

Date: 02/17/05

JFK ASSASSINATION SYSTEM
IDENTIFICATION FORM

AGENCY INFORMATION

AGENCY : CIA
RECORD NUMBER : 104-10127-10280
RECORD SERIES : JFK
AGENCY FILE NUMBER : 80T01357A

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

AGENCY ORIGINATOR : CIA
FROM : BRECKINRIDGE, S.D.
TO : MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD
TITLE : DISCUSSION ON MATTERS AFFECTED BY HSCA SUBPEONA.
DATE : 08/18/1978
PAGES : 6

SUBJECTS : MEXICO CITY
HSCA SUBPEONA

DOCUMENT TYPE : PAPER
CLASSIFICATION : CONFIDENTIAL
RESTRICTIONS : 1B
CURRENT STATUS : RELEASED IN PART PUBLIC - RELEASED WITH DELETIONS
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 10/28/97
COMMENTS : JFK57 : F5 : 1997.10.28.13:09:53:200092 : 2 COPIES OF
3-PAGE DOCUMENT. 1 COPY (22306) RELEASED.

Released under the John F. Kennedy
Assassination Records Collection Act of
1992 (44 USC 2107 Note). Case#:NW
65924 Date: 10-26-2021

[R] - ITEM IS RESTRICTED 104-10127-10280

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 # 78-3012

18 August 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Discussion on Matters Affected by HSCA Subpeona

1. This memorandum includes more than the above subject as there was a preliminary conversation with Ken Klein who initiated a request for an Agency position on Nosenko. I spoke with him briefly when I went down to the Headquarters entrance today to pick up Mr. Cornwell. I told Klein that we would not have someone available on 21 August to provide the testimony requested, but that a person is preparing for it. I said that we thought it inappropriate to address a staff member in giving an Agency position, and that in this case it would place in their record (thereby becoming HSCA property) sensitive matters that we have taken great pains to hold within the Agency. I said that written answers to the questions are being prepared, in addition to the statement. He asked if I would tell him who would make the statement; I replied that it was intended that John Hart do so, as he had studied the problem already and was not an actor in the earlier phases of the matter. I told Klein that I had tried to contact him by telephone, to give him this message, but that in any event a letter from the DDCI to Chairman Stokes was to have been delivered to the Committee this morning.

2. Cornwell and I met for slightly over a half hour today. I told him that I was embarrassed for Chairman Stokes over his subpoena. I said that the Harvey OPF had been reviewed in the morning of the day before the subpoena was voted. I said that the document being requested from the AMMUG file had not been found, which was known to his investigators, and that a subpoena could not produce it. I said that the other two matters were of very doubtful relevance to the charter of the Committee--the deception operation that I had described to him earlier could not in good faith be requested by the Committee, and the Mexico City history covered twenty years of activity with the most limited reference to the Oswald matter. I expressed the opinion that if they pressed for the subpoena that they would essentially be creating a constitutional confrontation at what is probably the most inopportune time so far as the investigation is concerned. I was not at all sure that the

22306

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Agency's response, if it had to become public, would not be embarrassing to the Committee. I said that I assumed that the issues on the Harvey file and the AMMUG file had been resolved already. Cornwell expressed ignorance on the AMMUG file and said that they had wanted to include the year 1959 in the Harvey file (we have provided 1960 through the period of his service as COS, Rome).

3. The balance of our conversation had to do with how we would handle the Proenza 201 file for the period in question and the Mexico City history. I had explained to Cornwell the difference between the 201 file and the operational file, without comment from him.


4. Cornwell stated that he knew from our earlier conversations that we wanted to limit access to these two matters. He was under instructions from Blakey to say that they could not accept such a limitation at this time; both Blakey and Cornwell are so busy that they cannot take this on themselves. I pointed out the dilemma between the situation created by their own time restraints and our security considerations. I told him that the investigators he wanted to look at this (Hardway and Lopez) labored under a burden of credibility in the Agency and that these young men are so callow that we did not want to trust them with the kind of information that they had been seeking. He said that if I knew something about them that he ought to be made aware of I should tell him. I replied that it was primarily their attitude and conduct and I did not feel it constructive to discuss it further.

5. I pointed out that Messrs. Sturbitts and Hawkins were ready to review the Mexico City history with him. In fact, he did go through it very briefly with them, noting that there were deleted sections with hand written explanations of the subject matter. Cornwell asked me to get authority for Hardway and Lopez to review these two matters. I first asked that Mr. Leap, who had worked the Mexico City problem be used, emphasizing that he was a mature person. I then asked if it would be acceptable to limit the review to one of the two. When he asked me which one it would be, I replied that it should be Lopez as much of the Proenza file is in Spanish which Lopez handles well.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

6. We left it that I would submit the Committee's request for Hardway and Lopez to review the matters, and that in any event Cornwell who is leaving for Dallas today would be back in town Tuesday to review the matter further. He wants Hardway and Lopez to see the file today and Monday; I said that I doubted that I could get a decision before later in the day. Cornwell's Dallas address will be the Holiday Inn on Regal Road if I have to call him.


S.D. Breckinridge

Distribution:

Orig - OLC/Subject
1 - OLC/Record
1 - OGC (Rininger)
1 - DDO
1 - Mr. Shepanek
1 - SA/DDCI

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

OLC # 78-3012

18 August 1978

Subpoena
HSCA

OLC RECORD COPY

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Discussion on Matters Affected by HSCA Subpoena

1. This memorandum includes more than the above subject as there was a preliminary conversation with Ken Klein who initiated a request for an Agency position on Nosenko. I spoke with him briefly when I went down to the Headquarters entrance today to pick up Mr. Cornwell. I told Klein that we would not have someone available on 21 August to provide the testimony requested, but that a person is preparing for it. I said that we thought it inappropriate to address a staff member in giving an Agency position, and that in this case it would place in their record (thereby becoming HSCA property) sensitive matters that we have taken great pains to hold within the Agency. I said that written answers to the questions are being prepared, in addition to the statement. He asked if I would tell him who would make the statement; I replied that it was intended that John Hart do so, as he had studied the problem already and was not an actor in the earlier phases of the matter. I told Klein that I had tried to contact him by telephone to give him this message, but that in any event a letter from the DDCI to Chairman Stokes was to have been delivered to the Committee this morning.

2. Cornwell and I met for slightly over a half hour today. I told him that I was embarrassed for Chairman Stokes over his subpoena. I said that the Harvey OPF had been reviewed in the morning of the day before the subpoena was voted. I said that the document being requested from the AMMUG file had not been found, which was known to his investigators, and that a subpoena could not produce it. I said that the other two matters were of very doubtful relevance to the charter of the Committee--the deception operation that I had described to him earlier could not in good faith be requested by the Committee, and the Mexico City history covered twenty years of activity with the most limited reference to the Oswald matter. I expressed the opinion that if they pressed for the subpoena that they would essentially be creating a constitutional confrontation at what is probably the most inopportune time so far as the investigation is concerned. I was not at all sure that the

CONFIDENTIAL

20340

CONFIDENTIAL

Agency's response, if it had to become public, would not be embarrassing to the Committee. I said that I assumed that the issues on the Harvey file and the AMMUG file had been resolved already. Cornwell expressed ignorance on the AMMUG file and said that they had wanted to include the year 1959 in the Harvey file (we have provided 1960 through the period of his service as COS, Rome).

3. The balance of our conversation had to do with how we would handle the Proenza 201 file for the period in question and the Mexico City history. I had explained to Cornwell the difference between the 201 file and the operational file, without comment from him.


4. Cornwell stated that he knew from our earlier conversations that we wanted to limit access to these two matters. He was under instructions from Blakey to say that they could not accept such a limitation at this time; both Blakey and Cornwell are so busy that they cannot take this on themselves. I pointed out the dilemma between the situation created by their own time restraints and our security considerations. I told him that the investigators he wanted to look at this (Hardway and Lopez) labored under a burden of credibility in the Agency and that these young men are so callow that we did not want to trust them with the kind of information that they had been seeking. He said that if I knew something about them that he ought to be made aware of I should tell him. I replied that it was primarily their attitude and conduct and I did not feel it constructive to discuss it further.

5. I pointed out that Messrs. Sturbitts and Hawkins were ready to review the Mexico City history with him. In fact, he did go through it very briefly with them, noting that there were deleted sections with hand written explanations of the subject matter. Cornwell asked me to get authority for Hardway and Lopez to review these two matters. I first asked that Mr. Leap, who had worked the Mexico City problem be used, emphasizing that he was a mature person. I then asked if it would be acceptable to limit the review to one of the two. When he asked me which one it would be, I replied that it should be Lopez as much of the Proenza file is in Spanish which Lopez handles well.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

6. We left it that I would submit the Committee's request for Hardway and Lopez to review the matters, and that in any event Cornwell who is leaving for Dallas today would be back in town Tuesday to review the matter further. He wants Hardway and Lopez to see the file today and Monday; I said that I doubted that I could get a decision before later in the day. Cornwell's Dallas address will be the Holiday Inn on Regal Road if I have to call him.


S.D. Breckinridge

Distribution:

Orig - OLC/Subject
1 - OLC/Record
1 - OGC (Rininger)
1 - DDO
1 - Mr. Shepanek
1 - SA/DDCI

CONFIDENTIAL