10/4/6/95

Dear George,

I've gone over the records you were kind enough to send me a bit more slowly. I write you about what interested me on the chance it may be of interest to you or Pincus. I did not see the two records his story said disclosed bugging of the USSR embassy in Mexico City and if you have them would appreciate them.

My interests are not those of the nuts and theorizers. It is in the assassination, not the CIA or the FBI as institutions. I oppose neither but I do oppose their malfunctioning and in the case of the CIA, its making and controlling national policy. I believe that is very wrong for any intelligence agency. When the army sent me to the OSS I did not have to go. I went willingly, believing ~~that~~ what turned out to be the case, I could do more good there than as an MP. And as you may recall, your exclaimed to me, "Why you are defending the FBI!"

I've not seen most of the newly-disclosed CIA records but I was sent and went over its Box 57 now at the Archives and I learned a bit from it. That box is the CIA Mexico City station's summary of its communications with HQ relating to the assassination. More or less, that is.

I believe these new records confirm what I wrote you, that a duplicate of the 10/1 interept tape at least did and does exist. Only some of the tapes were reused. I believe that the Goodpasture interrogation memo confirms that the Oswald picture was not destroyed. It also says that a woman involved opposed sending the wrong picture to Dallas and HQ. That means they then knew it was not of Oswald, as I think would have been obvious from the papers.

The supposed Kostikov stuff has always interested me because what I remember of spooking practise is that nobody connected with any one would ever go to an official place like an embassy. That told me that somebody had an interest in making up an inflamatory case. To what I believed earlier, Box 57 confirmed that. It discloses ~~that~~ what is in more detail in some of these records, that it was not Kostikov to whom Oswald spoke but Yatskov. These records hold the verbatim, the description of Kostikov given to Oswald. Box 57 discloses that was not a description of Kostikov.

CIA Mexico had its own interest in him and seem to have had him under surveillance before the assassination. I do not recall that from Box 57 but do recall the report they were placing him under physical surveillance. These records reflect that the Mexicans had him under surveillance, too. But they also disclose that all about him is presumed, including even his alleged KGB Department 13 connection. That is the so-called wet jobs part. But if all that was alleged was believed, that alone was an incitation to war.

So also was the crediting of the palpably false Alvarado fiction that the CIA kept from Mann so heated up about. The Box 57 records disclose he never gave up on

doing "something" about that made-up Cuban involvement in the assassination. Which lingers in Newman's book that is not about "Oswald and the CIA." CIA Mexico was so heated up about this that CIAHQ and FBIHQ applied pressure, the latter on the former, to debunk it as the FBI did unequivocally despite the clinging to it thereafter by those cowboys down there. They and Mann clung to it after Alvarado Ugarte confessed to what is obvious, that he'd made it up because he hated Castro and wanted "something" done to him ~~do~~. That something could have been only war. He was, remember, a Sambza agent.

These records disclose he had been a CIA source. They also disclose that he had not always been accurate. I never saw the latter before, yet the Mexico Xity station kept pumping his stiff up and ~~the~~ to Washington. (To U. Alexis Johnson at State as I now recall.)

Doing something was the thrust of the misuse made of the Silvia Duran stuff.

My initial interest in her and in the Mann hope for World War III began with the CIA's first disclosures, as I now recall of January, 1976. The Mann stuff was clear in them and what excited my interest in Duran is that CIAHQ ordered Mexico City, as I now recall, to try to get the Mexican cops not to beat her up on her second arrest. As these records do not disclose, both arrests were asked for by the station. The second seems to have had the intent of getting her to confess to having been Oswald's mistress, the ~~what~~ way those records put it.

Once she confess they let her go. Once she was free she denied it was true, saying it was beaten out of her.

Neman also makes a big thing of her serving Oswald, as he did also about the ambassador. To Newman these are reasons to believe that the ~~Cu~~ Cubans were "implicated" in the assassination.

When I first saw the CIA's concern about her not getting beaten up again I wondered if she had worked for it. It does not seem to be the norm for spookeries to care about women being beaten up. There is a cable in what you sent that is consistent with this and it is strong on seeing to it that not a word got to the press. There ~~was~~ can be other explanations for its concern but the one I suggest is not unreasonable.

I've completed the deaft of a long manuscript on Newman for the record for history, by the way. He is grossly wrong on what he basis his writing about Ossald on. Ignorant. I can only wonder if his "implicating" Castro in the JFK assassination is a prelude to his coming book. And I do wonder about the pressures on ARRB to disclose what he can use ~~in it~~ that has nothing to do with the assassination itself. this he

I've made no effort to dope out the cryptonyms that he got disclosed. They also have nothing to do sti with the assassination or with any legitimate inquiry into it.

I'll resume this later when I can.

I never shared the belief that it was not Oswald who went to Mexico City. However, in a record that establishes a possible special importance to the CIA of that 10/1 tape of a tap on the USSR embassy's phones, as in other records, the caller said to have been Oswald spoke "broken Russian." After living there as long as he had? Doc number 367-726 of 12/10/63. But not exact date. What this omits is in Box 57, that the description by is not of Kostikov.

The transcript of part of this intercept headed RUSSIAN EMBASSY 15-60-55 and under that the date 10/1/63, has the Kostikov description by the guard and what seems to be less than agreement of it by Oswald, his "yes" followed immediately with his purpose in calling.

While 1011-945 has no date on it, the Subject, "GFFLOOR Transmittal of LIENVOY Tape." with GEFLOOR seeming to be the assassination, this then would report the forwarding of that tape after the assassination.

37-5219 of the day after the assassination is the first CIA cable seeking secrecy for the Duran arrest.

The November 26 cable reporting Alvarado's palpably impossible allegation was sent to the White House from Mexico City, not through its HQ, and to State. It plays it all straight, suggesting no question about what is ludicrous on its face if the whole story is known. As it was not at the White House or at State. It was not for four days before the fact that he was not always accurate was cabled, not copies indicated to White House or State.

I believe that this, like the Duran concoction that had no basis at all, were intended to be inflamatory and to encourage doing "something" about Castro. Otherwise why no reference to Alvarado's dependability record and why not let HQ decide if the White House should be informed of what was entirely unconfirmed?

Consideration of this as the possible intention should also include the very inflamatory nature of the knowingly false Kostikov line that has gotten attention even since then particularly when Hosty writes or speaks. And it then gets attention.

Best,

Harold

There were a number of dubs of that tape in existence after the assassination.

Beginning 11/22/63 the destruction of anything related to the assassination was strictly prohibited without written Archives approval. Yet Lincus told me that the story is that no tape exists, which is what he as told.