

To The Editor

In the April 2 Outlook Section of your paper an article appeared headlined "The Oswald File: Tales of the Routing Slips - Six Weeks Before JFK's Murder, the CIA Didn't Tell Us That It Knew."

Some weeks prior <sup>a relative stranger</sup> I had been contacted by an editor of Outlook who informed me of <sup>yet another</sup> ~~the new~~ Presidential Committee set up to quell the new speculations generated by the Oliver Stone movie "JFK". He said a problem had arisen that only I could resolve. He would like to interview me bringing along an historian. Being an admirer of the Post and the Outlook section and believing that they adhered to integrity and veracity rather than pandering to sensationalism, I agreed, having checked the editor's credentials.

My husband and I had made an absolute decision never to submit to interviews by authors or journalists since the results inevitably were twisted, contested or downright untrue in an effort to cater to the persistent obsession of the American people with sensationalist presentations of tragedies and intelligence operations. I bitterly regret having breached this decision in my habit <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ reliability and good sense of your paper.

for my records I <sup>was shown</sup> ~~sent out~~ a summary of <sup>an</sup> ~~the~~ Oct 7 1963 cable from our Mexico City station reporting the visit of a man giving his name as Oswald to the Soviet <sup>Embassy</sup> and Cuban <sup>Embassy</sup> there seeking a visa. Headquarters replied with a summary of information based on State Dept reports regarding this

I was shown only a summary of an Oct 9 1963 cable from our Mexico City office to the State Dept. and a copy of the original cable. The summary is a very poor summary of the original cable. The original cable is a very long and detailed document. It contains a lot of information that is not included in the summary. I was also shown a copy of the original cable. It is a very long and detailed document. It contains a lot of information that is not included in the summary. I was also shown a copy of the original cable. It is a very long and detailed document. It contains a lot of information that is not included in the summary.

contact with Oswald in Moscow and his return to the U.S. The FBI information was included and it was stated that latest HQ information was a State report of May 1962. I did not help prepare this cable. I reviewed it in draft and coordinated its release. The Mexico station cable report ~~was~~ and the possible identification was disseminated October 10 to State, FBI, and Navy (Oswald was an ex. Marine) in Washington and Mexico Station was directed to pass it to their Mexico representatives, including INS.

I bitterly regret this decision. At the interview which was tape recorded by both men, the Outlook editor spoke hardly a word. The interview was done by Mr. Newman who is writing a book on "Oswald and the CIA". His approach can best be described as <sup>religiosity</sup> confrontational. I later told the editor that it appeared to me that he had set up this interview in order that Mr. Newman could ask his questions of me. The whole situation appeared to me to be making a mountains mountain out of a mole hill. My statements have been seriously contorted, taken out of context or, at best, misinterpreted. I asked for a copy of the material statements made by me which were to be used in the article prior to publication <sup>which I permitted and which appeared upon. That was my decision.</sup> for the record. I have never heard or read any information that there was any <sup>CIA</sup> relationship, direct or indirect, with Oswald. The Warren Commission, a body of distinguished, honorable, and knowledgeable men, reached this conclusion, as did the three other government commissions or committees <sup>set up in 1964 years.</sup> The CIA contributed whole heartedly in <sup>all</sup> these investigations.



I do not recall saying that the withholding of FBI information from CIA Mexico Station was deliberate, nor do I believe it.

My explanation would be that the two FBI reports of Oct 1963, mentioned in the Outlook article as initiated by me, went through extensive routing and would not have reached Oswald's dossier in Central Registry and been available to the desk officer who prepared and drafted the reply to the Mexican cable.

It had nothing to do with the preparation or drafting. I signed off on it as a matter of routine coordination and review.

The FBI reports in any case would not have added anything of significant value to the situation in Mexico City and the cable was a summary of pertinent facts. There was no particular reason to withhold

the FBI reports. The CIA explanation that the FBI reports were excluded states that the request focused only on the status of Oswald's citizenship and therefore draws only from State Dept information.

and I never saw the incoming cable from Mexico Station, so I was in no position to verify it. Frankly, I don't recall having been informed of this explanation in this form.

The quotation of my saying "this may or may not be true" was either taken out of context or distorted. I certainly would not have impugned the veracity of another CIA official.

Naturally, before the <sup>assassination</sup> and the FBI was the subject of great interest to both the CIA and the FBI. Even before the assassination, CIA would have explored every available asset abroad to establish his motives and activities. Some of this may have been operationally sensitive and therefore held closely

on a need-to-know basis. I have absolutely no personal knowledge of this. The fact, as publicly known now, that Oswald was a big headache to the Soviets who finally plead him as a metal worker in Mexico and were happy to return him to the States complete with Soviet wife, a most unusual occurrence as some Americans know to their sorrow, speaks for itself. In my opinion he was a complete psychopath if not in fact a psychopath.

The sub headline on the Outlook article "Six Weeks Before JFK's Murder, the CIA Didn't Tell All That It Knew" is sensationally misleading. The information in the cable from Mexico Station was disseminated to state, the FBI, DHS, and Navy (Oswald was an ex. Marine) and to their representatives in Mexico City.

The Soviets, Castro, the Mafia, and President Johnson have all been publicly suspected of having been behind the assassination. In the article it was stated that the ~~FFW~~ <sup>JFK</sup> John suggested that Kennedy was murdered because he was resisting escalation of the Vietnam War. Mr. Newman was an advisor to Oliver Stone. Are the military then to be considered the most suspect?

I apologize to all my former CIA colleagues and those suddenly concerned for my much regretted involvement in this most flagrantly ridiculous and incorrect article.