

This document is made available through the declassification efforts
and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:

The Black Vault



The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages released by the U.S. Government & Military.

Discover the Truth at: <http://www.theblackvault.com>

CONFIDENTIAL

OLC 79-0113/6
25 January 1979

SUBJECT: Comments on HSCA Draft Reports Classified Top Secret

This particular package seems to consist of two drafts, one of which is numbered pages 2000566 through 2000592. It appears to have some redundancy with an earlier draft having to do with the opening of the Oswald File. The second paper consists of pages 1-14. (U)

I. Oswald File

As a matter of form, one does not refer to the "Deputy Directorate of Operations" but to the Directorate of Operations. The DDO, literally, is the person of the Deputy Director and it is only in shorthand that the acronym DDO is used to refer to the Directorate of Operations. This comment applies to pages 2000570-2000571. (U)

On page 2000572, the last three lines of the first paragraph might be edited to read as follows: "...to determine who the writer was, who opened the file, and when it was done." (U)

On the same page, did the CIA reply say that disseminations inside CIA "has always" been based on written requirements? There are bound to have been ad hoc disseminations. (U)

At pages 2000574, 2000575, and 2000577, references are made to William Lawson and William Larson, apparently different spellings of the same name. Is this the name of an Agency employee? Should it be removed? (C)

Is the references to "persons associated with the Deputy Director of Operations" mean literally such a personal association or does it refer to people in the Directorate? In the same sentence the statement is rather categorical about a document warranting the opening of a 201 file; rather than the word "would" it would be more appropriate to use the word "could." Such an action was a judgment call and would not necessarily have meant that a 201 file would or would not have been opened. (U)

RETURN TO CIA
Background Use Only
Do Not Reproduce

22481

CONFIDENTIAL

DERIVATIVE CL BY 13190
 DECL REVW ON 1/17/85
DERIVED FROM 1-313

CONFIDENTIAL

The draft report makes a point on page 2000580. Obviously, documents post-dating the opening date would not have been in the file at the time it was opened. (U)

It is noted that Mrs. Egerter's name appears on pages 2000581, 2000582, 2000584, 2000585, 2000588, and 2000599. The HSCA editor has noted this suggesting that her position be cited in some instances, and we would suggest that the name be deleted. (C)

On page 2000584, in the full paragraph in the middle of the page, the statement is made that "Mrs. Egerter claims to have prepared" papers in response to a State Department request. She doesn't "claim," she simply stated that is the way she recalled it. We interviewed her and the story is quite simple. On page 2000586, the statement appears at the top of the page that "CI/SIG was cited as the 'source document.'" Since CI/SIG is an organization, it is not a source document per se. Is the draft report correct and is the citation someone's shorthand reference of authority rather than its source? (C)

Page 2000590 makes the statement that a CS component "failed to act...by initiating the opening of a 201 file on a person who posed a potential counter-intelligence threat." That represents an operational judgment as to what constitutes a possible subject of counter-intelligence interest and what action should stem from it; there is no one that we saw on the Committee staff who has any competence to make such a judgment, particularly in the present case. It would have been a judgment call then, and today still seems correct. (U)

II. Oswald Photo in Minsk

The names of DCD sources ^{os} [redacted] and ^{os} [redacted] appear throughout this section; at pages 1-3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 12. Are these names revealed in the Warren Commission already, and should they be deleted and referenced by general descriptions? (C)

In addition, the name of a ^{os} [redacted] appears at page 4. Lee Wigren appears at pages 5, 6, and 11. The name of Mrs. Voellmy (subsequently reported as Voellmy Vance) appears at pages 8 and 10. Shirley Stetson appears at pages 7, 10, 11 and 12. These should all be removed. (C)

Presumably we ought not object to describing how the photographs were obtained, although it says something about a method of collection. (U)

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

III. Oswald Correspondence During his Soviet Residence

At the top of page 2 we can smile at the HSCA's description of its perception of something as "unusual," which is a reflection of its frequently impressionistic approach to the matters of intelligence. However, I am not inclined to make issue with it. (U)

On pages 7 and 10, there are references to HTLINGUAL "volumes." It was my impression that there was very little Oswald-related correspondence in HTLINGUAL, but the use of the word "volume" conveys an impression of size that is not warranted. Question: Were there four file folders with a few pieces of paper, or were there large volumes of materials in which there were a few scraps of paper relating to Oswald? If my impression is correct, a comment on this would be an appropriate assist in contributing to the precision with which the Committee discusses the matter. (U)

CONFIDENTIAL