

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

THROUGH : Deputy Director for Support

SUBJECT : Pros and Cons of the Robert Maheu Case

1. This memorandum is for your information only and is forwarded with the thought that it may prove useful to you in your consideration of the difficulties now facing us in the Robert Maheu Case.

2. I have spent considerable time in an effort to evaluate the various alternatives open to us in this case. To me, it is not really a question of whether to brief or not to brief but rather to examine the consequences arising from either action. In an effort to delineate all possible actions which could result from either position you may take on this case, I have prepared the attached list of "pros and cons". It is completely objective and I have scraped the bottom of the barrel to list all possible consequences. It is forwarded with the thought that you might find it useful.

*Howard J. Osborn*  
 Howard J. Osborn  
 Director of Security

Attachment  
 List of Pros and Cons  
 on Robert Maheu Case

Distribution:  
 Orig. - DCI  
 1 - DDS  
 1 - General Counsel

EYES ONLY  
 SECRET

GROUP 1  
 Excluded from automatic  
 downgrading and  
 declassification

RETURN TO CIA  
 Background Use Only  
 Do Not Reproduce

14-00000  
EYES ONLY  
SECRET

## PROS AND CONS OF THE ROBERT MAHEU CASE

1. Senator Long has been told by Morris Shenker, his personal attorney, that Robert Maheu was involved in certain assignments for this Agency. He is specifically aware of our interest in the Onassis-Niarchus Case, as well as our use of Giancana (not the mission). Senator Long allegedly agreed to withhold the subpoena of Maheu if the Agency simply confirms Maheu's statement that he has been utilized in the past on sensitive assignments for CIA. Senator Long reportedly does not desire to know any of the particulars and reportedly agrees not to get the Agency involved through other witnesses that may be called.

2. If the Agency accepts this proposal, the following possibilities exist:

a. If the Senator honors the agreement, the following Pros and Cons exist:

### PROS

The Agency will not become involved and no publicity will ensue. This undoubtedly would also have a number of advantages for Maheu personally, since he would not be involved.

### CONS

The Senator could withhold the use of this information at this time, but could utilize the information later if he desired to do so.

He could withhold use of the information at this time, but have his Committee Staff dig into the matter more deeply to develop the full story in the case for use at a later date.

He could advise other individuals on the Hill that he had withheld the subpoena of Maheu due to the Agency's involvement in the two cases.

EYES ONLY  
SECRET

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

XERO  
COPY

14-00000  
EYES ONLY  
SECRET

b. If the Senator does not honor the agreement, the following Pros and Cons exist:

PROS

The Agency would be in a position of having attempted to cooperate with the Senate Committee by informing them of our interest in the matter.

We would be more sure of having the fullest support of Maheu, Morgan and Shenker since we have attempted to solve the problem and our attempts have failed through no fault of our own.

CONS

Maheu will be subpoenaed and upon inquiry into the Onassis and Giancana affairs, will refer the Committee to the Agency. This will publicly surface our connection. (The Onassis case does not present too much of a problem since this association has been a matter of court record, the Agency was not involved in wire tapping, and senior officials of the Government were well aware of the operation.)

Even though Maheu refers the Committee to the Agency in this matter, the Giancana situation could be most embarrassing. First of all, even though Maheu would not be involved in the questioning, the Committee might call Giancana to testify. The attendant publicity would possibly identify Maheu as an Agency intermediary to other members of the Giancana family.

If Maheu's association with the Agency is publicly identified, this may cause [redacted] to volunteer information on the Djakarta incidents.

The Senator could also leak it to the Press.

EYES ONLY  
SECRET

SECRET

SECRET

SECRET

08/12

SECRET  
SECRET

018/12

c. If the Agency does not accept Senator Long's proposal, the following Pros and Cons exist:

PROS

CONS

We have made no admissions and have furnished no validation to the Committee concerning our association with Maheu.

We risk arousing the ire of Maheu, Morgan, and Shenker because of our lack of cooperation.

We have not admitted to the Committee our involvement in the Onassis or Giancana affairs. We are in a position to simply deny any involvement in wire tapping in the Maheu case, which after all, is the purpose of the hearings of the Long Committee.

Since the Senator has reportedly been informed of our involvement with Maheu and we have not acknowledged it, he may then feel free to dig into the matter completely since we have not furnished him with the information.

Giancana may be called to testify and we could not control Giancana.

[redacted] could come into the picture as a result of the television publicity involving Maheu.

Our involvement in the Giancana situation would become known to other members of the Giancana family.

XERO COPY

XERO COPY

SECRET

SECRET

XERO COPY