Date: 10/19/20

Agency Information

AGENCY: HSCA

RECORD NUMBER: 180-10110-10004

RECORD SERIES: SECURITY CLASSIFIED TESTIMONY

AGENCY FILE NUMBER: 014718

Document Information

ORIGINATOR: HSCA

FROM: [Restricted]

TO:

TITLE: [Restricted]

DATE: 07/17/1978

PAGES: 198

SUBJECTS:

ANTI-CASTRO ACTIVITIES

CIA, METHODOLOGY

MEXICO CITY
[Restricted]
[Restricted]
[Restricted]

WC

DOCUMENT TYPE: TRANSCRIPT

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

RESTRICTIONS: 3
CURRENT STATUS: Redact
DATE OF LAST REVIEW: 01/01/2003

OPENING CRITERIA:

COMMENTS: Two duplicates follow and are included in Box 2 in four folders.Box 1.

v9.1

REPORTERS BUILDING, MACHINETON, THE STREET, S.W. (

3

5

7

8

9 10

11

13

l s lá

17

13

19

21

23

24 25 SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS

Subcommittee on the Assassination of John F. Kennedy

Washington, D. C.

Monday, July 17, 1978

Deposition of

RAYMOND G. ROCCA

called for examination by counsel for the subcommittee, pursuant to notice, in the offices of the Select Committee on Assassinations, Room 3501, House Annex No. 2, Second and D Streets, S. W., Washington, D. C., beginning at 9:50 o'clock, a.m., when were present:

For the subcommittee:

Michael Goldsmith, Staff Counsel
Charles Berk, Staff Counsel,
Elizabeth Berning, Notary.

Ms. Berning. What is the witness' name?

Mr. Goldsmith. Raymond Rocca.

Ms. Berning. Mr. Rocca, would you stand please, and raise your right hand.

Do you swear that the testimony that you are about to give is true and correct?

Mr. Rocca. I do.

Ms. Berning. Thank you.

REPORTERS MUTIDING, WASHINGTON, 5.11. STREET, 7.E.H

12

14

15

iá

Ţ

2

17

19

21

23

25

Mr. Goldsmith. Would you state your name and address for the record, sir?

Mr. Rocca. Raymond G. Rocca. R-O-C-C-A.

The address is 400 Linden -- L-I-N-D-E-N -- Lane, Falls Church, Virginia. The zip is 22042.

Mr. Goldsmith. Are you here today voluntarily?

Mr. Rocca. I am, indeed.

Mr. Goldsmith. Are you here without the need to resort to a subpoena on the part of the committee?

Mr. Rocca. That is correct.

Mr. Goldsmith. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record)

Mr. Goldsmith. Mr. Rocca, do you understand that you have a right to have counsel present today?

Mr. Rocca. Yes, indeed.

Mr. Goldsmith. And do you waive that right?

Mr. Rocca. I waive that right.

Mr. Goldsmith. At least for now.

Mr. Rocca. Yep. I expect that I will be able to judge in terms of the caveats indicated here where to ask your indulgence and just set aside and proceed.

Mr. Goldsmith. Fine. No problem.

Have you received a copy of the committee rules and House Resolutions 222, 433, and 760?

Mr. Rocca. I have -- for retention.

CONFIDENTIAL

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

(202) 554-2345 77.11 2

3

5

ć

7

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

lá

17

18

; Ç

20

Mr. Goldsmith. Yes.

Have you had an opportunity to read Rule Number 4.

Mr. Rocca. I have, indeed. I mean, I've read it.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do vou understand it as well?

Mr. Rocca. I understand it to the extent that it's possible under these circumstances.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you have any questions about it now?

Mr. Rocca. I have no questions about it now.

Mr. Goldsmith. Under the committee rules, Mr. Rocca, a witness has a right to receive a copy of a deposition transcript. In other words, whenever a witness gives a deposition statement, he has a right to receive a copy of the transcript.

However, the Central Intelligence Agency has asked the committee to request of present and former Agency employees to waive their right actually to receive a copy of the transcript The Agency is concerned that the transcript has classified information in it and would not want the transcript to leave the committee's secure areas.

So, for that reason, I would like to ask you whether you are willing to waive your right to receive a copy of the transcript. By doing so, however, you would still have the full right to review the transcript for accuracy and to make any necessary corrections. So, all you are waiving is your right to receive a copy.

I do. Mr. Rocca.

CONFIDENTIAL

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

20024 REPORTERS BUTEDING, MASHINGTON, D.C. 5.11. STREET,

25

STREET, **7TH**

Let me say that membership in the Agency has long since comported the waiving of constitutional rights in various respects. This is simply another --

Mr. Goldsmith. I won't be asking you to waive any more rights, I hope.

I would like you to know that the Court Reporter will be asked to certify the transcript as a complete, accurate, and true record of all the testimony given.

Mr. Rocca. Will there be an opportunity to correct it? There are mis-speakings and that kind of thing, whatever that word means. It has just been coined in the last year or so, "I mis-spoke."

Mr. Goldsmith. You will be given an opportunity to review the transcript for accuracy. If, in your opinion, it is not accurate, there is a procedure for rectifying those types of problems.

Now, are you retired from the Central Intelligence Agency? I am. Mr. Rocca.

Mr. Goldsmith. Have you received a copy of Acting Director Carlucci's 23 March, 1978 letter which, for the record, corresponds with JFK exhibit number 94?

Mr. Rocca. 23 March, 1978 -- I have.

Mr. Goldsmith. That is the letter that specifically discusses the question of secrecy agreements and authorizes Agency employees to respond to relevant questions made by this

CONFIDENTIAL

ŝ D. C. REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, 10 1 12 13 : 4 15 lá 5.11. 17 18 15 20

2

3

24

committee.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Rocca. Yes.

It also contains caveats which protect the continued interest in sources and in methods, which I regard as adequate under the circumstances, and therefore I accept this, and I understand.

Mr. Goldsmith. You understand that letter?

Mr. Rocca. Yes. He wants me to tell you all you need to know in order to get your job done.

Mr. Goldsmith. Yes.

I believe the letter indicates that so long as questions relevant to the committee's mandate are addressed to the witness, the Agency is authorizing you to answer those questions.

I would like to have this marked and offered as an exhibit.

(The document referred to was marked Rocca Exhibit Number 1.)

Mr. Rocca. I judge that this is the standard type of thing.

Mr. Goldsmith. Yes.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Goldsmith. I will indicate for the record that this exhibit is one that we have used for every witness that the committee either knew worked for the Central

CONFIDENTIAL

Intelligence Agency or thought might have worked for the Central Intelligence Agency. We have, at times, given the letter to witnesses who had no connection with the Agency.

How many years were you employed with the CIA?

Mr. Rocca. From its inception in 1937 to the 31st of December, 1974.

Mr. Goldsmith. What position did you hold when you retired in 1974?

Mr. Rocca. I was Deputy Chief of the Counter Intelligence staff.

Mr. Goldsmith. What position did you hold in 1963, at the time of President Kennedy's assassination?

Mr. Rocca. I was Chief of the Research and Analysis Division of the CI staff, the Counter Intelligence staff.

Mr. Goldsmith. Is that known as CI/R&A?

Mr. Rocca. That is. Correct.

Mr. Goldsmith. What responsibility, if any, did you have with regard to the CIA's investigation of the assassination in 1963?

Mr. Rocca. My responsibilities, in my own words, were to serve as the working level point of contact and facilitation to the Warren Commission staff, the working level point of contact and facilitation.

That was initiated some time in January. There is a memorandum of record which represented the results of

CONFIDENTIAL

24

conversations at about that time, which informed me of this decision. In other words, it was not a thing that I sought.

Mr. Goldsmith. Before we go into your responsibilities in more detail, would you describe for the record what the Counter Intelligence Research and Analysis staff did in 1963? In other words, what was the purpose of that unit?

Mr. Rocca. The unit was designed to bring to bear analytical intelligence, analytical brainpower, which meant all source, all overt source comprehension: a study of cases that had ceased to occupy operational significance, that is, closed cases; to maintain the ongoing record of overall quality and quantity of counter intelligence being performed by the entire DDP operational component; to -- operational component -- the Deputy Director for Plans.

Mr. Goldsmith. That's just in caps -- DDP.

Mr. Rocca. DDP -- I have listed now three functions, broadly speaking. To keep the community informed on the organization's structure and operational potential, that is, the threat of all intelligence services throughout the world, that is, by supervising the writing of an encyclopedic publication, which was called the NIS Section 56 at that time. This was a specific responsibility of the component.

In other words, it was a research support for operational components. The final major function, and this is important, is training. We were responsible for the supervision and

Ĺ

performance of CI training.

So, we kept the CI indicators, the overall record of CI organization throughout the world -- that is, the adversary services -- we worked on cases when they had ceased to be of direct concern to the operational components, and tried to make relationships between cases.

We were concerned, obviously, on the training side in working with other parts of the intelligence community, as well as training inside, and so forth.

I think that those five broad topics -- I could narrow them down --

Mr. Goldsmith. No, that's fine.

Mr. Rocca. I think this is sufficient to get us started.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who was in charge of the CIA's investigation into the assassination of President Kennedy?

Mr. Rocca. As far as I know, there was no formal provision for investigation. The investigation was the FBI's notCCIAss responsibility.

Mr. Goldsmith. Within CIA, isn't it fair to say that initially Jack Whitten was given responsibility for conducting the investigation?

Mr. Rocca. I don't want to nit-pick your language, but that was not an investigative responsibility, as I understood it.

The GP Floor phase, which he headed up --

CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. Goldsmith. The GP Floor?

Mr. Rocca. Floor phase.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would you define for the record what GP Floor is?

Mr. Rocca. GP Floor was the code name assigned by the DDP, by Mr. Helms and Mr. Karamissines and the desks, to characterize cable traffic during the initial phase of the Agency's relationship with the various authorities and with its own organizations or components overseas. This is a code facilitation, a telegram or telegraphic consideration. And, during that phase, it was indeed Mr. Whitten's responsibility. I think he did an extremely good job.

Mr. Goldsmith. So, GP Floor was a code name which was assigned to cable traffic pertaining to the Kennedy assassination, is that correct?

Mr. Rocca. As far as I know, during the period of November through January, and then it was phased out.

Mr. Goldsmith. And Mr. Whitten initially had responsibility for --

Mr. Rocca. Coordinating traffic, for working with the DDP with respect to what was being done over the whole world, as far as I know. This was before I got into it.

Mr. Goldsmith. After Mr. Whitten no longer had responsibility in that area, who took over the responsibility for coordinating the Agency's investigation?

1	Mr. Rocca. As far as I know, there was no further					
2	cryptonym assigned to it.					
3	Mr. Goldsmith. Nevertheless, without a cryptonym being					
4	assigned to it					
5	Mr. Rocca. And therefore cables would go to the DDP,					
∦ 6	would go to Mr. Helms or Mr. Karamissines, the various desks.					
7	In other words, it became a decentralized responsibility.					
8	In other words, there wasn't, as far as I can make					
9	out, a formal placement of an investigative responsibility.					
10	Mr. Goldsmith. Informally, who					
11	Mr. Rocca. I became or the CI staff and I for the					
12	staff became then because by that time a commission had					
13	been formed had become the point of contact for the					
14	commission.					
15	Mr. Goldsmith. So, informally, the CI staff was					
16	responsible for coordinating the CIA's investigation?					
17	Mr. Rocca. This is where I wonder about the use of the					
18	term that is, whatever we had done, whatever we were to do					
19	or did to assist the Warren Commission focused in the staff.					
20	Mr. Goldsmith. In the CI staff.					
21	Mr. Rocca. In the CI staff.					
22	Mr. Goldsmith. At the time, who was in charge of the					
23	CI staff?					
24	Mr. Rocca. Mr. Angleton, and Mr. Hunt was his deputy.					
25	Mr. Goldsmith. Was that Mr. E. Howard Hunt?					

_

Mr. Rocca. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. For the record, who is Mr. Hunt?

Mr. Rocca. Mr. Hunt was Mr. James Hunt, a totally different person.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know why the responsibility for providing information to the Warren Commission was given to the CI staff as opposed to Mr. Whitten?

Mr. Rocca. I do not.

I would judge -- and I am guessing now, this is purely a guess -- I never discussed it with him -- that as Chief of the Mexican Desk, which was his former job, the whole parameter of the case had shifted from its initial phase of October and November, where traces came up involving his files and his handling of the initial leads that developed out of the Mexican resources, and that he no longer regarded it as really his primary responsibility.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was there any conflict between Mr. Angleton and Mr. Whitten regarding the manner in which the investigation was to be conducted?

Mr. Rocca. As far as I know, there was none, and I did not hear of any at the time -- or since.

Mr. Goldsmith. Is it true that initially Mr. Whitten was given responsibility for the investigation and that Mr. Angleton in some manner interceded in the investigation being conducted by Mr. Whitten?

Mr. Rocca. If so, I do not know this and cannot sustain that allegation, by any information direct or indirect. I have never heard it even as hearsay.

By the whole line of questioning, I judge that you have your own interests.

Really, Mr. Whitten sat here (indicating) in a small desk in WH for the Mexican area. He was in a position to develop through the assets of the Mexico station extremely interesting material, which at the time was not recognized, obviously, as pertaining to anything like what came out of it in October or late September, and that was entirely appropriate to the WH division and area, and functional division.

Mr. Goldsmith. WH stands for Western Hemisphere?

Mr. Rocca. Western Hemisphere -- not White House -underline that, please, because this is another of the canards.

As I say, it was entirely appropriate in the GP Floor phase that he would have that. But the minute you had a commission set up outside the line obviously had to be the Director, and from the Director to his Chief of Operations overseas, because the spread involved then all of the divisions. Here you had Mr. Whitten being asked to sign off on cables that had to do with Netherlands, with U.K., with Australia, and it would have seemed to me utterly administratively simply a hybrid monster.

So, in effect, the concentration of supervisory

authority on the assistance being given the Warren Commission once they got underway was something, as I understand it, negotiated between the Commission itself and Mr. Helms.

Mr. Angleton was present. I may have been present at the meeting which decided that R & A would be the point of reference. I cannot recall.

But there is a memorandum -- off the record -- there and you should have it.

Mr. Goldsmith. There is a memorandum for the record which indicates --

Mr. Rocca. In January, which indicates how that thing got off. And it dispells, I think, any idea that there was some kind of internal machination.

Mr. Goldsmith. Where would that memorandum for the record be found -- because we have reviewed many files and have not come across that particular memorandum?

Mr. Rocca. Well, it should be found in the file.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would it be in the Oswald file?

Mr. Rocca. It would be in the Oswald file, and it should be around January.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who is the author of that memorandum?

Mr. Rocca. The author of that memorandum must have been Mr. Helms himself, or Mr. Karamissines. It reflected conversations that tookplace with Mr. Rankin. It may be a Warren Commission memorandum.

CONFIDENTIAL

22

23

24

But that memorandum exists. And, as I say, the memorandum, to me, represented a logical evolution of what had gone on in the development of the case.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would you be able to locate that memorandum for the committee?

In other words, do you still have a relationship with the Agency which would permit you to obtain that memorandum?

Mr. Rocca. Well. if you could arrange it for me to go out there, I would.

Can we have a little bit of a diversion now and perhaps go off the record? I want to ask about a number of other people who helped, who would know this.

Mr. Goldsmith. Fine. Let's go off the record for a moment. But I don't want to go off the record a whole lot in this deposition.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Goldsmith. Let's go back on the record.

Mr. Rocca. I have no formal knowledge of it by direction or indirection, or hearsay.

Mr. Goldsmith. By "it" you are referring to --

Mr. Rocca. Of such a thing having happened.

Mr. Goldsmith. You have to understand, Mr. Rocca, that we went off the record. So, for the record, by "it," what are ou referring to?

Mr. Rocca. The shift of the responsibility for overall

CONFIDENTIAL coordination of what the Agency was doing, from WH, Mr. Whitten, 2 to the staff. This was an utterly logical and completely 3 what I would call inevitable in terms of cost effectiveness and 4 everything else. Mr. Goldsmith. Did the shift take place right at the time that the Warren Commission was established? 6 Mr. Rocca. I have in memory the date 12 January, and 7 this is something that just comes now right out of my head. 8 9 Mr. Goldsmith. Fine. 10 Mr. Rocca. So, it was pursuant to that. Mr. Goldsmith. Why was the responsibility for the 11 investigation -- I am using that now in an informal sense, 12 because I think you feel more comfortable with that -- why was 13 the responsibility given to CI staff as opposed to some other 14 15 staff within the DDP? 16 Mr. Rocca. Because that's our business. 17

the business of dealing with activity involving espionage, sabotage, subversion, terrorism, and the whole works. It is spelled out in 1-1, Chapter 5. You will find that absolutely stated formally.

Mr. Goldsmith. So, of all the units within the CIA in 1963, the CI staff, you are saying, was best suited to be responsible for this?

That's right, yes, because, in addition, the staff had the responsibility for the DDP, for maintaining the

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

relations, the liaison relations, with the office of security within the Agency itself, the office of security, and with the FBI and other agencies. This was by directive 1-1, Chapter 5. I underline the importance of 1-1, Chapter 5.

Mr. Goldsmith. That is the CI staff charter?

Mr. Rocca. Charter -- and this shift was precisely directly in line with the implications of that charter. This is my reading now in retrospect.

Mr. Goldsmith. What was the line of reporting within the CIA with regard to information that was relevant to the assassination? By line of reporting I mean once information was received, who did it go to?

Tram talking now about the time the CI staff was responsible for the investigation.

Mr. Rocca. There were -- this is where you are going off, because the CI staff never displaced Mr. Helms in his direct relations with the Commission. The CI staff never displaced the direct relations between the Soviet Division, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Bagley, with the Commission. The CI staff never displaced the direct relations between Mr. Whitten -- even after it had taken over. In other words, it was a decentralized approach.

Now the material that did come through of a substantive nature developed by these components, and particularly the Soviet division, were brought down in the normal flow of day

≱⁄-

to day work. They were reviewed by me or by the assistants

I had, and they were Mr. Tom Hall, Mr. Thomas Hall, Ph.D.,

University of Chicago, in Slavic Studies, and our Russian

expert: Mr. Paul Hartman, who was a general research and search

man for the whole of the community and its resources; and

Mr. Arthur Dooley -- D-O-O-L-E-Y -- a former member of the

FBI who had transferred to the Agency many years before.

Now these people actually were dealing with the actual working level in the various divisions, or the various divisional elements, particularly in SB, would be working with me.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let's see if we can clarify this for a moment.

Overall responsibility was in the hands of Mr. Helms.

Mr. Rocca. That's correct. Now you're talking -- and that never changed.

Mr. Goldsmith. That never changed from the very beginning?

Mr. Rocca. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Helms was in charge, and Mr. Karamissines, his deputy, when he was not there. For sensitive aspects, Mr. Angleton and these two were in charge, or the division people.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was Mr. Angleton heavily involved in the investigation, other than occasional sensitive matters that arose?

Mr. Rocca. I think not. I think this is a correct

appraisal of his role at that time. He attended the general meetings.

Let me give you an example of what I have in mind.

Though I was the working level point of contact with the committee, that is, I knew Mr. Slawson in particular, and worked, I believe, closely and profitably with him, and without reservation, there was another historian. In any event, I was not cleared for the Nosenko case. So, I did not attend any of the discussions that took place on that matter, and that, too, is a matter of formal record.

You should find that record to back that up -- if you have not found it.

In other words, if you are looking for a fixed point of investigation here, you have to keep in mind that again, you had access to sources and methods and compartmentation was observed, notwithstanding the fact that I was the working level point of contact.

Mr. Goldsmith. So, the Nosenko case would be an example of a situation where Mr. Angleton would have been involved.

Mr. Rocca. It was Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was Mr. Angleton involved as well?

Mr. Rocca. I don't think he was at the meeting that concerned it over at the Warren Commission, because I had the delicious experience of being asked to leave at a certain

•

stage. I know he wasn't there.

Mr. Goldsmith. What would be an example of a sensitive situation that would prompt Mr. Angleton to have been involved in the investigation?

Mr. Rocca. Oh, he would have known all of that. Whatever else, I have no similar story to tell about him. I have the one to tell about myself and the Nosenko case, which I was not cleared for.

Mr. Goldsmith. But earlier you said that other than sensitive matters, Mr. Angleton basically was not involved in the investigation. I am wondering if you can give an example of a sensitive matter.

Mr. Rocca. Well, I would imagine all of the matters involving the intercept of correspondence, of Oswald's correspondence -- which I saw in 1975.

Mr. Goldsmith. So, in 1963, when you were working on this case, you did not see the correspondence, the cable_traffic, from Mexico City to CIA headquarters reporting Oswald's contact?

Mr. Rocca. Very definitely that is not the case and that is not what I said.

I'm talking about the correspondence intercepted.

Mr. Goldsmith. Which intercept are you talking about?

I am talking about the intercepted mail Mr. Rocca.

correspondence.

IDENTIAL

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

3

Ć

10

11

12

13

14

15

lá

17

18

19

20

24

*2

3

Mr. Goldsmith. Okay.

You are talking about the HDLINGUAL program?

Mr. Rocca. I'm talking about that material. He would have handled that.

And indeed, when I read it in 1975, it was clear that Mr. Papich had come over on Saturday morning and had taken all of the material on that file. But that was the first time I knew that that part of -- in other words, there was very strict compartmentation utilized within the whole group in order to protect sources and methods at the time that we were attempting to help this body. That's the point that I'm trying to make.

Mr. Angleton's role would have been, I would have imagined, in that connection.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was Mr. Angleton's role peripheral or central to the investigation?

Mr. Rocca. How can you say with an asset like that that it could be peripheral? I don't know, because I was not privy to the materials. But I could guess that it must have been important for him to put that material of Papich's to use immediately.

Mr. Goldsmith. Well, how much material was generated

I have no way of really recalling. Mr. Rocca. substantial file and I see no reason why you shouldn't have it

ONFIDENTIAL

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

ن BUTLDING, PASHINGTON, REFORTERS 5.1 STREET,

11

12

13

14

15

lá

17

8

19

20

7.TH

¥ 53

3

Then you can answer the question yourself.

Mr. Goldsmith. I want to explain to you, Mr. Rocca, that the mere fact that --

Mr. Rocca. I don't mean to be impertinent.

Mr. Goldsmith. -- files and documents are made available to us doesn't necessarily mean that the files and documents are accurate. One of the reason for taking deposition statements is because files and statements are not always accurate. fact, one of the purposes of this committee is to verify the accuracy of the Agency's own files.

Mr. Rocca. I take your point on that. Let me say that in one respect, for that reason, the Oswald file, which was the file that R & A kept, that is, the material pertaining to the 201 file -- you can be sure is the file because it was computerized, and you can't change the computer order without leaving a record. Therefore you can be sure that everything that went into it is still in it.

Mr. Goldsmith. With regard to the HDLINGUAL file, you indicated before, I believe, that the file was a thick one. Is that true?

No, not thick. It must have contained Mr. Rocca. seven or eight letters or so. But the man who would know exactly is Mr. Birch O'Neill. He headed the project.

> Mr. Goldsmith. We've spoken to Mr. Birch O'Neill.

I mean, he must know this exactly, then. Mr. Rocca.

JDENTIAL

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

REPORTERS BUILDING, VASHINGTON, !! 12 13 4 -15 Ìá 5.11. 17 *18

23

20

25

20024 D. C. REPORTERS BUTLDING, VASHINGTON, S. H. 7TH STREET,

10

11

12

13

2

15

lá.

17

18

19

20

Ţ

3

He must know this exactly.

Mr. Goldsmith. Again, the fact that we have talked to other people does not mean that we do not want information from you, if you have that information.

Mr. Rocca. Of course not.

Mr. Goldsmith. To the best of your recollection, how many Oswald intercepts were there in the HDLINGUAL program?

Mr. Rocca. Oh, this would be -- if you have to -as I say, I read it in 1975 at the moment the Rockefeller Commission was coming in. I'm sure they looked at the whole thing -- Mr. Ford, or whatever is the name of the individual who was concerned. I went through it cursorily with Mrs. Matson. She is the person who handed me the file. There must have been five, or six, or seven. But this is pure guess. There may be twelve, there may be three -- I can't say.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was there more than one?

Mr. Rocca. Oh, there was more than one.

Mr. Goldsmith. Fine.

Getting back to the guestion of organization, I think I understand from your testimony --

Mr. Rocca. When I say more than one, it involves both ends, that is, materials going out from Mrs. Oswald and material coming in from him. I don't know what the proportion is or even if there were things coming in, or if it was confined solely to things going out. As I say, this is something

NFIDENTIAL

25

DocId:32263409 Page 23

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

REPORTERS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

12

13

15

Ìá

17

18

19

20

2

3

ć

not a part of my bag.

Mr. Goldsmith. Fine. I understand.

Getting back to the guestion of organization, I think you have indicated --

Mr. Rocca. So, you have very clearly in mind now that in two areas that were of significance, I was completely cut out.

> Mr. Goldsmith. Yes.

Mr. Rocca, I'm sorry to have to ask you this again, but you are going to have to listen to my questions, and please try not to interrupt me.

Finally, getting back to the guestion of organization, for purposes of clarification, now, I think you've indicated very clearly that in terms of overall responsibility, it was in the hands of Mr. Helms.

Is that correct?

That is correct. Mr. Rocca.

Mr. Goldsmith. Other than that, I think you have indicated that the investigation was decentralized to some extent in that different area divisions, primarily Western Hemisphere and Soviet Europe were sending information upstream to headquarters -- and there may have been other divisions as well sending information, but primarily it was Western Hemisphere and Soviet Russia -- is that correct?

> Mr. Rocca. Yes.

> > DENTIAL

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

5.4. STREET,

23 24

25

DocId:32263409

5.11.

10

11

12

lá

17

18

19

20

‡

Mr. Helms held weekly meetings at which these generalizations were spread and which division chiefs complied with.

Mr. Goldsmith. Now, all of the information that the division chiefs were sending upstream at one time or another, I believe, went through the CI/R&A staff, is that correct?

Mr. Rocca. I can't say that all of them did. Those that are marked plainly on the record as having been were -- if they are all, I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. Fine. I realize that you can't state that all were. But, as a matter of your best recollection now -

Mr. Rocca. Mr. Helms indicated that all material. bearing on anything that could be of assistance to the Warren Commission should be seen by CI staff and R & A and marked for us. He issued very, very strictly worded indications -- they were verbal insofar as I know -- that we were to leave no stone unturned.

Mr. Goldsmith. And were Mr. Helms' orders generally followed?

Mr. Rocca. As far as I know, they were followed to the letter, by all that I know of.

Mr. Goldsmith. So, if you were asking different divisions to send to CI/R & A information pertinent to the investigation, can we assume safely that most of that information did, in fact, go to CI/R&A?

CONFIDENTIAL

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

ن REPORTERS BUTEDING, WASHINGTON, STREET,

24

25

DocId:32263409 Page 25

ن ث MASHIRGTON, REPOSTERS BUILDING,

Mr. Rocca. Your question turns on most of it. is no way that I can judge whether most of it did or not. That which struck some division chief or his assistant would have come forward, and much did.

Mr. Goldsmith. Assuming that Mr. Helms' orders were followed?

Mr. Rocca. Yes, assuming that they were followed.

Mr. Goldsmith. Fine.

Could you indicate for the record how the overall responsibility for the investigation was divided between the FBI and the CIA?

I understand that both organizations have different charters and different purposes. What was your understanding of the CIA's responsibilities for the investigation, as opposed to the FBI's?

Mr. Rocca. Well, as you have already detected, I object, I think, in principle to the use of the word "investigation," to apply to the CIA.

Mr. Goldsmith. Well, how would you like me to phrase the question? I would be glad to do that.

Mr. Rocca. CIA made its entire worldwide resources available to the Commission to assist it in gathering all information within the powers of its operatives and its operations.

Mr. Goldsmith. Are you saying, then, that the CIA

CONFIDENTIAL

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

2

3

24 25