

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>

TE 14 April 1978

~~BRECKINRIDGE~~

~~BRIGGS~~

~~WALLER~~

*Waller*  
JLL/KSCA file.

Anne Goodpastore is probably the person best qualified to speak on the subject of what went on in Mexico City Station. She was there at the time, and reviewed the files in depth last year. The concentration on points other than intelligence is interesting.

FROM: S.D. Breckinridge.

RETURN TO:

Subsequent telephonic inquiry to Miss Goodpastore developed that the paper she identified as Tab F was in fact a working draft of what became Tab F.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

14 April 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: Inspector General

SUBJECT : Anne Goodpasture's Appearance Before HSCA

1. I met with Anne Goodpasture and others this morning. She spent all day yesterday, without lunch, testifying before Congressman Dodd (and others from time to time), of the HSCA. She does not want to write anything about it, having questions about the Agency's ability and willingness to handle such a paper appropriately; based on her experience, detailed below, I agree with both her decision and her reasons.

2. She was called for the stated purpose of "an interview." In fact, she was interviewed Wednesday afternoon by Michael Goldsmith who went over in very general terms some of the subject matter he intended to cover. When it became apparent she was to testify before the Committee, she raised the question of misrepresentation as to why she was here, accusing them of "bad faith." She learned in the course of her exchanges that the rules of the Committee specify that a witness should have a week in which to prepare; a rule that the Committee seemed to be under no compulsion to observe.

3. By way of preliminary summary, it seems that she was subjected to what we might call hostile interrogation. It is her opinion that the questioning was designed for what she describes as "entrapment." She feels the thrust of the questioning did not have so much to do with the facts relating to Oswald, per se, but how the station was organized and functioned. On this point she was informed that one of the purposes of the Committee is the evaluation of the individual employees and the Agency as a whole, which seems to have been the main thrust of the questioning.

4. To her surprise there appeared to be a number of un-sanitized, raw documents in the possession of each of those present, having been reproduced in multiple copies. She recalls the following having copies: one for each Congressman, one for the clerk, one for the counsel (Goldsmith), a copy for her and apparently some others. She observes that Mr. Blakey was not present but Representatives Sawyer and Preyer were there for some of what happened. Representative Dodd conducted much of the questioning.

RETURN TO CIA  
Background Use Only  
Do Not Reproduce

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

2 APR 1978 013192

5. She stated that there was an unsanitized rough draft paper that she had typed out early in her work for us a year ago. We had asked to have a general description of how Mexico Station functioned to help our overall understanding, and she had written this in a sort of free form way. She says that this eight-page draft was clearly rough, it had to contain errors (which she says is borne out by the research that she did later). Also reproduced in full and unsanitized fashion for each of those present was Tab F of the 1977 report of the Special Task Force; this is a subject of a memorandum written by me on 11 April 1978, a copy of which is attached.

6. Attempts were made to take specific items of information out of context and build for them a significance they did not have, and to force her to make unqualified statements concerning them. When she declined to give specific testimony on various specific points on what happened in 1963, her interrogators challenged her both directly and by innuendo; as an example, they wanted to know the exact date on which, in Mexico City, she wrote a comment on an undated Washington Post newspaper story. They tried to impute to her supervisory responsibilities over a number of officers in the Mexico Station at the time; she had none and they tried to argue with her flat statement of fact. They tried to get her to testify as to the competence and "conscientious" work of the COS, using papers they questioned as a basis for attacking his ability. They were incapable or unwilling to understand or accept the fact that a station worked in a reasonable fashion that was contrary to some undisclosed pattern that they seemed to have formulated for themselves.

7. She is certain that Tom Keenon, Bob Shaw and [redacted] will be called to testify. She expressed a desire to talk with them and I urged her not to do so; although a reasonable thing to do under ordinary circumstances, in the face of a hostile inquiry of dubious purpose, such a contact would be twisted and presented as a form of collusion, and I felt that her discussion with them under these circumstances should not take place. However, I do believe the Office of General Counsel should be instructed to advise witnesses how to conduct themselves under such circumstances in terms of their legal rights; there apparently were a number of tense moments during her testimony requiring her to resist being cowed by the bullying tactics of counsel and Mr. Dodd. At the end of the day Mr. Dodd, on reflection, apologized to her for his questionable conduct.

8. It seems to me that there is a requirement for a formal review, outside the Office of the Legislative Counsel, as to how this Agency, itself, is abiding by the established ground rules

1/90

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

for what it delivers to HSCA. In view of the multiple copies made of material containing still-sensitive sources and methods, there is need for formal representation to Mr. Blakey at a level higher than the Office of Legislative Counsel on future relations with this Agency and the Committee. Whatever the action, steps should be taken to retrieve all information that has been passed improperly out of this Agency.



S. D. Breckinridge

Attachment:  
As Stated

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~