

---

Agency Information

AGENCY : HSCA  
RECORD NUMBER : 180-10142-10127  
RECORD SERIES : CIA SEGREGATED COLLECTION  
AGENCY FILE NUMBER : 23-15-03

---

Document Information

ORIGINATOR : HSCA  
FROM : CIA  
TO :

TITLE :

Released under the John F. Kennedy  
Assassination Records Collection Act of  
1992 (44 USC 2107 Note). Case#:NW  
66000 Date: 11-04-2021

DATE : 00/00/0000  
PAGES : 5

SUBJECTS :

SENATE INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE  
CIA, FILES

DOCUMENT TYPE : NOTES  
CLASSIFICATION : Unclassified  
RESTRICTIONS : 1A; 1B  
CURRENT STATUS : Redact  
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 08/07/1995

OPENING CRITERIA :

COMMENTS : Box 12

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>

Note to Myself

Ask what project file LICOOKIE placed

Ask who found Licookie memo in Dec. 1955


Ask what if any actions taken when it was found.

Ask: identity of CIA informant, Nov. 24, 1964, agent ~~X~~

Identify agent who wrote Nov. 24, 1964 X

Go Back to text for Q. ibids

Now call H. G. V. => get // bulletin  
interview  
always  
application



Dearest team leader, a.k.a. ZRSHARIC;

Please reread my Elena Garro write-up.

I feel it flows well now! (except Dec. 25  
Thomas memo summary). I can still phiten  
each section so that it <sup>deals</sup> relates only with  
Oswald - alone + Oswald - Activities in Mexi  
but the interesting aspect of the Write-Up is  
the CIA perchey us No theory.

Beginning with p. 29

What Committee did to investigate story

Results

Analysis

Conclusions.

Review of the  
 3) Requested and received from the Central Intelligence Agency letter of 2/4/76, to the Senate Intelligence Committee Agency a copy of the letter.

Did the Central Intelligence Agency write the Senate Intelligence Committee that no investigation <sup>of</sup> the Cuban Nov. 22, 1963 flight was conducted?

after a <sup>2/4/76</sup> careful review of the Central Intelligence <sup>H.S.</sup> letter to the Senate Intelligence Committee the <sup>Assoc.</sup> Commission has determined that the Senate Intelligence Report's interpretation of the letter is misleading. The Central Intelligence wrote the Senate Intelligence Committee that the Mexican authorities were asked about the reported flight delay, although there was no recorded response.  
 [CIA letter to Senate Intelligence Committee, 2/4/76.]

Did the Central Intelligence Agency further investigate the Report?

The Central Intelligence Agency conducted regular surveillance of Cuban flights, filing cable reports to Headquarters <sup>[Patt report p. 11]</sup>. There was one unilateral CIA surveillance team that observed arrivals and departures of Cuban flights, reporting any unusual incidents and providing copies of flight manifests. (ibid p. 11) The Mexican authorities also had a surveillance team of its own at the airport, which provided to the CIA photographs of passengers and copies of passenger lists (ibid p. 11). Additionally, a telephone tap operation (Liensoy) against the Cuban Embassy provided transcripts of conversations with the Cuban office

to a reported five-hour delay of a Cubana flight from Mexico City to Havana the evening of President Kennedy's assassination, November 22, 1963. [Senate Intelligence Committee Report, April 23, 1976, p. 30]

The most intriguing aspect of the report was that the reported delay was to await arrival at 10:30 P.M. EST of a private twin-engine aircraft, which deposited an unidentified passenger who boarded the <sup>Cubana</sup> aircraft without Customs clearance and traveled to Havana in the pilot's cabin. (Exhibit ps. 60-61) The Senate Intelligence Committee wrote that the Central Intelligence Agency "had no information indicating that a following investigation was conducted to determine the identity of the passenger and had no further information on the passenger, and no explanation for why a following investigation was not conducted. [Exhibit p. 61]

The ~~an~~ Senate Intelligence Committee Report raises major questions: did <sup>the</sup> Central Intelligence Agency write the Senate Intelligence Committee that no investigation <sup>was</sup> conducted; <sup>Did</sup> ~~the~~ Central Intelligence Agency ~~conduct~~ <sup>any</sup> further investigation; ~~what~~ <sup>was</sup> the result of the investigation; and, were they given to the Senate Intelligence Committee?

In an attempt to answer the questions posed by the Senate Intelligence Committee Report, the House Select Committee on Assassinations has done the following:

- 1) Conducted an extensive review of the Central Intelligence Agency files that pertain to the November 22, 1963 Cubana flights.
- 2) Requested <sup>Review</sup> a copy of ~~the~~ <sup>of the</sup> 1977 C.I.A. Staff Report and ~~sent~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>relevant</sup> portions <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>of</sup> the November 22, 1963 Cubana flights. <sup>TAB</sup> <sup>Book</sup> which included the

b) The Cubana flight departed at 2035 hours Mexico City time, 55 minutes ahead of the "alleged" arrival at 2130 hours of a private flight with a secret passenger. c) The <sup>Cuban</sup> departure at 2035 hours also contrasts further with ~~the alleged time of the Cuban flight~~ <sup>the Senate Intelligence Report which stated that the Cuban flight departed at 2200</sup> ~~2130~~.

Were the Results of the Central Intelligence Investigation given to the Senate Intelligence Committee?

Unfortunately, the Senate Intelligence Committee was only given the informant reports. The Central Intelligence Agency never allowed <sup>the Senate Int. Com</sup> them to review the J. FIRE & LLENUDY records. Hence, the Senate Intelligence Committee <sup>relying solely on the</sup> ~~could not have~~ reached the conclusions reached by the HSCA. informant's allegation, could have <sup>not</sup> ~~reached~~ <sup>reported</sup> the allegation any differently.