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U.S. House of Representatives
Subcommittee on the Assassination
Of John F. Kennedy of the
Select Committee on Assassinations,
Washington, D. C.

Deposition of

BARBARA MURPHY MANELL
called for examination by counsel for the subcommittee,
pursuant to notice, in the offices of the Select Committee on
Assassinations, Room 3370, House Office Building Annex II,
2nd and D Street, S.W., Washington, D. C., beginning at 9:00
a.m., before Albert Joseph LaFrance, a Notary Public in and
for the District of Columbia, when were present on behalf of
the respective parties:

MICHAEL GOLDSMITH, Counsel,
DAN HARDWAY, Committee Staff Member
Mr. Goldsmith. The first witness is Barbara Manell.

TESTIMONY OF BARBARA MANELL

Whereupon,

BARBARA MURPHY MANELL,

having first been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Mr. Goldsmith. State your name for the record.

Mrs. Manell. Barbara Murphy Manell, Mrs. Herbet Manell.

Mr. Goldsmith. Are you presently employed?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. You are not presently employed now?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. Were you formerly employed with the Central Intelligence Agency?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. For how many years did you work with the Agency?

Mrs. Manell. From 1952 until the summer of 1959 as an employee. From the summer of 1959 until 1965 as a contract employee at the Mexico City station.

Mr. Goldsmith. Since 1965 has with the

Mrs. Manell. No connection with the CIA. I have not worked since 1965.

Mr. Goldsmith. Mrs. Manell, I want to explain to you that under the Committee Rules the witness has the right to
receive a copy of his deposition statement. However, by virtue of the understanding that the Committee has reached with the Central Intelligence Agency, I would like to ask you to waive that right. Are you willing to waive that right?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. At the same time, I would like to explain to you even though you have waived the right to actually receive a copy of the deposition you may none the less come here and read the deposition statement at our offices. Do you understand that?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. I would like to show you a copy of a letter that was sent to the Committee Chairman, Mr. Stokes, by Mr. Carlucci, who was at the time the Acting Director of Central Intelligence. The letter for the record corresponds with JFK Exhibit Number 94. I would like to ask you to examine the letter. Have you done that?

Mrs. Manell. I have looked at this, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you understand the letter?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you understand by virtue of the letter you are released from your secrecy obligation insofar as answering questions that are relevant to this Committee's investigation?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, I understand that.
Mr. Goldsmith. For further background purposes, I want to explain to you the mandate of the Committee, in other words, the scope of the investigation. We are charged with investigating the death of President Kennedy and that encompasses who killed President Kennedy, was there a conspiracy, what was the effectiveness of the investigative agencies, specifically the FBI and the CIA, what relationship did the FBI and CIA have with the Warren Commission.

So the mandate, itself, is quite broad. Do you understand that?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, I understand that.

Mr. Goldsmith. Have you discussed the testimony that you are about to give today with anyone from the Central Intelligence Agency?

Mrs. Manell. With no one except my husband the day we were all together. Since then I have not discussed it with him.

Mr. Goldsmith. You are referring to the time you met with three Committee staff members and conducted a fairly in-depth interview?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, at the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Goldsmith. Other than at that time, you have not discussed the Committee's investigation or your testimony in any way?

Mrs. Manell. No, I have not discussed that with anyone.
Mr. Goldsmith. In 1963 where were you working for the CIA?

Mrs. Manell. In the Mexico City station.

Mr. Goldsmith. What were your responsibilities at that time?

Mrs. Manell. I was Assistant to the Head of the Soviet Section and I was not a full time employee. We had small children that were born there through the period that I was stationed there and I would say that I gave four to five hours a day in the Embassy.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who was the Head of the Soviet Section?

Mrs. Manell. Herbert Manell.

Mr. Goldsmith. He is your husband?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Specifically what responsibilities did you have in 1963 when you were working for him?

Mrs. Manell. Well, our job was, I would say, was counter-counter-espionage and FBI, meaning that we were responsible for trying to identify and mitigate any efforts on the part of the Soviets to work against American officials, American businessmen, Mexican personalities, and also to identify the Soviet intelligence persons at the Soviet Embassy, KGB and GRU and to mount operations against them.

We had many support functions in operation at the Embassy and part of my job was to assist.
Mr. Goldsmith. Before we go on, I may have left out one
other important question. For the record, are you testifying
here today voluntarily?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Under no compulsion whatsoever?

Mrs. Manell. None.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did your work in Mexico City involve
responsibility for various surveillance operations against
the Soviet Embassy and Consulate?

Mrs. Manell. I would say that I looked at the tape from
the telephone surveillance that we had.

Mr. Goldsmith. In addition to that, what other type
of surveillance operations were there, to your knowledge?

Mrs. Manell. I had nothing to do with them but I am
aware of them. Is that what you want to know, what they were?

Mr. Goldsmith. Yes.

Mrs. Manell. We had photographic surveillance. That
was unilateral. We had unilateral physical surveillance in
terms of two teams I believe we had at that time, which was
unilateral.

Mr. Goldsmith. By unilateral you mean that the opera-
tion was controlled by the station as opposed to a joint effort
by the Mexican Government?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. The telephone operations were joint
except that occasionally we would have unilateral setups.
Mr. Goldsmith. Your specific responsibility with regard to these surveillance operations was what?

Mrs. Manell. Was to review the tape of the telephone tap. I did not have to do with photographic surveillance or nothing to do with running the teams.

Mr. Goldsmith. By tape, what are you referring to?

Mrs. Manell. The transcripts of the tapes.

Mr. Goldsmith. The transcript and the tapes?

Mrs. Manell. No. I had nothing to do with the tapes. I only received the transcripts. I would review them for information that we would need for our work there.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who was the Chief of Station in Mexico City at that time?

Mrs. Manell. Winston MacCoy Scott.

Mr. Goldsmith. And the Deputy Chief?

Mrs. Manell. Warren Dean at one point. He was there and then Alan White. I think Tex Puckett was also a Deputy in between in the interim, as I recall. I could be wrong about who was there specifically at this time because we were there six years. As I say, I haven't refreshed my memory by looking at any files.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was Ann Goodpasture an employee at the Mexico City station at that time?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, she was.

Mr. Goldsmith. What responsibilities, if any, did she
she have with regard to the telephone tap operation?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know the mechanics of that, of
who logistically got the materials, just how it worked out.
But usually she was the one who delivered them to our section.

Mr. Goldsmith. You say she delivered them. You mean she came into the station and delivered the transcripts to you?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. How often did she do that?

Mrs. Manell. Every morning, I believe. I did not want to get into the whole business because I am not clear on it, just what the cutouts were and who met whom and all that.

Mr. Goldsmith. For the record again, I would like to tell you that all my questions will be asked only for personal knowledge. If you don't have personal knowledge, just say so.

Mrs. Manell. I mean I have vague ideas but I never asked anyone, is that so or is this so? So I will just say then if I don't actually know. I will say I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. Fine. As for Ms. Goodpasture, did she have other responsibilities in the Mexico City station?

Mrs. Manell. She had to do with the photographic surveillance. She supervised the development of the photographs which were done in the station. She had several things that she did for Mr. Scott of which I am not aware. She always had various cases. I never discussed them with her.
Mr. Goldsmith. To your knowledge, was Ann Goodpasture Winston Scott's right hand person?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, she was.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was there a good relationship? They were close. Mrs. Manell. Yes, they were close personal friends as well. Mr. Goldsmith.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was she closer to Winston Scott than other employees at the station?

Mrs. Manell. I think another fairly close friend of Scott was Dave Phillips. I would say he had a close personal relationship with him.

Mr. Goldsmith. Phillips and Goodpasture had the closest personal working relationships?

Mrs. Manell. Also I think Puckett at one time did and Estani Cona. I think they were, it may be exaggerated -- I am not sure, I know Estan Cona used to drive Mr. Scott to various things. I had the feeling that they were closer than some of the rest of us.

Mr. Goldsmith. So there was a handful of people who were significantly closer to Mr. Scott and it is fair to say that Ms. Goodpasture was among that group?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Continuing with Ms. Goodpasture, was she involved in supervising the tap operation?

Mrs. Manell. Logistically you mean? She had nothing
to do with supervising what we did. If you mean logistically
supervising it, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. How do you know that?

Mrs. Manell. Because she is the one who delivered the
transcript to us and I know that she had to do with obtaining
them.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know Tom Keenan?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. What was his responsibility?

Mrs. Manell. He worked with Annie and with -- I don't
know whether he actually worked with Estan Cona but they did
the same kind of things.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did Tom Keenan work in the tap operation?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was he in charge of that operation or
was Ann Goodpasture his supervisor?

Mrs. Manell. You see, I am not clear as to who replaced.
I associate Tom with Annie Simply because she was senior to
him and they were doing the same kind of work. I had the
feeling that she took him under her wing. He was new. He was
a new JOT, a Junior Officer Trainee type when he came to us.

Mr. Goldsmith. The Soviet operation was an extremely
sensitive operation, was it not, I mean the tap against the
Soviet Embassy?

Mrs. Manell. The telephone tap?
Mr. Goldsmith. Yes.

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. So it is unlikely that Keenan would have been given responsibility for supervising that operation as he was just a new officer?

Mrs. Manell. Well, he was being broken in to do a number of different things, as I recall, and I thought he worked with her. Now, I could be mistaken.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who actually made the policy decisions regarding the operation of the tap against the Soviet Embassy? Which phones would be covered?

Mrs. Manell. Those were already made before we arrived. I am sure it was Mr. Scott who made those decisions. Our predecessors might have suggested which sections of the Embassy would be the best ones to tap. For example, the commercial office was one of the taps we had. The Consular Office. There were several others.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was Ms. Goodpasture also involved in a supervisory role with regard to the photo-surveillance operation?

Mrs. Manell. Whenever I wanted to see anything that had to do with that I always sent to her and asked her about it. She -- that was not something -- they were kept in the file room in Registry but it was not something that one went into and dipped your hands into it. We checked with her
first.

Mr. Goldsmith. She was the person who controlled access to those photographs?

Mrs. Manell. As far as I was concerned, she was. I did not go in there and look for things. If I wanted to see something or I needed an opportunity to try to identify something, I would go to her and ask her about it.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know if she was designated formally as supervisor of the surveillance operation, photography operating against the Soviets?

Mrs. Manell. I am trying to think if she wasn't, who was. As far as I know, I would say she was, yes. But I am still not clear as to what Puckett did at that point. Was he here during this period or am I confused? Was he there earlier?

Mr. Goldsmith. Who?

Mrs. Manell. Puckett.

Mr. Goldsmith. Will you spell the last name?

Mrs. Manell. P-U-C-K-E-T-T. I don't know whether Annie -- whether they overlapped or what. I served there from 1959 to 1965. As I told you, I haven't looked at the files now. I may have misplaced him in the history of this thing.

Mr. Goldsmith. I would like to stress again that the time period we are talking about now is 1953.

Mrs. Manell. You see, I am just trying to think. I am
all that clear.

Mr. Goldsmith. Either Goodpasture or Puckett was in charge of the photo-surveillance operation.

Mrs. Manell. I would say it was Goodpasture because I can't think of anyone else who would have more responsibility than she.

Mr. Goldsmith. To refresh your memory now I am going to show you a CIA document. For the purpose of the record, I would like to state that this is CIA Document Number 170. The procedure that has been adopted for identifying CIA documents has been to refer to them by the number which has been assigned to each document by the CIA and to refer to the document by any particular exhibit number. For the future I will be referring to CIA document numbers and I will not be referring to any particular JFK exhibit number. The CIA numbers correspond with the numbers of any CIA documents that have been used at the Committee's hearings.

Referring your attention to CIA number 170, the middle of the page, it says: "Unilateral Photo, Soviets." Why don't you read that section for the relevant years. According to this document it seems that --

Mrs. Manell. You mean these people fall in this category?

Mr. Goldsmith. Yes, labeled "Unilateral Photo, Soviet."

Mrs. Manell. We had nothing to do with it.
Mr. Goldsmith. You didn't think William Bogg had anything to do with it?

Mrs. Manell. No, because he became my husband's assistant. I don't see why he would have any special -- any more than I did, just go in and ask to look at some things. But that is not right.

Mr. Goldsmith. What about Thomas Keenan?

Mrs. Manell. That is what I mean. He fits in there but I never knew how that was broken down. I would not object to that. He was here much before us.

Mr. Goldsmith. You are referring to Harry Mahoney?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. According to this, it indicates that Ann Goodpasture was charged or involved in this project from May 1957 to August 1964. It would indicate she was the alternat CO and internal routing. During that time period roughly corresponding we have Louis Pickett and Thomas Keenan.

Mrs. Manell. That is why you see, I am confused about which of these, you see.

Mr. Goldsmith. You are not sure if it was Goodpasture or Puckett that was the supervisor?

Mrs. Manell. I would have to see how else they categorized Puckett and then I could maybe tell which was his primary function. That is why I am not clear on that. I know they all had to do with that. I wouldn't say that he was
especially because he did the work, some of the type work of
my husband.

Mr. Goldsmith. You are referring to Mr. Mahoney?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. Perhaps in Mr. Mahoney's time he
perhaps had more to do with it, but we had nothing to do with
it except to ask to look at various and sundry --

Mr. Goldsmith. And Goodpasture was actually involved
in the photo-surveillance operation, to your knowledge?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. Could I say something without it
being written down?

Mr. Goldsmith. Off the record.

(Off the record discussion)

Mr. Goldsmith. On the record.

We just had a 30 second off the record discussion
during which the witness asked me whether I had any table
listing Agency employees in Mexico City and what their respon-
sibilities were during the period involved. I indicated to
Mrs. Manell that CIA number 170 is the closest thing that we
have to a table.

Let us go into a bit more detail on the telephone tap
operation.

First, with the unilateral operation. What telephones
were the subject of taps?

Mrs. Manell. I couldn't remember that specifically at
this time.
Mr. Goldsmith. Not the specific telephones tapped --

Mrs. Manell. Perhaps some Soviet that we had targeted, you mean that we thought might be vulnerable, we might try to set up a tap on him? I couldn't tell you any of the numbers, who the people were.

Mr. Goldsmith. I don't want the specific numbers. But there was a unilateral operation and liaison operation, is that right?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did they cover the same phones?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know in what way they were different?

Mrs. Manell. The bilateral covered the Embassy, Consulate and the Commercial Office. It was all located in one building. I think there were four or five. I am not sure of that either.

The unilateral -- I am not clear on this but as I recall, we would occasionally work out these unilateral telephones ☞ taps on Soviets who became of interest to the station. In other words, those that we had targeted as possibly being vulnerable or we were trying to identify whether they were KGB or GRU.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would the office telephones be tapped or home phone?
Mrs. Manell. They could be sitting in the office where we had the tap or it could be that they didn't. I don't remember.

Mr. Goldsmith. Staying with the unilateral operation what was the scope of the operation? By that I mean with regard to each phone that was being tapped, was the tap constantly in effect or in effect just during working hours?

Mrs. Manell. I don't remember.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you recall whether it was an automatic kind of tap? Whenever the phone call came in it would trigger the tap?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, it would go something like that, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. How thorough was the unilateral operation?

Mrs. Manell. I couldn't say. I think we would put it on sporadically. We would put it on for a certain period of time and I can't tell you how long, maybe three or four months. If something came of it we might continue it. Otherwise we would cut it out.

Mr. Goldsmith. And change to another target?

Mrs. Manell. Possibly, or just not have anything for awhile.

Mr. Goldsmith. Turning now to the liaison operation, I believe you indicated before that the subjects of both taps
were the Soviet Embassy and Consulate offices?

Mrs. Manell. And Commercial Offices?

Mr. Goldsmith. Approximately how many phones were being tapped?

Mrs. Manell. I think there were about four or five. I could be wrong. I am sure there was one in the Commercial office. I am sure there was one in the Consular office. I am not sure whether there were one or two in the Embassy. So, let us cut that back then to four at the most.

Mr. Goldsmith. To your knowledge, this operation was supervised by Ann Goodpasture?

Mrs. Manell. It is just that I am not clear about Ann Goodpasture and Estan Kona. I just don’t know, did she have that responsibility, because that is what I am not clear about.

Mr. Goldsmith. I have been informed that Estan Cona left in 1962.

Mrs. Manell. Well, I would say yes, that Ann Goodpasture had that responsibility.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did she make the decisions regarding which phones would be tapped?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mrs. Goldsmith. Who would make that decision?

Mrs. Manell. Win Scott would make that decision. I would assume he would check with the Soviet Section. However, as I explained to you, these were all set up before our
arrival.

Mr. Goldsmith. I presume that this tap operated in the
same manner as the unilateral one in that a phone call would
come in and the tap would automatically be triggered?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Goldsmith. How did the product of the tap get to
the station? What was the procedure, in other words?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know the procedure.

Mr. Goldsmith. Are you saying then that all you know
is that you got the transcript?

Mrs. Manell. That is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. You don't know --

Mrs. Manell. I have vague ideas but I never asked any-
one about it. So I would rather not be specific since I
can't be.

Mr. Goldsmith. No problem, fine. Do you know approxi-
mately how much time it took from the moment that a call was
intercepted until you received the transcript?

Mrs. Manell. I never looked at it from that standpoint.
I just took the tape each day as I got it and handled it. It
never occurred to me to look and see what date is this. I
would say within two to three days, perhaps earlier than that.
If Goodpasture says it was earlier than that, then she would
know.

Mr. Goldsmith. I don't want you to think that I am
looking for any particular answer one way or another.

Mrs. Manell. All I did was when it came in I knew it was the latest and I knew I had to take care of it and I did.

Mr. Goldsmith. As a matter of routine it would be two or three days?

Mrs. Manell. I would say so but if someone else who handled it said it was one day, I am not disputing that. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. How many years were you involved in reviewing the transcript?

Mrs. Manell. From the time of my arrival in the summer of 1959 until we left and I think it was the summer of 1965. I know it was 1965. I believe it was the summer.

Mr. Goldsmith. During those years you reviewed the transcripts from these various tap operations?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. You would have a fairly good idea then on the average amount of time that would pass from the moment of a call coming in until you received a transcript? It seems to me after working on that for that many years you should be familiar with it.

Mrs. Manell. I was more interested in the tape than I was in the logistics of it all. As I say, I never looked at the date and said "Oh my goodness, today we missed, there are two or three days passed, it should have been
yesterday." I never looked at it from that standpoint. I was only concerned with what was of interest to the Soviet Section in the tape and that is all I looked at. I was not conscious of looking at dates.

Mr. Goldsmith. As a general rule though, you felt that you were reviewing recent materials?

Mrs. Manell. Exactly, as they came in I received them, in other words.

Mr. Goldsmith. To the best of your memory, it would have been two or three days?

Mrs. Manell. I would think so. It could have been shorter than that.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know if you would receive Spanish transcriptions faster than you would receive English transcriptions?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, we did.

Mr. Goldsmith. Why was that?

Mrs. Manell. Because the Russian part of the tape would have to be transcribed after the Spanish translations were done by our Russian translator.

Mr. Goldsmith. To clarify, if a call came into one of the tapped phones and the conversation was in Spanish, all that would happen with that conversation is that it would be immediately transcribed in Spanish?

Mrs. Manell. That is right.
Mr. Goldsmith. You were familiar with Spanish?

Mrs. Manell. Right.

Mr. Goldsmith. So that conversation did not need to be translated from Spanish into English?

Mrs. Manell. That is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. Therefore that could go to you right away?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. As opposed to a call coming in in Russian, that would have to go to the Russian translator who would translate it from Russian into English?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. It would take somewhat more time for him to get the transcript to you?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. As I understand it, the Spanish transcriber would mark in some fashion that part of the tape that had the Russian section on it. When the Russian translator got that he would just have to move to those various sections. That would help him considerably. So that there might be then a day elapse there or a half day elapse.

Mr. Goldsmith. Were most of the conversations that you read Spanish or English; in other words, percentage-wise how many of the transcripts had to go to the Russian translator?

Mrs. Manell. I am trying to recall, I am trying to think of the batches of papers that came in and as I would see
something --

Mr. Goldsmith. In other words, do you recall whether you spent most of your time reading Spanish transcripts or English ones? If you read English ones that meant either that the person was speaking in English or it had been transcribed from another foreign language.

Mrs. Manell. I would say that I would look quickly through the Spanish. My Spanish is good enough for me to quickly look through it. If it was just legitimate business between the Embassy and someone on the outside in Spanish I would scan it. When I got to something transcribed into English from Russian I would take more pains with it because I wanted to establish relationships and I would want to check files and that sort of thing, to whom they were speaking.

Mr. Goldsmith. I am not sure that responds to the question. The question is were most of the transcripts that you read Spanish or were they English that had been translated from Russian or was it evenly distributed?

Mrs. Manell. If I had them the same day I would have seen piles, you see, and then I would know this one was thick, this was was thin. But I did not get them both at the same time. I took more pains, as I say, with that translated into English. I would say that I spent more time with that translated into English.

Mr. Goldsmith. When you received a transcript did you
receive the original?

    Mrs. Manell. I don't know. I received, I think they were yellow copies.

    Mr. Goldsmith. Carbon copies?

    Mrs. Manell. I did not receive the original. The original I guess would have been put in a regular file with only the originals in it. I would have gotten carbon copies. yellow carbon copies as I recall.

    Mr. Goldsmith. Were the English translations literal translations?

    Mrs. Manell. Yes.

    Mr. Goldsmith. They were not summaries, other words?

    Mrs. Manell. No, they were literal translations.

    Mr. Goldsmith. What about the Spanish transcripts you saw?

    Mrs. Manell. I think some of those might have been summaries, as I recall.

    Mr. Goldsmith. Did the transcript contain marginal notations? In other words, comments by the person transcribing or translating?

    Mrs. Manell. I think we discussed this when I saw you the first time. At that time, I said no. But I do remember that the Soviet Section asked the Russian translator to indicate, when he could, the tone of voice, the attitude of the person toward the other person, that sort of thing. As I
recall in parentheses there was a commend made by the translator. But he would never summarize, he would be literal in the transcription but he would have parenthetical expressions.

Mr. Goldsmith. Like "he sounds angry"?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, that is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who was the Russian translator?

Mrs. Manell. Boris.

Mr. Goldsmith. Tarasoff.

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was he generally competent and reliable?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. My husband put him in for promotions as I recall, because he was much better than the usual transcribers. He was very, very accurate and I think he had a real feel for it.

Mr. Goldsmith. After you reviewed the transcripts what did you do with them?

Mrs. Manell. I would route them to Mr. Scott and to any others who would have need of knowing about them. I would have them sent to Registry and I would indicate where they were to be filed in Registry.

Mr. Goldsmith. By Registry you are referring to the place where the transcripts were generally stored?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, to our whole storage area, the area for all the files of the station were kept there. We were not to have our own little files. We would keep some little
things but everything was to be put in the general files.
We were not to have any of our own little squirrel files.

Mr. Goldsmith. Is it fair to say that Mr. Scott was
meticulous about the files at the Mexico City station?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. In fact it is said of him that he would
not throw out a single piece of paper?

Mrs. Manell. That is certainly true. Many times I
would not indicate, for example, on some of these transcrip-
tions we might have to card names. If I did not indicate
that a certain name should be carded because I thought it was
unimportant, for example, Rostropovich's name, the fact he
gave a concert in Mexico City, if I did not do that, Mr.
Scott would mark it and he would send it back to me so I
could see that he had marked it for carding and for retention
and that I should have done that. Because he kept every scrap
of information it was very, very useful when we did any CE
studies as you can imagine, because it is easy to have lots
of material and then discard what you don't need rather than
to have summaries of various and sundry things made by other
people.

Mr. Goldsmith. By CE summary what are you referring to?

Just tell us what the term stands for.

Mrs. Manell. If we were doing a study on one of the
Soviets I would rather have a batch of material that I could
then discard.

Mr. Goldsmith. I understand. I am just trying to clarify for the record what does the term CE study mean?

Mrs. Manell. Counterespionage study.

Mr. Goldsmith. What happened to the Mexico City files after Mr. Scott died?

Mrs. Manell. I have no idea.

Mr. Goldsmith. Were the files intact when you left?

Mrs. Manell. When was that?

Mrs. Manell. I think it was in August, in the summer of 1965.

Mr. Goldsmith. Getting back to the transcript now what would happen if you came across a conversation that you regarded as being particularly interesting or significant? Was there any special procedure you would follow?

Mrs. Manell. My husband usually, the Head of the Soviet Section, usually reviewed the transcript as well. He probably would have seen what I saw but if I thought he hadn't I would bring it to his attention and I would take any action that was appropriate, whether it was just filing or whether it was bringing some information to a reports officer, for example, or showing it to another section within the station, something of interest to him.

Mr. Goldsmith. What is a reports officer?

Mrs. Manell. Someone who writes up the office intelli-
gence of the station.

Mr. Goldsmith. Where do his reports go? To head-
quartes?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. Some might be disseminated locally.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know if there was any special
procedure in effect for getting a tape to the translator,
Mr. Tarasoff, for example, if the person monitoring the tap
operation considered that conversation to be, considered a
particular conversation to be very significant? Was there
any special procedure for him to get the tape or the trans-
cript to Mr. Tarasoff immediately for translation?

Mrs. Manell. I presume there was, yes, but I don't
know. Sometimes we would tell him to be on the lookout for
something. There was contact between Tarasoff and my husband
and he might say, watch out for so and so.

Mr. Goldsmith. There would be similar contacts then
between your husband and the person who was actually monitor-
ing the tap?

Mrs. Manell. The Russian translator, yes, but not any
of the Spanish transcribers.

Mr. Goldsmith. Your husband would not ask any of the
Spanish transcribers?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. Because he did not trust them?

Mrs. Manell. No. We had no connection with them. They
were the bilateral group and we wouldn't -- I mean they would be the Mexicans and they would be cut out between them and, I presume, and Goodpasture. We did not have any direct contact with those people. The only people we were in touch with were Boris and his wife.

Mr. Goldsmith. If there was any special procedure then for asking the Spanish transcribers to expedite something it would be an arrangement worked out between the Spanish transcribers and Goodpasture or whoever the Spanish transcribers' contact was?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. There was no need to expose anyone at the station to those people except through the designated person.

Mr. Goldsmith. Turning now to the photo-surveillance operation, do you know what buildings were the subject of that operation?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. The Soviet Embassy.

Mr. Goldsmith. And the Conulate building also? Was there a difference between the Embassy and the Consulate?

Mrs. Manell. I have seen photographs but I am not clear now whether that was separate or whether it was a section of the building. I am not sure now whether it was just one huge building on Tacaubía. I am not sure whether that was one building or whether it was a building with a separate consulate. I know that the Commercial office was located there, the
Consulate and the residence.

Mr. Goldsmith. Basically there was a Soviet compound?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Which consisted of their various offices?

Mrs. Manell. That is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. It was essentially the compound that was under photosurveillance?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know how many cameras or photosites there were surveying the Soviet compound?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know the number.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was there a similar photosurveillance operation in effect against the Cuban Embassy and Consulate?

Mrs. Manell. I would presume so but I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did you review photographs from the surveillance operation?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did you ever have occasion to see any of them?

Mrs. Manell. If I ever saw them they were ones that had been selected and shown to me by Ann Goodpasture for some reason or other.

Mr. Goldsmith. As a matter of routine you would not be reviewing those materials?
Mrs. Manell. No. I don't believe any case officer at
the station could just go in and rifle through those files.
They were considered very sensitive.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was Ann Goodpasture's responsibility
to review those photographs for the purpose of evaluating
their technical quality or for the purpose of determining
whether a person of interest, of significance, had been
photographed?

Mrs. Manell. I would think it would be both. She was
a photographer then. She supervised the development of the
films that were done right in the station. I would say both.

Mr. Goldsmith. Her responsibility was not just a tech-
nical nature?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. For purposes of clarification, my
understanding is that you reviewed the transcript as a matter
of routine every day?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. But the photographs you did not review
as a matter of routine?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. By everyday, seven days a week or just
working days?

Mrs. Manell. Working days, give days a week.

Mr. Goldsmith. Monday through Friday?
Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was the photosurveillance operation against the Soviet compound in effect 24 hours a day?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know. I don't think they had capability of shooting at night.

Mr. Goldsmith. During all daylight hours?

Mrs. Manell. I am not specifically clear on this but I think they had some time off. I am not sure whether they were on on weekends. I don't know. I had better not say, I am not sure, I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. What about working days, was the operation in effect only during the hours that the Embassy and Consulate were open?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know. I really know next to nothing about the photographic surveillance. There is no point in my trying to dredge up vague ideas that I have because I was never told.

Mr. Goldsmith. You can see I am not pressing you.

Mrs. Manell. I will just confuse the issue, it is not clear in my mind so there is no point in my just rambling on and trying to dredge up something. I was never told.

Mr. Goldsmith. Right. For that reason, I am not pressing you. You tell me if you don't know and that will be fine. Do you know whether there was coordination between the photosurveillance operation and the wiretap operation?
Mrs. Manell. I don't quite follow the question.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let us say the person monitoring the
tap operation picks up a conversation that is very interesting.
Would he be able to contact the photosurveillance people and
say, hey, something is up.

Mrs. Manell. I would presume that is the purpose. I
would presume that one would have to, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would they do that directly or would the
they do it through an intermediary?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. How much coordination was there between
the Soviet operation and the Cuban operation at the Mexico
City station?

Mrs. Manell. I would think that if our interests coincide there would be, but in general we worked within our
own shops.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did your husband meet as a matter of
routine once a week or everyday with Dave Phillips?

Mrs. Manell. I don't think so but you will have to
ask him. As I recall, I think Mr. Scott held weekly meetings
which might be the answer to the question but I was never
present at those. The heads of sections, as I recall were
there.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would Ann Goodpasture typically be there,
too?
Mrs. Manell. I would think so, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Were reports frequently sent from Mexico City station to CIA headquarters?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. That is something that was done as a matter of routine?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. What form would the report take? Would they be sent be cable?

Mrs. Manell. They could be sent by cable or dispatched depending on the urgency.

Mr. Goldsmith. What is a dispatch?

Mrs. Manell. Dispatch is a letter form, the way the information is sent out. The cable form is the brief, the brief version of what the subject is and then it is usually followed by a dispatch.

Mr. Goldsmith. How is a dispatch actually communicated to headquarters? Is it teletyped?

Mrs. Manell. No. In a diplomatic pouch?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Before a report would be sent to headquarters what procedure would the person writing the report follow? To be more specific, you have hypothetically now a piece of information that you think is worthwhile communicating to headquarters. What steps, if any, would the
person writing the report take to make sure that the information he had was complete and there was nothing else to add?

Mrs. Manell. It depends on the type of report. If it concerned personalities or categorized subjects, one would check with the Registry files and dredge up all information available on the subject. In addition to the particular piece of information, one would dredge up all information about that subject and then it might or might not be handled by the reports officer.

If it was an original type of cable it would be handled by the section. If it was strictly an intelligence cable, while we might initiate it, still it would have to be handled by the reports officer because there was a certain way it had to be sent, certain designations and that sort of thing.

Mr. Goldsmith. Most reports would be sent by the reports officer?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, except that now and again she would be overburdened by reports and periodically we would have to be sort of retrained by her in order to put all these various designations on the cable. In general, it was done by the reports officer.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who was the reports officer?

Mrs. Manell. Rose Offenbacher.

Mr. Goldsmith. Before a report would be sent, would you, for example, check previous transcripts and the photo-
production materials to make sure that in the case of transcripts there wasn't additional relevant material and in case of production materials to make sure --

Mrs. Manell. That would be more of an operational type of cable. That would not be an intelligence cable. It would not involve the surveillance group.

Mr. Goldsmith. What is the difference between an operational cable and an intelligence cable?

Mrs. Manell. Well, the intelligence cable would be something that could be disseminated within the intelligence community and the operational cable would have to do with operations within our own agency, I mean within what we were working on. It would not be of any value to anyone outside.

Mr. Goldsmith. In which case would you go to check the transcripts and photos?

Mrs. Manell. In the case of the operational cable we would be more likely to check telephone and photos and ask someone to check the photos for us.

Mr. Goldsmith. What would be the purpose in having them check that?

Mrs. Manell. To clarify the situation.

Mr. Goldsmith. Just to make sure the information you were sending was complete?

Mrs. Manell. That is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. By an operational cable to you mean a
cable that pertains to an operation that Mexico City station has in effect?

Mrs. Manell. Or thinking of developing. In other words, it is not of interest to the general intelligence community.

Mr. Goldsmith. Were most of the cables that you sent to headquarters intelligence type cables or operational cables if you know?

Mrs. Manell. Operational cables because they would be information on various cases that we were working on, that our section would be working on. Dispatches would be sent. The intelligence cables would be much rarer where we would have a piece of information of general interest to the intelligence community.

Mr. Goldsmith. In most cases, since most of the cables were operational cases in most cases it was a matter of routine, you would check the transcripts, the photo-production materials and anything else you thought was relevant before sending the cable?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. I am trying to think. I really can't think of too many instances when I would be checking on the telephone taps and the photosurveillance. Really, what I am thinking of in terms of — say we are interested in a particular identified Soviet intelligence officer who perhaps is making a trip to the States, to the border. That would be an operational cable. We would want to make people aware of that.
We would want to mount something to have him watched if he
crossed the border, who he saw, what he did. That would not
be of interest to the intelligence community. I would not
be checking the photosurveillance or telephone taps particu-
larly about that.

Mr. Goldsmith. What would you be checking in that
element?

Mrs. Manell. Perhaps I would have checked there, yes.
Yes, I would have had to to know that he was doing that. We
could have heard about it through other means but I think that
I most probably would check that.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would you have done that personally or
would the reports officer have done that?

Mrs. Manell. She would not have been involved in the
operational cable. That was done within the section. The
reports officer had to do only with the intelligence cables,
not with the operational cables. They were handled within
the various sections in the station.

Mr. Goldsmith. In that case, the person who would
check up on the transcripts, for example, would be the
particular person who was in the section sending the cable?

Mrs. Manell. I would think so, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you recall doing that yourself on
occasion?
Mrs. Manell. Oh yes, that, but not checking, I did not just check photographs when I wanted to, I would go to Annie on photographs. The rest of it, the telephone materials, I would find already filed in the various files that they belonged in, in "P" files, subject files or whatever, or I could go to the runs, the chronological runs that were kept, of the bilateral telephone operation.

Mr. Goldsmith. By runs, what do you mean, the transcripts?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. I am sorry.

Mr. Goldsmith. What is a P file?

Mrs. Manell. A P file is a personal file.

Mr. Goldsmith. That is a local file kept at the station?

Mrs. Manell. That is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. Its counterpart at headquarters would be the 201 file?

Mrs. Manell. That is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do all CIA stations maintain P files or is that really a procedure that was instituted by Win Scott in Mexico City?

Mrs. Manell. They have their own terminology for it but everyone would have personal files, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Every station as a matter of routine would have ==
Mrs. Manell. The equivalent of a 201 file.

Mr. Goldsmith. They may not necessarily refer to it as a P file?

Mrs. Manell. No, I think they wouldn't. I have served in other stations and they did not call them P files there. We did in Mexico City.

Mr. Goldsmith. What criteria were there for deciding whether a report should be sent to headquarters? How did you decide in other words, that something was sufficiently significant to send a report?

Mrs. Manell. A lot of times we didn't decide because the reports officer had access to a lot of the material that we would have and she would have already made a decision about what was appropriate and what wasn't. It would be things that we developed that she would not be aware of that we would bring to her attention.

Mr. Goldsmith. Even so, I am sure there was a lot of information you had both of an intelligence nature and an operational nature. Did you send a cable for each particular item of information to headquarters?

Mrs. Manell. It would depend on whether it was a matter of urgency or not. I would say we sent him more dispatches than we sent cables.

Mr. Goldsmith. Cables suggests that the information is more important --
Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Than dispatch?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would a cable reflect the particular item being urgent?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. I can think of instances where it might not. I would think in general that is the method that one would use, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. In general if something was of routine significance it would ge sent to headquarters by means of dispatch?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. If it was non-routine, it would be sent by cable?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. Are you leading up to anything specific? I may not be on the same wave length that you are on.

Mr. Goldsmith. In response, I really can't tell you what I am leading up to if anything. However, I want to assure you that I will give you an opportunity to clarify any answer you have given to me.

Mrs. Manell. It is just that I thought you would have known about cables and dispatches. I am wondering, you know, why --

Mr. Goldsmith. I have to state first that by means of
this procedure I am not really authorized to answer questions asked by a witness but I will certainly give you an opportunity to clarify or expand on any answer you have given.

Secondly, to answer your question in part, although we have had an interview before, the purpose of the deposition is to put all of this on the record. In fact, many of the questions I have asked you I know what the answer is but the purpose is still to put it on the record.

Where would the cable go, once it reached headquarters?

Mrs. Manell. That would be up to headquarters to decide.

Mr. Goldsmith. You would send it to the central office in headquarters or central desk?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. The person at that desk would --

Mrs. Manell. We might decide at the station that it should go to other stations as well. We could make that decision locally.

Mr. Goldsmith. Is it fair to say that most of the information that you and your husband sent to headquarters would have gone to the Soviet Russia Counterintelligence Section?

Mrs. Manell. It would have gone first to the Western Hemisphere Division because we were under them. That was their bailiwick. We were under them geographically.

It is true that my husband was in the Soviet Section.
It was carried that way not for that reason, because it was of interest to the Soviet Section they would be automatically made aware of it, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would it also go to the Mexican desk?

Mrs. Manell. Within "WH"?

Mr. Goldsmith. To your knowledge, was information also transmitted to headquarters by means of telephone?

Mrs. Manell. I would guess it could be but I would think it would be rather rare.

Mr. Goldsmith. Why do you think it would be rare?

Mrs. Manell. For security reasons and also -- you know, for a matter of record generally things want to be put on record.

Mr. Goldsmith. If someone wanted to avoid putting something on the record, would he make a telephone call?

Mrs. Manell. I guess anybody could always pick up the phone.

Mr. Goldsmith. Have you ever heard of the term "Unaccountable Pouch"?

Mrs. Manell. I have heard the term, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know what that means?

Mrs. Manell. I guess unnumbered pouch. I don't specifically know.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know what it was used for?

Mrs. Manell. No, I don't.
Mr. Goldsmith. Did you ever use one yourself?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. Are you aware of any other manner in which a non-record communication could have been done?

Mrs. Manell. No. As I said before, anyone could pick up a telephone. I mean obviously there were rules, we would not just pick up a telephone and call headquarters about anything. We were not permitted to do that. We would not do that. What I mean was that, well, I mean if the Chief of Station, for example, wanted to call someone in headquarters, I am sure he could pick up the phone and call them.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know if he ever did that?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know Charlotte Bustof?

Mrs. Manell. No. The name is familiar to me and I understand she works in WH Division but I was never in WH Division so I don't know her.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did you know that in 1963 she worked on the Mexico Desk?

Mrs. Manell. I have heard that said, yes. I think the last time we were together, when I was interviewed the first time, her name was mentioned. But other than that, I don't know of her.

Mr. Goldsmith. What would be standard operating procedure at headquarters upon receiving a cable? How would they respond?
Mrs. Manell. I don't know how to answer that question.
I don't know what you mean.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would they typically respond to a cable?

Mrs. Manell. Oh, yes. I thought you meant within head-
quarters what was their movement.

Mr. Goldsmith. I may get to that later on.

A cable sent to headquarters.

Mrs. Manell. If it was something specific and we wanted
an answer, yes, they would answer, most probably by cable,
since we had sent it that way. Saying "Dispatch follows" is
how they would normally do it because there would be probably
more than they wanted to put in the dispatch.

Mr. Goldsmith. How long did it generally take to get a
response from headquarters?

Mrs. Manell. I think there is a rule, I don't know,
thinking back many years ago when I was first in that, a cable
had to be answered within a certain set amount of time. I
don't know what that is. In other words, it would require
a fast response, as fast as possible.

Mr. Goldsmith. I would like now to get into the
procedure at headquarters to the extent that you are aware of
it. Once the cable came in who would make the decision as to
where it would be routed?

Mrs. Manell. The person could tell by the designator
at the top who the responsible officer was for it. There
would be designators for area division and then for projects and so forth. By the tone of it one could tell who was responsible for that.

Mr. Goldsmith. The cable itself would have indications as to who should receive it?

Mrs. Manell. If there was enough put on the tope. I am getting into detail now and I am not answering your question. If it came from our section, if it came from Mexico City station it would go to the Mexico City desk and that would be WH Division.

Could we just wait for just one minute without putting this all down?

Mr. Goldsmith. Sure, go ahead.

(Off the record discussion)

Mr. Goldsmith. On the record.

Who would decide whether someone high up in the Agency should receive a particular cable? I imagine the person sending it in Mexico City station would be able to designate someone high up, DCI, for example, to see it.

Mrs. Manell. Yes, they probably could, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. What about at the receiving end? Who would decide that a cable is sufficiently important to go relatively high up? By high up I mean the DCI or the head of a particular division or the assistant to the head of a particular division. Who would make that decision?
Mrs. Manell. Well, the case officer certainly would not. You mean on the headquarters level who would decide on the headquarters level who higher up in headquarters should see it?

Mr. Goldsmith. Right.

Mrs. Manell. I would guess the head of the WH Division, the head of the division. I mean a case officer would work within his own section, his section head, and depending on what they decided together most probably -- I am not sure whether the head of the division sees every cable. I would suspect not.

Mr. Goldsmith. Basically it would be up to the person receiving the cable to bring it to the attention of the head of the division who would then make the decision to send it further up?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. There might be some interim discussion about it. The case officer would not go to the head of the division. He would go to the section chief and from there it would go up. It is just that GS-9s don't talk to 17s.

Mr. Goldsmith. Turning now specifically to the area of Lee Harvey Oswald, do you know whether the Tarasoffs or anyone else at the Mexico City station ever attempted to do a voice identification of Oswald's voice?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. In other words, listening to a tape of
the conversation and deciding whether or not the voice on the
tape was Oswald's?

Mrs. Manell. You mean because they had something to
compare it with?

Mr. Goldsmith. You might have something to compare
it with, you might not.

Mrs. Manell. I don't see how they could.

Mr. Goldsmith. For example, you might have one tape.
If you had Oswald's voice on TV you could obtain that tape
recording and you could --

Mrs. Manell. That is what I say, if you are comparing
it with something else.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know if any type of voice compari-
son was ever made?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. If it had been done would you have known?

Mrs. Manell. Maybe not. I was not there full time as
you recall. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. I would like to refer your attention now
to CIA document number 208 which is cable number 7025 and I
would like to ask you to read paragraph number 4.

Mrs. Manell. That is 4?

Mr. Goldsmith. It says W. J. Feinglass. I think it
refers to Boris. According to that it suggest that a voice
comparison was made.
Mrs. Manell. If he says so, it was.

Mr. Goldsmith. But you don't have personal knowledge of that?

Mrs. Manell. No. You could ask my husband about that. I am sure he knows.

Mr. Goldsmith. Before we move on, W. J. Feinglass would be a pseudonym for Boris?

Mrs. Manell. I presume it was.

Mr. Goldsmith. W. J. Feinglass would be a pseudonym?

Mrs. Manell. That is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. Pseudonyms are routinely used by the Agency?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. What would be the purpose of using the pseudonyms?

Mrs. Manell. To conceal their real identity in traffic.

Mr. Goldsmith. So if this cable were --

Mrs. Manell. -- were intercepted --

Mr. Goldsmith. -- no one would know who W. J. Feinglass refers to?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Does the Agency have a practice of having its employees, specifically case officers, use operational aliases?

Mrs. Manell. I wouldn't say so; no. It is done in
specific instances.

Mr. Goldsmith. If a case officer has a contact with an agent would he use his own name or would he use his pseudonym?

Mrs. Manell. He would never use a pseudonym. This was strictly for cable traffic. He would not use that at all. That was for cable and dispatch traffic only within the Agency.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would he use his own name then?

Mrs. Manell. He would use an operational alias in that case.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would an operational alias be listed anywhere at the Agency?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. It would be listed in the contact reports which would be made routinely and would be well documented.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know if the Agency has any central files indicating which operational aliases were being used by its officers?

Mrs. Manell. Well, they could check back to the station. I don't know. I would think that if they got the contract reports, at one point I know earlier we did not always send contact reports when I was at other places. But I think that for quite sometime in this period, contact reports were required to be forwarded on a monthly or tri-monthly basis.

Mr. Goldsmith. You don't know whether they maintained any kind of centralized file?
Mrs. Manell. It would be recorded, it would always be recorded in some fashion or form either in a contact report -- I don't know that there was a file as such maintained in the Embassy listing the aliases. But it could be carded most probably and then retrievable.

Mr. Goldsmith. Getting back to our friend Mr. Oswald, when was he first drawn to your attention?

Mrs. Manell. Through the bilateral transcriptions.

Mr. Goldsmith. So, you read a transcript involving Oswald?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you remember what that transcript said? We will give you a chance to look at the transcript in a moment. Do you remember offhand what the substance of it was?

Mrs. Manell. I know he was in touch with the Soviet Embassy by telephone and he was asking about a letter, a visa, as I recall.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was the Oswald contact with the Soviet Embassy considered to be unusual?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. Why not?

Mrs. Manell. Well, there were cases of other Americans who contacted the Embassy for various reasons. We were only obliged to report the contact of any American with the Soviet
Mr. Goldsmith. So in Oswald's case it was just a routine contact by an American as far as you were concerned?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. If that is the case, then why was the case sent concerning Oswald?

Mrs. Manell. That is why I asked you that earlier, because in the case of Americans we were required to send it by cable and not by dispatch.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was that a written regulation?

Mrs. Manell. I don’t know if it was written but it was understood at our station that any Americans who were in touch with the Soviet Embassy that that fact had to be known to headquarters by cable. It was always sent that way, whether we considered it very unimportant or routine or not. So there must have been a regulation but I am not aware of it.

Mr. Goldsmith. I guess then if we were to review the Mexico City station cable traffic to CIA headquarters we would find a lot of cables reporting contact by Americans?

Mrs. Manell. You would find others, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Each case the person identified himself or you had established identification?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. In Oswald's case, how did you know he was an American?
Mrs. Manell. I guess the person listening to the tape -- I don't recall whether it was in Spanish or Russian or what. I don't recall. As I recall, I saw it in English.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let us take a look at that transcript now. I would like to refer you to CIA document number 13. Please take a look at this.

Mrs. Manell. It was in Russian.

Mr. Goldsmith. You are looking at an English translation of a Russian conversation?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, that is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. What is the date of the transcript?

Mrs. Manell. 1 October 1963.

Mr. Goldsmith. That means that the conversation was had on 1 October 1963?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. It took place according to the transcript sometime after 9:55 in the morning, is that correct?

Mrs. Manell. That is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. In that transcript the person talking identifies himself as Lee Oswald, is that correct?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Based upon that transcript, is this the transcript that prompted the cable to be sent to CIA headquarters?

Mrs. Manell. I presume it was.
Mr. Goldsmith. We will give you a chance to look at all the transcripts.

Mrs. Manell. I am sure this must be it, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. What indications if any are there on this transcript that Oswald was an American?

Mrs. Manell. Well, he says he speaks in broken Russian. He could tell from that probably what nationality the person was and the name Lee Oswald sounds American. It is not a Mexican name certainly.

He says "and spoke in broken у́ссی́ан". If it were a Spanish person speaking broke Russian or English person speaking broken Russians the transcribers would know. The accents are different.

Mr. Goldsmith. The transcriber does not indicate whether it is an American speaking broke Russian or a Spanish person speaking broken Russian.

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. It indicates whoever was talking was --

Mrs. Manell. -- speaking in broken Russian, right.

Mr. Goldsmith. I notice that there is some writing on the bottom of the page.

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. What is that?

Mrs. Manell. It means that this came from the Russian Embassy. This I presume is the telephone. This is the date.
These are -- I am not sure whether that would be the lines where that occurred.

Mr. Goldsmith. On the tape?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. The last line would be the time?

Mrs. Manell. Is that it?

Mr. Goldsmith. 0921 to 1320. I notice there is no routing indication on this transcript. Is there any reason why that would be the case?

Mrs. Manell. I am wondering if this was the original one. I worked from the copy. It would have to be.

Mr. Goldsmith. In part it would seem this is the original because it has the handwriting on the bottom of the page.

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Whose handwriting is that? Can you tell?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know why there are no routing indications on the transcript?

Mrs. Manell. I have to say this must be the reason, that this was the original of the transcript and that this would be what would be in the files, the chronological files that were kept.

Mr. Goldsmith. The routing indications would normally
go on one of the copies?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. So, the original would not typically be marked up at all?

Mrs. Manell. That would be my guess from seeing this, yes. You see, it says page 1, copy number 1, so that must be what it is. You see, the kind that went through the station that were routed around would have various people's names and filed so and so at the bottom.

Mr. Goldsmith. What you are referring to here as the bottom, it says HSCA in caps. That refers to this Committee, House Select Committee on Assassinations, that was put on later. What action did you take after seeing this transcript?

Mrs. Manell. I think I was the third or beyond person who saw it. It was brought to my attention by the Chief, the Head of the Soviet Section, and by Ann Goodpasture who was discussing this and who was going to notify headquarters and do the memorandum. I think there was a bit of discussion about whose responsibility it was. As I recall, I was told to write it up.

Mr. Goldsmith. Why was there discussion about whose responsibility it was. I think we...

Mrs. Manell. I think because when it was an American it sort of fell between whether we should have to do it, whether it was our responsibility to send this up because it
had to be accompanied by a memo and it took time, or whether it was Ann's responsibility. It was just a little, not argument, but a discussion about, well, "you do it, I don't want to do it, you handle it", and I had to do it.

Mr. Goldsmith. This would have been accompanied by a memo?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. This type of thing, the cable would be written and at the same time the internal memo would be given to the Ambassador and whoever else should be notified about this. In this case the legal attache at the Embassy.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would a dispatch with more information follow?

Mrs. Manell. No, I don't think so. There was enough to make this -- that he was an American -- it was enough to make it a matter of record that he as an American was in touch with the Soviet Embassy and to give the gist of the conversation.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did Dave Phillips have anything to do with this cable, with this transcript at that time, in October 1963?

Mrs. Manell. I thought at that time that he had, that he was head of propaganda, covert action as they called it, propaganda type responsibility. I know later he became head of the Cuban Section but I am not sure just what timing there was there. I thought at this time he was head of the Covert
Action.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you remember ever discussing the cable with mine?

Mrs. Manell. I did not.

Mr. Goldsmith. What action did you take after seeing this transcript?

Mrs. Manell. I wrote the cables for headquarters and at the same time I attached the cable, I wrote the memo to be distributed to the Embassy and sent them both forward to Mr. Scott. That is the way we had to do it. You could not send the cable first and memo later. They had to go out attached. So he saw that there was a complete package.

Mr. Goldsmith. I recall from the interview that we had that you basically reviewed transcripts in a chronological order, is that right?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. So you reviewed the transcript from the 20th, the conversation that took place on the 20th before you reviewed transcripts of conversations that took place on the 21st?

Mrs. Manell. I would say so.

Mr. Goldsmith. Here we have a conversation that took place on 1 October 1963 but presumably by then you have seen transcripts from September 1963?

Mrs. Manell. I would think so. It would not have to
be but I would say so, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Based on the routine procedure you followed?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Now, prior to sending the cable did you check earlier transcripts to see if Oswald's name had come up earlier?

Mrs. Manell. I don't think we did that. I have a very good memory and I have a trained memory and I would remember if his name had come up previously and it had not. However, I did do a check of our files, a thorough check of the files. I also inquired of the Chief of Registry about whether he had seen this name recently, whether he was making up a P file or whatever. I might have looked into the Soviet contact file.

Mr. Goldsmith. You said you did a thorough check of your files. What would you be looking for?

Mrs. Manell. I would be looking at the card index to see if we had a card on him which would indicate what files you could find the information in.

Mr. Goldsmith. P file or subject file?

Mrs. Manell. P file or subject file, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did you link Oswald to any --

Mrs. Manell. And I looked at unfiled stuff too, as I recall.
Mr. Goldsmith. Did you link Oswald to any earlier contact to either the Soviet or Cuban Embassy or Consulate?

Mrs. Manell. No. There was nothing to indicate that when I did make my check. I did a thorough check as I always did. There was nothing to indicate that. I looked in the unfiled pile of things to be filed which could be quite considerable since Mr. Scott did keep almost every scrap of paper that went through the station and there was nothing on him at that time.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did you check the photo production materials?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. This was an operational cable was it not?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. I thought earlier you said that we did not look at those files, no. When we sent cables, I know that we said that we did look at a photograph but I did not get that photograph out. Ann got the photograph. I told you before that we just did not ruffle through those photographic files. They were very sensitive.

Mr. Goldsmith. You also said before, however, as I recall, that as a matter of procedure with regard to operational cables you would check transcripts.

Mrs. Manell. Yes. But since I was reviewing these on a
constant basis and since my memory was excellent then, I had a trained memory for dredging up information about people, I would have remembered if his name had come up.

Mr. Goldsmith. What about if his name had not come up but if there had been a contact by someone else, a contact by someone with either the Cuban or Soviet Embassy in which the person was seeking a visa?

Mrs. Manell. I would not see the Cuban transcript. However, Mr. Scott saw all transcripts. I don't know how many Annie saw. I don't know what she had to do with the Cuban transcript. But Mr. Scott definitely and I presume some other people in reading them would have seen the relationship. I did not see it because I did not read their transcript. As I say, I did a thorough check of the files and there was no indication of any other information on Oswald at that time including infuled material.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let us take a look at that cable now. I would like to refer you now to CIA 178. I believe this is a cable dated 8 October 1963. Is that correct?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Is this the cable that you sent?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, that is the cable I sent.

Mr. Goldsmith. Now, reading the first paragraph of this cable it does appear that the transcript you had in mind was this October transcript which is CIA number 13, is that
right?

Mrs. Manell. Right. This first section would have been
done on the basis of the transcript. The second section would
have been offered to me by my husband and Annie. They would
have worked on that.

Mr. Goldsmith. Now, turning from the cable back to the
transcript here it says in brackets, comment by the trans-
lator, the same who phoned a day or so ago and spoke in broken
Russian.

Mrs. Manell. Right.

Mr. Goldsmith. Despite this indication here I believe
your testimony is that you did not go back to check the
transcript because by virtue of your memory you knew that
Oswald's name had not come up in any earlier conversation,
is that correct?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Turning to the second paragraph of the
cable it says "have photos of a male who appears to be an
American entering SOVEMB 1216 hours, leaving 1222 on 1
October. Apparent age 35, athletic build, circa feet,
receding ahirline, balding top, wore khakis and sport shirt."

Can you explain how that photograph was obtained and
why reference to it was made in the cable?

Mrs. Manell. It was dredged up from the files by Ann
Goodpasture.
Mrs. Goldsmith. Not by you?

Mrs. Manell. No. I did not have access, neither did anyone else at the station, to go indiscriminately in those files. They were very sensitive. She and the head of the Soviet Section discussed this and gave me these particulars to include in the cable. She was very good at figuring out height because she would compare them with other things. She knew the specific heights of people and she had really developed quite an ability to do that, so I relied on her information and put that in the cable.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did Ann think that that photo showed Oswald?

Mrs. Manell. We say "appears to be". What we are trying to do was just correlate anything that we had.

Mr. Goldsmith. That does not quite answer the question. Did Ann think that the photo --

Mrs. Manell. I don't know what she thought.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did you talk to here about the photograph?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. She gave you a photo and she gave you the information contained in paragraph 2?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know whether she gave it to me. I know she discussed it with my husband. Which one gave it to me I don't know.
Mrs. Manell. Yes, but Mr. Goldsmith. Basically you were given this inform-

tion and --

Mrs. Manell. Yes, because I did not know anything

about any of this.

Mr. Goldsmith. You were basically given this informa-
tion and you sent it to Washington and at least with regard
to the information contained in paragraph 2 you did not
analytical work, you were just given that information?

Mrs. Manell. That is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. Now, Oswald's contract with the Soviet
Embassy, according to the cable, was on 1st October, or at least
he spoke to the Embassy on 1 October. Why did it take one
week for the cable to go out to headquarters?

Mrs. Manell. What day was 1 October and what day was
8 October?

Mr. Goldsmith. 1 October was a Tuesday.

Mrs. Manell. Wednesday, Thursday, by Friday probably
I had it. I don't know this was the case. I can only assume
now. Saturday and Sunday, we did not work Saturday and
Sunday unless we were working on something special that we
wanted to come in. Probably did not consider it that
important. It was one American. A number of others had been
at the Soviet Embassy throughout the summer. I just didn't
think it was that important.

Mr. Golds
Mr. Goldsmith. When did Ann give you the photograph
or the information?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know. Presumably I got it the day
I wrote the cable. She probably came in -- it was really a
matter of here is another one of these things again and we
were having a little gabble about who should sent it up
because it was a pain to do these. I probably, I think I
handled it as soon as I got it -- but I think there was a
discussion, as I say maybe a half a day, about who was going
to do it. It was done because it was required but it was
considered unimportant.

Mr. Goldsmith. In his book "Night Watch", Dave
Phillips --

Mrs. Manell. I have not read his book.

Mr. Goldsmith. Well, you should read it. You are
mentioned in the book.

Mrs. Manell. Really?

Mr. Goldsmith. Not by name but mention is made of you.
The gist of it was that the cable that linked the photo to
Oswald was sent out because you had read the transcript, you
had in front of you the photograph of this man, and Mr.
Phillips' words were "you put one and one together and did not
really get two."

Mrs. Manell. That may be. We say that right in here.

Mr. Goldsmith. I know, but what he said is that you
actually had the photo.

Mrs. Manell. Well, I am not saying that the photo was not in our shop but I don't remember specifically looking at the photo. It could have been there. I don't know. I wasn't one who sat down and said I had nothing to do with the hours or deciding the date or saying he looks 35 and has an athletic build. I did not say any of that. I probably saw the photograph at sometime but I did not see the photograph when I was writing this second paragraph. Ask Ann Goodpasture and my husband about that.

Mr. Goldsmith. Anyway, Mr. Phillips is incorrect when he attributes any analytical work to you?

Mrs. Manell. No, I wouldn't say so. The work I did was all analytical.

Mr. Goldsmith. Only with regard to this particular cable?

Mrs. Manell. You mean having to do with photographs?

Mr. Goldsmith. With this particular cable.

Mrs. Manell. Having to do with the second paragraph of this cable about the physical description of the person and when he entered and left, I had nothing to do with that.

Mr. Goldsmith. Have you read pages 140 and 141 of "Night Watch"?

Mrs. Manell. No. I just looked at this part up here.

Mr. Goldsmith. You read page 141?
Mrs. Manell. Yes. He does not have the facts straight. I presume he has not seen this file. He is doing it from memory. I don't get excited about this at all.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you agree or disagree with his version of the facts?

Mrs. Manell. I don't agree with it. I can see -- if you did not have this cable in front of you -- we are getting down to the phonetics and everything else. No, he doesn't present the facts as they occurred there. He is doing it from memory obviously.

Mr. Goldsmith. It says here, "Craig's wife," referring to you, "incorrectly surmised that contact was made by another person, photographed as an individual of interest because he had frequented the Soviet Embassy. She was describing the mysterious stranger and not, as found later, the person making the contact. She put one (Oswald seeking visa from the Soviet) and one (an unknown visit or to the Russian Embassy) together and come up with an incorrect two. The assumption that the two men were the same."

Mrs. Manell. We never said they were the same. It says so right here. The first paragraph describes this person's contact with the Embassy. The second section merely says, "have photos of a male. Appears to be American", and describes him. We are not saying that this person is the person in the first paragraph at all.
Mr. Goldsmith. Fine. I understand that point. I think the cable speaks for itself as you indicated.

The second point Mr. Phillips made, however, was that you had done the analytical work here, you had put the transcript together with the photograph. In fact, the photograph was given to you.

Mrs. Manell. That is right. The photograph was reviewed -- I don't think, I don't see anything to be upset about this really.

Mr. Goldsmith. There may not be anything to be upset about but it is not accurate, is it?

Mrs. Manell. Well, it makes good reading.

Mr. Goldsmith. Is it accurate?

Mrs. Manell. None of it is accurate because there is no such person as Craig or this or that. When you get down to this kind of thing it is not going to be accurate anyway.

Mr. Goldsmith. There is not any such person as Craig but we know Craig refers to your husband, Mrs. Manell, and "his wife" refers to you. Is his story accurate or inaccurate?

Mrs. Manell. It is inaccurate.

Mr. Goldsmith. Why is it inaccurate?

Mrs. Manell. Because we never said one and one makes two. We never said the subject of the cable was the same as the person described in the second paragraph of the cable.
We said maybe. That is all we said.

Mr. Goldsmith. I understand that. He also said that you were the person responsible for putting the two together.

Mrs. Manell. In his mind. In no one else's mind were they ever put together.

Mr. Goldsmith. So that aspect of it is not correct, you were not responsible for analytical work regarding the transcripts and the photographs, is that correct?

Mrs. Manell. I wrote the first paragraph and I did not write the second paragraph. The information in the second paragraph was given to me because I did not have access to the photographs.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let me rephrase the question. Did you in any way link the photograph to Oswald based upon analysis which you yourself had done?

Mrs. Manell. I never did analytical work as concerned the photographs, never.

Mr. Goldsmith. This particular photograph?

Mrs. Manell. This photograph or any other photograph.

Mr. Goldsmith. I would like to refer your attention now to CIA number 14 and 15. Will you please read that?

Mrs. Manell. What is the date of this? The 28th?

Mr. Goldsmith. The date is September 28, 1963.

Mrs. Manell. I did not see this at the time I wrote the cable. That is definite because I would have included this
in it.

Mr. Goldsmith. What is the date on the transcript?

Mrs. Manell. The date on the transcript is 28 September.

Mr. Goldsmith. You are indicating that you did not see this transcript beforehand? Is that correct?

Mrs. Manell. Wait a minute. Is this our stuff? Is this the Cuban stuff?

Mr. Goldsmith. Whic is it, yours or the Cuban? We need an answer for the record.

Mrs. Manell. I know you do but I am trying to see. I am looking at this. This is the basis that I wrote the cable. Therefore I could not have seen this or I would have put more information in. Maybe I decided it was not that vital anyway. I am not clear on it at this minute. I would say I must have seen this after I wrote the cable and then I sent it as I indicated here over to Shaw who was responsible for the Cuban section of the station because I did not indicate in the cable any connection with the Cuban Embassy.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let us take it step by step and slowly. First of all, that is the conversation that was received off the Lienvoy type operation, that is the liaison tap operation, is that correct?

Mrs. Manell. Wait a minute. Let me go back and let me think this thing over. I have not seen these files for 14 or 15 years. I know I sent here in this cable that we are
discussing is the information that I had then.

Mr. Goldsmith. Mrs. Manell, we will get to that question later on. Let us do this step by step.

The first question I have is whether this is Lienvoy type operation?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. I thought you were trying to ask me how come --

Mr. Goldsmith. You are anticipating me. I may well ask it but I have something to ask before then.

Mr. Goldsmith. You have to remember that I haven't looked at these files in 15 years and I don't want to be tricked into anything either. I want to be very forthright and I want to try to remember to the best of my ability, but I could be wrong. That is all I want to say.

Mr. Goldsmith. I understand that. You just indicated that you have not seen these files in 15 years. It is true, however, is it not, that you reviewed these files and the specific transcript with Dan Hardway and Betsy Wolf and myself and your husband.

Mrs. Manell. At the time you showed me because you were specific about showing me specific pieces of paper in the file. I never had access to look at the file. You pointed out certain things to me. This cable, for example, I remember seeing.

Mr. Goldsmith. I believe at that time we showed you all
the transcripts. There are four or five transcripts and I
believe we showed you all of them at that time.

Mrs. Manell. I don't remember if I saw all of them. If
you say I did -- I am trying to put this back in chronological
order to see if this first paragraph here was complete or
incomplete. That is what I am trying to see.

Mr. Goldsmith. There are routing indications on CIA
document number 14, is that correct, opposite Goodpasture,
Shaw?

Mrs. Manell. That is my handwriting.

Mr. Goldsmith. Above that?

Mrs. Manell. That is my handwriting, Scott, Goodpasture,
and Shaw.

Mr. Goldsmith. When would you put those routing on
there?

Mrs. Manell. I am not sure. I don't know what date I
got these. I would have put them on as soon as I saw it.

As soon as I had seen it and did whatever I had to do with it,
then I sent it onward to Scott, Goodpasture and Shaw and to
file.

Mr. Goldsmith. First of all, I would like to say I am
not attempting to trick you here. Earlier you said that
according to routine procedure you would receive the tran-
script in chronological order?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.
Mr. Goldsmith. Therefore, if routine procedure were
followed in this case the transcript dated 28 September you
would have seen before the transcript dated 1 October.

Mrs. Manell. I would say in general that would be so,
yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know whether that was the case in
this particular instance?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let me put it this way. If you received
this transcript after the October 1st one it would seem to me
that you still would have received it prior to October 8, the
date that the cable was sent to headquarters.

Mrs. Manell. You would think so, yes, that seem logical,
but I don't know why unless I thought that wasn't that impor-
tant in the first place, that I just wanted to get his name
on the record. I am not clear whether I saw this because I
am generally quite thorough when I do something.

Mr. Goldsmith. I understand.

Mrs. Manell. I just can't recall this, I mean the
sequence of when I saw each piece. It talks here about how
he went to the Cuban Embassy. I don't mention that in here.
That is why I think I didn't see it.

Mr. Goldsmith. If you saw this after October 8, the date
the cable was sent?

Mrs. Manell. I would not necessarily send a cable follow-
up if that is what you mean. To my way of looking at it, this
is an American citizen, yes, in contact with the Soviets, true,
not of interest to us really. He was in overt contact with
the Soviet Embassy, We sould not be terribly interested in
him except for the fact that he is an American.

Mr. Goldsmith. It does not strike you as more signifi-
cant that the American contacts the Soviet Embassy and he also
contacts the Cuban Embassy? To me that would make him seem
more significant and therefore, if you found out about this
after the time the cable was sent you would have sent another
cable.

Mrs. Manell. I did not sent another cable but I know
another cable was sent. I didn't send it.

Mr. Goldsmith. Another cable concerning Oswald was sent?

Mrs. Manell. I think so. Where is the whole file?

Wasn't there a cable saying he was in touch with the Cuban
Embassy?

Mr. Goldsmith. We have not seen one.

Mrs. Manell. I am pretty sure there was.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did you send that cable?

Mrs. Manell. No, I did not send the cable. When I found
out about it I remember this, I said how come?

Mr. Goldsmith. Who did? Do you know?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know who sent it. I think Ann
might have. She might have sent a follow-up one with this
information. I know I didn't have this because I would have been more thorough in the first paragraph. Why not put it all in? If I got this later I did not handle it. I know I did not send any cable of that.

Mr. Goldsmith. For the record, will you indicate what information is contained in that transcript that is not included in the cable?

Mrs. Manell. This indicates that -- wait a minute, there is no name mentioned here, is that right?

Mr. Goldsmith. Right. That is a good point. Does this transcript, dated 28 September, refer to the person speaking in broken Russian by name?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. Is Oswald's name mentioned at all?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. Essentially it indicates a contact with the Cuban Embassy, the fact that he had been at the Cuban Embassy?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. That is essentially all, isn't that it?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. Wait a minute now. Don't we say some-where there -- it could be that I did see this first.

Mr. Goldsmith. By this you are referring to the trans-
script?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. And there was no name mentioned. I
am trying to see when Boris said that it seems as though, if
he tried to link up the two. Let me say this. I know, at
least I am quite sure, that there was a cable sent after this
first cable that I sent that showed that he was in touch with
the Cuban Embassy. I did not send the cable.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let us move on to some of these other
transcripts. I would like to refer your attention now to
CIA number 17 and 18, which is a transcript dated 27 September
1963, the time is 1605 hours. Will you please read that?
There is a translation on the next page if you would like to
look at that, too.

Mrs. Manell. I don't remember ever seeing this.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you remember seeing the transcript
before?

Mrs. Manell. I don't remember seeing it but I could be
wrong.

Mr. Goldsmith. Whose handwriting is on the lefthand
side of the page?

Mr. Scott's.

Mr. Goldsmith. To the best of your memory, prior to the
time that the cable of October 8 was sent you did not see this
transcript dated 9/27/63?

Mrs. Manell. I just don't remember. Unless I skimmed
over it and I did not see anything, because the real meat of
the information is 1 October and this is 27 September and it
is unnamed. I may not have connected them.

I don't know whether I didn't see it or I saw it and
didn't connect them. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. Moving back to the transcript dated
September 28, 1963, are you certain nevertheless that
certainly before the assassination this transcript was linked
to Oswald?

Mrs. Manell. This has to be the one that was sent, that
there was a follow-up cable that was sent that showed that
Oswald was in touch with the Cuban Embassy as well as the
Soviet Embassy. I don't know if there is anything else that
you don't have. I don't know if the cable was sent on the
basis of this specific piece of information here or not, I
don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. My question is this. The September 28
transcript you clearly saw at some time?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. I wrote on it.

Mr. Goldsmith. My specific question, forgetting about
whether another cable was sent to CIA headquarters, my
specific question is whether this transcript was linked to
Oswald prior to the assassination?

Mrs. Manell. What does the transcriber say about this
voice? Does he link it with -- this transcript or a similar
one must have been a basis for the cable that was sent
linking --
Mr. Goldsmith. I really don't want you to focus or be concerned now about the other cable that was sent. My question is whether this transcript was linked to Oswald prior to the assassination, and I am referring now to the 28 September 1963 transcript.

Mrs. Manell. I can't tell you. Is there anything here that you see that says that this person speaking broken Russian is the same as -- I don't see anything about the Cuban Embassy. I don't understand this. I must have seen this after I sent this cable. I did not send a subsequent cable.

Mr. Goldsmith. You are certain one was sent?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. My question really still has not been answered. Prior to the assassination was the transcript dated September 28, 1963, linked to Oswald?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know that. There was some information that was linked because a cable was sent saying that Oswald had not only appeared at the Soviet Embassy but had a connection with the Cuban Embassy. That is all I know.

Mr. Goldsmith. According to the Agency's records there was only this one cable dated October 8, 1963.

Mrs. Manell. I don't understand this. I know that there was a link, I know that it was reported that there was a cable sent after this. It was a cable that was sent after this
that indicated that he was in touch with the Cubans as well as with Soviets. I did not send the cable.

Mr. Goldsmith. Based upon that, you are saying that Oswald was linked to this transcript of September 28?

Mrs. Manell. This or some other transcript, I don't know. I mean this is not a complete run of the transcripts for this period that we were covering. You see, if you had that --

Mr. Goldsmith. You are correct, the transcripts that we have here are those that the Agency has provided us and said have been linked to Oswald.

Mrs. Manell. Then this must have been the one. If that is the case, then I am sure this is the one if that is what they told you.

Mr. Goldsmith. When you say this is the one?

Mrs. Manell. Because this is the one that refers to the Cuban Embassy. If they say that this is the piece of information that links Oswald to the Cuban Embassy, then this is the piece of information.

Mr. Goldsmith. They don't say that. They have given us all of the transcripts that they say are linked to Oswald.

Mrs. Manell. I don't have any reason to think that there would be more except I can't pin down and say this was the specific one that was used as the basis for linking the two. That is all I am saying.
Mr. Goldsmith. Let us move on to CIA numbers 19 and 20. Number 19 is the transcript dated September 27, 1963, the time is 1626 hours. Would you please read that?

Mrs. Manell. I don't understand this time sequence on this at all because I did not see all of this about a wife, about four to five months, about any of this. It is a mystery to me. I don't understand it. It is not that I don't understand the transcript when I am looking at it. I am saying I don't understand how these things could ante-date my cable and not be put in the cable. That is what I am saying. I don't know when I saw these. I did see this because that is my writing there.

Mr. Goldsmith. What we have here is the situation under which according to the standard operating procedure you would have reviewed everything in chronological order. We have transcripts from September 27 and 28 which you are now saying you perhaps did not receive until after October 1st or after October 8th when you sent the cable to headquarters.

Mrs. Manell. Yes, because there would be no reason why not show this? Why would I not want to show it? It would add more information that I wanted to send about him even though we thought he was an unimportant American. If he would in touch with the Cuban Embassy I would have said so.

Mr. Goldsmith. If you sent the first cable to CIA
headquarters why would the responsibility for sending another
cable be delegated to anybody else but you?

Mrs. Manell. Maybe I wasn't there because I worked part
time. Perhaps I wasn't there. I see here he gives her
some action to take.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who wrote that?

Mrs. Manell. That is Mr. Scott's writing.

Mr. Goldsmith. He gave it to whom?

Mrs. Manell. To Annie. That is why I think the second
cable was written. I can't say for a certitude that Annie
wrote it but I think she did. I know there was a cable that
was sent that linked him to the Cubans, to the Cuban Embassy.
He is still unidentified.

Mr. Goldsmith. It says copy to Oswald P file. This is
on CIA number 19. When would that P file have been opened?

Mrs. Manell. I would think with the cable, the first
cable that I sent, and then all the information that had to
do with it would be put in that file, subsequent information.
I say here "Soviet contacts." At that point there was no
P file established for him. This is where we put anyone in
touch with the Soviet Embassy including Americans.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who wrote reference to P files?

Mrs. Manell. This is my writing here. I think that is
Herb's writing. This is not either of our writings here. It
is not Scott's writing, it is not anybody's here.
Mr. Goldsmith. Here is the point, that the transcript is dated September 27, 1963. It indicates that a copy is to go to Oswald's P files.

Mrs. Manell. Yes, but I have "file Soviet contact", and somebody else put this in. I didn't know that this was a P file, maybe I would have, I could have put it in both places.

Mr. Goldsmith. When would this have gotten into his P file?

Mrs. Manell. Immediately. As I told you before, when I went into Registry I did a thorough check. I would have checked all P files. I would have checked the Soviet contact file. I also checked, I remember, the unfiled stuff because we sometimes got a pile of that. I found no reference to Oswald. Now, this of course is not definitely Oswald at this time. It is about an unknown person who talks about going to Russia, about his wife and all of that.

Mr. Goldsmith. Oswald is not mentioned by name in any of these others, is he?

Mrs. Manell. No. In any of the ones we are discussing now he is not mentioned by name.

Mr. Goldsmith. Mrs. Manell, do you recall the interview that you had with Dan Hardway, Betsy Wolf and myself?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. In that interview Dan and Betsy were
taking notes. Based upon the notes of what you said that day
their best recollection was that in fact these transcripts
had been linked to Oswald prior to the assassination. Today
you are unclear about that.

Mrs. Manell. I am not talking about prior to the assas-
sination. I am talking in terms of the cable that I wrote.

Mr. Goldsmith. Could you give me the answer in terms of
the assassination in particular?

Mrs. Manell. I think if the transcriber says it is the
same person speaking in broken Russian, then it must be. I
am not doubting what he is saying.

Mr. Goldsmith. I agree that it must be the same person
or it may be the same person. That still does not answer the
question whether these transcripts were all linked to Oswald
prior to the assassination.

Mrs. Manell. I am sure they must have been, yes, but I
didn't do it, that is all I am saying. I had nothing to do
with the rest of it. I did the one thing and that is all I
did on Oswald.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who would have made that link and put
everything in the P files?

Mrs. Manell. The rest of the information? If it came
over my desk I would have sent it to his P file. I did not
do a roundup after all of this was over with. I only wrote
the original thing.
Mr. Goldsmith. Who would have made the link to Oswald? Would it have been Herbert Manell, your husband?

Mrs. Manell. I would think he and I together most probably because some of this is unclear. Boris would have had to do with it in connecting the broken Russian with the unidentified person.

Mr. Goldsmith. By the time of the assassination all of these materials would have been in his P file?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. To clarify, again to the best of your memory, you don't recall seeing the 27th and 28th transcripts prior to the time you sent the cable, the 10-8 cable?

Mrs. Manell. Let us put it this way, that I did not link them if I did see them. He was unnamed in it, in both of these transcripts. He was not named. If I saw them I did not think at that time that it was the person that I described in the cable or I would have put it in. It is either that or I didn't see it at the time I wrote the cable. Then I wouldn't have written a followup because he was on record. He was an American. I put him on record and that is all I did.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would you have written a followup if headquarters had requested to be kept apprised?

Mrs. Manell. I am just trying to think if the Cubans would have sent this. I don't understand this, that it just
came through on our lines. I just don't think that I could have seen these, is all I can think of. I was always trying to connect this one with that one whenever possible. If I had seen this I am sure I would have raised a lot of questions.

Mr. Goldsmith. This clearly came in on a Soviet phone?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. It would have been one of your lines?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. I am referring now to the 28 September 1963 transcript. Now, at the time of our interview, Mrs. Manell, according to the notes taken by Dan Hardway and Betsy Wolf you did not indicate to us at that time that you did not see the transcripts.

Mrs. Manell. I don't think you ever asked me that question.

Mr. Goldsmith. We certainly did.

Mrs. Manell. You did not ask me if there was a description. You did not suggest I was incomplete in sending the cable or raise any question like that at all that I remember. I mean, I am saying that I sent everything that was available to me when I sent that cable and I did not mention the Cuban Embassy. I would have mentioned the Cuban Embassy if I had seen it. It is a point of when it was recognized, when it was decided that these two unknowns were connected with Oswald. That is the point.
Mr. Goldsmith. That is exactly the issue.

Mrs. Manell. I am just not sure. I don't know. When did Boris link this up?

Mr. Goldsmith. One moment, Mrs. Manell.

Mrs. Manell. I remember those. There was something about this, the Cuban relationship because I remember being a bit annoyed, the more I think this thing through, about how come I didn't know about that. So there is something about either I didn't get this for some unknown reason -- perhaps they were holding it out to see if they could identify the person. I don't know. But there is something --

Mr. Goldsmith. Why don't you wait a moment. We are going to look up our notes, read them to you and have you comment on them.

I am going to read you the notes that were taken. They refer to you by your Agency pseudonym. "Dillinger was asked what action she took after receiving this transcript. She said she had already seen the prior transcripts and may have rechecked them. Because of the absence of information from prior transcripts in the cable, Gestetner -- Mr. Manell -- suggested that some of the prior transcripts may have been unavailable because they were being routed around the station."

"An examination of some of the prior transcripts revealed routing indications that Dillinger acknowledged writing."

Mrs. Manell. That is right.
Mr. Goldsmith. "After checking the station's files for further information on Oswald, she said she wrote the cable Mexico 6453"-- that is the cable dated October 8-- "and at the same time wrote a memo to the Legat. Dillinger acknowledged that the routing notation would have been written on the transcripts when she first received them. Gestetner acknowledged that a filing instruction directing one of the 9/27 conversations to the Oswald P file was in his handwriting. He indicated that this notation would have been made at the time the P file was opened.

"Both Gestetner and Dillinger acknowledged that the connection between the conversations was noted prior to the assassination."

Are those notes accurate?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. I don't believe I am contradicting myself. It is a little confusing, I can see. I am trying to answer to the best of my ability but all I am saying is that when I sent the first cable, if I had known about the connection with the Cubans or I had associated it -- I may not have associated it because he was not named, that is the only thing.

Mr. Goldsmith. I would like to stress again, the aim here is not to catch you in contradictions. Please don't misunderstand me. We are trying to review the record and have you explain it to us.
Mrs. Manell. I understand. I will try.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let us move on to CIA 183.

Mrs. Manell. It isn't that I am saying now that I didn't see these in sequence.

Mr. Goldsmith. You mean you may not have made the connection?

Mrs. Manell. That is right. That is all I am saying now in looking at this because I am thorough when I do something, you can bet on it, and I did not see or connect these things because he is not named in these transcripts. It is possible I saw them in sequence but because he wasn't named I did not think that I could present it factually in the cable. So I sent the cable as I did.

It can go around and around, that is all.

Mr. Goldsmith. Mrs. Manell, your explanation is perfectly understandable.

Mrs. Manell. I am not trying to obscure anything.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let me see if I can summarize the explanation for you very briefly. I don't want to put words in your mouth. Tell me if this is accurate.

When we first went over these transcripts your first response was that "I couldn't have seen these because there is no mention made to them in the cable dated October 8." After we reviewed the transcript a bit more you reconsidered somewhat and testified that you may have seen the earlier
transcripts in sequence but that because none of those
transcripts referred specifically to Oswald by name, for that
reason there was no reference made in the October 8 cable to
these earlier transcripts.

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Is that accurate?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Fine. In any event prior to the assassi-
nation all of the transcripts were tied to Oswald?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let us move on to CIA number 183. This
is a cable dated 11 October 1963 from CIA headquarters to
Mexico City station. Would you read through that?

Mrs. Manell. Do I have know the content or are you
just establishing this is the one I saw?

Mr. Goldsmith. I think you can skim it. If I have a
specific question about the content I will draw your attention
to it. Do you remember reading that cable when it came into
Mexico City station?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Whose handwriting is this in the upper
left hand portion of the page which says "sic" underscored?

Mrs. Manell. That is Mr. Scott's handwriting. This is
his.

Mr. Goldsmith. Also his check mark?
Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would he have put these marks in at the time the cable arrived at the Mexico City station?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, before he routed it he put those in.

Mr. Goldsmith. Now, the cable refers to Oswald as Lee Henry Oswald?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, that is why he put "sic" because he had it as Lee Oswald. He is saying it is Lee Henry Oswald. It is the full name which may or may not be our man. That is the way I interpret it when he put "sic".

Mr. Goldsmith. Are you interpreting the term "sic" to mean AKA, also known as?

Mrs. Manell. Not necessarily. I am saying this is the way headquarters has information on Lee Henry Oswald who may or may not be our Lee Oswald. That is why he put "sic".

Mr. Goldsmith. Generally the term "sic" is used to refer to a word or a subject and indicating that an error has been committed.

Mrs. Manell. That is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. When he refers to Lee Henry Oswald and sic is pointing to Henry do you think Scott is indicating there was an error here, that it was not Henry, it was Harvey?

Mrs. Manell. The first time I saw this I interpreted it to mean, and I am sure he meant that, this is headquarters information on a Lee Henry Oswald. We reported on a Lee
Oswald. So he is saying this could or could not be.

Mr. Goldsmith. Headquarters might be mistaken, it is a possibility?

Mrs. Manell. It is a possibility, yes. That is how I interpreted what he wrote. Not that he couldn't be our man, he could be, but it is just that the name is different.

Mr. Goldsmith. Paragraph 5 indicates, "Please keep headquarters advised of any further contact or possible identification of Oswald."

Mrs. Manell. Right. That would suggest that if there was lineage in all of that through here, I would think someone would have written another cable about all of this. From here on it was not in my hands.

Mr. Goldsmith. Please refer to CIA number 182. This is a routing sheet --

Mrs. Manell. Here is the date for the P file setup right here.

Mr. Goldsmith. Whose handwriting is that?

Mrs. Manell. That is Mr. Scott's.

Mr. Goldsmith. Mr. Scott is indicating here that a P file should be opened up, is that correct?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. A P file would have been opened up on Oswald shortly after October 11, 1963?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. Prior to that we would have had no
Soviet contact information on him.

Mr. Goldsmith. I would like to show you now CIA number 181 which is the headquarters copy of the October 11 cable. It indicates that Thomas Karamassines was the releasing officer.

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Why would Mr. Karamassines be the releasing officer?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you regard that as unusual, someone high up in the organization being a releasing officer?

Mrs. Manell. Perhaps because all of the other agencies are involved. I don't know. You would have to know what the rules and regulations are. Maybe because these various people were involved. That may have something to do with why he released it.

Mr. Goldsmith. So, those other agencies would not as a matter of routine be notified when an ordinary American contacts the Soviet Embassy?

Mrs. Manell: No. We would routinely notify the Attache, our headquarters would have been notified by cable and it would have been their responsibility to notify appropriate authority.

Mr. Goldsmith. By the time this cable reached Mexico City it was clear that CIA headquarters anyway considered Oswald's contact to be fairly significant, perhaps by virtue
of his background as a defector. Is that an accurate state-
ment?

Mrs. Manell. I guess so. I wasn't involved in all of
this.

Mr. Goldsmith. They certainly considered it sufficiently
important to notify all these other agencies?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, Looking at his background, the fact
that he had been in the Soviet Union and married a Soviet
woman, there was something strange about him.

Mr. Goldsmith. This particular cable, referring to 183,
the first paragraph, contains a correct description of Oswald
does it not?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know. I don't know, I never did
read how tall he was or anything else.

Mr. Goldsmith. It contains a description that the
Agency had on file for Oswald?

Mrs. Manell. For a Lee Henry Oswald, right.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know whether at that time anyone
at Mexico City station went back to the photograph to see
whether they matched?

Mrs. Manell. I couldn't answer that. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. On number 183, in the margin it says
24 years old.

Mrs. Manell. I don't know whose writing that is. I was
looking at that. This is the same writing. I don't know who
wrote that.

Mr. Goldsmith. Is it possible that it is Ann Goodpasture?

Mrs. Manell. I don't think White wrote like that. It
is not Scott's writing, it could have been White's, it could
have been Good pasture's. It is not mine. It is not Herb's
because I know his writing. It could have been someone in
files.

Mr. Goldsmith. Now, number 182 asks about photos. Mr.
Scott indicated --

Mrs. Manell. Yes, and put all data we have into it and
then he has a question mark, photo. This goes to the file.

That is me.

Mr. Goldsmith. This is action per paragraph 5 taken
October 1963?

Mrs. Manell. It looks like 15, it is 15 or 13.

Mr. Goldsmith. I believe Ann Goodpasture wrote "we
should ask headquarters for photo." She is in paragraph 4?

Mrs. Manell. That is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. This says action was taken?

Mrs. Manell. I took that. That is my writing. So we
wrote up memos.

Mr. Goldsmith. This here were it says "action per
paragraph 4 taken" does that refer to number 4 over here?

Mrs. Manell. Action per para 4 means down here.

Mr. Goldsmith. The cable?
Mrs. Manell. Yes. I wrote that. That is my writing.

Mr. Goldsmith. Now, I am referring you to CIA 185.

This is a cable to the Director.

Mrs. Manell. I don't know. I imagine Ann wrote that, or Herb.

Mr. Goldsmith. This is a cable asking for the photo?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. I didn't send it. I think Ann did because she was told to by Mr. Scott, he put "photos question mark." So that would have been her job.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who wrote this over here?

Mrs. Manell. That is my handwriting.

Mr. Goldsmith. Referring to action taken?

Mrs. Manell. Yes. This paragraph here in the cable which means the dissemination.

Mr. Goldsmith. Let us look at CIA number 187. Please read through that and tell us what it is. Would you identify this document?

Mrs. Manell. It is a memorandum from Mr. Scott to the Ambassador, to the U.S. Ambassador.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who is actually the author of the memo?

Mrs. Manell. I was.

Mr. Goldsmith. This was prepared for Mr. Scott?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. This is in reference to the Oswald contract, is that right?
Mr. Goldsmith. At the bottom of the page it indicates who else was to receive a copy?

Mrs. Manell. That is right.

Mr. Goldsmith. Why were so many people given copies of this memo, do you know?

Mrs. Manell. Because it was requested that we send it to them.

Mr. Goldsmith. In other words, the cable requested that?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. So, the cable indicated that headquarters was going to be routing this to the centrally located headquarters of the Agency in Washington, D. C., for example, and that Mexico City station was to contact the agency's local offices in Mexico City?

Mrs. Manell. Through memo, yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Now, this memo is dated 16 October. It also makes no reference to the contact with the Cuban Embassy.

Mrs. Manell. Well, because we were just following and doing what they told us to do. Which is send this information.

Mr. Goldsmith. Will you read paragraph 4 of the 183?

Mrs. Manell. "Station should pass info ref in para 1 to those various places."

Mr. Goldsmith. What does that mean when it says "info ref"?

Mrs. Manell. Any information contained in the reference,
which was our original cable.

Mr. Goldsmith. Basically you felt that your obligation was to tell them only about the --

Mrs. Manell. We sent everything but we did not put in height, weight and all of that. Why did they need to know that? We gave them the basic information for indentifying the person by name. We tole them what headquarters asked us to tell them.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know if a memo was sent to the other agencies when you found out that Oswald had been to the Cuban Embassy?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. Were any of these other agencies ever notified that Oswald was seeking a visa?

Mrs. Manell. We notified them as indicated here.

Mr. Goldsmith. This does not really say he is going to get a visa though, referring to number 197.

Mrs. Manell. What do we say in the cable? Did we say it was a visa?

Mr. Goldsmith. Here is the cable, it makes reference to a telegram. So the cable does not refer to a visa.

Mrs. Manell. Except we talk about consul.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would a consul be responsible for granting a visa?

Mrs. Manell. You might think that. I think the logical
thing would be to think that.

Mr. Goldsmith. Essentially your memo to the Ambassador gave in substance the information that you had sent to head-
quarters in your cable with some additional information?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, the information that headquarters asked us to send in addition.

Mr. Goldsmith. Paragraph 3 says "This office will advise you if additional information on this matter is received."

Do you know whether that information was ever sent?

Mrs. Manell. I don't know. I don't remember sending anything, I know.

Mr. Goldsmith. Mrs. Manell, if at the time the P file had been opened up all the transcripts had been tied into Oswald, by then it was known that Oswald was requesting a visa; wouldn't that be a fair statement?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Yet the memo to the Ambassador does not refer to that. Is there any particular reason why?

Mrs. Manell. Because we handled it and we were very careful in what we sent people. We sent them factual infor-
mation. We were told what to send and that is what we sent based on the original cable and the additional information. I did not reword it, in other words.

Mr. Goldsmith. You made an affirmative statement that you have no clarifying information.
Mrs. Manell. That is the way we decided to send it out. I don't know whether it is oversight on my part. Whether we just wanted to get it on the record or what, or did we want to give a whole grocery list about this man, I don't remember what went through our minds. I don't remember discussing it with anyone. Maybe I made the decision not to include the grocery list but give a bare outline. I did what headquarters asked me to, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. Goldsmith. The paragraph also indicates that you determined that Oswald had been in contact with Kostikov.

Mrs. Manell. That is mentioned in the transcript.

Mr. Goldsmith. How did you determine that?

Mrs. Manell. It said so in the transcript. I just finished reading it awhile ago. He is identified here.

Mr. Goldsmith. You are looking at the transcript of October 1st?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Looking at CIA number 13, which is the transcript from October 1st, is there a reference there to Kostikov?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Referring to CIA number 177, the cable dated October 8, here it reports that Oswald contacted the Soviet Embassy on 29 September. He spoke with consul whom he believed to be Kostikov. My question is, how would you get
from someone whom you believed --

Mrs. Manell. We knew it was Kostikov. He was in the Consulate Section. That is a description of him.

Mr. Goldsmith. How did you know that? You knew that Kostikov was in the Consulate Section?

Mrs. Manell. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Weren't there any other people in the Consulate Section that Oswald talked to?

Mrs. Manell. I don't remember the physical description of Kostikov. But I knew a whole lot about him. I probably decided that it was Kostikov.

Mr. Goldsmith. I have no further questions.

I thank you for cooperating with us.

Mrs. Manell. Is there anything that is unclear that I can help in any way?

Mr. Goldsmith. Was there any additional action taken on this matter prior to the assassination other than the cable that you think was sent to CIA headquarters?

Mrs. Manell. I am sure there was, but I didn't do it. I don't know.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did you assist your husband with this case after the assassination?

Mrs. Manell. Yes, in terms of following Soviet movements. Yes, we did considerable work on that.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was that the only aspect of your
involvement?

Mrs. Manell. As I recall, that is what we concerned ourselves with.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you know anything about the 1977 Inspector General report?

Mrs. Manell. No.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did anyone from the Inspector General's office of the CIA ever contact you?

Mrs. Manell. I have never been contacted, never.

Mr. Goldsmith. You have been very patient, Mrs. Manell. I want to thank you for your time.

Normally when we have a hearing, we give the witness an opportunity to make a statement. If you would like that opportunity now, please feel free.

Mrs. Manell. I can't think of anything. I have tried to be as forthright as possible. Are there any contradictions in your mind? I can see where we had difficulty over these transcripts. I am just not clear, I am just not clear about time sequence. But I know if I realized that this unnamed person was Oswald and was in touch with the Cuban Embassy that would have been a part of the original cable. There is no question about my not including it. If I had had that information it would have been included.

Mr. Goldsmith. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Manell. You are welcome.
Mr. Goldsmith. If your husband would like to come in here, I can do a marathon, but if you would like to break for lunch, that is fine.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the hearing was concluded.)
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