me it had complied with that request, refused to take it back and ignored my citing its own regulations, which require them to inform the requester in advance of the cost and to obtain a down payment in advance. It did nothing ~~as~~ required of it and held me responsible for its own transgressions. Since then, two decades ago, the only CIA records I have obtained are the copies of other agencies or copies friends have sent me.

The Archives sent Wrona a packing list and within the documents it sent him is the CIA's identification of the relevant file. The ^{archives} has those records in Records Group 203 Central Intelligence Agency Assassinations ~~of~~ records Collection. In that file these sent Wrona came from "CIA MISC. FILES BOX ¹⁵² Fe, F15, F16, F17 JFK99 - 0699." In identifying to Wrona the source of

the records sent him the Archives included a number of pages giving the "AGENCY FILE NUMBER" as CIA - DCI FILE. ¹ The DCI is the director. These were records the CIA created for its own purposes, "MEMO FOR THE RECORD". The "TITLE" ¹ is "DCI MEETINGS WITH THE PRESIDENT," followed by the dates of those meetings. The "SUBJECT" is "DCI MEETINGS PRESIDENT."

Under "COMMENTS" the CIA stated, among other things that are given as unexplained numbers, "ARRB REQUEST." Or, the disclosure was pursuant to the requirements of the 1992 law that supposedly required ⁴ all public disclosure of all assassination information. However, what disclosure there was was not for another ~~6~~ six years, according to the information the Archives provided.

However, despite the explicitness of the ~~the~~ Archives' identifications on a series of these records, the CIA stamped some of them as disclosed under its historical records program. It got away with this typical spook trickery in which the people it supposedly serves are its enemy because there was no possibility that the ARRB would require it to reprocess ^{the} millions of pages it had disclosed under that so-called historical records program which permitted withhold ¹⁹⁶ that the 1992 Act did not permit.

The ^{records} CIA's ^{director's} records copies of which the Archives sent Wrono contain no reference of any kind to any Kennedy desire to kill Castro or to get him killed and none to any planned invasion of Cuba, despite what these whoring with our history procalim.

Besides this, the CIA just withholds ^{information} period, and within my experience ^{it} then lied to the federal courts about what it did and did not do. Two decades later it was still withholding what it had been directed to disclose but in the concept that it is the government the CIA did ~~not~~ make those disclosures. ^{wiser and} it does regard itself as better informed than the elected government of which it supposedly is but a part. It has a long record of this with regard to disclosures that can embarrass it by disclosing its anti-democratic record. One of the more recent illustrations of this was in the Washington Post of October 7, 1999.

The CIA had helped ^{militarists and} native fascists overthrow the democratically elected Chilean government in an election won by the ^g Socialists and including what was known as a "popular front" of other parties. The Pinochet dictatorship was one of the bloodiest on a continent in which bloody dictatorships were common.

The main headline over the Post story is "CIA accused of 'Whitewash' on Pinochet." The subheading is, "Document release to Exclude Papers on Agency's Role in '73 Coup, Activists told." To the Post, the nonprofit ^{research} organization which seeks to make our history freely available, the National Security Archive," and those who lost loved ones to Pinochet's bloody dictatorship are "activists," with what that word can be taken to be intended ^{d/ convey:} to indicate.

By VERNON LOEB
Washington Post Staff Writer

Researchers and relatives of victims of human rights abuses in Chile charged yesterday that the CIA is withholding information about its covert operations in that country, contrary to a White House directive.

The National Archives is expected to make public on Friday hundreds of documents from the State Department, Pentagon and CIA relating to the military rule of Chilean Gen. Augusto Pinochet.

But activists said they have been told that the documents will not include any information about the CIA's involvement in a 1973 coup against Chilean President Salvador Allende or its support for Pinochet.

Peter Kornbluh, a researcher at the nonprofit National Security Archive, said the CIA seems to have adopted a narrow interpretation of the administration's declassification directive in an initial release of information June 30 and again this week. "Not a single word about CIA operations in support of the Pinochet regime" has been released, Kornbluh said. "This is a whitewash of history, pure and simple."

Moreover, the CIA recently succeeded in pulling back hundreds of documents on Chile that

were discovered in the files of the Nixon White House during the declassification initiative, he said.

"These are the best documents," Kornbluh said. "These are the documents which detail the history of U.S. covert operations to foment chaos and violence in Chile. And there's only one reason to withhold them—to continue to cover up this history."

~~"Twenty-five years later—come on, this is ridiculous."~~

~~— Joyce Horman, whose husband was killed in Chile in 1973, on delay in document release~~

Joyce Horman, the wife of an American journalist murdered in Chile in 1973, raised similar concerns in a letter last week to Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright. She wrote that the CIA has yet to release a single document about her husband, Charles Horman, even though such documents are known to exist.

"Twenty-five years later—come on, this is ridiculous," Horman said in an interview yesterday.

The Clinton administration agreed to declassify selected documents about human rights abuses in Chile from 1968 to 1991 after Pinochet was arrested last October in London. The arrest resulted from a Spanish request for Pinochet's extradition to face charges of human rights violations during his 17 years in power. A judge in London is expected to rule Friday on the extradition case.

A senior administration official overseeing the declassification process said yesterday he has a written commitment from CIA officials that such documents will be reviewed and released. "They agree with Peter Kornbluh that covert action files from this period will be searched," the official said.

A senior State Department official called the CIA's commitment "progress" but said, "There's concern, absolutely, within this building about the CIA's performance thus far... and its narrow reading of the directive."

Mark Mansfield, a CIA spokesman, said the agency recognizes its obligation to release documents about covert actions in Chile. "Declassification review is a time-consuming process," Mansfield said. "It requires a page-by-page review. By the time this process is completed, the documents I've mentioned will be released, consistent with our obligation to protect intelligence sources and methods."

insert on CIA/Pinochet/ National Security Archive

4A

Two days ^{later} ~~after~~ the post carried another story. On the front page it was headlined, "CIA May Have Had Role in Journalist's Murder." ~~The~~ carryover onto the inside page is headlined, "CIA Link to Journalist Death Cited." And, finally, ~~years~~ ^{thus} later, that "activists" are reported to have "applauded yesterday's release of about 1,100 ~~pages~~ government documents about Chile, which were declassified in a review ~~of~~ ordered by President Clinton in February, after Pinochet's arrest."

~~go~~ after so many years of ~~data~~ declassified materials and suppression.

After so many years of Pinochet murders and "disappearances."

After twenty-five years, or twenty-five years after the law required it to disclose what was requested under the law, the CIA ^{spokesman} is quoted as saying that "the agency recognizes its obligation to release documents about covert actions in Chile." He also said, without mention of the twenty-five years that had passed without its being done, that "Declassification is a time-consuming process because "It requires a page by page ^{review} ~~review~~." Release will be further delayed by the CIA's claimed "obligation to protect intelligence sources and methods." *insert 4A here*

The CIA has interpreted this provision of the law as a license to hide all ~~the~~ bloody thugs with which it dealt and which it paid to do their dirty and bloody deeds. That was not the intent of the law, *the FOIA or the 1992 Act.*

Nothing shames the CIA in its refusals to obey the laws that are typical of a democratic society. As with Pinochet's bloody dictatorship, the CIA was connected ~~to~~ ^{its} the murder ^{of} and oftentimes the torture before murder of ^{and women} ~~men~~ who believed in a ~~democratic~~ democratic society. That is not something ^{the CIA} it wants to be well-known and that is the reason for the withholding of what is, in essence, known without all the details being known and without identification of ⁹ those in the CIA who ~~were~~ had responsibility of any kind in ^{Pinochet's} these duplications of the terrors of the Hitler and Stalin regimes.

Nothing shames the CIA in federal courts because it knows the chances are that it will get away with anything at all ^{including the} and by lies it lays on the courts. In one of my FOIA lawsuits intended to bring to light ^{government information that} ~~what~~ was suppressed, in ~~the official investigation of the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.~~ hundreds of pages were withheld ~~to~~ allegedly to "protect" the "source."

The bureaucrat who made that lie up did not bother to consult the disclosed records because where what the government wanted to ~~to~~ suppress was withheld ~~at~~ there was a slip sheet which, in each and ~~of~~ every case identified the source supposedly "protected" ^{the withholding} from disclosure as a United States source!

The actual purpose of these withholdings is to reduce the possibility of embarrassment to the CIA or to the federal government.

This is hardly all. Far from it. But it does reflect the dishonest record of the CIA with regard to disclosures that, under the law, are required of it. Supposedly required ~~of~~ it, anyway.

However, for his own protection and that of the CIA he headed, the CIA's director, in the memos he wrote for the record ~~and for his and the CIA's protection~~, did not make any reference of any kind, no matter how indirect, of any request or order by Kennedy to have Castro ~~assassinated~~ assassinated.

Nobody writing to the contrary has ever produced any credible source and ~~actualities of the~~ not one has mentioned the political situation in which Castro, Khrushchev and ~~to a deal with the doves~~ others so clearly preferred Kennedy to what his assassination would give them, the hawk, Lyndon Johnson. (This is in greater detail in the manuscript I have written about the Seymour Hersh's largely fictional, The Dark Side of Camelot. It is also included in other manuscripts.)

This is to say that in addition to this fiction making no sense at all there is no factual support for it. There is no basis for the conjecture and there is no support of any kind for it.

and ~~are disclosed~~ and, what records do exist prove the opposite.