

SECRET

11/94

C/HRG

Subject: Agee Interview

Attached is a memo prepared by Charles Dollar recording his actions on the Agee interview. At that time, the DO concurred with John Carver in having NARA take deletions for the agency. Unfortunately, Dollar went beyond the agreement and made changes without notifying the Agency. Tilley has pulled the open copy off the shelf for the present.

The DO is reconsidering the earlier position and may propose that we take the past Agency position of neither confirming or denying comments by Agee. The "Dollar Redacted" copy at NARA would be replaced by a full text copy.

This raises several questions:

1. How to acknowledge review of the document without giving official status to the document? Our "no objection to release" stamp on a document is generally considered an "official release" by the Agency.
2. Is there a problem if we do not indicate that we have seen the document?
3. How do we treat documents of similar nature? Attached is an article by Wilcott which contains information on the [redacted] > To take any deletions would confirm what he is saying. (I am sure that the Lesar types have a copy of the article.)
4. There are numerous letters, interviews, testimony, etc., of private citizens (many former agency employees, but not all) in the HSCA referred material. Until now we have been taking deletions when requested by DO. Is there a problem with picking and choosing those we take deletions in and those we ignore?

One approach to the problem would be to review and redact as appropriate only official documents such as testimony and depositions. Letters, articles, interviews, etc., by private citizens would be release in full with no Agency comment or with a different stamp.

I have not discussed the above issues with the DO. Hal, Chuck and I have had several discussions and agree that the problem is broader than the Agee interview and that our current guidelines are not adequate.

Let me know when you have time to discuss.