
Agency Information

AGENCY : KISS/SCOW
RECORD NUMBER : 178-10004-10314

RECORD SERIES : SCOWCROFT MEMCONS, HANDWRITTEN

AGENCY FILE NUMBER : OCTOBER 1975

Document Information

ORIGINATOR : WH
FROM : SCOWCROFT, BRENT
TO : [Restricted]
TITLE : P/INTELLIGENCE MTG 13 OCT 75

Released under the John F. Kennedy
Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992
(44 USC 2107 Note). Case#:NW 88608
Date: 03-18-2025

DATE : 10/13/1975
PAGES : 8

SUBJECTS :
FORD, GERALD R.
KISSINGER, HENRY A.
COLBY, WILLIAM E.
CIA
CHURCH COMMITTEE
SCOWCROFT, BRENT
ASSASSINATIONS, FOREIGN LEADERS
BUCHEN, PHILIP

DOCUMENT TYPE : NOTES
CLASSIFICATION : Secret
RESTRICTIONS : 1B; 1C
CURRENT STATUS : Redact
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 08/12/1993

OPENING CRITERIA :

COMMENTS : Participants: Ford, Kissinger, Schlesinger, Levi, Lynn, Colby, Buchen, Marsh, Rumsfeld, Scowcroft, Raoul-Duval. Handwritten notes. For typed transcript see ID# 1781000410302.

Released under the John F.
Kennedy Assassination Records
Collection Act of 1992 (44 USC
2107 Note). Case#:NW 65360
Date: 06-01-2023

"Diff Files" for NARA 2025 Documents Release JFK Assassination Records

Generated using diff-pdf and OpenCV.
Thanks to the Mary Ferrell Foundation and
The Black Vault for their archiving work.

maryferrell.org
theblackvault.com
github.com/vslavik/diff-pdf
opencv.org

This file highlights **differences**
between the 2025 release, and previous releases.

Red: Newly revealed in 2025.
Blue: Present in earlier releases, but not in 2025.
Black: Unchanged between versions.

For Original Documents visit:
archives.gov/research/jfk/release-2025

Notes:

Black text on a blue background indicates content
that was previously redacted using black ink.

I did my best to be accurate in revealing what is new,
but please confirm with the original sources
where accuracy is essential.

Created by: x.com/hlywdufo

JFKdiffs.com

178-10004-10314

(Wty under way)

P/Intelligence Wty
CR, Scho, Lynn, Burke, 130 at 75
March, Rumsfeld)

NSA

S (Argued that Atty Gen should not oppose ~~the~~ surveillance)

P In case of tele. taps for a particular embassy you sign each one. For NSA, you would sign a genl one that it is w/in a law

L Yes, but I think it should be periodically renewed

S Question is whether Atty Gen should rule on surveillance. deleted at 5:00 PM takes an issue of Atty Gen ruling on overseas surveillance.

C The technology is advancing so fast that phone calls could be routed overseas for call bet. Wash + Rich.

L 2nd circuit has held that overhearing an Am. abroad is a violation.

R I would think Pres would want Atty Gen involved in periodic review so he would know what might come up in a paper.

S The article in a paper today results from Presidential deletions.

K What is in a paper today results from us dropping most quantitative parameters on a counter. The paper has just said we have broken a Egyptian code - it has been known. I think rather than just say a law is filed we should try to educate counts to a reality of a world + am natl security needs.

L Once a country, a count is moving, but in a wrong direction. We maybe need a statute that we have to be careful about our practices as we prepare a case.

P I think trying to get a statute would be a disaster.

~~SECRET~~

Photocopy
from
Gerald R. Ford Library

in today's environment. Maybe a statute in a year or so, but now will just have to use guidelines.

K Does Ed want to appear only U.S.A. op.

L I think we have to have some guidelines, perhaps as % of incidental US traffic overheard.

S I do. We can work out guidelines. I am worried about a Atty Gen. being the biggest intel officer for these purposes.

P Let's have State, Dep, CIA draw up guidelines and then submit it w/ Atty Gen.

B Church is ready on assets report. They will let me review a document for security & sensitivity, but not on a merits or case. We don't want to get you in position of rep. for a report. They won't let us edit it or approve it.

P I guess it's a matter on basis they would handle it as carefully as we have.

Sc. If they publish a report at all it is irresponsible.

K If these things get put out, senior officials will stop speaking frankly and foreign govt will wonder about this ability to work w/ us confidentially.

P I think this is a more highly sensitive area than any we have had.

C Any document which officially shows US involvement in assets is a F-P disaster.

P I have assumed they had a right to publish any of this.

L There is no legal way we can prevent it.

~~SECRET~~

Photocopy
from
Gerald R. Ford Library

P I don't know what the letters of transmittal was, but I said they had to handle these certain documents as we had - and we released none.

M Once they have a document, a speech & debate clause means that is no way we can prevent its release.

K The main element in these investigations is the turning over of documents. During the Gaulty, etc, there was testimony, but it did not involve all documents involved.

(Were discussion on this point)

P The vote was wanted on certain data

B We agreed that we would object to any report but that we would review ~~the~~ a document for most damaging quotations. It was apparent that we wouldn't get a vote in a vote not to publish a report.

M The vote has reported us to pass on a list of quotations. We agreed to do that except in context.

P I think we should review it and then say it is not in such interest to release it at all.

S We can send any letter we want following a review.

P I think we should review w/a tough eye and then say the document shouldn't be released, but if they determined, then some areas are more damaging than others.

K I think we have a proposed cert. issue which I think we have to face & establish some focus around this issue as a court has let it transpire then again.

SECRET

Photocopy
from
Gerald R. Ford Library

B All we are fighting is official information of material which is already widely known. This is not a good reason on which to go to court.

P I don't want to be any part of their publishing material like this. If they want to do that, it's their responsibility.

B That is position we have taken.

P We have to say every strongly we oppose a report, but that there are some more damaging than others.

M Let's get to the other issues.

C Church is issuing a lot of unsubstantiated premises covered up a matter to making them public - for sensationalism. They also want to go into sensitive current ops. One of them is Cuba, w/ a possible threat to Korea; Congo, w/ threat to Thailand, Laos, Indonesia, etc.

Pete wants to get into Portugal & Angola. We think have turned off Portugal. We ^{didn't} ~~turned~~ like + the blue on Angola. I think we do but he has 2 questions - was a decision making really seriously done. The other is ~~is~~ does Angola meet a participation of ~~interest~~ & with security.

P I think in a world interest they should stay away from current ops.

K If any Centre has right to participate in Pres' certification, we are in another legal situation.

C The same problem is that of trans. They have asked

SECRET

Photocopy
from
Gerald R. Ford Library

- for all records have relation of Pomran, Grief
ITT & If we acknowledge relationship, we will
kill the integrity & ability to place agents & get
copy. We would prefer avoiding to be outside dress
where there may be a question of propriety.
- K. We will have a monumental job getting any copy to
copy w/ us in the future.
- C. True, but if an allegation of impropriety, we can't say
we'll defend that.
- W. (There discussion of - Angolen issue)
H. Yes, you are right.
- K. There is one issue apparently pertaining to State-
promoting junior personnel to testify as to policy
manipulation. The danger is that juniors will
use this to get at their seniors who attended them as
for some & harass them for decisions
they made. To do otherwise would weaken F.S.
This to me is a question of absolute principle. It is
like the Court against people ^{who} depend themselves.
- A. Before we get into this one motion, I think we should
go thru a Boyart letter & remove those parts which
do contain names & policy. The Court has a
strong special charter & I think it is wrong to
decide ourselves. If it is going into litigation, I think
we should see if we cannot resolve & document.
- K. The basic point of dissent was to prove a conspiracy
in actions had a predilection for - flouting & thus dis-
cuss letter to - dish effects.
- S. Seems to me you are saying there is a principle
involved - that is, a right of junior officers to get

SECRET

Photocopy
from
Gerald R. Ford Library

- to a Secy w/o fear of being exposed.
- L. You have a strong public position now, but I think it will weaken when the letter becomes known, because 90% of a document is a recitation of fact.
- Lyons: The question is not one of impartiality - it is honesty - to let it happen - but what is a legal handle on it. There I think we are weak.
- S. State is deep. Take Britain, where a bureau in alliance w/ Congo can strangle a Secy.
- R. I am concerned about - integrity of C.F.S. It took us 15 yrs. to recover from the Century.
- P. If Boyatt was up there testifying what happened day by day, what would you say?
- K. I'd have no plot.
- L. ~~Let's~~ There is no doubt State & Def have prepared position, but I'm trying to preserve it for you & that means a long one can attack it.
- P. There are 2 issues: one is the sanctity of a closed channel & ~~second~~ other is testifying as to a fact. If you say a letter is acceptable. W/o having made a memo, I would say we strengthen our case if we cut out extraneous material in a memo.
- L. I think it is foolish to imagine this case into what you want it to be. When a document gets printed in a paper I think you will wonder whether this is a case on which to make an case.
- W. ~~It is~~ ~~the~~ ~~main~~ ~~one~~ ~~is~~ ~~possible~~ ~~that~~ ~~Boyatt~~

SECRET

Photocopy
from
Gerald R. Ford Library

might agree to release

P From larger point of view, what do you recommend

L Review of document to decide policy & sensitive matter & give a quote what is left, if there is some in a document. Then we are in a strong position to defend & issue

K What is your position about future of investigating agencies

L What tough. Don't know how you can hold it

R You have to depend that on political not legal ground.

P I think we have a defensible position if we send a secret agent & a junior officer up as a division of testimony.

M I agree w/ strong position ~~on~~ w/ respect to oversight controls. But this is a special case & circumstance

P I think we want a confrontation where we know & as/c public we can win. We ought to find a case which will give us both of those. How we handle this case ^{ought} to fall w/ in those parameters. Our witnesses I think are on a secret track & should stand. On a memo, I think we should take a look at.

K Zero FSO's have written letters, as have retired people like George Kennan, etc.

P Let's see if we can separate a fact from opinion

R Except from your intuitive & dissent principle.

Many dissents are ~~based~~ based on a ~~single~~ ^{single} assertion that a Secy doesn't know a fact, (over)

~~SECRET~~

Photocopy
from
Gerald R. Ford Library

David: How about expanding to a document by
providing a summary first?

L: Might be.

K: That I would do only in context of saying
these are all the contrary views expressed to
me.

P: Let's look at all these options & see where we
go.

K: If I am asked to do it, I'll do it, but I
think this is a profound issue of foreign
policy & a foreign threat. We are conceding
to a certain principle & arguing only on
fact.

P: But contrary is that if you get a bad case
& lose it you have done ^{no} ~~no~~ damage

K: That is true.

P: I think we can confront them & win if
we have the right case.

R: I think we better offer a protected cooperation
than a by and by one (other matters).

~~SECRET~~

Photocopy
from
Gerald R. Ford Library