

CIA SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
RELEASE IN FULL
2000

11 March 1993

NOTE FOR: Deputy Director for Operations

FROM: Peter Earnest
Chief, Media Relations

SUBJECT: WASHINGTON POST Request to Talk to an Agency
Specialist on the Kennedy Assassination

The WASHINGTON POST is preparing a series of articles on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Kennedy assassination. ✓

With the help of CIC, we recently arranged for George Lardner and Walter Pincus of the WASHINGTON POST to interview former KGB officer Yuri Nosenko about his knowledge of Lee Harvey Oswald during the time Oswald lived in the Soviet Union. To ensure that Nosenko's resettlement identity and location would remain protected, I made the arrangements for Nosenko to come to Washington for the interview. ✓

The POST reimbursed Nosenko for expenses and paid him a \$250 consulting fee. The interview was done on Wednesday, 3 March, at the POST offices downtown. I did not remain for it. Lardner and Pincus also hosted a lunch for Nosenko which was attended by Ben Bradlee. Lardner and Pincus were very pleased with their session with Nosenko and appreciative of our making it possible. I also spoke afterwards with Nosenko who said he was satisfied with how the interview was conducted and with the financial arrangements.

Shortly after the interview, Lardner faxed me a list of the questions that he and Pincus had prepared for themselves to use in checking out Nosenko's information. They asked if there was anyone at the Agency they could talk to about the individuals named. I told them that developing information in response to their questions would probably take a good deal of research and that I doubted the Agency would be able to take on such a task at this time for the POST. However, I said I would take it up with the appropriate offices.

Although I told the POST that I do not believe anyone would be willing to undertake research on their questions, I'm wondering if there is anyone around who might be knowledgeable of Nosenko's information who would be willing to talk with Lardner and Pincus on background based on his/her existing knowledge. I think Lardner and Pincus would be grateful for making such a person available even if

Jim
John
For circulation in HRC, f

SUBJECT: WASHINGTON POST Request

all their questions aren't answered. Considering that they are trying to do serious research on the Kennedy assassination, I think any effort on our part to help them would be seen as a gesture of good will.


Peter Earnest

Attachment:
As stated

_____ Agree to having a specialist talk to them on background about the Nosenko information if an appropriate person is available.

_____ No, do not want anyone from the DO talking about the Nosenko information.

SUBJECT: WASHINGTON POST Request to Talk to an Agency specialist in the Kennedy Assassination

DCI/PAI/Earnest:ncbx37758 (11 March 1993)

Distribution:

Original	Addressee
1	ADDO
1	SA/DDO
1	DO Registry
1	D/PAI
1	D/DO/CIC
1	C/DO/NROC
1	C/DO/CE
1	C/CSI
1	C/History Staff

Names of Russians we should try to track down about Lee Harvey Oswald, Yuri Nosenko and the JFK assassination:

1. General Oleg M. Gribanov, head of the Second Chief Directorate of the KGB in the early 1960s where Nosenko says he worked, primarily against American tourists, as deputy chief of the Seventh Department. Nosenko described himself as sort of favored by Gribanov and he said Gribanov instructed him, after the JFK assassination, to retrieve the Oswald file from the Minsk KGB right away.

2. Anatoliy Koralenko, deputy chief of the Second Chief Directorate or one of its departments, at time of JFK assassination. Nosenko said when the file arrived from Minski, he and Koralenko were going over the all-important first volume--and finding KGB had nothing to do with Oswald--when a KGB officer from the First Department came in and picked it up on Gribanov's orders, to review it and write a summary of it.

3. The officer who picked it up was Col. Matveyev, deputy chief(I think) of First(or American) Department, Second Chief Directorate. Unhave first name.

4. Chief of this First Department was Col. Sergei M. Fedoseyev or Fedoseev and presumably he would have had a hand in or supervised preparation of the "spravka" or summary.

5. Gribanov and more than 40 other KGB officers were kicked out because of Nosenko's defection, according to Nosenko. That right? *What happened?*

6. Maj. Georgi Rastrusin. Was in 1959 a senior case officer in KGB responsible for Intourist matters. Nosenko says that it was Rastrusin who told him about Oswald and how he wanted to stay in Soviet Union. Nosenko said Rastrusin said Oswald "doesn't present interest" to KGB and Nosenko checked out with his superiors. Word came back not to bother with Oswald. Nosenko was told to tell Rastrusin to tell Intourist to deal with him.

7. Rastrusin returned next day and said we got a problem. Oswald tried to kill self, etc. KGB washed hands of him, decided to let Intourist deal with him. Intourist then part of Ministry of Foreign Trade. Nosenko said he believes question of what to do with Oswald was run to top of that ministry and beyond, to Khrushchev or one of his deputies. In any case, decision was made to let Oswald stay in Minsk. But not, Nosenko says, by KGB.

8. In the fall of 1963, a KGB colleague, M. I. Turalin, Service No. 2(counterintelligence in foreign countries), First Chief Directorate, told Nosenko orally that Mexico City station had just sent a cable about a request by Oswald for a visa to re-enter Soviet Union. What should be done?

Nosenko said he said, 'wait a second. How come he's back in America?' At that point, Nosenko said he hadn't know Oswald had gone back.

9. Nosenko said he said let's go to chief of department who he identified as a Col. Chelnekov or Chelnenko(but later seemed to say his timing might be off and somebody else may have been chief of Nosenko's department at the time). In any case, Nosenko quoted chief as saying, in effect, 'I remember this crazy nut. No. No. No. Tell them we don't have any interest.'

Cable back to Mexico City advising KGB there get rid of Oswald by telling him to go back to his own country and apply for a visa at Soviet Embassy in Washington, etc., etc.

10. Col. Grundev, was chief of the KGB department in Minsk that was responsible for foreigners there.

11. Oleg Nechiporenko, one of three KGB officers stationed in Mexico City who reportedly interrogated or dealt with Oswald on his visit to Embassy there. Now living in Moscow area.

Other two Mexico City officers, both still alive in Russia: Valeriy Kostikov and Pavel Yatzkov.



Center for the Study of Intelligence

28 June 1994

Mr. Anthony Summers
Still Point
Dromore
Aglish, Cappoquin
Co. Waterford
Ireland

Dear Mr. Summers:

This is in response to your letter of 25 May 1994 to David Gries regarding the possible existence of tape recordings of Oswald's conversations with the Cuban and Soviet embassies in Mexico City until at least April 1964. As evidence of this possibility you cite FBI Director Hoover's statement the day after the assassination that his agents had listened to the tapes. You also state that Messrs. Coleman and Slawson recalled that Winston Scott arranged for them to listen to a tape recording of Oswald's conversations during their visit to Mexico City in April 1964 and that a senior CIA officer provided the tape to them.

In its review of CIA files on Oswald and the assassination of President Kennedy, the CIA Historical Review Group (HRG) found no tape recordings of Oswald's conversations with the Soviet or Cuban embassies. We did find transcriptions of such conversations and a number of documents stating that the tapes themselves had been routinely erased prior to the assassination. Nor has any tape been found in the FBI files.

The inconsistency you point out flows from a number of misstatements and errors made in documents immediately after the assassination. While these were corrected, the original errors continue to raise questions regarding the tapes. The following excerpts illustrate this point:

1. FBI Dallas To FBI HQ, 23 November 1963: "Inasmuch as the Dallas Agents who listened to the tape of conversation allegedly of Oswald from the Cuban Embassy to the Russian Embassy in Mexico and examined the photographs

Central Intelligence Agency

Washington, D.C. 20505

(703) 351-2698 Fax (703) 243-8343

of the visitor and were of the opinion that neither the tape nor the photograph pertained to Oswald,..."

2. FBI Director to the President, 23 November 1963: "Special Agents of this Bureau... have observed photographs of the individual referred to above and have listened to a recording of his voice. These Special Agents are of the opinion that the above-referred to individual was not Lee Harvey Oswald."

3. FBI SAC, Dallas, 23 November 1963 Cable to FBI Director: " It should be noted that the actual tape from which this transcript [of Oswald's call] was made has been erased."

4. Legal Attaché (FBI), Mexico City, Cable to FBI Headquarters, 25 November 1963: "Tapes obtained by CIA... here erased after two weeks, following making of typewritten transcripts of contents of these tapes. There appears to be some confusion in that no tapes were taken to Dallas but only typewritten transcripts supplied by CIA, the tapes not being available because they had been erased."

5. FBI Memorandum to U.S. Senate Select Committee, 27 February 1976: "Delivered herewith is material responsive to that letter pertaining to a voice recording referred to on page five of an FBI report to the President of the United States dated November 23, 1963. As was discussed... on February 24, 1976, the recording in question was never in the possession of the FBI and was not listened to by FBI Agents."

With respect to Coleman's and Slawson's recollections, the CIA file contains a number of internal Warren Commission documents on their trip to Mexico City. In a report on their visit, they state that in their meeting with Scott, they were shown original transcripts and translations of Oswald's telephone conversations. In a subsequent meeting with Scott and his deputy, arrangements were made for them to go through all the transcripts to use them as a basis for reconstructing Oswald's Mexico City activities concerning the two embassies. Slawson then spent considerable time reviewing and taking notes from the transcripts. None of these records mentions the existence of tapes of Oswald's calls or "listening to taped conversations."

The CIA/HRG review did turn up tapes of Oswald's radio debate in New Orleans and of a telephone conversation on 26 November between Cuban President Dorticos and Cuban Ambassador to Mexico Hernandez Armas. Scott discussed the latter tape with Coleman and Slawson, noting that the connection between the two speakers was very bad, that the tape was in CIA Headquarters and, that the Warren Commission might want to have it re-translated.

I hope that this information helps clarify the events surrounding the tapes. All of the documents quoted are available in the National Archives.

Yours truly,


John F. Pereira
Chief, Historical Review Group

25 May 1994

Memorandum for the Record

SUBJECT: Telephone Call from Anthony Summers re Oswald in Mexico City

1. Summers, author of Conspiracy, called long-distance from Ireland. After expressing pleasure in the amount and historic value of the JFK materials released by the Agency, he said that the specific reason for his call was a remaining ambiguity about the tapes of Oswald's calls to the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City.

2. The Agency, he said, told investigators that the tapes had been ~~erased~~. Summers said that he understood erasure as a normal procedure, with no sinister overtones. However, when he talked with former Warren Commission assistant counsels William Coleman and David Slawson, who visited the Mexico City Station in April 1964, they told him that they heard the tapes while in the Station and noted that they were of relatively poor quality. Also, Summers said that a former Agency employee with whom he spoke (whose name he said he could furnish, but not over the phone) said that he had heard the tapes.

3. Considering the 1964 date of the Slawson/Coleman trip and what Summers stated was the high credibility of the individuals who said they heard the tapes, Summers asked if our review had turned up the tapes or any documentation reflecting anything other than standard erasure procedure that could explain the apparent conflict between the timing of the Headquarters instruction to the field after the assassination not to destroy any file material, the date of the Slawson/Coleman visit and the absence of the tapes from the file.

4. I said that, to my knowledge, no one here had found the tapes nor had they encountered anything that would affect the conclusion that the tapes had been routinely erased. I said that no one reviewer here saw every document in the many archival boxes, but that had someone found anything to conflict with the previous testimony, it would have surfaced.

5. I got the impression that, in addition to continuing to review the material as it is released to NARA, Summers may seek a formal response to the question he asked me.

Charles W. Baggett

PHONE:

353 (Ireland) - 24 (Youghal) - 96210

FAX:

353 (Ireland) - 24 (Youghal) - 96467

ANTHONY SUMMERS**STILL POINT,
DROMORE,
AGLISH,
CAPPOQUIN,
CO. WATERFORD,
IRELAND.**

Mr. John F. Pereira,
Chief, Historical Review Group,
Center for Study of Intelligence,
Central Intelligence Agency,
Washington D.C. 20505

**CIA SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
RELEASE IN FULL**

6 July 1994

Dear Mr. Periera,

Thanks for your letter of June 28, regarding the Kennedy assassination case, and the matter of tape recordings. I was aware of virtually all the points you raise, since I recently took the trouble to visit Washington to peruse all available released material on the subject.

It does not, however, resolve the problem. While one might accept that human memory might fail in the case of one person, or even of two, it is surely astonishing that two former Warren Commission counsel say firmly for the record that in April 1964 they listened to tapes of Oswald contacts with one or more of the Communist missions, courtesy of the local CIA station chief, and that - in addition - a former senior station officer confirms that such tapes were played for them precisely as they describe. What should the serious scholar of the case conclude, that all three of these gentlemen have hopeless memories or are offering false information? Or could it be that the written record is wrong? Can we be certain that the CIA was not holding such tapes in 1964, and has not destroyed such tapes since? And can we be certain the CIA no longer has such tapes in its possession? I look forward with interest to your reply.

Sincerely,



~~INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

DRAFT

CIA SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
RELEASE IN FULL

24 February 1995

To: C/HRG 2000

Subject: Morley's request

The 10 October 1963 cable (Dir 74830) is a response to the Station's 9 October 1963 cable (Mexi 6453) which describes Oswald's contact with the Consul at the Soviet Embassy.

The information on Oswald in the 10 October cable (para. 1 - 3) deals with Oswald citizenship and current status and is based on State reporting. The cable is not a complete report on Oswald based on all information available.

The comment in Para. 3 re "latest HDQS information" appears to relate to citizenship issue, i.e., as of May 1962 State had confirmed Oswald's US citizenship. The statement is written in "cablese" and poorly worded, however, I don't believe it was meant to imply that there was no other information available on Oswald.

Karamessines signed as "releasing officer" and *someone signed for* J.C. King was *as* the "authentication officer." The cable would have been drafted by another officer, probably someone responding to a request on Oswald citizenship status.

Background (FYI Only):

The "Pre-Assassination" 201 file as released to NARA had at least one FBI document dated after May 1962 (DBA 20883 dated 30 August 1962/ received in the Agency 19 September 1962). There is also a 10 September 1963 FBI document that was received by the Agency on 19 September 1963. Given the handling of FBI documents (indexing and microfilming prior to dissemination), I doubt that this document had reached the 201 file by 10 October 1963.

There are no May 1962 documents/reports in the Pre-Assassination 201 File. Since Oswald left the USSR on 4 June 1962, there are numerous State documents dated May 1962 in the "JFK collection", however, no way to determined when there were received by the Agency.

The May 1962 "State report" may refer to a phone call to State or documents that were available but not in the 201 file.

~~INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

The cable referred to in your letter appears to focus only on the status of Oswald's citizenship. As such, it draws on information available from the State Department that bears on the question of citizenship. The cable is not regarded as an attempt to summarize all the information in CIA files on Oswald at the time.

23 February 1995

to: David Christian, Central Intelligence Agency
from: Jefferson Morley, Washington Post

In the next few days, The Washington Post plans to publish a news article about recently-declassified records from the CIA's Directorate of Plans concerning accused presidential assassin Lee Harvey Oswald. We would like to give you, or a designated Agency spokesman, the opportunity to comment on these records.

Routing slips on these documents show that in August 1962, September 1963 and October 1963, numerous offices in the Directorate of Plans received FBI reports on Oswald's personal, political and work activities.

Another recently-released document shows that on October 10, 1963 deputy director of plans Thomas Karamessines sent a cable to the Mexico City station stating that Headquarters' "latest HQ info" on Oswald was a State Department report dated May 1962.

Our question:

Does the Agency know why Mr. Karamessines told the Mexico City station on October 10, 1963 that the CIA had no information on Oswald since May 1962 when the Agency's records show that it had received three FBI reports on Oswald between May 1962 and October 1963?

Our deadline is Friday, Feb. 24 at 5 p.m.

I can be reached at 202/334-6053 (fax 202/334-5660). Thank you for your consideration.


Jefferson Morley
Washington Post

The Washington Post

1150 15th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20071-5530

Jefferson Morley

Outlook Section

7 November 1997

To: George Tenet, Director of Central Intelligence
From: Jefferson Morley, Washington Post

I write to request a briefing about the status of certain CIA records related to the Kennedy assassination. These records were produced by an Agency employee known as "Howard" who served as the case officer for a anti-Castro organization called the Revolutionary Student Directorate, DRE, from December 5, 1962 to mid-April 1964. In CIA files, the DRE was known by the cryptonym AMSPELL.

On November 22, 1963, "Howard" knew or should have known about the pro-Castro activities of accused assassin Lee Harvey Oswald in 1963. "Howard" was also in a position to evaluate public allegations of a Castroite assassination conspiracy made by his agents in the leadership of the DRE with whom he had extensive contact. He was obliged to report on the activities of these agents. Yet virtually all records related to "Howard's" activities in 1962-64 are missing from the National Archives. Inquiries to the JFK Assassination Records Review Board about these records have been unavailing.

Under the terms of the JFK Assassination Records Act, the director of the Agency's archival depository is required to give "expedited review for public disclosure of assassination records" in the Agency's possession. Because the CIA has otherwise shown (in the words of the JFK Assassination Records Review Board) "a high level of cooperation" and "undertaken significant efforts" to satisfy the standards of the JFK Records Act, the apparent withholding of records by and about "Howard" is an anomaly that should be clarified and corrected.

Background: On November 13, 1962, Deputy Director of Plans Richard Helms with two leaders of the DRE at CIA headquarters. Helms, according to minutes of the meeting, expressed a "personal interest" in developing a "reasonable collaboration" with the DRE. He assigned the group a new case officer whom he said would "be responsible to him [Helms] for the relationship."¹ According to other CIA records, this case officer used the name "Howard" in connection with DRE activities. As of April 1963, the DRE was receiving an average of \$51,000 per month from the Agency², the most of any single Cuban exile organization.

"Howard's" handling of the group casts new light on an old story: the Warren Commission's report that in August 1963, anti-Castro Cubans mounted a series of public confrontations with Lee Harvey Oswald. At the time, the ex-Marine wrote in a "political resume" that he was trying to harass and "infiltrate" the DRE chapter in New Orleans. When Oswald handed out pamphlets for the pro-Castro Fair Play for Cuba Committee on August 9, 1963, the DRE's New Orleans delegate Carlos Bringuier and other DRE members got into a fight with him. Bringuier notified the group's national leaders in Miami about the street altercation with Oswald. With the approval of DRE leaders in Miami, he then put Oswald under surveillance. He and a fellow anti-Castro activist also challenged Oswald to a debate on a local radio station. The DRE delegation taped the radio program and sent a copy to DRE headquarters in Miami. Finally, Bringuier, in consultation with DRE leaders in Miami, also put out a press release denouncing Oswald as a Marxist.

At the time, "Howard" was meeting regularly with DRE leaders in Miami and assisting their propaganda activities. One former leader of the DRE says that he is certain that "Howard" was informed of the group's contacts with Oswald at the time; another says that "Howard" was "probably" informed. These statements are in potential conflict with the Agency's longstanding position that none of its employees were knowledgeable of Oswald's activities in New Orleans in August 1963.

¹ See Memorandum for the Record, "Mr. Helms' conversation with Luis Fernandez Rocha and Jose Maria Lasa of the DRE regarding their Organizations Relationship with the Agency," 13 November 1962, JFK Collection, National Archives.

² See "Financial Payments Made by the Central Intelligence Agency to Cuban Exile Organizations," memo from Desmond Fitzgerald to Sterling Correll, April 1963, in John F. Kennedy Library.

In any case, there is no doubt that "Howard" was working with the DRE in the second half of 1963 to combat pro-Castro forces in the United States. In September 1963, "Howard" advanced four DRE leaders \$660 to travel to New York City and disrupt a conference of pro-Castro students, an apparent violation of the ban on CIA activities on U.S. soil.

While reporting regularly to "Howard" in the fall of 1963, the DRE leaders were stepping up their efforts to obtain weapons and money for an imminent military effort to liberate Cuba. In October 1963, DRE leader Juan Manual Salvat traveled, in violation of an administrative order confining him to Miami, to Dallas. There, FBI documents show that Salvat assigned two DRE members to negotiate for the purchase of weapons from a Dallas gun dealer, John Thomas Masen. According to a March 1964 FBI canvas of Dallas area gun dealers, Masen was one of two who sold the type of Mannlicher-Carcano bullets that struck President Kennedy.

After President Kennedy was killed, a DRE leader sent "Howard" a copy of a recording of the August 1963 radio debate with Oswald. The group published a special issue of "Trinchera," its CIA-funded publication, detailing Bringuier's contacts with Oswald and alleging that the accused assassin had acted at the behest of Fidel Castro. The group also launched a campaign by its Agency-funded delegations in Latin America to blame Kennedy's murder on the Cuban government.

"Howard's" reaction to the DRE's use of CIA funding to promote its JFK assassination conspiracy theory is unknown. It is known that "Howard" did not immediately inform his CIA colleagues investigating Oswald that his agents in the DRE had previously exposed the accused assassin as a sympathizer with the Cuban revolution. "Oswald's involvement with the pro-Castro movement was not at all surface[d] to us in the first weeks of the investigation," said "John Scelso," the CIA official in charge of the Agency's inquiry into Oswald.³

The Agency, in compliance with the JFK Records Act, has already disclosed most aspects of its relationship with the DRE, including the real names of two case officers who handled the group (David Phillips and Ross

³ See deposition of "John Scelso," House Select Committee on Assassinations, 16 May 1978, p. 166.

Crozier). The Agency has released the redacted 201 file of principal AMSPELL agent, Juan Manual Salvat Roque (201-286051). It has also released monthly "Operational Progress" reports on AMSPELL/DRE's activities in September and October 1962--the months right before "Howard" became the Agency's contact with the group--and on AMSPELL/DRE activities in May, June, July, August, September and October 1964--the months right after "Howard" was relieved of the DRE assignment.

The anomaly in the CIA records is this: If "Howard" reported on the group in the same fashion that his predecessor and successor did, he would have generated 17 monthly operational progress reports on AMSPELL/DRE activities between December 1962 and April 1964. Yet the National Archives has no such AMSPELL/DRE reports in that period. Nor have such reports been made available to the Review Board. Yet it is precisely these reports that are most likely to contain information relevant to the Kennedy assassination story. Specifically, "Howard's" reports on AMSPELL/DRE activities in August and November 1963, if they exist, demonstrably fit the legal definition of "assassination-related records" and thus have the presumption of "immediate disclosure" according to statute.

Among the questions I would like to discuss with knowledgeable representatives of the Agency are:

- 1) Did "Howard" report appropriately through the JMWAVE station in Miami about his activities on behalf of the CIA concerning the DRE in the period 1962 to 1964?
- 2) If so, was "Howard's" reporting on the DRE made available to "John Scelso" for the Agency's investigation of Oswald in 1963-64?
- 3) Were these records made available to the House Select Committee on Assassinations in 1977-78 in connection with its review of DRE activities?
- 4) Does "Howard's" reporting on DRE activities in August and November 1963 exist today?

NOV 10 1997 3:48PM

PUBLIC AFFAIRS
FROM WASH POST


OUTLOOK 202 334 5660

P. 6

- 5) If so, when will the Agency make these records available to the Review Board as mandated by law?
- 6) If these records no longer exist, what was the date and the reason for their disposition?
- 7) Does the CIA have any objection to the publication of "Howard's" real name?

I trust that knowledgeable representatives of the Agency will be able to clarify these issues for readers of the Washington Post.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.



Jefferson Morley
Outlook section



PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

TO: NAME: John P. / Barry H.

TEL: _____

FAX: 613 - 3063

FROM:

Phone: 703 482-7677

Fax: 703 482-6790

NUMBER OF PAGES: _____ (w/Cover Sheet)

REMARKS:

John / BARRY,

Here's a copy of our heads up Memo concerning the Post request for the JFK backgrounder. We said no based on the fact that the Review is ongoing. We provided no additional reasons or background info. Morley was not pleased and will "Appeal" our decision. Hope I captured your briefing in the note Tom

NOV. 14..1997 6:19PM

CIA PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

NO. 1818 P. 2

14 November 1997

Note for: DCI

From: Bill Harlow
Director of Public Affairs

Re: Possible Washington Post "Outlook" piece on
"Anomalies" in the CIA's JFK Assassination Document
Review

Jefferson Morley of the Washington Post is planning to write a story for the "Outlook" section on the government-wide JFK assassination document review. Morley requested a background briefing with members of the CIA/CSI review panel to discuss what he believes are "anomalies" in our disclosures to date. Specifically, Morley claims that CIA records relating to the Agency's relationship with an anti-Castro group called the Revolutionary Student Directorate (DRE) are missing from the National Archives. In addition, Morley claims that previously released JFK documents which reference a CIA case officer named "Howard," who Morley claims was the Agency's contact with the DRE, are also missing or incomplete.

After consulting with John Pereira, Chief, CSI/Historical Review Group, and Barry Harrelson, Chief, JFK Assassination Review, PAS informed Morley that it would not be appropriate to conduct a background briefing on the subject at this time because the Agency's JFK assassination document review is still ongoing. We emphasized to Morley that the CIA maintains an excellent working relationship with the Presidential review board and has been responsive to all inquiries and concerns the board has raised.

Background: At the request of the Presidential JFK Assassination Records Review Board, CSI is currently conducting a thorough re-review of all DRE related document to ascertain if "Howard" existed and to determine if documents are missing. To date no records containing the name "Howard" have been identified and CSI has not determined if there are any missing DRE documents. CSI believes the Agency's relationship with the Presidential board could be jeopardized, or damaged, if Morley were to receive a CIA briefing on the very questions the board has instructed CSI to investigate.

Attached is a copy of Morley's request for the background briefing.


Bill Harlow

Dissem: DDCI, DCI/CoS, DCI/EA, Counsel/DCI, EXDIR, D/EXDIR, DDO,
DDA, D/OCA, GC, D/CSI

The Washington Post

1150 15TH STREET, N. W.

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20071-5530

(202) 334-6000

OUTLOOK
(202) 334-7879

N

To: George Tenet, Director Central Intelligence

From: Jefferson Morley

Shortly after the assassination of President Kennedy on Nov. 22, 1963, a CIA case officer learned that his agents in a Miami-based anti-Castro organization had been in contact with Lee Harvey Oswald, then in custody as a suspect in the President's murder.

I would like to request an unclassified briefing on the activities and professional performance of this officer.

This officer was, according to former colleagues, a senior intelligence officer. He was the CIA's contact with the Revolutionary Student Directorate (DRE) from December 1962 until April 1964. He used the name "Howard" in his dealings with the Cuban students. The DRE is identified in CIA files by the cryptonym AMSPELL; the principle agent in the AMSPELL operation was Juan Manuel Salvat. The Washington Post has learned that the AMSPELL propaganda operation, funded by the CIA, had a decisive effect on media coverage of the Kennedy assassination.

Among the questions, I seek to clarify are:

—Did "Howard" report on the activities of the DRE/AMSPELL in August and November of 1963?

—Did "Howard" report on contacts between the DRE and Oswald in a timely fashion after the assassination?

—When will copies of "Howard's" reporting on DRE/AMSPELL be made available to the JFK Records Review Board?

JAN. 8. 1998 14:43PM


CIA PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF 202 334 5660

NO. 2084 P. 3 P. 3

I do not seek access to any classified information or documents. I seek the informed perspective of Agency employees familiar with Cuba operations in 1963 and Agency records already made public by the CIA related to DRE/AMSPELL and "Howard."

The spirit of full disclosure, embodied in the JFK Assassination Records Act, gives the CIA the opportunity to dispel misconceptions about the Agency and the circumstances leading to Kennedy's death. I hope that you will act in the spirit of that law and authorize knowledgeable persons at the CIA to clarify the story of the CIA propaganda operation known as AMSPELL for readers of the Washington Post.

Thank you for your cooperation.



Jefferson Morley
Assistant Editor
Outlook Section

The Washington Post

1150 15th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20071-5530

Jefferson Morley

Outlook Section

16 January 1998

To: Tom Crispell
From: Jefferson Morley

Re: request for unclassified briefing

Dear Tom,

This is to follow up on my fax to Director Tenet of 7 January 1998.

I would like to know if the Agency will be responsive to my request. If the Agency will not be able to provide an unclassified briefing on the DRE/AMSPELL documents that have been made public, could you notify me in writing with an explanation? I am handing in the story next week and need to include the Agency's response.

Thanks for your attention to this matter.

Jefferson Morley
Assistant Editor
Outlook Section

20 January 1998

Memorandum For: T. Jeremy Gunn
Executive Director.
Assassination Records Review Board

From: J. Barry Harrelson
Senior Reviewer
JFK Project

Subject: CIA-IR-21, Monthly Operational Reports
For the DRE

1. Reference is made to your request for subject information as further refined in your 18 December 1997 letter to Chief, Historical Review Group. Specifically, you asked about missing DRE monthly operational reports and the identity of "Howard," the name to which the DRE appears to have sent correspondence.

2. The Agency has searched appropriate data bases and files for the "missing" reports. In addition, the responsible offices have researched the questions contained within your request. Based on these rather extensive efforts, we can advise you as follows.

3. Missing operational monthly reports. The searches conducted by the Agency failed to locate any of the reports that appear to be "missing" -- December 1962 through April 1964, in general, and those for August and November 1963 in particular. It should be noted that during the period in question, major policy differences between the Agency and DRE developed. This was particularly true of the latter years of association because the DRE would not take directions or instructions about a number of operational matters, insisting on engaging in activities the Agency did not sanction. These differences caused the Agency to reduce the level of funding for the DRE. It also replaced the officer designated to deal with the DRE. Then, about the same time, the monthly operational reports trailed off. It seems probable these events are linked and that reporting in the form of such monthly reports simply stopped. The DRE files we did find are also within the sequestered JFK collection and they have previously been made available to ARRB staff member Manuel Legaspi.

4. The identity of "Howard." With reference to your request for information on "Howard," we, like you, have no clear understanding about the use of this particular name on

DRE messages. The phrase, "To Howard" was used as the addressee of several DRE prepared memoranda. We first attempted to identify if, in fact, "Howard" was an actual person. The name was not found to be a pseudonym. It also was not found to be a registered alias. It also is not the true name of any case officer associated with the DRE operation at the time the DRE documents were written. Following review of those data bases, knowledgeable case officers were queried suggested that the use of "To Howard" might have been nothing more than a routing indicator to ensure that the documents got to the correct CIA office/officer or that the sender was someone known to the recipient.

5. If you have any further questions in this regard, please advise.


J. Barry Harrelson

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

18 January 1998

MEMORANDUM FOR:

John Pereira @ DCI
Fred Wickham @ DOCIA SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
RELEASE IN FULL
2000

FROM:

J. Barry Harrelson
JFK Project Officer

OFFICE:

IMO/HRP

SUBJECT:

FYI - Jeff Morley's Requests re DRE

REFERENCE:

Morley's letters (2) to DCI

Last week Tom Crispell, Public Affairs, call me about a second letter to the DCI from Jeff Morley, Washington Post, re the DRE (Revolutionary Student Directorate), an anti-Castro organization that figures in the JFK assassination story. Again Morley ask for an unclassified briefing on the documents that have been made public, and clarification of the AMSPELL (DRE) operation and its "case officer" Howard.

I told Tom that HRG continued to recommend against a briefing and/or doing research for Morley. However, we are in the process of preparing a response to the ARRB on the DRE that will answer some of Morley's questions. Tom and I discussed the possibility of providing Morley a copy of our response to the JFK Board (ARRB) or referring him to the board. I told Tom I would have to discuss with C/HRG, the DO and board staff.

The DO (Bill McNair and Fred Wickham) are opposed to giving Morley any information. The ARRB Ex Dir. has no objection to the Agency providing Morley the same information we are giving the ARRB, however, they would not provide Morley a copy of our response. The ARRB considers this an open request and does not want to give incomplete information. If Morley is referred to the ARRB, he will be told that their records would be open to the public when the project is completed. Gunn did request that we make the DRE files in the sequestered collection a priority in the re-review and ask if we could re-review those documents mentioned in Morley's requests as soon as possible.

I passed the DO and ARRB responses to Tom. On Friday (16 Jan) Tom received a short note from Morley asking if the Agency was going to respond to his request; his deadline for the story is next week and needs to include the Agency's response. After further discussion, Tom said he would talk with Mansfield and recommend that Morley be given the same response as before: no briefing or written response to specific questions; additional information on the DRE will be made public through the ARRB and NARA as part of the review of JFK records.

For your information, the DO can find no record of a case office named "Howard". It appears that "Howard" may have been a routing indicator.

CC:

Ed Cohen @ DA

Sent on 18 January 1998 at 09:50:46 AM

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

From the Desk of J. Barry Harrelson

NOTE FOR: Thomas G. Crispell
FROM: J. Barry Harrelson
OFFICE: OIM/HRP
DATE: 01/28/98 04:06:28 PM
SUBJECT: Jeff Morley Request

1. In response to Jeff Morley's request re "Howard" and the DRE in his recent letter to the DCI, OIM/ HRP proposes the following oral response:

With reference to your request for information on "Howard", we have attempted to identify who he was and if, in fact, he was an actual person. The phrase, "To Howard" was used as the addressee of several DRE prepared memoranda. A comprehensive search of appropriate files was made. The name was not found to be a pseudonym or a registered alias. It also is not the true name of any case officer associated with the DRE operation at the time the DRE documents were written. Knowledgeable officers have suggested that the use of "To Howard" might have been a routing indicator to ensure that the documents got to the correct CIA office/officer.

2. The above response has been coordinated with Lee Strickland and the DO/IRO's office (Gloria Boyd). If you have any questions, please call me on 31825.

Barry

CC: John F. Pereira
Lee S. Strickland @ DA
Gloria M. Boyd @ DO
Sent on 28 January 1998 at 04:06:28 PM

Morelys questions

Q	A	In reply?
1a - Why did we lie?	We didn't	✓
1b - What officers said That Howard/Joannides didn't exist?	We said <u>Howard</u> didn't exist	✓
1b implied: Joannides was known as Howard	No answer	X

2a Why reporting?	Don't know	✓
2b Why didn't Joannides report on the the statements about Oswald	-	X
2c Shouldn't he have reported?	-	X
3b Can I have a briefing?	No (why?)	X

CIA SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
RELEASE IN FULL

2000
Kovach
input

MEMORANDUM

March 3, 1998

To: Jeremy Gunn
Executive Director

cc: Bob Skwirot
CIA Team Leader

From: Michelle Combs *Michelle Combs*
Special Assistant for Research and Review

Subject: CIA-IR-21 DRE Case Officer for December 1962 - April 1964

In response to ARRB's informal request for additional information and records, CIA-IR-21, CIA provided access to the Office of Personnel file for Mr. George E. Joannides. I have examined the personnel file for Mr. Joannides for the period 1961-64 and 1978-79. Mr. Joannides appears in documents in the CIA Sequestered Collection under his pseudonym Walter D. Newby.

During the period December 1962 to April 1964, Mr. Joannides was assigned as a covert action officer at JMWAVE, serving as deputy and then chief of the station's covert action branch. During this time period, Mr. Joannides was the case officer for the Cuban exile group Directorio Revolucionario Estudiantil (DRE). The descriptions of his duties and accomplishments in the personnel file are very general and contain no specific reference to his relationship with the DRE. There is no mention of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in the file and no information relevant to the assassination in the file. There is also no indication that Mr. Joannides may have used or been known by the name "Howard" during his contacts with the DRE, although personnel files typically would not reveal this information one way or another.

During the period mid-May 1978-January 1979, Mr. Joannides was assigned to work for Scott Breckinridge, the CIA's principal coordinator to the House Select Committee on Assassination (HSCA) as a focal person to keep track of the status of HSCA requests, particularly to the Directorate of Operations. In this role, Mr. Joannides developed and maintained a log and records of HSCA requests and CIA responses and handled the day-to-day follow up to HSCA requests.

Several performance evaluation reports from the 1962-64 time period and a memoranda from Scott Breckinridge on Mr. Joannides' duties during the 1978-1979 time frame were designated assassination records and are being processed for release.

e:\combs\cia-ir21.wpd
File 4.20.1 and 4.20.4

~~ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

NOTE FOR: James R. Oliver@DA
FROM: Glenn R. Jacobs
OFFICE: OIM/IRG
DATE: 09/29/98 03:46:26 PM
SUBJECT: Public Affairs/JFK

Per our conversation yesterday, I talked to Lee regarding about not providing a number to Public Affairs with respect to the ABC inquiry regarding the cost for declassifying JFK. He still wants to give the 35 FTE statement. Unfortunately, this has made its way to Ed who disagrees with both solutions. Ed has requested that we provide an overall FTE figure for the entire processing (6 years.) I tried my best to make this a simple project, but unfortunately was not successful. I now need your assistance (or Barry) to provide the FTE estimate. The Public Affairs Point of Contact is Anya C. Guilsher on 37758. I apologize for the inconvenience, but I tried. Thanks - Rusty

CC:
Sent on 29 September 1998 at 03:46:26 PM

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

CIA SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
RELEASE IN FULL
2000

NOTE: Morley 1. doc deleted

DRAFT

This doc
→ Morley.doc

MEMORANDUM FOR:

FROM: J. Barry Harrelson
Senior Reviewer, HRP/OIM

SUBJECT: Material For Response to 11 Dec 98 Ltr From Morley

The following information may be helpful in drafting a response to subject letter from Washington Post reporter, Jefferson Morely.

2. Basic Facts:

- (S) a. On 5 December 1962, Walter D. NEWBY, George Joannides, was introduced to a DRE leader as the new responsible case officer for the AMSPELL project, replacing Harold R. NOEMAYR. Dispatch UFGA-6891, 10 Dec 62
- (S) b. In "the middle of April" 1964, NEWBY was replaced by Keith T. BONGRINO (P), as the case officer on project AMSPELL. Dispatch UFGA 16,168, 8 June 64
- (U) c. Thus, NEWBY'S responsibility for the DRE/AMSPELL project was for the approximate period - 5 December 1962 - mid-April 1964.
- (U) d. The DRE Monthly Operational Reports that can be found end with the one for November 1962 (the month preceding NEWBY assuming responsibility for the project) and commence again with one for May 1964 (the month after NEWBY left the project).
- (U) e. NEWBY'S fitness reports for the periods in question state that his tasks, among other things, were:
 - Case officer for student project involving political action, propaganda, intelligence collection and hemisphere-wide apparatus. 1 Jan 62 - 31 Dec 62 Fitness Report, dtd 19 Jan 63.
 - Case officer for student project involving political action, propaganda, intelligence collection and a hemisphere-wide apparatus. 1 Jan 63- 31 Jul 63 Fitness Report, dtd 31 Jul 63.
 - Serves as senior case officer for a student project which involves distribution of printed propaganda, production of radio programs, and the development of political action programs. 1 Apr 63 - 31 March 64 Fitness Report, dtd 15 May 64.
- (U) f. In all three Fitness Reports, he received a "Strong" for his efforts on the above described DRE/AMSPELL Project.

- (S) g. Via WAVE-1064, dtd 7 November 1962 – the month of the last Operational Report before the gap and just a few weeks before NEWBY took over as the case officer, JMWAVE had recommended for a number of reasons that the AMSPELL project be terminated.
- (S) h. The 10 December 1962 Dispatch UFGA-6891 (the last Operational Report before the gap commenced) is illustrative of the confusion surrounding the project both from the way the “Subject” of the dispatch is styled and the comments within the dispatch. For example:

The “subject box has two lines. On line one it states, “Operational /GYROSE/KUWOLF/ AMSPELL.” On the second line it states, “AMSPELL Status” which is a clear reference to the problems and uncertainties with the project which are then set out within the report.

The report first notes the station’s November recommendation to terminate AMSPELL but then advises while it would continue to fund salaries and operational expenses, no new AMSPELL activities would be undertaken pending HQ’s response to the proposal to terminate.

Further, within the body of the report was the statement that “AMSPELL membership was being instructed to go out and seek other employment as a part of a plan for a ‘transition’ in the event of a rupture in relations with KUBARK.” It is not clear if this instruction was being made by Station officers or by AMSPELL leadership.

4. **Morley’s Allegations:** Turning to subject letter, Morley is more than a little disingenuous when he claims HRP responded to the ARRB “with inaccurate information: to wit, that no ‘actual person’ was handling contacts with the DRE in 1963.” He alleges in the next paragraph, “(t)hese statements are now shown to be false and misleading....” HRP’s 20 January 1998 memorandum to the ARRB plainly does not say what Morley alleges. We know who the case officer was before and after NEWBY and that NEWBY was the case officer in 1963. The Harrelson memorandum simply says that because of policy differences between the Agency and the DRE during the period in question, the Agency reduced its level of funding and also replaced the officer designated to deal with the DRE. The memorandum does not say the Agency withdrew the officer or suggest the absence of a case officer responsible for the project.
5. With respect to Morley’s claim that a representative of “CIA’s public information office” told him “no ‘actual person’ was handling contacts with the DRE in 1963,...” HRP’s record of that proposed conversation reflects a different story. The HRP record states that the Agency Public Affairs officer would recommend: a) that no briefing or written response to specific questions be given to Morely; and, b) that he be told additional information on the DRE would be made public through the ARRB and NARA as part of the review of JFK records..
6. Further, the Agency did not “fail to accurately disclose the activities of one of its case officers in 1963” to the ARRB as Morely claims. Indeed, Michelle Combs’ 3 March 1998 memorandum clearly demonstrates: a) she had access to Joannides’ personnel file; b) she was clearly aware he was NEWBY; and, c) she knew that he was the case officer for the DRE from December 1962 to April 1964. She knew these things because the Agency provided her full access to his personnel file and all other relevant materials. Her statement that “(t)he descriptions of his duties and in the personnel file are very general and contain no specific refrence to his relationship with the DRE,” is technically correct. The DRE is not mentioned by name within the file. However, the three quoted duties or tasks set-out above from the three Fitness Reports adequately demonstrate that the project for which he was a case officer was the DRE.
7. Where there ever DRE Operational Reports for the months December 1962 through April 1964. The answer to that question has not been found so far as HRP knows. All evidence and comment

received from the DO during our search on behalf of the ARRB suggests that the reports never existed. The coincidences of dates between NEWBY'S arrival and departure strongly suggest the confusion about the go/no-go status of the DRE with Agency sponsorship precipitated some decision to suspend the reports. Whether that decision was made by NEWBY or senior JMWAVE personnel is not known.

8. We have already answered the question about "Howard." Morely states "there is abundant evidence in CIA and DRE records that Joannides, using the pseudonym "Howard,"...etc. HRP's 20 January 1998 memorandum advised the Executive Director of the ARRB that we did not know who "Howard" was or if, in act, there was a person using the name "Howard." Further, according to the DO, the name was not found to be a pseudonym or the true name of an officer the DRE operation at the time the DRE documents were written.

J. Barry Harrelson
Senior Reviewer, JFK Project

DRAFT

DRAFT LETTER TO MORLEY

[CIA LETTERHEAD]

THIS
DUL~~2 Howard.doc~~
2 Howard.doc

Mr. Jefferson Morley
Staff Writer
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, NW.
Washington, D.C. 20071

Dear Mr. Morely:

This is in response to your letter of 3 December concerning the DRE, the DRE case officer and the identity of "Howard."

It appears that there is some confusion about what the Agency has said and not said about the above subjects. I hope the following facts will clarify matters for you.

First, the Agency has never said there was no case officer for the DRE during 1963. We know the identity of the case officer before NEWBY/Joannides; we know the case officer following Joannides; and, we know that Joannides was the DRE case officer for the period 5 December 1962 to mid April 1964. The 20 January 1998 memorandum to the ARRB simply says that differences between the Agency and the DRE caused the Agency to replace "the officer designated to deal with the DRE."

Second, the gap in DRE/AMSPELL operational reports for the months December 1962 through April 1963 (the so-called "missing reports") coincides almost exactly with NEWBY'S/Joannides' tenure as the DRE case officer. We do not know if the reports ever existed. We do know that the differences mentioned above caused JMWAVE to propose to Headquarters in November 1962 that the project be terminated. This was the month before NEWBY/Joannides assumed responsibility for the DRE and the last month an Operational Report was written before the gap. We like you can only speculate about why no reports exist -- whether NEWBY/Joannides decided on his own they were no longer necessary, whether he was told by a superior to stop them, or whether they were in fact written and cannot be found. We do not know.

Third, I turn to the identity/existence of "Howard." As you note, "To Howard" was used by the DRE as the apparent addressee on certain correspondence. We refer to our 20 January 1998 letter. "Howard" could not be found as a registered pseudonym or alias. We have no evidence to suggest "Howard" was an identity for Joannides. Lastly, so far as we can determine, "Howard" is not the true name of any officer associated with the DRE at the time the DRE documents were written.

The Agency has not made false or misleading statements to the ARRB about these matters. In fact, ARRB staff members thoroughly reviewed all of the materials on the DRE, NEWBY/Joannides, the "Howard" issue and, the question of the gap in the DRE operational reports.

Sincerely,

XXXXXXXXXX

INSPECTOR GENERAL

1998-1531

3 December 1998

Mr. L. Britt Snider
General Counsel
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, DC 20505

Dear Mr. Snider.

By way of introduction, my name is Jefferson Morley. I am a reporter for the Washington Post. Our mutual friend Scott Armstrong suggested that I write to you for clarification of certain issues related to CIA compliance with the JFK Assassination Records Act.

As you know, the mandate of the Act was for "immediate disclosure" of all documents related to the murder of President Kennedy. The purpose of the law was to re-establish the credibility of government institutions in the face of widespread public doubt and confusion about the events of November 1963. As you also know, the number three official at the agency, in compliance with the Act, submitted a sworn statement that the Agency has made available all assassination-related records for review by the JFK Assassination Records Review Board (ARRB).

The attached exchange of memoranda raises questions about the accuracy of the CIA's responses to the ARRB on a potentially important question.

At issue are the reporting and performance of George E. Joannides, a CIA case officer stationed in Miami in 1963 with responsibilities for a once-prominent Cuban exile group known as the Revolutionary Student Directorate or DRE. The DRE was an anti-Castro group whose members had a series of encounters with Lee Harvey Oswald 12 weeks before the Kennedy assassination. The DRE leaders were the very first people to issue public statements after the assassination about Oswald's pro-Castro activities and political convictions. A senior official of the Castro government alleged in 1995 that the DRE was involved in a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy.

The exchange of memoranda demonstrates that when the ARRB inquired last winter about the identity of the CIA contact for the DRE, the Historical Review office responded with inaccurate information: to wit, that no "actual person" was handling contacts with the DRE in 1963. When I posed the same question on behalf of the Washington Post to Tom Crispell of the CIA's public information office, I was also told that the CIA had no records as to the identity of the DRE's case officer.

These statements are now shown to be false and misleading, in effect, if not intent. As Ms. Combs' memo demonstrates, the DRE did have a case officer and that the fact was recorded in Mr. Joannides' Office of Personnel file. Both the DRE and Mr. Joannides were well known at JM/WAVE. The DRE, known by the cryptonym AM/SPELL, was receiving \$51,000 a month from the agency and Mr. Joannides was reporting to Ted Shackley among others.

The agency's inaccurate statement about Mr. Joannides logically raises questions about the agency's statement that it cannot locate any written reports generated by him. Obviously "knowledgeable officers" who did not know of Mr. Joannides' relationship with the DRE would not be well positioned to know of his reporting on that relationship. Former colleagues tell me that Mr. Joannides' professional duties on the AM/SPELL account would have included preparing contact reports on his meetings with DRE leaders and filing monthly reports to his superiors. Since Joannides had a reputation as a competent officer and since there is abundant

WFGA 6891
aka 16 Dec 62 -
"on 5 Dec Newby
replied 'NO EMBAY' as response case officer for 'project'."

From the 800 "Project 64"
aka 8 June 64
kind April 64
Newby replied = 1
by Keith T.
BONAIARRB (v)

Not what we said.

DID WE (CHRP) tell him this?

evidence in CIA and DRE records that Joannides, using the pseudonym "Howard," received written communications from and about the DRE, the most reasonable assumption (absent further explanation) is that he memorialized his activities in 1962-1964.

If the CIA can find no such records in its files, the question of the disposition of these records arises. If DRE-AM/SPELL files were destroyed according to procedure, there should be a record of it. If they were not destroyed according to procedure, their disposition needs to be accounted for under the spirit, if not the letter, of the JFK Records Act.

*We (HARP)
have no
knowledge
of this.*

My questions are as follows:

1) Why did the CIA make inaccurate statements last January to the ARRB and the Washington Post about the DRE's case officer? What are the names of the "knowledgeable officers" who informed J. Barry Harrelson that the man known to the DRE as "Howard" (i.e. George Joannides) was not an "actual person" but merely "a routing indicator?"

*- We (HARP)
did not*


2) What is the CIA's explanation for the complete absence of reporting on the DRE and Oswald from its extant files on the AM/SPELL operation? After the DRE made public statements about Lee Harvey Oswald on November 22, 1963, what were Mr. Joannides' reporting obligations, if any, under the procedures and practices of the Operations Directorate? Did Mr. Joannides, in the view of the Agency today, fulfill those obligations in all respects?

*We (HARP)
have no
explanation*

3) Will the CIA provide a background briefing to me and a colleague to clarify these and other questions arising from the documentation of the CIA's relationship with the DRE in 1962-64 and from Mr. Joannides' role in the Agency's response to the HSCA investigation in 1978-79?

The apparent failure of the CIA to accurately disclose the activities of one of its case officers in November 1963 to the JFK records review board is noteworthy. Public confidence in the CIA's sworn statements about its compliance with the JFK Records Act depends on verification of those statements. If the Historical Review Office was misinformed about Mr. Joannides and passed that inaccurate information to the public, it behooves the agency to correct the error quickly and clarify all questions arising from its original misstatements of fact.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.


Jefferson Morley
Staff Writer
Washington Post

o) 202/334-6863

f) 202/334-6138

Enclosure:

cc: Rick Atkinson
Scott Armstrong



Inspector General

(703) 874-2553

IG 1998-1532
11 December 1998

Mr. Jefferson Morley
Staff Writer
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20071

Dear Mr. Morley:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 3 December 1998, which posed several questions regarding the CIA's handling of information under the JFK Assassination Records Act.

Inasmuch as this Office does not have the information you are seeking, I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of your letter to the Office of Public Affairs as well as the Office of Information Management for response.

Please give my regards to Scott Armstrong when you see him.

Sincerely,

L. Britt Snider

Distribution:

Orig - Addressee
1 - OPA
1 - OIM
1 - IG Chrono

JAN. 11. 1999 5:22PM

CIA PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

NO. 4203 P. 1



PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

TO: NAME: Barry Harrelson
ORAM

TEL: _____

FAX: 613-3063

Phone: 703 482-7677
Fax: 703 482-6790

NUMBER OF PAGES: 7 (w/Cover Sheet)

REMARKS:

Here's the Morley stuff
& letter from our IG to him.

~~Administrative - Internal Use Only~~

28 January 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM: J. Barry Harrelson
Senior Reviewer, HRP/OIM

SUBJECT: Material For Response to 11 Dec 98 Ltr From Morley

The following background information addresses the questions and accusations made by Washington Post reporter, Jefferson Morley in his letter to of 11 December 1998 to Britt Snider. It has been coordinated with the DO JFK Team and DO/TRO (Gloria Boyd).

2. Basic Facts:

- a. On 5 December 1962, Walter D. NEWBY, George Joannides, was introduced to a DRE leader as the new responsible case officer for the AMSPELL project, replacing Harold R. NOEMAYR. Dispatch UFGA-6891, 10-Dec 62
- b. In "the middle of April" 1964, NEWBY was replaced by Keith T. BONGRINO (P), as the case officer on project AMSPELL. Dispatch UFGA 16,168, 8 June 64.
- c. Thus, NEWBY'S responsibility for the DRE/AMSPELL project was for the approximate period - 5 December 1962 - mid-April 1964.
- d. The DRE Monthly Operational Reports that can be found end with the one for November 1962 (the month preceding NEWBY assuming responsibility for the project) and commence again with one for May 1964 (the month after NEWBY left the project).
- e. NEWBY'S fitness reports for the periods in question state that his tasks, among other things, were:
 - Case officer for student project involving political action, propaganda, intelligence collection and hemisphere-wide apparatus. 1 Jan 62 - 31 Dec 62 Fitness Report, dtd 19 Jan 63.
 - Case officer for student project involving political action, propaganda, intelligence collection and a hemisphere-wide apparatus. 1 Jan 63- 31 Jul 63 Fitness Report, dtd 31 Jul 63.
 - Serves as senior case officer for a student project which involves distribution of printed propaganda, production of radio programs, and the development of political action programs. 1 Apr 63 - 31 March 64 Fitness Report, dtd 15 May 64.
- f. In all three Fitness Reports, he received a "Strong" for his efforts on the above described DRE/AMSPELL Project.

~~Administrative - Internal Use Only~~

~~Administrative Internal Use Only~~

g. Via WAVE-1064, dtd 7 November 1962 – the month of the last Operational Report before the gap and just a few weeks before NEWBY took over as the case officer, JMWAVE had recommended for a number of reasons that the AMSPELL project be terminated.

h. The 10 December 1962 Dispatch UFGA-6891 (the last Operational Report before the gap commenced) is illustrative of the confusion surrounding the project both from the way the "Subject" of the dispatch is styled and the comments within the dispatch. For example:

The "subject box has two lines. On line one it states, "Operational /GYROSE/KUWOLF/ AMSPELL." On the second line it states, "AMSPELL Status" which is a clear reference to the problems and uncertainties with the project which are then set out within the report.

The report first notes the station's November recommendation to terminate AMSPELL but then advises while it would continue to fund salaries and operational expenses, no new AMSPELL activities would be undertaken pending HQ's response to the proposal to terminate.

Further, within the body of the report was the statement that "AMSPELL membership was being instructed to go out and seek other employment as a part of a plan for a 'transition' in the event of a rupture in relations with KUBARK." It is not clear if this instruction was being made by Station officers or by AMSPELL leadership.

4. Morley's Allegations: Turning to subject letter, Morley is more than a little disingenuous when he claims HRP responded to the ARRB "with inaccurate information: to wit, that no 'actual person' was handling contacts with the DRE in 1963." He alleges in the next paragraph, "(t)hese statements are now shown to be false and misleading...." HRP's 20 January 1998 memorandum to the ARRB plainly does not say what Morley alleges. We know who the case officer was before and after NEWBY and that NEWBY was the case officer in 1963. The Harrelson memorandum simply says that because of policy differences between the Agency and the DRE during the period in question, the Agency reduced its level of funding and also replaced the officer designated to deal with the DRE. The memorandum does not say the Agency withdrew the officer or suggest the absence of a case officer responsible for the project.
5. With respect to Morley's claim that a representative of "CIA's public information office" told him "no 'actual person' was handling contacts with the DRE in 1963,..." HRP's record of that proposed conversation reflects a different story. The HRP record states that the Agency Public Affairs officer would recommend: a) that no briefing or written response to specific questions be given to Morley; and, b) that he be told additional information on the DRE would be made public through the ARRB and NARA as part of the review of JFK records..
6. Further, the Agency did not "fail to accurately disclose the activities of one of its case officers in 1963" to the ARRB as Morley claims. Indeed, Michelle Combs' 3 March 1998 memorandum clearly demonstrates: a) she had access to Joannides' personnel file; b) she was clearly aware he was NEWBY; and, c) she knew that he was the case officer for the DRE from December 1962 to April 1964. She knew these things because the Agency provided her full access to his personnel file and all other relevant materials. Her statement that "(t)he descriptions of his duties in the personnel file are very general and contain no specific reference to his relationship with the DRE," is technically correct. The DRE is not mentioned by name within the file. However, the three quoted duties or tasks set-out above from the three Fitness Reports adequately demonstrate that the project for which he was a case officer was the DRE.
7. Were there ever DRE Operational Reports for the months December 1962 through April 1964. The answer to that question has not been found so far as HRP knows. All evidence and comment received from the DO during our search on behalf of the ARRB suggests that the reports never

~~Administrative Internal Use Only~~

~~Administrative - Internal Use Only~~

existed. The coincidences of dates between NEWBY'S arrival and departure strongly suggest the confusion about the go/no-go status of the DRE with Agency sponsorship precipitated some decision to suspend the reports. Whether that decision was made by NEWBY or senior JMWAVE personnel is not known.

8. We have already answered the question about "Howard." Morley states "there is abundant evidence in CIA and DRE records that Joannides, using the pseudonym "Howard,"...etc. HRP's 20 January 1998 memorandum advised the Executive Director of the ARRB that we did not know who "Howard" was or if, in fact, there was a person using the name "Howard." Further, according to the DO, the name was not found to be a pseudonym or the true name of an officer the DRE operation at the time the DRE documents were written.

J. Barry Harrelson
Senior Reviewer, JFK Project

~~Administrative - Internal Use Only~~

Central Intelligence Agency



Washington, D.C. 20505

CIA SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
RELEASE IN FULL

2000

Feb 18, 1999

Mr. Jefferson Morley
Staff Writer
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20071

CIA SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
RELEASE ~~AS SANITIZED~~ IN FULL

2000

Dear Mr. Morley:

This responds to your letter of 3 December 1998 to Mr. Britt Snider concerning certain records released under the JFK Assassination Records Act and our representations to the JFK Assassination Records Review Board (ARRB). I believe that a careful review of the actual documents you cite (i.e., our 20 January 1998 letter to the ARRB and the 3 March 1998 internal ARRB memorandum) will answer your concerns. Accordingly, we have addressed your three principal questions below in this context.

First, you assert that in an exchange with the ARRB (presumably the 20 January 1998 letter), "... the Historical Review office responded with inaccurate information: to wit, that no 'actual person' was handling contacts with the DRE in 1963 ..." I believe it is abundantly clear that the 20 January 1998 letter says just the opposite. For example, paragraph 3 states that "... [the Agency]... replaced the officer designated to deal with the DRE. Then, about the same time, the monthly operational reports trailed off ..." Moreover, and far from contradicting our 20 January 1998 letter, the 3 March 1998 ARRB memorandum actually confirms the veracity of the earlier Agency statement.


Second, you assert that "The Agency's inaccurate statement about Mr. Joannides, logically raises questions about the agency's statement that it cannot locate any written reports generated by him." Here, neither the precondition for the statement, nor the statement itself, is accurate. Again, our 20 January letter provides the most logical explanation for the absence of any written reports on Mr. Joannides (i.e., AM/SPELL) and that is (a) the Agency reduced funding for the DRE during this period and (b) monthly reporting on the project "simply stopped" because of this reduced involvement.

And third, you raise the issue of the identity or existence of "Howard." As you note, "To Howard," was used as an apparent addressee on certain correspondence. However, as specifically addressed in the 20 January 1998 memorandum, the name "Howard" could not be found in our listings of registered pseudonyms or aliases and there is no other evidence to suggest that "Howard" was an identity for Joannides. Moreover, so far as we can determine, "Howard" is not the true name of any officer associated with the DRE at the time the DRE documents were written. In no way did the 20 January letter say categorically, as you suggest in your letter, that "... 'knowledgeable officers' ... informed J. Barry Harrelson that the man known to DRE as 'Howard' (i.e., George Joannides) was not an 'actual person' but merely 'a routing indicator.'" In sum, the one fact that remains today is that we have insufficient evidence as to who or what the word "Howard" represented and that is exactly what the 20 January letter says.

In sum, a careful review of the correspondence cited in your letter does not support an allegation that the Agency has made "false or misleading statements to the ARRB about these matters." In fact, the records on these issues establish quite clearly that the Agency was candid and truthful, that the ARRB staff members had access to and thoroughly reviewed all relevant information on the issues you raised, and that the ARRB was satisfied with their detailed review.

I trust that this information satisfies your concerns.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "James R. Oliver". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "James" being the most prominent part.

James R. Oliver
Chief, Historical Review Program

cc: Mr. Britt Snider

C/HRP/IRG/J. Oliver:blo/31287 (16 Feb 1999)
Irg/fo/general/lss/morely response.doc

Distribution:

Orig - Addressee

- 1 - Britt Snider (IG) 2X30 NHB
- 1 - Tom Crispell PAO) 7C25 OHB
- 1 - C/HRP
- 1 - D/OIM
- 1 - DD/OIM
- 1 - HRP B. Harrelson

UNCLASSIFIED

ADMINISTRATIVE_INTERNAL_USE_ONLY

From the Desk of James R. Oliver
Historical Review Program

31805

NOTE FOR: Thomas G. Crispell@DCI
FROM: James R. Oliver
OFFICE: OIM
DATE: 10/26/99 05:09:50 PM
SUBJECT: ALERT: Call from Morley, Washington Post

Tom, This is to confirm our telephone conversation of this afternoon.

We have been advised that Jefferson Morley, a staff writer for the Washington Post, phoned Michelle Combs (an industrial contractor for OIM's 25 Year Declassification program) this morning, to discuss a Memo for the Record that Ms. Combs had written when she was a staff officer with the JFK Assassination Records Review Board. Mr. Morley told Ms. Combs that he was writing an article for the Post (and possibly for The New Yorker) that involved George Joannides, who was a case officer with JM/WAVE assigned to work with a Cuban exile group, Revolutionary Student Directorate (DRE) in the 1961-64 time frame. Ms. Combs responded that she no longer worked for the Board and was currently employed in private industry. (We do not know if Mr. Morley knows that her contractor is working for the Agency's 25 year program). Mr. Morley offered to send her a draft of the article for her review. She said she would get back to him after Wednesday afternoon to respond to his proposal and she then reported the phone call to us. We have indicated to her that she should gracefully decline the offer to critique the article. She agreed to this.

You will recall that Mr. Morley wrote to Britt Snider last December asking several questions about Mr. Joannides and the DRE and asserting that CIA was less than responsive to the Board's requests for information. He cited two memoranda that had been released by the Board:

- a 20 January 1998 memo from Barry Harrelson to the Board explaining: (a) why there were no DRE monthly operational reports in the Agency's files and (b) the unexplained references to an addressee, "Howard," in agency cables; and
- a 3 March 1998 MFR from Ms Combs referencing information on Joannides. Mr. Morley alleged "inaccurate statements" by CIA to the ARRB and the Post and asked for a briefing on "the CIA's relationship with the DRE."

Our response, which was coordinated with O/Public Affairs, was provided to Mr. Morley on 18 February 1999 and addressed each of the major "inaccuracies" he alleged (basically, he had misread the documents). We did not offer a briefing.

As of this time we do not know what the theme of Mr. Morley's article(s) will be.

Jim O.

CC: Richard J. Warshaw@DA
Gregory L. Moulton@DA
J. Barry Harrelson@DA

Sent on 26 October 1999 at 05:09:50 PM

UNCLASSIFIED

① Why does he think he
got "false" information

② Review facts again —
- What are they; are we
wrong?

"murley"

CIA SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
RELEASE IN FULL
2000

TO: Tom Crispell, Mark Mansfield

FROM: Jefferson Morley (202) 334-6863

December 10, 1999

At the suggestion of John Pereira, I would like to have an on-the-record briefing on JFK assassination-related documents concerning the late George Joannides, an Agency employee from 1951 to 1979. Bob Blakey has also expressed an interest in such a briefing.

While I have no objection to taking portions of our conversation off the record, I would hope to at least get from this briefing three attributable statements in response to these questions.

- Fabian Escalante, a retired Cuban intelligence official, has said that members of the Revolutionary Student Directorate (DRE) were involved in a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy. At the time of Kennedy's death, this group received funding from the CIA. Does the CIA have any comment on Escalante's allegation? Will the CIA make public all records referenced in answering this

question?

- Will the Agency immediately account for and make public its records pertaining to George Joannides and his actions with regard to the DRE in 1963? Will it immediately account for and make public all records kept by Joannides during his work with the HSCA in 1978?
- Nora Slatkin, executive director of the CIA, affirmed in Sept. 1998 under oath that the Agency had made public all of its assassination-related records. Was Ms. Slatkin aware of the story of George Joannides at the time of her affidavit?

I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

~~ADMINISTRATIVE USE ONLY~~

From the Desk of J. Barry Harrelson

NOTE FOR: Thomas G. Crispell@DCI
FROM: J. Barry Harrelson
OFFICE: OIM/HRP
DATE: 12/15/99 05:59:18 PM
SUBJECT: Jeff Morley's request re Joannides

I talked with John Pereira; he did not suggest the Morley seek a briefing. Pereira will also give Mark Mansfield a call. My recommendation is that we not give Morley a briefing. I suspect that he will not be happy with our responses to his questions regardless of how presented. We are pulling the JFK files on Joannides for reference purposes, however, the question on Joannides and the HSCA will require some research. I will be out of the office on Thursday p.m. and Friday. If you have questions, please call Jim Oliver (31805).

CC: Gregory L. Moulton@DA
James R. Oliver@DA
William H. McNair@DO

Sent on 15 December 1999 at 05:59:18 PM

UNCLASSIFIED

~~ADMINISTRATIVE/CLASSIFIED USE ONLY~~

From the Desk of J. Barry Harrelson

NOTE FOR: James R. Oliver@DA
Eileen Wukitch@DA
FROM: J. Barry Harrelson
OFFICE: OIM/HRP
DATE: 12/16/99 11:21:29 AM
SUBJECT: Morley requests

A few points re Morley's questions - ok to share with Tom Crispell with caveat that I would like to do some follow-up research before we prepare an official written response:

1. Fabian Excalante - I assume we would not comment on Escalante's statement as a matter of policy. As for the DRE, the documents including DO files are available at NARA; most documents released in full [Frank or Horace can give you specific re type files and number of document - - remember JFK is full of duplicates documents, so number of hits will be greater than unique documents]. CIA funding is acknowledged; no records on a "conspiracy to kill Kennedy" were located.

2. George Joannides -

a. all documents pertaining to Joannides and the DRE that were located in the JFK sequestered collection and in our special searches were released; at the request of the ARRB four of Joannides' performance appraisals covering 1962-64 were also released.

b. Joannides served as an assistant to Scott Breckinridge, the Agency's Principal Coordinator for the HSCA investigation in 1978. A Memorandum on Joannides performance in that role was released at the request of the ARRB. I am not aware of any records "kept by Joannides". It is unlikely, given his position, that he would have kept a separate set of records. The ARRB staff had full access to the HSCA and Breckinridge material that we located; no additional "Joannides" documents were identified.

[Note: Michelle Combs, formerly with the ARRB now a Raytheon contractor with the 25 year program, is the expert on Joannides. Morley has contacted her in the past but may not be aware that we now works on Agency projects]

3. Nora Slatkin: Slatkin was not executive director in September 1998. I assume Morley is referring to the ExDir's declaration of September 1998. The ExDir would not have been personally aware of the Joannides records, however, he was correct in his statement that the HSCA sequestered collection and all other documents determined by the ARRB to be assassination-related records were released.

CC: Gregory L. Moulton@DA
Sent on 16 December 1999 at 11:21:29 AM

UNCLASSIFIED

CIA SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
RELEASE IN FULL
2000

20 January 1998

Memorandum For: T. Jeremy Gunn
Executive Director.
Assassination Records Review Board

From: J. Barry Harrelson
Senior Reviewer
JFK Project

Subject: CIA-IR-21, Monthly Operational Reports
For the DRE

1. Reference is made to your request for subject information as further refined in your 18 December 1997 letter to Chief, Historical Review Group. Specifically, you asked about missing DRE monthly operational reports and the identity of "Howard," the name to which the DRE appears to have sent correspondence.

2. The Agency has searched appropriate data bases and files for the "missing" reports. In addition, the responsible offices have researched the questions contained within your request. Based on these rather extensive efforts, we can advise you as follows.

3. Missing operational monthly reports. The searches conducted by the Agency failed to locate any of the reports that appear to be "missing" -- December 1962 through April 1964, in general, and those for August and November 1963 in particular. It should be noted that during the period in question, major policy differences between the Agency and DRE developed. This was particularly true of the latter years of association because the DRE would not take directions or instructions about a number of operational matters, insisting on engaging in activities the Agency did not sanction. These differences caused the Agency to reduce the level of funding for the DRE. It also replaced the officer designated to deal with the DRE. Then, about the same time, the monthly operational reports trailed off. It seems probable these events are linked and that reporting in the form of such monthly reports simply stopped. The DRE files we did find are also within the sequestered JFK collection and they have previously been made available to ARRB staff member Manuel Legaspi.

4. The identity of "Howard." With reference to your request for information on "Howard," we, like you, have no clear understanding about the use of this particular name on

JAN 11 1999 3:20 PM

res 618 3219

P.

DRE messages. The phrase, "To Howard" was used as the addressee of several DRE prepared memoranda. We first attempted to identify if, in fact, "Howard" was an actual person. The name was not found to be a pseudonym. It also was not found to be a registered alias. It also is not the true name of any case officer associated with the DRE operation at the time the DRE documents were written. Following review of those data bases, knowledgeable case officers were queried suggested that the use of "To Howard" might have been nothing more than a routing indicator to ensure that the documents got to the correct CIA office/officer or that the sender was someone known to the recipient.

5. If you have any further questions in this regard, please advise.



J. Barry Harrelson

MEMORANDUM

March 3, 1998

To: Jeremy Gunn
Executive Director

cc: Bob Skwirot
CIA Team Leader

From: Michelle Combs *Michelle Combs*
Special Assistant for Research and Review

Subject: CIA-IR-21 DRE Case Officer for December 1962 - April 1964

In response to ARRB's informal request for additional information and records, CIA-IR-21, CIA provided access to the Office of Personnel file for Mr. George E. Joannides. I have examined the personnel file for Mr. Joannides for the period 1961-64 and 1978-79. Mr. Joannides appears in documents in the CIA Sequestered Collection under his pseudonym Walter D. Newby.

During the period December 1962 to April 1964, Mr. Joannides was assigned as a covert action officer at JMWAVE, serving as deputy and then chief of the station's covert action branch. During this time period, Mr. Joannides was the case officer for the Cuban exile group Directorio Revolucionario Estudiantil (DRE). The descriptions of his duties and accomplishments in the personnel file are very general and contain no specific reference to his relationship with the DRE. There is no mention of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in the file and no information relevant to the assassination in the file. There is also no indication that Mr. Joannides may have used or been known by the name "Howard" during his contacts with the DRE, although personnel files typically would not reveal this information one way or another.

During the period mid-May 1978-January 1979, Mr. Joannides was assigned to work for Scott Breckinridge, the CIA's principal coordinator to the House Select Committee on Assassination (HSCA) as a focal person to keep track of the status of HSCA requests, particularly to the Directorate of Operations. In this role, Mr. Joannides developed and maintained a log and records of HSCA requests and CIA responses and handled the day-to-day follow up to HSCA requests.

Several performance evaluation reports from the 1962-64 time period and a memoranda from Scott Breckinridge on Mr. Joannides' duties during the 1978-1979 time frame were designated assassination records and are being processed for release.

e:\combs\cia-ir21.wpd
File 4.20.1 and 4.20.4

CIA HAS NO OBJECTION TO
DECLASSIFICATION FOR
RELEASE OF INFORMATION
IN THIS DOCUMENT



JAN. 11. 1999 3:22PM

CIA PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

NO. 4200 1.1.2

Inspector General

(703) 874-2553

CIA SPECIAL COLLECTIONS
RELEASE IN FULL
2000

IG 1998-1532
11 December 1998

Mr. Jefferson Morley
Staff Writer
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20071

Dear Mr. Morley:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 3 December 1998, which posed several questions regarding the CIA's handling of information under the JFK Assassination Records Act.

Inasmuch as this Office does not have the information you are seeking, I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of your letter to the Office of Public Affairs as well as the Office of Information Management for response.

Please give my regards to Scott Armstrong when you see him.

Sincerely,

L. Britt Snider

Distribution:

Orig - Addressee
1 - OPA
1 - OIM
1 - IG Chrono

INSPECTOR GENERAL

1998-1531

3 December 1998

Mr. L. Britt Snider
General Counsel
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, DC 20505

Dear Mr. Snider:

By way of introduction, my name is Jefferson Morley. I am a reporter for the Washington Post. Our mutual friend Scott Armstrong suggested that I write to you for clarification of certain issues related to CIA compliance with the JFK Assassination Records Act.

As you know, the mandate of the Act was for "immediate disclosure" of all documents related to the murder of President Kennedy. The purpose of the law was to re-establish the credibility of government institutions in the face of widespread public doubt and confusion about the events of November 1963. As you also know, the number three official at the agency, in compliance with the Act, submitted a sworn statement that the Agency has made available all assassination-related records for review by the JFK Assassination Records Review Board (ARRB).

The attached exchange of memoranda raises questions about the accuracy of the CIA's responses to the ARRB on a potentially important question.

At issue are the reporting and performance of George E. Joannides, a CIA case officer stationed in Miami in 1963 with responsibilities for a once-prominent Cuban exile group known as the Revolutionary Student Directorate or DRE. The DRE was an anti-Castro group whose members had a series of encounters with Lee Harvey Oswald 12 weeks before the Kennedy assassination. The DRE leaders were the very first people to issue public statements after the assassination about Oswald's pro-Castro activities and political convictions. A senior official of the Castro government alleged in 1995 that the DRE was involved in a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy.

The exchange of memoranda demonstrates that when the ARRB inquired last winter about the identity of the CIA contact for the DRE, the Historical Review office responded with inaccurate information: to wit, that no "actual person" was handling contacts with the DRE in 1963. When I posed the same question on behalf of the Washington Post to Tom Crispell of the CIA's public information office, I was also told that the CIA had no records as to the identity of the DRE's case officer.

These statements are now shown to be false and misleading, in effect, if not intent. As Ms. Combs' memo demonstrates, the DRE did have a case officer and that the fact was recorded in Mr. Joannides' Office of Personnel file. Both the DRE and Mr. Joannides were well known at JM/WAVE. The DRE, known by the cryptonym AM/SPELL, was receiving \$51,000 a month from the agency and Mr. Joannides was reporting to Ted Shackley among others.

The agency's inaccurate statement about Mr. Joannides logically raises questions about the agency's statement that it cannot locate any written reports generated by him. Obviously "knowledgeable officers" who did not know of Mr. Joannides' relationship with the DRE would not be well positioned to know of his reporting on that relationship. Former colleagues tell me that Mr. Joannides' professional duties on the AM/SPELL account would have included preparing contact reports on his meetings with DRE leaders and filing monthly reports to his superiors. Since Joannides had a reputation as a competent officer and since there is abundant

evidence in CIA and DRE records that Joannides, using the pseudonym "Howard," received written communications from and about the DRE, the most reasonable assumption (absent further explanation) is that he memorialized his activities in 1962-1964.

If the CIA can find no such records in its files, the question of the disposition of these records arises. If DRE-AM/SPELL files were destroyed according to procedure, there should be a record of it. If they were not destroyed according to procedure, their disposition needs to be accounted for under the spirit, if not the letter, of the JFK Records Act.

My questions are as follows:


1) Why did the CIA make inaccurate statements last January to the ARRB and the Washington Post about the DRE's case officer? What are the names of the "knowledgeable officers" who informed J. Barry Harrelson that the man known to the DRE as "Howard" (i.e. George Joannides) was not an "actual person" but merely "a routing indicator?"

2) What is the CIA's explanation for the complete absence of reporting on the DRE and Oswald from its extant files on the AM/SPELL operation? After the DRE made public statements about Lee Harvey Oswald on November 22, 1963, what were Mr. Joannides' reporting obligations, if any, under the procedures and practices of the Operations Directorate? Did Mr. Joannides, in the view of the Agency today, fulfill those obligations in all respects?

3) Will the CIA provide a background briefing to me and a colleague to clarify these and other questions arising from the documentation of the CIA's relationship with the DRE in 1962-64 and from Mr. Joannides' role in the Agency's response to the HSCA investigation in 1978-79?

The apparent failure of the CIA to accurately disclose the activities of one of its case officers in November 1963 to the JFK records review board is noteworthy. Public confidence in the CIA's sworn statements about its compliance with the JFK Records Act depends on verification of those statements. If the Historical Review Office was misinformed about Mr. Joannides and passed that inaccurate information to the public, it behooves the agency to correct the error quickly and clarify all questions arising from its original misstatements of fact.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.


Jefferson Morley
Staff Writer
Washington Post

o) 202/334-6863

f) 202/334-6138

Enclosure:

cc: Rick Atkinson
Scott Armstrong