

Dear Jim,

C.A. 82-0754

10/25/84

I've finished reading the Dube 1012/84 affidavit, Briggs Vaughn and attached records. I've not checked the disclosure assassinations plots record against the index, assuming that you will, because if it is included Dube has sworn falsely on it after its official disclosure that he, himself, undertook to explain under oath. \*

After the doctoral candidate finished his work and left and after I returned from the doctor (numbness in left arm and hand he attributes to pinched nerve) I made a few notes that I'll enclose after I read and correct them. \*\*

There is ambiguity regarding the person who in 7/66 was writing a book about the assassination. With loose reference it could mean someone who was working on a book already written and thus refer to someone other than me. ~~NY~~ Why not ask the lawyer if it means me? This does not involve any disclosure and you might get an answer. \*\*\*

Some of these documents are elliptical, less than definitive, etc. Some of the claims are at least unnecessary and probably unjustified. At no point is there any indication of any effort to learn if what was withheld had been made public and it is probable that some was. I think I've indicated some. evasive,

It would have been better if Bud had made some effort in 1977.

At several points I note existence of other relevant and interesting records but not all of them. Someone might want to ask for them, esp. <sup>for</sup> what CI did.

I'll send copies to Paul when I mail this. I'm knocking off for the night, beginning with supper, because I've not felt quite right, perhaps from apprehension. \*\*\*\*

I had an interesting and encouraging conversation with Lynch, who may have phoned before he had lunch. He was careful to say he is not predicting victory and to indicate areas of possible defeat. But he was encouraged by the attitude of the panel and the grant of a little extra time. I think he was also friendly, and he expressed his interest in and appreciation of the memo I sent him on New Deal lawyers I knew and said he planned to accept my invitation to come up with his family some weekend. He said you might have a more impartial report on the business. I have the impression that he did very well and that he did all that I asked that was, under the circumstances, appropriate. It would not have been appropriate for him to raise the matter of the gross lie, that I was "closely observed" in some kind of terrible deeds, because what is in our briefs is undeniable. Thus he could have used the time better on other things, as he did not say but I believe.

\* Not to have been included in this Vaughn, I was wrong.

\*\* Has taught college full time, is teaching part-time while working on thesis.

\*\*\* See enclosed memo

\*\*\*\* PH: In The Kennedy Loyalist Barber has a facsimile of an FBI TT. It bears no file # and I wonder about it. Do you know its antecedents? I do not want to start any correspondence with them. But as you'll see from the enclosed, copies of which I gave you years ago, some such communication was required. I've never seen so many typos in an FBI record as Barber prints. Is this what Walter reconstructed?

Best,

Briggs Vaughn index of 4/14/77

In each instance on the first few pages, he withholds all CIA stations and employees. <sup>(and later)</sup> It seems unlikely that none has ever been disclosed, as, for example, the Mexico and England stations have been, or involved employees, like Rocca, whose name has been withheld despite its official disclosures.

He also withholds the name of an FBI SA. In context it appears likely that this was the FBI's liaison agent, Sam Papich, also disclosed officially. Even his office address outside FBIHQ. *Cmd, I think, is necessary.*

1257-1035 I think is the document referred to above. Perhaps also earlier.

1271-1029 Do we have any relations with the country in question? If Cuba there are no relations to be damaged and the only reason there are no relations is that the US doesn't want any. Liaison names also withheld. Some, like Prouty, are not secret and have been disclosed.

1277-1025 Assuming all representations are true, from the description it seems that the document could be disclosed with exempt information withheld. With regard to the content, what the CIA might regard as of no interest might be of considerable interest to subject scholars who can have knowledge the CIA contact did not have of this Warren Commission witness.

1282-1023 The claim is that the information is so unique that its disclosure would identify the Agency's source in Miami. I question whether Briggs could possibly have enough subject matter knowledge to represent this alleged uniqueness ~~because of~~ <sup>for</sup> the multitudinous rumors in the Cuban community in Miami. It seems probable that the "foreign" intelligence source is actual an informer in Miami and on the Cuban community. If the subject is Cuba, there are no relations to be damaged.

1283-1022 Suggests that the CIA was operational in Dallas. Again, with stories about Marina the subject, there is little probability that there was any uniqueness that could identify the CIA's source. If the staff employee involved is J. Walton Moore, his CIA connection is overt and never secret. His component also is overt,

1292-1010 is of 5/19/67 and is described as a plan for countering alleged Communist propaganda about the JFK assassination. This description is improbable if not impossible because as of that time there was no such Communist campaign. The date coincides with intense interest in the Garrison probe. There seems to be little likelihood that disclosure could identify any of the multitudinous anti-Castros who then had such plans. Moreover, I doubt if Briggs has any way of knowing whether or not all of this is officially disclosed, as it probably has been. It seems that the document could be disclosed with no prospect of any injury, with appropriate claims to exemption.

1311-1036-B, 7/21/66, relates to someone writing a book about the JFK assassination. As of that time I do not know of anyone writing such a book besides me. Sylvia <sup>Magher's</sup> was not published but it had been written. (She was at the UN then.) The "social contact" between this person and several individuals suspected of hostile intelligence service associations may have been one-time or more from the language Briggs uses, but the "social activities" of the suspects is in the plural. Lane's book was written but not yet published, and they could have suspected some of those who knew him, like Ralph Schoenberger (?) and Bertrand Russell people. Unless those "social activities" were entirely secret there does not appear to be any probability that they could disclose what is described as "the intelligence source" or "methods," the former possibly merely someone who reported something and is not a regular "source" and the latter most likely no more of a method than reporting, which discloses nothing at all about a method. There is no ~~real~~ problem in excising the identification of the Agency employee to whom, apparently, the report was made or by whom it was repeated.

*Domestic contact  
(by review  
of OCS)*

1313-1036-C, relates "to an individual named in an FBI report who claimed to have worked for the CIA," with a name similar to but not identical with that of a CIA employee. There must be hundreds if not thousands of persons of whom this is true and thus there is no likelihood of disclosing the name of an actual CIA employee. Moreover, there are many such claims that have been disclosed by the FBI, whose document this is. The document was not referred to the FBI. Disclosing any name not identical with that of a CIA employee would not identify any CIA employee. It is difficult to see how even a similar name could have this result. I therefore suggest that there is a different reason for withholding and not referring back to the FBI. The date is of the beginnings of Garrison's public activity when, for example, Gordon Novel claimed to have been a CIA employee. (He also disclosed the name of a real CIA employee, as I recall Weiss.) The description is void on the content of the record.

(In general these records are to have some relationship with the JFK assassination that often is not even indicated, yet that information might be disclosed without any harm, so I find its omission provocative.)

1323-1040, which has to do with someone meeting Bringuier in Dallas, may have been disclosed by the FBI in its reportings of Bringuier's meetings and appearances, as well as in records relating to Penabaz *and others like them.*

1324-1041 is an illustration of the lack of explanation for withholding the information that relates to the assassination, with properly exempt information withheld.

1327-1042-A, unless this "private investigator" in his investigation had spoken only to the so-called "intelligence source" there is no probability of identifying that source from disclosure, and private investigators do not work that way. "his also raises questions about the physical possibility - was that investigator alive or dead? If Bill Boxley (Wood), he is dead. And his prior CIA association is public.

1328-1042-B suggests there was a check of names related to the Garrison fiasco that appeared in a published story. "It therefore appears likely that there could be disclosure, with appropriate claims to exemption. Certainly what appeared in the press is not exempt yet it is withheld. Here again what the CIA may regard as relevant is not a proper standard; what researchers regard as relevant is.

1331-1044 relates to an allegedly "unique" rumor about Clay ~~Shaw~~ Shaw, unique enough to identify the source. Few things are less likely than this, there were that many Shaw rumors and that many people aware of and retailing them.

1332-505/1045 contains no hint of the assassination information and no reason to believe that any such information was unique enough to disclose the source. The method, again, appears to be normal means of communication, not any "intelligence method."

1333-1046 withholds name of FBI SA who, if liaison, is disclosed.

1352-1060, sounds like several already disclosed stories, phonies

1355-1061 is a longer than average explanation which claims that "the substance" of what was reported to the CIA is already disclosed elsewhere. If that same information is reasonably segregable the CIA ought not be exercising the judgements of scholars who need not regard what the CIA describes as the only "substance" to include all that can be of interest to them. There are differences between the government and scholars on many matters, ranging from claimed solutions to the crime to what is relevant to private investigators. What may need protection can be protected, with disclosure of the content.

*and he  
could  
bring  
it into  
this?*

Documents attached to Briggs' Vaughn index

1240-1005, of 7/65, which is when Lane had suspended his activity and I was taking WW around to publishers - and I thus know of no other reason for any interest in the DeMohrenschildts, is a cross reference, without citation of the record itself, which ought be disclosable. I find it of interest and call your attention to the fact that it seems to say that a CIA component has a "permanent" collection of material on "Ruby/Oswald." This can refer to each separately or to an alleged relationship. But this seems to identify a component with permanent copies that can be provided.

\* 1249-1010 is a 1961 indices search requests covering Lee and Marina saying "see B," but no B is attached. The first name is not that of Oswald, but ?H.Oswald is added, with a 7/8/55 date, under "RESULTS REVIEW." Under this is "attached," but nothing is attached. There also seems to be a '64 date on a '61 search clip. Bearing the same Doc. Number is an "abstract slip," the first of the CIA's that I recall. Thus there seems to have been CIA abstracts like those of the FBI, which someone might want to request. If provided, they could identify the missing records. As they would if they'd been searched. Too illegible to be deciphered with any certainty, but two clear numbers are written on, 1048, 1049. Could these be the numbers of disclosed records?

1257-1035 suggests that the CIA tapes at least some incoming phone calls.

1258-1034 seems to indicate existence of a CIA "crank file."

1260-1033 is of interest because supposedly the names of all who worked with Oswald in the Marines have been disclosed and thus not properly withheld. Nor is his offer to help when those who were interviewed were disclosed publicly. What can be of considerable interest to scholars is this information, which appears to date to Oswald before and after transfer to Santa Ana. Among those I can recall this could fit Morony except that he claimed not to have spoken to other agencies, and he never worked for the FBI. This person seems to have been in a Marines reserve unit two of whose members were Agency employees and had tipped the CIA off about the coming call. The information provided is not attached, is not immune, and can be significant. This is hardly an intelligence source and no intelligence method is involved. At the least the privacy claim to withhold the name can't be asserted because of prior official disclosure and it alone can be important. Ask for the withheld information he provided, all of which was supposedly disclosed to and by the Commission.

1273-1027 reports a "Human Events" article stating that Oswald was seen several times by a CIA rep in the Moscow Embassy. What is interesting is that Richard E. Snyder is identified and there is no denial that he was still CIA or had been. But 609-786, same as 1274-1026, does.

1313-1036 and 1326-1042 relate to Clay Shae, Arcacha Smith. The first refers to communications from Domestic Contact Service, N.O., refers to its undisclosed communications regarding Shaw's relationship, I presume, if not other things also. That was 4/11/67. The second is dated 9/28/ and still does not contain complete info on Shaw, which appears to be unusual. It also is limited to DCS.

With regard to Arcacha, the CIA denies that he was the registered representative of Frente Revolucionario Democrática (FRD) but avoids reporting that his associate, Ronnie Caire, was so registered. If the CIA reported any relationship with FRD it is excised, but I believe that relationship is public, officially, whether or not by CIA. The apparent claim to withhold is "methods," not appropriate if disclosed. The answer to the question of the CIA's relationship and support of Cuban Revolutionary Council also is withheld, apparently the same claim, but it was officially disclosed when the CIA announced its termination as of the end of April 1963, (CIA denies any relationship with the Crusade to Free Cuba but there is an excision. Caire was Arcacha's associate ~~with~~ with regard to Alvin Beaubouef, interesting that his 5/9/67 trip to Washington

"was supplied by a CIA contact." He should be identifiable and of some interest? There is #11, which ask about any relations between Guy Banister and Hugh Ward with the CIA. The answer is excised. Unless they were employees, the claim is "intelligence methods," which is improbable. They do not claim confidential sources.

17 asks about lawyers involved and named and the CIA's denial is of payment or assistance, in general. Other relationships are possible, as, for example, if Dean Andrews' niece worked for the CIA. (She did work for an intelligence agency. I saw her the Saturday before she went to that work and shortly afterward when she was present at a conference of gifted students I addressed. She was present with a man she identified as a psychologist, with my last name. He ~~first~~ name is Pat Young.)

1331-502/1045, p. 3, at 8, states that CI made a detailed study of the Harrison investigation. It should be requested. I have no reason to doubt the rest of the information in this document.

1336-1049, when Guy Banister is mentioned,, follows his name with "#428810," which seems to indicate a CIA file or relationship, some identification of him with its given number.

1338-1052 begins with citation of a newspaper story about Banister. All the rest is excised. Unless he was an employee the exemption claimed is "relating to the nature of Agency intelligence methods."

1347-1059 quotes a "oke May article reporting that Novel had addressed a letter to a Mr. Weiss, presumably connected with the CIA. All following is withheld. the claim is in connection with the CIA only, as a source or activity requiring continued protection. (I think Weiss was DCI, but maybe not)